

Lady Deborah Moody. A discourse delivered before the New York Historical Society, May 1880, by James W. Gerard. Published by permission of the author by F. B. Patterson.

Gerard, James W. (James Watson), 1823-1900.
New York, D. Taylor, printer, 1880.

<https://hdl.handle.net/2027/coo.31924072059706>

HathiTrust



www.hathitrust.org

Public Domain

http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd

We have determined this work to be in the public domain, meaning that it is not subject to copyright. Users are free to copy, use, and redistribute the work in part or in whole. It is possible that current copyright holders, heirs or the estate of the authors of individual portions of the work, such as illustrations or photographs, assert copyrights over these portions. Depending on the nature of subsequent use that is made, additional rights may need to be obtained independently of anything we can address.

Production Note
Cornell University Library produced this volume to replace the irreparably deteriorated original. It was scanned using Xerox software and equipment at 600 dots per inch resolution and compressed prior to storage using CCITT Group 4 compression. The digital data were used to create Cornell's replacement volume on paper that meets the ANSI Standard Z39.48-1984. The production of this volume was supported in part by the Commission on Preservation and Access and the Xerox Corporation. Digital file copyright by Cornell University Library 1993.

LADY DEBORAH MOODY.

A DISCOURSE

DELIVERED BEFORE

The New York Historical Society,

MAY, 1880,

BY

JAMES W. GERARD.

PUBLISHED BY PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR BY

F. B. PATTERSON.

NEW YORK:

DOUGLAS TAYLOR, PRINTER, CORNER NASSAU AND FULTON STREETS.

1880.

NY 2007

LADY DEBORAH MOODY.

A DISCOURSE

DELIVERED BEFORE

The New York Historical Society,

MAY, 1880,

BY

JAMES W. GERARD.

PUBLISHED BY PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR BY

F. B. PATTERSON.

NEW YORK:

DOUGLAS TAYLOR, PRINTER, CORNER NASSAU AND FULTON STREETS.

1880.

NY.

LADY DEBORAH MOODY.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION AND TOLERATION.

Mere difference of opinion has ever been a fruitful source of strife.

Especially have those cherishing religious dogmas entertained feelings of hostility towards those who would not be convinced.

Even men wise and humane will join in a bitter hue and cry, on questions the truth or falsity of which is not susceptible of proof, and the truth or falsity of which is of no real concern to humanity.

There is no injustice so great, no prejudice so bitter, no hate so lasting, no enmity so unrelenting as that which has its foundation in sectarian opposition.

No deeds have been so bloody, no persecutions so cruel, no wars so terrible, as those instigated by differences of religious credence; and, it may be said, that no acts have been more shameful to humanity than those that make the ecclesiastical history of civilized Europe.

Races, nations and individuals resolved theological questions by mutual slaughter.

The Christian dove, surviving the attacks of Paganism, as it sailed down the tide of centuries, became as a vulture, smeared with gore.

The blood of Christian sectaries flowed from wounds mutually inflicted as deep as those ever made by a Nero or a Diocletian.

During the great thirty years' religious war on the Continent, so late as the seventeenth century, the enmity

between Lutheran and Calvinist equalled their mutual hate for the Romanist.

Incendiarism, robbery and slaughter were the only arguments thought of. Religion was used as the cloak for ambition and rapine, and in its name all Germany was laid waste. "Soldiers," says a contemporary, "treated men and women as none but the vilest of mankind would now treat brute beasts." "Outrages of unspeakable atrocity were committed everywhere; their flesh pierced with needles or cut to the bone with saws. Others were scalded with boiling water, or hunted with dogs."

The New World, from its earliest infancy, became a battleground for sectarianism.

More than eighty years before the landing at Plymouth, when the French Huguenots had established themselves on the Florida coast, and thought to have acquired a peaceful home, they were slaughtered by the Spaniards under Melendez. On landing with his force of Spanish cutthroats, this apostle of propagandism said, in answer to a summons as to his business there, "I am Melendez of Spain, sent with strict orders from my king to hunt and behead all the Protestants in these regions." He obeyed his orders. A cross was raised over the scene of carnage—a solemn mass was said—and the smell of blood and of smoking ruins went up to the Throne of Grace with the incense of the altar.

"I massacre these people," said Melendez, "not as Frenchmen, but as Lutherans."

Three years afterwards retribution came, and the wolves in their turn were hung to trees by de Gournes, the Gascon Huguenot.

The history of the origin and progress of the Reformed religion in England is not grateful to the Christian mind. Religion was enlisted, in turns by king, prelate and zealot, as an auxiliary to gratify lust, ambition, hate or revenge; and as an instrument to grasp or strengthen political power.

The despotic monarchs, Henry the Eighth, Mary, Elizabeth, James and Charles; ambitious prelates like Woolsey and Pole; obsequious tools of tyranny, like Cromwell under Henry, and Strafford under Charles; despotic primates like Cranmer and Laud; bloody prelates like Gardiner and Bonner; unseated abbots, unfrocked priests, deprived curates and the martyred laity—Romanist and Protestant, Conformist, and Dissenter, Puritan and Malignant—pass along the tide of history the actors in a great drama of blood.

The true essence of religion was lost sight of in the sectarian hate and zeal that claimed to sustain it.

The Reformed Prelacy became a mere part of State machinery, of which the Crown was the head; and any question of the King's spiritual, as well as civil supremacy was visited as a felony. Religious opinion became not a matter of faith, but of treason or allegiance.

Men had to believe by prescription; and religious creeds were imposed, not as a subject of conviction, but of ecclesiastical direction. Not only were outward acts criminal, but the conscience was dug out and shackled. Even silence became a crime, and oaths were applied to test those who maintained their opinions in secret.

Religion wore a motley garb. She varied not only her forms, but her doctrines, as this or that prelate came into office, or this or that State assassin could direct the myrmidions of the High Commission or the Star Chamber, or play upon the fantasies or weakness of royalty.

The most grievous part of the history of the Reformation is that such a reprobate as Henry the Eighth should have been selected as the instrument to bring it about. The immediate cause, too, was contemptible.

Its institution was not in the service of God, nor for the spiritual welfare of the English people. Anna Boleyn's charms were the motive power.

To these and to Pope Clement's opposition to the divorce

from stale Queen Katherine are we indebted for this holy work in England.

Theretofore, dubbed "Defensor Ecclesiæ," as a faithful son of Rome, little was required to change the creed of the vacillating tyrant, since upheld by history to the scorn and contempt of posterity.

As a curious illustration of this monarch's reformatory views, at about the time that he was excommunicated by a bull from St. Peter's, we read of his commencing the spiritual amelioration of his people by burning two men in London for denying transubstantiation.

Ann Ascough, John Lambert and scores of others were subsequently tortured and burned for entertaining similar views.

Under this spiritual Autocrat, too, was enacted the "Bloody statute," or the "whip with six strings," as it was called. "Each one," says Thomas Fuller, "as heavily laid on, fetching blood from the backs of Protestants." This statute embraced six articles of spiritual dogma. Opposition to the first of the articles, on the Eucharist, was punished with death; opposition, even by word, to the other spiritual abstractions was visited by scourging and imprisonment.

And so bluff King Hal went on with the Reform, using the axe and the faggot, now against Catholic, and now against Protestant.

Martyrdom was the doom for opposition to the King's doctrines, or question of his spiritual as well as temporary supremacy.

The horrible incidents of the succeeding reign are familiar. In the three years of Mary's persecution we are told that three hundred victims perished at the stake. Archbishop and bishop, priest and layman, lordly prelate and humble worshipper, men stout of heart and limb, who cursed the she-devil as they died, and trembling women and harmless boys—all alike yielded their lives at the mandate of this royal Moloch, whose commission for the

suppression of heresy made short work of those who did not bend to her relentless fanaticism.

