The Mayflower and Her Log; July 15, 1620-May 6, 1621 — Complete eBook

The Mayflower and Her Log; July 15, 1620-May 6, 1621 — Complete

The following sections of this BookRags Literature Study Guide is offprint from Gale's For Students Series: Presenting Analysis, Context, and Criticism on Commonly Studied Works: Introduction, Author Biography, Plot Summary, Characters, Themes, Style, Historical Context, Critical Overview, Criticism and Critical Essays, Media Adaptations, Topics for Further Study, Compare & Contrast, What Do I Read Next?, For Further Study, and Sources.

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Encyclopedia of Popular Fiction: "Social Concerns", "Thematic Overview", "Techniques", "Literary Precedents", "Key Questions", "Related Titles", "Adaptations", "Related Web Sites".

The following sections, if they exist, are offprint from Beacham's Guide to Literature for Young Adults: "About the Author", "Overview", "Setting", "Literary Qualities", "Social Sensitivity", "Topics for Discussion", "Ideas for Reports and Papers".

Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Page 1

INTRODUCTORY

O civilized humanity, world-wide, and especially to the descendants of the Pilgrims who, in 1620, laid on New England shores the foundations of that civil and religious freedom upon which has been built a refuge for the oppressed of every land, the story of the Pilgrim "Exodus" has an ever-increasing value and zest. The little we know of the inception, development, and vicissitudes of their bold scheme of colonization in the American wilderness only serves to sharpen the appetite for more.

Every detail and circumstance which relates to their preparations; to the ships which carried them; to the personnel of the Merchant Adventurers associated with them, and to that of the colonists themselves; to what befell them; to their final embarkation on their lone ship,—the immortal *may-Flower*; and to the voyage itself and to its issues, is vested to-day with, a supreme interest, and over them all rests a glamour peculiarly their own.

For every grain of added knowledge that can be gleaned concerning the Pilgrim sires from any field, their children are ever grateful, and whoever can add a well-attested line to their all-too-meagre annals is regarded by them, indeed by all, a benefactor.

Of those all-important factors in the chronicles of the "Exodus,"—the Pilgrim ships, of which the *may-Flower* alone crossed the seas,—and of the voyage itself, there is still but far too little known. Of even this little, the larger part has not hitherto been readily accessible, or in form available for ready reference to the many who eagerly seize upon every crumb of new-found data concerning these pious and intrepid Argonauts.

To such there can be no need to recite here the principal and familiar facts of the organization of the English "Separatist" congregation under John Robinson; of its emigration to Holland under persecution of the Bishops; of its residence and unique history at Leyden; of the broad outlook of its members upon the future, and their resultant determination to cross the sea to secure larger life and liberty; and of their initial labors to that end. We find these Leyden Pilgrims in the early summer of 1620, their plans fairly matured and their agreements between themselves and with their merchant associates practically concluded, urging forward their preparations for departure; impatient of the delays and disappointments which befell, and anxiously seeking shipping for their long and hazardous voyage.

It is to what concerns their ships, and especially that one which has passed into history as "the Pilgrim bark," the *may-Flower*, and to her pregnant voyage, that the succeeding chapters chiefly relate. In them the effort has been made to bring together in sequential relation, from many and widely scattered sources, everything germane that diligent and faithful research could discover, or the careful study and re-analysis of known data determine. No new and relevant item of fact discovered, however trivial in itself, has

failed of mention, if it might serve to correct, to better interpret, or to amplify the scanty though priceless records left us, of conditions, circumstances, and events which have meant so much to the world.

Page 2

As properly antecedent to the story of the voyage of the *may-Flower* as told by her putative "Log," albeit written up long after her boned lay bleaching on some unknown shore, some pertinent account has been given of the ship herself and of her "consort," the *Speedwell*; of the difficulties attendant on securing them; of the preparations for the voyage; of the Merchant Adventurers who had large share in sending them to sea; of their officers and crews; of their passengers and lading; of the troubles that assailed before they had "shaken off the land," and of the final consolidation of the passengers and lading of both ships upon the *may-Flower*, for the belated ocean passage. The wholly negative results of careful search render it altogether probable that the original journal or "Log" of the *may-Flower* (a misnomer lately applied by the British press, and unhappily continued in that of the United States, to the recovered original manuscript of Bradford's "History of Plimoth Plantation "), if such journal ever existed, is now hopelessly lost.

So far as known, no previous effort has been made to bring together in the consecutive relation of such a journal, duly attested and in their entirety, the ascertained daily happenings of that destiny-freighted voyage. Hence, this later volume may perhaps rightly claim to present —and in part to be, though necessarily imperfect—the sole and a true "Log of the *may-Flower*." No effort has been made, however, to reduce the collated data to the shape and style of the ship's "Log" of recent times, whose matter and form are largely prescribed by maritime law. While it is not possible to give, as the original—if it existed—would have done, the results of the navigators' observations day by day; the "Lat." and "Long."; the variations of the wind and of the magnetic needle; the tallies of the "lead" and "log" lines; "the daily run," *etc*.—in all else the record may confidently be assumed to vary little from that presumably kept, in some form, by Captain Jones, the competent Master of the Pilgrim bark, and his mates, Masters Clarke and Coppin.

As the charter was for the "round voyage," all the features and incidents of that voyage until complete, whether at sea or in port, properly find entry in its journal, and are therefore included in this compilation, which it is hoped may hence prove of reference value to such as take interest in Pilgrim studies. Although the least pleasant to the author, not the least valuable feature of the work to the reader—especially if student or writer of Pilgrim history—will be found, it is believed, in the numerous corrections of previously published errors which it contains, some of which are radical and of much historical importance. It is true that new facts and items of information which have been coming to light, in long neglected or newly discovered documents, *etc*., are correctives

Page 3

of earlier and natural misconceptions, and a certain percentage of error is inevitable, but many radical and reckless errors have been made in Pilgrim history which due study and care must have prevented. Such errors have so great and rapidly extending power for harm, and, when built upon, so certainly bring the superstructure tumbling to the ground, that the competent and careful workman can render no better service than to point out and correct them wherever found, undeterred by the association of great names, or the consciousness of his own liability to blunder. A sound and conscientious writer will welcome the courteous correction of his error, in the interest of historical accuracy; the opinion of any other need not be regarded.

Some of the new contributions (or original demonstrations), of more or less historical importance, made to the history of the Pilgrims, as the author believes, by this volume, are as follows:—

(a) A closely approximate list of the passengers who left Delfshaven on the *Speedwell* for Southampton; in other words, the names—those of Carver and Cushman and of the latter's family being added—of the Leyden contingent of the *may-Flower* Pilgrims.

(b) A closely approximate list of the passengers who left London in the *may-Flower* for Southampton; in other words, the names (with the deduction of Cushman and family, of Carver, who was at Southampton, and of an unknown few who abandoned the voyage at Plymouth) of the English contingent of the *may-Flower* Pilgrims.

(c) The establishment as correct, beyond reasonable doubt, of the date, Sunday, June 11/21, 1620, affixed by Robert Cushman to his letter to the Leyden leaders (announcing the "turning of the tide" in Pilgrim affairs, the hiring of the "pilott" Clarke, *etc*.), contrary to the conclusions of Prince, Arber, and others, that the letter could not have been written on Sunday.

(d) The demonstration of the fact that on Saturday, June 10/20, 1620, Cushman's efforts alone apparently turned the tide in Pilgrim affairs; brought Weston to renewed and decisive cooperation; secured the employment of a "pilot," and definite action toward hiring a ship, marking it as one of the most notable and important of Pilgrim "red-letter days."

(e) The demonstration of the fact that the ship of which Weston and Cushman took "the refusal," on Saturday, June 10/20, 1620, was not the *may-Flower*, as Young, Deane, Goodwin, and other historians allege.

(f) The demonstration of the fact (overthrowing the author's own earlier views) that the estimates and criticisms of Robinson, Carver, Brown, Goodwin, and others upon Robert Cushman were unwarranted, unjust, and cruel, and that he was, in fact, second to none

in efficient service to the Pilgrims; and hence so ranks in title to grateful appreciation and memory.

(g) The demonstration of the fact that the *may-Flower* was not chartered later than June 19/29, 1620, and was probably chartered in the week of June 12/22—June 19/29 of that year.

Page 4

(h) The addition of several new names to the list of the Merchant Adventurers, hitherto unpublished as such, with considerable new data concerning the list in general.

(i) The demonstration of the fact that Martin and Mullens, of the *may-Flower* colonists, were also Merchant Adventurers, while William White was probably such.

(j) The demonstration of the fact that "Master Williamson," the much-mooted incognito of Bradford's "Mourt's Relation" (whose existence even has often been denied by Pilgrim writers), was none other than the "ship's-merchant," or "purser" of the *may-Flower*,—-hitherto unknown as one of her officers, and historically wholly unidentified.

(k) The general description of; and many particulars concerning, the *may-Flower* herself; her accommodations (especially as to her cabins), her crew, *etc*., hitherto unknown.

(1) The demonstration of the fact that the witnesses to the nuncupative will of William Mullens were two of the *may*-FLOWER'S crew (one being possibly the ship's surgeon), thus furnishing the names of two more of the ship's company, and the only names—-except those of her chief officers—ever ascertained.

(m) The indication of the strong probability that the entire company of the Merchant Adventurers signed, on the one part, the charter-party of the *may-Flower*.

(n) An (approximate) list of the ages of the *may*-FLOWER'S passengers and the respective occupations of the adults.

(o) The demonstration of the fact that no less than five of the Merchant Adventurers cast in their lots and lives with the Plymouth Pilgrims as colonists.

(p) The indication of the strong probability that Thomas Goffe, Esquire, one of the Merchant Adventurers, owned the "*May-Flower*" when she was chartered for the Pilgrim voyage,—as also on her voyages to New England in 1629 and 1630.

(q) The demonstration of the fact that the Master of the *may-Flower* was Thomas Jones, and that there was an intrigue with Master Jones to land the Pilgrims at some point north of the 41st parallel of north latitude, the other parties to which were, not the Dutch, as heretofore claimed, but none other than Sir Ferdinando Gorges and the Earl of Warwick, chiefs of the "Council for New England," in furtherance of a successful scheme of Gorges to steal the Pilgrim colony from the London Virginia Company, for the more "northern Plantations" of the conspirators.

(r) The demonstration of the fact that a second attempt at stealing the colony—by which John Pierce, one of the Adventurers, endeavored to possess himself of the demesne and rights of the colonists, and to make them his tenants—was defeated only by the

intervention of the “Council” and the Crown, the matter being finally settled by compromise and the transfer of the patent by Pierce (hitherto questioned) to the colony.

Page 5

(s) The demonstration of the actual relations of the Merchant Adventurers and the Pilgrim colonists—their respective bodies being associated as but two partners in an equal copartnership, the interests of the respective partners being (probably) held upon differing bases—contrary to the commonly published and accepted view.

(t) The demonstration of the fact that the *may-Flower*—contrary to the popular impression—did not enter Plymouth harbor, as a "lone vessel," slowly "feeling her way" by chart and lead-line, but was undoubtedly piloted to her anchorage—previously "sounded" for her—by the Pilgrim shallop, which doubtless accompanied her from Cape Cod harbor, on both her efforts to make this haven, under her own sails.

(u) The indication of the strong probability that Thomas English was helmsman of the *may*-FLOWER'S shallop (and so savior of her sovereign company, at the entrance of Plymouth harbor on the stormy night of the landing on Clarke's Island), and that hence to him the salvation of the Pilgrim colony is probably due; and

(v) Many facts not hitherto published, or generally known, as to the antecedents, relationships, *etc*., of individual Pilgrims of both the Leyden and the English contingents, and of certain of the Merchant Adventurers.

For convenience' sake, both the Old Style and the New Style dates of many events are annexed to their mention, and double-dating is followed throughout the narrative journal or "Log" of the Pilgrim ship.

As the Gregorian and other corrections of the calendar are now generally well understood, and have been so often stated in detail in print, it is thought sufficient to note here their concrete results as affecting dates occurring in Pilgrim and later literature.

From 1582 to 1700 the difference between O.S. and N.S. was ten (10) days (the leap-year being passed in 1600). From 1700 to 1800 it was eleven (11) days, because 1700 in O.S. was leap-year. From 1800 to 1900 the difference is twelve (12) days, and from 1900 to 2000 it will be thirteen (13) days. All the Dutch dates were New Style, while English dates were yet of the Old Style.

There are three editions of Bradford's "History of Plimoth Plantation" referred to herein; each duly specified, as occasion requires. (There is, beside, a magnificent edition in photo-facsimile.) They are:—

(a) The original manuscript itself, now in possession of the State of Massachusetts, having been returned from England in 1897, called herein "orig. *Ms*."

(b) The Deane Edition (so-called) of 1856, being that edited by the late Charles Deane for the Massachusetts Historical Society and published in “Massachusetts Historical Collections,” vol. iii.; called herein “Deane’s ed.”

(c) The Edition recently published by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and designated as the “Mass. ed.”

Of “Mourt’s Relation” there are several editions, but the one usually referred to herein is that edited by Rev. Henry M. Dexter, D. D., by far the best. Where reference is made to any other edition, it is indicated, and “Dexter’s ed.” is sometimes named.

Page 6

AzelAmes.

Wakefield, *Massachusetts*,
March 1, 1901.

The Mayflower and her log

“Hail to thee, poor little ship *may-Flower*—of Delft Haven —poor, common-looking ship, hired by common charter-party for coined dollars,—caulked with mere oakum and tar, provisioned with vulgarest biscuit and bacon,—yet what ship Argo or miraculous epic ship, built by the sea gods, was other than a foolish bumbarge in comparison!”

ThomasCarlyle

CHAPTER I

The name—“*May-Flower*”

“Curiously enough,” observes Professor Arber, “these names [*may-Flower* and *Speedwell*] do not occur either in the Bradford manuscript or in ‘Mourt’s Relation.’”

[A Relation, or Journal, of the Beginning and Proceedings of the English Plantation settled at Plymouth in New England, *etc*. G. Mourt, London, 1622. Undoubtedly the joint product of Bradford and Winslow, and sent to George Morton at London for publication. Bradford says (op, cit. p. 120): “Many other smaler maters I omite, sundrie of them having been already published, in a Jurnall made by one of ye company,” *etc*. From this it would appear that Mourt’s Relation was his work, which it doubtless principally was, though Winslow performed an honorable part, as “Mourt’s” introduction and other data prove.]

He might have truthfully added that they nowhere appear in any of the letters of the “exodus” period, whether from Carver, Robinson, Cushman, or Weston; or in the later publications of Window; or in fact of any contemporaneous writer. It is not strange, therefore, that the Rev. Mr. Blaxland, the able author of the “Mayflower Essays,” should have asked for the authority for the names assigned to the two Pilgrim ships of 1620.

It seems to be the fact, as noted by Arber, that the earliest authentic evidence that the bark which bore the Pilgrims across the North Atlantic in the late autumn of 1620 was the *may-Flower*, is the “heading” of the “Allotment of Lands”—happily an “official” document—made at New Plymouth, New England, in March, 1623—It is not a little remarkable that, with the constantly recurring references to “the ship,”—the all-important factor in Pilgrim history,—her name should nowhere have found mention in the earliest Pilgrim literature. Bradford uses the terms, the “biger ship,” or the “larger ship,” and

Winslow, Cushman, Captain John Smith, and others mention simply the “vessel,” or the “ship,” when speaking of the *may-Flower*, but in no case give her a name.

It is somewhat startling to find so thorough-paced an Englishman as Thomas Carlyle calling her the *may-Flower* “of Delft-Haven,” as in the quotation from him on a preceding page. That he knew better cannot be doubted, and it must be accounted one of those ‘lapsus calami’ readily forgiven to genius,—proverbially indifferent to detail.

Page 7

Sir Ferdinando Gorges makes the curious misstatement that the Pilgrims had three ships, and says of them: "Of the three ships (such as their weak fortunes were able to provide), whereof two proved unserviceable and so were left behind, the third with great difficulty reached the coast of New England," *etc*.

CHAPTER II

THE MAY-FLOWER'S CONSORT THE SPEEDWELL

The *Speedwell* was the first vessel procured by the Leyden Pilgrims for the emigration, and was bought by themselves; as she was the ship of their historic embarkation at Delfshaven, and that which carried the originators of the enterprise to Southampton, to join the *may-Flower*, —whose consort she was to be; and as she became a determining factor in the latter's belated departure for New England, she may justly claim mention here as indeed an inseparable "part and parcel" of the *may*-FLOWER'S voyage.

The name of this vessel of associate historic renown with the *may-Flower* was even longer in finding record in the early literature of the Pilgrim hegira than that of the larger It first appeared, so far as discovered, in 1669—nearly fifty years after her memorable service to the Pilgrims on the fifth page of Nathaniel Morton's "New England's Memorial."

Davis, in his "Ancient Landmarks of Plymouth," makes a singular error for so competent a writer, when he says: "The agents of the company in England had hired the *Speedwell*, of sixty tons, and sent her to Delfthaven, to convey the colonists to Southampton." In this, however, he but follows Mather and the "Modern Universal History," though both are notably unreliable; but he lacks their excuse, for they were without his access to Bradford's "Historie." That the consort-pinnace was neither "hired" nor "sent to Delfthaven" duly appears.

Bradford states the fact,—that "a smale ship (of some 60 tune), was bought and fitted in Holand, which was intended to serve to help to transport them, so to stay in ye countrie and atend ye fishing and such other affairs as might be for ye good and benefite of ye colonie when they come ther." The statements of Bradford and others indicate that she was bought and refitted with moneys raised in Holland, but it is not easy to understand the transaction, in view of the understood terms of the business compact between the Adventurers and the Planters, as hereinafter outlined. The Merchant Adventurers—who were organized (but not incorporated) chiefly through the activity of Thomas Weston, a merchant of London, to "finance" the Pilgrim undertaking—were bound, as part of their engagement, to provide the necessary shipping,' *etc*., for the voyage. The "joint-stock or partnership," as it was called in the agreement of the Adventurers and Planters, was an equal partnership between but two parties, the Adventurers, as a body, being one of the co-partners; the Planter colonists,

Page 8

as a body, the other. It was a partnership to run for seven years, to whose capital stock the first-named partner (the Adventurers) was bound to contribute whatever moneys, or their equivalents,—some subscriptions were paid in goods, —were necessary to transport, equip, and maintain the colony and provide it the means of traffic, *etc*., for the term named. The second-named partner (the Planter body) was to furnish the men, women, and children, —the colonists themselves, and their best endeavors, essential to the enterprise,—and such further contributions of money or provisions, on an agreed basis, as might be practicable for them. At the expiration of the seven years, all properties of every kind were to be divided into two equal parts, of which the Adventurers were to take one and the Planters the other, in full satisfaction of their respective investments and claims. The Adventurers' half would of course be divided among themselves, in such proportion as their individual contributions bore to the sum total invested. The Planters would divide their half among their number, according to their respective contributions of persons, money, or provisions, as per the agreed basis, which was:
[Bradford's Historie, Deane's ed.; Arber, op. cit. p. 305. The fact that Lyford (Bradford, Historie, Mass. ed. p. 217) recommended that every "particular" (i.e. non-partnership colonist) sent out by the Adventurers—and they had come to be mostly of that class—-"should come over as an Adventurer, even if only a ser vant," and the fact that he recognized that some one would have to pay in L10 to make each one an Adventurer, would seem to indicate that any one was eligible and that either L10 was the price of the Merchant Adventurer's share, or that this was the smallest subscription which would admit to membership. Such "particular," even although an Adventurer, had no partnership share in the Planters' half-interest; had no voice in the government, and no claim for maintenance. He was, however, amenable to the government, subject to military duty and to tax. The advantage of being an Adventurer without a voice in colony affairs would be purely a moral one.]

that every person joining the enterprise, whether man, woman, youth, maid, or servant, if sixteen years old, should count as a share; that a share should be reckoned at L10, and hence that L10 worth of money or provisions should also count as a share. Every man, therefore, would be entitled to one share for each person (if sixteen years of age) he contributed, and for each L10 of money or provisions he added thereto, another share. Two children between ten and sixteen would count as one and be allowed a share in the division, but children under ten were to have only fifty acres of wild land. The scheme was admirable for its equity, simplicity, and elasticity, and was equally so for either capitalist or colonist.

Page 9

Goodwin notes, that, “in an edition of Cushman’s ‘Discourse,’ Judge Davis of Boston advanced the idea that at first the Pilgrims put all their possessions into a common stock, and until 1623 had no individual property. In his edition of Morton’s ‘Memorial’ he honorably admits his error.” The same mistake was made by Robertson and Chief Justice Marshall, and is occasionally repeated in this day. “There was no community of goods, though there was labor in common, with public supplies of food and clothing.” Neither is there warrant for the conclusion of Goodwin, that because the holdings of the Planters’ half interest in the undertaking were divided into L10 shares, those of the Adventurers were also. It is not impossible, but it does not necessarily follow, and certain known facts indicate the contrary.

Rev. Edward Everett Hale, in “The Pilgrims’ Life in Common,” says: “Carver, Winslow, Bradford, Brewster, Standish, Fuller, and Allerton. were the persons of largest means in the Leyden group of the emigrants. It seems as if their quota of subscription to the common stock were paid in ‘provisions’ for the voyage and the colony, and that by ‘provisions’ is meant such articles of food as could be best bought in Holland.” The good Doctor is clearly in error, in the above. Allerton was probably as “well off” as any of the Leyden contingent, while Francis Cooke and Degory Priest were probably “better off” than either Brewster or Standish, who apparently had little of this world’s goods. Neither is there any evidence that any considerable amount of “provision” was bought in Holland. Quite a large sum of money, which came, apparently, from the pockets of the Leyden Adventurers (Pickering, Greene, *etc*.), and some of the Pilgrims, was requisite to pay for the *Speedwell* and her refitting, *etc*.; but how much came from either is conjectural at best. But aside from “Hollands cheese,” “strong-waters” (schnapps), some few things that Cushman names; and probably a few others, obtained in Holland, most of the “provisioning,” as repeatedly appears, was done at the English Southampton. In fact, after clothing and generally “outfitting” themselves, it is pretty certain that but few of the Leyden party had much left. There was evidently an understanding between the partners that there should be four principal agents charged with the preparations for, and carrying out of, the enterprise,—Thomas Weston and Christopher Martin representing the Adventurers and the colonists who were recruited in England (Martin being made treasurer), while Carver and Cushman acted for the Leyden company. John Pierce seems to have been the especial representative of the Adventurers in the matter of the obtaining of the Patent from the (London) Virginia Company, and later from the Council for New England. Bradford says: “For besides these two formerly mentioned, sent from Leyden, *viz*., Master Carver and Robert Cushman, there

Page 10

was one chosen in England to be joyned with them, to make the provisions for the Voyage. His name was Master Martin. He came from Billerike in Essexe; from which parts came sundry others to go with them; as also from London and other places, and therefore it was thought meet and convenient by them in Holand, that these strangers that were to goe with them, should appointe one thus to be joyned with them; not so much from any great need of their help as to avoid all susspition, or jealosie, of any partialitie." But neither Weston, Martin, Carver, nor Cushman seems to have been directly concerned in the purchase of the *Speedwell*. The most probable conjecture concerning it is, that in furtherance of the purpose of the Leyden leaders, stated by Bradford, that there should be a small vessel for their service in fishing, traffic, *etc*., wherever they might plant the colony, they were permitted by the Adventurers to purchase the *Speedwell* for that service, and as a consort, "on general account."

It is evident, however, from John Robinson's letter of June 14, 1620, to John Carver, that Weston ridiculed the transaction, probably on selfish grounds, but, as events proved, not without some justification.

Robinson says: "Master Weston makes himself merry with our endeavors about buying a ship," [the *Speedwell*] "but we have done nothing in this but with good reason, as I am persuaded." Although bought with funds raised in Holland,

[Arber (The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers, p. 341) arrives at the conclusion that "The *Speedwell* had been bought with Leyden money. The proceeds of her sale, after her return to London, would, of course, go to the credit of the common joint-Stock there." This inference seems warranted by Robinson's letter of June 16/26 to Carver, in which he clearly indicates that the Leyden brethren collected the "Adventurers" subscriptions of Pickering and his partner (Greene), which were evidently considerable.]

it was evidently upon "joint-account," and she was doubtless so sold, as alleged, on her arrival in September, at London, having proved unseaworthy. In fact, the only view of this transaction that harmonizes with the known facts and the respective rights and relations of the parties is, that permission was obtained (perhaps through Edward Pickering, one of the Adventurers, a merchant of Leyden, and others) that the Leyden leaders should buy and refit the consort, and in so doing might expend the funds which certain of the Leyden Pilgrims were to pay into the enterprise, which it appears they did, —and for which they would receive, as shown, extra shares in the Planters' half-interest. It was very possibly further permitted by the Adventurers, that Mr. Pickering's and his partners' subscriptions to their capital stock should be applied to the purchase of the *Speedwell*, as they were collected by the Leyden leaders, as Pastor Robinson's letter of June 14/24 to John Carver, previously noted, clearly shows.

Page 11

She was obviously bought some little time before May 31, 1620,—probably in the early part of the month,—from the fact that in their letter of May 31st to Carver and Cushman, then in London, Messrs. Fuller, Winslow, Bradford, and Allerton state that “we received divers letters at the coming of Master Nash and our Pilott,” *etc*. From this it is clear that time enough had elapsed, since their purchase of the pinnace, for their messenger (Master Nash) to go to London,—evidently with a request to Carver and Cushman that they would send over a competent “pilott” to refit her, and for Nash to return with him, while the letter announcing their arrival does not seem to have been immediately written.

The writers of the above-mentioned letter use the words “we received,” —using the past tense, as if some days before, instead of “we have your letters,” or “we have just received your letters,” which would rather indicate present, or recent, time. Probably some days elapsed after the “pilott’s” arrival, before this letter of acknowledgment was sent. It is hence fair to assume that the pinnace was bought early in May, and that no time was lost by the Leyden party in preparing for the exodus, after their negotiations with the Dutch were “broken off” and they had “struck hands” with Weston, sometime between February 2/12, 1619/20, and April 1/11, 1620,—probably in March.

The consort was a pinnace—as vessels of her class were then and for many years called—of sixty tons burden, as already stated, having two masts, which were put in—-as we are informed by Bradford, and are not allowed by Professor Arber to forget—as apart of her refitting in Holland. That she was “square-rigged,” and generally of the then prevalent style of vessels of her size and class, is altogether probable. The name pinnace was applied to vessels having a wide range in tonnage, *etc*., from a craft of hardly more than ten or fifteen tons to one of sixty or eighty. It was a term of pretty loose and indefinite adaptation and covered most of the smaller craft above a shallop or ketch, from such as could be propelled by oars, and were so fitted, to a small ship of the SPEEDWELL’S class, carrying an armament.

None of the many representations of the *Speedwell* which appear in historical pictures are authentic, though some doubtless give correct ideas of her type. Weir’s painting of the “Embarkation of the Pilgrims,” in the Capitol at Washington (and Parker’s copy of the same in Pilgrim Hall, Plymouth); Lucy’s painting of the “Departure of the Pilgrims,” in Pilgrim Hall; Copes great painting in the corridor of the British Houses of Parliament, and others of lesser note, all depict the vessel on much the same lines, but nothing can be claimed for any of them, except fidelity to a type of vessel of that day and class. Perhaps the best illustration now known of a craft of this type is given in the painting by the Cuyps, father and

Page 12

son, of the “Departure of the Pilgrims from Delfshaven,” as reproduced by Dr. W. E. Griffis, as the frontispiece to his little monograph, “The Pilgrims in their Three Homes.” No reliable description of the pinnace herself is known to exist, and but few facts concerning her have been gleaned. That she was fairly “roomy” for a small number of passengers, and had decent accommodations, is inferable from the fact that so many as thirty were assigned to her at Southampton, for the Atlantic voyage (while the *may-Flower*, three times her tonnage, but of greater proportionate capacity, had but ninety), as also from the fact that “the chief [i.e. principal people] of them that came from Leyden went in this ship, to give Master Reynolds content.” That she mounted at least “three pieces of ordnance” appears by the testimony of Edward Winslow, and they probably comprised her armament.

We have seen that Bradford notes the purchase and refitting of this “smale ship of 60 tune” in Holland. The story of her several sailings, her “leakiness,” her final return, and her abandonment as unseaworthy, is familiar. We find, too, that Bradford also states in his “Historie,” that “the leakiness of this ship was partly by her being overmasted and too much pressed with sails.” It will, however, amaze the readers of Professor Arber’s generally excellent “Story of the Pilgrim Fathers,” so often referred to herein, to find him sharply arraigning “those members of the Leyden church who were responsible for the fitting of the *Speedwell*,” alleging that “they were the proximate causes of most of the troubles on the voyage [of the *may-Flower*] out; and of many of the deaths at Plymouth in New England in the course of the following Spring; for they overmasted the vessel, and by so doing strained her hull while sailing.” To this straining, Arber wholly ascribes the “leakiness” of the *Speedwell* and the delay in the final departure of the *Mayflower*, to which last he attributes the disastrous results he specifies. It would seem that the historian, unduly elated at what he thought the discovery of another “turning-point of modern history,” endeavors to establish it by such assertions and such partial references to Bradford as would support the imaginary “find.” Briefly stated, this alleged discovery, which he so zealously announces, is that if the *Speedwell* had not been overmasted, both she and the *may-Flower* would have arrived early in the fall at the mouth of the Hudson River, and the whole course of New England history would have been entirely different. Ergo, the “overmasting” of the *Speedwell* was a “pivotal point in modern history.” With the idea apparently of giving eclat to this announcement and of attracting attention to it, he surprisingly charges the responsibility for the “overmasting” and its alleged dire results upon the leaders of the Leyden church, “who were,” he repeatedly asserts, “alone responsible.”

Page 13

As a matter of fact, however, Bradford expressly states (in the same paragraph as that upon which Professor Arber must wholly base his sweeping assertions) that the "overmasting" was but "partly" responsible for the SPEEDWELL'S leakiness, and directly shows that the "stratagem" of her master and crew, "afterwards," he adds, "known, and by some confessed," was the chief cause of her leakiness.

Cushman also shows, by his letter,—written after the ships had put back into Dartmouth,—a part of which Professor Arber uses, but the most important part suppresses, that what he evidently considers the principal leak was caused by a very "loose board" (plank), which was clearly not the result of the straining due to "crowding sail," or of "overmasting." (See Appendix.)

Moreover, as the Leyden chiefs were careful to employ a presumably competent man ("pilott," afterwards "Master" Reynolds) to take charge of refitting the consort, they were hence clearly, both legally and morally, exempt from responsibility as to any alterations made. Even though the "overmasting" had been the sole cause of the SPEEDWELL'S leakiness, and the delays and vicissitudes which resulted to the *may-Flower* and her company, the leaders of the Leyden church—whom Professor Arber arraigns —-(themselves chiefly the sufferers) were in no wise at fault! It is clear, however, that the "overmasting" cut but small figure in the case; "confessed" rascality in making a leak otherwise, being the chief trouble, and this, as well as the "overmasting," lay at the door of Master Reynolds.

Even if the *may-Flower* had not been delayed by the SPEEDWELL'S condition, and both had sailed for "Hudson's River" in midsummer, it is by no means certain that they would have reached there, as Arber so confidently asserts. The treachery of Captain Jones, in league with Gorges, would as readily have landed them, by some pretext, on Cape Cod in October, as in December. But even though they had landed at the mouth of the Hudson, there is no good reason why the Pilgrim influence should not have worked north and east, as well as it did west and south, and with the Massachusetts Bay Puritans there, Roger Williams in Rhode Island, and the younger Winthrop in Connecticut, would doubtless have made New England history very much what it has been, and not, as Professor Arber asserts, "entirely different."

The cruel indictment fails, and the imaginary "turning point in modern history," to announce which Professor Arber seems to have sacrificed so much, falls with it.

The Rev. Dr. Griffis ("The Pilgrims in their Three Homes," p. 158) seems to give ear to Professor Arber's untenable allegations as to the Pilgrim leaders' responsibility for any error made in the "overmasting" of the *Speedwell*, although he destroys his case by saying of the "overmasting:" "Whether it was done in England or Holland is not certain." He says, unhappily chiming

Page 14

in with Arber's indictment: "In their eagerness to get away promptly, they [the Leyden men] made the mistake of ordering for the *Speedwell* heavier and taller masts and larger spars than her hull had been built to receive, thus altering most unwisely and disastrously her trim." He adds still more unhappily: "We do not hear of these inveterate landsmen and townsfolk [of whom he says, 'possibly there was not one man familiar with ships or sea life'] who were about to venture on the Atlantic, taking counsel of Dutch builders or mariners as to the proportion of their craft." Why so discredit the capacity and intelligence of these nation-builders? Was their sagacity ever found unequal to the problems they met? Were the men who commanded confidence and respect in every avenue of affairs they entered; who talked with kings and dealt with statesmen; these diplomats, merchants, students, artisans, and manufacturers; these men who learned law, politics, state craft, town building, navigation, husbandry, boat-building, and medicine, likely to deal negligently or presumptuously with matters upon which they were not informed? Their first act, after buying the *Speedwell*, was to send to England for an "expert" to take charge of all technical matters of her "outfitting," which was done, beyond all question, in Holland. What need had they, having done this (very probably upon the advice of those experienced ship-merchants, their own "Adventurers" and townsmen, Edward Pickering and William Greene), to consult Dutch ship-builders or mariners? She was to be an English ship, under the English flag, with English owners, and an English captain; why: should they defer to Dutch seamen or put other than an English "expert" in charge of her alterations, especially when England rightfully boasted the best? But not only were these Leyden leaders not guilty of any laches as indicted by Arber and too readily convicted by Griffis, but the "overmasting" was of small account as compared with the deliberate rascality of captain and crew, in the disabling of the consort, as expressly certified by Bradford, who certainly, as an eye-witness, knew whereof he affirmed.

Having bought a vessel, it was necessary to fit her for the severe service in which she was to be employed; to provision her for the voyage, *etc*.; and this could be done properly only by experienced hands. The Pilgrim leaders at Leyden seem, therefore, as noted, to have sent to their agents at London for a competent man to take charge of this work, and were sent a "pilott" (or "mate"), doubtless presumed to be equal to the task. Goodwin mistakenly says: "As Spring waned, Thomas Nash went from Leyden to confer with the agents at London. He soon returned with a pilot (doubtless [sic] Robert Coppin), who was to conduct the Continental party to England." This is both wild and remarkable "guessing" for the usually careful compiler of the "Pilgrim Republic." There is no warrant whatever for this assumption, and everything

Page 15

contra-indicates it, although two such excellent authorities as Dr. Dexter and Goodwin coincide—the latter undoubtedly copying the former—concerning Coppin; both being doubtless in error, as hereafter shown. Dexter says "My impression is that Coppin was originally hired to go in the *Speedwell*, and that he was the 'pilott' whose coming was 'a great incouragement' to the Leyden expectants, in the last of May, or first of June, 1620 [before May 31, as shown]; that he sailed with them in the *Speedwell*, but on her final putting back was transferred to the *may-Flower*." All the direct light any one has upon the matter comes from the letter of the Leyden brethren of May 31 [O.S.], 1620, previously cited, to Carver and Cushman, and the reply of the latter thereto, of Sunday, June 11, 1620. The former as noted, say: "We received diverse letters at the coming of Master Nash [probably Thomas] and our pilott, which is a great incouragement unto us . . . and indeed had you not sente him [the 'pilott,' presumably] many would have been ready to fainte and goe backe." Neither here nor in any other relation is there the faintest suggestion of Coppin, except as what he was, "the second mate," or "pilott," of the *may-Flower*. It is not reasonable to suppose that, for so small a craft but just purchased, and with the expedition yet uncertain, the Leyden leaders or their London agents had by June 11, employed both a "Master" and a "pilott" for the *Speedwell*, as must have been the case if this "pilott" was, as Goodwin so confidently assumes, "doubtless Robert Coppin." For in Robert Cushman's letter of Sunday, June 11, as if proposing (now that the larger vessel would be at once obtained, and would, as he thought, be "ready in fourteen days") that the "pilott" sent over to "refit" the *Speedwell* should be further utilized, he says: "Let Master Reynolds tarrie there [inferentially, not return here when his work is done, as we originally arranged] and bring the ship [the *Speedwell*], to Southampton." The latter service we know he performed.

The side lights upon the matter show, beyond doubt:—

(a) That a "pilott" had been sent to Holland, with Master Nash, before May 31, 1620;

(b) That unless two had been sent (of which there is no suggestion, and which is entirely improbable, for obvious reasons), Master Reynolds was the "pilott" who was thus sent;

(c) That it is clear, from Cushman's letter of June 11/21, that Reynolds was then in Holland, for Cushman directs that "Master Reynolds tarrie there and bring the ship to Southampton;"

(d) That Master Reynolds was not originally intended to "tarrie there," and "bring the ship," *etc*., as, if he had been, there would have been no need of giving such an order; and

(e) That he had been sent there for some other purpose than to bring the *Speedwell* to Southampton. Duly considering all the facts together, there can be no doubt that only one “pilott” was sent from England; that he was expected to return when the work was done for which he went (apparently the refitting of the *Speedwell*); that he was ordered to remain for a new duty, and that the man who performed that duty and brought the ship to Southampton (who, we know was Master Reynolds) must have been the “pilott”, sent over.

Page 16

We are told too, by Bradford,

[Bradford's Historie, as already cited; Arber, The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers, p. 341. John Brown, in his Pilgrim Fathers of New England, p. 198, says: "She [the *Speedwell*] was to remain with the colony for a year." Evidently a mistake, arising from the length of time for which her crew were shipped. The pinnace herself was intended, as we have seen, for the permanent use of they colonists, and was to remain indefinitely.]

that the crew of the *Speedwell* "were hired for a year," and we know, in a general way, that most of them went with her to London when she abandoned the voyage. This there is ample evidence Coppin did not do, going as he did to New England as "second mate" or "pilott" of the *may-Flower*, which there is no reason to doubt he was when she left London. Neither is there anywhere any suggestion that there was at Southampton any change in the second mate of the larger ship, as there must have been to make good the suggestion of Dr. Dexter.

Where the *Speedwell* lay while being "refitted" has not been ascertained, though presumably at Delfshaven, whence she sailed, though possibly at one of the neighboring larger ports, where her new masts and cordage could be "set up" to best advantage.

We know that Reynolds—"pilott" and "Master" went from London to superintend the "making-ready" for sea. Nothing is known, however, of his antecedents, and nothing of his history after he left the service of the Pilgrims in disgrace, except that he appears to have come again to New England some years later, in command of a vessel, in the service of the reckless adventurer Weston (a traitor to the Pilgrims), through whom, it is probable, he was originally selected for their service in Holland. Bradford and others entitled to judge have given their opinions of this cowardly scoundrel (Reynolds) in unmistakable terms.

What other officers and crew the pinnace had does not appear, and we know nothing certainly of them, except the time for which they shipped; that some of them were fellow-conspirators with the Master (self-confessed), in the "strategem" to compel the SPEEDWELL'S abandonment of the voyage; and that a few were transferred to the *Mayflower*. From the fact that the sailors Trevore and Ely returned from New Plymouth on the *Fortune* in 1621, "their time having expired," as Bradford notes, it may be fairly assumed that they were originally of the SPEEDWELL'S crew.

That the fears of the SPEEDWELL'S men had been worked upon, and their cooperation thus secured by the artful Reynolds, is clearly indicated by the statement of Bradford: "For they apprehended that the greater ship being of force and in which most of the provisions were stored, she would retain enough for herself, whatever became of them or the passengers, and indeed such speeches had been cast out by some of them."

Page 17

Of the list of passengers who embarked at Delfshaven, July 22, 1620, “bound for Southampton on the English coast, and thence for the northern parts of Virginia,” we fortunately have a pretty accurate knowledge. All of the Leyden congregation who were to emigrate, with the exception of Robert Cushman and family, and (probably) John Carver, were doubtless passengers upon the *Speedwell* from Delfshaven to Southampton, though the presence of Elder Brewster has been questioned. The evidence that he was there is well-nigh as conclusive as that Robert Cushman sailed on the *may-Flower* from London, and that Carver, who had been for some months in England,—chiefly at Southampton, making preparations for the voyage, was there to meet the ships on their arrival. It is possible, of course, that Cushman’s wife and son came on the *Speedwell* from Delfshaven; but is not probable. Among the passengers, however, were some who, like Thomas Blossom and his son, William Ring, and others, abandoned the voyage to America at Plymouth, and returned in the pinnace to London and thence went back to Holland. Deducting from the passenger list of the *Mayflower* those known to have been of the English contingent, with Robert Cushman and family, and John Carver, we have a very close approximate to the SPEEDWELL’S company on her “departure from Delfshaven.” It has not been found possible to determine with absolute certainty the correct relation of a few persons. They may have been of the Leyden contingent and so have come with their brethren on the *Speedwell*, or they may have been of the English colonists, and first embarked either at London or at Southampton, or even at Plymouth,—though none are supposed to have joined the emigrants there or at Dartmouth.

The list of those embarking at Delfshaven on the *Speedwell*, and so of the participants in that historic event,—a list now published for the first time, so far as known,—is undoubtedly accurate, within the limitations stated, as follows, being for convenience’ sake arranged by families:

The Family of Deacon John Carver (probably in charge of John Howland), embracing:—
Mrs. Katherine Carver,
John Howland (perhaps kinsman of Carver), “servant” or “employee,”
Desire Minter, or Minther (probably companion of Mrs. Carver, perhaps kinswoman),
Roger Wilder, “servant,”
“Mrs. Carver’s maid” (whose name has never transpired).

Master William Bradford and
Mrs. Dorothy (May) Bradford.

Master Edward Winslow and
Mrs. Elizabeth (Barker) Winslow,
George Soule a “servant” (or employee),
Elias Story, “servant.”

Elder William Brewster and
Mrs. Mary Brewster,
Love Brewster, a son,
Wrestling Brewster, a son.

Master Isaac Allerton and
Mrs. Mary (Morris) Allerton,
Bartholomew Allerton, a son,
Remember Allerton, a daughter,
Mary Allerton, a daughter,
John Hooke, “servant-boy.”

Page 18

Dr. Samuel Fuller and
William Butten, “servant"-assistant.

Captain Myles Standish and
Mrs. Rose Standish.

Master William White and
Mrs. Susanna (Fuller) White,
Resolved White, a son,
William Holbeck, “servant,”
Edward Thompson, “servant.”

Deacon Thomas Blossom and
----- Blossom, a son.

Master Edward Tilley and
Mrs. Ann Tilley.

Master John Tilley and
Mrs. Bridget (Van der Velde?) Tilley (2d wife),
Elizabeth Tilley, a daughter of Mr. Tilley by a former wife(?)

John Crackstone and
John Crackstone (Jr.), a son.

Francis Cooke and
John Cooke, a son.

John Turner and
—— Turner, a son,
—— Turner, a son.

Degory Priest.

Thomas Rogers and
Joseph Rogers, a son.

Moses Fletcher.

Thomas Williams.

Thomas Tinker and
Mrs. —— Tinker,
—— Tinker, a son.

Edward Fuller and
Mrs. —— Fuller,
Samuel Fuller, a son.

John Rigdale and
Mrs. Alice Rigdale.

Francis Eaton and
Mrs. —— Eaton,
Samuel Eaton, an infant son.

Peter Browne.

William Ring.

Richard Clarke.

John Goodman.

Edward Margeson.

Richard Britteridge.

Mrs. Katherine Carver and her family, it is altogether probable, came over in charge of Howland, who was probably a kinsman, both he and Deacon Carver coming from Essex in England,—as they could hardly have been in England with Carver during the time of his exacting work of preparation. He, it is quite certain, was not a passenger on the Speedwell, for Pastor Robinson would hardly have sent him such a letter as that received by him at Southampton, previously mentioned (Bradford's "Historie," Deane's ed. p. 63), if he had been with him at Delfshaven at the "departure," a few days before. Nor if he had handed it to him at Delfshaven, would he have told him in it, "I have written a large letter to the whole company."

John Howland was clearly a "secretary" or "steward," rather than a "servant," and a man of standing and influence from the outset. That he was in Leyden and hence a *Speedwell* passenger appears altogether probable, but is not absolutely certain.

Desire Minter (or Minther) was undoubtedly the daughter of Sarah, who, the "Troth Book" (or "marriage-in-tention" records) for 1616, at the Stadtbuis of Leyden, shows, was probably wife or widow of one William Minther—evidently of Pastor Robinson's congregation—when

she appeared on May 13 as a “voucher” for Elizabeth Claes, who then pledged herself to Heraut Wilson, a pump-maker, John Carver being

Page 19

one of Wilson's "vouchers." In 1618 Sarah Minther (then recorded as the widow of William) reappeared, to plight her troth to Roger Simons, brick-maker, from Amsterdam. These two records and the rarity of the name warrant an inference that Desire Minter (or Minther) was the daughter of William and Sarah (Willet) Minter (or Minther), of Robinson's flock; that her father had died prior to 1618 (perhaps before 1616); that the Carvers were near friends, perhaps kinsfolk; that her father being dead, her mother, a poor widow (there were clearly no rich ones in the Leyden congregation), placed this daughter with the Carvers, and, marrying herself, and removing to Amsterdam the year before the exodus, was glad to leave her daughter in so good a home and such hands as Deacon and Mistress Carver's. The record shows that the father and mother of Mrs. Sarah Minther, Thomas and Alice Willet, the probable grandparents of Desire Minter, appear as "vouchers" for their daughter at her Leyden betrothal. Of them we know nothing further, but it is a reasonable conjecture that they may have returned to England after the remarriage of their daughter and her removal to Amsterdam, and the removal of the Carvers and their granddaughter to America, and that it was to them that Desire went, when, as Bradford records, "she returned to her friends in England, and proved not very well and died there."

"Mrs. Carver's maid" we know but little about, but the presumption is naturally strong that she came from; Leyden with her mistress. Her early marriage and; death are duly recorded.

Roger Wilder, Carver's "servant;" was apparently in his service at Leyden and accompanied the family from thence. Bradford calls him "his [Carver's] man Roger," as if an old, familiar household servant, which (as Wilder died soon after the arrival at Plymouth) Bradford would not have been as likely to do—writing in 1650, thirty years after—if he had been only a short-time English addition to Carver's household, known to Bradford only during the voyage. The fact that he speaks of him as a "man" also indicates something as to his age, and renders it certain that he was not an "indentured" lad. It is fair to presume he was a passenger on the *Speedwell* to Southampton. (It is probable that Carver's "servant-boy," William Latham, and Jasper More, his "bound-boy," were obtained in England, as more fully appears.)

Master William Bradford and his wife were certainly of the party in the *Speedwell*, as shown by his own recorded account of the embarkation. (Bradford's "Historie," *etc*.)

Master Edward Winslow's very full (published) account of the embarkation ("Hypocrisie Unmasked," pp. 10-13, *etc*.) makes it certain that himself and family were *Speedwell* passengers.

Page 20

George Soule, who seems to have been a sort of “upper servant” or “steward,” it is not certain was with Winslow in Holland, though it is probable.

Elias Story, his “under-servant,” was probably also with him in Holland, though not surely so. Both servants might possibly have been procured from London or at Southampton, but probably sailed from Delfshaven with Winslow in the *Speedwell*.

Elder William Brewster and his family, his wife and two boys, were passengers on the *Speedwell*, beyond reasonable doubt. He was, in fact, the ranking man of the Leyden brethren till they reached Southampton and the respective ships’ “governors” were chosen. The Church to that point was dominant. (The Elder’s two “bound-boys,” being from London, do not appear as *Speedwell* passengers.) There is, on careful study, no warrant to be found for the remarkable statements of Goodwin ("Pilgrim Republic,” p. 33), that, during the hunt for Brewster in Holland in 1619, by the emissaries of James I. of England (in the endeavor to apprehend and punish him for printing and publishing certain religious works alleged to be seditious), “William Brewster was in London . . . and there he remained until the sailing of the *Mayflower*, which he helped to fit out;” and that during that time “he visited Scrooby.” That he had no hand whatever in fitting out the *Mayflower* is certain, and the Scrooby statement equally lacks foundation. Professor Arber, who is certainly a better authority upon the “hidden press” of the Separatists in Holland, and the official correspondence relating to its proprietors and their movements, says ("The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers,” p.196): “The Ruling Elder of the Pilgrim Church was, for more than a year before he left Delfshaven on the *Speedwell*, on the 22 July-1 August, 1620, a hunted man.” Again (p. 334), he says: “Here let us consider the excellent management and strategy of this Exodus. If the Pilgrims had gone to London to embark for America, many, if not most of them, would have been put in prison [and this is the opinion of a British historian, knowing the temper of those times, especially William Brewster.] So only those embarked in London against whom the Bishops could take no action.” We can understand, in light, why Carver—a more objectionable person than Cushman to the prelates, because of his office in the Separatist Church—was chiefly employed out of their sight, at Southampton, *etc*., while the diplomatic and urbane Cushman did effective work at London, under the Bishops’ eyes. It is not improbable that the personal friendship of Sir Robert

Page 21

Naunton (Principal Secretary of State to

> King James) for Sir Edward Sandys and the Leyden brethren (though officially seemingly active under his masters' orders in pushing Sir Dudley Carleton, the English ambassador at the Hague, to an unrelenting search for Brewster) may have been of material aid to the Pilgrims in gaining their departure unmolested. The only basis known for the positive expression of Goodwin resides in the suggestions of several letters' of Sir Dudley Carleton to Sir Robert Naunton, during the quest for Brewster; the later seeming clearly to nullify the earlier.

Under date of July 22, 1619, Carleton says: "One William Brewster, a Brownist, who has been for some years an inhabitant and printer at Leyden, but is now within these three weeks removed from thence and gone back to dwell in London," *etc*.On August 16, 1619 (N.S.), he writes: "I am told William Brewster is come again for Leyden," but on the 30th adds: "I have made good enquiry after William Brewster and am well assured he is not returned thither, neither is it likely he will; having removed from thence both his family and goods," *etc*.On September 7, 1619 (N.S.), he writes: "Touching Brewster, I am now informed that he is on this side the seas [not in London, as before alleged]; and that he was seen yesterday, at Leyden, but, as yet, is not there settled," *etc*.On September 13, 1619 (N.S.), he says: "I have used all diligence to enquire after Brewster; and find he keeps most at Amsterdam; but being 'incerti laris', he is not yet to be lighted upon. I understand he prepares to settle himself at a village called Leerdorp, not far from Leyden, thinking there to be able to print prohibited books without discovery, but I shall lay wait for him, both there and in other places, so as I doubt but either he must leave this country; or I shall, sooner or later, find him out."On September 20, 1619 (N.S.), he says: "I have at length found out Brewster at Leyden," *etc*. It was a mistake, and Brewster's partner (Thomas Brewer), one of the Merchant Adventurers, was arrested instead.

> On September 28, 1619 (N.S.), he states, writing from Amsterdam: "If he lurk here for fear of apprehension, it will be hard to find him," *etc*.

As late as February 8, 1619/20, there was still a desire and hope for his arrest, but by June the matter had become to the King—and all others—something of an old story. While, as appears by a letter of Robert Cushman, written in London, in May, 1619, Brewster was then undoubtedly there, one cannot agree, in the light of the official correspondence just quoted, with the conclusion of Dr. Alexander Young ("Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers," vol. i. p. 462),

Page 22

that “it is probable he [Brewster] did not return to Leyden, but kept close till the *Mayflower* sailed.”Everything indicates that he was at Leyden long after this; that he did not again return to London, as supposed; and that he was in hiding with his family (after their escape from the pursuit at Leyden), somewhere among friends in the Low Countries. Although by July, 1620, the King had, as usual, considerably “cooled off,” we may be sure that with full knowledge of the harsh treatment meted out to his partner (Brewer) when caught, though unusually mild (by agreement with the authorities of the University and Province of Holland), Brewster did not deliberately put himself “under the lion’s paw” at London, or take any chances of arrest there, even in disguise. Dr. Griffis has lent his assent ("The Pilgrims in their Homes,” p, 167), though probably without careful analysis of all the facts, to the untenable opinion expressed by Goodwin, that Brewster was “hiding in England” when the *Speedwell* sailed from Delfshaven. There can be no doubt that, with his ever ready welcome of sound amendment, he will, on examination, revise his opinion, as would the clear-sighted Goodwin, if living and cognizant of the facts as marshalled against his evident error. As the leader and guide of the outgoing part of the Leyden church we may, with good warrant, believe—as all would wish—that Elder Brewster was the chief figure the departing Pilgrims gathered on the *Speedwell* deck, as she took her departure from Delfshaven.

Master Isaac Allerton and his family, his wife and three children, two sons and a daughter, were of the Leyden company and passengers in the *Speedwell*. We know he was active there as a leader, and was undoubtedly one of those who bought the *Speedwell*. He was one of the signers of the joint-letter from Leyden, to Carver and Cushman, May 31 (O.S.) 1620.

John Hooke, Allerton’s “servant-lad,” may have been detained at London or Southampton, but it is hardly probable, as Allerton was a man of means, consulted his comfort, and would have hardly started so large a family on such a journey without a servant.

Dr. Samuel Fuller was, as is well known, one of the Leyden chiefs, connected by blood and marriage with many of the leading families of Robinson’s congregation. He was active in the preparations for the voyage the first signer of the joint-letter of May 31, and doubtless one of the negotiators for the *Speedwell*. His wife and child were left behind, to follow later as they did.

Page 23

William Butten, the first of the Pilgrim party to die, was, in all probability, a student-"servant" of Doctor Fuller at Leyden, and doubtless embarked with him at Delfshaven. Bradford calls him (writing of his death) "Wm. Butten, a youth, servant to Samuel Fuller." Captain Myles Standish and his wife Rose, we know from Bradford, were with the Pilgrims in Leyden and doubtless shipped with them. Arber calls him ("The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers," p. 378) a "chief of the Pilgrim Fathers" in the sense of a father and leader in their Israel; but there is no warrant for this assumption, though he became their "sword-hand" in the New World. By some writers, though apparently with insufficient warrant, Standish has been declared a Roman Catholic. It does not appear that he was ever a communicant of the Pilgrim Church. His family, moreover, was not of the Roman Catholic faith, and all his conduct in the colony is inconsistent with the idea that he was of that belief. Master William White, his wife and son, were of the Leyden congregation, both husband and wife being among its principal people, and nearly related to several of the Pilgrim band. The marriage of Mr. and Mrs. White is duly recorded in Leyden. William Holbeck and Edward Thompson, Master White's two servants, he probably took with him from Leyden, as his was a family of means and position, though they might possibly have been procured at Southampton. They were apparently passengers in the *Speedwell*. Deacon Thomas Blossom and his son were well known as of Pastor Robinson's flock at Leyden. They returned, moreover, to Holland from Plymouth, England (where they gave up the voyage), via London. The father went to New Plymouth ten years later, the son dying before that time. (See Blossom's letter to Governor Bradford. Bradford's Letter Book, "Plymouth Church Records," i. 42.) In his letter dated at Leyden, December 15, 1625, he says: "God hath taken away my son that was with me in the ship *Mayflower* when I went back again."

Edward Tilley (sometimes given the prefix of Master) his wife Ann are known to have been of the Leyden company. (Bradford's "Historie," p. 83.) It is doubtful if their "cousins," Henry Sampson and Humility Cooper, were of Leyden. They apparently were English kinsfolk, taken to New England with the Tilleys, very likely joined them at Southampton and hence were not of the SPEEDWELL'S passengers. Humility Cooper returned to England after the death of Tilley and his wife. That Mrs. Tilley's "given name" was Ann is not positively established, but rests on Bradford's evidence.

Page 24

John Tilley (who is also sometimes called Master) is reputed a brother of Edward, and is known to have been—as also his wife—of the Leyden church (Bradford, Deane's ed. p. 83.) His second wife Bridget Van der Velde, was evidently of Holland blood, and their marriage is recorded in Leyden. Elizabeth Tilley was clearly a daughter by an earlier wife. He is said by Goodwin ("Pilgrim Republic," p. 32) to have been a "silk worker" Leyden, but earlier authority for this occupation is not found.

John Crackstone is of record as of the Leyden congregation. His daughter remained there, and came later to America.

John Crackstone, Jr., son of above. Both were *Speedwell* passengers.

Francis Cooke has been supposed a very early member of Robinson's flock in England, who escaped with them to Holland, in 1608. He and his son perhaps embarked at Delfshaven, leaving his wife and three other children to follow later. (See Robinson's letter to Governor Bradford, "Mass. Hist. Coll.," vol. iii. p. 45, also Appendix for account of Cooke's marriage.)

John Cooke, the son, was supposed to have lived to be the last male survivor of the *may-Flower*, but Richard More proves to have survived him. He was a prominent man in the colony, like his father, and the founder of Dartmouth (Mass.).

John Turner and his sons are also known to have been of the Leyden party, as he was undoubtedly the messenger sent to London with the letter (of May 31) of the leaders to Carver and Cushman, arriving there June 10, 1620. They were beyond doubt of the SPEEDWELL'S list.

Degory Priest—or "Digerie," as Bradford calls him—was a prominent member of the Leyden body. His marriage is recorded there, and he left his family in the care of his pastor and friends, to follow him later. He died early.

Thomas Rogers and his son are reputed of the Leyden company. He left (according to Bradford) some of his family there—as did Cooke and Priest—to follow later. It has been suggested that Rogers might have been of the Essex (England) lineage, but no evidence of this appears. The Rogers family of Essex were distinctively Puritans, both in England and in the Massachusetts colony.

