

<sup>\*</sup>  
PUBLICATIONS

OF

The Colonial Society of Massachusetts

VOLUME X

---

TRANSACTIONS

1904-1906



BOSTON

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY

1907

**University Press :**  
**JOHN WILSON AND SON, CAMBRIDGE, U.S.A.**

## FEBRUARY MEETING, 1906.

A STATED MEETING of the Society was held at No. 25 Beacon Street, Boston, on Friday, 23 February, 1906, at three o'clock in the afternoon, the President, GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE, LL.D., in the chair.

The Records of the last Stated Meeting were read and, after a slight change in the last paragraph, were approved as amended.

The CORRESPONDING SECRETARY reported that a letter had been received from Mr. ROBERT DICKSON WESTON-SMITH of Cambridge accepting Resident Membership.

President KITTREDGE announced the death on 25 January, 1906, of General JOSEPH WHEELER, a Corresponding Member, and paid a brief tribute to the memory of this Southern soldier who never forgot his Massachusetts ancestry,<sup>1</sup> of which he was justly proud.

Mr. HENRY H. EDES exhibited a small portrait of Amos Kent, and made the following communication :

At the Stated Meeting of the Society in March, 1899,<sup>2</sup> I had the privilege of exhibiting to the members a miniature on ivory of the Rev. Dr. Joseph McKean, for nine years Boylston Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory in Harvard College. A few days after the meeting I received a call from Mr. Francis Randall Appleton (H. C. 1875), who told me he had long been seeking this miniature, and asked leave to copy it. This permission I readily got for him, and a life-size portrait in oil was painted by Mr. Joseph De Camp at the charge

<sup>1</sup> General Wheeler was a grandson of Gen. William Hull. See two pamphlets by Samuel Curtis Clarke: *Records of Some of the Descendants of Richard Hull* (1869), pp. 12, 16, 17; *Records of Some of the Descendants of John Fuller* (1869), pp. 11, 12; and pp. 365-369, below.

<sup>2</sup> Publications, vi. 151-155, where some account of Professor McKean will be found.

The Rev. HENRY A. PARKER read the following paper on —

### THE REVEREND FRANCIS DOUGHTY.

The Rev. Francis Doughty came to the Bay Colony probably in 1638 and is first known in America as an inhabitant of Dorchester.<sup>1</sup> He was the son of Francis Doughty, merchant, at one time an alderman of Bristol, England, who made his will 16 May, 1634,<sup>2</sup> he being then of Hampstead in the parish of Oldsbury, Gloucestershire.<sup>3</sup> His son, the emigrant, signs the will as witness "Fr: Doughtie, minst:," and this is the earliest record that has been found of him. He was neither of Oxford nor of Dublin University. In 1634 he was married and had three children, Mary, Francis, and Elias, who, as also his wife Bridget,<sup>4</sup> were afterwards with him here. The day before he made his will, Alderman Doughty executed a deed of trust of his farm at Hampstead for

<sup>1</sup> "Me Franciscū Doughty De Dorcestria in N. A. plantator' tener' &c. Henrico Webb in quingentis libris &c. Dat 29. 5. 1639. Coram Johē Winthrop gub. & meipō" (T. Lechford's Note-Book, p. 137).

<sup>2</sup> The will of Alderman Doughty mentions, besides son Francis and daughter Elizabeth, Spencer Achley, son of daughter Frances; John Dauyes, son of daughter Margaret; and Mary, Francis, and Eliah [Elias], children of son Francis (H. F. Waters, *Genealogical Gleanings in England*, i. 820). Alderman Doughty had also a son Jacob, who died about 1634 (Lechford's Note-Book, 1867, p. 110), and a brother Robert Doughty who died not later than 1637, leaving a widow Margaret (*Ibid.* p. 88). There was a John Doughty at Bristol, successively sheriff (1606), alderman, mayor, and member of Parliament (1628), who was probably the John Doughty, one of the patentees of the London and Bristol Adventurers for Colonizing Newfoundland (1610). This man, presumably a relative, died in 1628 or 1629. Doughty or Doughtie was not a Gloucestershire family. It is asserted in Bolton's *History of the County of Westchester, New York*, that the refugee was descended from "the Doughtys or Douteys of Easher Surrey, and Boston, Lincolnshire, England, descended from an English Saxon house of Dohteg, before the conquest" (ii. 414). Mr. Bolton is not critical in such matters. The family names would perhaps point to descent from Doughtys of Hanworth, County Norfolk; it is clearly not a Gloucestershire family.