The diocese of London, under the religious assassin, Bishop Bonner, was headquarters for the bloody work. Old Thomas Fuller, the learned prebendary of Sarum, says, in his Church History, that "lion, tiger, wolf, bear, yea, a whole forest of wild beasts, were centered in him, killing two hundred in the compass of three years. No sex, quality or age escaped him, whose fury reached from John Felty, a lad of eight years old, by him scourged to death, even unto Hugh Laverock, a cripple, sixty years old, whom he caused to be burned. Yea, sometimes he made cruel additions of his own invention, as when he caused a faggot to be tossed in the face of Mr. Denlie, the martyr, when he was ready to be burned."

Good Queen Bess used also to hang people for their religious abstractions, even although unimpeachable in their loyalty.

Barrow and Greenwood, hung at Tyburn, were specimens of her reformatory handiwork.

Under the tender reign of this virgin monarch, the Duke of Exeter's daughter and the Scavenger's daughter, and the five other deadly racks, were kept busy in the Tower.

John Lewes was burned for his Arian views on the Trinity; and Penry and Udall, men of blameless life, for circulating pamphlets, not heterodox in doctrine, but criticising ecclesiastical courts and ceremonies.

Under this "glorious reign" the Inquisitorial Court of the High Commission was created; and arbitrary conviction and punishment was enforced by compelling an oath to be taken by parties suspected of so-called heresy.

When the pedant James, the lauded translator of the Bible, became King, he illustrated some of its principles in this wise, when speaking of his Puritan subjects: "*I will*

make them conform, or I will harry them out of the land—or else, worse, I will only hang them ; that's all."

He burned Edward Wightman and Bartholomew Legate for upholding Unitarian ideas. The opinions of the latter, the royal buffoon tried to overcome by argument, but, being worsted therein, issued against his opponent the writ "*de hæretico comburendo*," which closed the argument at the stake. Even worthy Thomas Fuller, in his history, exults over this performance, and claims that it was quite a different thing from the burning of the Protestant martyrs in the days of Bloody Mary. He blasphemously says, "God seemed well pleased with this seasonable severity."

Under Charles I., Prynne, Bostwick, and Burton—men of high social standing and culture—had their ears cut off at the public pillory ; and Prynne was branded on both cheeks, for what were called libels on the established discipline of the Church of England.

This monarch's savage primate of Canterbury, Laud, was as great a tyrant over the mind and conscience as was his master over the civil rights of his subjects.

"Under Laud's direction," writes Macaulay, "every corner of the realm was subject to a constant and minute inspection. Every little congregation of Separatists was tracked out and broken up. Even the devotion of private families could not escape the vigilance of his spies."

Another annalist of these times remarks: "Laud and his prelates were abject in their dependence upon the Crown. They erected the most dangerous pretensions of the monarchy into religious dogmas. Their model, Bishop Andrews, had declared James to have been inspired by God. They preached passive obedience to the worst tyranny. They declared the person and goods of the subject to be at the King's absolute disposal, and turned religion into a systematic attack on English liberty."

During this comparatively modern reign, the Courts of High Commission and the Star Chamber were used as a standing means of attack against Puritan ministers ; and

holy and wise men were whipped, pilloried and maimed for any question of the powers of the prelacy.

Ceremonies most offensive to Puritan feeling were enforced in every parish; Geneva Bibles were suppressed; preachers were compelled by royal will to read the declaration in favor of Sunday pastimes from the pulpit; and hundreds of ministers, favoring simplicity of worship were cited before the High Commission and deprived of their cures.

One of Charles's truckling prelates, in preaching the doctrine of passive obedience to the King's behests, thundered out that to resist his will was to incur eternal damnation!

There is little lament, now, even from English historians, as Clio analyses and groups the incidents of this disgraceful reign, that Strafford, Laud, and King Charles "*the martyr*," as he is styled in the prayer-books—all conspirators against the mind and body of the subject—met with the stern retribution that they did from the humanity they had outraged and trampled upon.

THE CHURCH IN NEW ENGLAND.

What wonder is there, amid these persecutions, that those professing a simple faith, and desiring to be freed from an oppressive hierarchy, should have turned their backs upon their ancient home and sought, in a distant wilderness, freedom to worship God in peace, and that liberty of thought and action which has always been an aspiration of humanity?

Unlike those who settled the Southern continent, for this mere liberty of conscience and from no hope of gain, the Protestant pilgrims sorrowfully abandoned their native land, battled in frail barks the tempestuous ocean, encountered famine, and fought for very existence with the forces of nature and a savage foe.

Godly people in England, it was said, "began to apprehend a special hand of Providence in raising this plantation in Massachusetts, and their hearts were generally stirred to come over."

People of intelligence, wealth and culture flocked over, the more numerous as the oppressive hand of prelacy weighed stronger on life and conscience.

Three thousand colonists emigrated to New England in a single year.

The sense of a grand moral obligation, an earnest aspiration for truth, a firm, conscientious conviction, and a lofty enthusiasm, which had been transmitted through a century of persecution, sustained the hearts and nerved the arms of the noble bands who planted themselves as pioneers on New England's desolate coasts.

Even amid unexpected hardship and misery, Winthrop wrote: "We now enjoy God and Jesus Christ, and is not that enough? I thank God, I like so well to be here, as I do not repent my coming. I would not have altered my course, though I had seen all these afflictions. I never had more content of mind."

The clergymen that came over from England, and established themselves in the New England colonies, were generally men who had been connected with the English Church, of Calvinistic principles, but who were obliged by law to conduct public worship in conformity with the English statutes, and to withhold their own opinions when in conflict with the views prescribed by ecclesiastical convocation.

It is a strange illustration of human weakness that these victims of religious persecution should have, in turn, sought to shackle conscience and oppose toleration.

The practice and the principles of the Puritan fathers became far from harmonious. The rigid lines of their established faith were drawn as strictly and maintained almost as ruthlessly as in the father land, and the governing authority exacted conformity in spiritual matters as the condition of civil freedom.

Those who had been branded as heretics stigmatized others as heretics for differences on theological abstractions, and even for non-conformity to church routine.

The persecuted, in turn, turned persecutors, and visited

upon others the treatment against which, as an outrage upon human rights, they had solemnly protested.

The State, too, as in the country they had abandoned, was retained as comptroller in ecclesiastical affairs, and given power to punish ecclesiastical offences.

In an address by the elders, in convention, to the General Court at Boston, the claim is made that it belongs to the civil powers "to exercise care and authority in matters pertaining to religion and public worship, and to suppress enormities and heresies."

In the introduction to the laws of the colony of Plymouth is found the following declaration :

" It being a duty to restrain or provide against such as bring in dangerous errors or heresies tending to corrupt or destroy the souls of men, whoever is convicted of this offense, and continues obstinate therein, shall be fined, banished, or otherwise severely punished, as the court of magistrates shall udge meet."

We read of one who was condemned to fine and banishment, and to have his ears cut off, for speaking disrespectfully of the Church at Salem, and of another who was sentenced to fine, banishment and seizure of all his goods and the burning of his house for adherence to Episcopacy and a maypole.

It was evident, too, says one of their ancient historians, not only by Mrs. Ann Hutchinson's trial, but by many other public proceedings, that inquisition was made into men's private judgments as well as into their declarations and practice.

Toleration was preached against as a sin in rulers, which would bring down the judgment of heaven upon the land.

In the pocket of Governor Dudley, when he died, was found a copy of verses written with his own hand, of which the following were two of the lines :

" Let men of God in court and churches watch
O'er such as do a toleration hatch."