Moses Fletcher was a “smith” at Leyden, and of Robinson’s church. He was married there, in 1613, to his second wife. He was perhaps of the English Amsterdam family of Separatists, of that name. As the only blacksmith of the colonists, his early death was a great loss.

Thomas Williams, there seems no good reason to doubt, was the Thomas Williams known to have been of Leyden congregation. Hon. H. C. Murphy and Arber include him—apparently through oversight alone—in the list of those of Leyden who did not go, unless there were two of the name, one of whom remained in Holland.

Page 25

Thomas Tinker, wife, and son are not certainly known to have been of the Leyden company, or to have embarked at Delfshaven, but their constant association in close relation with others who were and who so embarked warrants the inference that they were of the SPEEDWELL'S passengers. It is, however, remotely possible, that they were of the English contingent.

Edward Fuller and his wife and little son were of the Leyden company, and on the *Speedwell*. He is reputed to have been a brother of Dr. Fuller, and is occasionally so claimed by early writers, but by what warrant is not clear.

John Rigdale and his wife have always been placed by tradition and association with the Leyden emigrants but there is a possibility that they were of the English party. Probability assigns them to the *Speedwell*, and they are needed to make her accredited number.

Francis Eaton, wife, and babe were doubtless of the Leyden list. He is said to have been a carpenter there (Goodwin, "Pilgrim Republic," p. 32), and was married there, as the record attests.

Peter Browne has always been classed with the Leyden party. There is no established authority for this except tradition, and he might possibly have been of the English emigrants, though probably a *Speedwell* passenger; he is needed to make good her putative number.

William Ring is in the same category as are Eaton and Browne. Cushman speaks of him, in his Dartmouth letter to Edward Southworth (of August 17), in terms of intimacy, though this, while suggestive, of course proves nothing, and he gave up the voyage and returned from Plymouth to London with Cushman. He was certainly from Leyden.

Richard Clarke is on the doubtful list, as are also John Goodman, Edward Margeson, and Richard Britteridge. They have always been traditionally classed with the Leyden colonists, yet some of them were possibly among the English emigrants. They are all needed, however, to make up the number usually assigned to Leyden, as are all the above "doubtfuls," which is of itself somewhat confirmatory of the substantial correctness of the list.

Thomas English, Bradford records, "was hired to goe master of a [the] shallopp" of the colonists, in New England waters. He was probably hired in Holland and was almost certainly of the *Speedwell*.

John Alderton (sometimes written Allerton) was, Bradford states, “a hired man, reputed [reckoned] one of the company, but was to go back (being a seaman) and so making no account of the voyages for the help of others behind” [probably at Leyden]. It is probable that he was hired in Holland, and came to Southampton on the *Speedwell*. Both English and Alderton seem to have stood on a different footing from Trevore and Ely, the other two seamen in the employ of the colonists.

Page 26

William Trevore was, we are told by Bradford, “a seaman hired to stay a year in the countrie,” but whether or not as part of the SPEEDWELL’S Crew (who, he tells us, were all hired for a year) does not appear. As the Master (Reynolds) and others of her crew undoubtedly returned to London in her from Plymouth, and her voyage was cancelled, the presumption is that Trevore and Ely were either hired anew or—more probably—retained under their former agreement, to proceed by the *may-Flower* to America, apparently (practically) as passengers. Whether of the consort’s crew or not, there can be little doubt that he left Delfshaven on the *Speedwell*.

—— Ely, the other seaman in the Planters’ employ, also hired to “remain a year in the countrie,” appears to have been drafted, like Trevore, from the *Speedwell* before she returned to London, having, no doubt, made passage from Holland in her. Both Trevore and Ely survived “the general sickness” at New Plimoth, and at the expiration of the time for which they were employed returned on the *Fortune* to England

Of course the initial embarkation, on Friday, July 21/31 1620, was at Leyden, doubtless upon the Dutch canal-boats which undoubtedly brought them from a point closely adjacent to Pastor Robinson’s house in the Klock-Steeg (Bell, Belfry, Alley), in the garden of which were the houses of many, to Delfshaven.

Rev. John Brown, D.D., says: “The barges needed for the journey were most likely moored near the Nuns’ Bridge which spans the Rapenburg immediately opposite the Klok-Steeg, where Robinsons house was. This, being their usual meeting-place, would naturally be the place of rendezvous on the morning of departure. From thence it was but a stone’s throw to the boats, and quickly after starting they would enter the Vliet, as the section of the canal between Leyden and Delft is named, and which for a little distance runs within the city bounds, its quays forming the streets. In those days the point where the canal leaves the city was guarded by a water-gate, which has long since been removed, as have also the town walls, the only remaining portions of which are the Morsch-gate and the Zylgate. So, gliding along the quiet waters of the Vliet, past the Water-gate, and looking up at the frowning turrets of the Cow-gate, ’they left that goodly and pleasant city which had been their resting-place near twelve years.’ . . . Nine miles from Leyden a branch canal connects the Vliet with the Hague, and immediately beyond their junction a sharp turn is made to the left, as the canal passes beneath the Hoom-bridge; from this point, for the remaining five miles, the high road from the Hague to Delft, lined with noble trees, runs side by side with the canal. In our time the canal-boats make a circuit of the town

Page 27

to the right, but in those days the traffic went by canal through the heart of the city . . . . Passing out of the gates of Delft and leaving the town behind, they had still a good ten miles of canal journey before them ere they reached their vessel and came to the final parting, for, as Mr. Van Pelt has clearly shown, it is a mistake to confound Delft with Delfshaven, as the point of embarkation in the *Speedwell*. Below Delft the canal, which from Leyden thither is the Vliet, then becomes the Schie, and at the village of Overschie the travellers entered the Delfshaven Canal, which between perfectly straight dykes flows at a considerable height above the surrounding pastures. Then finally passing through one set of sluice gates after another, the Pilgrims were lifted from the canal into a broad receptacle for vessels, then into the outer haven, and so to the side of the *Speedwell* as she lay at the quay awaiting their arrival."

Dr. Holmes has prettily pictured the "Departure" in his "Robinson of Leyden," even if not altogether correctly, geographically.

"He spake; with lingering, long embrace,
With tears of love and partings fond,
They floated down the creeping Maas,
Along the isle of Ysselmond."They passed the frowning towers of Briel,
The 'Hook of Holland's' shelf of sand,
And grated soon with lifting keel
The sullen shores of Fatherland."No home for these! too well they knew
The mitred king behind the throne;
The sails were set, the pennons flew,
And westward ho! for worlds unknown."

Winslow informs us that they of the Leyden congregation who volunteered for the American enterprise were rather the smaller fraction of the whole body, though he adds, as noted "that the difference was not great." A careful analysis of the approximate list of the Leyden colonists, —including, of course, Carver, and Cushman and his family,—-whose total number seems to have been seventy-two, indicates that of this number, forty-two, or considerably more than half (the rest being children, seamen, or servants), were probably members of the Leyden church. Of these, thirty, probably, were males and twelve females. The exact proportion this number bore to the numerical strength of Robinson's church at that time cannot be determined, because while something less than half as we know, gave their votes for the American undertaking, it cannot be known whether or not the women of church had a vote in the matter. Presumably they did not, the primitive church gave good heed to the words of Paul (i Corinthians xiv. 34), "Let your women keep silence in the churches." Neither can it be known—if they had a voice—whether the wives and daughters of some of the embarking Pilgrims, who did not go themselves at this time, voted with their husbands and fathers for the removal. The total number, seventy-two, coincides very nearly

Page 28

with the estimate made by Goodwin, who says: "Only eighty or ninety could go in this party from Leyden," and again: "Not more than eighty of the *may-Flower* company were from Leyden. Allowing for [i.e. leaving out] the younger children and servants, it is evident that not half the company can have been from Robinson's congregation." As the total number of passengers on the *Mayflower* was one hundred and two when she took her final departure from England, it is clear that Goodwin's estimate is substantially correct, and that the number representing the Leyden church as given above, *viz*., forty-two, is very close to the fact.

"When they came to the place" [Delfshaven], says Bradford, "they found the ship and all things ready; and such of their friends as could not come with them [from Leyden] followed after them; and sundry also came from Amsterdam (about fifty miles) to see them shipped, and to take their leave of them."

Saturday, July 22/Aug. 1, 1620, the Pilgrim company took their farewells, and Winslow records: "We only going aboard, the ship lying to the key [quay] and ready to sail; the wind being fair, we gave them [their friends] a volley of small shot [musketry] and three pieces of ordnance and so lifting up our hands to each other and our hearts for each other to the Lord our God, we departed."

Goodwin says of the parting: "The hull was wrapped in smoke, through which was seen at the stern the white flag of England doubly bisected by the great red cross of St. George, a token that the emigrants had at last resumed their dearly-loved nationality. Far above them at the main was seen the Union Jack of new device."

And so after more than eleven years of banishment for conscience' sake from their native shores, this little band of English exiles, as true to their mother-land—despite persecutions—as to their God, raised the flag of England, above their own little vessel, and under its folds set sail to plant themselves for a larger life in a New World.

And thus opens the "Log" of the *Speedwell*, and the "Westward-Ho" of the Pilgrim Fathers.

The SPEEDWELL'S *log*

Sunday, July 23/Aug. 2.

On the German Ocean. Wind fair. General course D.W., toward Southampton. sails set, running free.

Monday, July 24/Aug. 3.
Fair. Wind moderate. Dover Straits English Channel. In sight Dover Cliffs.

Tuesday, July 25/Aug. 5
Hugging English shore. Enters Southampton Water.

Wednesday, July 26/Aug. 5.
Came to anchor in Port of Southampton near ship *Mayflower* of Yarmouth, from London (to which this pinnace is consort), off the north of the West Quay.'

Page 29

Thursday, July 27/Aug. 6.
At anchor in port of Southampton.

Friday, July 28/Aug. 7.
Lying at anchor at Southampton.

Saturday, July 29/Aug. 8.
Lying at Southampton. *May-Flower* ready for sea, but pinnace leaking and requires re-trimming.

Sunday, July 30/Aug. 9.
Lying at Southampton.

Monday, July 31/Aug. 10.
Ditto.

Tuesday, Aug. 1/11.
Ditto.

Wednesday, Aug. 2/22.
Ditto. Pinnace leaking. Re-trimmed again.

Thursday, Aug 3/13.
Ditto. Receiving passengers, *etc*. Some of principal Leyden men assigned to *Speedwell*.

Friday, Aug. 4/14
Southampton. Making ready to leave.

Saturday, Aug. 5/55.
Dropped down Southampton Water and beat down Channel. Wind dead ahead. Laid general course W.S.W.

Sunday, Aug. 6/16.
Wind baffling. Beating down Channel.

Monday, Aug. 7/17.
Ditto.

Tuesday, Aug. 8/18.
Ditto. Ship leaking.

Wednesday, Aug. 9/19.
Ship leaking badly. Wind still ahead.

Thursday, Aug. 10/20.
Ship still leaking badly. Gaining on pumps. Hove to. Signalled *may-Flower*, in company. Consultation with Captain Jones and principal passengers. Decided vessels shall put back, Dartmouth, being nearest convenient port. Wore ship and laid course for Dartmouth with good wind.

Friday, Aug. 11/21.
Wind fair. Ship leaking badly.

Saturday, Aug. 12/22.
Made port at Dartmouth *may-Flower* in company. Came to anchor near *may-Flower*.

Sunday, Aug. 13/23.
Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor.

Monday, Aug. 14/24.
Moving cargo and overhauling and retrimming ship.

Tuesday, Aug. 15/25.
Lying at Dartmouth. At on ship.

Wednesday, Aug. 16/26.
Ditto. Found a plank feet long loose and admitting water freely, as at a mole hole. Seams opened some.

Page 30

Thursday, Aug. 17/27.
Lying at Dartmouth. Some dissension among chief of passengers. Ship's "Governor" unsatisfactory.

Friday, Aug. 18/28.
Lying at Dartmouth. Still at work on ship.

Saturday, Aug. 19/29.
Still lying at Dartmouth.

Sunday, Aug. 20/30.
Lying at Dartmouth.

Monday, Aug. 21/31
Still at Dartmouth. Overhauling completed. Cargo relaced. Making ready to go to sea.

Tuesday, Aug. 22/Sept. 1.
Still at Dartmouth. Lying at anchor ready for sea.

Wednesday, Aug. 23/Sept. 2.
Weighed anchor,' as did also *may-Flower*, and set sail. Laid general course W.S.W. Wind fair

Thursday, Aug. 24/Sept.3.
Fair wind, but ship leaking.

Friday, Aug. 25/Sept. 4.
Wind fair. Ship leaking dangerously. *May-Flower* in company.

Saturday, Aug. 26/Sept. 5.
About 100 leagues [300 miles] from Land's End. Ship leaking badly. Hove to. Signalled *may-Flower*, in company. Consultation between masters, carpenters, and principal passengers. Decided to put back into Plymouth and determine whether pinnace is seaworthy. Put about and laid course for Plymouth.

Sunday, Aug. 27/Sept. 6.

Wind on starboard quarter. Made Plymouth harbor and came to anchor. *May-Flower* in company.

Monday, Aug. 28/Sept. 7.

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. Conference of chief of Colonists and officers of *may-Flower* and *Speedwell*. No special leak could be found, but it was judged to be the general weakness of the ship, and that she would not prove sufficient for the voyage. It was resolved to dismiss her the *Speedwell*, and part of the company, and proceed with the other ship.

Page 31

Tuesday, Aug. 29/Sept. 8
Lying at Plymouth. Transferring cargo.

Wednesday, Aug. 30/Sept. 9
Lying at Plymouth. Transferring cargo.

Saturday, Sept. 2/12
Ditto. Reassignment of passengers. Master Cushman and family, Master Blossom and son, Wm. Ring and others to return in pinnace to London.

Sunday, Sept. 3/13
At anchor in Plymouth roadstead.

Monday, Sept. 4/14
Weighed anchor and took departure for London, leaving *may-Flower* at anchor in roadstead.

Saturday, Sept. 9/19
Off Gravesend. Came to anchor in Thames.

The end of the voyage and
of the log of the
may-FLOWER'S
consort

From Bradford we learn that the *Speedwell* was sold at London, and was "refitted", her old trip being restored, and that she afterwards made for her new owners many and very prosperous voyages.

CHAPTER III

THE MAY-FLOWER'S CHARTER AND THE ADVENTURERS

The ship *may-Flower* was evidently chartered about the middle of June, 1620 at London, by Masters Thomas West Robert Cushman acting together in behalf of the Merchant Adventurers (chiefly of London) and the English congregation of "Separatists" (the "Pilgrims"), at Leyden in Holland who, with certain of England associated, proposed to colony in America.

Professor Arber, when he says, in speaking of Cushman and Weston, "the hiring of the *may-Flower*, when they did do it, was their act alone, and the Leyden church nothing to

do with it," seems to forget that Cushman and his associate Carver had no other function or authority in their conjunction with Weston and Martin, except to represent the Leyden congregation. Furthermore, it was the avowed wish of Robinson (see his letter dated June 14, 1620, to John Carver), that Weston "may [should] presently succeed in hiring" [a ship], which was equivalent to hoping that Carver and Cushman—Weston's associates representing Leyden—would aid in so doing. Moreover, Bradford expressly states that: "Articles of Agreement, drawn by themselves were, by their [the Leyden congregation's] said messenger [Carver] sent into England, who together with Robert Cushman were to receive moneys and make provisions, both for shipping, and other things for the voyage."

Up to Saturday, June 10, nothing had been effected in the way of providing shipping for the migrating planters though the undertaking had been four months afoot—beyond the purchase and refitting, in Holland, by the Leyden people themselves, of a pinnace of sixty tons (the *Speedwell*) intended as consort to a larger ship—and the hiring of a "pilott" to refit her, as we have seen.

Page 32

The Leyden leaders had apparently favored purchasing also the larger vessel still needed for the voyage, hoping, perhaps, to interest therein at least one of their friends, Master Edward Pickering, a merchant of Holland, himself one of the Adventurers, while Master Weston had, as appears, inclined to hire. From this disagreement and other causes, perhaps certain sinister reasons, Weston had become disaffected, the enterprise drooped, the outlook was dubious, and several formerly interested drew back, until shipping should be provided and the good faith of the enterprise be thus assured.

It transpires from Robinson's letter dated June 14., before quoted (in which he says: "For shipping, Master Weston, it should seem is set upon hiring"), that Robinson's own idea was to purchase, and he seems to have dominated the rest. There is perhaps a hint of his reason for this in the following clause of the same letter, where he writes: "I do not think Master Pickering [the friend previously named] will ingage, except in the course of buying ['ships?'—Arber interpolates] as in former letters specified." If he had not then "ingaged" (as Robinson intimates), as an Adventurer, he surely did later, contrary to the pastor's prediction, and the above may have been a bit of special pleading. Robinson naturally wished to keep their, affairs, so far as possible, in known and supposedly friendly hands, and had possibly some assurances that, as a merchant, Pickering would be willing to invest in a ship for which he could get a good charter for an American voyage. He proved rather an unstable friend.

Robinson is emphatic, in the letter cited, as to the imperative necessity that shipping should be immediately provided if the enterprise was to be held together and the funds subscribed were to be secured. He evidently considered this the only guaranty of good faith and of an honest intention to immediately transport the colony over sea, that would be accepted. After saying, as already noted, that those behind-hand with their payments refuse to pay in "till they see shipping provided or a course taken for it," he adds, referring to Master Weston: "That he should not have had either shipping ready before this time, or at least certain [i.e. definite] means and course, and the same known to us, for it; or have taken other order otherwise; cannot in [according to] my conscience be excused."

Bradford also states that one Master Thomas Weston a merchant of London, came to Leyden about the same time [apparently while negotiations for emigration under their auspices were pending with the Dutch, in February or March, 1620], who was "well acquainted with some of them and a furtherer of them in their former proceedings.... and persuaded them.... not to meddle with the Dutch," *etc*. This Robinson confirms in his letter to Carver before referred to, saying: "You know right well we depend on Master Weston alone,.... and when we had in hand another course with the Dutchman, broke it off at his motion."

Page 33

On the morning of the 10th of June, 1620, Robert Cushman, one of the Leyden agents at London, after writing to his associate, Master John Carver, then at Southampton; and to the Leyden leaders—in reply to certain censorious letters received by him from both these sources —although disheartened by the difficulties and prospects before him, sought Master Weston, and by an urgent appeal so effectively wrought upon him, that, two hours later, coming to Cushman, he promised "he would not yet give it [the undertaking] up." Cushman's patience and endurance were evidently nearly "at the breaking point," for he says in his letter of Sunday, June 11, when success had begun to crown his last grand effort: "And, indeed, the many discouragements I find here [in London] together with the demurs and retirings there [at Leyden] had made me to say, 'I would give up my accounts to John Carver and at his coming from Southampton acquaint him fully with all courses [proceedings] and so leave it quite, with only the poor clothes on my back: But gathering up myself by further consideration, I resolved yet to make one trial more," *etc*. It was this "one trial more" which meant so much to the Pilgrims; to the cause of Religion; to America; and to Humanity. It will rank with the last heroic and successful efforts of Robert the Bruce and others, which have become historic. The effect of Cushman's appeal upon Weston cannot be doubted. It not only apparently influenced him at the time, but, after reflection and the lapse of hours, it brought him to his associate to promise further loyalty, and, what was much better, to act. The real animus of Weston's backwardness, it is quite probable, lay in the designs of Gorges, which were probably not yet fully matured, or, if so, involved delay as an essential part. "And so," Cushman states, "advising together, we resolved to hire a ship." They evidently found one that afternoon, "of sixty last" (120 tons) which was called "a fine ship," and which they "took liking of [Old English for trial (Dryden), equivalent to refusal] till Monday." The same afternoon they "hired another pilot . . . one Master Clarke."—of whom further.

It seems certain that by the expression, "we have hired another pilot here, one Master Clarke," *etc*.; that Cushman was reckoning the "pilott" Reynolds whom he had hired and sent over to them in Holland, as shown—as at the first, and now Clarke as "another." It nowhere appears that up to this date, any other than these two had been hired, nor had there been until then, any occasion for more than one.

If Cushman had been engaged in such important negotiations as these before he wrote his letters to Carver and the Leyden friends, on Saturday morning, he would certainly have mentioned them. As he named neither, it is clear that they had not then occurred. It is equally certain that Cushman's appeal to Weston was not made, and his renewed activity aroused, until after these letters had been dispatched and nothing of the kind could have been done without Weston.

Page 34

His letter-writing of June 10 was obviously in the morning, as proven by the great day's work Cushman performed subsequently. He must have written his letters early and have taken them to such place as his messenger had suggested (Who his messenger was does not appear, but it was not John Turner, as suggested by Arber, for he did not arrive till that night.) Cushman must then have looked up Weston and had an hour or more of earnest argument with him, for he says: "at the last [as if some time was occupied] he gathered himself up a little more" [i.e. yielded somewhat.] Then came an interval of "two hours," at the end of which Weston came to him,

[It would be highly interesting to know whether, in the two hours which intervened between Cushman's call on Weston and the latter's return call, Weston consulted Gorges and got his instructions. It is certain that he came prepared to act, and that vigorously, which he had not previously been.]

and they "advised together,"—which took time. It was by this evidently somewhat past noon, a four or five hours having been consumed. They then went to look for a ship and found one, which, from Cushman's remark, "but a fine ship it is," they must (at least superficially) have examined. While hunting for the ship they seem to have come across, and to have hired, John Clarke the "pilot," with whom they necessarily, as with the ship's people, spent some time. It is not improbable that the approach of dusk cut short their examination of the ship, which they hence "took liking of [refusal of] till Monday." It is therefore evident that the "refusal" of the "sixty last" ship was taken, and the "pilot" Clarke was "hired," on Saturday afternoon, June 10, as on Sunday, June 11, Cushman informed the Leyden leaders of these facts by letter, as above indicated, and gave instructions as to the SPEEDWELL'S "pilott," Master Reynolds.

We are therefore able to fix, nearly to an hour, the "turning of the tide" in the affairs of the Pilgrim movement to America.

It is also altogether probable that the Pilgrims and humanity at large are still further (indirectly) indebted to Cushman's "one more trial" and resultant Saturday afternoon's work, for the *may-Flower* (though not found that day), and her able commander Jones, who, whatever his faults, safely brought the Pilgrims through stormy seas to their "promised land."

Obligations of considerable and rapidly cumulative cost had now been incurred, making it imperative to go forward to embarkation with all speed, and primarily, to secure the requisite larger ship. Evidently Weston and Cushman believed they had found one that would serve, when on Saturday, they "took liking," as we have seen, of the "fine ship" of 120 tons, "till Monday." No less able authorities than Charles Deane, Goodwin, and Brown, with others, have mistakenly concluded that this ship was the *may-Flower*, and have so

Page 35

stated in terms. As editor of Bradford's history "Of Plimoth Plantation," Mr. Deane (in a footnote to the letter of Cushman written Sunday, June 11), after quoting the remark, "But it is a fine ship," mistakenly adds, "The renowned *Mayflower*.—Ed.," thus committing himself to the common error in this regard. John Brown, in his "Pilgrim Fathers of New England," confuses the vessels, stating that, "when all was ready for the start, a pilot came over to conduct the emigrants to England, bringing also a letter from Cushman announcing that the *Mayflower*, a vessel of one hundred and eighty tons, Thomas Jones, Master, would start from London to Southampton in a week or two," *etc*. As we have seen, these statements are out of their relation. No pilot went for that purpose and none carried such a letter (certainly none from Cushman), as alleged. Cushman's letter, sent as we know by John Turner, announced the finding of an entirely different vessel, which was neither of 180 tons burden, nor had any relation to the *may-Flower* or her future historic freight. Neither was there in his letter any time of starting mentioned, or of the port of Southampton as the destination of any vessel to go from London, or of Jones as captain. Such loose statements are the bane of history. Goodwin, usually so accurate, stumbles unaccountably in this matter—which has been so strangely misleading to other competent men—and makes the sadly perverted statement that, "In June, John Turner was sent, and he soon returned with a petulant (sic) letter from Cushman, which, however, announced that the ship *Mayflower* had been selected and in two weeks would probably leave London for Southampton." He adds, with inexcusable carelessness in the presence of the words "sixty last" (which his dictionary would have told him, at a glance, was 120 tons), that: "This vessel (Thomas Jones, master) was rated at a hundred and eighty tons . . . . Yet she was called a fine ship," *etc*. It is evident that, like Brown, he confused the two vessels, with Cushman's letter before his eyes, from failure to compute the "sixty last." He moreover quotes Cushman incorrectly. The great disparity in size, however, should alone render this confusion impossible, and Cushman is clear as to the tonnage ("sixty last"), regretting that the ship found is not larger, while Bradford and all other chroniclers agree that the *may-Flower* was of "9 score" tons burden.

It is also evident that for some reason this smaller ship (found on Saturday afternoon) was not taken, probably because the larger one, the *may-Flower*, was immediately offered to and secured by Masters Weston and Cushman, and very probably with general approval. Just how the *may-Flower* was obtained may never be certainly known. It was only on Saturday, June 10, as we have seen, that Master Weston had seriously set to work to look for a ship; and although the refusal

Page 36

of one—not wholly satisfactory—had been prudently taken that day, it was both natural and politic that as early as possible in the following week he should make first inquiry of his fellow-merchants among the Adventurers, whether any of them had available such a ship as was requisite, seeking to find, if possible, one more nearly of the desired capacity than that of which he had "taken the refusal" on Saturday. It appears altogether probable that, in reply to this inquiry, Thomas Goffe, Esq., a fellow Adventurer and shipping-merchant of London, offered the *may-Flower*, which, there is ample reason to believe, then and for ten years thereafter, belonged to him.

It is quite likely that Clarke, the newly engaged "pilot," learning that his employers required a competent commander for their ship, brought to their notice the master of the ship (the *Falcon*) in which he had made his recent voyage to Virginia, Captain Jones, who, having powerful friends at his back in both Virginia Companies (as later appears), and large experience, was able to approve himself to the Adventurers. It is also probable that Thomas Weston engaged him himself, on the recommendation of the Earl of Warwick, at the instance of Sir Ferdinando Gorges.

As several weeks would be required to fit the ship for her long voyage on such service, and as she sailed from London July 15, her charter-party must certainly have been signed by June 20, 1620. The *Speedwell*, as appears from various sources (Bradford, Winslow *et al*.), sailed from Delfshaven, Saturday, July 22. She is said to have been four days on the passage to Southampton, reaching there Wednesday, July 26. Cushman, in his letter of Thursday, August 17, from Dartmouth to Edward Southworth, says, "We lay at Southampton seven days waiting for her" (the *Speedwell*), from which it is evident, both that Cushman came on the *may-Flower* from London, and that the *may-Flower* must have left London at least ten days before the 26th of July, the date of the SPEEDWELL'S arrival. As given traditionally, it was on the 15th, or eleven days before the SPEEDWELL'S arrival at Southampton.

By whom the charter-party of the *may-Flower* was signed will probably remain matter of conjecture, though we are not without intimations of some value regarding it. Captain John Smith tells us that the Merchant Adventurers (presumably one of the contracting parties) "were about seventy, . . . not a Corporation, but knit together by a voluntary combination in a Society without constraint or penalty. They have a President and Treasurer every year newly chosen by the most voices, who ordereth the affairs of their Courts and meetings; and with the assent of most of them, undertaketh all the ordinary business, but in more weighty affairs, the assent of the whole Company is required." It would seem from the foregoing—which, from so intelligent a source at a date so contemporaneous,

Page 37

ought to be reliable—that, not being an incorporated body, it would be essential that all the Adventurers (which Smith expressly states was their rule) should “assent” by their signatures, which alone could bind them to so important a business document as this charter-party. It was certainly one of their “more weighty affairs,” and it may well be doubted, also, if the owner of the vessel (even though one of their number) would accept less than the signatures of all, when there was no legal status by incorporation or co-partnership to hold them collectively.

If the facts were indeed as stated by Smith,—whose knowledge of what he affirmed there is no reason to doubt,—there can be little question that the contract for the service of the *may-Flower* was signed by the entire number of the Adventurers on the one part. If so, its covenants would be equally binding upon each of them except as otherwise therein stipulated, or provided by the law of the realm. In such case, the charter-party of the *may-Flower*, with the autograph of each Merchant Adventurer appended, would constitute, if it could be found, one of the most interesting and valuable of historical documents. That it was not signed by any of the Leyden congregation—in any representative capacity—is well-nigh certain. Their contracts were with the Adventurers alone, and hence they were not directly concerned in the contracts of the latter, their “agents” being but co-workers with the Adventurers (under their partnership agreements), in finding shipping, collecting moneys, purchasing supplies, and in generally promoting the enterprise. That they were not signing-parties to this contract, in particular, is made very certain by the suggestion of Cushman’s letter of Sunday, June 11, to the effect that he hoped that “our friends there [at Leyden] if they be quitted of the ship-hire [as then seemed certain, as the Adventurers would hire on general account] will be induced to venture [invest] the more.” There had evidently been a grave fear on the part of the Leyden people that if they were ever to get away, they would have to hire the necessary ship themselves.

There is just the shadow of a doubt thrown upon the accuracy of Smith’s statement as to the non-corporate status of the Adventurers, by the loose and unwieldy features which must thereby attach to their business transactions, to which it seems probable that merchants like Weston, Andrews, Beauchamp, Shirley, Pickering, Goffe, and others would object, unless the law at that time expressly limited and defined the rights and liabilities of members in such voluntary associations. Neither evidences of (primary) incorporation, or of such legal limitation, have, however, rewarded diligent search. There was evidently some more definite and corporate form of ownership in the properties and values of the Adventurers, arrived at later. A considerable reduction in the number of proprietors

Page 38

was effected before 1624—in most cases by the purchase of the interests of certain ones by their associates—for we find their holdings spoken of in that year as "sixteenths," and these shares to have sometimes been attached for their owners' debts. A letter of Shirley, Brewer et als., to Bradford, Allerton et als., dated London, April 7, 1624, says: "If it had not been apparently sold, Mr. Beauchamp, who is of the company also, unto whom he [Weston] oweth a great deal more, had long ago attached it (as he did other's 16ths)," *etc*. It is exceedingly difficult to reconcile these unquestionable facts with the equal certainty that, at the "Composition" of the Adventurers with the Planters in 1626, there were forty-two who signed as of the Adventurers. The weight, however, of evidence and of probability must be held to support the conclusion that in June, 1620, the organization was voluntary, and that the charter-party of the *may-Flower* was signed—" on the one part "—by each of the enrolled Adventurers engaged in the Leyden congregation's colonization scheme. Goodwin' alone pretends to any certain knowledge of the matter, but although a veracious usually reliable writer, he is not infallible, as already shown, and could hardly have had access to the original documents,—which alone, in this case, could be relied on to prove his assertion that "Shortly articles were signed by both parties, Weston acting for the Adventurers." Not a particle of confirmatory evidence has anywhere been found in Pilgrim or contemporaneous literature to warrant this statement, after exhaustive search, and it must hence, until sustained by proof, be regarded as a personal inference rather than a verity. If the facts were as appears, they permit the hope that a document of so much prima facie importance may have escaped destruction, and will yet be found among the private papers of some of the last survivors of the Adventurers, though with the acquisition of all their interests by the Pilgrim leaders such documents would seem, of right, to have become the property of the purchasers, and to have been transferred to the Plymouth planters.

This all-important and historic body—the company of Merchant Adventurers—is entitled to more than passing notice. Associated to "finance" the projected transplantation of the Leyden congregation of "Independents" to the "northern parts of Virginia," under such patronage and protection of the English government and its chartered Companies as they might be able to secure, they were no doubt primarily brought together by the efforts of one of their number, Thomas Weston, Esq., the London merchant previously named, though for some obscure reason Master John Pierce (also one of them) was their "recognized" representative in dealing with the (London) Virginia Company and the Council for the Affairs of New England, in regard to their Patents.

Page 39

Bradford states that Weston “was well acquainted with some of them the Leyden leaders and a furtherer of them in their former proceedings,” and this fact is more than once referred to as ground for their gratitude and generosity toward him, though where, or in what way, his friendship had been exercised, cannot be learned,—perhaps in the difficulties attending their escape from “the north country” to Holland. It was doubtless largely on this account, that his confident assurances of all needed aid in their plans for America were so relied upon; that he was so long and so fully trusted; and that his abominable treachery and later abuse were so patiently borne.

We are indebted to the celebrated navigator, Captain John Smith, of Virginia fame, always the friend of the New England colonists, for most of what we know of the organization and purposes of this Company. His ample statement, worthy of repetition here, recites, that “the Adventurers which raised the stock to begin and supply this Plantation, were about seventy: some, Gentlemen; some, Merchants; some, handicraftsmen; some adventuring great sums, some, small; as their estates and affections served . . . . These dwell most about London. They are not a corporation but knit together, by a voluntary combination, in a Society, with out constraint or penalty; aiming to do good and to plant Religion.” Their organization, officers, and rules of conduct, as given by Smith, have already been quoted. It is to be feared from the conduct of such men as Weston, Pierce, Andrews, Shirley, Thornell, Greene, Pickering, Alden, and others, that profitable investment, rather than desire “to do good and to plant Religion,” was their chief interest. That the higher motives mentioned by Smith governed such tried and steadfast souls as Bass, Brewer, Collier, Fletcher, Goffe, Hatherly, Ling, Mullens, Pocock, Thomas, and a few others, there can be no doubt.

[Weston wrote Bradford, April 10, 1622, “I perceive and know as well as another ye disposition of your adventurers, whom ye hope of gaine hath drawne on to this they have done; and yet I fear ye hope will not draw them much further.” While Weston’s character was utterly bad, and he had then alienated his interest in both Pilgrims and Adventurers, his judgment of men was evidently good.]

No complete list of the original “seventy” has ever been found, and we are indebted for the names of forty-two, of the fifty who are now known, to the final “Composition” made with the Pilgrim colonists, through the latter’s representatives, November 15/25, 1626, as given by Bradford, and to private research for the rest. The list of original members of the company of Merchant Adventurers, as ascertained to date, is as follows. More extended mention of them appears in the notes appended to this list.

Page 40

Robert Allden, Thomas Fletcher, Emanuel Altham, Thomas Goffe, Richard Andrews, Peter Gudburn, Thomas Andrews, William Greene, Lawrence Anthony, Timothy Hatherly, Edward Bass, Thomas Heath, John Beauchamp, William Hobson, Thomas Brewer, Robert Holland, Henry Browning, Thomas Hudson, William Collier, Robert Keayne, Thomas Coventry, Eliza Knight, John Knight, John Revell, Miles Knowles, Newman Rookes, John Ling, Samuel Sharpe, Christopher Martin(Treasurer pro tem.), James Shirley (Treasurer), Thomas Millsop, William Thomas, Thomas Mott, John Thornell William Mullens, Fria Newbald, Matthew Thornell William Pennington, William Penrin. Joseph Tilden, Edward Pickering, Thomas Ward, John Pierce, John White, John Pocock, John Wincob, Daniel Poynton, Thomas Weston, William Quarles, Richard Wright.

Shirley, in a letter to Governor Bradford, mentions a Mr. Fogge and a Mr. Coalson, in a way to indicate that they might have been, like himself, Collier, Thomas, Hatherly, Beauchamp, and Andrews, also of the original Merchant Adventurers, but no proof that they were such has yet been discovered. It has been suggested that Sir Edwin Sandys was one of the number, at the inception of the enterprise, but—though there is evidence to indicate that he stood the friend of the Pilgrims in many ways, possibly lending them money, *etc*.—there is no proof that he was ever one of the Adventurers. It is more probable that certain promoters of Higginson's and Winthrop's companies, some ten years later, were early financial sponsers of the *may-Flower* Pilgrims. Some of them were certainly so, and it is likely that others not known as such, in reality, were. Bradford suggests, in a connection to indicate the possibility of his having been an "Adventurer," the name of a "Mr. Denison," of whom nothing more is known. George Morton of London, merchant, and friend of the leaders from the inception, and later a colonist, is sometimes mentioned as probably of the list, but no evidence of the fact as yet appears. Sir George Farrer and his brother were among the first of the Adventurers, but withdrew themselves and their subscriptions very early, on account of some dissatisfaction.

It is impossible, in the space at command, to give more than briefest mention of each of these individual Adventurers.

Allden. Was at one time unfriendly to the Pilgrims,—Bradford calls him "one of our powerfullest opposers,"—but later their ally. Little is known of him. He appears to have been of London.

Altham. Was Master of the pinnace *little James*, belonging chiefly to Fletcher, and apparently expected to command her on her voyage to New Plymouth in 1623, as consort of the *Anne*, but for some reason did not go, and William Bridge went as her Master, in his stead.

Page 41

Andrews (Richard). Was one of the wealthiest and most liberal of the Adventurers. He was a haberdasher of Cheapside, London, and an Alderman of the city. He became an early proprietor and liberal benefactor of the Massachusetts Bay Company, but most illogically gave the debt due him from Plymouth Colony (L540) to the stronger and richer Bay Colony. He had been, however, unjustly prejudiced against the Pilgrims, probably through the deceit of Pierce, Weston, Shirley, and Allerton.

Andrews (Thomas). A Lord Mayor of London, reputed a brother of the last-named. Never very active in the Adventurers' affairs, but friendly, so far as appears.

Anthony. Little or nothing is known concerning him.

Bass. Was one of the enduring friends of the struggling Colony and loaned them money when they were in dire straits and the prospect of recovery was not good. He was of London, and considerable is known concerning him.

Beauchamp. Was one of the most active of the Company for many years. Generally to be relied upon as the Colony's friend, but not without some sordid self seeking. Apparently a wealthy citizen and "salter" of London.

Brewer. Is too well-known as long the partner of Brewster in the conduct of the "hidden press" at Leyden, and as a sufferer for conscience' sake, to require identification. He was a wealthy man, a scholar, writer, printer, and publisher. Was of the University of Leyden, but removed to London after the departure of the chief of the Pilgrims. Was their stanch friend, a loyal defender of the faith, and spent most of his later life in prison, under persecution of the Bishops.

Browning. Does not appear to have been active, and little is known of him.

Collier. Was a stanch and steadfast friend. Finally cast in his lot with the Pilgrims at New Plymouth and became a leading man in the government there. His life is well known. He was a "brewer."

Coventry. Appears only as a signer, and nothing is known of him.

Fletcher. Was a well-to-do merchant of London, a warm friend and a reliance of the Pilgrims. The loss of the *little James* was a severe blow to him financially.

Greene. Appears to have been a merchant and a partner in Holland (and perhaps at London) of Edward Pickering. They were well acquainted personally with the Pilgrims, and should have been among their most liberal and surest friends. Facts indicate, however, that they were sordid in their interest and not entirely just.

Page 42

Goffe. Was a London merchant and ship-owner, as else where appears. He was not only a Merchant Adventurer, but a patentee and deputy-governor of the Massachusetts Company, and an intimate friend of Winthrop. He lost heavily by his New England ventures. There is, as shown elsewhere, good reason to believe that he was the owner of the *may-Flower* on her historic voyage, as also when she came over in Higginson's and Winthrop's fleets, ten years later.

Gudburn. Appears only as a signer, so far as known.

Hatherly. Was a well-to-do friend of the Pilgrims, and after many complaints had been made against them among the "Purchasers" —arising out of the rascality of Shirley and Allerton—went to New England on a mission of inquiry. He was perfectly convinced of the Pilgrims' integrity and charmed with the country. He made another visit, and removed thither in 1633, to remain. He became at once prominent in the government of New Plimoth Colony.

Heath. Does not appear to have been active, and naught is known of him.

Hobson. Is known only as a signer of the "Composition."

Holland. Was a friend and ally of the Pilgrims, and one of their correspondents. He is supposed to have been of the ancient house of that name and to have lived in London.

Hudson. Was not active, and appears as a signer only.

Keayne. Was a well-to-do citizen of the vicinity of London, a friend, in a general way, of the Pilgrims. He came to Boston with Winthrop. Was prominent in the Massachusetts Colony. Was the founder and first commander of the early Artillery Company of Boston, the oldest military organization of the United States, and died at Boston, leaving a large estate and a very remarkable will, of which he made Governor Winslow an "overseer." He was an erratic,—but valuable, citizen.

Knight (Eliza). Seems to have been the only woman of the Adventurers, so far as they are known, but no thing is known of her. It has been suggested that the given name has been wrongly spelled and should be "Eleazar,"—a man's name,—but the "Composition" gives the signature as Eliza, clearly, as published.

Knight (John). Finds no especial mention. He was probably a relative of Eliza.

Knowles. Appears only as a signer of the “Composition.”

Ling. Was a wealthy friend of the colonists and always true to them. He lost his property and was in poverty when the Pilgrims (though not yet well on their feet), in grateful remembrance of his fidelity, sent him a generous gift.

Martin. Was the first treasurer of the colonists and also a *may-Flower* Pilgrim. Mention of him appears later. He was no credit to the Company, and his early death probably prevented much vexation.

Page 43

Millsop. Appears only as a signer of the "Composition."

Mott. Has no especial mention, but is believed to have sent some of his people to Plymouth Colony at an early day.

Mullens. Was, as appears elsewhere, a well-conditioned tradesman of Surrey, England, who was both an Adventurer and a *may-Flower* Pilgrim, and Martin and himself appear to have been the only ones who enjoyed that distinction. He died, however, soon after the arrival at Plymouth. That he was an Adventurer is but recently discovered by the author, but there appears no room for doubt as to the fact. His record was brief, but satisfactory, in its relation to the Pilgrims.

Newbald. Finds no especial mention.

Pennington. Appears only as a signer. It is a London name.

Penrin. Appears only as a signer of the "Composition."

Pickering. Is introduced to us first as a Leyden merchant, through John Robinson's letters. He appears to have been a shrewd, cold-blooded calculator, like his partner-Adventurer, Greene, not interested especially in the Pilgrims, except for gain, and soon deserting the Adventurers. His family seem to have been in favor with Charles *ii*. (See Pepys' "Diary.")

Pierce (John). Although recognized by the Virginia Companies and Council for New England, as the representative of the Adventurers, he has only been recently generally reckoned a chief man of the Adventurers. A Protean friend of the Pilgrims, never reliable, ever pretentious, always self-seeking, and of no help. He was finally ruined by the disasters to his ship, the *Paragon*, which cost him all his interests. Having attempted treacherously to secure to himself the Patent granted in the Colony's interest, he was compelled by the Council to surrender its advantages to the Adventurers and colonists.

Pocock. Was a stanch and firm supporter of the Pilgrims and their interests, at all times, and to the end. He was also a financial supporter and deputy-governor the Massachusetts Company, under Winthrop. A correspondent of Bradford. A good man.

Poyton. Finds no especial mention. He appears as a signer only.

Quarles. Appears only as a signer of the “Composition.”

Revell. Was a very wealthy citizen, merchant, and ship owner of London, and a good man. He became also ardently interested in Winthrop’s Company. Was an “assistant” and one of the five “undertakers” chosen to go to New England to reside. He went to New England on the *Jewell* of Winthrop’s fleet, and was part owner of the *lady* ARBELLA. He evidently, however, did not like the life, and returned after a few weeks’ stay.

Page 44

Rookes. Appears only as a signer.

Sharpe. Was also a friend of both Pilgrim and Puritan. He came to New England in 1629, and settled first at Salem, in the Massachusetts Company. He died in 1658, having long been a ruling elder of the church there. He met with many enemies, but was a valuable man and an able one. He was Governor Cradock's New England agent.

Shirley. Requires little mention here. The perfidious friend of the Pilgrims,—perhaps originally true to them,—he sunk everything for hope of gain. He was treasurer of the Adventurers, one of their most active and intelligent men, but proved a rascal and a canting hypocrite. He was a "citizen and gold-smith" of London.

Thomas. Has nowhere been enumerated in any list of the Adventurers (though occasionally mentioned as such by recent writers), which is strange, as repeated letters of his to Bradford, and other data, show him to have been one of the best and truest of them all. He sold his interests before the "Composition" and became a colonist after 1630. He was the fifth of the Adventurers to come to New England to remain, and cast in his lot with the Pilgrims at New Plimoth—Martin, Mullens, Collier, and Hatherly preceding him. A wealthy and well-informed man, he became a power in the government. Probably Welsh by birth, he was a London merchant when the Adventurers were organized. His home at Marshfield, Massachusetts, has since become additionally famous as the home of Daniel Webster.

Thornell (John). Is sometimes confounded with another Adventurer, Matthew Thornhill, as his name is some times so spelled. There is reason to believe they were related. He was not a friend to the Pilgrims.

Thornhill (or Thornell), (Matthew). Little is known concerning him.

Tilden. Was of an old family in Kent, "a citizen and girdler of London," as his will declares, his brother (Nathaniel) later coming to New England and settling near Hatherly at Scituate. Nathaniel's son Joseph—named for his uncle—was made his executor and heir. The uncle was always a firm friend of the Pilgrims. Mr. Tilden's will is given by Waters ("Genealogical Gleanings," vol. i. p. 71), and is of much interest.

Ward. Appears only as a signer.

White. Probably the Rev. John White, a stanch friend of the Pilgrims, although not a “Separatist,” and intimately connected with the upbuilding of New England. His record was a broad and noble one. Goodwin says: “Haven thinks White was that Dorchester clergyman reputed to be the author of the Planters’ Plea.” Probably, but not certainly, William White of the Pilgrims was also an Adventurer.

Page 45

Wincob (?). Was a gentleman of the family of the Countess of Lincoln, and the one in whose name the first patent in behalf of the Adventurers and Pilgrims (which, however, was never used) was taken. It is only recently that evidences which, though not conclusive, are yet quite indicative, have caused his name to be added to the list, though there is still a measure of doubt whether it belongs there.

Weston. Requires little mention here. Once a friend of the Pilgrims and unmistakably the organizer of the Adventurers, he became a graceless ingrate and rascal. An instrument of good at first, he became a heartless and designing enemy of the Planters. He was a "citizen and merchant [ironmonger] of London." It is altogether probable that he was originally a tool of Sir Ferdinando Gorges and was led by him to influence the Leyden brethren to break off negotiations with the Dutch. He died poor, at Bristol, England.

Wright. Perhaps came to New Plimoth and married a daughter of the *may-Flower* Pilgrim, Francis Cooke. If so, he settled at Rehoboth and became its leading citizen. He may possibly have been the settler of that name in the Bay-Colony, and the weight of evidence rather favors the latter supposition.

Of the Adventurers, Collier, Hatherly, Keayne, Mullens, Revell, Pierce, Sharpe, Thomas, and Weston, probably Wright and White, possibly others, came to America for longer or shorter periods. Several of them were back and forth more than once. The records show that Andrews, Goffe, Pocock, Revell, Sharpe, and White were subsequently members of the Massachusetts (Winthrop's) Company.

Professor Arberl finds but six of the Pilgrim Merchant Adventurers who later were among the Adventurers with Winthrop's Company of Massachusetts Bay, *viz*.:—Thomas Andrews, John Pocock, Samuel Sharpe, Thomas Goffe, John Revell, John White.

He should have added at least, the names of Richard Andrews and Robert Keayne, and probably that of Richard Wright.

Of their number, Collier, Hatherly, Martin, Mullens, Thomas, and (possibly) Wright were Plymouth colonists Martin and Mullens, as noted, being *may-Flower* Pilgrims. Nathaniel Tilden, a brother of Joseph Tilden of the Adventurers, came, as previously mentioned, to the Colony from Kent, settling at Scituate. Joseph, being apparently unmarried, made his nephew, Joseph of Scituate, his residuary legatee, and his property mostly came over to the Colony.

Page 46

Collier, Hatherly, and Thomas all located within a few miles of one another, were all wealthy and prominent men in the government of the Colony, were intimate friends,—-the first and last especially,—and lent not a little dignity and character to this new dependency of King James the First. The remaining twenty or thereabouts whose names are not surely known—though a few of them are pretty safely conjectured, some being presumably of the Holland Pilgrims and their friends—were probably chiefly small contributors, whose rights were acquired from time to time by others of larger faith in the enterprise, or greater sympathy or means. Not all, however, who had ceased to hold their interests when the "Composition" was made with Allerton in behalf of the colonists, in 1626, were of these small holders. Weston was forced out by stress of circumstances; Thomas moved to New England; Pierce was ruined by his ventures by sea; Martin and Mullens died in 1621; Pickering and Greene got out early, from distrust as to profits; Wincob alone, of this class, was a small investor, if he was one at all.

By far the greater portion of the sums invested by the Adventurers in behalf of the Colony is represented by those whose names are known, those still unknown representing, doubtless, numbers rather than amounts. It is, however, interesting to note, that more than four sevenths of the original number, as given by Captain John Smith, continued to retain their interests till the "Composition" of 1626. It is to be hoped that it may yet be possible to increase considerably, if not to perfect, the list of these coadjutors of the Pilgrims—the Merchant Adventurers—the contracting "party of the second part," to the charter-party of the *may-Flower*.

Who the Owner of the *may-Flower* was, or who his representative, the "party of the first part," to the charter party of the Pilgrim ship, cannot be declared with absolute certainty, though naturally a matter of absorbing interest. There is, however, the strongest probability, as before intimated, that Thomas Goffe, Esq., one of the Merchant Adventurers, and always a stanch friend of the Pilgrims, was the owner of the historic vessel,—and as such has interwoven his name and hers with the histories of both the Pilgrim and Puritan hegiras from Old to New England. He was, as previously stated, a wealthy "merchant and ship owner of London," and not only an Adventurer with the Leyden Pilgrims, but—nearly ten years later—a patentee of the Massachusetts Company and one of its charter officers.

We are told in the journal of Governor Winthrop of that Company—then on board the *lady* ARBELLA, the, "Admiral" or flagship of his fleet, riding at Cowes, ready to set sail for New England—that on "Easter Monday (March 29), 1630, the *Charles*, the *may-Flower*, the *William and Francis*, the *Hopewell*, the *Whale*, the *success*, and the *trial*,"

Page 47

of his fleet, were “still at Hampton [Southampton] and are not ready.” Of these seven ships it is certain that Mr. Goffe owned at least two, as Governor Winthrop—in writing, some days later, of the detention of his son Henry and his friend Mr. Pelham, who, going ashore, failed to return to the governor’s ship before she sailed from Cowes, and so went to the fleet at Southampton for passage—says: “So we have left them behind and suppose they will come after in one of Mr. Goffe’s ships.” It is clear, therefore, that Mr. Goffe, who was an intimate friend and business associate of Governor Winthrop, as the latter’s correspondence amply attests, and was a charter deputy-governor of the Massachusetts Company, and at this time “an assistant,” was the owner of at least two (probably not more) of these seven belated ships of the governor’s fleet, riding at Southampton. Bearing in mind that the *may-Flower* and the *Whale* were two of those ships, it becomes of much importance to find that these two ships, evidently sailing in company (as if of one owner), arrived together in the harbor of Charlestown, New England, on Thursday, July 1, having on board one of them the governor’s missing son, Henry Winthrop. If he came—as his father expected and as appears certain—“in one of Mr. Goffe’s ships,” then evidently, either the *may-Flower* or the *Whale*, or both, belonged to Mr. Goffe. That both were Goffe’s is rendered probable by the fact that Governor Winthrop—writing of the vessels as if associated and a single interest—states that “most of their cattle [on these ships] were dead, whereof a mare and horse of mine.” This probability is increased, too, by the facts that the ships evidently kept close company across the Atlantic (as if under orders of a common owner, and as was the custom, for mutual defence and assistance, if occasion required), and that Winthrop who, as we above noted, had large dealings with Goffe, seems to have practically freighted both these ships for himself and friends, as his freight bills attest. They would hence, so far as possible, naturally keep together and would discharge their cargoes and have their accountings to a single consignee, taken as nearly together as practicable. Both these ships came to Charlestown,—as only one other did,—and both were freighted, as noted, by one party.

Sadly enough, the young man, Henry Winthrop, was drowned at Salem the very day after his arrival, and before that of either of the other vessels: the *Hopewell*, or *William and Francis* (which arrived at Salem the 3d); or the *trial* or *Charles* (which arrived—the first at Charlestown, of the last at Salem—the 5th); or the *success* (which arrived the 6th); making it certain that he must have come in either the *may-Flower* or the *Whale*. If, as appears, Goffe owned them both, then his ownership of the *may-Flower*

Page 48

in 1630 is assured, while all authorities agree without cavil that the *may-Flower* of Winthrop's fleet in that year (1630) and the *may-Flower* of the Pilgrims were the same. In the second "General Letter of Instructions" from the Massachusetts Company in England—dated London, May 28, 1629—to Governor Endicott and his Council, a duplicate of which is preserved in the First Book of the Suffolk Registry of Deeds at Boston, the historic vessel is described as "The *may-Flower*, of Yarmouth —William Pierse, Master," and Higginson, in his "Journal of a Voyage to New England," says, "The fifth ship is called the *may-Flower* carrying passengers and provisions." Yarmouth was hence undoubtedly the place of register, and the hailing port of the *may-Flower*,—she was very likely built there,—and this would remain the same, except by legal change of register, wherever she was owned, or from what ever port she might sail. Weston and Cushman, according to Bradford, found and hired her at London, and her probable owner, Thomas Goffe, Esq., was a merchant of that city. Dr. Young remarks: "The *Mayflower* Of Higginson's fleet is the renowned vessel that brought the Pilgrim Fathers to Plymouth in 1620." Hon. James Savage says "The *Mayflower* had been a name of renown without forming part of this fleet [Winthrop's, 1630], because in her came the devoted planters of Plimouth [1620] and she had also brought in the year preceding [1629] some of Higginson's company to Salem." Goodwin' says: "In 1629 she [the Pilgrim *may-Flower*] came to Salem with a company of the Leyden people for Plymouth, and in 1630 was one of the large fleet that attended John Winthrop, discharging her passengers at Charlestown." Dr. Young remarks in a footnote: "Thirty-five of the Leyden congregation with their families came over to Plymouth via Salem, in the *may-Flower* and *Talbot*."

In view of such positive statements as these, from such eminent authorities and others, and of the collateral facts as to the probable ownership of the *may-Flower* in 1630, and on her earlier voyages herein presented, the doubt expressed by the Rev. Mr. Blaxland in his "Mayflower Essays," whether the ship bearing her name was the same, on these three several voyages, certainly does not seem justified.

Captain William Pierce, who commanded the *may-Flower* in 1629, when she brought over part of the Leyden company, was the very early and intimate friend of the Pilgrims —having brought over the *Anne* with Leyden passengers in 1623—and sailed exclusively in the employ of the Merchant Adventurers, or some of their number, for many years, which is of itself suggestive.

Page 49

To accept, as beyond serious doubt, Mr. Goffe's ownership of the *may-Flower*, when she made her memorable voyage to New Plimoth, one need only to compare, and to interpret logically, the significant facts; —that he was a ship-owner of London and one of the body of Merchant Adventurers who set her forth on her Pilgrim voyage in 1620; and that he stood, as her evident owner, in similar relation to the Puritan company which chartered her for New England, similarly carrying colonists, self-exiled for religion's sake, in 1629 and again in 1630. This conviction is greatly strengthened by the fact that Mr. Goffe continued one of the Pilgrim Merchant Adventurers, until their interests were transferred to the colonists by the "Composition" of 1626, and three years later (1629) sent by the *may-Flower*, on her second New England voyage, although under a Puritan charter, another company from the Leyden congregation. The (cipher) letter of the "Governor and deputies of the New-England Company for a plantation in Massachusetts Bay" to Captain John Endicott, written at Gravesend, England, the 17th of April, 1629, says: "If you want any Swyne wee have agreed with those of Ne[w] Plimouth that they deliver you six Sowes with pigg for which they a[re] to bee allowed 9 lb. in accompt of what they the Plymouth people owe unto Mr. Goffe [our] deputie [Governor]." It appears from the foregoing that the Pilgrims at New Plymouth were in debt to Mr. Goffe in 1629, presumably for advances and passage money on account of the contingent of the Leyden congregation, brought over with Higginson's company to Salem, on the second trip of the *may-Flower*. Mr. Goffe's intimate connection with the Pilgrims was certainly unbroken from the organization of their Merchant Adventurers in 1619/20, through the entire period of ten years, to 1630. There is every reason to believe, and none to doubt, that his ownership of the *may-Flower* of imperishable renown remained equally unbroken throughout these years, and that his signature as her owner was appended to her Pilgrim charter-party in 1620. Whoever the signatories of her charter-party may have been, there can be no doubt that the good ship *may-Flower*, in charge of her competent, if treacherous, Master, Captain Thomas Jones, and her first "pilot," John Clarke, lay in the Thames near London through the latter part of June and the early part of July, in the summer of 1620, undergoing a thorough overhauling, under contract as a colonist-transport, for a voyage to the far-off shores of "the northern parts of Virginia."

Page 50

In whatever of old English verbiage, with quaint terms and cumbersome repetition, the stipulations of this contract of were concealed, there can be no doubt that they purported and designed to “ingage” that “the Good ship *may-Flower* of Yarmouth, of 9 score tuns burthen, whereof for the present viage Thomas Joanes is Master,” should make the “viage” as a colonist-transport, “from the city of London in His Majesty’s Kingdom of Great Britain,” *etc*., “to the neighborhood of the mouth of Hudson’s River, in the northern parts of Virginia and return, calling at the Port of Southampton, outward bound, to complete her lading, the same of all kinds, to convey to, and well and safely deliver at, such port or place, at or about the mouth of Hudson’s River, so-called, in Virginia aforesaid, as those in authority of her passengers shall direct,” *etc*., with provision as to her return lading, through her supercargo, *etc*.