<sup>3</sup> "A farme called Hamsted farme . . . worth 2000 l at the least" (Lechford's Note-Book, p. 111). There is Oldbury-on-the-Hill on the east border of Gloucestershire, and Oldbury-on-Severn, each with its Roman camp.

<sup>4</sup> It is not expressly stated that Elizabeth Cole's "sister" is her sister-in-law and her brother Francis' wife, but so it seems.

ten years, for the payment of certain sums; subject to this trust the leasehold farm was left to his son Francis; and his daughter, Elizabeth, then unmarried, was left sole executrix. This daughter Elizabeth afterwards said that her brother was "in his fathers displeasure" and that she had induced her father to make his will as he did at the solicitation of her brother, who promised that thus it should turn out more to her advantage.<sup>1</sup>

The next that is known of the refugee is that on All Saints' Day (1 November), 1635, he preached at the "Chapel of Wapping," and in his bidding prayer before the sermon took occasion to commit a blazing indiscretion, calculated to be almost as annoying to the Puritans as it was offensive to their opponents. An English canon of 1603 provides for the "Bidding Prayer" thus:

Before all sermons, lectures, and homilies, the preachers and ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer, in *this form or to this effect*, as briefly as conveniently they may: "Ye shall pray for CHRIST'S Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland. And herein I require you most especially to pray for the king's most excellent Majesty, our Sovereign Lord James [Charles], King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, and supreme governor of these his realms, and all other his dominions and countries, over all persons, in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, *etc.*"<sup>2</sup>

What Mr. Doughty called the King, at Wapping, was, "Charles by common election and general consent King of England." This coming to the notice of the High Commission, was not considered "to the same effect" as the words of the canon. Accordingly, we find him before that court: on 28 January, 1635-36, he "appeared and took oath;"<sup>3</sup> and on 4 February was "pronounced contumacious for non-appearance, his punishment being reserved till next court day,"<sup>4</sup> — when he seems to have appeared, for, on 11 February it was ordered that the "defendant is to satisfy the

<sup>1</sup> Lechford's Note-Book, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> W. F. Hook, Church Dictionary (1846), p. 121.

<sup>3</sup> Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1635-1636, p. 471.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 479.

Bishop of London [Juxon] within a month.”<sup>1</sup> On 18 February he desired “his petition to be read;”<sup>2</sup> it was “referred to the Bishop of London,” and on 5 May Mr. Doughty “gave up the following submission which he desired might be accepted:”

The humble submission of Francis Doughty, clerk. Whereas it is charged upon me that in a prayer before my sermon upon All Saints Day last past, in the chapel of Wapping, instead of giving his sacred Majesty his just and royal title, according to the canon in that case provided, I used these words, ‘Charles, by common election and general consent King of England,’ I protest that I did not intend or premeditate any such detestable words, and if through inadvertency I let any such fall, I am heartily sorry, and most humbly beseech his Majesty’s gracious pardon, professing and acknowledging from the bottom of my heart, that his Majesty’s crown and dignity is most justly descended unto his sacred person by lineal succession and inheritance, and shall daily pray that it may continue in his royal line to many generations. London, February 19th, 1635.<sup>3</sup>

This submission the court accepted, and having admonished him “to beware how he let slip any undutiful speeches against his Majesty’s church or state, dismissed him.” Mr. Doughty seems thus to have escaped rather easily from a really dangerous situation.

The next notice we have of him is in a letter of 6 April, 1637, from Algernon Percy, Earl of Northumberland, to Sir Thomas Roe. The Earl, writing from London, says that he —

has only seen the Archbishop of Canterbury once since his coming out of the country; will take occasion to say something to him concerning Mr. Doughtie: who is going to settle himself upon two small livings which he has.<sup>4</sup>

When before the High Commission, Mr. Doughty was vicar of Sodbury,<sup>5</sup> Gloucestershire, and this letter would seem to indicate that he had been deprived of that benefice; unless indeed it

<sup>1</sup> Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1635–1636, p. 487.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 496.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 505.

<sup>4</sup> Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1636–1637, p. 557.