The use of the book of common prayer was forbidden by the Salem Church as a "deadly and pestiferous book;" and by the laws of Connecticut the punishment was as severe

for reading that book as for making mince pies, dancing, or kissing the baby on Sunday.

Nonconformists were scourged and fined for their ideas, no matter how mildly expressed; and even if they met together privately to partake of communion, they were disfranchised and imprisoned.

Ann Hutchinson and those who thought with her on the abstractions of sanctification and justification were banished the Commonwealth; and Roger Williams found hospitality from the Wampanoags and the Dutch, which had been denied him by his fellow-colonists.

Any sympathy expressed for the sufferings of the victims, or criticisms made on the severe action of the magistrates, was visited with fines and scourging. Any questioning of the authority of any part of the Biblical history was visited with scourging, and a second offence with death. These things, at times, provoked the criticism of the wise and liberal men of the New England colonies. Sir Richard Saltonstall, in a letter to Cotton and Wilson, two of the most bigoted of the New England clergymen, in alluding to their intoleration, says:

“It doth not a little grieve my spirit to hear what sadd things are reported daily of your tyranny and persecution in New England, as that you fyne, whip and imprison men for their conscience. First, you compell such to come into your assemblies as you know will not joyne with you in worship; and when they shew their dislike thereof and witness against it, then you styrre up your magistrates to punish them for (such as you conceive) their public affronts.”

When Dr. Robert Child and others, who were compelled to contribute to the support of the church, applied to the Massachusetts authorities, in 1646, to be allowed to partake of Christian ordinances in the Congregational churches, or else to be allowed to set up an Episcopal church for themselves, their reasonable application was deemed subversive and seditious, and they were imprisoned and heavily fined.

Hutchinson says: “Bigotry and blind zeal prevailed among Christians of every sect and profession. Each denied to each other what all had a right to claim—liberty of conscience.”

The plea made for all this intolerance was the usual excuse of necessity. It was urged that heretics and sectarians might disturb the public peace.

The same plea, however, had been the excuse for intolerance under the Tudors and the Stuarts, and was inappropriate against those who were neither disturbers of the public peace or morals, but asked merely forbearance and repose.

Toleration was never allowed in Massachusetts until the declaration of indulgence of James II. established it.

It has been remarked, as a singular feature in the history of New England theology, that there was no freedom of conscience and worship there until it was established by a tyrant and a bigot, who was a Romanist.

The shining exception in those early New England days was Roger Williams. A refugee from intolerance in England and Massachusetts, he could not apply to others the injustice of which he had been the victim. Fleeing to the wilderness, where he founded a State, he freely extended to refugees, for conscience sake, the tolerance he had preached.

Many of the best of the English colonists moved to the Dutch colony, for freedom of conscience and liberty of worship. The Dutch authorities encouraged this emigration, and found great return in it by the addition of able-bodied and experienced men to strengthen and enrich the State.

The Dutch colonial government, in the main, was an indulgent one to sectaries. It followed the principles of the mother country in tolerating all sects of a Christian character.

In 1656, when Stuyvesant issued a proclamation forbidding preachers not having been called by ecclesiastical or temporal authority, from holding conventicles not in harmony with the established religion as set forth by the synod of Dort, the ordinance expressly disclaimed "any lording over the conscience, or any prohibition of the read-

ing of God's Holy Word, and the domestic praying and worship of each one in his family."

The home government subsequently rebuked the Director for his sectarian zeal.

Any objection to the Quakers, on the part of the Dutch colonists, was rather from their being political malcontents than from any objection to their principles.

In this spirit Governor Stuyvesant caused John Bowne to be banished from the colony.

The Dutch West India Company, however, wrote back to Stuyvesant these admonitory and memorable words :

"The consciences of men ought to be free and unshackled so long as they continue moderate, peaceable, inoffensive and not hostile to the government. Such have been the maxims of prudence and toleration by which the magistrates of this city (Amsterdam) have been governed, and the consequences have been that the oppressed and persecuted have found among us an asylum of distress. Follow in the same steps, and you will be blessed."

ANABAPTISTS AND QUAKERS.

The two "damnable heresies," as they were called, which gave the New England colonists the most concern, were the doctrines of the Anabaptists and of the Quakers.

The ire of both the civil and ecclesiastical powers was visited upon them, and even the simple profession of such tenets, without any outward act of worship, was sufficient to bring upon the professors disgrace and punishment.

The principles of the Anabaptists, although obnoxious, created no civil disturbance, and had as much basis of biblical authority as any other of the polemical dogmas. Their views were similar to those of the Baptists of this day.

The word "Anabaptism," as formerly used, signified a rebaptising; the Anabaptists holding that the baptism of infants was unwarranted, and that the ceremony, to be effective as a means of saving grace, should be performed upon adults, who could understand and conscientiously seek the beneficent sacrament.

The original Anabaptists of Germany, who formed themselves into a sect during the early period of the Reforma-

tion, in their reformatory zeal transcended that of Luther; their piety at times breaking forth into ungoverned fanaticism and aggressive political action.

Imposters and anti-Christians arose among them, trading on the religious enthusiasm of the peasants, and leading revolts against the civil authority.

Munzer, in 1521, at Saxony, and Matthias of Harlem, set whole provinces in a blaze, and Buccold at Leyden, after dubbing himself King John and assuming the purple, finally expiated his zeal, under torture, in an iron cage.

Such extreme action of zealots involved even peaceable professors of the creed in obloquy.

These patiently suffered martyrdom.

Their fellow-Protestants, even in Switzerland and the Netherlands, were as unrelenting as any.

Even Zwinglius, persecuted himself, pronounced on Mantz the sentence, "*Qui iterum mergit mergatur.*"

Menno Simonis, their last great spiritual leader, was the instrument of gathering them into a body of Protestant Christians, under the name of Mennonites.

The baptists in England, from Henry VIII. to William III., struggled vigorously for religious freedom, and were leaders in the battle against ecclesiastical oppression.

Anabaptists came over in large numbers to England when Ann of Cleves was married to Henry VIII. Their doctrines were offensive to the English hierarchy, and were condemned in the articles of religion promulgated in Henry's reign as a detestable heresy. Their sufferings at the stake testified to their sincerity and to the tyranny over conscience, which, in that day, and long after, colored Anglo-Episcopacy with Protestant blood.

The New England colonists were no more tolerant of the Anabaptists than were the prelates and the Star Chamber of the fatherland.

The Massachusetts law against the Anabaptists was enacted in 1644.

They were, in it, termed “incendiaries of the commonwealth and infectors of persons in main matters of religion ;” and it was provided,

“That if any person, within this jurisdiction, shall either openly condemn or oppose the baptising of infants, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation or use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance, and shall appear to the court wilfully and obstinately to continue therein, after due time and means of conviction, every such person shall be sentenced to banishment.”

Thomas Painter was whipped because not able to pay a fine imposed for not suffering his child to be baptised.

Joseph Redknap was imprisoned for a similar neglect.

Roger Williams, whose name stands out in colors of light against the bigotry of the time, protested against these enactments. Both he and Ann Hutchinson were opposed to the baptism of infants, and both were alike, for their opinions, driven into the wilderness, she to be murdered by Indians, he to found a State, the first principle of which, as promulgated by its founder, was the noble one, since universal in this land, “that matters relating to conscience and religion were to be free of the control of civil magistrates, and that no one was to be accounted a delinquent for doctrine.”