It is probable that the exact stipulations of the contract will never transpire, and we can only roughly guess at them, by somewhat difficult comparison with the terms on which the *lady* ARBELLA, the “Admiral,” or flagship, of Winthrop’s fleet, was chartered in 1630, for substantially the like voyage (of course, without expectation or probability, of so long a stay on the New England coast), though the latter was much the larger ship. The contract probably named an “upset” or total sum for the “round voyage,” as was the of the case with the *lady* ARBELLA, though it is to be hoped there was no “demurrage” clause, exacting damage, as is usual, for each day of detention beyond the “lay days” allowed, for the long and unexpected tarries in Cape Cod and Plymouth harbors must have rolled up an appalling “demurrage” claim. Winthrop enters among his memoranda, “The agreement for the ARBELLA L750, whereof is to be paid in hand [i e. cash down] the rest upon certificate of our safe arrival.” The sum was doubtless considerably in excess of that paid for the *may-Flower*, both because she was a much larger, heavier-armed, and better-manned ship, of finer accommodations, and because ships were, in 1630, in far greater demand for the New England trade than in 1620, Winthrop’s own fleet including no less than ten. The adjustments of freight and passage moneys between the Adventurers and colonists are matter of much doubt and perplexity, and are not likely to be fully ascertained. The only light thrown upon them is by the tariffs for such service on Winthrop’s fleet, and for passage, *etc*., on different ships, at a little later day. It is altogether probable that transportation of all those accepted as colonists, by the agents of the Adventurers and “Planters,” was without direct charge to any individual, but was debited against the whole. But as some had better quarters than others, some much more and heavier furniture, *etc*., while some had bulky and heavy goods for their personal benefit (such as William Mullen’s cases of “boots and shoes,” *etc*.), it is fair to assume that some schedule of rates for “tonnage,” if not for individuals, became necessary, to prevent complaints and to facilitate accounts. Winthrop credits Mr. Goffe—owner of two of the ships in 1630—as follows:—

Page 51

> "For ninety-six passengers at L4, L384.
> For thirty-two tons of goods at L3 (per ton).
> For passage for a man, his wife and servant, (3 persons)
> L16/10, L5/10 each."

Goodwin shows the cost of transportation at different times and under varying conditions. "The expense of securing and shipping Thos. Morton of 'Merry Mount' to England, was L12 7 0," but just what proportion the passage money bore to the rest of the account, cannot now be told. The expense of Mr. Rogers, the young insane clergyman brought over by Isaac Allerton, without authority, was, for the voyage out: "For passage L1. For diet for eleven weeks at 4s. 8d. per week, total L3 11 4" [A rather longer passage than usual.] Constant Southworth came in the same ship and paid the same, L3 11 4, which may hence be assumed as the average charge, at that date, for a first-class passage. This does not vary greatly from the tariff of to-day, (1900) as, reduced to United States currency, it would be about $18; and allowing the value of sterling to be about four times this, in purchase ratio, it would mean about $73. The expenses of the thirty-five of the Leyden congregation who came over in the *may-Flower* in 1620, and of the others brought in the *Lion* in 1630, were slightly higher than these figures, but the cost of the trip from Leyden to England was included, with that of some clothing. In 1650, Judge Sewall, who as a wealthy man would be likely to indulge in some luxury, gives his outlay one way, as, "Fare, L2 3 0; cabin expenses, L4 11 4; total, L6 14 4."

CHAPTER IV

THE MAY-FLOWER—THE SHIP HERSELF

Unhappily the early chroniclers familiar with the *may-Flower* have left us neither representation nor general description of her, and but few data from which we may reconstruct her outlines and details for ourselves. Tradition chiefly determines her place in one of the few classes into which the merchant craft of her day were divided, her tonnage and service being almost the only other authentic indices to this class.

Bradford helps us to little more than the statement, that a vessel, which could have been no other, "was hired at London, being of burden about 9 score" [tons], while the same extraordinary silence, which we have noticed as to her name, exists as to her description, with Smith, Bradford, Winslow, Morton, and the other contemporaneous or early writers of Pilgrim history. Her hundred and eighty tons register indicates in general her size, and to some extent her probable model and rig.

Page 52

Long search for a reliable, coetaneous picture of one of the larger ships of the merchant service of England, in the Pilgrim period, has been rewarded by the discovery of the excel lent “cut” of such a craft, taken from M. Blundeville’s “New and Necessarie Treatise of Navigation,” published early in the seventeenth century. Appearing in a work of so high character, published by so competent a navigator and critic, and (approximately) in the very time of the Pilgrim “exodus,” there can be no doubt that it quite correctly, if roughly and insufficiently, depicts the outlines, rig, and general cast of a vessel of the *may-Flower* type and time, as she appeared to those of that day, familiar therewith.

It gives us a ship corresponding, in the chief essentials, to that which careful study of the detail and minutiae of the meagre *may-Flower* history and its collaterals had already permitted the author and others to construct mentally, and one which confirms in general the conceptions wrought out by the best artists and students who have attempted to portray the historic ship herself.

Captain J. W. Collins, whose experience and labors in this relation are further alluded to, and whose opinion is entitled to respect, writes the author in this connection, as follows “The cut from Blundeville’s treatise, which was published more or less contemporaneously with the *Mayflower*, is, in my judgment, misleading, since it doubtless represents a ship of an earlier date, and is evidently [sic] reproduced from a representation on tapestry, of which examples are still to be seen (with similar ships) in England. The actual builder’s plans, reproduced by Admiral Paris, from drawings still preserved, of ships of the MAYFLOWER’S time, seem to me to offer more correct and conclusive data for accurately determining what the famous ship of the Pilgrim Fathers was like.”

Decidedly one of the larger and better vessels of the merchant class of her day, she presumably followed the prevalent lines of that class, no doubt correctly represented, in the main, by the few coeval pictures of such craft which have come down to us. No one can state with absolute authority, her exact rig, model, or dimensions; but there can be no question that all these are very closely determined from even the meagre data and the prints we possess, so nearly did the ships of each class correspond in their respective features in those days. There is a notable similarity in certain points of the *may-Flower*, as she has been represented by these different artists, which is evidence upon two points: first, that all delineators have been obliged to study the type of vessel to which she belonged from such representations of it as each could find, as neither picture nor description of the vessel herself was to be had; and second, that as the result of such independent study nearly all are substantially agreed as to what the salient features

Page 53

of her type and class were. A model of a ship [3 masts] of the *may-Flower* type, and called in the Society's catalogue "A Model of the *may Flower*, after De Bry," but itself labelled "Model of one of Sir Walter Raleigh's Ships," is (mistakenly) exhibited by the Pilgrim Society at Plymouth. It is by no means to be taken as a correct representation of the Pilgrim bark. Few of the putative pictures of the *may-Flower* herself are at all satisfactory,—apart from the environment or relation in which she is usually depicted,—-whether considered from an historical, a nautical, or an artistic point of view. The only one of these found by the author which has commanded (general, if qualified) approval is that entitled "The *may-Flower* at Sea," a reproduction of which, by permission, is the frontispiece of this volume. It is from an engraving by the master hand of W. J. Linton, from a drawing by Granville Perkins, and appeared in the "New England Magazine" for April, 1898, as it has elsewhere. Its comparative fidelity to fact, and its spirited treatment, alike commend it to those familiar with the subject, as par excellence the modern artistic picture of the *may-Flower*, although somewhat fanciful, and its rig, as Captain Collies observes, "is that of a ship a century later than the *may-Flower*; a square topsail on the mizzen," he notes, "being unknown in the early part of the seventeenth century, and a jib on a ship equally rare." Halsall's picture of "The Arrival of the *may-Flower* in Plymouth Harbor," owned by the Pilgrim Society, of Plymouth, and hung in the Society's Hall, while presenting several historical inaccuracies, undoubtedly more correctly portrays the ship herself, in model, rig, *etc*., than do most of the well-known paintings which represent her. It is much to be regretted that the artist, in woeful ignorance, or disregard, of the recorded fact that the ship was not troubled with either ice or snow on her entrance (at her successful second attempt) to Plymouth harbor, should have covered and environed her with both.

Answering, as the *may-Flower* doubtless did, to her type, she was certainly of rather "blocky," though not unshapely, build, with high poop and forecastle, broad of beam, short in the waist, low "between decks," and modelled far more upon the lines of the great nautical prototype, the water-fowl, than the requirements of speed have permitted in the carrying trade of more recent years. That she was of the "square rig" of her time —when apparently no use was made of the "fore-and-aft" sails which have so wholly banished the former from all vessels of her size—goes without saying. She was too large for the lateen rig, so prevalent in the Mediterranean, except upon her mizzenmast, where it was no doubt employed.

Page 54

The chief differences which appear in the several “counterfeit presentments” of the historic ship are in the number of her masts and the height of her poop and her forecastle. A few make her a brig or “snow” of the oldest pattern, while others depict her as a full-rigged ship, sometimes having the auxiliary rig of a small “jigger” or “dandy-mast,” with square or lateen sail, on peak of stern, or on the bow sprit, or both, though usually her mizzenmast is set well aft upon the poop. There is no reason for thinking that the former of these auxiliaries existed upon the *may-Flower*, though quite possible. Her 180 tons measurement indicates, by the general rule of the nautical construction of that period, a length of from 90 to 100 feet, “from taffrail to knighthead,” with about 24 feet beam, and with such a hull as this, three masts would be far more likely than two. The fact that she is always called a “ship”—to which name, as indicating a class, three masts technically attach—is also somewhat significant, though the term is often generically used. Mrs. Jane G. Austin calls the *may-Flower* a “brig,” but there does not appear anywhere any warrant for so doing.

At the Smithsonian Institution (National Museum) at Washington, D. C., there is exhibited a model of the *may-Flower*, constructed from the ratio of measurements given in connection with the sketch and working plans of a British ship of the merchant *may-Flower* class of the seventeenth century, as laid down by Admiral Francois Edmond Paris, of France, in his “Souvenirs de Marine.” The hull and rigging of this model were carefully worked out by, and under the supervision of Captain Joseph W. Collins (long in the service of the Smithsonian Institution, in nautical and kindred matters, and now a member of the Massachusetts Commission of Inland Fisheries and Game), but were calculated on the erroneous basis of a ship of 120 instead of 180 tons measurement. This model, which is upon a scale of 1/2 inch to 1 foot, bears a label designating it as “The ‘*Mayflower*’ of the Puritans” [sic], and giving the following description (written by Captain Collins) of such a vessel as the Pilgrim ship, if of 120 tons burthen, as figured from such data as that given by Admiral Paris, must, approximately, have been. (See photographs of the model presented herewith.) “A wooden, carvel-built, keel vessel, with full bluff bow, strongly raking below water line; raking curved stem; large open head; long round (nearly log-shaped) bottom; tumble in top side; short run; very large and high square stern; quarter galleries; high forecastle, square on forward end, with open rails on each side; open bulwarks to main [spar] and quarter-decks; a succession of three quarter-decks or poops, the after one being nearly 9 feet above main [spar] deck; two boats stowed on deck; ship-rigged, with pole masts [i.e. masts in one piece]; without jibs; square sprit sail (or water sail under bowsprit); two square sails on fore and main masts, and lateen sail on mizzenmast.”

Page 55

Dimensions of Vessel. Length, over all, knightheads to taffrail, 82 feet; beam, 22 feet; depth, 14 feet; tonnage, 120; bowsprit, outboard, 40 feet 6 inches; spritsail yard, 34 feet 6 inches; foremast, main deck to top, 39 feet; total length, main [spar] deck to truck, 67 feet 6 inches; fore-yard, 47 feet 6 inches; foretopsail yard, 34 feet 1 2 inches; mainmast, deck to top, 46 feet; total, deck to truck, 81 feet; main yard, 53 feet; maintopsail yard, 38 feet 6 inches; mizzen mast, deck to top, 34 feet; total, deck to truck, 60 feet 6 inches; spanker yard, 54 feet 6 inches; boats, one on port side of deck, 17 feet long by 5 feet 2 inches wide; one on starboard side, 13 feet 6 inches long by 4 feet 9 inches wide. The above description "worked out" by Captain Collins, and in conformity to which his putative model of the "*May Flower*" was constructed, rests, of course, for its correctness, primarily, upon the assumptions (which there is no reason to question) that the "plates" of Admiral Paris, his sketches, working plans, dimensions, *etc*., are reliable, and that Captain Collins's mathematics are correct, in reducing and applying the Admiral's data to a ship of 120 tons. That there would be some considerable variance from the description given, in applying these data to a ship of 60 tons greater measurement (i.e. of 180 tons), goes without saying, though the changes would appear more largely in the hull dimensions than in the rigging. That the description given, and its expression in the model depicted, present, with considerable fidelity, a ship of the *may*-FLOWER'S class and type, in her day,—though of sixty tons less register, and amenable to changes otherwise,—is altogether probable, and taken together, they afford a fairly accurate idea of the general appearance of such a craft.

In addition to mention of the enlargements which the increased tonnage certainly entails, the following features of the description seem to call for remark.

It is doubtful whether the vessels of this class had "open bulwarks to the main [spar] deck," or "a succession of three quarter-decks or poops." Many models and prints of ships of that period and class show but two. It is probable that if the jib was absent, as Captain Collins believes (though it was evidently in use upon some of the pinnaces and shallops of the time, and its utility therefore appreciated), there was a small squaresail on a "dandy" mast on the bowsprit, and very possibly the "sprit" or "water-sail" he describes. The length of the vessel as given by Captain Collins, as well as her beam, being based on a measurement of but 120 tons, are both doubtless less than they should be, the depth probably also varying slightly, though there would very likely be but few and slight departures otherwise from his proximate figures. The long-boat would be more likely to be lashed across the hatch amidships than stowed on the port side of the deck, unless in use for stowage purposes, as previously

Page 56

suggested. Captain Collins very interestingly notes in a letter to the author, concerning the measurements indicated by his model: "Here we meet with a difficulty, even if it is not insurmountable. This is found in the discrepancy which exists between the dimensions—length, breadth, and depth—requisite to produce a certain tonnage, as given by Admiral Paris and the British Admiralty. Whether this is due to a difference in estimating tonnage between France (or other countries) and Great Britain, I am unable to say, but it is a somewhat remarkable fact that the National Museum model, which was made for a vessel of 120 tons, as given by Admiral Paris who was a Frenchman, has almost exactly the proportions of length, depth, and breadth that an English ship of 180 tons would have, if we can accept as correct the lists of measurements from the Admiralty records published by Charnock . . . In the third volume of Charnock's 'History of Marine Architecture,' p. 274., I find that a supply transport of 175 tons, built in 1759, and evidently a merchant ship originally, or at least a vessel of that class, was 79.4 feet long (tonnage measure), 22.6 feet beam, and 11.61 feet deep." The correspondence is noticeable and of much interest, but as the writer comments, all depends upon whether or not "the measurement of the middle of the eighteenth century materially differed in Great Britain from what it was in the early part of the previous century."

Like all vessels having high stems and sterns, she was unquestionably "a wet ship,"—-upon this voyage especially so, as Bradford shows, from being overloaded, and hence lower than usual in the water. Captain John Smith says: "But being pestered [vexed] nine weeks in this leaking, unwholesome ship, lying wet in their cabins; most of them grew very weak and weary of the sea." Bradford says, quoting the master of the *may-Flower* and others: "As for the decks and upper works they would caulk them as well as they could, . . . though with the working of the ship, they would not long keep staunch." She was probably not an old craft, as her captain and others declared they "knew her to be strong and firm under water;" and the weakness of her upper works was doubtless due to the strain of her overload, in the heavy weather of the autumnal gales. Bradford says: "They met with many contrary winds and fierce storms with which their ship was shrewdly shaken and her upper works made very leaky." That the confidence of her master in her soundness below the water-line was well placed, is additionally proven by her excellent voyages to America, already noted, in 1629, and 1630, when she was ten years older.

Page 57

That she was somewhat “blocky” above water was doubtless true of her, as of most of her class; but that she was not unshapely below the water-line is quite certain, for the re markable return passage she made to England (in ballast) shows that her lower lines must have been good. She made the run from Plymouth to London on her return voyage in just thirty-one days, a passage that even with the “clipper ships” of later days would have been respectable, and for a vessel of her model and rig was exceptionally good. She was “light” (in ballast), as we know from the correspondence of Weston and Bradford, the letter of the former to Governor Carver—who died before it was received—upbraiding him for sending her home “empty.” The terrible sickness and mortality of the whole company, afloat and ashore, had, of course, made it impossible to freight her as intended with “clapboards” [stave-stock], sassafras roots, peltry, *etc*. No vessels of her class of that day were without the high poop and its cabin possibilities,—admirably adapting them to passenger service,—and the larger had the high and roomy topgallant forecastles so necessary for their larger crews. The breadth of beam was always considerably greater in that day than earlier, or until much later, necessitated by the proportionately greater height ("topsides"), above water, at stem and stern. The encroachments of her high poop and forecastle left but short waist-room; her waist-ribs limited the height of her “between decks;” while the “perked up” lines of her bow and stern produced the resemblance noted, to the croup and neck of the wild duck. That she was low “between decks” is demonstrated by the fact that it was necessary to “cut down” the Pilgrims’ shallop—an open sloop, of certainly not over 30 feet in length, some 10 tons burden, and not very high “freeboard”—“to stow” her under the *may*-FLOWER’S spar deck. That she was “square-rigged” follows, as noted, from the fact that it was the only rig in use for ships of her class and size, and that she had “topsails” is shown by the fact that the “top-saile halliards” were pitched over board with John Howland, and saved his life. Bradford says: “A lustie yonge man (called John Howland) coming upon some occasion above ye grattings, was with a seele of ye shipe throwne into ye sea: but it pleased God yt he caught hould of ye top-saile halliards which hunge over board & rane out at length yet he held his hould . . . till he was haled up,” *etc*. Howland had evidently just come from below upon the poop-deck (as there would be no “grattings” open in the waist to receive the heavy seas shipped). The ship was clearly experiencing “heavy weather” and a great lurch ("seele”) which at the stern, and on the high, swinging, tilting poop-deck would be most severely felt, undoubtedly tossed him over the rail. The topsail halliards were probably trailing alongside and saved him, as they have others under like circumstances.

Page 58

Whether or not the *may-Flower* had the “round house” under her poop-deck, ——a sort of circular-end deck-house, more especially the quarters, by day, of the officers and favored passengers; common, but apparently not universal, in vessels of her class,—we have no positive knowledge, but the presumption is that she had, as passenger ships like the *Paragon* (of only 140 tons), and others of less tonnage, seem to have been so fitted!

It is plain that, in addition to the larger cabin space and the smaller cabins,—-“staterooms,” nowadays,—common to ships of the *may*-FLOWER’S size and class, the large number of her passengers, and especially of women and children, made it necessary to construct other cabins between decks. Whether these were put up at London, or Southampton, or after the SPEEDWELL’S additional passengers were taken aboard at Plymouth, does not appear. The great majority of the men and boys were doubtless provided with bunks only, “between decks,” but it seems that John Billington had a cabin there. Bradford narrates of the gunpowder escapade of young Francis Billington, that, “there being a fowling-piece, charged in his father’s cabin [though why so inferior a person as Billington should have a cabin when there could not have been enough for better men, is a query], shot her off in the cabin, there being a little barrel of powder half-full scattered in and about the cabin, the fire being within four feet of the bed, between the decks, . . . and many people gathered about the fire,” *etc*.

Whatever other deductions may be drawn from this very badly constructed and ambiguous paragraph of Bradford, two things appear certain,—one, that Billington had a “cabin” of his own “between decks;” and the other, that there was a “fire between decks,” which “many people” were gathered “about.” We can quite forgive the young scamp for the jeopardy in which he placed the ship and her company, since it resulted in giving us so much data concerning the *may*-FLOWER’S “interior.” Captain John Smith’s remark, already quoted, as to the *may*-FLOWER’S people “lying wet in their cabins,” is a hint of much value from an experienced navigator of that time, as to the “interior” construction of ships and the bestowal of passengers in them, in that day, doubtless applicable to the *may-Flower*.

While it was feasible, when lying quietly at anchor in a land-locked harbor, with abundance of fire-wood at hand, to have a fire, about which they could gather, even if only upon the “sand-hearth” of the early navigators, when upon boisterous seas, in mid-ocean, “lying . . . in their cabins” was the only means of keeping warm possible to voyagers. In “Good Newes from New England,” we find the lines:—

> “Close cabins being now prepared,
> With bred, bief, beire, and fish,
> The passengers prepare themselves,
> That they might have their wish.”

Page 59

Her magazine, carpenter's and sailmaker's lockers, *etc*., were doubtless well forward under her forecastle, easily accessible from the spar-deck, as was common to merchant vessels of her class and size. Dr. Young, in his "Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers" (p. 86, note), says: "This vessel was less than the average size of the fishing-smacks that go to the Grand Banks. This seems a frail bark in which to cross a stormy ocean of three thousand miles in extent. Yet it should be remembered that two of the ships of Columbus on his first daring and perilous voyage of discovery, were light vessels, without decks, little superior to the small craft that ply on our rivers and along our coasts . . . . Frobisher's fleet consisted of two barks of twenty-five tons each and a pinnace of ten tons, when he sailed in 1576 to discover a north-west passage to the Indies. Sir Francis Drake, too, embarked on his voyage for circumnavigating the globe, in 1577, with five vessels, of which the largest was of one hundred, and the smallest fifteen tons. The bark in which Sir Humphrey Gilbert perished was of ten tons only." The *little James*, which the Company sent to Plymouth in July, 1623, was "a pinnace of only forty-four tons," and in a vessel of fifty tons (the *Speedwell*), Martin Pring, in 1603, coasted along the shores of New England. Goodwin says: "In 1587 there were not in all England's fleet more than five merchant vessels exceeding two hundred tons." The *Sparrow-Hawk* wrecked on Cape Cod in 1626 was only 40 feet "over all." The Dutch seem to have built larger vessels. Winthrop records that as they came down the Channel, on their way to New England (1630), they passed the wreck of "a great Dutch merchantman of a thousand tons."

The *may*-FLOWER'S galley, with its primitive conditions for cooking, existed rather as a place for the preparation of food and the keeping of utensils, than for the use of fire. The arrangements for the latter were exceedingly crude, and were limited to the open "hearth-box" filled with sand, the chief cooking appliance being the tripod-kettle of the early navigators: This might indeed be set up in any part of the ship where the "sand-hearth" could also go, and the smoke be cared for. It not infrequently found space in the fore castle, between decks, and, when fine weather prevailed, upon the open deck, as in the open caravels of Columbus, a hundred years before. The bake-kettle and the frying-pan held only less important places than the kettle for boiling. It must have been rather a burst of the imagination that led Mrs. Austin, in "Standish of Standish," to make Peter Browne remind poor half-frozen Goodman—whom he is urging to make an effort to reach home, when they had been lost, but had got in sight of the *may-Flower* In the harbor—of "the good fires aboard of her." Moreover, on January 22, when Goodman was lost, the company had occupied their

Page 60

"common-house" on shore. Her ordnance doubtless comprised several heavy guns (as such were then reckoned), mounted on the spar-deck amid ships, with lighter guns astern and on. the rail, and a piece of longer range and larger calibre upon the forecastle. Such was the general disposal of ordnance upon merchant vessels of her size in that day, when an armament was a 'sine qua non'. Governor Winslow in his "Hypocrisie Unmasked," 1646 (p. 91), says, in writing of the departure of the Pilgrims from Delfshaven, upon the *Speedwell*: "The wind being fair we gave them a volley of small shot and three pieces of ordnance," by which it seems that the *Speedwell*, of only sixty tons, mounted at least "three pieces of ordnance" as, from the form of expression, there seem to have been "three pieces," rather than three discharges of the same piece.

The inference is warranted that the *may-Flower*, being three times as large, would carry a considerably heavier and proportionate armament. The *lady* ARBELLA, Winthrop's ship, a vessel of 350 tons, carried "twenty-eight pieces of ordnance;" but as "Admiral" of the fleet, at a time when there was a state of war with others, and much piracy, she would presumably mount more than a proportionate weight of metal, especially as she convoyed smaller and lightly armed vessels, and carried much value. There is no reason to suppose that the *may-Flower*, in her excessively crowded condition, mounted more than eight or ten guns, and these chiefly of small calibre. Her boats included her "long-boat," with which the experience of her company in "Cape Cod harbor" have made us familiar, and perhaps other smaller boats,—besides the Master's "skiff" or "gig," of whose existence and necessity there are numerous proofs. "Monday the 27," Bradford and Winslow state, "it proved rough weather and cross winds, so as we were constrained, some in the shallop and others in the long-boat," *etc*. Bradford states, in regard to the repeated springings-a-leak of the *Speedwell*: "So the Master of the bigger ship, called Master Jones, being consulted with;" and again, "The Master of the small ship complained his ship was so leaky . . . so they [Masters Jones and Reynolds] came to consultation, again," *etc*. It is evident that Jones was obliged to visit the *Speedwell* to inspect her and to consult with the leaders, who were aboard her. For this purpose, as for others, a smaller boat than the "long-boat" would often serve, while the number of passengers and crew aboard would seem to demand still other boats. Winthrop notices that their Captain (Melborne) frequently "had his skiff heaved out," in the course of their voyage. The Master's small boat, called the "skiff" or "gig," was, no doubt, stowed (lashed) in the waist of the ship, while the "long-boat" was probably lashed on deck forward, being hoisted out and in, as the practice of those days was, by "whips,"

Page 61

from the yardarms. It was early the habit to keep certain of the live-stock, poultry, rabbits, *etc*., in the unused boats upon deck, and it is possible that in the crowded state of the *may-Flower* this custom was followed. Bradford remarks that their "goods or common store . . . were long in unlading [at New Plimoth] for want of boats." It seems hardly possible that the Admiralty authorities,—though navigation laws were then few, crude, and poorly enforced,—or that the Adventurers and Pilgrim chiefs themselves, would permit a ship carrying some 130 souls to cross the Atlantic in the stormy season, without a reasonable boat provision. The capacity of the "long-boat" we know to have been about twenty persons, as nearly that number is shown by Bradford and Winslow to have gone in her on the early expeditions from the ship, at Cape Cod. She would therefore accommodate only about one sixth of the ship's company. As the "gig" would carry only five or six persons,—while the shallop was stowed between decks and could be of no service in case of need upon the voyage,—the inference is warranted that other boats were carried, which fail of specific mention, or that she was wofully lacking. The want of boats for unlading, mentioned by Bradford, suggests the possibility that some of the ship's quota may have been lost or destroyed on her boisterous voyage, though no such event appears of record, or is suggested by any one. In the event of wreck, the Pilgrims must have trusted, like the Apostle Paul and his associates when cast away on the island of Melita, to get to shore, "some on boards and some on broken pieces of the ship." Her steering-gear, rigging, and the mechanism for "getting her anchors," "slinging," "squaring," and "cockbilling" her yards; for "making" and "shortening" sail; "heaving out" her boats and "handling" her cargo, were of course all of the crude and simple patterns and construction of the time, usually so well illustrating the ancient axiom in physics, that "what is lost [spent] in power is gained in time."

The compass-box and hanging-compass, invented by the English cleric, William Barlow, but twelve years before the Pilgrim voyage, was almost the only nautical appliance possessed by Captain Jones, of the *may-Flower*, in which no radical improvement has since been made. Few charts of much value—especially of western waters—had yet been drafted, but the rough maps and diagrams of Cabot, Smith, Gosnold, Pring, Champlain and Dermer, Jones was too good a navigator not to have had. In speaking of the landing at Cape Cod, the expression is used by Bradford in "Mourt's Relation," "We went round all points of the compass," proving that already the mariner's compass had become familiar to the speech even of those not using it professionally.

That the ship was "well-found" in anchors (with solid stocks), hemp cables, "spare" spars, "boat-tackling" and the heavy "hoisting-gear" of those days, we have the evidence of recorded use. "The *may-Flower*," writes Captain Collins, would have had a hemp cable about 9 inches in circumference. Her anchors would probably weigh as follows: sheet anchor (or best bower) 500 to 600 lbs.; stream anchor 350 to 400 lbs.; the spare anchors same as the stream anchor.

Page 62

“Charnock’s Illustrations” show that the anchors used in the *may-Flower* period were shaped very much like the so called Cape Ann anchor now made for our deep-sea fishing vessels. They had the conventional shaped flukes, with broad pointed palms, and a long shank, the upper end passing through a wooden stock. [Tory shows in his diagrams some of the anchors of that period with the space between the shank and flukes nearly filled up in the lower part with metal.] Such an anchor has the maximum of holding powers, and bearing in mind the elasticity of the hemp cables then used, would enable a vessel to ride safely even when exposed to heavy winds and a racing sea: There is no doubt, according to the British Admiralty Office,—which should be authority upon the matter, —that the flag under which the *may-Flower*, and all other vessels of the merchant marine of Great Britain, sailed, at the time she left England (as noted concerning the *Speedwell*), was what became known as the “Union Jack,” as decreed by James the First, in 1606, supplanting the English ensign, which had been the red cross of St. George upon a white field. The new flag resulted from the “union” of the crowns and kingdoms of England and Scotland, upon the accession of James VI. of Scotland to the English throne, as James I. of England, upon the death of queen Elizabeth. Its design was formed by superimposing the red cross of St. George upon the white cross of St. Andrew, on a dark blue field; in other words, by imposing the cross of St. George, taken from the English ensign, upon the Scotch flag, and creating there by the new flag of Great Britain.

In a little monograph on “The British Flag—Its Origin and History,” a paper read by its author, Jona. F. Morris, Esq., before the Connecticut Historical Society, June 7, 1881, and reprinted at Hartford (1889), Mr. Morris, who has made much study of the matter, states (p. 4): “In 1603, James VI. of Scotland was crowned James I. of England. The Scots, in their pride that they had given a king to England, soon began to contend that the cross of St. Andrew should take precedence of the cross of St. George, that ships bearing the flag of the latter should salute that of St. Andrew. To allay the contention, the King, on the 12th of April, 1606, ordered that all subjects of Great Britain travelling by sea shall bear at the maintop the red cross of St. George and the white cross, commonly called the cross of St. Andrew, joined together according to a form made by his heralds besides this all vessels belonging to South Britain or England might wear the cross of St. George at the peak or fore, as they were wont, and all vessels belonging to North Britain or Scotland might wear the cross of St. Andrew at the fore top, as they had been accustomed; and all vessels were for bidden to wear any other flag at their peril. The new flag thus designed by the heralds and proclaimed by this order was called the ‘King’s Colors.’

Page 63

For a long period the red cross had been the colors of English navigators, as well as the badge of English soldiery . . . . No permanent English settlement in America was made until after the adoption of the 'King's Colors.' Jamestown, Plymouth, Salem, and Boston were settled under the new flag, though the ships bringing over settlers, being English vessels, also carried the red cross as permitted." Mr. Barlow Cumberland, of Toronto, Canada, has also given, in a little monograph entitled "The Union Jack" (published by William Briggs of that city, 1898), an admirable account of the history of the British jack, which confirms the foregoing conclusions. The early English jack was later restored. Such, roughly sketched, was the Pilgrim ship, the renowned *may-Flower*, as, drafted from the meagre but fairly trustworthy and suggestive data available, she appears to us of to-day.

HER HISTORY:

In even the little we know of the later history of the ship, one cannot always be quite sure of her identity in the records of vessels of her name, of which there have been many. Dr. Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, of Boston, says that "a vessel bearing this name was owned in England about fifteen years or more before the voyage of our forefathers, but it would be impossible to prove or disprove its identity with the renowned *may-Flower*, however great such a probability might be. It is known, nevertheless, that—the identical famous vessel afterwards hailed from various English ports, such as London, Yarmouth, and Southampton, and that it was much used in transporting immigrants to this country. What eventually became of it and what was the end of its career, are equally unknown to history." Goodwin says: "It does not appear that the *may-Flower* ever revisited Plymouth, but in 1629 she came to Salem," with a company of the Leyden people for Plymouth, under command of Captain William Peirce, the warm friend of the Pilgrims, and in 1630 was one of the large fleet that attended John Winthrop, under a different master, discharging her passengers at Charlestown. Nothing is certainly known of her after that time. In 1648 a ship [hereinafter mentioned by Hunter] named the *may-Flower* was engaged in the slave trade, and the ill-informed as well as the ill-disposed have sometimes sneeringly alleged that this was our historic ship; but it is ascertained that the slaver was a vessel of three hundred and fifty tons,—nearly twice the size of our ship of happy memory. In 1588 the officials of Lynn (England) offered the "*May-Flower*" (150 tons) to join the fleet against the dreaded Spanish Armada. In 1657, Samuel Vassall, of London, complained that the government had twice impressed his ship, *may-Flower*, which he had "fitted out with sixty men, for the Straits." Rev. Joseph Hunter, author of "The Founders of New Plymouth," one

Page 64

of the most eminent antiquarians in England, and an indefatigable student of Pilgrim history among British archives, says: "I have not observed the name of *may Flower* [in which style he always writes it] before the year 1583 . . . But the name soon became exceedingly popular among those to whom belonged the giving of the names to vessels in the merchant-service. Before the close of that century [the sixteenth] we have a *may-Flower* of Hastings; a *may-Flower* of Rie; a *may-Flower* of Newcastle: a *may Flower* of Lynn; and a *may-Flower* Of Yarmouth: both in 1589. Also a *may-Flower* of Hull, 1599; a *may Flower* of London of eighty tons burden, 1587, and 1594, Of which Richard Ireland was the master, and another *may-Flower* of the same port, of ninety tons burthen, of which Robert White was the master in 1594, and a third *may-Flower* of London, unless it is the same vessel with one of the two just spoken of, only with a different master, William Morecock. In 1587 there was a *may-Flower* Of Dover, of which John Tooke was the master. In 1593 there was a *may-Flower* of Yarmouth of 120 tons, of which William Musgrove was the master. In 1608 there was a *may-Flower* of Dartmouth, of which Nicholas Waterdonne was the master; and in 1609 a *may-Flower* of Middleburgh entered an English port."

Later in the century we find a *may-Flower* of Ipswich, and another of Newcastle in 1618; a *may-Flower* of York in 1621; a *may-Flower* of Scarborough in 1630, Robert Hadock the master; a *may-Flower* of Sandwich the same year, John Oliver the master; a *may-Flower* of Dover, 1633, Walter Finnis, master, in which two sons of the Earl of Berkshire crossed to Calais. "Which of these was the vessell which carried over the precious [Pilgrim] freight cannot perhaps be told [apparently neither, unless perhaps the *may-Flower* of Yarmouth of 1593, in which case her tonnage is incorrectly given], but we learn from Mr. Sherley's letter to Governor Bradford' that the same vessel was employed in 1629 in passing between the two countries, a company of the church at Leyden, who had joined in the first emigration, intending to pass in it to America; and in the same author we find that the vessel arrived in the harbour of Charlestown [N. E.] on July 1, 1630. There was a *may-Flower* which, in 1648, gained an unenviable notoriety as a slaver. But this was not the *may-Flower* which had carried over the first settlers, it being a vessel Of 350 tons, while the genuine *may-Flower* was of only 180 tons." Of the first of her two known visits, after her voyage with the Pilgrim company from Leyden, Goodwin says: "In August, 1629, the renowned *may-Flower* came

Page 65

from England to Salem under Plymouth's old friend [William] Peirce, and in her came thirty-five Leyden people, on their way to Plymouth." The number has been in dispute, but the large cost of bringing them, over L500, would suggest that their families must have also come, as has been alleged, but for the following from Governor Bradford's Letter Book: "These persons," he says, "were in all thirty-five, which came at this time unto us from Leyden, whose charge out of Holland into England, and in England till the ship was ready, and then their transportation hither, came to a great deal of money, for besides victuals and other expenses, they were all newly apparelled." Shirley, one of the Adventurers, writing to Governor Bradford in 1629, says: "Here are now many of your friends from Leyden coming over. With them also we have sent some servants, or in the ship that went lately (I think called the *Talbot*), and this that these come in is the *may-Flower*." All that Higginson's journal tells of her, as noted, is, that "she was of Yarmouth;" was commanded by William Peirce, and carried provisions and passengers, but the fact that she was under command of Captain Peirce of itself tells much. On her next trip the *may-Flower* sailed from Southampton, in May, 1630, as part of Winthrop's fleet, and arrived at Charlestown July 1. She was, on this voyage, under command of a new master (perhaps a Captain Weatherby), Captain Peirce having, at this time, command of the ship *Lyon*, apparently in the service of Plymouth Colony. A vessel of this name [*may-Flower*] was sailing between England and Boston in 1656. Young says: "The *may-Flower* is a ship of renown in the history of the colonization of New England. She was one of the five vessels which, in 1629, conveyed Higginson's company to Salem, and also one of the fleet which, in 1630, brought over his colony to Massachusetts Bay."

October 6, 1652, "Thomas Webber, Mr. of the good shipp called the *Mayflower* of the burden of Two hundred Tuns or there abouts . . . . Rideing at Ancor in the Harber of Boston," sold one-sixteenth of the ship "for good & valluable Consideracons to Mr. John Pinchon of Springfield Mrchant." The next day, October 7, 1652, the same "Thomas Webber, Mr, of the good Shipp called the *may Flower* of Boston in New England now bound for the barbadoes and thence to London," acknowledges an indebtedness to Theodore Atkinson, a wealthy "hatter, felt-maker," and merchant of Boston, and the same day (October 7, 1652), the said "Thomas Webber, Mr. of the good shipp called the *may Flower* of the burthen of Two hundred tuns or thereabouts," sold "unto Theodore Atkinson felt-maker one-sixteenth part as well of said Shipp as of all & singular her masts Sails Sail-yards Ancors Cables Ropes Cords Gunns Gunpowder Shott Artillery Tackle Munition apparrell boate skiffe and furniture

Page 66

to the same belonging." It is of course possible that this was the historic ship, though, if so, reappearing twenty two years after her last known voyage to New England. If the same, she was apparently under both new master and owner. From the facts that she is called "of Boston in New England" and was trading between that port, "the Barbadoes" and London, it is not impossible that she may have been built at Boston—a sort of namesake descendant of the historic ship—and was that *may-Flower* mentioned as belonging, in 1657, to Mr. Samuel Vassall; as he had large interests alike in Boston, Barbadoes, and London. Masters of vessels were often empowered to sell their ships or shares in them. Although we know not where her keel was laid, by what master she was built, or where she laid her timbers when her work was done, by virtue of her grand service to humanity, her fame is secure, and her name written among the few, the immortal names that were not born to die.

CHAPTER V

THE OFFICERS AND CREW OF THE MAYFLOWER

The officers and crew of the *may-Flower* were obviously important factors in the success of the Pilgrim undertaking, and it is of interest to know what we may concerning them. We have seen that the "pilot," John Clarke, was employed by Weston and Cushman, even before the vessel upon which he was to serve had been found, and he had hence the distinction of being the first man "shipped" of the *may*-FLOWER'S complement. It is evident that he was promptly hired on its being known that he had recently returned from a voyage to Virginia in the cattle-ship *Falcon*, as certain to be of value in the colonists' undertakings.

Knowing that the Adventurers' agents were seeking both a ship and a master for her, it was the natural thing for the latter, that he should propose the Captain under whom he had last sailed, on much the same voyage as that now contemplated. It is an interesting fact that something of the uncertainty which for a time existed as to the names and features of the Pilgrim barks attaches the names and identity of their respective commanders. The "given" name of "Master" Reynolds, "pilott" and "Master" of the *speed well*, does not appear, but the assertion of Professor Arber, though positive enough, that "the Christian name of the Captain of the *may-Flower* is not known," is not accepted by other authorities in Pilgrim history, though it is true that it does not find mention in the contemporaneous accounts of the Pilgrim ship and her voyage.

There is no room for doubt that the Captain of the *Falcon*—whose release from arrest while under charge of piracy the Earl of Warwick procured, that he might take command of the above-named cattle-ship on her voyage to Virginia, as hereinafter shown—was Thomas Jones. The identity of this man and "Master Jones" who assumed command of

the *may-Flower*—with the former mate of the *Falcon*, John Clarke, as his first officer—is abundantly certified by circumstantial evidence of the strongest kind, as is also the fact that he commanded the ship *discovery* a little later.

Page 67

With the powerful backing of such interested friends as the Earl of Warwick and Sir Ferdinando Gorges, undoubtedly already in league with Thomas Weston, who probably made the contract with Jones, as he had with Clarke, the suggestion of the latter as to the competency and availability of his late commander would be sure of prompt approval, and thus, in all probability, Captain Thomas Jones, who finds his chief place in history—and a most important one—as Master of the *may-Flower*, came to that service.

In 1619, as appears by Neill, the Virginia Company had one John Clarke in Ireland, "buying cattle for Virginia." We know that Captain Jones soon sailed for Virginia with cattle, in the *Falcon*, of 150 tons, and as this was the only cattle ship in a long period, we can very certainly identify Clarke as the newly-hired mate of the *may-Flower*, who, Cush man says (letter of June 11/21, 1620), "went last year to Virginia with a ship of kine." As 1620 did not begin until March 25, a ship sailing in February would have gone out in 1619, and Jones and Clarke could easily have made the voyage in time to engage for the *may-Flower* in the following June. "Six months after Jones's trip in the latter" (i.e. after his return from the Pilgrim voyage), Neill says, "he took the *discovery* (60 tons) to Virginia, and then northward, trading along the coast. The Council for New England complained of him to the Virginia Company for robbing the natives on this voyage. He stopped at Plymouth (1622), and, taking advantage of the distress for food he found there, was extortionate in his prices. In July, 1625, he appeared at Jamestown, Virginia, in possession of a Spanish frigate, which he said had been captured by one Powell, under a Dutch commission, but it was thought a resumption of his old buccaneering practices. Before investigation he sickened and died."

That Jones was a man of large experience, and fully competent in his profession, is beyond dispute. His disposition, character, and deeds have been the subject of much discussion. By most writers he is held to have been a man of coarse, "unsympathetic" nature, "a rough sea-dog," capable of good feeling and kindly impulses at times, but neither governed by them nor by principle. That he was a "highwayman of the seas," a buccaneer and pirate, guilty of blood for gold, there can be no doubt. Certainly nothing could justify the estimate of him given by Professor Arber, that "he was both fair-minded and friendly toward the Pilgrim Fathers," and he certainly stands alone among writers of reputation in that opinion. Jones's selfishness,

Page 68

[Bradford himself—whose authority in the matter will not be doubted—says (Historie, Mass. ed. p. 112): "As this calamitie, the general sickness, fell among ye passengers that were to be left here to plant, and were basted ashore and made to drinke water, that the sea-men might have ye more bear [beer] and one in his sickness desiring but a small can of beare it was answered that if he were their own father he should have none." Bradford also shows (op. cit. p. 153) the rapacity of Jones, when in command of the *discovery*, in his extortionate demands upon the Plymouth planters, notwithstanding their necessities.]

threats, boorishness, and extortion, to say nothing of his exceedingly bad record as a pirate, both in East and West Indian waters, compel a far different estimate of him as a man, from that of Arber, however excellent he was as a mariner. Professor Arber dissents from Goodwin's conclusion that Captain Jones of the *discovery* was the former Master of the *may-Flower*, but the reasons of his dissent are by no means convincing. He argues that Jones would not have accepted the command of a vessel so much smaller than his last, the *discovery* being only one third the size of the *may-Flower*. Master-mariners, particularly when just returned from long and unsuccessful voyages, especially if in bad repute,—as was Jones, —are obliged to take such employment as offers, and are often glad to get a ship much smaller than their last, rather than remain idle. Moreover, in Jones's case, if, as appears, he was inclined to buccaneering, the smaller ship would serve his purpose—as it seems it did satisfactorily. Nor is the fact that Bradford speaks of him—although previously so well acquainted—as "one Captain Jones," to be taken as evidence, as Arber thinks, that the Master of the *discovery* was some other of the name. Bradford was writing history, and his thought just then was the especial Providence of God in the timely relief afforded their necessities by the arrival of the ships with food, without regard to the individuals who brought it, or the fact that one was an acquaintance of former years. On the other hand, Winslow—in his "Good Newes from New England" —records the arrival of the two ships in August, 1622, and says, "the one as I take [recollect] it, was called the *discovery*, Captain Jones having command thereof," which on the same line of argument as Arber's might be read, "our old acquaintance Captain Jones, you know"! If the expression of Bradford makes against its being Captain Jones, formerly of the *may-Flower*, Winslow's certainly makes quite as much for it, while the fact which Winslow recites, *viz*. that the *discovery*, under Jones, was sailing as consort to the *Sparrow*, a ship of Thomas Weston,—who employed him for the *may-Flower*, was linked with him in the Gorges conspiracy, and had become nearly as degenerate

Page 69

as he,—is certainly significant. There are still better grounds, as will appear in the closely connected relations of Jones, for holding with Goodwin rather than with Arber in the matter. The standard authority in the case is the late Rev. E. D. Neill, D. D., for some years United States consul at Dublin, who made very considerable research into all matters pertaining to the Virginia Companies, consulting their original records and "transactions," the Dutch related documents, the "Calendars of the East India Company," *etc*. Upon him and his exhaustive work all others have largely drawn,—-notably Professor Arber himself,—and his conclusions seem entitled to the same weight here which Arber gives them in other relations. Dr. Neill is clearly of opinion that the Captains of the *may-Flower* and the *discovery* were identical, and this belief is shared by such authorities in Pilgrim literature as Young, Prince, Goodwin, and Davis, and against this formidable consensus of opinion, Arber, unless better supported, can hardly hope to prevail.

The question of Jones's duplicity and fraud, in bringing the Pilgrims to land at Cape Cod instead of the "neighbor-hood of Hudson's River," has been much mooted and with much diversity of opinion, but in the light of the subjoined evidence and considerations it seems well-nigh impossible to acquit him of the crime—for such it was, in inception, nature, and results, however overruled for good.

The specific statements of Bradford and others leave no room for doubt that the *may-Flower* Pilgrims fully intended to make their settlement somewhere in the region of the mouth of "Hudson's River." Morton states in terms that Captain Jones's "engagement was to Hudson's River." Presumably, as heretofore noted, the stipulation of his charter party required that he should complete his outward voyage in that general locality. The northern limits of the patents granted in the Pilgrim interest, whether that of John Wincob (or Wincop) sealed June 9/ 19, 1619, but never used, or the first one to John Pierce, of February 2/12, 1620, were, of course, brought within the limits of the First (London) Virginia Company's charter, which embraced, as is well-known, the territory between the parallels of 34 deg. and 41 deg. N. latitude. The most northerly of these parallels runs but about twenty miles to the north of the mouth of "Hudson's River." It is certain that the Pilgrims, after the great expense, labor, and pains of three years, to secure the protection of these Patents, would not willingly or deliberately, have planted themselves outside that protection, upon territory where they had none, and where, as interlopers, they might reasonably expect trouble with the lawful proprietors. Nor was there any reason why, if they so desired, they should not have gone to "Hudson's River" or its vicinity, unless it was that they had once seemed to recognize the States General of

Page 70

Holland as the rightful owners of that territory, by making petition to them, through the New Netherland Company, for their authority and protection in settling there. But even this fact constituted no moral or legal bar to such action, if desirable First, because it appears certain that, whatever the cause, they "broke off" themselves their negotiations with the Dutch,—whether on account of the inducements offered by Thomas Weston, or a doubt of the ability of the Dutch to maintain their claim to that region, and to protect there, or both, neither appears nor matters. Second, because the States General—-whether with knowledge that they of Leyden had so "broken off" or from their own doubts of their ability to maintain their claim on the Hudson region, does not appear—-rejected the petition made to them in the Pilgrims' behalf. It is probable that the latter was the real reason, from the fact that the petition was twice rejected.

In view of the high opinion of the Leyden brethren, entertained, as we know, by the Dutch, it is clear that the latter would have been pleased to secure them as colonists; while if at all confident of their rights to the territory, they must have been anxious to colonize it and thus confirm their hold, increase their revenues as speedily as possible, and

Third, because it appears upon the showing of the petition itself, made by the New Netherland Company (to which the Leyden leaders had looked, doubtless on account of its pretensions, for the authority and protection of the States General, as they afterward did to the English Virginia Company for British protection), that this Company had lost its own charter by expiration, and hence had absolutely nothing to offer the Leyden people beyond the personal and associate influence of its members, and the prestige of a name that had once been potential. In fact, the New Netherland Company was using the Leyden congregation as a leverage to pry for itself from the States General new advantages, larger than it had previously enjoyed.

Moreover it appears by the evidence of both the petition of the Directors of the New Netherland Company to the Prince of Orange (February 2/12, 1619/20), and the letters of Sir Dudley Carleton, the British ambassador at the Hague, to the English Privy Council, dated February 5/15, 1621/22, that, up to this latter date the Dutch had established no colony

[British State Papers, Holland, Bundle 165. Sir Dudley Carleton's Letters. "They have certain Factors there, continually resident, trading with savages . . . but I cannot learn of any colony, either I already planted there by these people, or so much as intended." Sir Dudley Carleton's Letters.]

on the territory claimed by them at the Hudson, and had no other representation there than the trading-post of a commercial company whose charter had expired. There can be no doubt that the Leyden leaders knew, from their dealings with the New Netherland

Company, and the study of the whole problem which they evidently made, that this region was open to them or any other parties for habitation and trade, so far as any prior grants or charters under the Dutch were concerned, but they required more than this.

Page 71

To Englishmen, the English claim to the territory at “Hudson’s River” was valid, by virtue of the discovery of the Cabots, under the law of nations as then recognized, not withstanding Hudson’s more particular explorations of those parts in 1609, in the service of Holland, especially as no colony or permanent occupancy of the region by the Dutch had been made.

Professor John Fiske shows that “it was not until the Protestant England of Elizabeth had come to a life-and-death grapple with Spain, and not until the discovery of America had advanced much nearer completion, so that its value began to be more correctly understood, that political and commercial motives combined in determining England to attack Spain through America, and to deprive her of supremacy in the colonial and maritime world. Then the voyages of the Cabots assumed an importance entirely new, and could be quoted as the basis of a prior claim on the part of the English Crown, to lands which it [through the Cabots] had discovered.”

Having in mind the terrible history of slaughter and reprisal between the Spanish and French (Huguenot) settlers in Florida in 1565-67,

[Bancroft, History of the United States, vol. i. p. 68; Fiske, Discovery of America, vol. ii. p. 511 et seq. With the terrible experience of the Florida plantations in memory, the far-sighted leaders of the Leyden church proposed to plant under the shelter of an arm strong enough to protect them, and we find the Directors of the New Netherland Company stating that the Leyden party (the Pilgrims) can be induced to settle under Dutch auspices, “provided, they would be guarded and preserved from all violence on the part of other potentates, by the authority, and under the protection of your Princely Excellency and the High and Mighty States General.” Petition of the Directors of the New Netherland Company to the Prince of Orange.]

the Pilgrims recognized the need of a strong power behind them, under whose aegis they might safely plant, and by virtue of whose might and right they could hope to keep their lives and possessions. The King of England had, in 1606, granted charters to the two Virginia Companies, covering all the territory in dispute, and, there could be no doubt, would protect these grants and British proprietorship therein, against all comers. Indeed, the King (James I.) by letter to Sir Dudley Carleton, his ambassador at the Hague, under date of December 15, 1621, expressly claimed his rights in the New Netherland territory and instructed him to impress upon the government of the States General his Majesty’s claim,—“who, ‘jure prime occupation’ hath good and sufficient title to these parts.” There can be no question that the overtures of Sandys, Weston, and others to make interest for them with one of these English Companies, agreed as well with both the preferences and convictions of the Leyden Pilgrims, as they did with the hopes and designs of Sir Ferdinando Gorges.

Page 72

In the light of these facts, there appears to have been neither legal nor moral bar to the evident intention of the Pilgrims to settle in the vicinity of “Hudson’s River,” if they so elected. In their light, also, despite the positive allegations of the truthful but not always reliable Morton, his charges of intrigue between the Dutch and Master Jones of the *may-Flower*, to prevent the settlement of his ship’s company at “Hudson’s River,” may well be doubted. Writing in “New England’s Memorial” in 1669, Morton says: “But some of the Dutch, having notice of their intentions, and having thoughts about the same time of erecting a plantation there likewise, they fraudulently hired the said Jones, by delays while they were in England, and now under pretence of the shoals the dangers of the Monomoy Shoals off Cape Cod to disappoint them in going thither.” He adds: “Of this plot between the Dutch and Mr. Jones, I have had late and certain intelligence.” If this intelligence was more reliable than his assertion concerning the responsibility of Jones for the “delays while they were in England,” it may well be discredited, as not the faintest evidence appears to make him responsible for those delays, and they are amply accounted for without him. Without questioning the veracity of Morton (while suggesting his many known errors, and that the lapse of time made it easy to misinterpret even apparently certain facts), it must be remembered that he is the original sponsor for the charge of Dutch intrigue with Jones, and was its sole support for many years. All other writers who have accepted and indorsed his views are of later date, and but follow him, while Bradford and Winslow, who were victims of this Dutch conspiracy against them, if it ever existed, were entirely silent in their writings upon the matter, which we may be sure they would not have been, had they suspected the Dutch as prime movers in the treachery. That there was a conspiracy to accomplish the landing of the *may-Flower* planters at a point north of “the Hudson” (in fact, north of the bounds defined by the (first) Pierce patent, upon which they relied), *i.e*. north of 41 deg. N. latitude,—is very certain; but that it was of Dutch origin, or based upon motives which are attributed to the Dutch, is clearly erroneous. While the historical facts indicate an utter lack of motive for such an intrigue on the part of the Dutch, either as a government or as individuals, there was no lack of motive on the part of certain others, who, we can but believe, were responsible for the conspiracy. Moreover, the chief conspirators were such, that, even if the plot was ultimately suspected by the Pilgrims, a wise policy—indeed, self-preservation —would have dictated their silence. That the Dutch were without sufficient motive or interest has been declared. That the States General could have had no wish to reject so exceptionally excellent a body of colonists as subjects,

Page 73

and as tenants to hold and develop their disputed territory—if in position to receive them and guarantee them protection —is clear. The sole objection that could be urged against them was their English birth, and with English regiments garrisoning the Dutch home cities, and foreigners of every nation in the States General's employ, by land and by sea, such an objection could have had no weight. Indeed, the Leyden party proposed, if they effected satisfactory arrangements with the States General (as stated by the Directors of the New Netherland Company), "to plant there [at "Hudson's River"] a new commonwealth, all under the order and command of your Princely Excellency and their High Mightinesses the States General:" The Leyden Pilgrims were men who kept their agreements.

The Dutch trading-companies, who were the only parties in the Low Countries who could possibly have had any motive for such a conspiracy, were at this time themselves without charters, and the overtures of the principal company, made to the government in behalf of themselves and the Leyden brethren, had recently, as we have seen, been twice rejected. They had apparently, therefore, little to hope for in the near future; certainly not enough to warrant expenditure and the risk of disgraceful exposure, in negotiations with a stranger—an obscure ship-master—to change his course and land his passengers in violation of the terms of his charter-party;—negotiations, moreover, in which neither of the parties could well have had any guaranty of the other's good faith.

But, as previously asserted, there was a party—to whom such knavery was an ordinary affair—who had ample motive, and of whom Master Thomas Jones was already the very willing and subservient ally and tool, and had been such for years. Singularly enough, the motive governing this party was exactly the reverse of that attributed—-though illogically and without reason—to the Dutch. In the case of the latter, the alleged animus was a desire to keep the Pilgrim planters away from their "Hudson's River" domain. In the case of the real conspirators, the purpose was to secure these planters as colonists for, and bring them to, the more northern territory owned by them. It is well known that Sir Ferdinando Gorges was the leading spirit of the "Second Virginia Company," as he also became (with the Earl of Warwick a close second) of "The Council for the Affairs of New England," of which both men were made "Governors," in November of 1620, when the Council practically superseded the "Second Virginia Company." The Great Charter for "The Council of Affairs of New England," commonly known as "The Council for New England," issued Tuesday, November 3/13, 1620, and it held in force till Sunday, June 7/17, 1635.

Page 74

Although not its official head, and ranked at its board by dukes and earls, Sir Ferdinando Gorges was—as he had been in the old Plymouth (or Second) Virginia Company—the leading man. This was largely from his superior acquaintance with, and long and varied experience in, New England affairs. The "Council" was composed of forty patentees, and Baxter truly states, that "Sir Ferdinando Gorges, at this time [1621] stood at the head of the Council for New England, so far as influence went; in fact, his hand shaped its affairs." This company, holding—by the division of territory made under the original charter-grants—a strip of territory one hundred miles wide, on the North American coast, between the parallels of 41 deg. and 45 deg. N. latitude, had not prospered, and its efforts at colonization (on what is now the Maine coast), in 1607 and later, had proved abortive, largely through the character of its "settlers," who had been, in good degree, a somewhat notable mixture of two of the worst elements of society,—-convicts and broken-down "gentlemen."