<sup>5</sup> There were three Sodburys, close together: Little Sodbury, where the incumbent was a rector; Chipping Sodbury; and Old Sodbury, where the clergymen were vicars. Old Sodbury seems more likely to have been meant by the word Sodbury.

was some other Mr. Doughtie<sup>1</sup> the Earl was purposing to settle in the two small livings. For the intervening time the acts of the Court of High Commission are lost, otherwise we should probably find an account of his trial for that nonconformity for which Doughty is said to have left England. The time of his coming to America is not known, but his name appears as one of the forty-six ancient purchasers at Cohannet. Mr. Emery argues that this purchase was made in 1638, not in 1637 as others have stated.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Doughty was in the Bay Colony in the summer of 1639, though then purposing, as his sister thought, to leave this jurisdiction. It does not appear that there was any bad feeling between him and the magistrates here, but he was in serious trouble nevertheless, for his sister Elizabeth, executrix of his father's estate, having in the meantime been married to William Cole of Sutton, Chew-Magna, Somersetsshire, came here also, with her husband, and entered suit for a considerable amount, which she claimed her brother owed her, in equity, if not in law, from the settlement of her father's estate.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Lechford took up her cause as advocate with a rather indiscreet zeal which got him into serious trouble with the magistrates, who disciplined him for approaching the jury out of court in his client's behalf. The details of the case are known only from Mr. Lechford's Note-Book and are not easy to understand, but fortunately it is not necessary for us to retry the case. Throughout the protracted litigation concerning Mrs. Cole's claims against her brother, the officials of the Colony seem to have been scrupulously anxious to be both just and merciful. In the complaint of the Coles is the following request :

And because the said Compl<sup>ts</sup> have not such exact proofe of the premises as the Law requires therefore they humbly pray that the said Francis [Doughty] may be enjoyned to answer the premises and every parte thereof in writing upon his oath.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On 12 January, 1635-36, Henry Doughty, clerk, vicar of Meriden, County Warwick, was before the High Commission on some charge not named (Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1635-1636, pp. 468, 472).

<sup>2</sup> S. H. Emery, Ministry of Taunton i. 18, 37.

<sup>3</sup> For a general statement of Mrs. Cole's claim in this first case against her brother, see Lechford's Note-Book, p. 110.

<sup>4</sup> Lechford's Note-Book, p. 173.

Whether the court complied does not appear. This case was tried before a jury, at the quarter court, September, 1639.

On 3 September of the next year, 1640, was tried another suit of the Coles against Francis Doughty, concerning a deed of trust made between the Coles, before marriage, and Francis and Bridget Doughty.<sup>1</sup> The jury found for the defendant, and Doughty was given £10 costs. Doughty then, at the same session of the court, sued the Coles "for unjust molestation," asking to have the before-mentioned deed of trust delivered into the court and cancelled; the jury found for Doughty with costs, and "thereupon y<sup>e</sup> judgm<sup>t</sup> of y<sup>e</sup> Co<sup>t</sup>e was accordingly y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> said deed indented should be cancelled;" but as Mrs. Cole, who was chiefly interested in the deed and had procured "y<sup>e</sup> said Doughty to be arested," was not present with her husband at the trial, the court respited the cancelling of the bond for eight months, to give the Coles opportunity, if they wished, to show cause why the indenture should not be cancelled. As they did not appear, the deed was cancelled by order of the court in May, 1641.

Meanwhile, Mr. Doughty was in Cohannet, hoping, I suppose, to be received as a minister, or, at least, to be allowed there the privileges of a church member, which, owing to his more liberal opinion concerning the baptism of children, and, probably, from his Presbyterian leanings, he could not have acquired in the Bay Colony. Cohannet was organized in the autumn of 1638, and it seems that the name was changed to Taunton and that the church there was organized, after the strictest Bay Colony model, in the end of the year 1639 or the beginning of 1640. At this organization Mr. John Wilson and Mr. Richard Mather with some others were present to "give the right hand of fellowship." Lechford's account is as follows:

*Cohannet, alias Taunton, is in Plymouth Patent. There is a Church gathered of late, and some ten or twenty of the Church, the rest excluded. Master Hooke Pastor, master Streate Teacher. Master Hooke*

---

<sup>1</sup> "The Answer & Complaint" of Mrs. Cole, "Boston (4). 25. 1640," are in Lechford's Note-Book, p. 150. Mr. Doughty's brief letter to Governor Winthrop asking what to do about it, is in 5 Massachusetts Historical Collections, i. 308. For a general account of the trial and result, see Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 205-207. See also Records of the Court of Assistants (1906), iii. 5 note.