In a communication of Roger Williams to Endicott, relative to the fining and scourging of some Baptists at Lynn, who were guilty of the crime of holding a religious meeting in a private house, he concludes in these memorable words: “I end with an humble cry to the Father of mercies that no sleep may seize upon your eyes until your serious thoughts have calmly and unchangeably, through help from Christ, fixed on a moderation towards the spirit and conscience of all mankind, merely differing from or opposing yours with only religious and spiritual opposition.”

The Quakers in the New England settlements were even

more obnoxious to our rigid forefathers than the Anabaptists, and were persecuted with greater zeal.

Scourging, banishment and hanging were common punishments for the outward manifestation of their peculiar tenets, and the holding even of private conventicles for their simple worship was held an offence both against God and the State.

Their patience and persistence under this savage persecution from their fellow-exiles is as marvellous on their side as is the bigotry which harassed them.

Even those who lodged, fed or showed ordinary human sympathy toward any of that "pestilent company and notorious heretics, the Quakers," as they were termed, and particularly those who accompanied the victims on their last march to the scaffold, were fined, scourged or disfranchised.

At New Haven Quakers were to be branded with the letter "H" if they came a second time into the colony, and, for a fourth visit, both males and females were to have their tongues bored through with a hot iron.

In 1658 three Quakers had each a right ear cut off for visiting Boston a second time without permission.

The execution of Mary Dyer illustrates fully the zeal of the Quakers and the opposing zeal that persecuted them.

I select the following episode from a history of the time:

"The whole court met together, sent for Mary Dyer, who rebelliously, after sentence of death passed against her, returned to this jurisdiction. Being come before the court, she acknowledged herself to be Mary Dyer, the person who was condemned by this court to death! Being asked what she had to say why sentence should not be executed, she gave no other answer but that she denied our law, and came to bear witness on it, and could not choose but come and do as formerly."

"JUNE 1.—The day previous to this Mary Dyer, on hearing the Governor again sentence her to death, answered: 'There is no more than thou saidst before.' He rejoined: 'But now it is to be executed; therefore, prepare yourself for to-morrow, at nine o'clock.' After other remarks she was carried back to prison. At the time appointed, Marshal Michelson came for her with a guard, and found her composed, with her friend Margaret Smith in the same apartment. She was brought out, and, with a band of soldiers, led through the town, the drums being beaten before and behind her, that none might hear her speak, all the way to the place of execution, which was about a mile. When she had gone up the ladder, some said to her that

if she would return she might come down and save her life; to which she replied: 'Nay, I cannot, for in obedience to the will of the Lord I came, and in His will I abide faithfully to the death.' Then Captain John Webb said that she had been there before, and had the sentence of banishment upon pain of death, and had broken the law in coming again now, and therefore she was guilty of her own blood; to which she returned: 'Nay, I came to keep blood guiltiness from you, desiring you to repeal the unrighteous and unjust law of banishment, upon pain of death, made against the innocent servants of the Lord.' Mr. Wilson said: 'Mary Dyer, O, repent! O, repent! and be not so deluded and carried away by the deceit of the devil.' To this she answered: 'Nay, man, I am not now to repent.' And, being asked by some whether she would have the elders pray for her, she said: 'I know never an elder here.' A bystander remarked that she had said she had been in Paradise; to which she answered: 'Yea, I have been in Paradise several days.' Sewall adds: 'In this well-disposed condition she was turned off and died a martyr of Christ, being twice led to death, which the first time she expected with undaunted courage, and now suffered with Christian fortitude.'

We read, also, that one Edward Wharton, at Salem, was fined and whipped for merely remarking that two Quakers were unjustly hung.

It must be confessed, however, that the Quakers, in those times, were rather too self-asserting, and their zeal often led them to the commission of acts that were subversive of the public order, or that shocked the moral sense.

Great must have been the wonder and tribulation of the decent matrons of Salem when the wife of Robert Wilson went through the town, utterly denuded of clothing, as a sign of the spiritual nakedness, as she termed it, of the town and colony. We can, imagine, too, the consternation of the elders of the church at Hampton, in New Hampshire, when Lydia Wardwell, in order to demonstrate her deep impression of the spiritual destitution of the people of the church, in Newbury Meeting House, walked naked up the aisle in presence of the startled congregation.

LADY MOODY.

Such was the condition of nonconformity in New England when Lady Deborah Moody fled from England and settled in the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

She was the widow of Sir Henry Moody, of Garesden, in

Wiltshire, who was one of the baronets created by James in 1622.

Lady Deborah's maiden name was Dunch. The Dunches were an ancient family from Berkshire. Their politics favored liberty of conscience and freedom of Parliaments.

Lady Deborah's father, Walter Dunch, was a member of Parliament in Elizabeth's time. Her uncle Edward was a member both in the time of James and of Charles I.

His son, Sir William, was uncle by marriage to Cromwell, and the son of Sir William, as a member of Parliament during the troublous times of Charles the First and of Cromwell, was a strenuous advocate of the rights of the subject.

Thus Lady Deborah, on the father's side, sprang from a family in close sympathy with those who battled for constitutional and natural rights.

She drank in, from her family association, those principles of religious freedom that were trampled on in her native land, and the denial of which caused her to flee from it, an exile, never to return.

Of Sir Henry Moody little has been ascertained; he was of a Wiltshire family. It is recorded in Burke's Extinct Baronetages that he died in about the year 1632.

There was one son of the marriage surviving, Sir Henry, the younger, of whom mention will be made hereafter. There was also a daughter, whose history has not been ascertained.

About the time of the death of the elder Sir Henry the condition of the English subject was deplorable.

The Crown claimed and exercised despotic power; the judges were servile tools; compulsory loans and extraordinary taxes were enforced; arbitrary detentions, at the King's will, were made; trade was interfered with by royal proclamation; torture was a part of judicial procedure, and

the Court and courtiers derided the idea of any liberty in the subject.

The Established Church, too, was at the zenith of its power, and daily approached nearer to the Romish ritual.

Prelates sat in the Council and Star Chamber, and enforced conformity with unrelenting rigor.

Every deviation from the prescribed doctrines was rank heresy; every word uttered against the established hierarchy was treasonable; the divine right of the king and of the episcopacy was adopted as a canon and enforced as a doctrine, under pain of excommunication. Printers, and even readers of reformed books, were prosecuted. Prelates became the statesmen, showing how close was the corporation of Church and State. Laud became Prime Minister, and Juxon Lord High Treasurer.

Five years before leaving England, it is stated in Lewis's History of Lynn, Lady Moody had gone from her country residence to London, where she remained, in opposition to a penal statute, which enjoined that no person should reside beyond a limited time from their own homes. The Court of the Star Chamber made an order that "Dame Deborah Moody and the others should return to their hereditaments in forty days, in the good example necessary to the poorer class."

The state of the English subject then being that of slavery to the Crown and Prelacy, and the Lady Moody being a particular object of animadversion by the inquisitorial Court of the Star Chamber, she resolved to abandon her native land.

She decided to settle in the colony of Massachusetts Bay. To this colony a strong tide of immigration was fleeing of those who sought it as a place of repose and religious peace. Many of the colonists, and some of the English patentees who formed the company, were persons of rank and influence.

Lady Moody was evidently a friend of the Winthrops,

father and son, the former of whom had become governor of the colony.

There is a letter, among the Massachusetts annals, from Mrs. Priscilla Paynter to John Winthrop, Jr., dated in 1631, and directed to him as her beloved son, he being then in London. The letter states, among other things, that forty pounds, which was due as part of the marriage portion of his wife (who was a step-daughter of Mrs. Paynter), was lodged in "Lady Moudde's hands, which if you will be earnest with her," the letter states, "I make no doubt she will pay it forthwith."

Lady Moody left England either before the year 1640 or early in that year, and was doubtless accompanied by several friends, some of whom went with her subsequently to New Amsterdam.