"In 1607," says Goodwin, "Gorges and the cruel Judge Popham planted a colony at Phillipsburg (or Sagadahoc, as is supposed), by the mouth of the Kennebec. Two ships came, '*the gift of god*' and the '*Mary and John*,' bringing a hundred persons. Through August they found all delightful, but when the ships went back in December, fifty five of the number returned to England, weary of their experience and fearful of the cold .... With spring the ships returned from England; "but by this time the remainder were ready to leave," so every soul returned with Gilbert [the Admiral] . . . . For thirty years Gorges continued to push exploration and emigration to that region, but his ambition and liberality ever resulted in disappointment and loss." The annals of the time show that not a few of the Sagadahoc colonists were convicts, released from the English jails to people this colony.

Hakluyt says: "In 1607 [this should read 1608], disheartened by the death of Popham, they all embarked in a ship from Exeter and in the new pynnace, the '*Virginia*,' built in the colony, and sett sail for England, and this was the end of that northern colony upon the river Sachadehoc [Kennebec]."

No one knew better than the shrewd Gorges the value of such a colony as that of the Leyden brethren would be, to plant, populate, and develop his Company's great demesne. None were more facile than himself and the buccaneering Earl of Warwick, to plan and execute the bold, but—as it proved—easy coup, by which the Pilgrim colony was to be stolen bodily; for the benefit of the "Second Virginia Company" and its successor, "the Council for New England," from the "First (or London) Company," under whose patent (to John Pierce) and patronage they sailed. They apparently did not take their patent with them,—it would have been worthless if they had,—and they

Page 75

were destined to have no small trouble with Pierce, before they were established in their rights under the new patent granted him (in the interest of the Adventurers and themselves), by the "Council for New England." Master John Wincob's early and silent withdrawal from his apparently active connection with the Pilgrim movement, and the evident cancellation of the first patent issued to him in its interest, by the (London) Virginia Company, have never been satisfactorily explained. Wincob (or Wincop), we are told, "was a religious Gentleman, then belonging to the household of the Countess of Lincoln, who intended to go with them [the Pilgrims] but God so disposed as he never went, nor they ever made use of this Patent, which had cost them so much labor and charge." Wincob, it appears by the minutes of the (London) Virginia Company of Wednesday, May 26/June 5, 1619, was commended to the Company, for the patent he sought, by the fourth Earl of Lincoln, and it was doubtless through his influence that it was granted and sealed, June 9/19, 1619. But while Wincob was a member of the household of the Dowager Countess of Lincoln, mother of the fourth Earl of Lincoln; John, the eldest son of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, had married the Earl's daughter (sister ?), and hence Gorges stood in a much nearer relation to the Earl than did his mother's friend and dependant (as Wincob evidently was), as well as on a much more equal social footing. By the minutes of the (London) Virginia Company of Wednesday, February 2/ 12, 1619/20, it appears that a patent was "allowed and sealed to John Pierce and his associates, heirs and assigns," for practically the same territory for which the patent to Wincob had been given but eight months before. No explanation was offered, and none appears of record, but the logical conclusion is, that the first patent had been cancelled, that Master Wincob's personal interest in the Pilgrim exodus had ceased, and that the Lincoln patronage had been withdrawn. It is a rational conjecture that Sir Ferdinando Gorges, through the relationship he sustained to the Earl, procured the withdrawal of Wincob and his patent, knowing that the success of his (Gorges's) plot would render the Wincob patent worthless, and that the theft of the colony, in his own interest, would be likely to breed "unpleasantness" between himself and Wincob's sponsors and friends among the Adventurers, many of whom were friends of the Earl of Lincoln.

The Earl of Warwick, the man of highest social and political rank in the First (or London) Virginia Company, was, at about the same time, induced by Gorges to abandon his (the London) Company and unite with himself in securing from the Crown the charter of the "Council of Affairs for New England." The only inducements he could offer for the change must apparently have resided in the promised large results of plottings disclosed by him (Gorges), but he needed the influential and unscrupulous Earl for the promotion of his schemes,

Page 76

and won him, by some means, to an active partnership, which was doubtless congenial to both. The “fine Italian hand” of Sir Ferdinando hence appears at every stage, and in every phase, of the Leyden movement, from the mission of Weston to Holland, to the landing at Cape Cod, and every movement clearly indicates the crafty cunning, the skilful and brilliant manipulation, and the dogged determination of the man.

That Weston was a most pliant and efficient tool in the hands of Gorges, “from start to finish” of this undertaking, is certainly apparent. Whether he was, from the outset, made fully aware of the sinister designs of the chief conspirator, and a party to them, admits of some doubt, though the conviction strengthens with study, that he was, from the beginning, ‘particeps criminis’. If he was ever single-minded for the welfare of the Leyden brethren and the Adventurers, it must have been for a very brief time at the inception of the enterprise; and circumstances seem to forbid crediting him with honesty of purpose, even then. The weight of evidence indicates that he both knew, and was fully enlisted in, the entire plot of Gorges from the outset. In all its early stages he was its most efficient promoter, and seems to have given ample proof of his compliant zeal in its execution. His visit to the Leyden brethren in Holland was, apparently, wholly instigated by Gorges, as the latter complacently claims and collateral evidence proves. In his endeavor to induce the leaders to “break off with the Dutch,” their pending negotiations for settlement at “Hudson’s River,” he evidently made capital of, and traded upon, his former kindness to some of them when they were in straits,—a most contemptible thing in itself, yet characteristic of the man. He led the Pilgrims to “break off” their dealings with the Dutch by the largest and most positive promises of greater advantages through him, few of which he ever voluntarily kept (as we see by John Robinson’s sharp arraignment of him), his whole object being apparently to get the Leyden party into his control and that of his friends,—the most subtle and able of whom was Gorges. Bradford recites that Weston not only urged the Leyden leaders “not to meddle with ye Dutch,” but also,—“not too much to depend on ye Virginia [London] Company,” but to rely on himself and his friends. This strongly suggests active cooperation with Gorges, on Weston’s part, at the outset, with the intent (if he could win them by any means, from allegiance to the First (London) Virginia Company), to lead the Leyden party, if possible, into Gorges’s hands and under the control and patronage of the Second (or Plymouth) Virginia Company. Whatever the date may have been, at which (as Bradford states) the Leyden people “heard, both by Mr. Weston and others, yt sundrie Honble: Lords had obtained a large grante from ye king for ye more northerly parts of that countrie, derived out of ye Virginia patents, and wholly secluded from theire Governmente, and to

Page 77

be called by another name, *viz*. New England, unto which Mr. Weston and the chiefe of them begane to incline;" Bradford leaves us in no doubt as to Weston's attitude toward the matter itself. It is certain that the governor, writing from memory, long afterward, fixed the time at which the Honble: Lords had obtained "their large grante" much earlier than it could possibly have occurred, as we know the exact date of the patent for the, "Council for New England," and that the order for its issue was not given till just as the Pilgrims left Leyden; so that they could not have known of the actual "grante" till they reached Southampton. The essential fact, stated on this best of authority, is, that "Mr. Weston and the chiefe of them [their sponsors, *i.e*. Weston and Lord Warwick, both in league with Gorges] begane to incline to Gorges's new Council for New England." Such an attitude (evidently taken insidiously) meant, on Weston's part, of necessity, no less than treachery to his associates of the Adventurers; to the (London) Virginia Company, and to the Leyden company and their allied English colonists, in the interest of Sir Ferdinando Gorges and his schemes and of the new "Council" that Gorges was organizing. Weston's refusal to advance "a penny" to clear the departing Pilgrims from their port charges at Southampton; his almost immediate severance of connection with both the colonists and the Adventurers; and his early association with Gorges,—in open and disgraceful violation of all the formers' rights in New England,—to say nothing of his exhibition of a malevolence rarely exercised except toward those one has deeply wronged, all point to a complete and positive surrender of himself and his energies to the plot of Gorges, as a full participant, from its inception. In his review of the Anniversary Address of Hon. Charles Francis Adams (of July 4, 1892, at Quincy), Daniel W. Baker, Esq., of Boston, says: "The Pilgrim Fathers were influenced in their decision to come to New England by Weston, who, if not the agent of Gorges in this particular matter, was such in other matters and held intimate relations with him."

The known facts favor the belief that Gorges's cogitations on colonial matters—-especially as stimulated by his plottings in relation to the Leyden people—led to his project of the grant—and charter for the new "Council for New England," designed and constituted to supplant, or override, all others. It is highly probable that this grand scheme —duly embellished by the crafty Gorges,—being unfolded to Weston, with suggestions of great opportunities for Weston himself therein, warmed and drew him, and brought him to full and zealous cooperation in all Gorges's plans, and that from this time, as Bradford states, he "begane to incline" toward, and to suggest to the Pilgrims, association with Gorges and the new "Council." Not daring openly to declare his change of allegiance and his perfidy, he undertook, apparently, at first, by suggestions,

Page 78

e.g. “not to place too much dependence on the London Company, but to rely on himself and friends;” that “the fishing of New England was good,” *etc*.; and making thus no headway, then, by a policy of delay, fault finding, *etc*., to breed dissatisfaction, on the Pilgrims’ part, with the Adventurers, the patent of Wincob, *etc*., with the hope of bringing about “a new deal” in the Gorges interest. The same “delays” in sailing, that have been adduced as proof of Jones’s complicity with the Dutch, would have been of equal advantage to these noble schemers, and if he had any hand in them-which does not appear—it would have been far more likely in the interest of his long-time patron, the Earl of Warwick, and of his friends, than of any Dutch conspirators.

Once the colonists were landed upon the American soil, especially if late in the season, they would not be likely, it doubtless was argued, to remove; while by a liberal policy on the part of the “Council for New England” toward them—when they discovered that they were upon its territory—they could probably be retained. That just such a policy was, at once and eagerly, adopted toward them, as soon as occasion permitted, is good proof that the scheme was thoroughly matured from the start. The record of the action of the “Council for New England”—which had become the successor of the Second Virginia Company before intelligence was received that the Pilgrims had landed on its domain—is not at hand, but it appears by the record of the London Company, under date of Monday, July 16/26, 1621, that the “Council for New England” had promptly made itself agreeable to the colonists. The record reads: “It was moved, seeing that Master John Pierce had taken a Patent of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, and thereupon seated his Company [the Pilgrims] within the limits of the Northern Plantations, as by some was supposed,'" *etc*. From this it is plain that, on receipt by Pierce of the news that the colony was landed within the limits of the “Council for New England,” he had, as instructed, applied for, and been given (June 1, 1621), the (first) “Council” patent for the colony. For confirmation hereof one should see also the minutes of the “Council for New England” of March 25/April 4., 1623, and the fulsome letter of Robert Cushman returning thanks in behalf of the Planters (through John Pierce), to Gorges, for his prompt response to their request for a patent and for his general complacency toward them Hon. James Phinney Baxter, Gorges’s able and faithful biographer, says: “We can imagine with what alacrity he [Sir Ferdinando] hastened to give to Pierce a patent in their behalf.” The same biographer, clearly unconscious of the well-laid plot of Gorges and Warwick (as all other writers but Neill and Davis have been), bears testimony (all the stronger because the witness is unwitting of the intrigue), to the ardent interest Gorges had in its success. He says: “The warm desire of Sir Ferdinando Gorges to

Page 79

see a permanent colony founded within the domain of the Plymouth [or Second] Virginia Company was to be realized in a manner of which he had never dreamed [sic!] and by a people with whom he had but little sympathized, although we know that he favored their settlement within the territorial limits of the Plymouth [Second] Company." He had indeed "favored their settlement," by all the craft of which he was master, and greeted their expected and duly arranged advent with all the jubilant open-handedness with which the hunter treats the wild horse he has entrapped, and hopes to domesticate and turn to account. Everything favored the conspirators. The deflection north-ward from the normal course of the ship as she approached the coast, bound for the latitude of the Hudson, required only to be so trifling that the best sailor of the Pilgrim leaders would not be likely to note or criticise it, and it was by no means uncommon to make Cape Cod as the first landfall on Virginia voyages. The lateness of the arrival on the coast, and the difficulties ever attendant on doubling Cape Cod, properly turned to account, would increase the anxiety for almost any landing-place, and render it easy to retain the sea-worn colonists when once on shore. The grand advantage, however, over and above all else, was the entire ease and certainty with which the cooperation of the one man essential to the success of the undertaking could be secured, without need of the privity of any other, *viz*. the Master of the *may-Flower*, Captain Thomas Jones.

Let us see upon what the assumption of this ready and certain accord on the part of Captain Jones rests. Rev. Dr. Neill, whose thorough study of the records of the Virginia Companies, and of the East India Company Calendars and collateral data, entitles him to speak with authority, recites that, "In 1617, Capt. Thomas Jones (sometimes spelled Joanes) had been sent to the East Indies in command of the ship *Lion* by the Earl of Warwick (then Sir Robt. Rich), under a letter of protection from the Duke of Savoy, a foreign prince, ostensibly 'to take pirates,' which [pretext] had grown, as Sir Thomas Roe (the English ambassador with the Great Mogul) states, 'to be a common pretence for becoming pirate.'" Caught by the famous Captain Martin Pring, in full pursuit of the junk of the Queen Mother of the Great Mogul, Jones was attacked, his ship fired in the fight, and burned,—with some of his crew,—and he was sent a prisoner to England in the ship *bull*, arriving in the Thames, January 1, 1618/19. No action seems to have been taken against him for his offences, and presumably his employer, Sir Robert, the coming Earl, obtained his liberty on one pretext or another. On January 19, however, complaint was made against Captain Jones, "late of the *Lion*," by the East India Company, "for hiring divers men to serve the King of Denmark in the East Indies." A few days after his arrest

Page 80

for “hiring away the Company’s men, Lord Warwick got him off” on the claim that he had employed him “to go to Virginia with cattle.” From the “Transactions” of the Second Virginia Company, of which—as we have seen—Sir Ferdinando Gorges was the leading spirit, it appears that on “February 2, 1619/20, a commission was allowed Captain Thomas Jones of the *Falcon*, a ship of 150 tons” [he having been lately released from arrest by the Earl of Warwick’s intercession], and that “before the close of the month, he sailed with cattle for Virginia,” as previously noted. Dr. Neill, than whom there can be no better authority, was himself satisfied, and unequivocally states, that “Thomas Jones, Captain of the *may-Flower*, was without doubt the old servant of Lord Warwick in the East Indies.” Having done Sir Robert Rich’s (the Earl of Warwick’s) “dirty work” for years, and having on all occasions been saved from harm by his noble patron (even when piracy and similar practices had involved him in the meshes of the law), it would be but a trifling matter, at the request of such powerful friends as the Earl and Sir Ferdinando Gorges, to steal the Pilgrim Colony from the London Virginia Company, and hand it over bodily to the “Council for New England,”—the successor of the Second (Plymouth) Virginia Company,—in which their interests were vested, Warwick having, significantly, transferred his membership from the London Company to the new “Council for New England,” as it was commonly called. Neill states, and there is abundant proof, that “the Earl of Warwick and Gorges were in sympathy,” and were active coadjutors, while it is self-evident that both would be anxious to accomplish the permanent settlement of the “Northern Plantations” held by their Company. That they would hesitate to utilize so excellent an opportunity to secure so very desirable a colony, by any means available, our knowledge of the men and their records makes it impossible to believe,—while nothing could apparently have been easier of accomplishment. It will readily be understood that if the conspirators were these men,—upon whose grace the Pilgrims must depend for permission to remain upon the territory to which they had been inveigled, or even for permission to depart from it, without spoliation, —men whose influence with the King (no friend to the Pilgrims) was sufficient to make both of them, in the very month of the Pilgrims’ landing, “governors” of “The Council for New England,” under whose authority the Planters must remain,—the latter were not likely to voice their suspicions of the trick played upon them, if they discovered it, or openly to resent it, when known. Dr. Dexter, in commenting on the remark of Bradford, “We made Master Jones our leader, for we thought it best herein to gratifie his kindness & forwardness,” sensibly says, “This proves nothing either way, in regard to the charge which Secretary Morton makes of treachery against Jones, in landing the company

Page 81

so far north, because, if that were true, it was not known to any of the company for years afterward, and of course could not now [at that time] impair their feelings of confidence in, or kindness towards, him. Moreover, the phraseology, “we thought it best to gratifie,” suggests rather considerations of policy than cordial desire, and their acquaintance, too, with the man was still young. There is, however, no evidence that Jones’s duplicity was suspected till long afterward, though his character was fully recognized. Gorges himself furnishes, in his writings, the strongest confirmation we have of the already apparent fact, that he was himself the prime conspirator. He says, in his own “Narration,” “It was referred [evidently by himself] to their [the London Virginia Company’s] consideration, how necessary it was that means might be used to draw unto those their enterprises, some of those families that had retired themselves into Holland for scruple of conscience, giving them such freedom and liberty as might stand with their liking.” When have we ever found Sir Ferdinando Gorges thus solicitous for the success of the rival Virginia Company? Why, if he so esteemed the Leyden people as excellent colonists, did he not endeavor to secure them himself directly, for his own languishing company? Certainly the “scruple of conscience” of the Leyden brethren did not hinder him, for he found it no bar, though of the Established Church himself, to giving them instantly all and more than was asked in their behalf, as soon as he had them upon his territory and they had applied for a patent. He well knew that it would be matter of some expense and difficulty to bring the Leyden congregation into agreement to go to either of the Virginia grants, and he doubtless, and with good reason, feared that his repute and the character and reputation of his own Company, with its past history of failure, convict settlers, and loose living, would be repellent to these people of “conscience.” If they could be brought to the “going-point,” by men more of their ilk, like Sir Edwin Sandys, Weston, and others, it would then be time to see if he could not pluck the ripe fruit for himself,—as he seems to have done.

“This advice,” he says, “being hearkened unto, there were [those] that undertook the putting it in practice [Weston and others] and it was accordingly brought to effect,” *etc*. Then, reciting (erroneously) the difficulties with the *Speedwell*, *etc*., he records the *may*-FLOWER’S arrival at Cape Cod, saying, “The . . . ship with great difficulty reached the coast of New England.” He then gives a glowing, though absurd, account of the attractions the planters found—in midwinter —especially naming the hospitable reception of the Indians, despite the fact of the savage attack made upon them by the Nausets at Cape Cod, and adds: “After they had well considered the state of their affairs and found that the authority they had

Page 82

from the London Company of Virginia, could not warrant their abode in that place," which "they found so prosperous and pleasing [sic] they hastened away their ship, with orders to their Solicitor to deal with me to be a means they might have a grant from the Council of New England Affairs, to settle in the place, which was accordingly performed to their particular satisfaction and good content of them all." One can readily imagine the crafty smile with which Sir Ferdinando thus guilelessly recorded the complete success of his plot. It is of interest to note how like a needle to the pole the grand conspirator's mind flies to the fact which most appeals to him —that they find "that the authority they had . . . could not warrant their abode in that place." It is of like interest to observe that in that place which he called "pleasant and prosperous" one half their own and of the ship's company had died before they hastened the ship away, and they had endured trial, hardships, and sorrows untellable,—although from pluck and principle they would not abandon it. He tells us "they hastened away their ship," and implies that it was for the chief purpose of obtaining through him a grant of the land they occupied. While we know that the ship did not return till the following April,—and then at her Captain's rather than the Pilgrims' pleasure,—it is evident that Gorges could think of events only as incident to his designs and from his point of view. His plot had succeeded. He had the "Holland families" upon his soil, and his willing imagination converted their sober and deliberate action into the eager haste with which he had planned that they should fly to him for the patent, which his cunning had—as he purposed—rendered necessary. Of course their request "was performed," and so readily and delightedly that, recognizing John Pierce as their mouthpiece and the plantation as "Mr. Pierces Plantation," Sir Ferdinando and his associates—the "Council for New England," including his joint-conspirator, the Earl of Warwick—gave Pierce unhesitatingly whatever he asked. The Hon. William T. Davis, who alone among Pilgrim historians (except Dr. Neill, whom he follows) seems to have suspected the hand of Gorges in the treachery of Captain Jones, here demonstrated, has suggested that: "Whether Gorges might not have influenced Pierce, in whose name the patent of the Pilgrims had been issued—and whether both together might not have seduced Capt. Jones, are further considerations to be weighed, in solving the problem of a deviation from the intended voyage of the *Mayflower*." Although not aware of these suggestions, either of Mr. Davis or of Dr. Neill, till his own labors had satisfied him of Gorges's guilt, and his conclusions were formed, the author cheerfully recognizes the priority to his own demonstration, of the suggestions of both these gentlemen. No thing appears of record, however, to indicate that John Pierce was in any way

Page 83

a party to Gorges's plot. On the contrary, as his interest was wholly allied to his patent, which Gorges's scheme would render of little value to his associate Adventurers and himself he would naturally have been, unless heavily bribed to duplicity beyond his expectations from their intended venture, the last man to whom to disclose such a conspiracy. Neither was he necessary in any way to the success of the scheme. He did not hire either the ship or her master; he does not appear to have had any Pilgrim relations to Captain Jones, and certainly could have had no such influence with him as Gorges could himself command, through Warwick and his own ability—from his position at the head of the "New England Council"—to reward the service he required. That Gorges was able himself to exert all the influence requisite to secure Jones's cooperation, without the aid of Pierce, who probably could have given none, is evident. Mr. Davis's suggestion, while pertinent and potential as to Gorges, is clearly wide of the mark as to Pierce. He represented the Adventurers in the matter of patents only, but Weston was in authority as to the pivotal matter of shipping. An evidently hasty footnote of Dr. Neill, appended to the "Memorial" offered by him to the Congress of the United States, in 1868, seems to have been the only authority of Mr. William T. Davis for the foregoing suggestion as to the complicity of Pierce in the treachery of Captain Jones, except the bare suspicion, already alluded to, in the records of the London Company. Neill says: "Captain Jones, the navigator of the *may-Flower*, and John Pierce, probably had arranged as to destination without the knowledge of the passengers." While of course this is not impossible, there is, as stated, absolutely nothing to indicate any knowledge, participation, or need of Pierce in the matter, and of course the fewer there were in the secret the better.

Unobservant that John Pierce was acting upon the old adage, "second thief best owner," when he asked, a little later, even so extraordinary a thing as that the "Council for New England" would exchange the patent they had so promptly granted him (as representing his associates, the Adventurers and Planters) for a "deed-pole," or title in fee, to himself alone, they instantly complied, and thus unwittingly enabled him also to steal the colony, and its demesne beside. It is evident, from the very servile letter of Robert Cushman to John Pierce (written while the former was at New Plymouth, in November-December, 1621, on behalf of the *may-Flower* Adventurers), that up to that time at least, the Pilgrims had no suspicion of the trick which had been played upon them. For, while too adroit recklessly to open a quarrel with those who could—if they chose —destroy them, the Pilgrims were far too high-minded to stoop to flattery and dissimulation (especially with any one known to have been guilty of treachery toward them), or to permit

Page 84

any one to do so in their stead. In the letter referred to, Cush man acknowledges in the name of the colonists the “bounty and grace of the President and Council of the Affairs of New England [Gorges, Warwick, et als.] for their allowance and approbation” of the “free possession and enjoyment” of the territory and rights so promptly granted Pierce by the Council, in the colonists’ interest, upon application. If the degree of promptness with which the wily Gorges and his associates granted the petition of Pierce, in the colony’s behalf for authority to occupy the domain to which Gorges’s henchman Jones had so treacherously conveyed them, was at all proportionate to the fulsome and lavish acknowledgments of Cushman, there must have been such eagerness of compliance as to provoke general suspicion at the Council table. Gorges and Warwick must have “grinned horribly behind their hands” upon receipt of the honest thanks of these honest planters and the pious benedictions of their scribe, knowing themselves guilty of detestable conspiracy and fraud, which had frustrated an honest purpose, filched the results of others’ labors, and had “done to death” good men and women not a few. Winslow, in “Hypocrisie Unmasked,” says: “We met with many dangers and the mariners’ put back into the harbor of the Cape.” The original intent of the Pilgrims to go to the neighborhood of the Hudson is unmistakable; that this intention was still clear on the morning of November 10 (not 9th) —after they had “made the land”—has been plainly shown; that there was no need of so “standing in with the land” as to become entangled in the “rips” and “shoals” off what is now known as Monomoy (in an effort to pass around the Cape to the southward, when there was plenty of open water to port), is clear and certain; that the dangers and difficulties were magnified by Jones, and the abandonment of the effort was urged and practically made by him, is also evident from Winslow’s language above noted,—“and the mariners put back,” *etc*. No indication of the old-time consultations with the chief men appears here as to the matter of the return. Their advice was not desired. “The mariners put back” on their own responsibility.

Goodwin forcibly remarks, “These waters had been navigated by Gosnold, Smith, and various English and French explorers, whose descriptions and charts must have been familiar to a veteran master like Jones. He doubtless magnified the danger of the passage [of the shoals], and managed to have only such efforts made as were sure to fail. Of course he knew that by standing well out, and then southward in the clear sea, he would be able to bear up for the Hudson. His professed inability to devise any way for getting south of the Cape is strong proof of guilt.”

The sequential acts of the Gorges conspiracy were doubtless practically as follows:—

(a) The Leyden leaders applied to the States General of Holland, through the New Netherland Company, for their aid and protection in locating at the mouth of “Hudson’s” River;

Page 85

(b) Sir Dudley Carleton, the English ambassador at the Hague, doubtless promptly reported these negotiations to the King, through Sir Robert Naunton;

(c) The King, naturally enough, probably mentioned the matter to his intimate and favorite, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, the leading man in American colonization matters in the kingdom;

(d) Sir Ferdinando Gorges, recognizing the value of such colonists as the Leyden congregation would make, anxious to secure them, instead of permitting the Dutch to do so, and knowing that he and his Company would be obnoxious to the Leyden leaders, suggested, as he admits, to Weston, perhaps to Sandys, as the Leyden brethren's friends, that they ought to secure them as colonists for their (London) Company;

(e) Weston was dispatched to Holland to urge the Leyden leaders to drop the Dutch negotiations, come under English auspices, which he guaranteed, and they, placing faith in him, and possibly in Sandys's assurances of his (London) Virginia Company's favor, were led to put themselves completely into the hands of Weston and the Merchant Adventurers; the Wincob patent was cancelled and Pierces substituted;

(f) Weston, failing to lead them to Gorges's company, was next deputed, perhaps by Gorges's secret aid, to act with full powers for the Adventurers, in securing shipping, *etc*.;

(g) Having made sure of the Leyden party, and being in charge of the shipping, Weston was practically master of the situation. He and Cushman, who was clearly entirely innocent of the conspiracy, had the hiring of the ship and of her officers, and at this point he and his acts were of vital importance to Gorges's plans. To bring the plot to a successful issue it remained only to effect the landing of the colony upon territory north of the 41st parallel of north latitude, to take it out of the London Company's jurisdiction, and to do this it was only necessary to make Jones Master of the ship and to instruct him accordingly. This, with so willing a servant of his masters, was a matter of minutes only, the instructions were evidently given, and the success of the plot—the theft of the *may-Flower* colony—was assured.

To a careful and candid student of all the facts, the proofs are seemingly unmistakable, and the conclusion is unavoidable, that the *may-Flower* Pilgrims were designedly brought to Cape Cod by Captain Jones, and their landing in that latitude was effected, in pursuance of a conspiracy entered into by him, not with the Dutch, but with certain of the nobility of England; not with the purpose of keeping the planters out of Dutch territory, but with the deliberate intent of stealing the colony from the London Virginia Company, under whose auspices it had organized and set sail, in the interest, and to the advantage, of its rival Company of the "Northern Plantations."

It is noteworthy that Jones did not command the *may-Flower* for another voyage, and never sailed afterward in the employ of Thomas Goffe, Esq., or (so far as appears) of any reputable shipowner. Weston was not such, nor were the chiefs of the "Council for New England," in whose employ he remained till his death.

Page 86

The records of the Court of the “Council” show, that “as soon as it would do,” and when his absence would tend to lull suspicion as to the parts played, Captain Jones’s noble patrons took steps to secure for him due recognition and compensation for his services, from the parties who were to benefit directly, with themselves, by his knavery. The records read:

“July 17, 1622. A motion was made in the behaffe of Captaine Thomas Jones, Captaine of the *discovery*, nowe employed in Virginia for trade and fishinge [it proved, apparently, rather to be piracy], that he may be admitted a freeman in this Companie in reward of the good service he hath there [Virginia in general] performed. The Court liked well of the motion and condiscended thereunto.” The *discovery* left London at the close of November, 1621. She arrived at Jamestown, Virginia, in April, 1622. She reached Plymouth, New England, in August, 1622. Her outward voyage was not, so far as can be learned, eventful, or entitled to especial consideration or recognition, and the good store of English trading-goods she still had on hand—as Governor Bradford notices—on her arrival at Plymouth indicates no notable success up to that time, in the way of a trading-voyage, while “fishing” is not mentioned. For piracy, in which she was later more successful, she had then had neither time nor opportunity. The conclusion is irresistible, that “the good service” recognized by the vote recorded was of the past (he had sailed only the *may-Flower* voyage for the “Council” before), and that this recognition was a part of the compensation previously agreed upon, if, in the matter of the *may-Flower* voyage, Captain Jones did as he was bidden. Thus much of the crafty Master of the *may-Flower*, Captain Thomas Jones,—his Christian name and identity both apparently beyond dispute, —whom we first know in the full tide of his piratical career, in the corsair *Lion* in Eastern seas; whom we next find as a prisoner in London for his misconduct in the East, but soon Master of the cattle-ship *Falcon* on her Virginia voyage; whom we greet next—and best—as Admiral of the Pilgrim fleet, commander of the destiny freighted *may-Flower*, and though a conspirator with nobles against the devoted band he steered, under the overruling hand of their Lord God, their unwitting pilot to “imperial labors” and mighty honors, to the founding of empire, and to eternal Peace; whom we next meet—fallen, “like Lucifer, never to hope again” —as Captain of the little buccaneer,—the *discovery*, disguised as a trading-ship, on the Virginian and New England coasts; and lastly, in charge of his leaking prize, a Spanish frigate in West Indian waters, making his way—death-stricken—into the Virginia port of Jamestown, where (July, 1625), he “cast anchor” for the last time, dying, as we first found him, a pirate, to whom it had meantime been given to “minister unto saints.”

Page 87

Of *John Clarke*, the first mate of the *may-Flower*, we have already learned that he had been in the employ of the First (or London) Virginia Company, and had but just returned (in June, 1620) from a voyage to Virginia with Captain Jones in the *Falcon*, when found and employed by Weston and Cushman for the Pilgrim ship. Dr. Neill quotes from the "Minutes of the London Virginia Company," of Wednesday, February 13/23, 1621/2, the following; which embodies considerable information concerning him:—

"February 13th, 1621. Master Deputy acquainted the Court, that one Master John Clarke being taken from Virginia long since [Arber interpolates, "in 1612"] by a Spanish ship that came to discover the Plantation, that forasmuch as he hath since that time done the Company presumably the First (or London) Virginia Company good service in many voyages to Virginia; and, of late [1619] went into Ireland, for the transportation of cattle to Virginia; he was a humble suitor to this Court that he might be a Free brother of the Company, and have some shares of land bestowed upon him."

From the foregoing he seems to have begun his American experiences as early as 1612, and to have frequently repeated them. That he was at once hired by Weston and Cushman as a valuable man, as soon as found, was not strange.

He seems to have had the ability to impress men favorably and secure their confidence, and to have been a modest and reliable man. Although of both experience and capacity, he continued an under-officer for some years after the Pilgrim voyage, when, it is fair to suppose, he might have had command of a ship. He seems to have lacked confidence in himself, or else the breadth of education necessary to make him trust his ability as a navigator.

He is not mentioned, in connection with the affairs of the Pilgrims, after he was hired as "pilot,"—on Saturday afternoon the 10th of June, 1620, at London,—until after the arrival at Cape Cod, and evidently was steadily occupied during all the experience of "getting away" and of the voyage, in the faithful performance of his duty as first mate (or "pilot") of the *may-Flower*. It was not until the "third party" of exploration from Cape Cod harbor was organized and set out, on Wednesday, December 6, that he appeared as one of the company who put out in the shallop, to seek the harbor which had been commended by Coppin, "the second mate." On this eventful voyage—when the party narrowly escaped shipwreck at the mouth of Plymouth harbor—they found shelter under the lee of an island, which (it being claimed traditionally that he was first to land there on) was called, in his honor, "Clarke's Island," which name it retains to this day. No other mention of him is made by name, in the affairs of ship or shore, though it is known inferentially that he survived the general illness which attacked and carried off half of the ship's company. In November,

Page 88

1621,—the autumn following his return from the Pilgrim voyage,—he seems to have gone to Virginia as “pilot” (or “mate”) of the *flying hart*, with cattle of Daniel Gookin, and in 1623 to have attained command of a ship, the *providence*, belonging to Mr. Gookin, on a voyage to Virginia where he arrived April 10, 1623, but died in that colony soon after his arrival. He seems to have been a competent and faithful man, who filled well his part in life. He will always have honorable mention as the first officer of the historic *may-Flower*, and as sponsor at the English christening of the smiling islet in Plymouth harbor which bears his name.

Of *Robert Coppin*, the “second mate” (or “pilot”) of the *may-Flower*, nothing is known before his voyage in the Pilgrim ship, except that he seems to have made a former to the coast of New England and the vicinity of Cape Cod, though under what auspices, or in what ship, does not transpire. Bradford says: “Their Pilotte, one Mr. Coppin, who had been in the countrie before.” Dr. Young a suggests that Coppin was perhaps on the coast with Smith or Hunt. Mrs. Austin imaginatively makes him, of “the whaling bark *Scotsman* of Glasgow,” but no warrant whatever for such a conception appears.

Dr. Dexter, as elsewhere noted, has said: “My impression is that Coppin was originally hired to go in the *Speedwell*, . . that he sailed with them [the Pilgrims] in the *speed well*, but on her final putting back was transferred to the *may-Flower*.” As we have seen in another relation, Dr. Dexter also believed Coppin to have been the “pilot” sent over by Cushman to Leyden, in May, 1620, and we have found both views to be untenable. It was doubtless because of this mistaken view that Dr. Dexter believed that Coppin was “hired to go in the *Speedwell*,” and, the premise being wrong, the conclusion is sequentially incorrect. But there are abundant reasons for thinking that Dexter’s “impression” is wholly mistaken. It would be unreasonable to suppose (as both vessels were expected to cross the ocean), that each had not—certainly on leaving Southampton her full complement of officers. If so, each undoubtedly had her second mate. The *may*-FLOWER’S officers and crew were, as we know, hired for the voyage, and there is no good reason to suppose that the second mate of the *may-Flower* was dismissed at Plymouth and Coppin put in his place which would not be equally potent for such an exchange between the first mate of the *Speedwell* and Clarke of the *may-Flower*. The assumption presumes too much. In fact, there can be no doubt that Dexter’s misconception was enbased upon, and arose from, the unwarranted impression that Coppin was the “pilot” sent over to Leyden. It is not likely that, when the SPEEDWELL’S officers were so evidently anxious to escape the voyage, they would seek transfer to the *may-Flower*.

Page 89

Charles Deane, the editor of Bradford's "Historie" (ed.1865), makes, in indexing, the clerical error of referring to Coppin as the "master-gunner," an error doubtless occasioned by the fact that in the text referred to, the words, "two of the masters-mates, Master Clarke and Master Coppin, the master-gunner," *etc*., were run so near together that the mistake was readily made.

In "Mourt's Relation" it appears that in the conferences that were held aboard the ship in Cape Cod harbor, as to the most desirable place for the colonists to locate, "Robert Coppin our pilot, made relation of a great navigable river and great harbor in the headland of the Bay, almost right over against Cape Cod, being a right line not much above eight leagues distant," *etc*. Mrs. Jane G. Austin asserts, though absolutely without warrant of any reliable authority, known tradition, or probability, that "Coppin's harbor . . . afterward proved to be Cut River and the site of Marshfield," but in another place she contradicts this by stating that it was "Jones River, Duxbury." As Coppin described his putative harbor, called "Thievish Harbor," a "great navigable river and good harbor" were in close relation, which was never true of either the Jones River or "Cut River" localities, while any one familiar with the region knows that what Mrs. Austin knew as "Cut River" had no existence in the Pilgrims' early days, but was the work of man, superseding a small river-mouth (Green Harbor River), which was so shallow as to have its exit closed by the sand-shift of a single storm.

Young, with almost equal recklessness, says: "The other headland of the bay," alluded to by Coppin, was Manomet Point, and the river was probably the North River in Scituate; but there are no "great navigable river and good harbor" in conjunction in the neighborhood of Manomet, or of the North River,—the former having no river and the latter no harbor. If Coppin had not declared that he had never seen the mouth of Plymouth harbor before ("mine eyes never saw this place before"), it might readily have been believed that Plymouth harbor was the "Thievish Harbor" of his description, so well do they correspond.

Goodwin, the brother of Mrs. Austin, quite at variance with his sister's conclusions, states, with every probability confirming him, that the harbor Coppin sought "may have been Boston, Ipswich, Newburyport, or Portsmouth."

As a result of his "relation" as to a desirable harbor, Coppin was made the "pilot" of the "third expedition," which left the ship in the shallop, Wednesday, December 6, and, after varying disasters and a narrow escape from shipwreck—through Coppin's mistake—-landed Friday night after dark, in the storm, on the island previously mentioned, ever since called "Clarke's Island," at the mouth of Plymouth harbor.

Nothing further is known of Coppin except that he returned to England with the ship. He has passed into history only as Robert Coppin, "the second mate" (or "pilot") of the *may-Flower*.

Page 90

But one other officer in merchant ships of the *may-Flower* class in her day was dignified by the address of “Master” (or Mister), or had rank with the Captain and Mates as a quarter-deck officer,—except in those instances where a surgeon or a chaplain was carried. That the *may-Flower* carried no special ship’s-surgeon has been supposed from the fact of Dr. Fuller’s attendance alike on her passengers and crew, and the increased mortality of the seamen—after his removal on shore.

> [The author is greatly indebted to his esteemed friend, Mr. George Ernest Bowman, Secretary-General of the Society of *may-Flower* Descendants, for information of much value upon this point. He believes that he has discovered trustworthy evidence of the existence of a small volume bearing upon its title-page an inscription that would certainly indicate that the *may-Flower* had her own surgeon. A copy of the inscription, which Mr. Bowman declares well attested (the book not being within reach), reads as follows:—
>
> “To Giles Heale Chirurgeon,
> from Isaac Allerton
> in Virginia.
> Feb. 10, 1620.”

Giles Heale’s name will be recognized as that of one of the witnesses to John Carver’s copy of William Mullens’s nuncupative will, and, if he was the ship’s-surgeon, might very naturally appear in that relation. If book and inscription exist and the latter is genuine, it would be indubitable proof that Heale (who was surely not a *may-Flower* passenger) was one of the ship’s company, and if a “chirurgeon,” the surgeon of the ship, for no other Englishmen, except those of the colonists and the ship’s company, could have been at New Plymouth, at the date given, and New England was then included in the term “Virginia.” It is much to be hoped that Mr. Bowman’s belief may be established, and that in Giles Heale we shall have another known officer, the surgeon, of the *may-Flower*.]

That she had no chaplain goes without saying. The Pilgrims had their spiritual adviser with them in the person of Elder Brewster, and were not likely to tolerate a priest of either the English or the Romish church on a vessel carrying them. The officer referred to was the representative of the business interests of the owner or chartering-party, on whose account the ship made the voyage; and in that day was known as the “ship’s-merchant,” later as the “purser,” and in some relations as the “supercargo.” No mention of an officer thus designated, belonging to the *may-Flower*, has ever been made by any writer, so far as known, and it devolves upon the author to indicate his existence and to establish, so far as possible, both this and his identity.

Page 91

A certain “Master Williamson,” whose name and presence, though but once mentioned by Governor Bradford, have greatly puzzled Pilgrim historians, seems to have filled this berth on board the *may-Flower*. Bradford tells us that on Thursday, March 22, 1620/21, “Master Williamson” was designated to accompany Captain Standish—practically as an officer of the guard—to receive and escort the Pokanoket chief, Massasoit, to Governor Carver, on the occasion of the former’s first visit of state. Prior to the recent discovery in London, by an American genealogist, of a copy of the nuncupative will of Master William Mullens, one of the *may-Flower* Pilgrims, clearly dictated to Governor John Carver on board the ship, in the harbor of New Plymouth (probably) Wednesday, February 21, 1620 (though not written out by Carver till April 2, 1620), on which day (as we learn from Bradford), Master Mullens died, no other mention of “Master Williamson” than that above quoted was known, and his very existence was seriously questioned. In this will, as elsewhere noted, “Master Williamson” is named as one of the “Overseers.” By most early writers it was held that Bradford had unwittingly substituted the name “Williamson” for that of Allerton, and this view—apparently for no better reasons than that both names had two terminal letters in common, and that Allerton was associated next day with Standish on some military duty—came to be generally accepted, and Allerton’s name to be even frequently substituted without question.——Miss Marcia A. Thomas, in her “Memorials of Marshfield” (p. 75), says: “In 1621, Master Williamson, Captain Standish, and Edward Winslow made a journey to make a treaty with Massasoit. He is called ‘Master George,’ meaning probably Master George Williamson,” *etc*.

This is certainly most absurd, and by one not familiar with the exceptional fidelity and the conscientious work of Miss Thomas would rightly be denounced as reckless and reprehensible fabrication. Of course Williamson, Standish, and Winslow made no such journey, and made no treaty with Massasoit, but aided simply in conducting, with due ceremonial, the first meeting between Governor John Carver and the Indian sachem at Plymouth, at which a treaty was concluded. There is no historical warrant whatever for the name of “George,” as appertaining to “Master William son.” The fact, however,—-made known by the fortunate discovery mentioned,—that “Master Williamson” was named in his will by Master Mullens as one of its “Overseers,” and undoubtedly probated the will in England, puts the existence of such a person beyond reasonable doubt. That he was a person of some dignity, and of very respectable position, is shown by the facts that he was chosen as Standish’s associate, as lieutenant of the guard, on an occasion of so much importance, and was thought fit by Master Mullens, a careful and clear-headed man as his will proves,—to be named an “Overseer”

Page 92

of that will, charged with responsible duties to Mullens's children and property. It is practically certain that on either of the above-mentioned dates (February 21, or March 22) there were no human beings in the Colony of New Plymouth beside the passengers of the *may-Flower*, her officers and crew, and the native savages. Visitors, by way of the fishing vessels on the Maine coast, had not yet begun to come, as they did a little later. It is certain that no one of the name of "Williamson" was among the colonist passengers, or indeed for several years in the colony, and we may at once dismiss both the passengers and the savages from our consideration. This elimination renders it inevitable that "Master Williamson" must have been of the ship's company. It remains to determine, if possible, what position upon the *may*-FLOWER'S roster he presumably held. His selection by "Master" Mullens as one of the "Over seers" of his will suggests the probability that, having named Governor Carver as the one upon whom he would rely for the care of his family and affairs in New England, Mr. Mullens sought as the other a proper person, soon to return to England, and hence able to exercise like personal interest in his two children and his considerable property left there? Such a suggestion points to a returning and competent officer of the ship. That "Master Williamson" was above the grade of "petty officer," and ranked at least with the mates or "pilots," is clear from the fact that he is invariably styled "Master" (equivalent to Mister), and we know with certainty that he was neither captain nor mate. That he was a man of address and courage follows the fact that he was chosen by Standish as his lieutenant, while the choice in and of itself is a strong bit of presumptive proof that he held the position on the *may-Flower* to which he is here assigned.

The only officer commonly carried by a ship of the *may-Flower* class, whose rank, capacities, and functions would comport with every fact and feature of the case, was "the ship's-merchant," her accountant, factor, and usually—when such was requisite—-her "interpreter," on every considerable (trading) voyage.

It is altogether probable that it was in his capacity of "interpreter" (as Samoset and Tisquantum knew but little English), and on account of what knowledge of the Indian tongue he very probably possessed, that Standish chose Williamson as his associate for the formal reception of Massasoit. It is indeed altogether probable that it was this familiarity with the "trade lingo" of the American coast tribes which influenced —perhaps determined—his employment as "ship's-merchant" of the *may-Flower* for her Pilgrim voyage, especially as she was expected to "load back" for England with the products of the country, only to be had by barter with the Indians. It is evident that there must naturally have been some provision

Page 93

made for communication with the natives, for the purposes of that trade, *etc*., which the Planters hoped to establish. Trading along the northern coast of Virginia (as the whole coast strip was then called), principally for furs, had been carried on pretty actively, since 1584, by such navigators as Raleigh's captains, Gosnold, Pring, Champlain, Smith, Dermer, Hunt, and the French and Dutch, and much of the "trade lingo" of the native tribes had doubtless been "picked up" by their different "ship's-merchants." It appears by Bradford' that Dermer, when coasting the shores of New England, in Sir Ferdinando Gorges's employ, brought the Indian Tisquantum with him, from England, as his interpreter, and doubtless from him Dermer and other ship's officers "picked up" more or less Indian phrases, as Tisquantum (Squanto) evidently did of English. Winslow, in his "Good Newes from New England," written in 1622, says of the Indian tongue, as spoken by the tribes about them at Plymouth, "it is very copious, large, and difficult. As yet we cannot attain to any great measure thereof, but can understand them, and explain ourselves to their understanding, by the help of those that daily converse with us." This being the case, after two years of constant communication, and noting how trivial knowledge of English speech Samoset and Tisquantum had, it is easy to understand that, if Williamson had any knowledge of the native tongue, Standish would be most anxious to have the benefit of it, in this prime and all-important effort at securing a permanent alliance with the ruling sachem of the region. Bradford, in "Mourt's Relation," speaking of the speech of Governor Carver to Massasoit, says: "He [Massasoit] liked well of the speech and heard it attentively, though the interpreters did not well express it." Probably all three, Tisquantum, Samoset, and Williamson, had a voice in it.

That "Master Williamson" was a veritable person at New Plymouth, in February and March, 1620/21, is now beyond dispute; that he must have been of the ship's company of the *may-Flower* is logically certain; that he was one of her officers, and a man of character, is proven by his title of "Master" and his choice by Standish and Mullens for exceptional and honorable service; that the position of "ship's-merchant" alone answers to the conditions precedent, is evident; and that such an officer was commonly carried by ships of the *may-Flower* class on such voyages as hers is indicated by the necessity, and proven by the facts known as to other ships on similar New England voyages, both earlier and later. The fact that he was called simply "Master Williamson," in both cases where he is mentioned, with out other designation or identification, is highly significant, and clearly indicates that he was some one so familiarly known to all concerned that no occasion for any further designation apparently occurred to the minds of Mullens, Carver, or Bradford, when referring to him.

Page 94

In the case of Master John Hampden, the only other notable incognito of early Pilgrim literature, the description is full, and the only question concerning him has been of his identity with John Hampden, the English patriot of the Cromwellian era. It is, therefore, not too much to assert that the *may-Flower* carried a "ship's-merchant" (or purser), and that "Master Williamson" was that officer. If close-linked circumstantial evidence is ever to be relied upon, it clearly establishes in this case the identity of the "Master Williamson" who was Governor Bradford's incognito, and the person of the same name mentioned a month earlier in "Master" Mullens's will; as also the fact that in him we have a new officer of the *may Flower*, hitherto unknown as such to Pilgrim literature. If Mr. Bowman's belief as to Giles Heale (see note) proves correct, we have yet another, the Surgeon.

The Carpenter, Gunner, Boatswain, Quartermaster, and "Masters-mates" are the only "petty officers" of the Pilgrim ship of whom any record makes mention. The carpenter is named several times, and was evidently, as might be expected, one of the most useful men of the ship's crew. Called into requisition, doubtless, in the conferences as to the condition of the *Speedwell*, on both of her returns to port, at the inception of the voyage, he was especially in evidence when, in mid-ocean, "the cracking and bending of a great deck-beam," and the "shaken" condition of "the upper works" of the *may-Flower*, gave rise to much alarm, and it was by his labors and devices, and the use of the now famous "jack-screw," that the bending beam and leaking deck were made secure. The repairs upon the shallop in Cape Cod harbor also devolved upon him, and mention is made of his illness and the dependence placed upon him. No doubt, in the construction of the first dwellings and of the ordnance platform on the hill, *etc*., he was the devising and principal workman. He undoubtedly returned to England with the ship, and is known in history only by his "billet," as "the carpenter" of the *may-Flower*.

The Master Gunner seems to have been a man with a proclivity for Indian barter, that led him to seek a place with the "third expedition" at Cape Cod, thereby nearly accomplishing his death, which indeed occurred later, in Plymouth harbor, not long before the return of the ship.

The Boatswain is known, by Bradford's records, to have died in the general sickness which attacked the crew while lying in Plymouth harbor. The brief narrative of his sickness and death is all that we know of his personality. The writer says: "He was a proud young man, and would often curse and scoff at the passengers," but being nursed when dying, by those of them who remained aboard, after his shipmates had deserted him in their craven fear of infection, "he bewailed his former conduct," saying, "Oh! you, I now see, show your love like Christians indeed, one to another, but we let one another lie and die like dogs."

Page 95

Four Quartermasters are mentioned (probably helmsmen simply), of whom three are known to have died in Plymouth harbor.

“Masters-mates” are several times mentioned, but it is pretty certain that the “pilots” (or mates) are intended. Bradford and Winslow, in “Mourt’s Relation,” say of the reappearance of the Indians: “So Captain Standish, with another [Hopkins], with their muskets, went over to them, with two of the masters-mates that follow them without [side?] arms, having two muskets with them: Who these “masters-mates” were does not appear.” The language, “two of the masters-mates,” would possibly suggest that there were more of them. It hardly seems probable that both the mates of the *may-Flower* would thus volunteer, or thrust themselves forward in such a matter, and it seems doubtful if they would have been permitted (even if both ashore at one time, which, though unusual, did occur), to assume such duty. Whoever they were, they did not lack courage.

The names of the petty officers and seamen of the *may-Flower* do not appear as such, but the discovery of the (evidently) nuncupative will of William Mullens—herein referred to—has perhaps given us two of them. Attached to John Carver’s certificate of the particulars of this will, filed at Somerset House, London, are the names, “Giles Heale” and “Christopher Joanes.” As Mr Mullens died Wednesday, February 21, 1620, on board the *may-Flower* in Plymouth harbor, on which day we know from Bradford’ that “the Master [Jones, whose name was Thomas] came on shore with many of his sailors,” to land and mount the cannon on the fort, and as they had a full day’s work to draw up the hill and mount five guns, and moreover brought the materials for, and stayed to eat, a considerable dinner with the Pilgrims, they were doubtless ashore all day. It is rational to interpret the known facts to indicate that in this absence of the Captain and most of his crew ashore, Mr. Mullens, finding himself failing fast, sent for Governor Carver and —unable to do more than speak —dictated to him the disposition of his property which he desired to make. Carver, noting this down from his dictation, undoubtedly called in two of the ship’s company (Heale very likely being the ship’s-surgeon), who were left aboard to “keep ship,” to hear his notes read to Mullens and assented to by him, they thus becoming the witnesses to his will, to the full copy of which, as made by Carver (April 2), they affixed their names as such. As there were then at Plymouth (besides savages) only the passengers and crew of the *may-Flower*, and these men were certainly not among the passengers, it seems inevitable that they were of the crew. That “Christopher Joanes” was not the Master of the ship is clear, because Heale’s is the first signature, and no man of the crew would have dared to sign before the Captain; because the Captain’s name was (as demonstrated) Thomas; and because we

Page 96

know that he was ashore all that day, with most of his men. It is by no means improbable that Captain Jones had shipped one of his kinsmen in his crew, possibly as one of the "masters mates" or quartermasters referred to (and it is by no means certain that there were not more than two), though these witnesses may have been quartermasters or other petty officers left on board as "ship-keepers." Certain it is that these two witnesses must have been of the crew, and that "Christopher Joanes" was not the Captain, while it is equally sure, from the collateral evidence, that Master Mullens died on shipboard. Had he died on shore it is very certain that some of the leaders, Brewster, Bradford, or others, would have been witnesses, with such of the ship's officers as could aid in proving the will in England. It is equally evident that the officers of the ship were absent when Master Mullens dictated his will, except perhaps the surgeon.

The number of seamen belonging to the ship is nowhere definitely stated. At least four in the employ of the Pilgrims were among the passengers and not enrolled upon the ships' lists. From the size of the ship, the amount of sail she probably carried, the weight of her anchors, and certain other data which appear,—such as the number allowed to leave the ship at a time, *etc*.,—it is probably not a wild estimate to place their number at from twenty to twenty-five. This is perhaps a somewhat larger number than would be essential to work the ship, and than would have been shipped if the voyage had been to any port of a civilized country; but on a voyage to a wild coast, the possibilities of long absence and of the weakening of the crew by death, illness, *etc*., demanded consideration and a larger number. The wisdom and necessity of carrying, on a voyage to an uninhabited country, some spare men, is proven by the record of Bradford, who says: "The disease begane to fall amongst them the seamen also, so as allmost halfe of their company dyed before they went away and many of their officers and lustyest men; as ye boatson, gunner, 3 quarter maisters, the cooke, and others."

The *lady* ARBELLA, the "Admiral" of Governor Winthrop's fleet, a ship of 350 tons, carried 52 men, and it is a fair inference that the *may-Flower*, of a little more than half her tonnage, would require at least half as many. It is, therefore, not unlikely that the officers and crew of the *may-Flower*, all told, mustered thirty men, irrespective of the sailors, four in number (Alderton, English, Trevore, and Ely), in the Pilgrims' employ.

CHAPTER VI

THE MAY-FLOWER'S PASSENGERS

The passenger list of the *Speedwell* has given us the names of the Leyden members of the company which, with the cooperation of the associated Merchant Adventurers, was, in the summer of 1620, about to emigrate to America.

Page 97

Though it is not possible, with present knowledge, positively to determine every one of those who were passengers in the *may-Flower* from London to Southampton, most of them can be named with certainty.

Arranged for convenience, so far as possible, by families, they were:—

Master Robert Cushman, the London agent of the Leyden company,
Mrs. Mary (Clarke)-Singleton Cushman, 2d wife,
Thomas Cushman, son (by 1st wife).

Master Christopher Martin, treasurer-agent of the colonists,
Mrs. Martin, wife,
Solomon Prower, “servant,”
John Langemore, “servant.”

Master Richard Warren.

Master William Mullens,
Mrs. Alice Mullens, wife,
Joseph Mullens, 2d son,
Priscilla Mullens, 2d daughter,
Robert Carter, “servant.”

Master Stephen Hopkins,
Mrs. Elizabeth (Fisher?) Hopkins, 2d wife,
Giles Hopkins, son (by former wife),
Constance Hopkins, daughter (by former wife),
Damaris Hopkins, daughter,
Edward Dotey, “servant,”
Edward Leister, “servant.”

Gilbert Winslow.

James Chilton,
Mrs. Susanna (2) Chilton, wife,
Mary Chilton, daughter.

Richard Gardiner.

John Billington,
Mrs. Eleanor (or Helen) Billington, wife,
John Billington (Jr.), son,
Francis Billington, son.

William Latham, “servant-boy” to Deacon Carver.

Jasper More, “bound-boy” to Deacon Carver.

Ellen More, “little bound girl” to Master Edward Winslow.

Richard More, “bound-boy” to Elder Brewster.
------- More, “bound-boy” to Elder Brewster.

There is a possibility that Thomas Rogers and his son, Joseph, who are usually accredited to the Leyden company, were of the London contingent, and sailed from there, though this is contra-indicated by certain collateral data.

It is possible, also, of course, that any one or more of the English colonists (with a few exceptions—such as Cushman and family, Mullens and family, the More children and others—known to have left London on the *may-Flower*) might have joined her (as did Carver and Alden, perhaps Martin and family) at Southampton, but the strong presumption is that most of the English passengers joined the ship at London.

It is just possible, too, that the seamen, Alderton (or Allerton), English, Trevore, and Ely, were hired in London and were on board the *may-Flower* when she left that port, though they might have been employed and joined the ship at either Southampton, Dartmouth, or Plymouth. It is strongly probable, however, that they were part, if not all, hired in Holland, and came over to Southampton in the pinnace.

Robert Cushman—the London agent (for more than three years) of the Leyden congregation, and, in spite of the wickedly unjust criticism of Robinson and others, incompetent to judge his acts, their brave, sagacious, and faithful servant—properly heads the list.

Page 98

Bradford says: "Where they find the bigger ship come from London, Mr. Jones, Master, with the rest of the company who had been waiting there with Mr. Cushman seven days." Deacon Carver, probably from being on shore, was not here named. In a note appended to the memoir of Robert Cushman (prefatory to his Discourse delivered at Plymouth, New England, on "The Sin and Danger of Self-Love") it is stated in terms as follows: "The fact is, that Mr. Cushman procured the larger vessel, the *may-Flower*, and its pilot, at London, and left in that vessel." The statement—though published long after the events of which it treats and by other than Mr. Cushman—we know to be substantially correct, and the presumption is that the writer, whoever he may have been, knew also.Sailing with his wife and son (it is not probable that he had any other living child at the time), in full expectation that it was for Virginia, he encountered so much of ungrateful and abusive treatment, after the brethren met at Southampton,—especially at the hands of the insufferable Martin, who, without merit and with a most reprehensible record (as it proved), was chosen over him as "governor" of the ship,—that he was doubtless glad to return from Plymouth when the *Speedwell* broke down. He and his family appear, therefore, as "*May-Flower* passengers," only between London and Plymouth during the vexatious attendance upon the scoundrelly Master of the *Speedwell*, in his "doublings" in the English Channel. His Dartmouth letter to Edward Southworth, one of the most valuable contributions to the early literature of the Pilgrims extant, clearly demonstrates that he was suffering severely from dyspepsia and deeply wounded feelings. The course of events was his complete vindication, and impartial history to-day pronounces him second to none in his service to the Pilgrims and their undertaking. His first wife is shown by Leyden records to have been Sarah Reder, and his second marriage to have occurred May 19/June 3, 1617, [sic] about the time he first went to England in behalf of the Leyden congregation.