received ordination from the hands of one *Bishop* a Schoolmaster, and one *Parker* an Husbandman, and then master *Hooke* joyned in ordaining master *Streate*. One master *Doughty*, a Minister, opposed the gathering of the Church there, alleadging that according to the Covenant of *Abraham*, all mens children that were of baptized parents, and so *Abrahams* children, ought to be baptized; and spake so in publike, or to that effect, which was held a disturbance, and the Ministers spake to the Magistrate to order him: the Magistrate commanded the Constable, who dragged master *Doughty* out of the Assembly. He was forced to goe away from thence, with his wife and children. . . . And being a man of estate when he came [to] the country, is undone.<sup>1</sup>

This is the incident which Mr. Brodhead represents thus: "Francis Doughty, a dissenting clergyman, while preaching at Cohasset,<sup>2</sup> was dragged out of the assembly for venturing to assert that 'Abraham's children should have been baptized.'"<sup>3</sup> This is inaccurate and hardly intelligible. However, Mrs. Lamb follows Brodhead almost verbatim.<sup>4</sup> What Lechford means by saying

<sup>1</sup> Plain Dealing, J. H. Trumbull's edition (1867), pp. 90-92.

<sup>2</sup> Cohasset (Indian name Quonahassit or Conohasset), formerly part of Hingham, was incorporated into a district 26 April, 1770 (Manual of the General Court, 1905, p. 154).

<sup>3</sup> History of the State of New York (1853), i. 333.

<sup>4</sup> History of the City of New York (1877), i. 104, 105. Mr. B. F. Thompson, in the second edition of his History of Long Island (1843), seems to have started this "Cohasset" preacher, who has ever since been confusing the New Yorker and confounding the New Englander, in spite of the careful account of Mr. Doughty given by the learned and accurate Mr. Riker in his Annals of Newtown (1852), pp. 17-25. Mr. Thompson does not mention Mr. Doughty or the Mespat settlement in his first edition, but has acquired abundant misinformation for the second edition, a part of which is as follows:

Francis Doughty . . . came to Long Island in 1644, and was the first minister of Flushing, probably a baptist, but afterwards turned Quaker. . . . This was the same Francis Doughty who was at Cohasset in 1642, and mentioned by Leechford in his "News from New England," as being dragged out of a public assembly, for asserting that Abraham's children should have been baptized (ii. 70 and note).

Brodhead follows in 1853, and the Rev. G. H. Mandeville in his Flushing, Past and Present (1860), has improved on Mr. Thompson thus:

Francis Doughty . . . seemes to have preached at Taunton, Mass., and "for declaring that Abraham ought to have been baptized," he was by order of the Magistrates dragged by the Constables out of the public assembly and soon after was compelled to leave with his children. He also preached at Linn, Mass., where he denied baptism to

that Mr. Doughty "was forced to goe away" from Taunton is not quite clear. Doughty was not banished, but he was not made a freeman, his office as minister was not recognized, and he was not allowed the privileges of a church member, and it may be that he was otherwise made uncomfortable. At a General Court at Plymouth 2 March, 1640, his servant was set in the stocks "for swearing profanely" and he himself was fined thirty shillings for selling a pound of powder to the natives.<sup>1</sup> This was a large sum; of the eight towns in the Plymouth Patent four including Taunton paid but fifty shillings each by general levy for the officers of the Patent. This fine was allowed by the General Court, on petition of Taunton, to that town on condition of their building

---

infants. This doctrine could not be tolerated in that puritanical atmosphere (pp. 105, 106).

Mrs. Lamb follows in 1877, and in 1885 G. W. Schuyler tells of this same "minister at Cohasset" and "preacher at Cohasset" as "torn from his pulpit" and "rudely expelled," "because of some doubtful expressions in his sermon" or "because of some expressions which sounded like heresy" (Colonial New-York, ii. 29, 91). And still the tale goes on. Mr. B. Tuckerman in 1893 speaks of "Francis Doughty, expelled from Cohasset for preaching that Abraham's children should have been baptized" (Peter Stuyvesant, p. 30). And in 1896 we still read of this "Cohasset" victim of New England intolerance, that "his chief heresy was the assertion that Abraham's children should have received the rite of baptism" (Miss Martha B. Flint, Early Long Island, p. 163 and note).