If she had waited a little longer, she would have witnessed the commencement of the mighty political change whose throes and heavings throughout the land were then hardly visible.

Soon after her departure began the session of the Long Parliament, which put an end to the arbitrary jurisdiction of the Crown, and, within two years, expelled the Bishops from its sessions, and brought Strafford's career to a close, on the scaffold.

Lady Moody appears to have sailed without either of her children or any relatives—a harassed and lonely widow—voluntarily exiling herself for conscience sake.

She established her residence in the colony, at the settlement then known as *Saugus*, but subsequently called Lynn. The colony, at the time of her arrival, had been settled not over twelve years, and was still in a rude state.

In April, 1640, we find her name placed among the members of the Congregational Church at Salem, situate about five miles north of Lynn.

She immediately busied herself in establishing a permanent residence in the country of her adoption.

In May of the year 1640, the General Court of Massachusetts granted her 400 acres of land, to be selected by her, for a plantation.

In 1641 she purchased the large farm of John Humphries, at a place then and now known as Swampscott, near Lynn.

John Humphrey, whose farm she purchased, was one of the original patentees; he had married a daughter of the Earl of Lincoln. She was a sister of Lady Arabella Johnson, who succumbed to the hardships of her new life, soon after her arrival.

The Humphrey farm was beautifully situated between the ocean cliffs of the Essex coast and a river in the rear.

This farm was stocked with cattle, and was put under extensive culture by Lady Moody.

She resided either at Lynn or at Salem, at which latter place she had a small house next to that occupied by the Rev. Hugh Peters. Peters subsequently returned to England, to be one of Cromwell's fighting chaplains, and to lose his life for treason to Charles I., he being supposed to be one of those who stood masked on the scaffold when that monarch was beheaded.

On Lady Moody's subsequent removal to New Netherland, she leased her farm to Daniel King, who in 1651 purchased the same of her, it then consisting of about 1,200 acres.

The purchase of the Humphrey farm seems to have somewhat embarrassed Lady Moody.

Lechford, in 1641 says, "Lady Moody lives at Lynn, but is of Salem church. She is a good lady, almost undone by buying Master Humphries' farm, Swampscott."

Hardly had she become comfortably settled in her new possessions, than she had personal experience that she was not to enjoy that religious freedom which had been the inducement of her exile.

After her arrival, probably, she became impressed with the peculiar views on baptism that had been promulgated by Roger Williams and his followers, and which had taken root in all the New England settlements.

In three years after joining the church at Salem, we find that she was *admonished* by that church for denying the propriety of infant baptism.

She was subsequently formally excommunicated by that church, for denying that the baptism of infants was of divine ordinance.

Governor Winthrop, in his annals, speaks of her as follows: "The Ladye Moodye, a wise and anciently religious woman, being taken with the error of denying baptism to infants, was dealt withal by many of the elders and others, and admonished by the church of Salem (whereof she was a member); but persisting still, and to avoid further trouble, etc., she removed to the Dutch, agt the advice of all her friends. Many others infected with anabaptism removed thither also. She was after excommunicated."

We also find that, under date of December, 1842, in the proceedings of the Quarterly Court, "the Lady Deborah Moodie, Mrs. King and the wife of John Tillton, were presented for houldinge that the baptising of infants is noe ordinance of God."

Mrs. King was a neighbor of Lady Moody. She was wife of Dan'l King, who lived at Swampscott. John Tilton came over at the same time as Lady Moody, and afterwards removed with her to Gravesend, where he became an officer of the town.

The number of inhabitants at Lynn became greatly diminished after the year 1641, when the immigration from England seemed to fall off, and many of the best families, under the pressure of the theocratic administration of civil affairs, removed to other settlements in New England or to Long Island.

This fact was adverted to in a petition presented in 1645

to the General Court, for the abatement of the general taxes to be paid by Lynn.

The petition alludes to the departure of those who had paid a large part of the taxes, and speaks of "those few able persons which were with and of us, it's not unknowne how many of them have deserted us; as my Lady Moody, whose share in a former rate of this town, at £80, was about £4, and her estate, left now in a life rate, pays not £1. 10s."

It does not appear by the above extracts that Lady Moody was actually banished by the Government authorities; but the admonition and arraignment she was the subject of did not suit her high spirit and sensitive nature, and she preferred to abandon her friends and the country of her adoption, and flee to strangers, to remaining an object of reproach and criticism; and under restraint of all expression of her religious creed.

Again harassed—still seeking a haven of repose—Lady Moody, for a second time, became a voluntary exile.

In the summer of 1643, she reluctantly bade farewell to the Massachusetts colony and the Pilgrim Fathers, and set her face towards New Amsterdam.

The mode of transit, in those days, between New England and New Amsterdam was on the trading vessels passing through Long Island Sound.

She was accompanied by some of her friends, who harmonized with her religious views, and was subsequently joined by others.

There is a letter in the Massachusetts records, written in March, 1643, stating that the Rev. Mr. Walton, of Marblehead, "is for Long Island shortly, there to set down with my Lady Moodie, from under civill and church watch, among ye Dutch."

During her early sojourn, at New Amsterdam, Lady Moody does not appear to have been satisfied with her condition there. Possibly there may have been some ani-

madversion upon her, on account of her peculiar religious tenets, and, it has been stated, that she was arraigned before the Director and Council on account of them. I have not, however, found the authority for this statement.

We are led, however, to infer that there was some dissatisfaction or disappointment on her part, from a request that she made for a return to the New England colony. This is evidenced by the contents of a letter written by Deputy-Governor John Endicott to Governor Winthrop. It is dated in the spring of 1644, and the original is now with the Winthrop family in Boston.

In the postscript of this letter are the following words :

“ SALEM, the 22d of the 2d mo., 1644.

“ SIR, since I wrot my Lettre, Mr. Norrice came to mee, to tell mee, that hee heard that the Lady Moody hath written to you to give her advice for her returne. I shall desire that shee may not have advice to returne to this Jurisdiction, vnless shee will acknowledge her ewill in opposing the Churches, & leave her opinions behinde her, ffor shee is a dangerous woeman. My brother Ludlow writt to mee, that, by meanes of a booke she sent to Mrs. Eaton, shee questions her owne baptisme & it is verie doubtfull whither shee will be reclaymed, shee is so farre engaged. *The Lord rebuke Satan, the aduersarie of our Soules.*”

Matters, however, seem to have been amicably arranged with the New Amsterdam authorities, for Lady Moody and her friends were allowed to settle upon a large tract of land on Long Island at that portion of the island known subsequently as the town of Gravesend, for which a patent was subsequently given. This place was situated on the southwesterly coast of Long Island, within a few miles of New Amsterdam.

The name was given to it by Governor Kieft, after the Dutch town (*s'Gravensande*) of that name, on the river Maas.

Lady Moody, being a person of substance, no doubt had as comfortable a residence built for her as could be erected at that time. It was evidently a large substantial structure, for it was used as a sort of citadel when the town was attacked by Indians.

The settlement was made at Gravesende about two years before the date of the patent before referred to. It is sup-

posed to have been in the spring of 1643; and the colonists immediately began to enclose their lands within palisades, and to plant and raise cattle, Coney Island being used as a pasture ground.

Among her other possessions, Lady Moody owned a drove of hogs. From the old records we find that the crew of a certain English privateer, the "*Seven Stars*," landed on the farm of Anthony Jansen Van Salee, in the bay, and stole his pumpkins, and would have carried away a lot of hogs from Coney Island had they not learned that they belonged to Lady Moody.