Mrs. Mary (Clarke)-Singleton Cushman appears only as a passenger of the *may-Flower* on her channel voyage, as she returned with her husband and son from Plymouth, England, in the *Speedwell*.

Thomas Cushman, it is quite clear, must have been a son by a former wife, as he would have been but a babe, if the son of the latest wife, when he went to New England with his father, in the *Fortune*, to remain. Goodwin and others give his age as fourteen at this time, and his age at death is their warrant. Robert Cushman died in 1625, but a "Mary, wife [widow?] of Robert Cushman, and their son, Thomas," seem to have been remembered in the will of Ellen Bigge, widow, of Cranbrooke,

Page 99

England, proved February 12, 1638 (Archdeaconry, Canterbury, vol. lxx. leaf 482). The will intimates that the "Thomas" named was "under age" when the bequest was made. If this is unmistakably so (though there is room for doubt), then this was not the Thomas of the Pilgrims. Otherwise the evidence is convincing.

Master Christopher Martin, who was made, Bradford informs us, the treasurer-agent of the Planter Company, Presumably about the time of the original conclusions between the Adventurers and the Planters, seems to have been appointed such, as Bradford states, not because he was needed, but to give the English contingent of the Planter body representation in the management, and to allay thereby any suspicion or jealousy. He was, if we are to judge by the evidence in hand concerning his contention and that of his family with the Archdeacon, the strong testimony that Cushman bears against him in his Dartmouth letter of August 17, and the fact that there seems to have been early dissatisfaction with him as "governor" on the ship, a very self-sufficient, somewhat arrogant, and decidedly contentious individual. His selection as treasurer seems to have been very unfortunate, as Bradford indicates that his accounts were in unsatisfactory shape, and that he had no means of his own, while his rather surprising selection for the office of "governor" of the larger ship, after the unpleasant experience with him as treasurer-agent, is difficult to account for, except that he was evidently an active opponent of Cushman, and the latter was just then in disfavor with the colonists. He was evidently a man in the prime of life, an "Independent" who had the courage of his convictions if little discretion, and much of that energy and self-reliance which, properly restrained, are excellent elements for a colonist. Very little beside the fact that he came from Essex is known of him, and nothing of his wife. He has further mention hereafter.

Solomon Prower is clearly shown by the complaint made against him by the Archdeacon of Chelmsford, the March before he sailed on the *may-Flower*, to have been quite a youth, a firm "Separatist," and something more than an ordinary "servant." He seems to have been summoned before the Archdeacon at the same time with young Martin (a son of Christopher), and this fact suggests some nearer relation than that of "servant." He is sometimes spoken of as Martin's "son," by what warrant does not appear, but the fact suggests that

he may have been a step-son. Bradford, in recording his death, says: “Dec. 24, this day dies Solomon Martin.” This

Page 100

could, of
course, have been none other than Solomon Prower. Dr. Young, in his "Chronicles," speaking of Martin, says, "he brought his wife and two children." If this means Martin's children, it is evidently an error. It may refer to age only. His case is puzzling, for Bradford makes him both "servant" and "son." If of sufficient age and account to be cited before the Archdeacon for discipline, it seems strange that he should not have signed the "Compact." Even if a "servant" this would seem to have been no bar, as Dotey and Leister were certainly such, yet signers. The indications are that he was but a well-grown lad, and that his youth, or severe illness, and not his station, accounts for the absence of his signature. If a young foster-son or kinsman of Martin, as seems most likely, then Martin's signature was sufficient, as in the cases of fathers for their sons; if really a "ser vant" then too young (like Latham and Hooke) to be called upon, as were Dotey and Leister.

John Langemore; there is nothing (save the errors of Dr. Young) to indicate that he was other than a "servant."

Richard Warren was probably from Kent or Essex. Surprisingly little is known of his antecedents, former occupation, *etc*.

William Mullens and his family were, as shown, from Dorking in Surrey, and their home was therefore close to London, whence they sailed, beyond doubt, in the *may-Flower*. The discovery at Somerset House, London, by Mr. Henry F. Waters, of Salem, Massachusetts; of what is evidently the nuncupative will of William Mullens, proves an important one in many particulars, only one of which need be referred to in this connection, but all of which will receive due consideration. It conclusively shows Mr. Mullens not to have been of the Leyden congregation, as has sometimes been claimed, but that he was a well-to-do tradesman of Dorking in Surrey, adjacent to London. It renders it certain, too, that he had been some time resident there, and had both a married daughter and a son (William), doubtless living there, which effectually overthrows the "imaginary history" of Baird, and of that pretty story, "Standish of Standish," whereby the Mullens (or Molines) family are given French (Huguenot) antecedents and the daughter is endowed with numerous airs, graces, and accomplishments, professedly French.

Page 101

Dr. Griffis, in his delightful little narrative, “The Pilgrims in their Three Homes, England, Holland, America,” cites the name “Mullins” as a Dutch distortion of Molines or Molineaux. Without questioning that such it might be,—for the Dutch scribes were gifted in remarkable distortions of simple names, even of their own people,—they evidently had no hand in thus maltreating the patronym of William Mullens (or Mullins) of the Pilgrims, for not only is evidence entirely wanting to show that he was ever a Leyden citizen, though made such by the fertile fiction of Mrs. Austin, but Governor Carver, who knew him well, wrote it in his will “Mullens,” while two English probate functionaries of his own home-counties wrote it respectively “Mullens” and “Mullins.”Dr. Grifs speaks of “the Mullens family” as evidently [sic] of Huguenot or Walloon birth or descent, but in doing so probably knew no other authority than Mrs. Austin’s little novel, or (possibly) Dr. Baird’s misstatements.A writer in the “New England Historic-Genealogical Register,” vol. xlvii, p. 90, states, that “Mrs. Jane G. Austin found her authority for saying that Priscilla Mullens was of a Huguenot family, in Dr. Baird’s ‘History of Huguenot Emigration to America,’ vol. i. p. 158,” *etc*., referring to Rev. Charles W. Baird, D. D., New York. The reference given is a notable specimen of very bad historical work. Of Dr. Baird, one has a right to expect better things, and the positiveness of his reckless assertion might well mislead those not wholly familiar with the facts involved, as it evidently has more than one. He states, without qualification or reservation, that “among the passengers in the *Speedwell* were several of the French who had decided to cast in their lot with these English brethren. William Molines and his daughter Priscilla, afterwards the wife of John Alden and Philip Delanoy, born in Leyden of French parents, were of the number.” One stands confounded by such a combination of unwarranted errors. Not only is it not true that there “were several of the French among the passengers in the *Speedwell*,” but there is no evidence whatever that there was even one. Those specifically named as there, certainly were not, and there is not the remotest proof or reason to believe, that William Mullens (or Molines) and his daughter Priscilla (to say nothing of the wife and son who accompanied him to America, whom Baird forgets) ever even saw Leyden or Delfshaven. Their home had been at Dorking in Surrey, just across the river from London, whence the *may-Flower* sailed for New England, and nothing could be more absurd than to assume that they were passengers on the *Speedwell* from Delfshaven to Southampton.So far from Philip Delanoy (De La Noye or Delano) being a passenger on the *Speedwell*, he was not even one of the Pilgrim company, did not

Page 102

go to New England till the following year (in the *Fortune*), and of course had no relation to the *Speedwell*. Neither does Edward Winslow—the only authority for the parentage of "Delanoy"—state that "he was born in Leyden," as Baird alleges, but only that "he was born of French parents . . . and came to us from Leyden to New Plymouth,"—an essential variance in several important particulars. Scores and perhaps hundreds of people have been led to believe Priscilla Mullens a French Protestant of the Leyden congregation, and themselves—as her descendants—"of Huguenot stock," because of these absolutely groundless assertions of Dr. Baird. They lent themselves readily to Mrs. Austin's fertile imagination and facile pen, and as "welcome lies" acquired a hold on the public mind, from which even the demonstrated truth will never wholly dislodge them. The comment of the intelligent writer in the "Historic-Genealogical Register" referred to is proof of this. So fast-rooted had these assertions become in her thought as the truth, that, confronted with the evidence that Master Mullens and his family were from Dorking in England, it does not occur to her to doubt the correctness of the impression which the recklessness of Baird had created,—that they were of Leyden,—-and she hence amusingly suggests that "they must have moved from Leyden to Dorking." These careless utterances of one who is especially bound by his position, both as a writer and as a teacher of morals, to be jealous for the truth, might be partly condoned as attributable to mistake or haste, except for the facts that they seem to have been the fountain-head of an ever-widening stream of serious error, and that they are preceded on the very page that bears them by others as to the Pilgrim exodus equally unhappy. It seems proper to suggest that it is high time that all lovers of reliable history should stand firmly together against the flood of loose statement which is deluging the public; brand the false wherever found; and call for proof from of all new and important historical propositions put forth.

Stephen Hopkins may possibly have had more than one wife before Elizabeth, who accompanied him to New England and was mother of the sea-born son Oceanus. Hopkins's will indicates his affection for this latest wife, in unusual degree for wills of that day. With singular carelessness, both of the writer and his proof-reader, Hon. William T. Davis states that Damaris Hopkins was born "after the arrival" in New England. The contrary is, of course, a well established fact. Mr. Davis was probably led into this error by following Bradford's "summary" as affecting the Hopkins family. He states therein that Hopkins "had one son, who became a seaman and died at Barbadoes probably Caleb, and four daugh ters born here." To make up these "four" daughters "born here" Davis found it

Page 103

necessary to include Damaris, unmindful that Bradford names her in his list of *may-Flower* passengers. It is evident, either that Bradford made a mistake in the number, or that there was some daughter who died in infancy. It is evident that Dotey and Leister, the "servants" of Hopkins, were of English origin and accompanied their master from London.

Gilbert Winslow was a brother of Edward Winslow, a young man, said to have been a carpenter, who returned to England after "divers years" in New England. There is a possibility that he was at Leyden and was a passenger on the *Speedwell*. It has been suggested that he spent the greater part of the time he was in New England, outside of the Pilgrim Colony. He took no part in its affairs.

James Chilton and his family are but little known to Pilgrim writers, except the daughter Mary, who came into notice principally through her marriage with John Winslow, another brother of Governor Edward, who came over later. Their name has assumed a singular prominence in popular regard, altogether disproportionate to either their personal characteristics, station, or the importance of their early descendants. Some unaccountable glamour of romance, without any substantial foundation, is probably responsible for it. They left a married daughter behind them in England, which is the only hint we have as to their home just prior to the embarkation. There has been a disposition, not well grounded, to regard them as of Leyden.

Richard Gardiner, Goodwin unequivocally places with the English colonists (but on what authority does not fully appear), and he has been claimed, but without any better warrant, for the Leyden list.

John Billington and his family were unmistakably of the English colonists. Mrs. Billington's name has been variously given, *e.g*. Helen, Ellen, and Eleanor, and the same writer has used them interchangeably. One writer has made the inexcusable error of stating that "the younger son, Francis, was born after the arrival at New Plymouth," but his own affidavit shows him to have been born in 1606.

William Latham, a "servant-boy" of Deacon Carver, has always been of doubtful relation, some circumstances indicating that he was of

Leyden and hence was a *Speedwell* passenger, but others—and these the more significant—rendering it probable that he was an English boy, who was obtained in London (like the More children) and apprenticed to Carver, in which case he probably came in the *may-Flower* from London, though he may have awaited her coming with his master at Southampton,

Page 104

in which case he probably originally embarked there, with him, on the *Speedwell*, and was transferred with him, at Plymouth, to the *may-Flower*. There is, of course, also still the possibility that he came with Carver's family from Leyden. Governor Carver's early death necessarily changed his status somewhat, and Plymouth early records do not give much beyond suggestion as to what the change was; but all indications confirm the opinion that he was a poor boy—very likely of London or vicinity—taken by Carver as his "servant."

The More children, Jasper, Richard, their brother (whose given name has never transpired), and Ellen, their sister, invite more than passing mention. The belief has always been current and confident among students of Pilgrim history that these More children, four in number, "put" or "indentured" to three of the Leyden leaders, were probably orphaned children of some family of the Leyden congregation, and were so "bound" to give them a chance in the new colony, in return for such services as they could render to those they accompanied. If thus of the Leyden contingent they would, of course, be enumerated as passengers in the *Speedwell* from Delfshaven, but if of the English contingent they should probably be borne on the list of passengers sailing from London in the *may-Flower*, certainly should be reckoned as part of the English contingent on the *may-Flower* at Southampton. An affidavit of Richard More, perhaps the eldest of these children, indentured to Elder Brewster, dated in 1684., found in "Proceedings of the Provincial Court, Maryland Archives, vol. xiv. ('New England Historic-Genealogical Register,' vol 1. p. 203)," affirms the deponent to be then "seaventy years or thereabouts" of age, which would have made him some six years of age, "or thereabouts," in 1620. He deposes "that being in London at the house of Mr. Thomas Weston, Iron monger, in the year 1620, he was from there transported to New Plymouth in New England," *etc*. This clearly identifies Richard More of the *may Flower*, and renders it well-nigh certain that he and his brothers and sister, "bound out" like himself to Pilgrim leaders, were of the English company, were probably never in Leyden or on the *Speedwell*, and were very surely passengers on the *may-Flower* from London, in charge of Mr. Cushman or others. The fact that the lad was in London, and went from thence direct to New England, is good evidence that he was not of the Leyden party. The fair presump tion is that his brothers and sister were, like

Page 105

himself, of English birth, and humble—perhaps deceased—parents, taken because of their orphaned condition. It is highly improbable that they would be taken from London to Southampton by land, at the large expense of land travel in those days, when the *may-Flower* was to sail from London. That they would accompany their respective masters to their respectively assigned ships at Southampton is altogether likely. The phraseology of his affidavit suggests the probability that Richard More, his brothers, and sister were brought to Mr. Weston's house, to be by him sent aboard the *may-Flower*, about to sail. The affidavit is almost conclusive evidence as to the fact that the More children were all of the English colonists' party, though apprenticed to Leyden families, and belonged to the London passenger list of the Pilgrim ship. The researches of Dr. Neill among the *Ms*. "minutes" and "transactions" of the (London) Virginia Company show germanely that, on November 17, 1619, "the treasurer, council, and company" of this Virginia Company addressed Sir William Cockaine, Knight, Lord Mayor of the city of London, and the right worthys the aldermen, his brethren, and the worthys the "common council of the city," and returning thanks for the benefits conferred, in furnishing out one hundred children this last year for "the plantation in Virginia" (from what Neill calls the "homeless boys and girls of London"), states, that, "forasmuch as we have now resolved to send this next spring [1620] very large supplies," *etc*., "we pray your Lordship and the rest . . . to renew the like favors, and furnish us again with one hundred more for the next spring. Our desire is that we may have them of twelve years old and upward, with allowance of L3 apiece for their transportation, and 40s. apiece for their apparel, as was formerly granted. They shall be apprenticed; the boys till they come to 21 years of age, the girls till like age or till they be married," *etc*.
A letter of Sir Edwin Sandys (dated January 28, 1620) to Sir Robert Naunton shows that "The city of London have appointed one hundred children from the superfluous multitude to be transported to Virginia, there to be bound apprentices upon very beneficial conditions." In view of the facts that these More children—and perhaps others—were "apprenticed" or "bound" to the Pilgrims (Carver, Winslow, Brewster, *etc*.), and that there must have been some one to make the indentures, it seems strongly probable that these four children of one family,—as Bradford shows,—very likely orphaned, were among

Page 106

those designated by the city of London for the
benefit of the (London) Virginia Company in the spring of 1620. They seem to have been waifs caught up in the westward-setting current, but only Richard survived the first winter. Bradford, writing in 1650, states of Richard More that his brothers and sister died, "but he is married [1636] and hath 4 or 5 children." William T. Davis, in his "Ancient Landmarks of Plymouth" (p. 24), states, and Arber copies him, that "he was afterwards called Mann; and died at Scituate, New England, in 1656." The researches of Mr. George E. Bowman, the able Secretary of the Massachusetts Society of *may-Flower* Descendants, some time since disproved this error, but Mores affidavit quoted conclusively determines the matter.

The possible accessions to the company, at London or Southampton, of Henry Sampson and Humility Cooper, cousins of Edward Tilley and wife, would be added to the passengers of the pinnace rather than to the *may*-FLOWER'S, if, as seems probable, their relatives were of the *Speedwell*. If Edward Tilley and his wife were assigned to the *may Flower*, room would doubtless also be found for these cousins on the ship. John Alden, the only positively known addition (except Carver) made to the list at Southampton, was, from the nature of his engagement as "cooper," quite likely assigned to the larger ship. There are no known hints as to the assignments of passengers to the respective vessels at Southampton—then supposed to be final—-beyond the remarks of Bradford that "the chief [principal ones] of them that came from Leyden went on this ship [the *Speedwell*] to give the Master content," and his further minute, that "Master Martin was governour in the biger ship and Master Cushman assistante." It is very certain that Deacon Carver, one of the four agents of the colonists, who had "fitted out" the voyage in England, was a passenger in the *Speedwell* from Southampton,—as the above mentioned remark of Bradford would suggest,—and was made "governour" of her passengers, as he later was of the whole company, on the *may-Flower*. It has sometimes been queried whether, in the interim between the arrival of the *Speedwell* at Southampton and the assignment of the colonists to their respective ships (especially as both vessels were taking in and transferring cargo), the passengers remained on board or were quartered on shore. The same query has arisen, with even better reason, as to the passengers of the *Speedwell* during the stay at Dartmouth, when the consort was being carefully overhauled to find her leaks, the suggestion being made that in this case some of them might have found accommodation on board the larger ship. The question may be fairly considered as settled negatively, from the facts that the colonists, with few exceptions, were unable

Page 107

to bear such extra expense themselves; the funds of the Adventurers—if any were on hand, which appears doubtful—were not available for the purpose; while the evidence of some of the early writers renders it very certain that the Leyden party were not released from residence on shipboard from the time they embarked on the *Speedwell* at Delfshaven till the final landing in the harbor of New Plimoth. Just who of the Leyden chiefs caused themselves to be assigned to the smaller vessel, to encourage its cowardly Master, cannot be definitely known. It may be confidently assumed, however, that Dr. Samuel Fuller, the physician of the colonists, was transferred to the *may-Flower*, upon which were embarked three fourths of the entire company, including most of the women and children, with some of whom, it was evident, his services would be certainly in demand. There is little doubt that the good Elder (William Brewster) was also transferred to the larger ship at Southampton, while it would not be a very wild guess—-in the light of Bradford's statement—to place Carver, Winslow, Bradford, Standish, Cooke, Howland, and Edward Tilley, and their families, among the passengers on the consort. Just how many passengers each vessel carried when they sailed from Southampton will probably never be positively known. Approximately, it may be said, on the authority of such contemporaneous evidence as is available, and such calculations as are possible from the data we have, that the *Speedwell* had thirty (30), and the *may-Flower* her proportionate number, ninety (90)—a total of one hundred and twenty (120).

Captain John Smith says,

[Smith, New England's Trials, ed. 1622, London, p. 259. It is a singular error of the celebrated navigator that he makes the ships to have, in less than a day's sail, got outside of Plymouth, as he indicates by his words, "the next day," and "forced their return to Plymouth." He evidently intends to speak only in general terms, as he entirely omits the (first) return to Dartmouth, and numbers the passengers on the *may-Flower*, on her final departure, at but "one hundred." He also says they "discharged twenty passengers."]

apparently without pretending to be exact, "They left the coast of England the 23 of August, with about 120 persons, but the next day [sic] the lesser ship sprung a leak that forced their return to Plymouth; where discharging her [the ship] and twenty passengers, with the great ship and a hundred persons, besides sailors, they set sail again on the 6th of September."

Page 108

[Dr. Ames, so stringent in his requirements of other authors, for example Jane Austin, has to this point been pathetically naive as to the opinions of Captain John Smith. Captain Smith's self-serving and very subjective narratives of his own voyages obtained for him the very derogatory judgement by his contemporaries. One of the best reviews of John Smith's life may be found in a small book on this adventurer by Charles Dudley Warner. D.W.]

If the number one hundred and twenty (120) is correct, and the distribution suggested is also exact, *viz*. thirty (30) to the *Speedwell* and ninety (90) to the *may-Flower*, it is clear that there must have been more than twelve (the number usually named) who went from the consort to the larger ship, when the pinnace was abandoned. We know that at least Robert Cushman and his family (wife and son), who were on the *may-Flower*, were among the number who returned to London upon the *Speedwell* (and the language of Thomas Blossom in his letter to Governor Bradford, else where quoted, indicates that he and his son were also there), so that if the ship's number was ninety (90), and three or more were withdrawn, it would require fifteen (15) or more to make the number up to one hundred and two (102), the number of passengers we know the *may-Flower* had when she took her final departure. It is not likely we shall ever be able to determine exactly the names or number of those transferred to the *may-Flower* from the consort, or the number or names of all those who went back to London from either vessel. Several of the former and a few of the latter are known, but we must (except for some fortunate discovery) rest content with a very accurate knowledge of the passenger list of the *may-Flower* when she left Plymouth (England), and of the changes which occurred in it afterward; and a partial knowledge of the ship's own complement of officers and men.

Goodwin says: "The returning ones were probably of those who joined in England, and had not yet acquired the Pilgrim spirit." Unhappily this view is not sustained by the relations of those of the number who are known. Robert Cushman and his family (3 persons), Thomas Blossom and his son (2 persons), and William Ring (1 person), a total of six, or just one third of the putative eighteen who went back, all belonged to the Leyden congregation, and were far from lacking "the Pilgrim spirit." Cushman was both ill and heart-sore from fatigue, disappointment, and bad treatment; Ring was very ill, according to Cushman's Dartmouth letter; but the motives governing Blossom and his son do not appear, unless the comparatively early death of the son—after which his father went to New England—furnishes a clue thereto. Bradford says: "Those that went back were, for the most part, such as were willing to do so, either out of some discontent, or fear they conceived of the ill success of the Voyage,

Page 109

seeing so many crosses befallen and the year time so far spent. But others, in regard of their own weakness and the charge of many young children, were thought [by the Managers] least useful and most unfit to bear the brunt of this hard adventure." It is evident from the above that, while the return of most was from choice, some were sent back by those in authority, as unfit for the undertaking, and that of these some had "many young chil dren." There are said to have been eighteen who returned on the *Speedwell* to London. We know who six of them were, leaving twelve, or two thirds, unknown. Whether these twelve were in part from Leyden, and were part English, we shall probably never know. If any of them were from Holland, then the number of those who left Delfshaven on the *Speedwell* is increased by so many. If any were of the English contingent, and probably the most were,—then the passenger list of the *may-Flower* from London to Southampton was probably, by so many, the larger. It is evident, from Bradford's remark, that, among the twelve unknown, were some who, from "their own weakness and charge of many young children, were thought least useful and most unfit," *etc*. From this it is clear that at least one family was included which had a number of young children, the parents' "own weakness" being recognized. A father, mother, and four children (in view of the term "many") would seem a reasonable surmise, and would make six, or another third of the whole number. The probability that the unknown two thirds were chiefly from England, rather than Holland, is increased by observation of the evident care with which, as a rule, those from the Leyden congregation were picked, as to strength and fitness, and also by the fact that their Leyden homes were broken up. Winslow remarks, "the youngest and strongest part were to go," and an analysis of the list shows that those selected were mostly such. Bradford, in stating that Martin was "from Billericay in Essex," says, "from which part came sundry others." It is quite possible that some of the unknown twelve who returned were from this locality, as none of those who went on the *may-Flower* are understood to have hailed from there, beside the Martins.

All the colonists still intending to go to America were now gathered in one vessel. Whatever previous disposition of them had been made, or whatever relations they might have had in the disjointed record of the exodus, were ephemeral, and are now lost sight of in the enduring interest which attaches to their final and successful "going forth" as *may-Flower* Pilgrims.

Page 110

Bradford informs us—as already noted—that, just before the departure from Southampton, having "ordered and distributed their company for either ship, as they conceived for the best," they "chose a Governor and two or three assistants for each ship, to order the people by the way, and see to the disposing of the provisions, and such like affairs. All which was not only with the liking of the Masters of the ships, but according to their desires." We have seen that under this arrangement —the wisdom and necessity of which are obvious—Martin was made "Governor" on the "biger ship" and Cushman his "assistante." Although we find no mention of the fact, it is rendered certain by the record which Bradford makes of the action of the Pilgrim company on December 11, 1620, at Cape Cod,—when they "confirmed" Deacon John Carver as "Governor,"—that he was and had been such, over the colonist passengers for the voyage (the ecclesiastical authority only remaining to Elder Brewster), Martin holding certainly no higher than the second place, made vacant by Cushman's departure.

Thus, hardly had the Pilgrims shaken the dust of their persecuting mother-country from their feet before they set up, by popular voice (above religious authority, and even that vested by maritime law in their ships' officers), a government of themselves, by themselves, and for themselves. It was a significant step, and the early revision they made of their choice of "governors" certifies their purpose to have only rulers who could command their confidence and respect. Dr. Young says: "We know the age of but few of the Pilgrims," which has hitherto been true; yet by careful examination of reliable data, now available, we are able to deter mine very closely the ages of a considerable number, and approximately the years of most of the others, at the time of the exodus. No analysis, so far as known, has hitherto been made of the vocations (trades, *etc*.) represented by the *may-Flower* company. They were, as befitted those bent on founding a colony, of considerable variety, though it should be understood that the vocations given were, so far as ascertained, the callings the individuals who represented them had followed before taking ship. Several are known to have been engaged in other pursuits at some time, either before their residence in Holland, or during their earlier years there. Bradford tells us that most of the Leyden congregation (or that portion of it which came from England, in or about 1608) were agricultural people. These were chiefly obliged to acquire handicrafts or other occupations. A few, *e.g*. Allerton, Brewster, Bradford, Carver, Cooke, and Winslow, had possessed some means, while others had been bred to pursuits for which there was no demand in the Low Countries. Standish, bred to arms, apparently followed his profession nearly to the time of departure, and resumed it in the colony, adding thereto the calling which, in all times and

Page 111

all lands, had been held compatible in dignity with that of arms,—the pursuit of agriculture. While always the “Sword of the White Men,” he was the pioneer “planter” in the first settlement begun (at Duxbury) beyond Plymouth limits. Of the “arts, crafts or trades” of the colonists from London and neighboring English localities, but little has been gleaned. They were mostly people of some means, tradesmen rather than artisans, and at least two (Martin and Mullens) were evidently also of the Merchant Adventurers.

Their social (conjugal) conditions—not previously analyzed, it is thought—have been determined, it is believed, with approximate accuracy; though it is of course possible that some were married, of whom that fact does not appear, especially among the seamen.

The passengers of the *may-Flower* on her departure from Plymouth (England), as arranged for convenience by families, were as appears by the following lists.

While the ages given in these lists are the result of much careful study of all the latest available data, and are believed, when not exact, to be very close approximates; as it has been possible to arrive at results, in several cases, only by considerable calculation, the bases of which may not always have been entirely reliable, errors may have crept in. Though the author is aware that, in a few instances, the age stated does not agree with that assigned by other recognized authority, critical re-analysis seems to warrant and confirm the figures given.

The actual and comparative youth of the majority of the colonist leaders —the Pilgrim Fathers—is matter of comment, even of surprise, to most students of Pilgrim history, especially in view of what the Leyden congregation had experienced before embarking for America. Only two of the leaders exceeded fifty years of age, and of these Governor Carver died early. Of the principal men only nine could have been over forty, and of these Carver, Chilton, Martin, Mullins, and Priest (more than half died within a few months after landing), leaving Brewster, Warren (who died early), Cooke, and Hopkins —neither of the latter hardly forty—the seniors. One does not readily think of Alden as but twenty-one, Winslow as only twenty-five, Dr. Fuller as about thirty, Bradford as only thirty-one when chosen Governor, Allerton as thirty-two, and Captain Standish as thirty-six. Verily they were “old heads on young shoulders.” It is interesting to note that the dominant influence at all times was that of the Leyden contingent.

Of these, all except William Butten, who died upon the voyage, reached Cape Cod in safety, though some of them had become seriously ill from the hardships encountered, and Howland had narrowly escaped drowning. Two were added to the number en voyage,—Oceanus Hopkins, born upon the sea, and Peregrine White, born soon after the arrival in Cape Cod harbor. This made the total of the passenger list 103, before

further depletion by death occurred, though several deaths again reduced it before the *may-Flower* cast anchor in Plymouth harbor, her final haven on the outward voyage.

Page 112

Deacon John Carver's place of birth or early life is not known, but he was an Essex County man, and was probably not, until in middle life, a member of Robinson's congregation of "Independents." His age is determined by collateral evidence.

Mrs. Katherine Carver, it has been supposed by some, was a sister of Pastor Robinson. This supposition rests, apparently, upon the expression of Robinson in his parting letter to Carver, where he says: "What shall I say or write unto you and your good wife, my loving sister?" Neither the place of Mrs. Carver's nativity nor her age is known.

Desire Minter was evidently a young girl of the Leyden congregation, between the ages of fourteen and seventeen, who in some way (perhaps through kinship) had been taken into Carver's family. She returned to England early. See ante, for account of her (probable) parentage.

John Howland was possibly of kin to Carver and had been apparently some years in his family. Bradford calls him a "man-servant," but it is evident that "employee" would be the more correct term, and that he was much more than a "servant." It is observable that Howland signed the Compact (by Morton's List) before such men as Hopkins, the Tilleys, Cooke, Rogers, and Priest, which does not indicate much of the "servant" relation. His antecedents are not certainly known, but that he was of the Essex family of the name seems probable. Much effort has been made in recent years to trace his ancestry, but without any considerable result. His age at death (1673) determines his age in 1620. He was older than generally supposed, being born about 1593.

Roger Wilder is also called a "man-servant" by Bradford, and hardly more than this is known of him, his death occurring early. There is no clue to his age except that his being called a "man-servant" would seem to suggest that he was of age; but the fact that he did not sign the Compact would indicate that he was younger, or he may have been extremely ill, as he died very soon after arrival.

William Latham is called a "boy" by Bradford, though a lad of 18. It is quite possible he was one of those "indentured" by the corporation of London, but there is no direct intimation of this.

"Mrs. Carver's maid," it is fair to presume, from her position as lady's-maid and its requirements in those days, was a young woman of

eighteen or twenty years, and this is confirmed by her early marriage. Nothing is known of her before the embarkation. She died early.

Page 113

Jasper More, Bradford says, “was a child yt was put to him.” Further information concerning him is given in connection with his brother Richard, “indentured” to Elder Brewster. He is erroneously called by Justin Winsor in his “History of Duxbury” (Massachusetts) a child of Carver’s, as Elizabeth Tilley is “his daughter.” Others have similarly erred.

Elder William Brewster’s known age at his death determines his age in 1620. He was born in 1566-67. His early life was full of interest and activity, and his life in Holland and America no less so. In early life he filled important stations. Steele’s “Chief of the Pilgrims” is a most engaging biography of him, and there are others hardly less so, Bradford’s sketch being one of the best.

Mrs. Mary Brewster’s age at her death determines it at the embarkation, and is matter of computation.

Love Brewster was the second son of his parents, his elder brother Jonathan coming over afterwards.

Wrestling Brewster was but a “lad,” and his father’s third son.

Richard More and his brother, Bradford states, “were put to him” (Elder Brewster) as bound-boys. For a full account of their English origin, Richard’s affidavit, *etc*., see ante. This makes him but about six, but he was perhaps older.

Governor Edward Winslow’s known age at his death fixes his age at the time of the exodus, and his birth is duly recorded at Droitwich, in Worcester, England. (See “Winslow Memorial,” David Parsons Holton, vol. i. p. 16.)

Mrs. Elizabeth (Barker) Winslow, the first wife of the Governor, appears by the data supplied by the record of her marriage in Holland, May 27, 1618, to have been a maiden of comporting years to her husband’s, he being then twenty-three. Tradition makes her slightly younger than her husband.

George Soule, it is evident,—like Howland,—though denominated a “servant” by Bradford, was more than this, and should rather have been styled, as Goodwin points out, “an employee” of Edward Winslow. His age is approximated by collateral evidence, his marriage, *etc*.

Elias Story is called “man-servant” by Bradford, and his age is unknown. The fact that he did not sign the Compact indicates that he was under age, but extreme illness may have prevented, as he died early.

Ellen More, “a little girl that was put to him” (Winslow), died early. She was sister of the other More children, “bound out” to Carver and Brewster, of whom extended mention has been made.

Governor William Bradford’s date of birth fixes his age in 1620. His early home was at Austerfield, in Yorkshire. Belknap ("American Biography,” vol. ii. p. 218) says: “He learned the art of silk-dyeing.”

Page 114

Mrs. Dorothy (May) Bradford's age (the first wife of the Governor) is fixed at twenty-three by collateral data, but she may have been older. She was probably from Wisbeach, England. The manner of her tragic death (by drowning, having fallen overboard from the ship in Cape Cod harbor), the first violent death in the colony, was especially sad, her husband being absent for a week afterward. It is not known that her body was recovered.

Dr. Samuel Fuller, from his marriage record at Leyden, made in 1613, when he was a widower, it is fair to assume was about thirty, perhaps older, in 1620, as he could, when married, have hardly been under twenty-one. His (third) wife and child were left in Holland.

William Butten (who died at sea, November 6/16), Bradford calls "a youth." He was undoubtedly a "servant"-assistant to the doctor.

Isaac Allerton, it is a fair assumption, was about thirty-four in 1620, from the fact that he married his first wife October 4, 1611, as he was called "a young man" in the Leyden marriage record. He is called "of London, England," by Bradford and on the Leyden records. He was made a "freeman" of Leyden, February 7, 1614. Arber and others state that his early occupation was that of "tailor," but he was later a tradesman and merchant.

Mary (Norris) Allerton is called a "maid of Newbury in England," in the Leyden record of her marriage, in October, 1611, and it is the only hint as to her age we have. She was presumably a young woman. Her death followed (a month later) the birth of her still-born son, on board the *may-Flower* in Plymouth harbor, February 25/March 7, 1621.

Bartholomew Allerton, born probably in 1612/13 (his parents married October, 1611), was hence, as stated, about seven or eight years old at the embarkation. He has been represented as older, but this was clearly impossible. He was doubtless born in Holland.

Remember Allerton, apparently Allerton's second child, has (with a novelist's license) been represented by Mrs. Austin as considerably older than six, in fact nearer sixteen (Goodwin, p. 183, says, "over 13"), but the known years of her mother's marriage and her brother's birth make this improbable. She was, no doubt, born in Holland about 1614—She married Moses Maverick by 1635, and Thomas Weston's only child, Elizabeth, was married from her house at Marblehead to Roger Conant, son of the first "governor" of a Massachusetts Bay "plantation."

Mary Allerton, apparently the third child, could hardly have been much more than four years old in 1620, though Goodwin ("Pilgrim Republic," p. 184) calls her eleven, which is an error. She was probably born in Holland about 1616. She was the last survivor of the passengers of the *may-Flower*, dying at Plymouth, New England, 1699.

Page 115

John Hooke, described by Bradford as a “servant-boy,” was probably but a youth. He did not sign the Compact. Nothing further is known of him except that he died early. It is quite possible that he may have been of London and have been “indentured” by the municipality to Allerton, but the presumption has been that he came, as body-servant of Allerton, with him from Leyden.

Captain Standish’s years in 1620 are conjectural (from fixed data), as is his age at death. His early home was at Duxborough Hall, in Lancashire. His commission as Captain, from Queen Elizabeth, would make his birth about 1584. Rose Standish, his wife, is said by tradition to have been from the Isle of Man, but nothing is known of her age or antecedents, except that she was younger than the Captain. She died during the “general sickness,” early in 1621.

Master Christopher Martin, as previously noted, was from Billerica, in Essex. From collateral data it appears that he must have been “about forty” years old when he joined the Pilgrims. He appears to have been a staunch “Independent” and to have drawn upon himself the ire of the Archdeacon of Chelmsford, (probably) by his loud-mouthed expression of his views, as only “a month before the *may-Flower* sailed” he, with his son and Solomon Prower of his household (probably a relative), were cited before the archdeacon to answer for their shortcomings, especially in reverence for this church dignitary. He seems to have been at all times a self-conceited, arrogant, and unsatisfactory man. That he was elected treasurer and ship’s “governor” and permitted so much unbridled liberty as appears, is incomprehensible. It was probably fortunate that he died early, as he did, evidently in utter poverty. He had a son, in 1620, apparently quite a grown youth, from which it is fair to infer that the father was at that time “about forty.” Of his wife nothing is known. She also died early.

Solomon Prower, who is called by Bradford both “son” and “servant” of Martin, seems from the fact of his “citation” before the Archdeacon of Chelmsford, *etc*., to have been something more than a “servant,” possibly a kinsman, or foster-son, and probably would more properly have been termed an “employee.” He was from Billerica, in Essex, and was, from the fact that he did not sign the Compact, probably under twenty-one or very ill at the time. He died early. Of John Langemore, his fellow “servant,” nothing is known, except that he is spoken of by Young as one of two “children” brought over by Martin (but on no apparent authority), and he did not sign the Compact,

though this might have been from extreme illness, as he too died early.

Page 116

William White was of the Leyden congregation. He is wrongly called by Davis a son of Bishop John White, as the only English Bishop of that name and time died a bachelor. At White's marriage, recorded at the Stadthaus at Leyden, January 27/February 1, 1612, to Anna [Susanna] Fuller, he is called "a young man of England." As he presumably was of age at that time, he must have been at least some twenty-nine or thirty years old at the embarkation, eight years later. His son Peregrine was born in Cape Cod harbor. Mr. White died very early.

Susanna (Fuller) White, wife of William, and sister of Dr. Fuller (?), was apparently somewhat younger than her first husband and perhaps older than her second. She must, in all probability (having been married in Leyden in 1612), have been at least twenty-five at the embarkation eight years later. Her second husband, Governor Winslow, was but twenty-five in 1620, and the presumption is that she was slightly his senior. There appears no good reason for ascribing to her the austere and rather unlovable characteristics which the pen of Mrs. Austin has given her.

Resolved White, the son of William and Susanna White, could not have been more than six or seven years old, and is set down by Goodwin and others—on what seems inconclusive evidence—at five. He was doubtless born at Leyden.

William Holbeck is simply named as "a servant" of White, by Bradford. His age does not appear, but as he did not sign the Compact he was probably "under age." From the fact that he died early, it is possible that he was too ill to sign.

Edward Thompson is named by Bradford as a second "servant" of Master White, but nothing more is known of him, except that he did not sign the Compact, and was therefore probably in his nonage, unless prevented by severe sickness. He died very early.

Master William Mullens (or Molines, as Bradford some times calls him) is elsewhere shown to have been a tradesman of some means, of Dorking, in Surrey, one of the Merchant Adventurers, and a man of ability. From the fact that he left a married daughter (Mrs. Sarah Blunden) and a son (William) a young man grown, in England, it is evident that he must have been forty years old or more when he sailed for New England, only to die aboard the ship in New Plymouth harbor. That he was not a French Huguenot of the Leyden contingent, as pictured by Rev. Dr. Baird and Mrs. Austin, is certain.

Mrs. Alice Mullens, whose given name we know only from her husband's will, filed in London, we know little about. Her age was (if she was his first wife) presumably about that of her husband, whom she survived but a short time.

Page 117

Joseph Mullens was perhaps older than his sister Priscilla, and the third child of his parents; but the impression prevails that he was slightly her junior,—on what evidence it is hard to say. That he was sixteen is rendered certain by the fact that he is reckoned by his father, in his will, as representing a share in the planter's half-interest in the colony, and to do so must have been of that age.

Priscilla Mullens, whom the glamour of unfounded romance and the pen of the poet Longfellow have made one of the best known and best beloved of the Pilgrim band, was either a little older, or younger, than her brother Joseph, it is not certain which. But that she was over sixteen is made certain by the same evidence as that named concerning her brother.

Robert Carter is named by Bradford as a "man-servant," and Mrs. Austin, in her imaginative "Standish of Standish," which is never to be taken too literally, has made him (see p. 181 of that book) "a dear old servant," whom Priscilla Mullens credits with carrying her in his arms when a small child, *etc*. Both Bradford's mention and Mr. Mullens's will indicate that he was yet a young man and "needed looking after." He did not sign the Compact, which of itself indicates nonage, unless illness was the cause, of which, in his case, there is no evidence, until later.

Richard Warren, as he had a wife and five pretty well grown daughters, must have been forty-five or more when he came over. He is suggested to have been from Essex.

Stephen Hopkins is believed to have been a "lay-reader" with Mr. Buck, chaplain to Governor Gates, of the Bermuda expedition of 1609 (see Purchas, vol. iv. p. 174). As he could hardly have had this appointment, or have taken the political stand he did, until of age, he must have been at least twenty-one at that time. If so, he would have been not less than thirty two years old in 1620, and was probably considerably older, as his son Giles is represented by Goodwin ("Pilgrim Republic," p. 184) as being "about 15." If the father was but twenty-one when the son was born, he must have been at least thirty-seven when he became a *may-Flower* Pilgrim. The probabilities are that he was considerably older. His English home is not known. Professor Arber makes an error (The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers," p. 261) in regard to Hopkins which, unless noted, might lead to other and more serious mistakes. Noting the differences between John Pierce and a Master Hopkins, heard before

the Council for New England, May 5/15, 1623, Arber designates Master Hopkins as “Stephen” (on what authority does not appear), and leaves

Page 118

us to infer that it was the Pilgrim Hopkins. On further inquiry it transpires that the person who was at variance with Master John Pierce over the matter of passage and freight money, on account of the unfortunate *Paragon*, was a Rev. Master Hopkins (not Stephen of the *may-Flower*), who, we learn from Neill's "History of the Virginia Company," was "recommended July 3, 1622, by the Court of the Company to the Governor of Virginia, . . . being desirous to go over at his own charge. He was evidently a passenger on both of the disastrous attempts of the *Paragon* under Captain William Pierce, and being forced back the second time, apparently gave up the intention of going.

Mrs. Elizabeth Hopkins, nothing is known concerning, except that she was not her husband's first wife. Sometime apparently elapsed between her husband's marriages.

Giles Hopkins we only know was the son of his father's first wife, and "about 15." An error (of the types presumably) makes Griffis ("The Pilgrims in their Three Homes," p. 176) give the name of Oceanus Hopkins's father as Giles, instead of Stephen. Constance (or Constantia) Hopkins was apparently about eleven years old in 1620, as she married in 1627, and probably was then not far from eighteen years old. Damaris Hopkins, the younger daughter of Master Hopkins, was probably a very young child when she came in the *may-Flower*, but her exact age has not been as certained. Davis, as elsewhere noted, makes the singular mistake of saying she was born after her parents arrived in New England. She married Jacob Cooke, and the ante-nuptial agreement of his parents is believed to be the earliest of record in America, except that between Gregory Armstrong and the widow Billington.

Edward Dotey is called by Bradford "a servant," but nothing is known of his age or antecedents. It is very certain from the fact that he signed the Compact that he was twenty-one. He was a very energetic man. He seems to have been married before coming to New England, or soon after.

Edward Leister (the name is variously spelled) was a "servant," by Bradford's record. He was doubtless of age, as he signed the Compact.

Master John Crackstone, being (apparently) a widower with a son, a child well grown, was evidently about thirty five years old when he embarked for New England. He left a daughter behind. He died early.

John Crackstone, Jr., was but a lad, and died early.

Page 119

Master Edward Tilley (sometimes spelled Tillie) and his wife Ann seem to have been without children of their own, and as they took with them to New England two children who were their kindred, it may be inferred that they had been married some little time. It is hence probable that Mr. Tilley was in the neighborhood of thirty. His wife's age is purely conjectural. They were, Bradford states, "of the Leyden congregation."

Henry Sampson was apparently but a young English lad when he came over in the *may-Flower* with his cousins the Tilleys. As he married in 1636, he was probably then about twenty-one, which would make him five or six when he came over. Goodwin ("Pilgrim Republic," p. 184) says he was "six."

Humility Cooper is said by Bradford to have been a "cosen" of the Tilleys, but no light is given as to her age or antecedents. She was but a child, apparently. She returned to England very soon after the death of Mr. and Mrs. Tilley, and "died young."

Master John Tilley, having twice married, and having a daughter some fourteen years old, must have been over thirty-five years old when he sailed on the Pilgrim ship. His birthplace and antecedents are not known, but he was "of the Leyden congregation."

Mrs. Bridget (Van der Velde) Tilley was just possibly a second wife. Nothing is known concerning her except that she was of Holland, and that she had, apparently, no child.

Elizabeth Tilley is said by Goodwin (op. cit. p. 298) and others to have been fourteen years old at her parents' death in 1621, soon after the arrival in New England. She was the child of her father's first wife. She married John Howland before 1624. Historians for many years called her the "daughter of Governor Carver," but the recovery of Bradford's *Ms*. "historie" corrected this, with many other misconceptions, though to some the error had become apparent before. Her will also suggests her age.

Francis Cooke's age in 1620 is fixed by his known age at his death ("about 81") in 1663. He was from the north of England, and long a member of Robinson's congregation, both in England and in Holland(?).

John Cooke, son of Francis, is known to have been about ten years old when he sailed with his father for America, as his parents did not

marry before 1609. He was undoubtedly born at Leyden. He was long supposed to have been the last male survivor of the original passengers (dying at Dartmouth in 1695.)

James Chilton's antecedents and his age are quite unknown. He must have been at least fifty, as he had a married daughter in Leyden, according to Bradford. He died among the first, and there is nothing of record to inform us concerning him, except Bradford's meagre mention. He may have lived at Leyden.

Page 120

Mrs. Chilton's given name is declared by one writer to have been Susanna, but it is not clearly proven. Whence she came, her ancestry, and her age, are alike unknown.

Mary Chilton was but a young girl in 1620. She married, before 1627, John Winslow, and was probably not then over twenty, nor over fourteen when she came with her parents in the *may-Flower*.

Thomas Rogers appears, from the fact that he had a son, a lad well-grown, to have been thirty or more in 1620. His birthplace, antecedents, and history are unknown, but he appears to have been "of the Leyden congregation." His wife and children came later.

Joseph Rogers was only a "lad" aboard the *may-Flower*, but he left a considerable posterity. Nothing is surely known of him, except that he was Thomas's son.

Degory Priest had the distinction of being "freeman" of Leyden, having been admitted such, November 16, 1615. He was by occupation a "hatter," a man of some means, who left a wife and at least two children in Holland when he embarked for America. His known age at death gives his age at sailing but a few months previous. At his marriage in Leyden, October 4, 1611, he was called "of London." He was about thirty-two when he married. His wife (a widow Vincent) was a sister of Isaac Allerton, who also was married at the same time that he was. Goodwin ("Pilgrim Republic," p. 183) also gives his age as "forty-one." His widow remarried and came over later. Dexter ("Mourt's Relation," p. 69, note) states, quoting from Leyden *Ms*. records, that "Degory Priest in April, 1619, calling himself a 'hatter,' deposes that he 'is forty years of age.'" He must, therefore, have been about forty-one when he sailed on the *may-Flower*, and forty-two years old at his death.

John Rigdale and his wife Alice afford no data. They both died early, and there is no record concerning either of them beyond the fact that they were passengers.

Edward Fuller and his wife have left us little record of themselves save that they were of Leyden, that he is reputed a brother of Dr. Samuel Fuller (for whom they seem to have named the boy they brought over with them,—leaving apparently another son, Matthew, behind), and that both died the first winter. He must have been at least twenty-five, judging from the fact that he was married and had two children, and was perhaps somewhat older (though traditionally

represented as younger) than his brother. Neither his occupation nor antecedents are surely known.

Samuel Fuller—the son of Edward Fuller and his wife—is called by Bradford “a young child.” He must have been some five or six years of age, as he married in 1635, fifteen years later, and would presumably have been of age, or nearly so.

Page 121

Thomas Tinker's name, the mention of his "wife" and "son," the tradition that they were "of the Leyden congregation" (which is not sure), the certainty that they were *may-Flower* passengers,—on Brad ford's list,—and that all died early, are all we know of the Tinker family.

John Turner and his two sons we know little about. He seems to have been a widower, as no mention is found of his wife, though this is not certain. He was of the Leyden congregation, and evidently a man of some standing with the leaders, as he was made their messenger to Carver and Cushman in London, in June, 1620, and was apparently accustomed to travel. He appears to have had business of his own in England at the time, and was apparently a man of sober age. As he had three children,—a daughter who came later to New England, and two sons, as stated by Bradford,—it is probable that he was thirty or over. He and both his sons died in the spring of 1621.

Francis Eaton was of Leyden, a carpenter, and, having a wife and child, was probably a young man about twenty five, perhaps a little younger. He married three times.

Mrs. Sarah Eaton, wife of Francis, was evidently a young woman, with an infant, at the date of embarkation. Nothing more is known of her, except that she died the spring following the arrival at Plymouth.

Samuel Eaton, the son of Francis and his wife, Sarah, Bradford calls "a sucking child:" He lived to marry.

Gilbert Window was the third younger brother of Governor Edward Winslow, and is reputed to have been a carpenter. He was born on Wednesday, October 26, 1600, at Droitwitch, in Worcester, England. ("Winslow Memorial," vol. i. p. 23.) He apparently did not remain long in the colony, as he does not appear in either the "land division" of 1623 or the "cattle division" of 1627; and hence was probably not then in the "settlement," though land was later allowed his heirs, he having been an "original" voyager of the Plymouth colony. He was but twenty years and fifteen days old when he signed the Compact, but probably was—from his brother's prominence and his nearness to his majority—counted as eligible. Bradford states that he returned to England after "divers years" in New England, and died there. It has been suggested that he went very early to some of the other "plantations."

John Alden was of Southampton, England, was hired as “a cooper,” was twenty-one years old in 1620, as determined by the year of his birth, 1599 ("Alden Memorial,” p. 1), and became the most prominent and useful of any of the English contingent of the *may Flower*

Page 122

company. Longfellow's delightful poem, "The Courtship of Miles Standish," has given him and his bride, Priscilla Mullens, world-wide celebrity, though it is to be feared that its historical accuracy would hardly stand criticism. Why young Alden should have been "hired for a cooper at Southampton," with liberty to "go or stay" in the colony, as Bradford says he was (clearly indicating that he went to perform some specific work and return, if he liked, with the ship), has mystified many. The matter is clear, however, when it is known, as Griffis shows, that part of a Parliamentary Act of 1543 reads: "Whosoever shall carry Beer beyond Sea, shall find Sureties to the Customers (?) of that Port, to bring in Clapboard [staves] meet [sufficient] to make so much Vessel [barrel or "kilderkin"] as he shall carry forth." As a considerable quantity of beer was part of the *may*-FLOWER'S lading, and her consignors stood bound to make good in quantity the stave-stock she carried away, it was essential, in going to a wild country where it could not be bought, but must be "got out" from the growing timber, to take along a "cooper and cleaver" for that purpose. Moreover, the great demand for beer-barrel stock made "clapboard" good and profitable return lading. It constituted a large part of the *fortune's* return freight (doubtless "gotten out" by Alden), as it would have undoubtedly of the *may*-FLOWER'S, had the hardship of the colony's condition permitted.

Peter Browne we know little concerning. That he was a man of early middle age is inferable from the fact that he married the widow Martha Ford, who came in the *Fortune* in 1621. As she then was the mother of three children, it is improbable that she would have married a very young man. He appears, from certain collateral evidence, to have been a mechanic of some kind, but it is not clear what his handicraft was or whence he came.

John Billington (Bradford sometimes spells it Billinton) and his family, Bradford tells us, "were from London." They were evidently an ill-conditioned lot, and unfit for the company of the planters, and Bradford says, "I know not by what friend shuffled into their Company." As he had a wife and two children, the elder of whom must have been about sixteen years old, he was apparently over thirty-five years of age. There is a tradition that he was a countryman bred, which certain facts seem to confirm. (See land

allotments for data as to age of boys, 1632.) He was the only one of the original colonists to suffer the “death penalty” for crime.

Page 123

Mrs. Ellen (or “Elen”) Billington, as Bradford spells the name, was evidently of comporting age to her husband’s, perhaps a little younger. Their two sons, John and Francis, were lively urchins who frequently made matters interesting for the colonists, afloat and ashore. The family was radically bad throughout, but they have had not a few worthy descendants. Mrs. Billington married Gregory Armstrong, and their antenuptial agreement is the first of record known in America.

John Billington, Jr., is always first named of his father’s two sons, and hence the impression prevails that he was the elder, and Bradford so designates him. The affidavit of Francis Billington (Plymouth County, Mass., Deeds, vol. i. p. 81), dated 1674, in which he declares himself sixty-eight years old, would indicate that he was born in 1606, and hence must have been about fourteen years of age when he came on the *may-Flower* to New Plymouth. If John, his brother, was older than he, he must have been born about 1604, and so was about sixteen when, he came to New England. The indications are that it was Francis, the younger son, who got hold of the gunpowder in his father’s cabin in Cape Cod harbor, and narrowly missed blowing up the ship. John died before 1630. Francis lived, as appears, to good age, and had a family.

Moses Fletcher was of the Leyden company, a “smith,” and at the time of his second marriage at Leyden, November 30/December 21, 1613, was called a “widower” and “of England.” As he was probably of age at the time of his first marriage,—presumably two years or more before his last,—he must have been over thirty in 1620. He was perhaps again a widower when he came over, as no mention is made of his having wife or family. He was possibly of the Amsterdam family of that name. His early death was a great loss to the colony.

A Thomas Williams is mentioned by Hon. Henry C Murphy ("Historical Magazine,” vol. iii. pp. 358, 359), in a list of some of Robinson’s congregation who did not go to New England in either the *may-Flower*, *Fortune*, *Anne*, Or *little James*. He either overlooked the fact that Williams was one of the *may-Flower* passengers, or else there were two of the name, one of whom did not go. Nothing is known of the age or former history of the Pilgrim of that name. He died in the spring of 1621 (before the end of March). As he signed the Compact, he must have been over twenty-one. He may have left a wife, Sarah.

Page 124

John Goodman we know little more about than that he and Peter Browne seem to have been "lost" together, on one occasion (when he was badly frozen), and to have had, with his little spaniel dog, a rencontre with "two great wolves," on another. He was twice married, the last time at Leyden in 1619. He died before the end of March, 1621. As he signed the Compact, he must have been over twenty-one.

Edward Margeson we know nothing about. As he signed the Compact, he was presumably of age.

Richard Britteridge affords little data. His age, birthplace, or occupation do not transpire, but he was, it seems, according to Bradford, the first of the company to die on board the ship after she had cast anchor in the harbor of New Plymouth. This fact negatives the pleasant fiction of Mrs. Austin's "Standish of Standish" (p. 104), that Britteridge was one of those employed in cutting sedge on shore on Friday, January 12. Poor Britteridge died December 21, three weeks earlier. He signed the Compact, and hence may be accounted of age at the landing at Cape Cod.

Richard Clarke appears only as one of the passengers and as dying before the end of March. He signed the Compact, and hence was doubtless twenty-one or over.

Richard Gardiner, we know from Bradford, "became a seaman and died in England or at sea." He was evidently a young man, but of his age or antecedents nothing appears. He signed the Compact, and hence was at least twenty-one years old.

John Alderton (sometimes spelled Allerton), we are told by Bradford,—as elsewhere noted,—"was hired, but was reputed one of the company, but was to go back, being a seaman and so, presumably, unmindful of the voyages, for the help of others." Whether Bradford intended by the latter clause to indicate that he had left his family behind, and came "to spy out the land," and, if satisfied, to return for them, or was to return for the counsel and assistance of Robinson and the rest, who were to follow, is not clear, but the latter view has most to support it. We learn his occupation, but can only infer that he was a young man over twenty-one from the above and the fact that he signed the Compact. It has been suggested that he was a relative of Isaac Allerton, but this is nowhere shown and is improbable. He died before the *may-Flower* returned to England.

Thomas English (or Enlish), Bradford tells us ("Historie," Mass. ed. p. 533), "was hired to goe Master of a [the] shallop here." He, however, "died here before the ship returned." It is altogether probable that he was the savior of the colony on that stormy night

Page 125

when the shallop made Plymouth harbor the first time, and, narrowly escaping destruction, took shelter under Clarke's Island. The first three governors of the colony, its chief founders,—Carver, Bradford, and Winslow,—with Standish, Warren, Hopkins, Howland, Dotey, and others, were on board, and but for the heroism and prompt action of "the lusty sea man which steered," who was—beyond reasonable doubt—English, as Bradford's narrative ("Morton's Memorial") shows, the lives of the entire party must, apparently, have been lost. That English was, if on board—Bradford shows in the "Memorial" that he was—as Master of the shallop, properly her helmsman in so critical a time, goes without saying, especially as the "rudder was broken" and an oar substituted; that the ship's "mates," Clarke and Coppin, were not in charge (although on board) fully appears by Bradford's account; and as it must have taken all of the other (four) seamen on board to pull the shallop, bereft of her sail, in the heavy breakers into which she had been run by Coppin's blunder, there would be no seaman but English for the steering-oar, which was his by right. Had these leaders been lost at this critical time,—before a settlement had been made,—it is certain that the colony must have been abandoned, and the Pilgrim impress upon America must have been lost. English's name should, by virtue of his great service, be ever held in high honor by all of Pilgrim stock. His early death was a grave loss. Bradford spells the name once Enlish, but presumably by error. He signed the Compact as Thomas English.