Mr. Doughty's contention was, of course, as Lechford clearly stated, that the children of *all* baptized Christians ought to be baptized; that baptism should not be refused to those whose parents had neither of them been admitted to membership ("full covenant relation") in a local church organization on the Congregational model. And the occasion of his protest was the organization of the Cohannet church, at which a "covenant" was to be adopted. Doughty wished to have this restriction excluded, or possibly to have an express provision for the baptism of the children of all Christians inserted. The mention of "Abraham's children" was a theological argument and illustration in favor of his contention, then easily understood by every one, — compare Galatians, iii. 27-29.

<sup>1</sup> Plymouth Colony Records, ii. 8. And after he was settled in Mespat. We find that at the General Court at Plymouth held 6 June, 1643, —

John Gilbert, Jnr, compins ag<sup>st</sup> M<sup>r</sup> Francis Doughty, in an action of trespas vpon the case, to the da<sup>m</sup> xx<sup>s</sup> [omission in record] bushells of corne attached by the constable of Taunton; the deffent made no answer. The Court awards the corne to the pitiff, onely Thomas Gilbert promiseth to make it good if the debt be not proued (*Ibid.* vii. 35).

a passable road through the swamps to Plymouth. Seven years later the General Court demanded the return of that thirty shillings or the making of the road which Taunton had not made.<sup>1</sup> Lechford, arguing that the magistrates *enforced* the decisions of the ministers, says, "was not . . . master *Doughty* forced to the Island of *Aquedney*;" and in a paper probably written by Doughty's son-in-law, we read that in coming to New England to escape trouble in England he "found that he had got out of the frying-pan into the fire." The same thing might possibly be said of his change from New England to New Netherland. For as Mr. Trumbull remarks, "He failed . . . 'to secure that happy home,' which (Mr. Brodhead tells us) he came, from persecutions in Massachusetts, to seek."<sup>2</sup>

I do not know how Mr. Doughty got on at Newport, Rhode Island.<sup>3</sup> He seems to have been on the Island at least a year, and his name appears in the Newport records, which I have had no opportunity to examine. But he was not likely to be pleased, however the Rhode Islanders treated him, with that common

<sup>1</sup> Plymouth Colony Records, ii, 17, xi, 37.

<sup>2</sup> Lechford, *Plain Dealing*, p. 92 *note*.

<sup>3</sup> Lechford, writing of the Island of *Aquedney*, says :

The place where the Church was, is called *Newport*, but that Church, I heare, is now dissolved; . . . At the other end of the Island there is another town called *Portsmouth*, but no Church: there is a meeting of some men, who there teach one another, and call it *Prophesie*;

and in the Massachusetts Historical Society Manuscript quoted by Trumbull in a note :

There is Mr. *Lenthall* a minister out of office and imployment, and lives very poorly. Mr. *Doughty* also is come to this Island. . . . He [*Lenthall*] stood upon his ministrie and against the Church Covenant in the Bay, and diverse joyneing to choose him their minister at Weymouth, by subscribing to a paper for that end, he was censured in the generall Court at Boston, and so were they that joyned in that election, and one of them named *Brittaine* for words saying that some of the Ministers in the Bay were Brownists, and that they would not [*sic*] till it came to the swords point, was whipt, and had eleven stripes (*Plain Dealing*, p. 94 and *note*).

In fact, I take it, Doughty and Lenthall were Presbyterian Nonconformists, or inclined to that opinion, and that Doughty tried at Taunton to do very much what Lenthall succeeded in carrying somewhat further at Weymouth. Lenthall returned to England in 1642, the same year that Doughty went to Long Island, and is probably the same Robert Leynthall who was "of Oxon, cler. fil. ORIEL COLL., matric. 17 Oct., 1611, aged 14; B. A. from ALL SOULS' COLL. 8 July, 1619, rector of Aston Sandford, Bucks, 1627, and of Great Hampden, Bucks, 1643" (J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, iii, 902).