In the winter following the settlement, the town had to undergo the horrors of a marauding attack from the Indians, but they were driven off by the stout colonists, some of whom were expert Indian fighters.

Winthrop writes, in 1643, of Indians "who, having killed and driven away all the English upon the main, as far as Stamford (for so far the Dutch had gained possession by the English), they passed on to Long Island, and there assaulted the Lady Moody in her home several times, for there were forty men gathered there to defend it."

At another time, under an attack from the Indians, the settlers had to betake themselves to *Amersfoort*, or *Flatlands*, for temporary refuge. This was probably before the town was properly fortified by the palisades. Possibly it may have been these Indian attacks that led Lady Moody to desire to return to New England.

The first patentee in the Gravesend region was Anthony Jansen Van Salee, who figures, not very creditably, in the early history of New Amsterdam.

His patent was for 100 morgens or two hundred acres of land, "over against Conyen (or Coney) Island." It is dated August 1st, 1639; and was confirmed in 1643.

The patent from Director Keift to Lady Moody, and the first settlers at Gravesende, is dated 19th December, 1645.

It gives and grants unto "Ye honoured Lady Deborah Moody; Sir Henry Moody, Baronet; Ensign George Bax-

ter, and Sergeant James Hubbard, and any that shall join in association with them, a tract bounded on the creek adjacent to Coneyne Island; also, by land of Anthony Johnson and Robert Pennoyer, and by the ocean; with privilege to graze cattle on Conyne Island;" with power to erect a town and fortifications, and "to have and enjoy *the free libertie of conscience according to the costome and manner of Holland, without molestation or disturbance from any madgistrate or madgistrates, or any other ecclesiastical minister* that may pretend jurisdiction over them, and with liberty to constitute themselves a body politic as freemen of the Province and Town of Gravesende." Power was also given to nominate to the Director members of a minor Court of three men, to be constituted, and also a Schout or chief magistrate.

The patent is upon the condition that the patentees and their heirs "shall faithfully acknowledge and reverently respect the high and mighty Lord the Estates General of the United Belgic provinces, His Highness Prince Frederick, by the grace of God Prince of Orange; and the Right Honorable Lords of the West India Company."

It will be observed that liberty of conscience and of worship, free from disturbance by the civil power, is fully provided for in this patent.

Prior to the Gravesend grant, Gov. Kieft, in May, 1644, had made a grant of the whole of "Conyen Island," consisting of about 44 morgens of land, to one Gysbert Op-Dyke.

A subsequent grant in the vicinity was made, in November, 1645, to one Robert Pennoyer. This tract is described as lying between the land of "A. Jansen (Van Salee) and Meleydie Moedy."

Gravesend was intended for a large city, and laid out in a circuit of ten acres, with streets converging to the centre. To each person was allotted a village residence within the pallisades, while without were the appurtenant farms.

In the proceedings in a certain action, instituted many

years after the settlement by the magistrates of Gravesend, it appeared in the evidence taken before the notary that Lady Moody and her associates habitually used Coney Island for their cattle, and the valleys there for their hogs.

The magistrates claimed that Evart Petersen and Harman Vedder, in the name of one De Wolf, a merchant of Amsterdam, under claim of right through Gysbert OpDyck, had given written notice to the petitioners to drive away the town cattle and that said persons had erected a salt kettle on the island.

The magistrates prayed a mandamus, that the town of Gravesend might be maintained in possession of Coney Island, in such manner as they have possessed it for nineteen years.

Pieters and Vedder subsequently brought suit, and the magistrates put in answer, that Coney Island was granted to Lady Moody, her associates and successors in 1643, for pasture and for hay.

Judgment was obtained in January, 1662, by the town, against the claim of Van OpDyck, in this action of Pieters and Vedder.

The settlers at Gravesend seem to have been generally affected with anabaptist views, and to have had no settled church.

In an account of the state of the churches in New Netherland, given in 1657, by Domines Megapoleusis and Drisius, addressed to the *classis* at Amsterdam, they speak of the inhabitants of Gravesend as being Mennonists—"yea," the account states, "they, for the most part, reject infant baptism, the Sabbath, the office of preacher and the teachers of God's word; saying that through these have come all sorts of contention into the world. Whenever they meet together, the one or the other reads something for them."

After five or six years of settlement, we get an idea of

Lady Moody's pecuniary condition and style of living, and the extent of her farming operations, from a letter written in 1649 by her agent to Wm. King, the purchaser of her Swampscott farm.

On the back of this letter, apparently written by the lady herself, is a list of articles which she desired Mr. King to send her in part payment of the farm.

This list is still extant among the town records of Salem, and is curious as showing the articles of wear, and the various implements in use at that day.

Among the articles desired to be sent are, "Two yards of black Taffety; 40 yeardes of broad dowlasse; 40 yeardes of holland; 40 yeardes, at 4s. per yard, of Broadclothe; of whit fustenn, 10 yards; of brown fussten, 10 yards; oune good greene Rugg; oune paire of blankets; of narrow teek for bouldsters and pyllovs, 20 yards; one piece cullered stuff; one of shagy bayss, 20 yds; 8 seyeths for mowing (I pray let them be very good); of plow chains 3; & 2 peauter pots." There is also a request for nails, saws, angurs and other tools; shoes, skilletts and other implements and articles for domestic use; and for a hundredweight of iron.

Lady Moody seems to have retained very friendly feelings to the Winthrop family, notwithstanding her exile.

The following is the copy of a letter written by her to John Winthrop, Jr., the Governor of Connecticut. It is addressed "To y^e worshipfull and my much honored friend Mr. John Winthrop, at his house at Pequid, give this," and the contents are as follows:

[1649 ?]

"WORTHY SUR,—My respective love to you remem[bered,] acknowliging my selfe for youre many kindness[es] & respecte to me much obliged to you. I have written divers times to you, but I dout you have not received it; at present, being in hast, I can not inlarg my selfe, only my request is y you will be pleased, either by this bote, if in your wisdom you see not a conuenienter oportunitie, to send to me those things y^t Mr. Throgmortone brought for me, & I understand are with you, for I am in great need of y^m, together with Marke Lucars chest & other things. So with my respective love to you & youre wife, with Mrs. Lacke, remembred, hoping you & they, with youre children, are in helth, I rest, comitting you to y^e protection of y^e Allmighti. Pray remember my nesesiti in this thing.

DEBORAH MOODY."

Lady Moody seems to have been on terms of great friendly intimacy with Director Kieft's successor, Governor Stuyvesant.

Among the records we find a letter of September 3, 1654, from him to Lady Moody, informing her of the appointment of Commissioners to settle the boundaries between Gravesend, Anthony Jansen's land and the land patented to Pennoyer. The letter is subscribed as "*Your honor's affectionate friend, P. Stuyvesant.*"

The Gravesend settlers, it will be remembered, were mostly English; and, although they held their lands under a patent from the Dutch, on the condition of allegiance to the States General, were ever chafing under the Dutch rule, and ready to join in alliance with Connecticut and the other English settlements on Long Island.

In 1653, war was carried on between England and Holland, which gave additional feeling of unrest to the Gravesend settlers, and caused a treasonable co-operation between them and the New England colonists.

Cromwell, in 1654, made peace with Holland, just as the New Englanders were preparing an expedition to attack New Amsterdam.

Subsequently, in the same year, Gravesend became openly disaffected; the colonists denied the right of the Director to pass upon nominations, and appointed twelve men of their own selection to manage the town. Ensign Baxter and Sergeant Hubbard were nominated magistrates.

This nomination was distasteful to Stuyvesant; for those men were supposed to have treasonable designs against the Dutch authority.

To settle matters, in December of that year, Stuyvesant went in person to Gravesend, and stayed at Lady Moody's house.