William Trevore was, according to Bradford, one of "two seamen hired to stay a year in the countrie." He went back when his time expired, but later returned to New England. Cushman (Bradford, "Historie," p. 122) suggests that he was telling "sailors' yarns." He says: "For William Trevore hath lavishly told but what he knew or imagined of Capewock Martha's Vineyard, Monhiggon, and ye Narragansetts." In 1629 he was at Massachusetts Bay in command of the *handmaid* (Goodwin, p. 320), and in February, 1633 (Winthrop, vol. i. p. 100), he seems to have been in command of the ship *William* at Plymouth, with passengers for Massachusetts Bay. Captain Standish testified in regard to Thompson's Island in Boston harbor, that about 1620 he "was on that Island with Trevore," and called it "Island Trevore." (Bradford, "Historie," Deane's ed. p. 209.) He did not sign the

Compact, perhaps because of the limitations of his contract (one year).

Page 126

—— Ely (not Ellis, as Arber miscalls him, “The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers,” p. 377) was the other of the “two seamen hired to stay a year,” *etc*. He also returned when his time expired. (Bradford, Hist. Mass. ed. p. 534.) He did not sign the Compact, probably for the reason operative in .Trevore’s case. A digest of the foregoing data gives the following interesting, if incomplete, data (errors excepted):—

Adult males (hired seamen and servants of age included)... 44
Adult females (including Mrs. Carver’s maid)..... 19
Youths, male children, and male servants, minors..... 29
Maidens, female children..... 10

102

Married males..... 26
Married females..... 18
Single (adult) males (and young men)..... 25
Single (adult) females (Mrs. Carver’s maid)..... 1

Vocations of adults so far as known (except wives, who are presumed housekeepers for their husbands):—

Carpenters.....
... 2
Cooper..... 1
Fustian-worker and silk-dyer..... 1
Hatter..... 1
Lay-reader..... 1
Lady’s-maid..... 1
Merchants..... 3
Physician..... 1
Printers and publishers..... 2
Seamen..... 4
Servants (adult)..... 10
Smith..... 1
Soldier..... 1
Tailor..... 1
Tradesmen..... 2

Allowing for the addition of Wilder and the two sailors, Trevore and Ely, who did not sign it, the number of those who signed the Compact tallies exactly with the adult males. Besides these occupations, it is known that several of the individuals representing them were skilled in other callings, and were at some time teachers, accountants, linguists, writers, *etc*., while some had formerly practised certain handicrafts; Dr. Fuller, *e.g*. having formerly been a “silk-worker,” Brad ford (on the authority of Belknap), a “silk-dyer,” and others “fustian-workers.” Hopkins had apparently sometime before dropped his character of “lay-reader,” and was a pretty efficient man of affairs, but his vocation at the time of the exodus is not known.

Page 127

The former occupations of fourteen of the adult colonists, Browne, Billington, Britteridge, Cooke, Chilton, Clarke, Crackstone, Goodman, Gardiner, Rogers, Rigdale, Turner, Warren, and Williams are not certainly known. There is evidence suggesting that Browne was a mechanic; Billington and Cooke had been trained to husbandry; that Chilton had been a small tradesman; that Edward Tilley had been, like his brother, a silk-worker; that Turner was a tradesman, and Warren a farmer; while it is certain that Cooke, Rogers, and Warren had been men of some means.

Of the above list of fourteen men whose last occupations before joining the colonists are unknown, only five, *viz*. Browne, Billington, Cooke, Gardiner, and Warren lived beyond the spring of 1621. Of these, Warren died early, Gardiner left the colony and "became a seaman;" the other three, Billington, Browne, and Cooke, became "planters." Thomas Morton, of "Merry Mount," in his "New Eng land's Canaan" (p. 217), gives Billington the sobriquet "Ould Woodman."

The early deaths of the others make their former handicrafts—except as so much data pertaining to the composi tion and history of the colony— matters of only ephemeral interest.

CHAPTER VII

QUARTERS, COOKING, PROVISIONS

Probably no more vexatious problem presented itself for the time being to the "governors" of the two vessels and their "assistants," upon their selection, than the assignment of quarters to the passengers allotted to their respective ships. That these allotments were in a large measure determined by the requirements of the women and children may be considered certain. The difficulties attendant on due recognition of social and official station (far more imperative in that day than this) were in no small degree lessened by the voluntary assignment of themselves, already mentioned, of some of the Leyden chief people to the smaller ship; but in the interests of the general welfare and of harmony, certain of the leaders, both of the Leyden and London contingents, were of necessity provided for in the larger vessel. The allotments to the respective ships made at Southampton, the designation of quarters in the ships themselves, and the final readjustments upon the *may-Flower* at Plymouth (England), when the remaining passengers of both ships had been united, were all necessarily determined chiefly with regard to the needs of the women, girls, and babes. Careful analysis of the list shows that there were, requiring this especial consideration, nineteen women, ten young girls, and one infant. Of the other children, none were so young that they might not readily bunk with or near their fathers in any part of the ship in which the latter might be located.

Page 128

We know enough of the absolute unselfishness and devotion of all the Leyden leaders, whatever their birth or station,—so grandly proven in those terrible days of general sickness and death at New Plymouth,—to be certain that with them, under all circumstances, it was noblesse oblige, and that no self-seeking would actuate them here. It should be remembered that the *may-Flower* was primarily a passenger transport, her passengers being her principal freight and occupying the most of the ship, the heavier cargo being chiefly confined to the "hold." As in that day the passenger traffic was, of course, wholly by sailing vessels, they were built with cabin accommodations for it, as to numbers, *etc*., proportionately much beyond those of the sailing craft of to-day. The testimony of Captain John Smith, "the navigator," as to the passengers of the *may-Flower* "lying wet in their cabins," and that of Bradford as to Billington's "cabin between decks," already quoted, is conclusive as to the fact that she had small cabins (the "staterooms" of to-day), intended chiefly, no doubt, for women and children. The advice of Edward Winslow to his friend George Morton, when the latter was about to come to New England in the *Anne*, "build your cabins as open as possible," is suggestive of close cabins and their discomforts endured upon the *may-Flower*. It also suggests that the chartering-party was expected in those days to control, if not to do, the "fitting up" of the ship for her voyage. In view of the usual "breadth of beam" of ships of her class and tonnage, aft, and the fore and aft length of the poop, it is not unreasonable to suppose that there were not less than four small cabins on either side of the common (open) cabin or saloon (often depicted as the signing-place of the Compact), under the high poop deck. Constructed on the general plan of such rooms or cabins to-day (with four single berths, in tiers of two on either hand), there would be—if the women and girls were conveniently distributed among them—space for all except the Billingtons, who we know had a cabin (as had also doubtless several of the principal men) built between decks. This would also leave an after cabin for the Master, who not infrequently made his quarters, and those of his chief officer, in the "round house," when one existed, especially in a crowded ship.

Cabins and bunks "between decks" would provide for all of the males of the company, while the seamen, both of the crew and (some of) those in the employ of the Pilgrims—-like Trevore and Ely—were no doubt housed in the fore castle. Alderton and English seem to have been counted "of the company." The few data we have permit us to confidently assume that some such disposition of the passengers was (necessarily) made, and that but for the leaky decks, the inseparable discomforts of the sea, and those of over crowding, the wives of the Pilgrims (three of whom gave birth to children aboard the ship), and their daughters, were fairly "berthed."

Page 129

Bradford is authority for the statement that with the “governor” of the ship’s company were chosen “two or three assistants . . . to order [regulate] the people by the way [on the passage] and see to the disposition of the provisions,” *etc*. The last-named duty must have been a most difficult and wearisome one. From what has been shown of the poverty of the ship’s cooking facilities (especially for so large a company), one must infer that it would be hopeless to expect to cook food in any quantity, except when all conditions favored, and then but slowly and with much difficulty. From the fact that so many would require food at practically the same hours of the day, it is clear that there must have been distribution of food (principally uncooked) to groups or families, who, with the aid of servants (when available), must each have prepared their own meals, cooking as occasion and opportunity indicated; much after the manner of the steerage passengers in later days, but before those of the great ocean liners. There appears to have been but one cook for the officers and crew of the ship, and his hands were doubtless full with their demands. It is certain that his service to the passengers must have been very slight. That “the cook” is named as one of the ship’s crew who died in Plymouth harbor (New England) is all the knowledge we have concerning him.

The use of and dependence upon tea and coffee, now so universal, and at sea so seemingly indispensable, was then unknown, beer supplying their places, and this happily did not have to be prepared with fire. “Strong waters”—Holland gin and to some extent “aqua vitae” (brandy)—were relied upon for the (supposed) maintenance of warmth. Our Pilgrim Fathers were by no means “total abstainers,” and sadly bewailed being deprived of their beer when the supply failed. They also made general and habitual (moderate) use of wine and spirits, though they sharply interdicted and promptly punished their abuse.

In the absence of cooking facilities, it became necessary in that day to rely chiefly upon such articles of food as did not require to be prepared by heat, such as biscuit (hard bread), butter, cheese ("Holland cheese” was a chief staple with the Pilgrims), “haberdyne” (or dried salt codfish), smoked herring, smoked ("cured “) ham and bacon, “dried neat’s tongues,” preserved and “potted” meats (a very limited list in that day), fruits, *etc*. Mush, oatmeal, pease-puddings, pickled eggs, sausage meats, salt beef and pork, bacon, “spiced beef,” such few vegetables as they had (chiefly cabbages, turnips, and onions,—there were no potatoes in that day), *etc*., could be cooked in quantity, when the weather permitted, and would then be eaten cold.

Except as dried or preserved fruits, vegetables (notably onions), limes, lemon juice, and the free use of vinegar feebly counteracted, their food was distinctively stimulant of scorbutic and tuberculosis disease, which constant exposure to cold and wet and the overcrowded state of the ship could but increase and aggravate. Bradford narrates of one of the crew of the *may-Flower* when in Plymouth harbor, as suggestive of the wretched conditions prevalent in the ship, that one of his shipmates, under an agreement to care for him, “got him a little spice and made him a mess of beef, once or twice,” and then deserted him.

Page 130

Josselyn, in his “Two Voyages to New England,” gives as the result of the experience and observations had in his voyages, but a few years later, much that is interesting and of exceptional value as to the food and equipment of passengers to, and colonists in, this part of America. It has especial interest, perhaps, for the author and his readers, in the fact that Josselyn’s statements were not known until after the data given in these pages had been independently worked out from various sources, and came therefore as a gratifying confirmation of the conclusions already reached.

Josselyn says as to food, as follows:—“The common proportion of victuals for the sea to a mess (being 4 men) is as followeth:—

“2 pieces of Beef of 3 lb. 1/4 apiece. Pork seems to have been inadvertently omitted.

“Four pounds of Bread [ship-bread].

“One pint & 1/2 of Pease.

“Four Gallons of Bear [Beer], with mustard and vinegar for 3 flesh days in the week.”

“For four fish days to each mess per day:—

“Two pieces of Codd or Haberdine, making 3 pieces of a fish, *i.e*. a dried salt cod being divided into three pieces, 2 of those pieces were to be a day’s ration for 4 men.

“Four pounds of Bread.

“Three-quarters of a pound of cheese.

“Bear as before.”

“Oatmeal per day for 50 men 1 Gallon [dry], and so proportionable for more or fewer.”

“Thus you see the ship’s provision is Beefe and Porke, Fish, Butter, Cheese, Pease, Pottage, Water-Gruel, Bisket, and six shilling Bear.”

“For private fresh provision you may carry with you (in case you or any of yours should be sick at sea):—

“Conserves of Roses, Clove-Gilliflowers, Wormwood, Green-Ginger, Burnt-Wine, English Spirits, Prunes to stew, Raisons of the Sun, Currence [currants], Sugar, Nutmeg, Mace, Cinnamon, Pepper and Ginger, White Bisket, Butter, or ‘Captains biscuit,’ made with wheat flour or Spanish Rusk, Eggs, Rice, Juice of Lemons, well put up to cure or prevent the Scurvy, Small Skillets, Pipkins, Porringers and small Frying Pans.”

Josselyn further gives us an estimate for:—

“Victuals for a whole year to be carried out of England for one man and so for more after this rate.” He annexed also their current prices:—

“Eight bushels of Meal [Rye meal probably intended]
Two bushels of Pease at 3/s
Two bushels of Oatmeal at 4s/6d
One Gallon of Aqua Vitae
One Gallon of Oyl
Two Gallons of Vinegar
[No estimate of Beef or Pork, or of vegetables, is included.]
A Hogshead of English Bear
A Hogshead of Irish Bear
A Hogshead of Vinegar
A bushel of Mustard seed
A Kental [Quintal] of fish, Cod or Haberdine, 112 lb.”

Edward Window, in his letter to George Morton before mentioned, advising him as to his voyage, says: “Bring juice of lemons and take it fasting. It is of good use.”

Page 131

It is indeed remarkable that, totally unused to any such conditions, wet, cold, poorly fed, overcrowded, storm-tossed, bruised and beaten, anxious, and with no homes to welcome them, exposed to new hardships and dangers on landing, worn and exhausted, any of the *may*-FLOWER'S company survived. It certainly cannot be accounted strange that infectious diseases, once started among them, should have run through their ranks like fire, taking both old and young. Nor is it strange that—though more inured to hardship and the conditions of sea life—with the extreme and unusual exposure of boat service on the New England coast in mid winter, often wading in the icy water and living aboard ship in a highly infected atmosphere, the seamen should have succumbed to disease in almost equal ratio with the colonists. The author is prepared, after careful consideration, to accept and professionally indorse, with few exceptions, the conclusions as to the probable character of the decimating diseases of the passengers and crew of the *may-Flower*, so ably and interestingly presented by Dr. Edward E. Cornwall in the "New England Magazine" for February, 1897—From the fact that Edward Thompson, Jasper More, and Master James Chilton died within a month of the arrival at Cape Cod (and while the ship lay in that harbor), and following the axiom of vital statistics that "for each death two are constantly sick," there must have been some little (though not to say general) sickness on the *may-Flower* when she arrived at Cape Cod. It would, in view of the hardship of the voyage, have been very remarkable if this had not been the case. It would have been still more remarkable if the ill-conditioned, thin-blooded, town-bred "servants" and apprentices had not suffered first and most. It is significant that eight out of nine of the male "servants" should have died in the first four months. It was impossible that scurvy should not have been prevalent with both passengers and crew.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MAY-FLOWER'S LADING

Beside her human freight of one hundred and thirty or more passengers and crew, the lading of the *may-Flower* when she sailed from Plymouth (England), September 6/16, 1620, was considerable and various. If clearing at a custom-house of to-day her manifest would excite no little interest and surprise. Taking no account of the ship's stores and supplies (necessarily large, like her crew, when bound upon such a voyage, when every possible need till her return to her home port must be provided for before sailing), the colonists' goods and chattels were many, their provisions bulky, their ordnance, arms, and stores (in the hold) heavy, and their trading-stock fairly ample. Much of the cargo originally stowed in the *Speedwell*, a part, as we know, of her company, and a few of her crew were transferred to the *may-Flower* at Plymouth, and there can be no doubt that the ship was both crowded and overladen.

Page 132

It is altogether probable that the crowded condition of her spar and main decks caused the supply of live-stock taken—whether for consumption upon the voyage or for the planters' needs on shore—to be very limited as to both number and variety. It has been matter of surprise to many that no cattle (not even milch-cows) were taken, but if—as is not unlikely—it was at first proposed to take a cow or two (when both ships were to go and larger space was available), this intent was undoubtedly abandoned at Plymouth, England, when it became evident that there would be dearth of room even for passengers, none whatever for cattle or their fodder (a large and prohibitive quantity of the latter being required for so long a voyage), and that the lateness of the season and its probable hardships would endanger the lives of the animals if taken. So far as appears the only domestic live-stock aboard the *may-Flower* consisted of goats, swine, poultry, and dogs. It is quite possible that some few sheep, rabbits, and poultry for immediate consumption (these requiring but little forage) may have been shipped, this being customary then as now. It is also probable that some household pets—cats and caged singing-birds, the latter always numerous in both England and Holland—were carried on board by their owners, though no direct evidence of the fact is found. There is ample proof that goats, swine, poultry, and dogs were landed with the colonists at New Plymouth, and it is equally certain that they had at first neither cattle, horses, nor sheep. Of course the she-goats were their sole reliance for milk for some time, whether afloat or ashore, and goat's flesh and pork their only possibilities in the way of fresh meat for many months, save poultry (and game after landing), though we may be sure, in view of the breeding value of their goats, poultry, and swine, few were consumed for food. The "fresh meat" mentioned as placed before Massasoit' on his first visit was probably venison, though possibly kid's meat, pork, or poultry. Of swine and poultry they must have had a pretty fair supply, judging from their rapid increase, though their goats must have been few. They were wholly without beasts of draft or burden (though it seems strange that a few Spanish donkeys or English "jacks" had not been taken along, as being easily kept, hardy, and strong, and quite equal to light ploughing, hauling, carrying, *etc*.), and their lack was sorely felt. The space they and their forage demanded it was doubtless considered impracticable to spare. The only dogs that appear in evidence are a large mastiff bitch (the only dog of that breed probably seen on these shores since Pring's "bigge dogges" so frightened the Indians' in this region seventeen years before)

Page 133

[Captain Martin Pring had at Plymouth, in 1603, two great “mastive dogges” named “Fool” and “Gallant,” the former being trained to carry a half-pike in his mouth. “The Indians were more afraid of these dogs than of twenty men.” American Magazine of History; Goodwin, Pilgrim Republic, p. 3.]

and a small spaniel, both the property of passengers, though there may have been others not mentioned. Speaking of the venison found in a tree by one of the exploring parties, Winslow says: “We thought it fitter for the dogs than for us,” perhaps suggesting by his word “the” their own dogs aboard ship and provision for them. There is an intimation as to the ownership of these two dogs in the facts that on certainly two occasions John Goodman was accompanied by the little spaniel (once when alone), from which it may perhaps be inferred that he was the dog’s master; while the big mastiffs presence when only Peter Browne and Goodman were together suggests that Browne was her owner. The goats, swine, rabbits, and poultry were doubtless penned on the spar-deck forward, while possibly some poultry, and any sheep brought for food, may have been temporarily housed—as was a practice with early voyagers—in the (unused) ship’s boats, though these appear to have been so few in number and so much in demand that it is doubtful if they were here available as pens. The heavy cargo and most of the lighter was of course stowed in the hold, as the main deck (or “’tween decks”) was mostly occupied as quarters for the male passengers, old and young, though the colonists’ shallop, a sloop-rigged boat some thirty feet in length, had been “cut down” and stowed “between the decks” for the voyage. A glimpse of the weary life at sea on that long and dreary passage is given in Bradford’s remark that “she was much opened with the people’s lying in her during the voyage:” This shallop with her equipment, a possible spare skiff or two, the chests, “boxes,” and other personal belongings of the passengers, some few cases of goods, some furniture, *etc*., constituted the only freight for which there could have been room “between decks,” most of the space (aft) being occupied by cabins and bunks.

The provisions in use, both by passengers and crew, were probably kept in the lazarette or “runs,” in the stern of the ship, which would be unusually capacious in vessels of this model; some—the bulkiest—in the hold under the forward hatch, as the custom was, and to some extent still is. The food supply of the Pilgrims, constituting part of the *may*-FLOWER’S Cargo, included, as appears from authentic sources:—

Breadstuff’s, including,—
- Biscuits or ship-bread (in barrels).
- Oatmeal (in barrels or hogsheads).
- Rye meal (in hogsheads).

Butter (in firkins).
Cheese, “Hollands” and English (in boxes).
Eggs, pickled (in tubs).
Fish, “haberdyne” [or salt dried cod] (in boxes).

Page 134

Smoked herring (in boxes).
Meats, including,—
    Beef, salt, or “corned” (in barrels).
        Dry-salted (in barrels).
        Smoked (in sacks).
        Dried neats’-tongues (in boxes).
    Pork, bacon, smoked (in sacks or boxes).
        Salt ["corned”] (in barrels).
        Hams and shoulders, smoked (in canvas sacks or hogsheads).
Salt (in bags and barrels).
Vegetables, including,—
    Beans (in bags and barrels).
    Cabbages (in sacks and barrels).
    Onions (in sacks).
    Turnips (in sacks).
    Parsnips (in sacks).
    Pease (in barrels), and
Vinegar (in hogsheads), while,—
Beer (in casks), brandy, “aqua vitae” (in pipes), and gin ["Hollands,”
    “strong waters,” or “schnapps”] (in pipes) were no small or
    unimportant part, from any point of view, of the provision supply.

Winslow, in his letter to George Morton advising him as to his preparations for the voyage over, says: “Be careful to have a very good bread-room to keep your biscuit in.” This was to keep them from dampness. Winthrop gives us the memorandum of his order for the ship-bread for his voyage in 1630. He says: “Agreed with Keene of Southwark, baker, for 20,000 of Biscuit, 15,000 of brown, and 5,000 of white.” Captain Beecher minutes: “10 M. of bread for the ship ARBELLA.” Beecher’s memorandum of “oatmeal” is “30 bushels.” Winslow mentions “oatmeal,” and Winthrop notes among the provisions bought by Captain William Pierce, “4 hhds. of oatmeal.” Rye meal was usually meant by the term “meal,” and Window in his letter to George Morton advises him: “Let your meal be so hard-trod in your casks that you shall need an adz or hatchet to work it out with;” and also to “be careful to come by [be able to get at] some of your meal to spend [use] by the way.” Notwithstanding that Bradford’ speaks of their “selling away” some “60 firkins of butter,” to clear port charges at Southampton, and the leaders, in their letter to the Adventurers from that port (August 3), speak of themselves, when leaving Southampton in August, 1620, as “scarce having any butter,” there seems to have been some left to give as a present to Quadrequina, Massasoit’s brother, the last of March following, which would indicate its good “keeping” qualities. Wood, in his “New England’s Prospect” (ch. 2), says: “Their butter and cheese were corrupted.” Bradford

mentions that their lunch on the exploration expedition of November 15, on Cape Cod, included “Hollands cheese,” which receives also other mention. There is a single mention, in the literature of the day, of eggs preserved in salt, for use on shipboard. “Haberdyne” (or dried salt cod) seems to have been a favorite and staple article of diet aboard ship. Captain Beecher minutes “600 haberdyne for the ship ARBELLA.” Wood says: “Their fish was rotten.” Smoked “red-herring” were familiar food to all the *may-Flower* company. No house or

Page 135

ship of England or Holland in that day but made great dependence upon them. Bacon was, of course, a main staple at sea. In its half-cooked state as it came from the smoke-house it was much relished with their biscuit by seamen and others wishing strong food, and when fried it became a desirable article of food to all except the sick. Mention is made of it by several of the early Pilgrim writers. Carlyle, as quoted, speaks of it as a diet-staple on the *may-Flower*. Salt ("corned") beef has always been a main article of food with seamen everywhere. Wood' states that the "beef" of the Pilgrims was "tainted." In some way it was made the basis of a reputedly palatable preparation called "spiced beef," mentioned as prepared by one of the sailors for a shipmate dying on the *may-Flower* in Plymouth harbor. It must have been a very different article from that we now find so acceptable under that name in England. Winthrop' gives the price of his beef at "19 shillings per cwt." Winslow advises his friend Morton, in the letter so often quoted, not to have his beef "dry-salted," saying, "none can do it better than the sailors," which is a suggestion not readily understood. "Smoked" beef was practically the same as that known as "jerked," "smoked," or "dried" beef in America. A "dried neat's-tongue" is named as a contribution of the Pilgrims to the dinner for Captain Jones and his men on February 21, 1621, when they had helped to draw up and mount the cannon upon the platform on the hill at Plymouth. Winthrop paid "14d. a piece" for his "neats' tongues." The pork of the Pilgrims is also said by Wood' to have been "tainted." Winthrop states that his pork cost "20 pence the stone" (14 lbs.).

Hams seem to have been then, as now, a highly-prized article of diet. Goodwin mentions that the salt used by the Pilgrims was (evaporated) "sea-salt" and very "impure." Winthrop mentions among his supplies, "White, Spanish, and Bay salt."

The beans of the Pilgrims were probably of the variety then known as "Spanish beans." The cabbages were apparently boiled with meat, as nowadays, and also used considerably for "sour-krout" and for pickling, with which the Leyden people had doubtless become familiar during their residence among the Dutch. As anti-scorbutics they were of much value. The same was true of onions, whether pickled, salted, raw, or boiled. Turnips and parsnips find frequent mention in the early literature of the first settlers, and were among their stock vegetables. Pease were evidently staple articles of food with the Plymouth people, and are frequently named. They probably were chiefly used for porridge and puddings, and were used in large quantities, both afloat and ashore.

Page 136

Vinegar in hogsheads was named on the food-list of every ship of the Pilgrim era. It was one of their best antiscorbutics, and was of course a prime factor in their use of "sour krout," pickling, *etc*. The fruits, natural, dried, and preserved, were probably, in that day, in rather small supply. Apples, limes, lemons, prunes, olives, rice, *etc*., were among the luxuries of a voyage, while dried or preserved fruits and small fruits were not yet in common use. Winslow, in the letter cited, urges that "your casks for beer . . . be iron bound, at least for the first [end] tyre" [hoop]. Cushman states that they had ample supplies of beer offered them both in Kent and Amsterdam. The planters' supply seems to have failed, however, soon after the company landed, and they were obliged to rely upon the whim of the Captain of the *may-Flower* for their needs, the ship's supply being apparently separate from that of the planters, and lasting longer. Winthrop's supply seems to have been large ("42 tons"—probably tuns intended). It was evidently a stipulation of the charter-party that the ship should, in part at least, provision her crew for the voyage,—certainly furnish their beer. This is rendered certain by Bradford's difficulty (as stated by himself) with Captain Jones, previously referred to, showing that the ship had her own supply of beer, separate from that of the colonists, and that it was intended for the seamen as well as the officers.

Bradford mentions "aqua vitae" as a constituent of their lunch on the exploring party of November 15. "Strong waters" (or Holland gin) are mentioned as a part of the entertainment given Massasoit on his first visit, and they find frequent mention otherwise. Wine finds no mention. Bradford states in terms: "Neither ever had they any supply of foode from them [the Adventurers] but what they first brought with them;" and again, "They never had any supply of vitales more afterwards (but what the Lord gave them otherwise), for all ye company [the Adventurers] sent at any time was allways too short for those people yt came with it."

The clothing supplies of the Pilgrims included hats, caps, shirts, neck-cloths, jerkins, doublets, waistcoats, breeches (stuff and leather), "hosen," stockings, shoes, boots, belts (girdles), cloth, piece-goods (dress-stuff's), "haberdasherie," *etc*., *etc*., all of which, with minor items for men's and women's use, find mention in their early narratives, accounts, and correspondence. By the will of Mr. Mullens it appears that he had twenty-one dozen of shoes and thirteen pairs of boots on board, doubtless intended as medium of exchange or barter. By the terms of the. contract with the colonists, the Merchant Adventurers were to supply all their actual necessities of Clothing food, clothing, *etc*., for the full term of seven years, during which the labors of the "planters" were to be for the joint account. Whether under this

Page 137

agreement they were bound to fully “outfit” the colonists before they embarked (and did so), as was done by Higginson’s company coming to Salem in 1628-29 at considerable cost per capita, and as was done for those of the Leyden people who came over in 1629 with Pierce in the *may-Flower* and the *Talbot* to Salem, and again in 1630 with the same Master (Pierce) in the *Lion* by the Plymouth successors to the Adventurers (without recompense), does not clearly appear. No mention is found of any “outfitting” of the *may-Flower* passengers except the London apprentices. There is no doubt that a considerable supply of all the above-named articles was necessarily sent by the Adventurers on the *may-Flower*, both for the Pilgrims’ needs on the voyage and in the new colony, as also for trading purposes. There seems to have been at all times a supreme anxiety, on the part of both Pilgrim and Puritan settlers, to get English clothes upon their red brethren of the forest, whether as a means of exchange for peltry, or for decency’s sake, is not quite clear. There was apparently a greater disparity in character, intelligence, and station between the leaders of Higginson’s and Winthrop’s companies and their followers than between the chief men of the Pilgrims and their associates. With the former were titles and considerable representation of wealth and position. With the passengers of the *may-Flower* a far greater equality in rank, means, intelligence, capacity, and character was noticeable. This was due in part, doubtless, to the religious beliefs and training of the Leyden contingent, and had prompt illustration in their Compact, in which all stood at once on an equal footing. There was but little of the “paternal” nature in the form of their government (though something at times in their punishments), and there was much personal dignity and independence of the individual. An equipment having so much of the character of a uniform—not to say “livery”—as that furnished by Higginson’s company to its people suggests the “hedger and ditcher” type of colonists (of whom there were very few among the Plymouth settlers), rather than the scholar, publisher, tradesman, physician, hatter, smith, carpenter, “lay reader,” and soldier of the Pilgrims, and would certainly have been obnoxious to their finer sense of personal dignity and proportion. Doubtless an equivalent provision existed—though in less “all-of-a-pattern” character—in the bales and boxes of the *may*-FLOWER’S cargo for every need suggested by the list of the Higginson “outfit,” which is given herewith, both as matter of interest and as affording an excellent idea of the accepted style and needs in dress of a New England settler (at least of the men) of 1620-30. One cannot fail to wonder at the noticeably infrequent mention of provision in apparel, *etc*., for the women and children. The inventory of the “Apparell for 100 men” furnished by Higginson’s

Page 138

company in 1628-29 gives us, among others, the following items of clothing for each emigrant:— 4 “peares of shoes.” 4 “peares of stockings.” 1 “peare Norwich gaiters.” 4 “shirts.” 2 “suits dublet and hose of leather lyn’d with oyld skyn leather, ye hose & dublett with hooks & eyes.”
1 “sute of Norden dussens or hampshire kersies lynd the hose with skins, dublets with lynen of gilford or gedlyman kerseys.” 4 bands. 2 handkerchiefs. 1 “wastecoat of greene cotton bound about with red tape.” 1 leather girdle. 1 “Monmouth cap.” 1 “black hatt lyned in the brows with lether.” 5 “Red knitt capps milf’d about 5d apiece.” 2 “peares of gloves.” 1 “Mandiliion lynd with cotton” [mantle or greatcoat]. 1 “peare of breeches and waistcoat.” 1 “leather sute of Dublett & breeches of oyled leather.” 1 “peare of leather breeches and drawers to weare with both there other sutes.”

In 1628 Josselyn put the average cost of clothing to emigrants to New England at L4 each. In 1629 good shoes cost the “Bay” colonists 2s/7d per pair. In his “Two Voyages to New England” previously referred to, Josselyn gives an estimate (made about 1628) of the “outfit” in clothing needed by a New England settler of his time. He names as “Apparel for one man—and after this rate for more:—”

One Hatt
One Monmouth Cap
Three falling bands
Three Shirts
One Wastcoat
One Suite of Frize (Frieze)
One Suite of Cloth
One Suite of Canvas
Three Pairs of Irish Stockings
Four Pairs of Shoes
One Pair of Canvas Sheets
Seven ells of coarse canvas, to make a bed at sea for two men, to be filled with straw
One Coarse Rug at Sea

The Furniture of the Pilgrims has naturally been matter of much interest to their descendants and others for many years. While it is doubtful if a single article now in existence can be positively identified and truthfully certified as having made the memorable voyage in the *may-Flower* (nearly everything having, of course, gone to decay with the wear and tear of more than two hundred and fifty years), this honorable origin is still assigned to many heirlooms, to some probably correctly. Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes in his delightful lines, “On Lending a Punch Bowl,” humorously claims for his convivial silver vessel a place with the Pilgrims:—

> "Along with all the furniture, to fill their new abodes,
> To judge by what is still on hand, at least a hundred loads."

To a very few time-worn and venerated relics—such as Brewster's chair and one or more books, Myles Standish's Plymouth sword, the Peregrine White cradle, Winslow's pewter, and one or two of Bradford's books—a strong probability attaches that they were in veritate, as traditionally avowed, part of the *may*-FLOWER'S freight, but of even these the fact cannot be proven beyond the possibility of a doubt.

Page 139

From its pattern and workmanship, which are of a period antedating the “departure from Delfshaven,” and the ancient tradition which is traceable to Brewster’s time, it appears altogether probable that what is known as “Elder Brewster’s chair” came with him on the ship. There is even greater probability as to one of his books bearing his autograph.

The sword of Myles Standish, in possession of the Pilgrim Society, may claim, with equal probability, *may-Flower* relation, from its evident antiquity and the facts that, as a soldier, his trusty blade doubtless stayed with him, and that it is directly traceable in his descendants’ hands, back to his time; but an equally positive claim is made for similar honors for another sword said to have also belonged to the Captain, now in the keeping of the Massachusetts Historical Society.

The Peregrine White cradle “is strongly indorsed as of the *may-Flower*, from the facts that it is, indubitably, of a very early Dutch pattern and manufacture; that Mrs. White was anticipating the early need of a cradle when leaving Holland; and that the descent of this one as an heirloom in her (second) family is so fairly traced.”

The pewter and the silver flask of Winslow not only bear very early “Hallmarks,” but also the arms of his family, which it is not likely he would have had engraved on what he may have bought after notably becoming the defender of the simplicity and democracy of the “Pilgrim Republic.” Long traceable use in his family strengthens belief in the supposition that these articles came with the Pilgrims, and were then very probably heirlooms. One of Governor Bradford’s books (Pastor John Robinson’s “Justification of Separation"), published in 1610, and containing the Governor’s autograph, bears almost ‘prima facie’ evidence of having come with him in the *may-Flower*, but of course might, like the above-named relics, have come in some later ship.

In this connection it is of interest to note what freight the *may-Flower* carried for the intellectual needs of the Pilgrims. Of Bibles, as the “book of books,” we may be sure—-even without the evidence of the inventories of the early dead—there was no lack, and there is reason to believe that they existed in several tongues, *viz*. in English, Dutch, and possibly French (the Walloon contribution from the Huguenots), while there is little doubt that, alike as publishers and as “students of the Word,” Brewster, Bradford, and Winslow, at least, were possessed of, and more or less familiar with, both the Latin and Greek Testaments. It is altogether probable, however, that Governor Bradford’s well attested study of “the oracles of God in the original” Hebrew, and his possession of the essential Hebrew Bible, grammar, and lexicon, were of a later day. Some few copies of the earliest hymnals ("psalme-bookes")—then very limited in number—there is evidence that the Holland

Page 140

voyagers had with them in the singing of their parting hymns at Leyden and Delfshaven, as mentioned by Winslow and in the earlier inventories: These metrical versions of the Psalms constituted at the time, practically, the only hymnology permitted in the worship of the "Separatists," though the grand hymn of Luther, "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," doubtless familiar to them, must have commended itself as especially comforting and apposite.

Of the doctrinal tracts of their beloved Pastor, John Robinson, there is every probability, as well as some proof, that there was good supply, as well as those of Ainsworth and Clyfton and of the works of William Ames, the renowned Franeker Professor, the controversial opponent but sincere friend of Robinson: the founder of evangelical "systematic theology," [method—Methodist? D.W.] whom death alone prevented from becoming the President of Harvard College. We may be equally sure that the few cases of books in the freight of the Pilgrim ship included copies of the publications of the "hidden and hunted press" of Brewster and Brewer, and some at least of the issues of their fellows in tribulation at Amsterdam and in Scotland and England. Some few heavy tomes and early classics in English, Dutch, Latin, and Greek were also presumably among the goodly number of books brought in the *may Flower* by Brewster, Bradford, Winslow, Fuller, Hopkins, Allerton, Standish, and others, though it is probable that the larger part of the very considerable library of four hundred volumes, left at his death by Brewster (including sixty-two in Latin), and of the respectable libraries of Fuller, Standish, and others, named in their respective inventories, either were brought over in the later ships, or were the products of the earliest printers of New England. One is surprised and amused that the library of the good Dr. Fuller should contain so relatively small a proportion of medical works (although the number in print prior to his death in 1633 was not great), while rich in religious works pertinent to his functions as deacon. It is equally interesting to note that the inventory of the soldier Standish should name only one book on military science, "Bariffe's Artillery," though it includes abundant evidence to controvert, beyond reasonable doubt, the suggestion which has been made, that he was of the Romanist faith. Just which of the books left by the worthies named, and others whose inventories we possess, came with them in the Pilgrim ship, cannot be certainly determined, though, as before noted, some still in existence bear intrinsic testimony that they were of the number. There is evidence that Allerton made gift of a book to Giles Heale of the *may-Flower* (perhaps the ship's surgeon), while the ship lay at Plymouth, and Francis Cooke's inventory includes "1 great Bible and 4 olde bookes," which as they were "olde," and he was clearly not a book-buyer, very probably came with him in the ship. In fact, hardly an adult of the Leyden colonists, the inventory of whose estate at death we possess, but left one or more books which may have been his companions on the voyage.

Page 141

Some of the early forms of British and Dutch calendars, “annuals,” and agricultural “hand-books,” it is certain were brought over by several families, and were doubtless much consulted and well-thumbed “guides, counsellors, and friends” in the households of their possessors. The great preponderance of reading matter brought by the little colony was, however, unquestionably of the religious controversial order, which had been so much a part of their lives, and its sum total was considerable. There are intimations, in the inventories of the Fathers, of a few works of historical cast, but of these not many had yet been printed. “Caesar’s Commentaries,” a “History of the World,” and a “History of Turkey” on Standish’s shelves, with the two Dictionaries and “Peter Martyr on Rome” on Dr. Fuller’s, were as likely to have come in the first ship, and to have afforded as much satisfaction to the hungry readers of the little community as any of the books we find named in the lists of their little stock. It is pathetic to note, in these days of utmost prodigality in juvenile literature, that for the Pilgrim children, aside from the “Bible stories,” some of the wonderful and mirth-provoking metrical renderings of the “Psalme booke,” and the “horne booke,” or primer (the alphabet and certain elementary contributions in verse or prose, placed between thin covers of transparent horn for protection), there was almost absolutely nothing in the meagre book-freight of the Pilgrim ark. “Milk for Babes,” whether as physical or mental pabulum, was in poor supply aboard the *may-Flower*.

The most that can be claimed with confidence, for particular objects of alleged *may-Flower* relation, is that there is logical and moral certainty that there was a supply of just such things on board, because they were indispensable, and because every known circumstance and condition indicates their presence in the hands to which they are assigned, while tradition and collateral evidence confirm the inference and sometimes go very far to establish their alleged identity, and their presence with their respective owners upon the ship. A few other articles besides those enumerated in possession of the Pilgrim Society, and of other societies and individuals, present almost equally strong claims with those named, to be counted as “of *may-Flower* belonging,” but in no case is the connection entirely beyond question. Where so competent, interested, and conscientious students of Pilgrim history as Hon. William T. Davis, of Plymouth, and the late Dr. Thomas B. Drew, so long the curator of the Pilgrim Society, cannot find warrant for a positive claim in behalf of any article as having come, beyond a doubt, “in the *may Flower*,” others may well hesitate to insist upon that which, however probable and desirable, is not susceptible of conclusive proof.

Page 142

That certain articles of household furniture, whether now existent or not, were included in the ship's cargo, is attested by the inventories of the small estates of those first deceased, and, by mention or implication, in the narratives of Bradford, Winslow, Morton, and other contemporaries, as were also many utensils and articles of domestic use. There were also beyond question many not so mentioned, which may be safely named as having very certainly been comprised in the ship's lading, either because in themselves indispensable to the colonists, or because from the evidence in hand we know them to have been inseparable from the character, social status, daily habits, home life, or ascertained deeds of the Pilgrims. When it is remembered that furnishings, however simple, were speedily required for no less than nineteen "cottages" and their households, the sum total called for was not inconsiderable.

[Bradford, in Mourt's Relation (p. 68), shows that the colonists were divided up into "nineteen families," that "so we might build fewer houses." Winslow, writing to George Morton, December 11/21, 1621, says: "We have built seven dwelling-houses and four for the use of the plantation." Bradford (Historie, Mass. ed. p. 110) calls the houses "small cottages."]

Among the furniture for these "cottages" brought on the Pilgrim ship may be enumerated: chairs, table-chairs, stools and forms (benches), tables of several sizes and shapes (mostly small), table-boards and "cloathes," trestles, beds; bedding and bed-clothing, cradles, "buffets," cupboards and "cabinets," chests and chests of drawers, boxes of several kinds and "trunks," andirons, "iron dogs," "cob-irons," fire-tongs and "slices" (shovels), cushions, rugs, and "blanckets," spinning wheels, hand-looms, *etc*., *etc*. Among household utensils were "spits," "bake-kettles," pots and kettles (iron, brass, and copper), frying-pans, "mortars" and pestles (iron, brass, and "belle-mettle"), sconces, lamps (oil "bettys"), candlesticks, snuffers, buckets, tubs, "runlets," pails and baskets, "steel yards," measures, hour-glasses and sun-dials, pewter-ware (platters, plates, mugs, porringers, *etc*.), wooden trenchers, trays, "noggins," "bottles," cups, and "lossets." Earthen ware, "fatten" ware (mugs, "jugs," and "crocks "), leather ware (bottles, "noggins," and cups), table-ware (salt "sellars," spoons, knives, etc), *etc*. All of the foregoing, with numerous lesser articles, have received mention in the early literature of the Pilgrim exodus, and were undeniably part of the *may*-FLOWER'S lading.

Page 143

The *may-Flower* origin claimed for the “Governor Carver chair” and the “Elder Brewster chair” rests wholly upon tradition, and upon the venerable pattern and aspect of the chairs themselves. The “Winslow chair,” in possession of the Pilgrim Society at Plymouth (Mass.), though bearing evidence of having been “made in Cheapside, London, in 1614,” is not positively known to have been brought on the *may-Flower*. Thacher’s “History of Plymouth” (p. 144.) states that “a sitting-chair, said to have been screwed to the floor of the *may*-FLOWER’S cabin for the convenience of a lady, is known to have been in the possession of Penelope Winslow (who married James Warren), and is now in possession of Hannah White.” There are certain venerable chairs alleged, with some show of probability, to have been the property of Captain Standish, now owned in Bridgewater, but there is no record attached to them, and they are not surely assignable to either ship or owner. That some few tables —mostly small —were brought in the *may-Flower*, there is some evidence, but the indications are that what were known as “table-boards”—long and narrow boards covered with what were called “board-cloths”—very largely took the place of tables. The walnut-top table, said to have once been Governor Winslow’s and now in possession of the Pilgrim Society, is not known to have come over with him, and probably did not. It was very likely bought for the use of the Council when he was governor. The “table-boards” mentioned were laid on “trestles” (cross-legged and folding supports of proper height), which had the great merit that they could be placed in any convenient spot and as easily folded up, and with the board put away, leaving the space which a table would have permanently occupied free for other use.

Bradford mentions that when the fire of Sunday, January 14., 1621, occurred in the “common house,” the “house was as full of beds as they could lie one by another.” There is a doubt, however, whether this indicates bedsteads or (probably) “pallets” only. Beds, bedding of all sorts, pillow-"beers,” pillow-cases and even “mattrises,” are of most frequent mention in the earliest wills and inventories. (See Appendix.) “Buffets,” “cupboards,” and “cabinets,” all find mention in the earliest writers and inventories, and one or two specimens, for which a *may-Flower* history is claimed, are in possession of the Pilgrim Society and others. The “White” cabinet, of putative *may-Flower* connection, owned by the Pilgrim Society, is a fine example of its class, and both its “ear marks” and its known history support the probable truth of the claim made for it. Of “chests” and “chests-of-drawers” there were doubtless goodly numbers in the ship, but with the exception of a few chests (or the fragments of them), for which a *may-Flower* passage is vaunted, little is known of them. The chest claimed to be that of

Page 144

Elder Brewster, owned by the Connecticut Historical Society, was not improb ably his, but that it had any *may-Flower* relation is not shown. A fragment of a chest claimed to have been "brought by Edward Winslow in the *may-Flower*" is owned by the Pilgrim Society, and bears considerable evidence of the probable validity of such claim, but proof positive is lacking. Boxes of several kinds and sizes were part of the Pilgrims' chattels on their ship, some of them taking the place of the travellers' "trunks" of to-day, though "trunks" were then known by that name and find early mention in Pilgrim inventories, and there were no doubt some upon the Pilgrim ship. A few claiming such distinction are exhibited, but without attested records of their origin.

"Andirons, fire-dogs, and cob-irons" (the latter to rest roasting spits upon) were enumerated among the effects of those early deceased among the Pilgrims, rendering it well-certain that they must have been part of their belongings on the *may-Flower*. Fire-tongs and "slices" [shovels] are also frequently mentioned in early Pilgrim inventories, placing them in the same category with the "andirons and fire-dogs."

In "Mourt's Relation," in the accounts given of the state reception of Massasoit, "a green rug and three or four cushions" are shown to have performed their parts in the official ceremonies, and were, of course, necessarily brought in the *may-Flower*.

Spinning-wheels and hand-looms were such absolute necessities, and were so familiar and omnipresent features of the lives and labors of the Pilgrim housewives and their Dutch neighbors of Leyden, that we should be certain that they came with the Pilgrims, even if they did not find mention in the earliest Pilgrim inventories. Many ancient ones are exhibited in the "Old Colony," but it is not known that it is claimed for any of them that they came in the first ship. It is probable that some of the "cheese fatts" and churns so often named in early inventories came in the ship, though at first there was, in the absence of milch kine, no such use for them as there had been in both England and Holland, and soon was in New England.

Among cooking utensils the roasting "spit" was, in one form or another, among the earliest devices for cooking flesh, and as such was an essential of every household. Those brought by the Plymouth settlers were probably, as indicated by the oldest specimens that remain to us, of a pretty primitive type. The ancient "bake-kettle" (sometimes called "pan"), made to bury in the ashes and thus to heat above and below, has never been superseded where resort must be had to the open fire for cooking, and (practically unchanged) is in use to-day at many a sheep-herder's and cowboy's camp fire of the Far West. We may be sure that it was in every *may-Flower* family, and occasional ancient specimens are yet to be found in "Old

Page 145

Colony" garrets. Pots and kettles of all sorts find more frequent mention in the early inventories than anything else, except muskets and swords, and were probably more numerous upon the ship than any other cooking utensil. A few claimed to be from the Pilgrim ship are exhibited, chief of which is a large iron pot, said to have been "brought by Myles Standish in the *may-Flower*," now owned by the Pilgrim Society.

Hardly an early Pilgrim inventory but includes "a mortar and pestle," sometimes of iron, sometimes of "brass" or "belle-mettle" (bell metal). They were of course, in the absence of mills, and for some purposes for which small hand mills were not adapted, prime necessities, and every house hold had one. A very fine one of brass (with an iron pestle), nine and a half inches across its bell-shaped top,—exhibited by the Pilgrim Society, and said to have been "brought in the *may-Flower* by Edward Winslow,"—-seems to the author as likely to have been so as almost any article for which that distinction is claimed.

The lighting facilities of the Pilgrims were fewer and cruder than those for cooking. They possessed the lamp of the ancient Romans, Greeks, and Hebrews, with but few improvements,—a more or less fanciful vessel for oil, with a protuberant nose for a wick, and a loose-twisted cotton wick. Hand-lamps of this general form and of various devices, called "betty-lamps," were commonly used, with candlesticks of various metals, —iron, brass, silver, and copper,—though but few of any other ware. For wall-lighting two or more candle sockets were brought together in "sconces," which were more or less elaborate in design and finish. One of the early writers (Higginson) mentions the abundance of oil (from fish) available for lamps, but all tallow and suet used by the early colonists was, for some years (till cattle became plentiful), necessarily imported. Some of the "candle-snuffers" of the "first comers" doubtless still remain. We may be sure every family had its candles, "betty-lamps," candlesticks, and "snuffers." "Lanthorns" were of the primitive, perforated tin variety—only "serving to make darkness visible" now found in a few old attics in Pilgrim towns, and on the "bull-carts" of the peons of Porto Rico, by night. Fire, for any purpose, was chiefly procured by the use of flint, steel, and tinder, of which many very early specimens exist. Buckets, tubs, and pails were, beyond question, numerous aboard the ship, and were among the most essential and highly valued of Pilgrim utensils. Most, if not all of them, we may confidently assert, were brought into requisition on that Monday "wash-day" at Cape Cod, the first week-day after their arrival, when the women went ashore to do their long-neglected laundrying, in the comparatively fresh water of the beach pond at Cape Cod harbor. They are frequently named in the earliest inventories. Bradford also mentions the filling of a "runlet" with

Page 146

water at the Cape. The “steel-yards” and “measures” were the only determiners of weight and quantity—as the hour-glass and sun dial were of time—possessed at first (so far as appears) by the passengers of the Pilgrim ship, though it is barely possible that a Dutch clock or two may have been among the possessions of the wealthiest. Clocks and watches were not yet in common use (though the former were known in England from 1540), and except that in “Mourt’s Relation” and Bradford’s “Historie” mention is made of the time of day as such “o’clock” (indicating some degree of familiarity with clocks), no mention is made of their possession at the first. Certain of the leaders were apparently acquainted at Leyden with the astronomer Galileo, co-resident with them there, and through this acquaintance some of the wealthier and more scholarly may have come to know, and even to own, one of the earliest Dutch clocks made with the pendulum invented by Galileo, though hardly probable as early as 1620. Pocket watches were yet practically unknown.

Except for a few pieces of silver owned by the wealthiest of their number, pewter was the most elegant and expensive of the Pilgrims’ table-ware. A pewter platter said to have been “brought over in the *may-Flower*” is now owned by the Pilgrim Society, which also exhibits smaller pewter formerly Edward Winslow’s, and bearing his “arms,” for which, as previously noted, a like claim is made. Platters, dishes, “potts,” ladles, bottles, “flaggons,” “skelletts,” cups, porringers, “basons,” spoons, candlesticks, and salt “sellars,” were among the many pewter utensils unmistakably brought on the good ship.

The wooden-ware of the colonists, brought with them, was considerable and various. The Dutch were long famous for its fabrication. There was but very little china, glass, or pottery of any kind in common use in western Europe in 1620; some kinds were not yet made, and pewter, wood, and leather largely filled their places. Wooden trenchers (taking the place of plates), trays, “noggins” (jug or pitcher-like cups), cups, and “lossets” (flat dishes like the bread-plates of to day), were of course part of every housewife’s providings. Some few of Pilgrim origin possibly still exist. As neither coffee, tea, nor china had come into use, the cups and saucers which another century brought in—to delight their owners in that day and the ceramic hunter in this—were not among the “breakables” of the “good-wife” of the *may-Flower*. The “table-plenishings” had not much variety, but in the aggregate the (first) “nineteen families” must have required quite a quantity of spoons, knives, salt “sellars,” *etc*. Forks there were none, and of the accessories of to-day (except napkins), very few. Meat was held by the napkin while being cut with the knife. Josselyn’ gives a list of “Implements for a family of six persons” going to New England.

Page 147

Kitchen utensils:—

"1 Iron Pot.
1 Great Copper Kettle.
1 Small Kettle.
1 Lesser Kettle.
1 Large Frying pan.
1 Brass Mortar.
1 Spit.
1 Gridiron.
2 Skillets.
Platters, dishes, and spoons of wood.
A pair of Bellows.
A Skoope, *etc*."

Among the implements of husbandry, *etc*., and mechanics' tools we find evidence of hoes, spades, shovels, scythes, "sikles," mattocks, bill-hooks, garden-rakes, hay-forks ("pitch-forks"), besides seed-grain and garden seeds. Axes, saws, hammers, "adzs," augers, chisels, gouges, squares, hatchets, an "iron jack-scrue," "holdfasts" (vises), blacksmiths' tools, coopers' tools, iron and steel in bar, anvils, chains, *etc*., "staples and locks," rope, lime (for mortar), nails, *etc*., are also known to have been in the ship. Francis Eaton, the carpenter, seems to have had a very respectable "kit," and Fletcher, the smith, was evidently fairly "outfitted."

The implements of husbandry were of the lighter (?) sort; no ploughs, harrows, carts, harness, stone-drags, or other farming tools requiring the strength of beasts for their use, were included. In nothing could they have experienced so sharp a contrast as in the absence of horses, cattle, and sheep in their husbandry, and especially of milch kine. Bradford and Window both mention hoes, spades, mattocks, and sickles, while shovels, scythes, bill-hooks (brush-scythes, the terrible weapons of the English peasantry in their great "Mon mouth" and earlier uprisings), pitchforks, *etc*., find very early mention in inventories and colonial records. Josselyn, in his "Two Voyages to New England," gives, in 1628, the following very pertinent list of "Tools for a Family of six persons, and so after this rate for more,—intending for New England." This may be taken as fairly approximating the possessions of the average *may-Flower* planter, though probably somewhat exceeding individual supplies. Eight years of the Pilgrims' experience had taught those who came after them very much that was of service.

5 Broad Howes [hoes]. 6 Chisels. 5 Narrow Howes [hoes]. 3 Gimblets. 5 Felling Axes. 2 hatchets. 2 steel hand saws. 2 frones (?) to cleave pail! (Probably knives for cleaving pail stock.) 2 hand saws. 2 hand-bills. 1 whip saw, set and files with box. Nails of all sorts. 2 Pick-axes. A file and rest. 3 Locks and 3 paire fetters. 2 Hammers. 2 Currie Combs. 3 Shovels. Brands for beasts. 2 Spades. A hand vice. 2 Augers. A pitchfork, *etc*. 2 Broad Axes.

Unhappily we know little from contemporaneous authority as to what grain and other seeds the Pilgrims brought with them for planting. We may be sure, however, that rye, barley, oats, wheat, pease, and beans were the bulkiest of this part of their freight, though Bradford mentions the planting of “garden seeds” their first spring.

Page 148

While we know from the earliest Pilgrim chronicles that their mechanics' implements embraced axes, saws, hammers, "adzs," augers, hatchets, an "iron jack-scrue," "staples and locks," *etc*., we know there must have been many other tools not mentioned by them, brought over with the settlers. The "great iron-scrue," as Bradford calls it in his original *Ms*., played, as all know, a most important part on the voyage, in forcing the "cracked and bowed" deck-beam of the ship into place. Governor Bradford tells us that "it was brought on board by one of the Leyden passengers," and one may hazard the guess that it was by either Moses Fletcher, the smith, or Francis Eaton, the "carpenter." "Staples" and "locks" found their place and mention, as well as the "chains," "manacles," and "leg-irons" named in the list of accoutrements for offence or defence, when it became necessary to chain up the Indian spy of the Neponsets (as narrated by Winslow in his "Good Newes from New England") and other evil-doers. The planters seem to have made stiff "mortar," which premises the use of lime and indicates a supply.

Among the fishing and fowling implements of the *may Flower* colonists are recorded, nets, "seynes," twine, fish hooks, muskets (for large game), "fowling pieces," powder, "goose-shot," "hail-shot," *etc*.

Such early mention is found of the nets, "seynes," *etc*., of their fishing equipment, as to leave no room for doubt that store of them was brought in the ship. They seem to have been unfortunate in the size of their fish-hooks, which are spoken of as "too large" even for cod. They must, as Goodwin remarks, "have been very large." Window also says, "We wanted fit and strong seines and other netting."

They seem to have relied upon their muskets to some extent for wild fowl (as witness Winslow's long and successful shot at a duck, on his visit to Massasoit), as they undoubtedly did for deer, *etc*. They were apparently fairly well supplied with them, of either the "matchlock" or "snaphance" (flintlock) pattern, though the planters complained to the Merchant Adventurers (in their letter of August 3, from Southampton), that they were "wanting many muskets," *etc*. That they had some "fowling-pieces" is shown by the fact that young Billington seems (according to Bradford) to have "shot one off in his father's cabin" aboard ship in Cape Cod harbor, and there are several other coeval mentions of them.

The arms and accoutrements (besides ordnance) of the *may-Flower* Pilgrims, known on the authority of Bradford and Winslow to have been brought by them, included muskets ("matchlocks"), "snaphances" (flintlocks), armor ("corslets," "cuirasses," "helmets," "bandoliers," *etc*.), swords, "curtlaxes" (cutlasses), "daggers," powder, "mould-shot," "match" (slow-match for guns), "flints," belts, "knapsacks," "drum," "trumpet," "manacles," "leg-irons," *etc*.,

Page 149

etc. "Pistols" (brass) appear in early inventories, but their absence in the early hand-to-hand encounter at Wessagussett indicates that none were then available, or that they were not trusted. It is evident from the statement of Bradford that every one of the sixteen men who went out (under command of Standish) on the "first exploration" at Cape Cod had his "musket, sword, and corslet;" that they relied much on their armor, and hence, doubtless, took all possible with them on the ship. They probably did not long retain its use. In the letter written to the Adventurers from Southampton, the leaders complain of "wanting many muskets, much armour, &c."

Josselyn gives' the equipment he considers necessary for each man going to New England to settle:—

"Armor compleat:—
One long piece [musket] five feet or five and a half long.
One Sword.
One bandoleer.
One belt.
Twenty pounds of powder.
Sixty pounds of shot or lead, pistol and Goose-shot."