refuge which his friends the Dutch ministers called the latrina of New England. With the record of his having sold twelve acres of land at Taunton, his connection with the Old Colony ceases. From Rhode Island he betook himself to New Amsterdam, where he was well received by Director Kieft, who was then promoting emigration from New England. Doughty took the oath of allegiance and received on 28 March, 1642, a patent for 13,332 acres<sup>1</sup> at Mespat (Newtown), Long Island. Here he was joined by Richard Smith and others of his friends. They had for neighbors the settlements of Mrs. Hutchinson at Annie's Hoeck and of John Throgmorton at Throg's Neck, and Lady Deborah Moody with her Baptists from Salem at Gravensande,<sup>2</sup> — all together involved in common disaster when in September, 1643, the Indians unexpectedly attacked them. The Newtown settlement then numbered over eighty persons, some of the men were killed and most of their houses burnt and their cattle killed.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "In area ûa continentem sex millia sexcenta sexaginta sex jugera Hollandica, aut circiter ignographice inclusum," *etc.* (Riker, *Annals of Newtown*, p. 413). A Dutch acre is said to be a little less than two English acres, and this patent "embraced nearly the whole of the present town of Newtown" (*Ibid.* p. 17). The Indian name for Newtown, sometimes written Mespachtes by the Dutch, was usually shortened to Mespat, and in modern days has been corrupted to Maspeth (*Ibid.* p. 13 *note*).

<sup>2</sup> Soon corrupted, as now, to Gravesend.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Doughty's affairs became of much consequence in New Netherland and of some importance in Holland. We have three sources of information: (1) Remonstrance of New Netherland, 23 July, 1649; (2) The answer made by Stuyvesant's Secretary to this attack on him; (3) Some court records. The court records are meagre so far as they are found in print. The Remonstrance and reply are, as is to be expected, largely contradictory. The leader of the men who took over the Remonstrance was Adriaen van der Donck, a man of education far beyond most of the colonists and of excellent character and understanding. He had married Mary Doughty 22 October, 1645, and was thoroughly informed in all the matters concerned. He is supposed to have written the Remonstrance. While he cannot be considered unbiassed, he was yet under no compulsion to make any statements or bring forward any matter he did not wish, while Stuyvesant's agent had to answer point by point, and that was not easy. Where there is contradiction the presumption then seems in favor of the correctness of the Remonstrance. The Remonstrance was for relief from the tyranny of the Directors General. Kieft had been a "grafter," a fool and a tyrant; Stuyvesant, honest and no fool, was a tyrant and not scrupulous. Doughty's experiences were related as one instance of a man

Doughty and his settlers escaped to New Amsterdam, where he acted as minister to the English and where he is said to have founded the first Presbyterian church. The Newtown people made a half-hearted attempt to return to their patent during the Indian war, and after it was concluded in 1645 Mr. Doughty and others went back to Newtown, but soon fell out over property rights, Mr. Doughty claiming a sort of patroonship. Kieft decided against Doughty, giving him only his private farm, on his appealing disallowed the appeal, and condemned Doughty to twenty-four hours' imprisonment and a fine of twenty-five guilders, and he was kept in jail until the fine was paid. He removed to Flushing in 1646 or 1647, where again he was the first minister. O'Callaghan calls him an Independent, but the Dutch ministers writing with full knowledge and of this very point say that he and Denton<sup>1</sup> were Presbyterians. The Flushing people, among whom later was Captain John Underhill who, whatever his faults, seems to have saved Manhattan in the Indian wars (1643-1645), promised Mr. Doughty one hundred guilders salary.

Meantime trouble arose again from Mrs. Cole. She and her husband seem to have gone to Wheelwright's settlement at Exeter, New Hampshire, but in 1644 they were again in Boston, petitioning the General Court to reopen their case, and on 29 May, William Cole her husband having lately died, Mrs. Cole so far prevailed that she was "alowed a bill of reveiw in the action . . . whereby her deede that was cancelled may be made good, as before

---

who had suffered from both Directors, and the object of the answer was to deny the charges, or at all events to discredit him. All that is alleged against him is his alleged poverty when he first came, which is probably exaggerated, his alleged debt to the Company — given as a reason for not allowing him to go away, — and the assertion that he had no rights in the Mespát patent except to a farm, — which seems clearly false. He and his associates unnamed in the patent appear to have had equal rights. For the Remonstrance of New Netherland, the Short Digest of the Excesses and highly injurious Neglect, the Answer of the West India Company to the Remonstrance, and Secretary van Tienhoven's Answer to the Remonstrance, see Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, particularly, i. 305, 310, 311, 334, 335, 341, 426, 427. For an account of van der Donck by O'Callaghan, see *Ibid.* i. 532 note.