Lady Moody seems to have acted as a pacificator in the matter. Her high standing and character among the settlers gave her great influence over them. Stuyvesant, also, had a great respect for her; for he confided to her the

nomination of the magistrates for that and for subsequent years, and her popularity with the Gravesend people reconciled them to this unusual procedure.

Subsequently, in 1655, Baxter, Hubbard and other of the malcontents openly revolted and hoisted the English flag, claiming that they were under English law. This revolt was speedily quelled by Stuyvesant, and Baxter and Hubbard were thrown into prison at New Amsterdam.

Among the records appears a letter written in 1655 from Lady Moody and John Tilton, clerk of the town, to Director Stuyvesant, notifying him of their selection of the town officers for his approval. The nomination was confirmed by the Governor, in spite of a remonstrance from the Dutch inhabitants of the town. The reasons of the remonstrance alleged were, that there was no Dutchman among the nominees, and that the Gravesend people had given out that no Dutchman should have anything to do with the government at Gravesend.

In 1655 the settlement, it appears, was again attacked by some Indians, who had descended the Hudson River, and after devastating the settlements on the New Jersey coast and on Staten Island, passed over to Long Island, attacked the Gravesend settlement, and Lady Moody's house was besieged. The settlers were unable, unassisted, to beat off their savage foe, but made a stout resistance until they were relieved by Dutch soldiers from New Amsterdam.

I have been unable to gather any more facts as to the life of Lady Deborah Moody, who was the only woman of rank that settled in our ancient Dutch State, and who, as Judge Benson remarks, came as another Dido to found a colony.

SIR HENRY MOODY.

Lady Moody's only son was Sir Henry, who succeeded his father in the baronetcy.

At what time Sir Henry came to America is not ascertained. It is not clear whether he came over with his

mother to New England, or whether he joined her afterwards there, or at Gravesend, of which latter place he was one of the patentees.

In 1624, as appears from the records of Wiltshire, he was eighteen years of age.

If so, in 1643, at the time of the settlement at Gravesend, nineteen years later, he would have been aged thirty-seven.

It is probable that Sir Henry was in New England at some time before going to New Nederland. In a report made in 1661, by Captain Thomas Breedon, to the English Council for Foreign Plantations, on the state of the New England colonies, as to their feeling of allegiance to the Royal Government, then recently re-established, he speaks of a person having been seized in New England by the authorities several years back, under suspicion that he was the king; they resolving, if such was the case, to send him to England; but that Sir Henry Moody and others, who were acquainted with the king's appearance, had identified the accused as a different person.

The king here referred to was doubtless Charles II, whom Sir Henry had seen in England, when Prince of Wales, either at Court, or during the wars with the Parliamentarians. Sir Henry partook, doubtless, of his mother's principles, and, like her, he gave up his country, friends and social standing to seek a land where he might have liberty of person and of conscience.

By the English records it appears that he sold the family estate at Garesden before leaving, thereby indicating an intention never to return.

Sir Henry and the English settlers at Gravesend, although under allegiance to the Dutch, as has been seen, had strong sympathy with the English Government, especially during the period when the English, under Cromwell, were at war with Holland.

From the New Haven records it appears that, on the trial of one Captain Manning, in 1654, he presented a cer-

tificate under the hand of Sir Henry Moody, Knight, and some others, directed to all admirals, captains, &c., to the effect that he, Manning, had tendered his vessel to serve the Commonwealth of England.

Manning was tried for trading with the Dutch, and so serving the enemies of England during the war with Holland under the Protectorate.

The records of Gravesend and New Amsterdam do not furnish us with much information as to the doings of Sir Henry. He appears, however, to have been a prominent man in the settlement, and to have enjoyed the confidence and respect of his fellow townsmen, who often sought his advice.

Towards the end of the year 1659, Sir Henry seems to have contemplated leaving Gravesend for Virginia, as a region more congenial to his tastes and national feeling.

There was little to retain him at Gravesend. His venerable mother had passed away. He had, so far as it appears, no relatives or connections in this country, and the people that surrounded him were doubtless uncongenial, he being, as appears by the list of his books below given, a man of culture and literary tastes.

Another reason for his leaving Gravesend was that he had become embroiled with some of his neighbors in disagreeable litigation, and his estate was much impaired.

Doubtless the various Indian raids had made havoc with the stock and crops on his farm; and the Plantation at Swampscott had been sold at a great sacrifice.

We find him, accordingly, in May, 1659, making a transfer of some of his land to one Johnson.

It is described as a double lot. The deed transfers the grantor's right of inheritance from his deceased mother, Deborah Moody, patentee thereof, from the honored Wm. Kieft, unto her.

This deed fixes the date of Lady Moody's decease as before May 1659.

The property sold was probably the family home and

message at Gravesend. Johnson, it seems, was unable to pay for the land.

We next find records of a suit for slander brought by Sir Henry against this same Johnson, who was apparently a great plague to the Baronet.

The complaint alleged that Johnson came to Sir Henry's house and used abusive language. A witness, Annetje Wall, testified that she was scouring pewter there, and Johnson asked her what she did there, and commanded her to take it away, calling Sir Henry, at the same time, a dog, a rogue and a "*skellumme*", and abused her with evil language. The Court made award that Johnson should pay ten guilders, and gave an admonition to him to behave better or fare worse.

In July 1659 there was another action brought by Sir Henry against this Johnson, the purchaser of his land. By the minutes of the trial it appears that the plaintiff alleged that he daily expected a vessel in which to leave the country, having sold his "outwear," seeing that he could not subsist here.

He alleged that Johnson had bought his land, house, plate and cattle, but had yet not paid for it.

He stated that he should not be able to get to Virginia unless payment was made.

He also claimed that Johnson prevented him from living in his house.

The Court stated that, as Johnson had no defence to the claim, and as Sir Henry Moody produced a bill of sale amounting to 13 ankers of brandy, it awarded the full amount to be paid in fourteen days and costs. And also decided that Sir Henry should continue to live in the house for the present.

There was another suit by Sir Henry against Johnson for detaining corn, in which Sir Henry was also successful.

Sir Henry, about this year, 1659, seems also to have been of service to the Dutch Government, against the Indians.

In a report made to Lord Clarendon as to the condition of the Dutch, it is stated that in September, 1659, a fort belonging to the Dutch, about 80 miles above the Manhattas, being besieged by Indians, Sir Henry Moody was requested by the Dutch authorities to raise a company to go to its assistance, which he did; and, having entered the Fort, set up the English colors there. The effect of the English interference caused a cessation of further hostilities by the Indians.

Sir Henry soon afterwards departed for Virginia, which colony he had visited before that time, as we infer from a letter written by John Davenport to John Winthrop, Jr., dated in February, 1659. This letter gives an account of military movements in England by General Monk and Lord Lambert, with relation to their supposed action in behalf of the restoration. The writer thus concludes: "The storie runs in Sir Henrie Moody's report sent in his letter from Virginia to an Englishman, a Captain at Manatoes."

Besides the reasons above adduced for leaving New Nederland for Virginia, it is probable that Sir Henry felt that, as the tenure of the Gravesend settlers under their patent had been on condition of allegiance to the Dutch authority, and as the temper of the settlement was to rebel against such authority, he could not, with honor, continue among them and favor their principles of revolt.

Virginia had always maintained a friendly intercourse with New Nederland, while there was always jealousy and rivalry on the part of the New England colonies.

Stuyvesant's brother-in-law, Nicolas Varlett, and Captain Bryan Newton, deputed by Stuyvesant, had previously gone to Virginia, to propose a treaty of mutual fellowship and commerce, and for protection against "the savage and barbarous nations, the enemies of both."