"Another list gives an idea of 'complete armor.'"
Corselet
Breast [plate or piece].
Back [ditto].
Culet (?).
Gorget [throat-piece].
Tussis [thigh-pieces].
Head-piece "[morion skull-cap]."

Bradford states that they used their "curtlaxes" (cutlasses) to dig the frozen ground to get at the Indians' corn, "having forgotten to bring spade or mattock." "Daggers" are mentioned as used in their celebrated duel by Dotey and Leister, servants of Stephen Hopkins. Bradford narrates that on one of their exploring tours on the Cape the length of guard duty performed at night by each "relief" was determined by the inches of slow-match burned ("every one standing when his turn came while five or six inches of match was burning"), clearly indicating that they had no watches with them. The "drum" and "trumpet" are both mentioned in "Mourt's Relation" in the account given of Massasoit's reception, the latter as eliciting the especial attention of his men, and their efforts at blowing it.

The Ordnance (cannon) brought in the ship consisted (probably) of ten guns, certainly of six. Of these, two (2) were "sakers,"—guns ten feet long of 3 to 4 inches bore, weighing from fifteen to eighteen hundred pounds each; two (2) were "minions" (or

“falcons"),—guns of 3 1/2 inch bore, weighing twelve hundred pounds (1200 lbs.) each; and two (2) were “bases,”—small guns of 1 1/4 inch bore, weighing some three hundred pounds (300 1bs.) each. These were mounted on “the Hill” fort or platform. It is probable that besides these were the four smallest cannon, called “patereros” (or “murderers"), which, at the time of De Rasiere’s visit to Plymouth in 1627, were mounted on a platform (in front of the Governor’s house), at the intersection of the two streets of the town, and commanded its several approaches. It is not likely that they were sent for after 1621, because the Adventurers were

Page 150

never in mood to send if asked, while Bradford, in speaking of the first alarm by the Indians, says, “This caused us to plant our great ordnance in places most convenient,” leaving a possible inference that they had smaller ordnance in reserve. With this ordnance was of course a proper supply of ammunition adapted to its use. The “sakers” are said to have carried a four-pound ball, the “minions” a three-pound ball, and the “bases” a ball of a pound weight. There is not entire agreement between authorities, in regard to the size, weight, and calibre of these different classes of early ordnance, or the weight of metal thrown by them, but the above are approximate data, gathered from careful comparison of the figures given by several. There is no doubt that with this heavy ordnance and ammunition they stowed among their ballast and dunnage (as was the case in Higginson’s ships), their “spare chains and anchors, chalk, bricks, sea-coal (for blacksmithing), iron, steel, lead, copper, red-lead, salt,” *etc*.; all of which they also necessarily had, and from their bulk, character, and weight, would stow as low in the ship as might be.

That a considerable “stock of trading goods” was included in the *may*-FLOWER’S lading is mentioned by at least one writer, and that this was a fact is confirmed by the records of the colonists’ dealings with the Indians, and the enumeration of not a few of the goods which could have had, for the most part, no other use or value. They consisted largely of knives, bracelets (bead and metal), rings, scissors, copper-chains, beads, “blue and red trading cloth,” cheap (glass) jewels ("for the ears,” *etc*.), small mirrors, clothing (e. g. “red-cotton horseman’s coats—laced,” jerkins, blankets, *etc*.), shoes, “strong waters,” pipes, tobacco, tools and hard ware (hatchets, nails, hoes, fish-hooks, *etc*.), rugs, twine, nets, *etc*., *etc*. A fragment of one of the heavy hoes of the ancient pattern—“found on the site of the Pilgrim trading house at Manomet”—is owned by the Pilgrim Society, and speaks volumes of the labor performed by the Pilgrims, before they had ploughs and draught-cattle, in the raising of their wonderful crops of corn. Such was the *may*-FLOWER’S burden, animate and inanimate, whe —the last passenger and the last piece of freight transferred from the *Speedwell*—her anchor “hove short,” she swung with the tide in Plymouth roadstead, ready to depart at last for “the Virginia plantations.”

CHAPTER IX

THE JOURNAL OF THE SHIP MAY-FLOWER

Thomas Jones, Master, from London, England, towards “Hudson’s River” in Virginia

Page 151

[The voyage of the *may-Flower* began at London, as her consort's did at Delfshaven, and though, as incident to the tatter's brief career, we have been obliged to take note of some of the happenings to the larger ship and her company (at Southampton, *etc*.), out of due course and time, they have been recited only because of their insuperable relation to the consort and her company, and not as part of the *may*-FLOWER'S own proper record]

Saturday, July 15/25, 1620

Gravesend. Finished lading. Got passengers aboard and got under way for Southampton. Dropped down the Thames to Gravesend with the tide.

[Vessels leaving the port of London always, in that day, "dropped down with the tide," tug-boats being unknown, and sail-headway against the tide being difficult in the narrow river.]

Masters Cushman and Martin, agents of the chartering—party, came aboard at London.

Sunday, July 16/26

Gravesend. Channel pilot aboard. Favoring wind.

Monday, July 17/27

In Channel. Course D.W. by W. Favoring wind.

Tuesday, July 18/28

In Channel. Southampton Water.

Wednesday, July 19/29

Southampton Water. Arrived at Southampton and came to anchor.

[Both ships undoubtedly lay at anchor a day or two, before hauling in to the quay. The *may-Flower* undoubtedly lay at anchor until after the *Speedwell* arrived, to save expense]

Thursday, July 20/30

Lying at Southampton off north end of "West Quay."

Friday, July 21/31

Lying at Southampton. Masters Carver,

Cushman, and Martin, three of the agents here. Outfitting ship, taking in lading, and getting ready for sea.

Saturday, July 22/Aug 1
Lying off Quay, Southampton.

Sunday, July 23/Aug 2
Lying off Quay, Southampton.

Monday, July 24/Aug 3
Lying off Quay, Southampton.

Tuesday, July 25/Aug 4
Lying off Quay, Southampton. Waiting for consort to arrive from Holland.

Page 152

Wednesday, July 26/Aug 5

Lying off Quay, Southampton. Pinnace *Speedwell*, 60 tons, Reynolds, Master, from Delfshaven, July 22, consort to this ship, arrived in harbor, having on board some 70 passengers and lading for Virginia. She came to anchor off north end "West Quay."

Thursday, July 27/Aug. 6

Lying at Quay, Southampton, *Speedwell* warped to berth at Quay near the ship, to transfer lading.

[Some of the cargo of the *Speedwell* is understood to have been here transferred to the larger ship; doubtless the cheese, "Hollands," and other provisions, ordered, as noted, by Cushman]

Friday, July 28/Aug. 7

Lying at Quay, Southampton, Much parleying and discontent among the passengers.

[Bradford gives an account of the bickering and recrimination at Southampton, when all parties had arrived. Pastor Robinson had rather too strenuously given instructions, which it now began to be seen were not altogether wise. Cushman was very much censured, and there was evidently some acrimony. See Cushman's Dartmouth letter of August 17 to Edward Southworth, Bradford's Historie, Mass. ed. p. 86.]

Saturday, July 29/Aug. 8

Lying at Quay, Southampton. Some of the passengers transferred from *Speedwell* and some to her. Master Christopher Martin chosen by passengers their "Governour" for the voyage to order them by the way, see to the disposing of their pro visions, *etc*. Master Robert Cushman chosen "Assistant." The ship ready for sea this day, but obliged to lie here on account of leakiness of consort, which is forced to retrim. Ship has now 90 passengers and consort 30.

Sunday, July 30/Aug. 9

Lying at Southampton.

Monday, July 31/Aug. 10

Lying at Southampton. Letters received for passengers from Holland. One from the Leyden Pastor [Robinson] read out to the company that came from that place.

Tuesday, Aug. 1/Aug. 11

Lying at anchor at Southampton. *Speedwell* retrimmed a second time to overcome leakiness.

Page 153

Wednesday, Aug. 2/Aug. 12

> Lying at anchor at Southampton. Master Weston, principal agent of the Merchants setting out the voyage, came up from Lon don to see the ships dispatched, but, on the refusal of the Planters to sign certain papers, took offence and returned to London in displeasure, bidding them "stand on their own legs," *etc*.

[The two "conditions" which Weston had changed in the proposed agreement between the Adventurers and Planters, the Leyden leaders refused to agree to. Bradford, op cit. p. 61. He says: "But they refused to sign, and answered him that he knew right well that these were not according to the first Agreement." Dr. Griffis has made one of those little slips common to all writers—though perfectly conversant with the facts—in stating as he does (The Pilgrims in their Three Homes, *etc*. p. 158), with reference to the new "conditions" which some blamed Cushman for assenting to, as "more fit for thieves and slaves than for honest men," that, "nevertheless they consented to them;" while on p. 169 he says "The *Speedwell* people [i.e. the Leyden leaders would not agree with the new conditions, without the consent of those left behind in Leyden."The fact is that the Pilgrims did not assent to the new conditions, unwarrantably imposed by Weston, though of small consequence in any view of the case, until Cushman came over to New Plymouth in the *Fortune*, in 1621, and by dint of his sermon on the "Sin and Danger of Self-Love," and his persuasion, induced them (they being also advised thereto by Robinson) to sign them. All business up to this time had been done between the Adventurers and the Pilgrims, apparently, without any agreement in writing. It was probably felt, both by Robinson and the Plymouth leaders, that it was the least reparation they could make Cushman for their cruel and unjust treatment of him, realizing at length that, through all vicissitudes, he had proven their just, sagacious, faithful, and efficient friend. There does not appear to be any conclusive evidence that any articles of agreement between the Adventurers and colonists were signed before the *may-Flower* Sailed.]

Thursday, Aug. 3/Aug. 13

> Lying at anchor at Southampton. After Master Weston's departure, the Planters had a meeting and resolved to sell some of such stores as they could best spare, to clear port charges, *etc*., and to write a general letter to the Adventurers explaining the case, which they did. Landed some three score firkins of butter, sold as determined.

Page 154

Friday, Aug. 4/Aug. 14

Lying at anchor at Southampton. Consort nearly ready for sea. Heard that the King's warrant had issued to Sir James Coventry, under date of July 23, to prepare a Patent for the Council for the Affairs of New England to supersede the Plymouth Virginia Company, Sir Ferdinando Gorges and Sir Robert Rich the Earl of Warwick among the Patentees.

Saturday, Aug. 5/Aug. 15

Weighed anchor, as did consort, and in company dropped down Southampton Water. Took departure from Cowes, Isle of Wight, and laid course down the Solent to Channel. Winds baffling. General course S.W. by S.

Sunday, Aug. 6/Aug. 16

Head winds. Beating out Channel. *Speedwell* In Company. Passed Bill of Portland.

Monday, Aug. 7/Aug. 17

Wind contrary. Beating out Channel. *Speedwell* In company.

Tuesday, Aug. 8/Aug. 18

Wind still contrary. Beating out Channel. *Speedwell* in company.

Wednesday, Aug. 9/Aug. 19

Wind ahead. Beating down Channel. Consort in company.

Thursday, Aug. 10/20

Wind fair. All sail set. *Speedwell* in company. Signalled by consort, which hove to. Found to be leaking badly. On consultation of Masters and chief of passengers of both ships, it was concluded that both should put into Dartmouth, being nearest port. Laid course for Dartmouth with wind ahead.

Thursday, Aug. 11/21

Wind ahead. Bearing up to Dartmouth.

Saturday, Aug. 12/22

Made port at Dartmouth. *Speedwell* in company, and came to anchor in harbor.

Page 155

[Bradford, op. cit. Deane's ed. p. 68, note. Russell (Pilgrim Memorials, p. 15) says: "The ships put back into Dartmouth, August 13/23." Goodwin (op. cit. p. 55) says: "The port was reached about August 23." Captain John Smith strangely omits the return of the ships to Dartmouth, and confuses dates, as he says "But the next day after leaving Southampton the lesser ship sprung a leak that forced their return to Plymouth," *etc*. Smith, New England's Trials, 2d ed. 1622. Cushman's letter, written the 17th, says they had then lain there "four days," which would mean, if four full days, the 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th.]

Sunday, Aug. 13/23

Lying at anchor with *Speedwell* leaking badly in Dartmouth harbor. No passengers, except leaders, allowed ashore.

[Cushman in his letter to Edward Southworth, written at Dartmouth, August 17, says that Martin, the "governour" of the passengers in the *may-Flower*, "will not suffer them the passengers to go, ashore lest they should run away." This probably applied especially to such as had become disaffected by the delays and disasters, the apprenticed ("bound") servants, *etc*. Of course no responsible colonist would be thus restrained for the reason alleged.]

Monday, Aug. 14/24

Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor. *Speedwell* at Quay taking out lading for thorough overhauling.

Tuesday, Aug. 15/25

Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor.

Wednesday, Aug. 16/26

Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor. *Speedwell* being thoroughly overhauled for leaks. Pronounced "as open and leaky as a sieve." Much dissatisfaction between the passengers, and discontent with the ship's "governour" Master Martin, between whom and Mr. Cushman, the "assistant," there is constant disagreement.

[Cushman portrays the contemptible character and manner of Martin very sharply, and could not have wished to punish him worse for his meannesses than he has, by thus holding him up to the scorn of the world, for all time. He says, 'inter alia': "If I speak to him, he flies in my face and saith no complaints shall be heard or received but by

himself, and saith: 'They are froward, and waspish, discontented people, and I do ill to hear them.'"]

Thursday, Aug. 17/27

Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor. Consort being searched and mended. Sailors offended at Master Martin because of meddling.

Page 156

[Cushman's letter, Dartmouth, August 17. He says: "The sailors also are so offended at his ignorant boldness in meddling and controling in things he knows not what belongs to, as that some threaten to mischief him . . . . But at best this cometh of it, that he makes himself a scorn and laughing stock unto them."]

Friday, Aug. 18/28

Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor. Consort still repairing. Judged by workmen that mended her sufficient for the voyage.

Saturday, Aug. 19/29

Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor. *Speedwell* relading.

Sunday, Aug. 20/30

Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor.

Monday, Aug. 21/31

Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor. Consort relading.

Tuesday, Aug. 22/Sept. 1

Lying at anchor, Dartmouth harbor. Both ships ready for sea.

[Bradford, Historie, Deane's ed. p. 68. He says: "Some leaks were found and mended and now it was conceived by the workmen and all, that she was sufficient, and they might proceed without either fear or danger." Bradford shows (op. cit. p. 69) note that they must have left Dartmouth "about the 21st" of August. Captain John Smith gives that date, though somewhat confusedly. Arber (the Story of the Pilgrim Fathers, p. 343 says: "They actually left on 23 August." Goodwin (Pilgrim Republic, p. 55) says : "Ten days were spent in discharging and re-stowing the *Speedwell* and repairing her from stem to stern," *etc*.)]

Wednesday, Aug. 23/Sept. 2

Weighed anchor, as did consort. Laid course W.S.W. Ships in company. Wind fair.

Thursday, Aug. 24/Sept. 3

Comes in with wind fair. General course W.S.W. Consort in company.

Friday, Aug. 25/Sept. 4

Comes in with wind fair. Course W.S.W. *Speedwell* in company.

Saturday, Aug. 26/Sept. 5

Observations showed ship above 100 leagues W.S.W. of Land's End. *Speedwell* signalled and hove to. Reported leaking dangerously. On consultation between Masters and carpenters of both ships, it was concluded to put back into Plymouth—Bore up for Plymouth. Consort in company.

Page 157

Sunday, Aug. 27/Sept. 6
Ship on course for Plymouth. *Speedwell* in company.

Monday, Aug. 28/Sept. 7
Made Plymouth harbor, and came to anchor in the Catwater, followed by consort.

Tuesday, Aug. 29/Sept. 8
At anchor in roadstead. At conference of officers of ship and consort and the chief of the Planters, it was decided to send the *Speedwell* back to London with some 18 or 20 of her passengers, transferring a dozen or more, with part of her lading, to the

may-Flower.

Wednesday, Aug. 30/Sept. 9
At anchor in Plymouth roadstead off the Barbican. Transferring passengers and lading from consort, lying near by. Weather fine.

[Goodwin notes (Pilgrim Republic, p. 57) that "it was fortunate for the overloaded *may-Flower* that she had fine weather while lying at anchor there, . . . for the port of Plymouth was then only a shallow, open bay, with no protection. In southwesterly gales its waters rose into enormous waves, with such depressions between that ships while anchored sometimes struck the bottom of the harbor and were dashed in pieces."]

Thursday, Aug. 31/Sept. 10
At anchor in Plymouth roadstead. Transferring cargo from *Speedwell*.

Friday, Sept. 1/Sept. 11
At anchor in Plymouth roadstead. Transferring passengers and freight to and from consort. Master Cushman and family, Master Blossom and son, William Ring, and others with children, going back to London in *Speedwell*. All Of SPEEDWELL'S passengers who are to make the voyage now aboard. New "governour" of ship and

assistants chosen. Master Carver
"governour."

[We have seen that Christopher Martin was made "governour" of the passengers on the *may-Flower* for the voyage, and Cushman "assistant." It is evident from Cushman's oft-quoted letter (see ante) that Martin became obnoxious, before the ship reached Dartmouth, to both passengers and crew. It is also evident that when the emigrants were

Page 158

all gathered in the *may-Flower* there was a new choice of officers (though no record is found of it), as Cushman vacated his place and went back to London, and we find that, as noted before, on November 11 the colonists "confirmed" John Carver as their "governour," showing that he had been such hitherto. Doubtless Martin was deposed at Southampton (perhaps put into Cushman's vacant place, and Carver made "governour" in his stead.)]

Saturday, Sept. 2/Sept. 12
At anchor, Plymouth roadstead. Some of principal passengers entertained ashore by friends of their faith. *Speedwell* sailed for London. Quarters assigned, *etc*.

Sunday, Sept. 3/Sept. 13
At anchor in Plymouth roadstead.

Monday, Sept. 4/Sept. 14
At anchor in Plymouth roadstead. Some Of company ashore.

Tuesday, Sept. 5/Sept. 15
At anchor in Plymouth roadstead. Ready for sea.

Wednesday, Sept. 6/Sept. 16
Weighed anchor. Wind E.N.E., a fine gale. Laid course W.S.W. for northern coasts of Virginia.

Thursday, Sept. 7/Sept. 17
Comes in with wind E.N.E. Light gale continues. Made all sail on ship.

Friday, Sept. 8/Sept. 18
Comes in with wind E.N.E. Gale continues. All sails full.

Saturday, Sept. 9/Sept. 19
Comes in with wind E.N E. Gale holds. Ship well off the land.

Sunday, Sept. 10/Sept. 20
Comes in with wind E.N.E. Gale holds.

Distance lost, when ship bore up for Plymouth, more than regained.

Monday, Sept. 11/Sept. 21

Same; and so without material change, the daily record of wind, weather, and the ship's general course—the repetition of which would be both useless and wearisome—continued through the month and until the vessel was near half the seas over. Fine warm weather and the "harvest-moon." The usual equinoctial weather deferred.

Saturday, Sept. 23/Oct. 3

One of the seamen, some time sick with a grievous disease, died in a desperate manner. The first death and burial at sea of the voyage.

Page 159

[We can readily imagine this first burial at sea on the *may Flower*, and its impressiveness. Doubtless the good Elder “committed the body to the deep” with fitting ceremonial, for though the young man was of the crew, and not of the Pilgrim company, his reverence for death and the last rites of Christian burial would as surely impel him to offer such services, as the rough, buccaneering Master (Jones would surely be glad to evade them).Dr. Griffis (The Pilgrims in their Three Homes, p. 176) says “The Puritans [does this mean Pilgrims ?] cared next to nothing about ceremonies over a corpse, whether at wave or grave.” This will hardly bear examination, though Bradford’s phraseology in this case would seem to support it, as he speaks of the body as “thrown overboard;” yet it is not to be supposed that it was treated quite so indecorously as the words would imply. It was but a few years after, certainly, that we find both Pilgrim and Puritan making much ceremony at burials. We find considerable ceremony at Carver’s burial only a few months later. Choate, in his masterly oration at New York, December 22, 1863, pictures Brewster’s service at the open grave of one of the Pilgrims in March, 1621.]A sharp change. Equinoctial weather, followed by stormy westerly gales; encountered cross winds and continued fierce storms. Ship shrewdly shaken and her upper works made very leaky. One of the main beams in the midships was bowed and cracked. Some fear that the ship could not be able to perform the voyage. The chief of the company perceiving the mariners to fear the sufficiency of the ship (as appeared by their mutterings) they entered into serious consultation with the Master and other officers of the ship, to consider, in time, of the danger, and rather to return than to cast themselves into a desperate and inevitable peril.There was great distraction and difference of opinion amongst the mariners themselves. Fain would they do what would be done for their wages’ sake, being now near half the seas over; on the other hand, they were loath to hazard their lives too desperately. In examining of all opinions, the Master and others affirmed they knew the ship to be strong and firm under water, and for the buckling bending or bowing of the main beam, there was a great iron scrue the passengers brought out of Holland which would raise the beam into its place. The which being done, the carpenter and Master affirmed that a post put under it, set firm in the lower deck, and otherwise bound, would make it sufficient. As for the decks and upper works, they would caulk them as well as they could; and though with the working of the ship they would not long keep staunch, yet there would otherwise be no great danger if they did not overpress her with sails. So they resolved to proceed.In sundry of these stormes, the winds were so

Page 160

fierce and the seas so high, as the ship could not bear a knot of sail, but was forced to hull drift under bare poles for divers days together. A succession of strong westerly gales. In one of the heaviest storms, while lying at hull, [hove to D.W.] a lusty young man, one of the passengers, John Howland by name, coming upon some occasion above the gratings latticed covers to the hatches, was with the seel [roll] of the ship thrown into the sea, but caught hold of the topsail halliards, which hung overboard and ran out at length; yet he held his hold, though he was sundry fathoms under water, till he was hauled up by the same rope to the brim of the water, and then with a boathook and other means got into the ship again and his life saved. He was something ill with it.

The equinoctial disturbances over and the strong October gales, the milder, warmer weather of late October followed.

Mistress Elizabeth Hopkins, wife of Master Stephen Hopkins, of Billericay, in Essex, was delivered of a son, who, on account of the circumstances of his birth, was named Oceanus, the first birth aboard the ship during the voyage.

A succession of fine days, with favoring winds.

Monday Nov. 6/16

William Butten; a youth, servant to Doctor Samuel Fuller, died. The first of the passengers to die on this voyage.

Monday Nov. 7/17

The body of William Butten committed to the deep. The first burial at sea of a passenger, on this voyage.

Monday Nov. 8/18

Signs of land.

Monday Nov. 9/19

Closing in with the land at nightfall. Sighted land at daybreak. The landfall made out to be Cape Cod the bluffs [in what is now the town of Truro, Mass.]. After a conference between the Master of the ship and the chief colonists, tacked about and stood for the southward. Wind and weather fair. Made our course S.S.W., continued

proposing to go to a river ten leagues south of the Cape Hudson's River. After had sailed that course about half the day fell amongst dangerous shoals and foaming breakers [the shoals off Monomoy] got out of them before night and the wind being contrary put round again for the Bay of Cape Cod. Abandoned efforts to go further south and so announced to passengers.

Page 161

[Bradford (Historie, Mass. ed. p. 93) says: "They resolved to bear up again for the Cape." No one will question that Jones's assertion of inability to proceed, and his announced determination to return to Cape Cod harbor, fell upon many acquiescent ears, for, as Winslow says: "Winter was come; the seas were dangerous; the season was cold; the winds were high, and the region being well furnished for a plantation, we entered upon discovery." Tossed for sixty-seven days on the north Atlantic at that season of the year, their food and firing well spent, cold, homesick, and ill, the bare thought of once again setting foot on any land, wherever it might be, must have been an allurement that lent Jones potential aid in his high-handed course.]

Saturday Nov. 11/21

Comes in with light, fair wind. On course for Cape Cod harbor, along the coast. Some hints of disaffection among colonists, on account of abandonment of location

[Bradford (in Mourt's Relation) says: "This day before we come to harbor Italics the author's, observing some not well affected to unity and concord, but gave some appearance of faction, it was thought good there should be an Association and Agreement that we should combine together in one body; and to submit to such Government and Governors as we should, by common consent, agree to make and choose, and set our hands to this that follows word for word." Then follows the Compact. Bradford is even more explicit in his Historie (Mass. ed. p. 109), where he says: "I shall a little returne backe and begin with a combination made by them before they came ashore, being ye first foundation of their governments in this place; occasioned partly by ye discontent & mutinous speeches that some of the strangers amongst them [i.e. not any of the Leyden contingent had let fall from them in ye ship—-That when they came ashore they would use their owne libertie: for none had power to command them, the patents they had being for Virginia, and not for New-England which belonged to another Government, with which ye London [or First Virginia Company had nothing to doe, and partly that such an acte by them done . . . might be as firm as any patent, and in some respects more sure." Dr. Griffis is hardly warranted in making Bradford to say, as he does (The Pilgrims in their Three Homes, p. 182), that "there were a few people I 'shuffled' in upon them the company who were probably unmitigated scoundrels." Bradford speaks only of Billington and his family as those "shuffled into their company," and while he was not improbably one of the agitators (with Hopkins) who were the proximate causes of the drawing up of the Compact, he was not, in this case, the responsible leader. It is evident from the foregoing that the "appearance of faction" did not show itself until the vessel's

Page 162

prow was turned back toward Cape Cod Harbor, and it became apparent that the effort to locate “near Hudson’s River” was to be abandoned, and a location found north of 41 degrees north latitude, which would leave them without charter rights or authority of any kind. It is undoubtedly history that Master Stephen Hopkins,—then “a lay-reader” for Chaplain Buck,—on Sir Thomas Gates’s expedition to Virginia, had, when some of them were cast away on the Bermudas, advocated just such sentiments—on the same basis—as were now bruited upon the *may-Flower*, and it could hardly have been coincidence only that the same were repeated here. That Hopkins fomented the discord is well-nigh certain. It caused him, as elsewhere noted, to receive sentence of death for insubordination, at the hands of Sir Thomas Gates, in the first instance, from which his pardon was with much difficulty procured by his friends. In the present case, it led to the drafting and execution of the Pilgrim Compact, a framework of civil self-government whose fame will never die; though the author is in full accord with Dr. Young (Chronicles, p. 120) in thinking that “a great deal more has been discovered in this document than the signers contemplated,”—wonderfully comprehensive as it is. Professor Herbert B. Adams, of Johns Hopkins University, says in his admirable article in the Magazine of American History, November, 1882 (pp—798 799): “The fundamental idea of this famous document was that of a contract based upon the common law of England,”—certainly a stable and ancient basis of procedure. Their Dutch training (as Griffis points out) had also led naturally to such ideas of government as the Pilgrims adopted. It is to be feared that Griffis’s inference (The Pilgrims in their Three Homes, p. 184), that all who signed the Compact could write, is unwarranted. It is more than probable that if the venerated paper should ever be found, it would show that several of those whose names are believed to have been affixed to it “made their ‘mark.’” There is good reason, also, to believe that neither “sickness” (except unto death) nor “indifference” would have prevented the ultimate obtaining of the signatures (by “mark,” if need be) of every one of the nine male servants who did not subscribe, if they were considered eligible. Severe illness was, we know, answerable for the absence of a few, some of whom died a few days later.The fact seems rather to be, as noted, that age—not social status was the determining factor as to all otherwise eligible. It is evident too, that the fact was recognized by all parties (by none so clearly as by Master Jones) that they were about to plant themselves on territory not within the jurisdiction of their steadfast friends, the London Virginia Company, but under control of those formerly of the Second (Plymouth) Virginia Company, who (by the intelligence they received while at Southampton) they knew would be erected

Page 163

into the “Council for the Affairs of New England.” Goodwin is in error in saying (Pilgrim Republic, p. 62), “Neither did any other body exercise authority there;” for the Second Virginia Company under Sir Ferdinando Gorges, as noted, had been since 1606 in control of this region, and only a week before the Pilgrims landed at Cape Cod (i.e. on November 3) King James had signed the patent of the Council for New England, giving them full authority over all territory north of the forty-first parallel of north latitude, as successors to the Second Virginia Company. If the intention to land south of the forty-first parallel had been persisted in, there would, of course, have been no occasion for the Compact, as the patent to John Pierce (in their interest) from the London Virginia Company would have been in force. The Compact became a necessity, therefore, only when they turned northward to make settlement above 41 deg. north latitude. Hence it is plain that as no opportunity for “faction”—and so no occasion for any “Association and Agreement”—existed till the *may-Flower* turned northward, late in the afternoon of Friday, November to, the Compact was not drawn and presented for signature until the morning of Saturday, November 11. Bradford’s language, “This day, before we came into harbour,” leaves no room for doubt that it was rather hurriedly drafted—and also signed—before noon of the 11th. That they had time on this winter Saturday—hardly three weeks from the shortest day in the year—to reach and encircle the harbor; secure anchorage; get out boats; arm, equip, and land two companies of men; make a considerable march into the land; cut firewood; and get all aboard again before dark, indicates that they must have made the harbor not far from noon. These facts serve also to correct another error of traditional Pilgrim history, which has been commonly current, and into which Davis falls (Ancient Landmarks of Plymouth, p. 60), *viz*. that the Compact was signed “in the harbor of Cape Cod.” It is noticeable that the instrument itself simply says, “Cape Cod,” not “Cape Cod harbour,” as later they were wont to say. The leaders clearly did not mean to get to port till there was a form of law and authority.]for settlement on territory under the protection of the patent granted in their interest to John Pierce, by the London Virginia Company.[The patent granted John Pierce, one of the Merchant Adventurers, by the London Virginia Company in the interest of the Pilgrims, was signed February 2/12, 1619, and of course could convey no rights to, or upon, territory not conveyed to the Company by its charter from the King issued in 1606, and the division of territory made thereunder to the Second Virginia Company. By this division the London Company was restricted northward by the 41st parallel, as noted, while the Second Company could not claim the 38th as its southern bound, as the charter stipulated that the nearest

Page 164

settlements under the respective companies should not be within one hundred miles of each other.]Meeting in main cabin of all adult male passengers except their two hired seamen, Trevore and Ely, and those too ill—to make and sign a mutual ’Compact”[The Compact is too well known to require reprinting here (see Appendix); but a single clause of it calls for comment in this connection. In it the framers recite that, “Having undertaken to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia,” *etc*. From this phraseology it would appear that they here used the words “northern parts of Virginia” understandingly, and with a new relation and significance, from their connection with the words “the first colony in,” for such declaration could have no force or truth except as to the region north of 41 deg. north latitude. They knew, of course, of the colonies in Virginia under Gates, Wingfield, Smith, Raleigh, and others (Hopkins having been with Gates), and that, though there had been brief attempts at settlements in the “northern plantations,” there were none there then, and that hence theirs would be in a sense “the first,” especially if considered with reference to the new Council for New England. The region of the Hudson had heretofore been included in the term “northern parts of Virginia,” although in the southern Company’s limit; but a new meaning was now designedly given to the words as used in the Compact, and New England was contemplated.]to regulate their civil government. This done, they confirmed Master Carver their “governour” in the ship on the voyage, their “governour” for the year. Bore up for the Cape, and by short tacks made the Cape [Paomet, now Provincetown] Harbor, coming to an anchorage a furlong within the point. The bay so circular that before coming to anchor the ship boxed the compass [i.e. went clear around all points of it].Let go anchors three quarters of an English mile off shore, because of shallow water, sixty-seven days from Plymouth (Eng.), eighty-one days from Dartmouth, ninety-nine days from Southampton, and one hundred and twenty from London. Got out the long-boat and set ashore an armed party of fifteen or sixteen in armor, and some to fetch wood, having none left, landing them on the long point or neck, toward the sea.

[The strip of land now known as Long Point, Provincetown (Mass.) harbor.]

Those going ashore were forced to wade a bow-shot or two in going aland. The party sent ashore returned at night having seen no person or habitation, having laded the boat with juniper wood.

Sunday, Nov. 12/22

At anchor in Cape Cod harbor. All hands piped to service. Weather mild.

Page 165

Monday, Nov. 13/23

At anchor in Cape Cod harbor, unshipped the shallop and drew her on land to mend and repair her.

[Bradford (Historie, Mass. ed. p. 97) says: "Having brought a large shallop with them out of England, stowed in quarters in ye ship they now gott her out and sett their carpenters to worke to trime her up: but being much brused and shatered in ye ship with foule weather, they saw she sould be longe in mending." In 'Mourt's Relation' he says: "Monday, the 13th of November, we unshipped our shallop and drew her on land to mend and repair her, having been forced to cut her down, in bestowing her betwixt the decks, and she was much opened, with the peoples lying in her, which kept us long there: for it was sixteen or seventeen days before the Carpenter had finished her." Goodwin says she was "a sloop-rigged craft of twelve or fifteen tons." There is an intimation of Bradford that she was "about thirty feet long." It is evident from Bradford's account (Historie, Mass. ed. p. 105) of her stormy entrance to Plymouth harbor that the shallop had but one mast, as he says "But herewith they broake their mast in 3 pieces and their saill fell overboard in a very grown sea."]

Many went ashore to refresh themselves, and the women to wash.

Tuesday, Nov. 14/24

Lying at anchor. Carpenter at work on shallop. Arms and accoutrements being got ready for an exploring party inland.

Wednesday, Nov. 15/25

Lying at anchor in harbor. Master and boat's crew went ashore, followed in the afternoon by an armed party of sixteen men under command of Captain Myles Standish. Masters William Bradford, Stephen Hopkins, and Edward Tilley being joined to him for council. The party to be gone from the ship a day or two. Weather mild and ground not frozen.

Thursday, Nov. 16/26

Lying at anchor in harbor. Exploring party still absent from ship. Weather continues open.

Friday, Nov. 17/27

At anchor, Cape Cod harbor. Weather open. Saw signal-fire on the other side of bay this morning, built by exploring party as arranged. The Master, Governor Carver, and

Page 166

many of the company ashore in afternoon, and met exploring party there on their return to ship. Hearing their signal-guns before they arrived at the shore, sent long-boat to fetch them aboard. They reported seeing Indians and following them ten miles without coming up to them the first afternoon out, and the next day found store of corn buried, and a big ship's kettle, which they brought to the ship with much corn. Also saw deer and found excellent water.

Saturday, Nov. 18/28

At anchor, Cape Cod harbor. Planters helving tools, *etc*. Carpenter at work on shallop, which takes more labor than at first supposed. Weather still moderate. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Nov. 19/29

At anchor, Gape Cod harbor. Second Sunday in harbor. Services aboard ship. Seamen ashore. Change in weather. Colder.

Monday, Nov. 20/30

At anchor, Cape Cod harbor. Carpenter and others at work on shallop, getting out stock for a new shallop, helving tools, making articles needed, *etc*.

Tuesday, Nov. 21/Dec. 1

At anchor in harbor. Much inconvenienced in going ashore. Can only go and come at high water except by wading, from which many have taken coughs and colds.

Wednesday, Nov. 22/Dec. 2

At anchor in harbor. Weather cold and stormy, having changed suddenly.

Thursday, Nov. 23/Dec. 3

At anchor in harbor. Cold and stormy. Work progressing on shallop.

Friday, Nov. 24/Dec. 4

At anchor in harbor. Continues cold and stormy.

Saturday, Nov. 25/Dec. 5

At anchor in harbor. Weather same. Work on shallop pretty well finished and she can be used, though more remains to be done. Another exploration getting ready for Monday. Master and crew anxious to unlade and return for England. Fetched wood and water.

Page 167

Sunday, Nov. 26/Dec. 6

At anchor, Cape Cod harbor. Third Sunday here. Master notified Planters that they must find permanent location and that he must and would keep sufficient supplies for ship's company and their return.

[Bradford, Historie, Mass. ed. p. 96. The doubt as to how the ship's and the colonists' provisions were divided and held is again suggested here. It is difficult, however, to understand how the Master "must and would" retain provisions with his small force against the larger, if it came to an issue of strength between Jones and Standish.]

Monday, Nov. 27/Dec. 7

At anchor, Cape Cod harbor. Rough weather and cross winds. The Planters determined to send out a strong exploring party, and invited the Master of the ship to join them and go as leader, which he agreed continued to, and offered nine of the crew and the long-boat, which were accepted. Of the colonists there were four-and-twenty, making the party in all four-and-thirty. Wind so strong that setting out from the ship the shallop and long-boat were obliged to row to the nearest shore and the men to wade above the knees to land. The wind proved so strong that the shallop was obliged to harbor where she landed. Mate in charge of ship. Blowed and snowed all day and at night, and froze withal. Mistress White delivered of a son which is called "Peregrine." The second child born on the voyage, the first in this harbor.

Tuesday, Nov. 28/Dec. 8

At anchor, Cape Cod harbor. Cold. Master Jones and exploring party absent on shore with long-boat and colonists' shallop. The latter, which beached near ship yesterday in a strong wind and harbored there last night, got under way this morning and sailed up the harbor, following the course taken by the long-boat yesterday, the wind favoring. Six inches of snow fell

yesterday and last night. Crew at work clearing snow from ship.

Page 168

Wednesday, Nov. 29/Dec. 9

At anchor, Cape Cod harbor. Cold. Foul weather threatening. Master Jones with sixteen men in the long-boat and shallop came aboard towards night (eighteen men remaining ashore), bringing also about ten bushels of Indian corn which had been found buried. The Master reports a long march, the exploration of two creeks, great numbers of wild fowl, the finding of much corn and beans,' *etc*.

[This seems to be the first mention of beans (in early Pilgrim literature) as indigenous (presumably) to New England. They have held an important place in her dietary ever since.]

Thursday, Nov. 30/Dec. 10

At anchor in harbor. Sent shallop to head of harbor with mattocks and spades, as desired by those ashore, the seamen taking their muskets also. The shallop came alongside at nightfall with the rest of the explorers—the tide being out—bringing a lot of Indian things, baskets, pottery, wicker-ware, *etc*., discovered in two graves and sundry Indian houses they found after the Master left them. They report ground frozen a foot deep.

Friday, Dec. 1/11

At anchor, Cape Cod harbor. Carpenter finishing work on shallop. Colonists discussing locations visited, as places for settlement.

Saturday, Dec. 2/12

At anchor in harbor. Much discussion among colonists as to settlement, the Master insisting on a speedy determination. Whales playing about the ship in considerable numbers. One lying within half a musket-shot of the ship, two of the Planters shot at her, but the musket of the one who gave fire first blew in pieces both

stock and barrel, yet no one was hurt.
Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Dec. 3/13

At anchor in Cape Cod harbor. The fourth Sunday here. Scarce any of those aboard free from vehement coughs, some very ill. Weather very variable.

Page 169

Monday, Dec. 4/14

At anchor in Cape Cod harbor. Carpenter completing repairs on shallop. Much discussion of plans for settlement. The Master urging that the Planters should explore with their shallop at some distance, declining in such season to stir from the present anchorage till a safe harbor is discovered by them where they would be and he might go without danger. This day died Edward Thompson, a servant of Master William White, the first to die aboard the ship since she anchored in the harbor. Burying-party sent ashore after services to bury him.

Tuesday, Dec. 5/15

At anchor in harbor. Francis Billington, a young son of one of the passengers, put the ship and all in great jeopardy, by shooting off a fowling-piece in his father's cabin between decks where there was a small barrel of powder open, and many people about the fire close by. None hurt. Weather cold and foul.

Wednesday, Dec. 6/16

At anchor in harbor. Very cold, bad weather. This day died Jasper More, a lad bound to Governor Carver. The second death in the harbor. The third exploring party got away from the ship in the afternoon in the shallop, intent on finding a harbor recommended by the second mate, Robert Coppin, who had visited it. Captain Standish in command, with whom were Governor Carver, Masters Bradford, Winslow, John Tilley and Edward Tilley, Warren and Hopkins, John Howland, Edward Dotey, and two of the colonists' seamen, Alderton and English, and of the ship's company, the mates Clarke and Coppin, the master-gunner and three sailors, eighteen in all. The shallop was a long time getting clear of

the point, having to row, but at last got up her sails and out of the harbor. Sent burying-party ashore with body of little More boy, after services aboard.

Page 170

Thursday, Dec. 7/17

At anchor in Cape Cod harbor. This day Mistress Dorothy Bradford, wife of Master Bradford, who is away with the exploring party to the westward, fell over board and was drowned.

Friday, Dec. 8/18

At anchor in harbor. A strong south-east gale with heavy rain, turning to snow and growing cold toward night, as it cleared. This day Master James Chilton died aboard the ship. The third passenger, and first head of a family; to die in this harbor.

Saturday, Dec. 9/19

At anchor in harbor. Burying-party sent ashore after services aboard, to bury Chilton. Fetched wood and water.

[The death of Chilton was the first of the head of a family, and it may readily be imagined that the burial was an especially affecting scene, especially as following so closely upon the tragic death of Mrs. Bradford (for whom no funeral or burial arrangements are mentioned?? D.W.)]

Sunday, Dec. 10/20

At anchor in Cape Cod harbor. The fifth Sunday in this harbor. The exploring party still absent. Four deaths one by drowning; very severe weather; the ship's narrow escape from being blown up; and the absence of so many of the principal men, have made it a hard, gloomy week.

Monday, Dec. 11/21

At anchor in harbor. Clear weather.

Tuesday, Dec. 12/22

At anchor in harbor. Exploration party still absent.

Wednesday, Dec. 13/23

At anchor in harbor. Exploration party returned to ship, where much sad

intelligence met them (especially Master Bradford), as to his wife's drowning. The exploring party report finding a considerable Indian burying-place; several Indian houses; a fierce attack on them by Indians on Friday morning, but without harm; a severe gale on the same afternoon, in

Page 171

which their rudder-hinges broke, their
mast was split in three pieces, their sail
fell over board in a heavy sea, and they
were like to have been cast away in making
a harbor which Master Coppin thought he
knew, but was deceived about. They landed
on an island at the mouth of the harbor,
which they named for Master Clarke, the
first mate, and spent Saturday and Sunday
there, and on Monday examined the harbor
they found, and are agreed that it is the
place for settlement. Much satisfaction
with the report among the colonists.

Thursday, Dec. 14/24
At anchor, Cape Cod harbor. The colonists
have determined to make settlement at the
harbor they visited, and which is
apparently, by Captain John Smith's chart
of 1616, no other than the place he calls
"Plimoth" thereon. Fetched wood and water.

Friday, Dec. 15/25
Weighed anchor to go to the place the
exploring party discovered. Course west,
after leaving harbor. Shallop in company.
Coming within two leagues, the wind coming
northwest, could not fetch the harbor, and
was faine to put round again towards Cape
Cod. Made old anchorage at night. The
thirty-fifth night have lain at anchor
here. Shallop returned with ship.

Saturday, Dec. 16/26
Comes in with fair wind for Plymouth.
Weighed anchor and put to sea again and made
harbor safely. Shallop in company. Within
half an hour of anchoring the wind changed,
so if letted [hindered] but a little had
gone back to Cape Cod. A fine harbor.
Let go anchors just within a long spur of
beach a mile or more from shore. The end of

the outward voyage; one hundred and two days from Plymouth (England to Plymouth New England). One hundred and fifty-five days from London.

Page 172

The ships journal while she lay in Plymouth harbor

Sunday, Dec. 17/27

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. Services on ship. This harbor is a bay greater than Cape Cod, compassed with goodly land. It is in fashion like a sickle or fish-hook.

Monday, Dec. 18/28

At anchor, Plymouth harbor: The Master of the ship, with three or four of the sailors and several of the Planters, went aland and marched along the coast several miles. Made careful examination of locality. Found many brooks of fine water, abundant wood, *etc*. The party came aboard at night weary with marching.

Tuesday, Dec. 19/29

At anchor, Plymouth harbor. A party from the ship went ashore to discover, some going by land and some keeping to the shallop. A creek was found leading up within the land and followed up three English miles, a very pleasant river at full sea. It was given the name of "Jones River" in compliment to the Master of the ship. A bark of thirty tons may go up at high tide, but the shallop could scarcely pass at low water. All came aboard at night with resolution to fix, to-morrow, which of the several places examined they would settle upon.

Wednesday, Dec. 20/30

At anchor, Plymouth harbor, many ill. Dec. After service the colonists decided to go ashore this morning and determine upon one of two places which were thought most fitting for their habitation. So a considerable party went ashore and left twenty of their number there to make a rendezvous, the rest coming on board at

night. They reported that they had chosen by the most voices the site first looked at by the largest brook, near where they landed on the 11th on a large rock [Plymouth Rock].

Page 173

[The “Rock” seems to have become the established landing place of the Pilgrims, from the time of the first visit of the third exploring party on December 11/21. The absurdity of the claims of the partisans of Mary Chilton, in the foolish contention which existed for many years as to whether she or John Alden was the first person to set foot upon the “Rock,” is shown by the fact that, of course, no women were with the third exploring party which first landed there, while it is also certain that Alden was not of that exploring party. That Mary Chilton may have been the first woman to land at Cape Cod harbor is entirely possible, as it is that she or John Alden may have been the first person to land on the “Rock” after the ship arrived in Plymouth harbor. It was a vexatious travesty upon history (though perpetuated by parties who ought to have been correct) that the Association for building the Pilgrim Monument at Plymouth should issue a pamphlet giving a picture of the “Landing of the Pilgrims, December 21, 1620,” in which women are pictured, and in which the shallop is shown with a large fore-and-aft mainsail, while on the same page is another picture entitled, “The Shallop of the *may-Flower*,” having a large yard and square-sail, and a “Cuddy” (which last the *may*-FLOWER’S shallop we know did not have). The printed description of the picture, however, says: “The cut is copied from a picture by Van der Veldt, a Dutch painter of the seventeenth century, representing a shallop,” *etc*. It is matter of regret to find that a book like Colonel T. W. Higginson’s ‘Book of American Explorers’, intended for a text-book, and bearing the imprint of a house like Longmans, Green & Co. should actually print a “cut” showing Mary Chilton landing from a boat full of men (in which she is the only woman) upon a rock, presumably Plymouth Rock.]

Thursday, Dec. 21/31

At anchor, Plymouth harbor. Wet and stormy, so the Planters could not go ashore as planned, having blown hard and rained extremely all night. Very uncomfortable for the party on shore. So tempestuous that the shallop could not go to land as soon as was meet, for they had no victuals on land. About eleven o’clock the shallop went off with much ado with provision, but could not return, it blew so strong. Such foul weather forced to ride with three anchors ahead. This day Richard Britteridge, one of the colonists, died aboard the ship, the first to die in this harbor.

Page 174

Friday, Dec. 22/Jan. 1

At anchor, Plymouth harbor. The storm continues, so that no one could go ashore, or those on land come aboard. This morning goodwife Allerton was delivered of a son, but dead-born. The third child born on board the ship since leaving England,—the first in this harbor.

Saturday, Dec. 23/Jan. 2

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. Sent body of Britteridge ashore for burial, the storm having prevented going before, and also a large party of colonists to fell timber, *etc*. Left a large number on shore at the rendezvous. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Dec. 24/Jan. 3

At anchor, Plymouth harbor. Second Sunday here. This day died Solomon Prower, one of the family of Master Martin, the treasurer of the colonists, being the sixth death this month, and the second in this harbor. A burying-party went ashore with Prower's body, after services aboard.

Monday, Dec. 25/Jan. 4

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. Christmas Day, but not observed by these colonists, they being opposed to all saints' days, *etc*. The men on shore Sunday reported that they "heard a cry of some savages," as they thought, that day. A large party went ashore this morning to fell timber and begin building. They began to erect the first house about twenty feet square for their common use, to receive them and their goods. Another alarm as of Indians this day. All but twenty of the Planters came aboard at night, leaving the rest to keep court of guard. The colonists began to drink water, but at night the Master caused them to have some beer.

Tuesday, Dec. 26/Jan. 5

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. A violent storm of wind and rain. The weather so foul this morning that none could go ashore.

Page 175

Wednesday, Dec. 27/Jan. 6

At anchor in harbor. Sent working party ashore. All but the guard came aboard at night.

Thursday, Dec. 28/Jan. 7

At anchor. All able went ashore this morning to work on a platform for ordnance on the hill back of the settlement, commanding the harbor. The Planters this day laid out their town-site and allotted ground to the several families. Many of the colonists ill from exposure. All but the guard came off to the ship at night.

Friday, Dec. 29/Jan. 8

At anchor in harbor. No working-party went aland. The Planters fitting tools, *etc*., for their work. The weather wet and cold.

Saturday, Dec. 30/Jan. 9

At anchor in harbor. Very stormy and cold. No working-party sent aland. The Planters fitting tools, *etc*. Great smokes of fires visible from the ship, six or seven miles away, probably made by Indians.

Sunday, Dec. 31/Jan. 10

At anchor in harbor. The third Sunday in this harbor. Sailors given leave to go ashore. Many colonists ill.

Monday, Jan. 1/Jan. 11

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. This day Degory Priest, one of the colonists, died aboard the ship. A large party went ashore early to work. Much time lost between ship and shore, the ship drawing so much water as obliged to anchor a mile and a half off. The working-party came aboard at nightfall. Fetched wood and water.

Tuesday, Jan. 2/Jan. 12

At anchor in harbor. Sent burying-party

ashore with Priest's body. Weather good. Working-party aland and returned to ship at night.

Wednesday, Jan. 3/Jan. 13

At anchor in harbor. Working-party aland, returned at night. They report seeing great fires of the Indians. Smoke seen from the ship. Have seen no savages since arrival.

Page 176

Thursday, Jan. 4/Jan. 14

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. Captain Standish, with four or five men, went to look for savages, and though they found some of their old houses "wigwams" could not meet with any of them.

Friday, Jan. 5/Jan. 15

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. Working-party went aland early. One of the sailors found a live herring upon the shore, which the Master had to his supper. As yet have caught but one cod.

Saturday, Jan. 6/Jan. 16

At anchor in harbor. In judgment of Masters Brewster, Bradford, and others, Master Martin, the colonists' treasurer, was so hopelessly ill that Governor Carver, who had taken up his quarters on land, was sent for to come aboard to speak with him about his accounts. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Jan. 7/Jan. 17

At anchor in harbor. Fourth Sunday here. Governor Carver came aboard to talk with Master Martin, who was sinking fast.

Monday, Jan. 8/Jan. 18

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. A very fan fair day. The working-party went aland early. The Master sent, the shallop for fish. They had a great tempest at sea and were in some danger. They returned to the ship at night, with three great seals they had shot, and an excellent great cod. Master Martin died this day. He had been a "governour" of the passengers on the ship, and an "assistant," and was an Adventurer. One of the Master-mates took a musket, and went with young Francis Billington to find the great inland sea the latter had seen from the top of a tree, and found a great

water, in two great lakes [Billington Sea,]
also Indian houses.

Page 177

Tuesday, Jan. 9/Jan. 19

At anchor in harbor. Fair day. Sent burying-party ashore after services aboard, with the body of Master Martin, and he was buried with some ceremony on the hill near the landing-place. The settlers drew lots for their meersteads and garden-plots. The common-house nearly finished, wanting only covering.

Wednesday, Jan. 10/Jan. 20

At anchor in harbor. Party went aland from ship. Frosty.

Thursday, Jan. 11/Jan. 21

At anchor in harbor. A fair day. Party ashore from ship and coming off at night, reported Master William Bradford very ill: Many ill aboard.

Friday, Jan. 12/Jan. 22

At anchor in harbor. Began to rain at noon and stopped all work. Those coming aboard ship at night reported John Goodman and Peter Browne, two of the colonists, missing, and fears entertained that they may have been taken by Indians. Froze and snowed at night. The first snow for a month. An extremely cold night.

Saturday, Jan. 13/Jan. 23

At anchor in harbor. The Governor sent out an armed party of ten or twelve to look for the missing men, but they returned without seeing or hearing anything at all of them. Those on shipboard much grieved, as deeming them lost. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Jan. 14/Jan. 24

At anchor in harbor. About six o'clock in the morning, the wind being very great, the watch on deck spied the great new rendezvous on shore on fire and feared it fired by Indians, but the tide being out,

men could not get ashore for three quarters of an hour, when they went armed. At the landing they heard that the lost men were returned, some frost-bitten, and that the thatch

Page 178

of the common-house only was burnt
by a spark, but no other harm done the roof. The most loss was Governor Carver's and Master Bradford's, both of whom lay sick in bed, and narrowly missed being blown up with powder. The meeting was to have been kept ashore to-day, the greater number of the people now being there, but the fire, *etc*., prevented. Some of those sick in the common-house were fain to return aboard for shelter. Fifth Sunday in this harbor.

Monday, Jan. 15/Jan. 25
At anchor in Plymouth harbor. Rained much all day. They on shipboard could not go ashore nor they on shore do any labor, but were all wet.

Tuesday, Jan. 16/Jan. 26
At anchorage. A fine, sunshining day like April. Party went aland betimes. Many ill both on ship and on shore.

Wednesday, Jan. 17/Jan. 27
At anchorage. Another fine, sunshining day. Working-party went aland early. Set on shore some of the Planters' goods.

[Mourt's Relation, Dexter's ed. p. 77. Bradford states (op. cit. Mass. ed. p. 110) that they were hindered in getting goods ashore by "want of boats," as well as sickness. Mention is made only of the "long-boat" and shallop. It is possible there were no others, except the Master's skiff]

Thursday, Jan. 18/Jan. 28
At anchorage. Another fine, bright day. Some of the common goods [i.e. belonging to all] set on shore.

Friday, Jan. 19/Jan. 29
At anchorage. A shed was begun on shore to

receive the goods from the ship. Rained at
noon but cleared toward night.

[Cleared toward evening (though wet at noon), and John Goodman went out to try his frozen feet, as is recorded, and had his encounter with wolves.]

Saturday, Jan. 20/Jan. 30

At anchorage. Shed made ready for goods
from ship. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Jan. 21/Jan. 31

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. Sixth Sunday
in this harbor. Many ill. The Planters
kept their meeting on land to-day for the
first time, in the common-house.

Page 179

Monday, Jan. 22/Feb. 1

At anchorage. Fair day. Hogsheads of meal sent on shore from ship and put in storehouse.

Tuesday, Jan. 23/Feb. 2

At anchorage. The general sickness increases, both on shipboard and on land.

Wednesday, Jan. 24/Feb. 3

At anchor in harbor. Fair weather. Party on shore from ship and returned at night.

Thursday, Jan. 25/Feb. 4

At anchorage. Weather good. Party set ashore and came aboard at night.

Friday, Jan. 26/Feb. 5

At anchorage. Weather good. Party set ashore. The sickness increases.

Saturday, Jan. 27/Feb. 6

At anchorage. Weather fair. Good working weather all the week, but many sick. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Jan. 28/Feb. 7

At anchorage, Plymouth harbor. Seventh Sunday in this harbor. Meeting kept on shore. Those of Planters on board who were able, and some of the ship's company, went ashore, and came off after service.

Monday, Jan. 29/Feb. 8

At anchor, Plymouth harbor. Morning cold, with frost and sleet, but after reason ably fair. Both long-boat and shallop carrying Planters' goods on shore. Those returning reported that Mistress Rose Standish, wife of Captain Standish, died to-day.

Tuesday, Jan. 30/Feb. 9

At anchorage. Cold, frosty weather, so no working-party went on shore from ship. The

Master and others of the ship's company saw two savages that had been on the island near the ship [Clarke's Island]. They were gone so far back again before they were discovered that could not speak with them. The first natives actually seen since the encounter on the Cape.

Wednesday, Jan. 31/Feb. 10

At anchor in harbor. Still cold and frosty, with sleet. No party went on shore. Eight of the colonists have died this month on the ship and on shore.

Page 180

Thursday, Feb. 1/Feb. 11
At anchor in harbor. Weather better, and some of those on board the ship went on shore to work, but many ill.

Friday, Feb. 2/Feb. 12
At anchorage. The same.

Saturday, Feb. 3/13
At anchorage. Weather threatening. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Feb. 4/14
At anchor, Plymouth harbor. The eighth Sunday in this harbor, and now inexpedient to think of getting away, till both Planters and crew in better condition as to health.

[Bradford, Historie, p. 92; Young, Chronicler, p. 198. Bradford says (op. cit. Mass. ed, pp. 120, 121): “The reason on their parts why she stayed so long was ye necessitie and danger that lay upon them, for it was well toward ye ende of December before she could land anything here, or they able to receive anything ashore. After wards, ye 14 of January the house which they had made for a general randevoze by casulty fell afire, and some were faine to retire aboard for shelter. Then the sickness begane to fall sore amongst them, and ye weather so bad as they could not make much sooner dispatch. Againe, the Governor & chiefe of them seeing so many dye, and fall down sick dayly, thought it no wisdom to send away the ship, their condition considered, and the danger they stood in from ye Indians, till they could procure some shelter; and therefore thought it better to draw some more charge upon themselves & friends ["demurrage?”] than hazard all. The Mr. and sea-men likewise; though before they hasted ye passengers a shore to be goone [gone], now many of their men being dead, and of ye ablest of them [as is before noted, and of ye rest many lay sick & weake, ye Mr, durst not put to sea till he saw his men begine to recover, and ye hart of winter over."]]A very rainy day with the heaviest gusts of wind yet experienced. The ship in some danger of oversetting, being light and unballasted.

Monday, Feb. 5/15
At anchor in harbor. Clearing weather.

Tuesday, Feb. 6/16
At anchor in harbor. Cold and clear.

Wednesday, Feb. 7/17
At anchor in harbor. Much colder.

Thursday, Feb. 8/18

At anchorage. Hard, cold weather.