The Commissioners met with a hospitable reception at Jamestown, and a treaty stipulating for free trade and commerce was negotiated: a condition of the treaty was,

that the inhabitants of the respective provinces were to have mutual rights in each other's courts of justice; runaway servants were to be mutually surrendered, and absconding debtors arrested.

Soon afterwards, in the year 1660, Sir Henry Moody, as representing Virginia, was sent to ratify the treaty with the Dutch authorities.

Our State records now give us some rather interesting details of Sir Henry's visit to New Amsterdam.

By the minutes of the proceedings it appears that, on the 21st of June, 1660, he arrived as the Ambassador from Virginia, and made his appearance officially before the Director and Council.

He was treated with great respect, and was reconducted, on leaving, by two members of the Council, escorted by two halbadiers. He exhibited his credentials in the shape of a letter from Sir William Berkeley, Governor, and Theodore Blande, Speaker of the Assembly of Virginia, to the Director and Council, empowering him to receive their signatures to the proposed treaty.

The letter introduced Sir Henry in courteous terms, as representing the Virginia Government, and requested the Dutch Government to honor his draft for 4,000 pounds weight of tobacco.

Tobacco was one of the standards of currency in those days; one pound of tobacco, by a law of Virginia, being made equal to three shillings.

By another letter from Governor Berkeley, it appears that Governor Stuyvesant had made a present of white wine to Governor Berkeley, which the latter acknowledges, with many thanks, and states that by next vessel he will reciprocate by sending some of his best tobacco, and will satisfy Stuyvesant for what Sir Henry had had of him.

In June, 1660, we find, on the records of the Governor and Council, a resolution to advance 1000 or 1200 guilders to Sir Henry Moody, and a memoranda of the delibera-

tions on the proposed treaty, with a statement that Sir Henry had full power to make any change in the treaty.

The money thus provided was probably not for Sir Henry's personal use, but for some public purpose of the Virginia Government.

In September, 1660, the records show that Sir Henry disposed of a "tract and plantation" at Gravesend, to one John Bowne.

The worldly affairs of Sir Henry, at about this time, seem to have been at a low ebb. The English patrimony at Garsden had doubtless been parted with at a sacrifice, on his departure from England; the farm at Swampscott had been sold at a great loss, and the Gravesende estate seems to have been sold, under pressure, to purchasers that were unable to pay the purchase-money. While sojourning at New Amsterdam, Sir Henry took lodgings with one Daniel Litschoe, an inn-keeper. Litschoe's inn was situated just by the *Water-poort*, or City water gate, near the present junction of Wall and Pearl Streets.

Litschoe was one of the early emigrants to New Amsterdam, and was a retired soldier, having been an ensign in the Dutch army. His tavern was pleasantly situated on the water side, on the outskirts of the town, in a rural position, overlooking the waters of the bay and the green hills of Breuckelen.

Before returning to Virginia, where he soon afterwards died, Sir Henry, who seems then to have been in great straits, left certain books in the hands of Daniel Litschoe in security for the payment of his board and lodging. The catalogue of these books has come down to us. They are not only interesting, as connected with the subject of our memoir, but curious to the antiquarian, as showing what were the books then in vogue, forming part of the library of a cultivated man of the time.

The catalogue reads as follows: "A Latyn Bible, in folio—A written book, in folio, containing private matters of State—A written book, in folio, containing private matters

of the king—Seventeen several books of devinite matters—A dictinaruis Latin & English—15 several Latin & Italian books of divirs matters—A book, in folio, containing the voyage of Ferdinand Mendoz—A book in folio kalleth *Sylva Sylvarum*—A book in quarto calleth *Bartas'* six days work of the Lord, translit in English by Josa. Sylvester—A book in quarto calleth the Summe and substance of the conference which it pleased his excellent Majestie to have with the Lords, bishops, &c., at Hampton Court, contracteth by William Barlow—A book, in quarto, calleth Ecclesiastica Interpretatio, or the Expositions upon the difficult and doubtful passages of the 7 Epistles, called Catholique, and the Revelation collecteth by John Mayer—Eleven several books more, of divers substantants—The verification of his Fathers Knights' order, given by King James.”

This catalogue is found in the notarial records of Solomon Lachair, one of the New Amsterdam notaries, under date of 1661.

Lachair testifies as follows: “That, at request of Daniel Litschoe, inn keeper, at his home, where was exhibited an obligation dated 20th Sept. 1661, written in English, and signed by the Bt. Sir Henry Moody, who died in Virginia, at the house of one Colonel Morrittson; and also a quantity of 50 written and printed books, which, the requirment declared, were left in pledge with him and as security of his debt, by the above named Sir Henry Moody.”

Lachair afterwards wrote to Col. Morrittson enclosing a notarial copy of the obligation in behalf of Litschoe, stating that he held the above obligation of Sir Henry for 320 guilders, to be paid in March next, at the *Manothans*—“Which money,” Litschoe states, “I lent him, some part to keep his reputacion, and the other part he spent here in my house, where he did lodge with his man, Henry, and where for he did give me said obligation,” and, the record states, “that the library of books was left as security for the debt, besides the verification of his father's Knights order given under the great seal of King James, whych he did esteem very much.”

The letter asks the Colonel to pay the debt, to prevent a sale of the books, "at public outcry," particularly as some of them were of "private matters of the king." This letter was sent to Virginia with the catalogue of the books. Lachair, in his certificate, states that he kept one of Sir Henry's books, temporarily, for his fees.

The next incident we find in the records is under date of April, 1662, when Daniel Litschoe having died, his widow, Annekin, is ordered by the Orphans' Court to bring with her into Court an inventory of her husband's estate. Litschoe's will, as proved, bore date on the 26th December, 1661, stating that he was then sick in bed and was Lieutenant of a Burgher Company.

Subsequently the widow requests by petition to be allowed to sell by the bailiff "some books, which she has, belonging to Sir Henry Moody, as, according to obligation, she has a claim on him for a considerable sum." The petition was granted.

These books then were doubtless sold. They were the last of the property of the Moody family.

Some of these books are doubtless still in this city. Those relating to the private matters of the State and of the King would, doubtless, if discovered, prove to be of great historical interest.

It does not require much stretch of the imagination to infer that at least one of the books above referred to is in the Library of this Society. It is the one called "Bartas' Six Days' Work of the Lord." This book I now hold in my hand. It was published in 1605, and has been a quarto, but has been cut down by a ruthless modern binder to its present size. The title-page has been lost, but on one of the pages I find written the name of "Cornelius Island," under date of 1662. He was probably a purchaser at the sale, which was made in that year.

The above, Mr. President, is all I have been able to

gather relative to the history of those two interesting personages, Lady Deborah Moody and her son.

They are interesting figures in our ancient colonial history, not only as being the only English persons of rank who lived among our Dutch predecessors, but as illustrating the varying fortunes of that class of emigrants who abandoned friends, rank and home rather than surrender liberty of conscience and worship, without which existence, anywhere, was, to them, intolerable.

Their fortunes painfully illustrate, also, the narrow and oppressive spirit of the time, which claimed to shackle the will and bind the spirit to the conventional dictations of arbitrary authority, which kept even thought chained down to limits prescribed by sinister policy or prejudice; which ruthlessly punished, as heretical, all questioning of ecclesiastical dominion, and, as treasonable, all criticism of civil rule.

Happy are we, in this age of enlightenment, to be free from thralldom such as this, and to live in a time when, and a place where, the rights of individual humanity are recognized and respected; and where freedom of speech, of action and of thought are recognized as fundamental rights, which no government, lay or ecclesiastical, dares to tamper with.