Page 181

Friday, Feb. 9/19

At anchorage. Cold weather continues. Little work possible. The little house for the sick people on shore took fire this afternoon, by a spark that kindled in the roof. No great harm done. The Master going ashore, killed five geese, which he distributed among the sick people. He also found a good deer the savages had killed, having also cut off his horns. A wolf was eating him. Cannot conceive how he came there.

Saturday, Feb. 10/20

At anchor in harbor. Getting goods on shore, but sickness makes both Planters and crew shorthanded. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Feb. 11/21

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. Ninth Sunday in this harbor.

Monday, Feb. 12/22

At anchorage. Getting goods on shore.

Tuesday, Feb. 13/23

At anchorage. Rainy.

Wednesday, Feb. 14/24

At anchorage. More sickness on ship and on shore than at any time, and more deaths. Rainy, clearing.

[The sickness and mortality had rapidly increased and was now at its height]

Thursday, Feb. 15/25

At anchorage. Northerly wind and frost.

Friday, Feb. 16/26

At anchorage. Northerly wind continues, which continues the frost. Those from shore reported that one of the Planters, being out fowling and hidden in the reeds,

about a mile and a half from the settlement, saw twelve Indians marching toward the plantation and heard many more. He hurried home with all speed and gave the alarm, so all the people in the woods at work returned and armed themselves, but saw nothing of the Indians. Captain Standish's and Francis Cooke's tools also stolen by Indians in woods. A great fire toward night seen from the ship, about where the Indians were discovered.

Page 182

Saturday, Feb. 17/27

At anchorage. All the colonists on the ship able to go on shore went this morning to attend the meeting for the establishment of military orders among them. They chose Captain Standish their captain, and gave him authority of command in affairs. Two savages appeared on the hill, a quarter of a mile from the plantation, while the Planters were consulting, and made signs for Planters to come to them. All armed and stood ready, and sent two towards them, Captain Standish and Master Hopkins, but the natives would not tarry. It was determined to plant the great ordnance in convenient places at once. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Feb. 18/28

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. The Feb. tenth Sunday in this harbor. Many sick, both on board the ship and on shore.

Monday, Feb. 19/Mar. 1

At anchorage. Got one of the great guns on shore with the help of some of the Planters.

Tuesday, Feb. 20/Mar. 2

At anchorage. Getting cannon ashore and mounted.

Wednesday, Feb. 21/Mar. 3

At anchorage. The Master, with many of the sailors, went on shore, taking one of the great pieces called a minion, and with the Planters drew it up the hill, with another piece that lay on the shore, and mounted them and a saller and two bases—five guns—on the platform made for them. A hard day's work. The Master took on shore with him a very fat goose he had shot, to which the Planters added a fat crane, a mallard, and a dried neat's tongue (ox tongue), and

Planters and crew feasted together. When the Master went on shore, he sent off the Governor to take the directions of Master Mullens

Page 183

as to his property, as he was lying
near to death,—as also Master White. Master Mullens dictated his will to the Governor, which he noted down, and Giles Heale, the chirurgeon, and Christopher Joanes, of the crew, witnessed, they being left aboard to care for the sick, keep the ship, *etc*. Master Mullens and Master White both died this day. Two others also died. Got the men aboard about nightfall.

Thursday, Feb. 22/Mar. 4
At anchorage. Large burial-party went ashore with bodies of Masters Mullens and White, and joined with those on shore made the chief burial thus far had. The service on shore, the most of the people being there, Master Mullens being one of the chief subscribing Adventurers, as well as one of the chief men of the Planters, as was Master White. Their deaths much deplored.

Friday, Feb. 23/Mar. 5
At anchorage. Party from the ship went on shore to help finish work on the ordnance.

Saturday, Feb. 24/Mar. 6
At anchorage. Same. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Feb. 25/Mar. 7
At anchorage in Plymouth harbor. Eleventh Sunday in this harbor. Mistress Mary Allerton, wife of Master Isaac Allerton, one of the chief men of the colonists, died on board this day, not having mended well since the birth of her child, dead-born about two months agone.

Monday, Feb. 26/Mar. 8
At anchor in harbor. Burying-party went

ashore to bury Mistress Allerton, services being held there.

Tuesday, Feb. 27/Mar. 9

At anchorage. The sickness and deaths of the colonists on shore have steadily increased, and have extended to the ship, which has lost several of its petty officers, including the master gunner, three quarter-masters, and cook, and a third of the crew, many from scurvy.

Page 184

[There can be no doubt that both planters and ship's crew suffered severely from scurvy. The conditions all favored it, the sailors were familiar with it, and would not be likely to be mistaken in their recognition of it, and Dr. Fuller, their competent physician, would not be likely to err in his diagnosis of it. Tuberculosis was its very natural associate.]

Wednesday, Feb. 28/Mar. 10

At anchorage. The last day of the month. The fifty-third day the ship has lain in this harbor, and from the present rate of sickness and death aboard, no present capacity or prospect of getting away, those better being yet weak. The Planters have lost seventeen this month, their largest mortality.

Thursday, Mar. 1/11

At anchorage. Blustering but milder weather.

Friday, Mar. 2/12

At anchorage. Same.

Saturday, Mar. 3/13

At anchorage. Wind south. Morning misty [foggy]. Towards noon warm and fine weather. At one o'clock it thundered. The first heard. It rained sadly from two o'clock till midnight. Fetched wood and water.

Sunday, Mar. 4/14

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. The twelfth Sunday in this harbor. Cooler. Clear weather.

Monday, Mar. 5/15

At anchorage. Rough weather.

Tuesday, Mar. 6/16

At anchorage. Same.

Wednesday, Mar. 7/17

At anchor in harbor. Wind full east, cold but fair. The Governor went this day with a party of five, to the great ponds, discovered by one of the ship's mates and Francis Billington. Some planting done in the settlement.

Thursday, Mar. 8/18

At anchor in harbor. Rough easterly weather.

Friday, Mar. 9/19

At anchorage. Same. Many sick aboard.

Saturday, Mar. 10/20

At anchorage. Same. Fetched wood and water.

Page 185

Sunday, Mar. 11/21

At anchorage, Plymouth harbor. The thirteenth Sunday the ship has lain in this harbor. Many of crew yet ill, including boatswain.

Monday, Mar. 12/22

At anchorage. Easterly weather.

Tuesday, Mar. 13/23

At anchorage. The sickness and mortality on ship and on shore continue.

Wednesday, Mar. 14/24

At anchorage. Same.

Thursday, Mar. 15/25

At anchorage. Same.

Friday, Mar. 16/26

At anchorage. A fair, warm day, towards noon. The Master and others went ashore to the general meeting. The plantation was startled this morning by a visit from an Indian who spoke some English and bade "Welcome." He is from Monhiggon, an island to the eastward some days' sail, near where Sir Ferdinando Gorges had a settlement. He was friendly, and having had much intercourse with Englishmen who came to fish in those parts, very comfortable with them. He saw the ship in the harbor from a distance and supposed her to be a fishing vessel. He told the Governor that the plantation was formerly called "Patuxet" [or Apaum], and that all its inhabitants had been carried off by a plague about four years ago. All the afternoon was spent in communication with him. The Governor purposed sending him aboard the ship at night, and he was well content to go and went aboard the shallop to come to the ship, but the wind was high and water scant [low], so that the shallop could not go to

the ship. The Governor sent him to Master Hopkins's house and set a watch over him.

Saturday, Mar. 17/27

At anchor in harbor. The Master and others came off to the ship. Samoset the Indian went away back to the Massasoits whence he came. A reasonably fair day. Fetched wood and water.

Page 186

Sunday, Mar. 18/28

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. The fourteenth Sunday the ship has lain at this anchorage. A fair day. The sickness stayed a little. Many went on shore to the meeting in the common-house. Samoset the savage came again, and brought five others with him.

[This Sunday visit was doubtless very much to the dislike of the good brethren, or at least of the leaders, but policy dictated every possible forbearance. Their consciences drew the line at trade, however, and they got rid of their untimely visitors as soon as possible without giving offense. Massasoit's men seem to have shown, by leaving their peltry with them, a confidence in their new white neighbors that is remarkable in view of the brevity of their friendship.]They left their bows and arrows a quarter of a mile from the town, as instructed. The Planters gave them entertainment, but would not truck with them.

["Truck—to trade." All early and modern lexicographers give the word, which, though now obsolete, was in common use in parts of New England fifty years ago.]

They sang and danced after their manner, and made semblance of amity and friendship. They drank tobacco and carried pounded corn to eat. Their faces were painted. They brought a few skins which they left with the Planters, and returned the tools which Captain Standish and Francis Cooke left in the woods. The Planters dismissed them with a few trifles as soon as they could, it being Sunday, and they promised soon to return and trade. Samoset would not go with them, feigning sick, and stayed. Those on shore from the ship came off to her at night.

Monday, Mar. 19/29

At anchorage. A fair day. The Planters digging and sowing seeds.

Tuesday, Mar. 20/30

At anchorage. A fine day. Digging and planting of gardens on shore. Those sick of the crew mending.

Wednesday, Mar. 21/31

At anchorage. A fine warm day. Beginning to put ship in trim for return voyage. Bringing ballast, *etc*. Some, including the Masters-mates, went on shore, who on

return reported that the Planters sent the Indian Samoset away. A general meeting of the Planters was held at the common-house,

Page 187

to conclude laws and orders, and to confirm the military orders formerly proposed, and twice broken off by the savages coming, as happened again. After the meeting had held an hour or so, two or three savages appeared on the hill over against the town, and made semblance of daring the Planters. Captain Standish and another, with their muskets, went over to them, with the two Masters-mates of the ship, who were ashore, also armed with muskets. The savages made show of defiance, but as our men drew near they ran away. This day the carpenter, who has long been ill of scurvy, fitted the shallop to carry all the goods and furniture aboard the ship, on shore.

Thursday, Mar. 22/Apr. 1

At anchorage. A very fair, warm day. At work on ship getting ready for sea, bringing ballast aboard, *etc*. Another general meeting of the Planters which all able attended. They had scarce been an hour together when Samoset the Indian came again with one Squanto, the only native of Patuxet (where the Planters now inhabit) surviving, who was one of the twenty captives carried away from this place by Captain Hunt, to England. He could speak a little English. They brought three other Indians with them. They signified that their great Sagamore, Masasoyt, was hard by, with Quadequina his brother, and all their men. They could not well express what they would in English, but after an hour the king came to the top of the hill, over against the plantation, with his train of about sixty men. Squanto went to him and brought a message that one should be sent to parley with him, and Master Edward Winslow went, to know hisnmind, and

signify the wish of the Governor to have trading and peace with him, the Governor sending presents to the king and his brother, with something to eat and drink.

Page 188

[Edward Winslow gives us here another proof of that rare self-sacrifice, that entire devotion to his work, and that splendid intrepidity which so signally characterized his whole career. At this most critical moment, the fate of the little colony trembling in the balance, when there was evident fear of treachery and surprise on the part of both the English and the savages; though the wife of his youth lay at the point of death (which came but two days later), and his heart was heavy with grief; forgetting all but the welfare of his little band of brethren, he goes forward alone, his life in his hand, to meet the great sachem surrounded by his whole tribe, as the calm, adroit diplomatist, upon whom all must depend; and as the fearless hostage, to put himself in pawn for the savage chief.]The king, leaving Master Winslow with brother, came over the brook, with some twenty of his men, leaving their bows and arrows behind them, and giving some six or seven of their men as hostages for Master Winslow. Captain Standish, with Master Williamson, the ship's-merchant, as interpreter,[It would seem from the frequent mention of the presence of some of the ship's company, Master Jones, the "Masters-mates," and now the "ship's-merchant," that the ship was daily well represented in the little settlement on shore. The presence of Master Williamson on this occasion is perhaps readily accounted for. Every other meeting with the Indians had been unexpected, the present one was anticipated, and somewhat eagerly, for upon its successful issue almost everything depended. By this time Standish had probably become aware that Tisquantum's command of English was very limited, and he desired all the aid the ship's interpreter could give. By some means, the sachem and the colonists succeeded in establishing on this day a very good and lasting understanding.]

> and a guard of half a dozen musketeers, met
> the king at the brook,

[The guard was probably made thus small to leave the body of the colonists as strong a reserve force as possible to meet any surprise attack on the part of the Indians. Colonel Higginson, in his Book of American Explorers, gives a cut of this meeting of Massasoit and his pineses with Standish and his guard of honor, but it is defective in that the guard seems to have advanced to the hill ("Strawberry," or later "Watson's") to meet the sachem, instead of only to "the brook;" and more especially in that there are but two officers with the "six musketeers," where there ought to be three, *viz*. Standish, in command, Edward Window, as the envoy and hostage (in full armor), and "Mr. Williamson," the ship's-merchant or purser, as interpreter, perhaps acting as lieutenant of the guard. It is always matter of regret when books, especially text-books, written by authors of some repute, and published

Page 189

by reputable houses, fail, for want of only a little care in the study of the available history of events they pictorially represent, to make their pictures and the known facts correspond.]and they saluted each other, and the guard conducted the Sagamore to one of the new houses then building, where were placed a green rug and three or four cushions. Then came the Governor with drum and trumpet, and a guard of musketeers, and they drank to each other in some strong waters, and the Governor gave the king and his followers meat, and they made a treaty in King James's name, and drank tobacco together. His face was painted a sad red, and his head and face were oiled, which made him look greasy. All his followers were more or less painted. So after all was done, the Governor conducted him to the brook, and his brother came, and was also feasted, and then conveyed him to the brook, and Master Winslow returned. Samoset and Squanto stayed in the town and the Indians stayed all night in the woods half a mile away. The last of the colonists on board the ship went ashore to remain to-day.

Friday, Mar. 23/Apr. 2

At anchor. A fair day. Some of the ship's company went on shore. Some of the Indians came again, and Captain Standish and Master Allerton went to see the king, and were welcomed by him. This morning the Indians stayed till ten or eleven of the clock, and the Governor, sending for the king's kettle, filled it with pease, and they went their way? Making ready for sea, getting ballast, wood, and water from the shore, *etc*. The Planters held a meeting and concluded both of military orders and some laws, and chose as Governor, for the coming year, Master John Carver, who was "governor" on the ship.

Saturday, Mar. 24/April 3

At anchorage. The ship's company busy with preparations for the return voyage, bringing ballast, wood, and water from the shore, *etc*., the ship having no lading for the return. This day died, on shore, Mistress Elizabeth Winslow, wife of Master Winslow. Many still sick. More on the ship than on shore.

Sunday, Mar. 25/April 4

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. The fifteenth Sunday in this port. Many of the crew dead and some still sick, but the sickness and mortality lessening.

Page 190

Monday, Mar. 26/April 5

At anchor. Bringing ballast from shore and getting ship in trim.

Tuesday, Mar. 27/April 6

At anchorage. Getting ballast, overhauling rigging, getting wood, water, *etc*., from shore.

Wednesday, Mar. 28/April 7

At anchorage. Same.

Thursday, Mar. 29/April 8

At anchorage. The Master offered to take back any of the colonists who wished to return to England, but none desired to go. Getting in stores and ballast.

Friday, Mar. 30/April 9

At anchorage. Hastening all preparations for sailing. Getting ballast, *etc*. Water butts filled.

Saturday, Mar. 31/April 10

At anchorage. Setting up rigging, bending light sails, *etc*. Getting ballast and wood from the beach and island. The colonists have lost thirteen by death the past month, making in all half of their number.

Sunday, April 1/11

At anchor in Plymouth harbor. The sixteenth Sunday the ship has lain at anchor here, and to be the last, being nearly ready to sail. Most of the crew ashore on liberty. In the sixteen weeks the ship has lain here, half of her crew (but none of her officers) have died, and a few are still weak. Among the petty officers who have died have been the master gunner, boatswain, and three quartermasters, beside the cook, and more than a third of the sailors. A bad voyage for the owner, Adventurers, ship, and crew.

Monday, April 2/12

Still at anchor, but making last preparations for voyage. Ship's officers made farewells on shore. Governor Carver copied out, and Giles Heale and Chris. Jones witnessed, Master Mullens's will, to go to England.

Page 191

Tuesday, April 3/13

Still at anchorage, but (near) ready to
sail with a fair wind. Master Williamson,
the ship's-merchant [purser], appointed by
Master Mullens an overseer of his will,
takes copy of same to England for probate,
with many letters, keepsakes, *etc*., *etc*.,
to Adventurers and friends. Very little
lading, chiefly skins and roots. Make
adieus to Governor Carver and company.

Wednesday, April 4/14

Still at anchor in Plymouth harbor. Sails
loosened and all ready for departure except
Governor's letters. Last visits of shore
people to ship. Sail with morning tide, if
wind serves. One hundred and ten days in
this harbor.

Thursday, April 5/15

Got anchors, and with fair wind got
underway at full tide. Many to bid adieu.
Set colors and gave Planters a parting
salute with the ensign and ordnance.
Cleared the harbor without hindrance, and
laid general course E.S.E. for England
with a fine wind. Took departure from Cape
Cod early in the day, shook off the land
and got ship to rights before night. All
sails set and the ship logging her best.

And so the *may-Flower* began her speedy, uneventful, homeward run, of but thirty-one days, arriving in England May 6, 1621, having been absent, on her "round voyage," from her sailing port, two hundred and ninety-six days.

Theend of the voyage
and of this
journal

Author's note. Of the "Log" Of the *may-Flower*, the author is able to repeat the assurance given as to the brief Journal of the *Speedwell*, and is able to say, in the happy phrase of Griffis, "I have tried to state only recorded facts, or to give expression to well grounded inferences."

APPENDIX

In view of the natural wish of many of “restricted facilities,” to consult for themselves the full text of certain of the principal letters and documents which have imparted much of the most definite and valuable information concerning the Pilgrim movement, it has been thought well to include certain of them here verbatim, that they may be of ready availability to the reader. The list comprises copies of—

Page 192

I. The Agreement of the Merchant Adventurers and Planters;

II. The Letter of the Leyden Leaders to John Carver and Robert Cushman (at London), May 31/June 10, 1620;

III. The Letter of Robert Cushman to John Carver (then at Southampton), Saturday, June 10/20, 1620;

IV. The Letter of Robert Cushman to the Leyden Leaders, June 10/20, 1620;

V. The Letter of Robert Cushman to the Leyden Leaders, Sunday, June 11/21, 1620;

VI. The Letter of Rev. John Robinson to John Carver at London, June 14/24, 1620;

VII. The Letter of the Planters to the Merchant Adventurers from Southamp ton, August 3, 1620;

VIII. The Letter of Robert Cushman (from Dartmouth) to Edward Southworth, Thursday, August 17,1620;

IX. The *may-Flower* Compact;

X. The Nuncupative Will of Master William Mullens; and

XI. The Letter of “One of the Chiefe of ye Companie” (The Merchant Adventurers), dated at London, April 9, 1623—

Many other early original documents frequently referred to in this volume are of no less interest than those here given, but most of them have either had such publication as to be more generally known or accessible, or involve space and cost disproportionate to their value in this connection.

I
the agreement of the merchant adventurers and planters

Anno: 1620, July 1.

1. The adventurers & planters doe agree, that every person that goeth being aged 16. years & upward, be rated at 10li., and ten pounds to be accounted a single share.

2. That he goeth in person, and furnisheth him selfe out with 10li. either in money or other provisions, be accounted as haveing 20li. in stock, and in ye devission shall receive a double share.

3. The persons transported & ye adventurers shall continue their joynt stock & partnership togeather, ye space of 7 years, (excepte some unexpected impedimente doe cause ye whole company to agree otherwise,) during which time, all profits & benifits that are gott by trade, traffick, trucking, working, fishing, or any other means of any person or persons, remaine still in ye comone stock untill ye division.

4. That at their coming ther, they chose out such a number of fitt persons, as may furnish their ships and boats for fishing upon ye sea; imploying the rest of their severall faculties upon ye land; as building houses, tilling, and planting ye ground, & makeing shuch comodities as shall be most usefull for ye collonie.

5. That at ye end of ye 7 years, ye capitall & profits, *viz*. the houses, lands, goods and chatels, be equally devided betwixte ye adventurers, and planters; wch done, every man shall be free from other of them of any debt or detrimente concerning this adventure.

6. Whosoever cometh to ye colonie hereafter, or putteth any into ye stock, shall at the ende of ye 7. years be alowed proportionably to ye time of his so doing.

Page 193

7. He that shall carie his wife & children, or servants, shall be alowed for everie person now aged 16. years & upward, a single share in ye devision, or if he provid them necessaries, a duble share, or if they be between 10. year old and 16., then 2. of them to be reconed for a person, both in trasportation and devision.

8. That such children as now goe, & are under ye age of ten years, have noe other shar in ye devision, but 50. acers of unmanured land.

9. That such persons as die before ye 7. years be expired, their executors to have their parte or sharr at ye devision, proportionably to ye time of their life in ye collonie.

10. That all such persons as are of this collonie, are to have their meate, drink, apparell, and all provissions out of ye comon stock & goods of ye said collonie.

Governor Bradford adds:—

"The chief and principal differences betwene these & the former [original] conditions, stood in those 2. points; that ye houses, & lands improved, espetialy gardens & home lotts should remaine undevided wholy to ye planters at ye 7. years end. 2ly, yt they should have had 2. days in a weeke for their owne private imploymente, for ye more comforte of themselves and their families, espetialy such as had families."

[Apparently, as has been noted, neither these articles of agreement, nor their predecessors which received the approval of the Leyden leaders, were ever signed by the contracting parties, until Robert Cushman brought the later draft over in the *Fortune*, in 1621, and the planter body (advised thereto by Pastor Robinson, who had previously bitterly opposed) signed them. Much might be truly said on either side of this controversy—indeed was said at the time; but if the Pilgrims were to abandon their contention, whatever its merits, in a year's time, as they did, it would seemingly have been much better not to have begun it, for it undoubtedly cost them dear.]

II
letter of the Leyden leaders to John Carver and Robert Cushman, at London

May 31/June 10, 1620.

To their loving freinds John Carver and Robart Cushman, these, &c.

Good bretheren, after salutations, &c. We received diverse letters at ye coming of Mr. [Thomas] Nash & our pilott, which is a great incouragmente unto us, and for whom we hop after times will minister occasion of praising God; and indeed had you not sente him, many would have been ready to fainte and goe backe. Partly in respecte of ye new conditions which have bene taken up by you, which all men are against, and partly in regard of our owne inabillitie to doe any one of those many waightie bussineses you

referr to us here. For ye former wherof, wheras Robart Cushman desirs reasons for our dislike, promising therupon to alter ye same, or els saing we should thinke he hath no brains, we desire him to exercise them therin,

Page 194

refering him to our pastors former reasons, and them to ye censure of ye godly wise. But our desires are that you will not entangle your selvs and us in any such unreasonable courses as those are, *viz*. yt the marchants should have ye halfe of mens houses and lands at ye dividente; and that persons should be deprived of ye 2. days in a weeke agreed upon, yea every momente of time for their owne perticuler; by reason wherof we cannot conceive why any should carie servants for their own help and comfort; for that we can require no more of them than all men one of another. This we have only by relation from Mr. Nash, & not from any writing of your owne, & therfore hope you have not proceeded farr in so great a thing without us. But requiring you not to exseed the bounds of your comission, which was to proceed upon ye things or conditions agred upon and expressed in writing (at your going over it), we leave it, not without marveling, that your selfe, as you write, knowing how smale a thing troubleth our consultations, and how few, as you fear, understands the busnes aright, should trouble us with such matters as these are, &c. Salute Mr. Weston from us, in whom we hope we are not deceived; we pray you make known our estate unto him, and if you thinke good shew him our letters, at least tell him (yt under God) we much relie upon him & put our confidence in him; and, as your selves well know, that if he had not been an adventurer with us, we had not taken it in hand; presuming that if he had not seene means to accomplish it, he would not have begune it; so we hope in our extremitie he will so farr help us as our expectation be no way made frustrate concerning him. Since therfor, good brethren, we have plainly opened ye state of things with us in this matter, you will, &c. Thus beseeching ye Allmightie, who is allsufficiente to raise us out of this depth of difficulties, to assiste us herin; raising such means by his providence and fatherly care for us, his pore children & servants, as we may with comforte behould ye hand of our God for good towards us in this our bussines, which we undertake in his name & fear, we take leave & remaine

Your perplexed, yet hopful
bretheren,

June 10, New Stille Ano: 1620. *Samuel Fuller*, *Edward Winslow*,
William Bradford, *Isaac Allerton*.

III
the letter of Robert Cushman (*at London*), *to*
John Carver (*at Southampton*)

Saturday, June 10/20, 1620.

To his loving freind Mr. John Carver, these, &c.

Page 195

Loving freind, I have received from you some letters, full of affection & complaints, & what it is you would have of me I know not; for your crieing out, Negligence, negligence, negligence, I marvell why so negligente a man was used in ye bussines: Yet know you yt all that I have power to doe hear, shall not be one hower behind, I warent you. You have reference to Mr. Weston to help us with money, more then his adventure; wher he protesteth but for his promise, he would not have done any thing. He saith we take a heady course, and is offended yt our provissions are made so farr of; as also that he was not made aquainted with our quantitie of things; and saith yt in now being in 3. places, so farr remote, (i.e. Leyden, London, and Southampton) we will, with going up & downe, and wrangling & expostulating, pass over ye sourer before we will goe. And to speake ye trueth, they is fallen already amongst us a flatt schisme; and we are redier to goe to dispute, then to sett forwarde a vaiage. I have received from Leyden since you wente (to Southampton) 3. or 4. letters directed to you, though they only conscerne me. I will not trouble you with them. I always feared ye event of ye Amsterdamers (members of Rev. Henry Ainsworth's church there) striking in with us. I trow you must excomunicate me, or els you must goe without their companie, or we shall wante no quareling; but let them pass.

We have reckoned, it should seeme, without our host; and, count upon a 150. persons, ther cannot be founde above 1200li. & odd moneys of all ye venturs you can reckone, besids some cloath, stockings, & shoes, which are not counted; so we shall come shorte at least 3. or 400li. I would have had some thing shortened at first of beare (beer) & other provissions in hope of other adventurs, & now we could have, both in Amsterd & Kente, beere inough to serve our turne, but now we cannot accept it without prejudice. You fear we have begune to build & and shall not be able to make an end; indeed, our courses were never established by counsell, we may therfore justly fear their standing. Yea, then was a schisme amongst us 3. at ye first. You wrote to Mr. Martin, to prevente ye making of ye provissions in Kente, which he did, and sett downe his resolution how much he would have of every thing, without respecte to any counsell or exception. Surely he yt is in a societie & yet regards not counsell, may better be a king then a consorte. To be short, if then be not some other dispossition setled unto then yet is, we yt should be partners of humilitie and peace, shall be examples of jangling & insulting. Yet your money which you ther [Southampton] must have, we will get provided for you instantly. 500li. you say will serve; for ye rest which hear & in Holand is to be used, we may goe scratch for it. For Mr. Crabe, of whom you write, he hath promised to goe with us, yet I tell you I shall not be without feare till I see him shipped, for he [i.e. his going] is much opposed, yet I hope he will not faile. Thinke ye best of all, and bear with patience what is wanting, and ye Lord guid us all.

Your loving freind,

Robart Cushman.

London June 10. Ano: 1620.

Page 196

IV

the letter of Robert Cushman to the Leyden leaders

(Probably written at London, Saturday, June 10/20, 1620.)

Brethern, I understand by letters & passagess yt have come to me, that ther are great discontents, & dislike of my proceedings amongst you. Sorie I am to hear it, yet contente to beare it, as not doubting but yt partly by writing, and more principally by word when we shall come togeather, I shall satisfie any reasonable man. I have been perswaded by some, espetialy this bearer, to come and clear things unto you; but as things now stand I cannot be absente one day, excepte I should hazard all ye viage. Neither conceive I any great good would come of it. Take then, brethern, this as a step to give you contente. First, for your dislike of ye alteration of one clause in ye conditions, if you conceive it right, ther can be no blame lye on me at all. For ye articles first brought over by John Carver were never seene of any of ye adventurers hear, excepte Mr. Weston, neither did any of them like them because of that clause; nor Mr. Weston him selfe, after he had well considered it. But as at ye first ther was 500li. withdrawne by Sr. Georg Farrer and his brother upon that dislike, so all ye rest would have withdrawne (Mr. Weston excepted) if we had not altered yt clause. Now whilst we at Leyden conclude upon points, as we did, we reckoned without our host, which was not my faulte. Besids, I shewed you by a letter ye equitie of yt condition, & our inconveniences, which might be sett against all Mr. Rob: [Robinson's] inconveniences, that without ye alteration of yt clause, we could neither have means to gett thither, nor supplie wherby to subsiste when we were ther. Yet notwithstanding all those reasons, which were not mine, but other mens wiser than my selfe, without answer to any one of them, here cometh over many quirimonies, and complaints against me, of lording it over my brethern, and making conditions fitter for theeves & bondslaves then honest men, and that of my owne head I did what I list. And at last a paper of reasons, framed against yt clause in ye conditions, which as yey were delivered me open, so my answer is open to you all. And first, as they are no other but inconveniences, such as a man might frame 20. as great on ye other side, and yet prove nor disprove nothing by them, so they misse & mistake both ye very ground of ye article and nature of ye project.

For, first, it is said, that if ther had been no divission of houses & lands, it had been better for ye poore. True, and yt showeth ye inequalitie of ye condition; we should more respect him yt ventureth both his money and his person, then him yt ventureth but his person only.

2. Consider whereaboute we are, not giveing almes, but furnishing a store house; no one shall be porer then another for 7. years, and if any be rich, none can be pore. At ye least, we must not in such bussines crie, Pore, pore, mercie, mercie. Charitie hath it[s] life in wraks, not in venturs; you are by this most in a hopefull pitie of makeing, therefore complaine not before you have need.

Page 197

3. This will hinder ye building of good and faire houses, contrarie to ye advise of pollitiks. A. So we would have it; our purpose is to build for ye presente such houses as, if need be, we may with litle greefe set a fire, and rune away by the lighte; our riches shall not be in pompe, but in strength; if God send us riches, we will imploye them to provid more men, ships, munition, &c. You may see it amongst the best pollitiks, that a comonwele is readier to ebe then to flow, when once fine houses and gay cloaths come up.

4. The Govet may prevente excess in building. A. But if it be on all men beforehand resolved on, to build mean houses, ye Govet laboure is spared.

5. All men are not of one condition. A. If by condition you mean wealth, you are mistaken; if you mean by condition, qualities, then I say he that is not contente his neighbour shall have as good a house, fare, means, &c. as him selfe, is not of a good qualitie. 2ly. Such retired persons, as have an eie only to them selves, are fitter to come wher catching is, then closing; and are fitter to live alone, then in any societie, either civil or religious.

6. It will be of litle value, scarce worth 5li. A. True, it may not be worth halfe 5li. If then so smale a thing will content them, (the Adventurers) why strive we thus aboute it, and give them occasion to suspecte us to be worldly & covetous? I will not say what I have heard since these complaints came first over [from Leyden].

7. Our freinds with us yt adventure mind not their owne profite, as did ye old adventurers. A. Then they are better than we, who for a little matter of profite are readie to draw back, and it is more apparente, brethern looke too it, that make profit your maine end; repente of this, els goe not least you be like Jonas to Tarshis. Though some of them mind not their profite, yet others doe mind it; and why not as well as we? venturs are made by all sorts of men, and we must labour to give them all contente, if we can.

8. It will break ye course of comunitie, as may be showed by many reasons. A. That is but said, and I say againe, it will best foster comunion, as may be showed by many reasons.

9. Great profite is like to be made by trucking, fishing, &c. A. As it is better for them, so for us; for halfe is ours, besids our living still upon it, and if such profite in yt way come, our labour shall be ye less on ye land, and our houses & lands will be of less value.

10. Our hazard is greater than theirs. A. True, but doe they put us upon it? doe they urge or egg us? hath not ye motion & resolution been always in our selves? doe they any more then in seeing us resolute if we had means, help us to means upon equall termes & conditions! If we will not goe, they are content to keep their moneys.

Thus I have pointed at a way to loose those knots, which I hope you will consider seriously, and let me have no more stirr about them.

Page 198

Now furder, I hear a noise of slavish conditions by me made; but surly this is all I have altered, and reasons I have sent you. If you mean it of ye 2. days in a week for perticuler, as some insinuate, you are deceived; you may have 3. days in a week for me if you will. And when I have spoken to ye adventurers of times of working, they have said they hope we are men of discretion & conscience, and so fitt to be trusted our selves with that. But indeed ye ground of our proceedings at Leyden was mistaken, and so here is nothing but tottering every day, &c.

As for them of Amsterdam, [i.e. the members of Rev. Henry Ainsworth's church there] I had thought they would as soon gone to Rome as with us; for our libertie is to them as ratts bane, and their riggour as bad to us as ye Spanish Inquisition. If any practise of mine discourage them, let them yet draw back; I will undertake they shall have their money againe presently paid hear. Or if the Company think me to be ye Jonas, let them cast me of before we goe; I shall be content to stay with good will, having but ye cloaths on my back; only let us have quietnes, and no more of these clamors; full little did I expect these things which are now come to pass, &c.

Yours,

R. *Cushman*.

V

the letter of Robert Cushman to the Leyden leaders, *London*

(Sunday, June 11/21, 1620.)

Salutations, &c. I received your letter [of May 31/June 10] yesterday, by John Turner, with another ye same day from Amsterdam by Mr. W. savouring of ye place whenc it came. And indeed the many discouragements I find her,[London] togeather with ye demurrs and retirings ther,[Leyden] had made me to say, I would give up my accounts to John Carver, & at his comeing aquainte him fully with all courses, and so leave it quite, with only ye pore cloaths on my back. But gathering up my selfe by further consideration, I resolved yet to make one triall more, and to acquainte Mr. Weston with ye fainted state of our bussines; and though he hath been much discontented at some thing amongst us of late, which hath made him often say, that save for his promise, he would not meadle at all with ye bussines any more, yet considering how farr we were plunged into maters, & how it stood both on our credits & undoing, at ye last he gathered up him selfe a litle more, & coming to me 2. hours after, he tould me he would not yet leave it. And so advising togeather we resolved to hire a ship, and have tooke liking of one till Monday, about 60. laste, for a greater we cannot gett, excepte it be tow great; but a fine ship it is. And seeing our neer freinds ther are so streite lased, we hope to assure her without troubling them any further; and if ye ship fale too small, it fitteth well yt such as stumble at strawes

Page 199

already, may rest them ther a while, least worse blocks come in ye way ere 7. years be ended. If you had beaten this bussines so throuly a month agoe, and write to us as now you doe, we could thus have done much more conveniently. But it is as it is; I hope our freinds they, if they be quitted of ye ship hire, will be indusced to venture ye more. All yt I now require is yt salt and netts may ther be boughte, and for all ye rest we will here provid it; yet if that will not be, let them but stand for it a month or tow, and we will take order to pay it all. Let Mr. Reinholds tarie ther, and bring ye ship to Southampton. We have hired another pilote here, one Mr. Clarke, who went last year to Virginia with a ship of kine.

You shall here distinctly by John Turner, who I thinke shall come hence on tewsday night. I had thought to have come with him, to have answered to my complaints; but I shal lerne to pass litle for their censurs; and if I had more minde to goe & dispute & expostulate with them, then I have care of this waightie bussines, I were like them who live by clamours & jangling. But neither my mind nor my body is at libertie to doe much, for I am fettered with bussines, and had rather study to be quiet, then to make answer to their exceptions. If men be set on it, let them beat ye eair; I hope such as are my sinceire freinds will not thinke but I can give some reason of my actions. But of your mistaking aboute ye mater,

& other things tending to this bussines, I shall nexte informe you more distinctly. Mean space entreate our freinds not to be too bussie in answering matters, before they know them. If I doe such things as I canot give reasons for, it is like you have sett a foole aboute your bussines, and so turne ye reproofe to your selves, & send an other, and let me come againe to my Combes. But setting aside my naturall infirmities, I refuse not to have my cause judged, both of God, & all indifferent men; and when we come togeather I shall give accounte of my actions hear. The Lord, who judgeth justly without respect of persons, see into ye equitie of my cause, and give us quiet, peacable, and patient minds, in all these turmoils, and sanctifie unto us all crosses whatsoever. And so I take my leave of you all, in all love & affection.

I hope we shall gett all hear ready in 14. days.

Your pore brother,

Robart Cushman.

[London] June 11. 1620 [O.S.].

VI

A *letter of Mr*. *John Robinson to John Carver*,
June 14. (N.S.), 1620

[Professor Arber ("The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers," p. 317) has apparently failed to notice that in the original *Ms*. of Bradford, this letter is dated "June 14, 1620, N. Stile," which would make it June 4., O.S., while Arber dates it "14/24 June," which is manifestly

incorrect. A typographical error in Arber (p. 317) directs the letter to “Leyden” instead of to London.]

June 14. 1620. N. Stile.

Page 200

My dear freind & brother, whom with yours I alwaise remember in my best affection, and whose wellfare I shall never cease to comend to God by my best & most earnest praires. You doe throwly understand by our generall letters ye estate of things hear, which indeed is very pitifull; espetialy by wante of shiping, and not seeing means lickly, much less certaine, of having it provided; though withall ther be great want of money & means to doe needfull things. Mr. [Edward] Pickering, you know before this, will not defray a peny hear; though Robert Cushman presumed of I know not how many 100li. from him, & I know not whom. Yet it seems strange yt we should be put to him to receive both his & his partners [William Greene's] adventer, and yet Mr. Weston write unto him, yt in regard of it, he hath drawne upon him a 100li. more. But they is in this some misterie, as indeed it seems ther is in ye whole course. Besids, wheras diverse are to pay in some parts of their moneys yet behinde, they refuse to doe it, till they see shiping provided, or a course taken for it. Neither doe I thinke is ther a man hear would pay anything, if he had againe his money in his purse. You know right well we depended on Mr. Weston alone, and upon such means as he would procure for this commone bussines; and when we had in hand an other course with ye Dutchmen, broke it of at his motion, and upon ye conditions by him shortly after propounded. He did this in his love I know, but things appeare not answerable from him hitherto. That he should have first have put in his moneys, is thought by many to have been but fitt, but yt I can well excuse, he being a marchante and haveing use of it to his benefite; whereas others, if it had been in their hands, would have consumed it. But yt he should not but have had either shipping ready before this time, or at least certaine means, and course, and ye same knowne to us for it, or have taken other order otherwise, cannot in my conscience be excused. I have heard yt wen he hath been moved in the bussines, he hath put it of from him selfe, and referred it to ye others; and would come to Georg Morton [in London] & enquire news of him aboute things, as if he had scarce been some accessarie unto it. Wlether he hath failed of some helps from others which he expected, and so be not well able to goe through with things, or whether he hath feared least you should be ready too soone & so encrease ye charge of shiping above yt is meete, or whether he hath thought by withhoulding to put us upon straits, thinking yt therby Mr. Brewer and Mr. Pickering would be drawne by importunitie to doe more, or what other misterie is in it, we know not; but sure we are yt things are not answerable to such an occasion. Mr. Weston maks himselfe mery with our endeavors aboute buying a ship, [the *Speedwell*], but we have done nothing in this but with good reason, as I am perswaded, nor yet that I know in any thing els, save in those tow: ye one, that we imployed

Page 201

Robart Cushman, who is known (though a good man & of spetiall abilities in his kind, yet) most unfitt to deale for other by reason of his singularitie, and too great indifferancie for any conditions, and for (to speak truly) that we have had nothing from him but termes & presumptions. The other, yt we have so much relyed, by implicite faith as it were, upon generalities, without seeing ye perticuler course & means for so waghtie an affaire set down unto us. For shiping, Mr. Weston, it should seeme, is set upon hireing, which yet I wish he may presently effecte; but I see litle hope of help from hence if so it be. Of Mr. [Thomas] Brewer, you know what to expecte. I doe not thinke Mr. Pickering will ingage, excepte in ye course of buying [ships?] in former letters specified. Aboute ye conditions, you have our reason for our judgments of what is agreed. And let this spetially be borne in minde, yt the greatest pane of ye Collonie is like to be imployed constantly, not upon dressing they perticuler land & building houses, but upon fishing, trading, &c. So as ye land & house will be but a trifell for advantage to ye adventurers, and yet the devission of it a great discouragmente to ye planters, who would with singuler care make it comfortable with borowed houres from their sleep. The same consideration of comone imploymente constantly by the most is a good reason not to have ye 2, daies in a week denyed ye few planters for private use, which yet is subordinate to comone good. Consider also how much unfite that you & your liks must serve a new prentishipe of 7. years, and not a daies freedome from taske. Send me word what persons are to goe, who of usefull faculties, & how many, & perticulerly of every thing. I know you wante not a minde. I am sorie you have not been at London all this while, but ye provissions could not want you. Time will suffer me to write no more; fare, you & yours well allways in ye Lord, in whom I rest.

Yours to use,

John' Robinson.

VII
the letter of the planters to the merchant adventurers (*from Southampton*)

Aug. 3. Ano. 1620.

Beloved freinds, sory we are that ther should be occasion of writing at all unto you, partly because we ever expected to see ye most of you hear, but espetially because ther should any difference at all be conceived betweene us. But seing it faleth out that we cannot conferr togeather, we thinke it meete (though brefly) to show you ye just cause & reason of our differing from those articles last made by Robert Cushman, without our comission or knowledg.

Page 202

And though he might propound good ends to himselfe, yet it no way justifies his doing it. Our maine diference is in ye 5.& 9. article, concerning ye deviding or holding of house and lands; the injoying whereof some of your selves well know, was one spetiall motive, amongst many other, to provoke us to goe. This was thought so reasonable, yt when ye greatest of you in adventure (whom we have much cause to respecte), when he propounded conditions to us freely of his owne accorde, he set this downe for one; a coppy wherof we have sent unto you, with some additions then added by us; which being liked on both sids, and a day set for ye paimente of moneys, those in Holland paid in theirs. After yt, Robert Cushman, Mr. [John] Pierce, & Mr. [Christopher] Martine, brought them into a better forme, & write them in a booke now extante; and upon Robarts [Cushmans] shewing them and delivering Mr. [William] Mullins a coppy thereof under his hand (which we have), he payed in his money. And we of Holland had never seen other before our coming to Hamton, but only as one got for him selfe a private coppy of them; upon sight wherof we manyfested uter dislike, but had put of our estats & were ready to come, and therfore was too late to rejecte ye vioage. Judge therefore we beseech you indifferently of things, and if a faulte have bene comited, lay it where it is, & not upon us, who have more cause to stand for ye one, then you have for ye other. We never gave Robart Cushman comission to make any one article for us, but only sent him to receive moneys upon articles before agreed on, and to further ye provissions till John Carver came, and to assiste him in it. Yet since you conceive your selves wronged as well as we, we thought meete to add a branch to ye end of our 9. article, as will allmost heale that wound of it selfe, which you conceive to be in it. But that it may appeare to all men yt we are not lovers of our selves only, but desire also ye good & inriching of our freinds who have adventured your moneys with our persons, we have added our last article to ye rest, promising you againe by leters in ye behalfe of the whole company, that if large profits should not arise within ye 7. years, yt we will continue togeather longer with you, if ye Lord give a blessing.—[Bradford adds in a note, “It is well for them yt this was not accepted."]—This we hope is sufficente to satisfie any in this case, espetialy freinds, since we are asured yt if the whole charge was devided into 4. parts, 3. of them will not stand upon it, nether doe regarde it, &c. We are in shuch a streate at presente, as we are forced to sell away 60li. worth of our provissions to cleare ye Haven [Southampton] & withall put our selves upon great extremities, scarce haveing any butter, no oyle, not a sole to mend a shoe, nor every man a sword to his side, wanting many muskets, much armoure, *etc*. And yet we are willing to expose our selves to shuch eminente dangers as are like to insue, & trust to ye good providence of God, rather then his name & truth should be evill spoken of for us. Thus saluting all of you in love, and beseeching ye Lord to give a blesing to our endeavore, and keepe all our harts in ye bonds of peace & love, we take leave & rest,

Yours, &c

Page 203

Aug. 3. 1620.

["It was subscribed with many names of ye cheefest of ye company."
—Bradford, "Historie," Mass. ed. p. 77.]

VIII
the letter of Robert Cushman (*from Southampton*)
to Edward Southworth

To his loving friend Ed[ward] S[outhworth] at Henige House, in ye Duks Place [London], these, &c.

Dartmouth [Thursday] Aug. 17, [Anno 1620.]

Loving friend, my most kind remembrance to you & your wife, with loving E. M. &c. whom in this world I never looke to see againe. For besids ye eminente dangers of this viage, which are no less then deadly, an infirmitie of body Hath seased me, which will not in all licelyhoode leave me till death. What to call it I know not, but it it is a bundle of lead, as it were, crushing my harte more & more these 14. days, as that allthough I doe ye acctions of a liveing man, yet I am but as dead; but ye will of God be done. Our pinass [the *Speedwell*] will not cease leaking, els I thinke we had been halfe way at Virginia, our viage hither hath been as full of crosses, as our, selves have been of crokednes. We put in hear to trime her, & I thinke, as others also, if we had stayed at sea but 3. or 4. howers more, shee would have sunke right downe. And though she was twice trimed at Hamton, yet now shee is open and lekie as a seine; and ther was a borde, a man might have puld of with his fingers, 2 foote longe, wher ye water came in as at a mole hole. We lay at Hamton 7. days, in fair weather, waiting for her, and now we lye hear waiting for her in as faire a wind as can blowe, and so have done these 4. days, and are like to lye 4. more, and by yt time ye wind will happily turne as it did at Hamton. Our victualls will be halfe eaten up, I thinke, before we goe from the coaste of England, and if our viage last longe, we shall not have a months victialls when we come in ye countrie. Near 700li. hath bene bestowed at Hamton upon what I know not. Mr. Martin saith he neither can nor will give any accounte of it, and if he be called upon for accounts he crieth out of unthankfulness for his paines & care, that we are susspitious of him, and flings away, and will end nothing. Also he so insulteh over our poore people with shuch scorne and contempte, as if they were not good enough to wipe his shoes. It would break your hart to see his dealing, and ye mourning of our people. They complaine to me, & alass! I can doe nothing for them; if I speake to him, he flies in my face, as mutinous, and saith no complaints shall be heard or received but by him selfe, and saith they are forwarde, & waspish, discontented people, & I doe ill to hear them. Ther are others yt would lose all they have put in, or make satisfaction for what they have had, that they might departe; but he will not hear them, nor suffer them to goe ashore, least they should rune away. The sailors also are so offended at

Page 204

his ignorante bouldnes, in medling & controuling in things he knows not what belongs too, as yt some threaten to misscheefe him, others say they will leave ye shipe & goe their way. But at ye best this cometh of it, yt he maks him selfe a scorne & laughing stock unto them. As for Mr. Weston, excepte grace doe greatly swaye with him, he will hate us ten times more then ever he loved us, for not confirming ye conditions. But now, since some pinches have taken them, they begine to reveile ye trueth, and say Mr. Robinson was in ye falte who charged them never to consente to those conditions, nor chuse me into office, but indeede apointed them to chose them they did chose. But he and they will rue too late, they may now see, & all be ashamed when it is too late, that they were so ignorante, yea, & so inordinate in their courses. I am sure as they were resolved not to seale those conditions, I was not so resolute at Hamton to have left ye whole bussines, excepte they would seale them, and better ye vioage to have bene broken of then, then to have brought such miserie to our selves, dishonour to God, & detrimente to our loving freinds, as now it is like to doe. 4. or 5. of ye cheefe of them which came from Leyden, came resolved never to goe on those conditions. And Mr. Martine, he said he never received no money on those conditions, he was not beholden to ye marchants, for a pine [pennie], they were bloudsuckers, & I know not what. Simple man, he indeed never made any conditions wth the marchants, nor ever spake with them.

But did all that money flie to Hamton, or was it his owne? Who will goe lay out money so rashly & lavishly as he did, and never know how he comes by it, or on what conditions? I tould him of ye alteration longe agoe, & he was contente; but now he dominires, & said I had betrayed them into ye hands of slaves; he is not beholden to them, he can set out 2 ships him selfe to a viage. When, good man? He hath but 50li. in, & if he should give up his accounts he would not have a penie left him, —["This was found true afterwards.] W[illiam] B"[radford]]—as I am persuaded, &c. Freind, if ever we make a plantation, God works a mirakle; especially considering how scante we shall be of victualls, and most of all ununited amongst our selves, & devoyd of good tutors and regimente. Violence will break all. Wher is ye meek & humble spirite of Moyses? & of Nehemiah who reedified ye wals of Jerusalem, and ye state of Israell? Is not ye sound of Rehoboams braggs daly hear amongst us? Have not ye philosophers and all wise men observed yt, even in setled comone welths, violente governours bring either them selves, or people, or boath, to ruine; how much more in ye raising of comone wealths, when ye mortar is yet scarce tempered yt should bind ye wales [walls]. If I should write to you of all things which promiscuously forerune our ruine, I should over charge my weake head and greeve your tender hart; only this, I pray

Page 205

you prepare for evill tidings of us every day. But pray for us instantly, it may be ye Lord will be yet entreated one way or other to make for us. I see not in reason how we shall escape even ye gasping of hunger starved persons; but God can doe much, & his will be done. It is better for me to dye, then now for me to bear it, which I doe daly, & expect it howerly; haveing received ye sentance of death, both within me & with out me. Poore William Ring & my selfe doe strive who shall be meate first for ye fishes; but we looke for a glorious resurrection, knowing Christ Jesus after ye flesh no more, but looking unto ye joye yt is before us, we will endure all these things and accounte them light in comparison of ye joye we hope for. Remember me in all love to our freinds as if I named them, whose praiers I desire earnestly, & wish againe to see, but not till I can with more comforte looke them in ye face. The Lord give us that true comforte which none can take from us. I had a desire to make a breefe relation of our estate to some freind. I doubte not but your wisdome will teach you seasonably to utter things as here after you shall be called to it. That which I have writen is treue, & many things more which I have for borne. I write it as upon my life, and last confession in England. What is of use to be spoken of presently, you may speake of it, and what is fitt to conceile, conceall. Pass by my weake maner, for my head is weake, and my body feeble, ye Lord make me strong in him, and keepe both you & yours.

Your loving freind,

Robart Cushman.

Dartmouth, Aug. 17, 1620.

IX

the may-Flower compact

In ye name of God, Amen. We whose names are underwriten, the loyall subjects of our dread soveraigne Lord, King James, by ye grace of God, of Great Britaine, Franc, & Ireland king, defender of ye faith, &c., haveing under taken, for ye glorie of God, and advancemente of ye Christian faith, and honour of our king & countrie, a voyage to plant ye first colonie in ye Northerne parts of Virginia, doe by these presents solemnly & mutualy in ye presence of God, and one of another, covenant & combine our selves together into a civill body politick, for our better ordering & preservation & furtherance of ye ends aforesaid: and by vertue hearof to enacte, constitute, and frame such just & equall lawes, ordinances, actes, constitutions, & offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meete & convenient for ye generall good of ye Colonie, unto which we promise all due submission and obedience. In witnes wherof we have here under subscribed our names at Cape-Codd ye 11. of November, in ye year of ye raigne of our soveraigne lord, King James, of England, France, & Ireland ye eighteenth, and of Scotland ye fiftie fourth. Ano. Dom. 1620

Page 206

X

A *copy of the nuncupative will of master William Mullens*

[Undoubtedly taken by Governor Carver on board the *may-Flower*.]

[Although the dictation must, apparently, have been taken on the day of Master Mullens's death, February 21/March 3, 1620, Governor Carver evidently did not write out his notes, and have them witnessed, till April 2, 1621, some weeks later.]

"April, 1621.

In the name of God, Amen: I comfit my Soule to God that gave it and my bodie to the earth from whence it came. Alsoe I give my goodes as followeth: That fforty poundes wch is in the hand of good-man Woodes I give my wife tenn poundes, my sonne Joseph tenn poundes, my daughter Priscilla tenn poundes, and my eldest sonne tenn poundes. Alsoe I give to my eldest sonne all my debtes, bonds, bills (onelye yt forty poundes excepted in the handes of goodman Wood) given as aforesaid wth all the stock in his owne handes. To my eldest daughter I give ten shillinges to be paied out of my sonnes stock Furthermore that goodes I have in Virginia as followeth To my wife Alice halfe my goodes. 2. to Joseph and Priscilla the other halfe equallie to be devided betweene them. Alsoe I have xxi dozen of shoes, and thirteene paire of bootes wch I give into the Companies handes for forty poundes at seaven years end if they like them at that rate. If it be thought to deare as my Overseers shall thinck good. And if they like them at that rate at the devident I shall have nyne shares whereof I give as followeth twoe to my wife, twoe to my sonne William, twoe to my sonne Joseph, towe to my daughter Priscilla, and one to the Companie. Allsoe if my sonne William will come to Virginia I give him my share of land furdermore I give to my two Overseers Mr. John Carver and Mr. Williamson, twentye shillinges apeece to see this my will performed desiringe them that he would have an eye over my wife and children to be as fathers and freindes to them, Allsoe to have a speciall eye to my man Robert wch hathe not so approved himselfe as I would he should have done.

This is a Coppye of Mr. Mullens his Will of all particulars he hathe given. In witnes whereof I have sette my hande John Carver, Giles Heale, Christopher Joanes."

XI

the letter of "*One of the chiefe of ye companie*"
[*The merchant adventurers*]
dated at London, *April* 9, 1623

Page 207

Loving friend, when I write my last leter, I hope to have received one from you well-nigh by this time. But when I write in Des: I little thought to have seen Mr. John Pierce till he had brought some good tidings from you. But it pleased God, he brought us ye wofull tidings of his returne when he was half-way over, by extraime tempest, werin ye goodnes & mercie of God appeared in sparing their lives, being 109. souls. The loss is so great to Mr. Pierce &c., and ye companie put upon so great charge, as veryly, &c. Now with great trouble & loss, we have got Mr. John Pierce to assigne over ye grand patente to ye companie, which he had taken in his owne name, and made quite voyd our former grante. I am sorie to writ how many hear thinke yt the hand of God was justly against him, both ye first and 2. time of his returne; in regard he, whom you and we so confidently trusted, but only to use his name for ye company, should aspire to be lord over us all, and so make you & us tenants at his will and pleasure, our assurance or patente being quite voyd & disanuled by his means. I desire to judg charitably of him. But his unwillingness to part with his royall lordship, and ye high rate he set it at, which was 500li. which cost him but 50li., maks many speake and judg hardly of him. The company are out for goods in his ship, with charge aboute ye passengers, 640li., &c.

We have agreed with 2 merchants for a ship of 140 tunes, caled ye Anne, which is to be ready ye last of this month, to bring 60 passengers & 60 tune of goods, &c—[Bradford, Historie, Mass. ed. p. 167.]

ADDENDA

Governor Winslow, in his “Hypocrisie Unmasked” (pp. 89,90), indicates that the representatives of the Leyden congregation (Cushman and Carver) sought the First (or London) Virginia Company as early as 1613. It is beyond doubt that preliminary steps toward securing the favor, both of the King and others, were taken as early as 1617, and that the Wincob Patent was granted in their interest, June 9/19, 1619. But the Leyden people were but little advanced by the issue of this Patent. They became discouraged, and began early in 1620 (perhaps earlier) negotiations with the Dutch, which were in progress when, at the instance of Sir Ferdinando Gorges, Thomas Weston undertook (February 2/12, April 1/11, 1620) to secure the Leyden party, avowedly for the London Virginia Company, but really for its rival, the Second Virginia Company, soon to be merged in the “Council of Affairs for New England.” It was then, and under these influences, that the Leyden leaders “broke off,” as Bradford puts it, their negotiations with the Dutch authorities, who, however, apparently about the same time, determined to reject their propositions. While the renewal of the Leyden leaders’ negotiations, through Weston, were, “on their face” (and so far as the Pilgrims were concerned), with the First Virginia Company, with whom, through Sir Edwin

Page 208

Sandys and other friends, their original efforts were made, they were, as stated, subverted by Gorges's plans and Weston's cooperation, in the interest of the Second Virginia Company. The Merchant Adventurers were represented, in the direct negotiations for the Patent only, by John Pierce, who, at that time, was apparently dealing honestly, and was not, so far as appears, in Gorges's confidence, though later he proved a traitor and a consummate rascal, albeit he always acted, apparently, alone. The so-called "Pierce Patent" (which displaced the Wincob) was rendered worthless by the landing of the Pilgrims north of 41 deg. north latitude. The third Patent (Pierce's second) was from the Council for New England to Pierce, for the colonists, but was exchanged by him for a "deed-pole" to himself, though at last surrendered to the colony under stress.

ETEXT EDITOR'S BOOKMARKS:

All business without any agreement in writing
Anxiety to get English clothes upon their red brethren
As 1620 did not begin until March 25
Borowed houres from their sleep
Crime—for such it was, in inception, nature, and results
Forks there were none
Genius,—proverbially indifferent to detail
Lanterns—only "serving to make darkness visible"
Malevolence rarely exercised except toward those one has wronged
Meat was held by the napkin while being cut with the knife
Not to be too bussie in answering matters, before they know them
Old Style and the New Style dates
Personal inference rather than a verity
Redier to goe to dispute, then to sett forwarde
Sorie I am to hear it, yet contente to beare it
The old adage, "second thief best owner"
Theft of the *may-Flower* colony
Thinke ye best of all, and bear with patience what is wanting
Transplantation to the "northern parts of Virginia"
Welcome lies acquired a hold on the public mind