<sup>1</sup> Richard Denton of Wethersfield and Stamford, Connecticut, and about 1644 of Hempstead, Long Island.

the cancelling thereof.”<sup>1</sup> Then she seems to have given the Colony a rest for three years; but in the spring of 1647 she obtained from the General Court an order for the Secretary to write and send by special messenger to Doughty a letter saying that —

though nothing was shewed, in y<sup>e</sup> 6 months limited by y<sup>e</sup> Co<sup>r</sup>te of Assistants, why y<sup>e</sup> deede should not be canceled, nor nothing since w<sup>ch</sup> may cause us to question y<sup>e</sup> form<sup>r</sup> verdit<sup>t</sup> & iudgm<sup>t</sup>, yet, *etc.*,<sup>2</sup>

and desiring Mr. Doughty to come himself or to send the Court an authentic copy of the deed of release, or other instruments or evidences which in court he formerly produced, that the court may review the case, and saying further that if he does not come within six months the court is resolved to proceed as best they may in the matter. He did not appear; and in November, out of consideration for the widowhood and poverty of this persistent woman, the General Court, asserting that the Court of Assistants had done her no injustice and had followed the law of England and the laws and custom of the Colony, nevertheless annulled the cancellation of the before-mentioned deed so far as the power and credit of the General Court may prevail and further provided that “y<sup>e</sup> order shalbe exemplified und<sup>r</sup> the seale of this colony, if y<sup>e</sup> petition<sup>r</sup> shall so desire.”<sup>3</sup>

Mrs. Cole still pursued the Court: which, though manifestly losing patience, on 18 October, 1648, agreed<sup>4</sup> to endeavor to procure Mr. Doughty’s return to Boston to answer if Mrs. Cole would put up good security to pay charges and possible damages. In May, 1649,<sup>5</sup> she petitioned the Court again in the same matter. Finally, in May, 1650, the Court answered that they had done what they conceive is fully just under which the petitioner “ought to rest herself satisfied nor can they further act therein.”<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Massachusetts Colony Records, ii. 74.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 191; iii. 138, 139.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 205–207.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 257.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 272.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 190. Mrs. Cole’s name appears again on these records three times. On 16 October, 1650, “being visited with longe & sore sicknes, & hauing spent all her estate,” she petitions for help and is granted £20 (*Ibid.* iii. 217). On 14 October, 1651, John Lewes petitions for fifty shillings expended for her “mayntenance” and it is granted, “it beinge the last the

In May, 1647, Stuyvesant the new autocrat arrived in New Amsterdam, and considering that his own authority was involved, promptly took sides against the colonists and in support of the actions of the retiring Director Kieft. In some degree he favored Doughty, even as was afterward claimed going to the length of compelling the Flushing people to choose him for their minister.<sup>1</sup> However, they soon fell out. The Flushing people did not pay the salary as promised and we find him raising tobacco there.<sup>2</sup> The uncomfortable position in which he found himself in relation to the Director General is thus stated in the Remonstrance of New Netherland:

In the beginning, also, when Director Kieft was still here, the English Clergyman requested permission to depart to the Islands or to Netherland, as he had lived and labored a long while without proper maintenance, and as his land was now confiscated; but he always received an unfavorable answer and was threatened with this and that. Finally, it came to pass that he may depart on condition of promising under his hand that, wherever he should go, he would not mention, nor complain of the manner he was treated here in New Netherland by Director Kieft or Stuyvesant.<sup>3</sup>

This was not denied, but it was asserted that he was in debt to the Company. Van der Donck was partially successful in obtaining better conditions for the people of Manhattan, but excited such animosity of the Company that he was refused passage on any of their ships, after his wife and children were embarked, and they sailed without him. It was at this time (1653), while van der Donck was still in Holland, that the Commissioners of the United Colonies, who were inquiring into the alleged purpose of Stuyvesant to use the Indians against New England, saw Mrs. van der Donck and her father at Staten Island.<sup>4</sup> Mrs. van der Donck

---

country is like to pay for her, whose extremity was such as deserved pitty" (*Ibid.* iii. 256). And last there is in May, 1652, a grant to pay a final physician's bill (*Ibid.* iii. 276).

<sup>1</sup> H. Onderdonk, *Queens County in Olden Times*, p. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Records of New Amsterdam, i. 143, ii. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, i. 311; *cf.* i. 305, 310, 332, 334, 341, 426; 427.

<sup>4</sup> Plymouth Colony Records, x. 45, 46. It seems worth noting that Mrs. van der Donck could speak "very good Indian."

had some evidence that seems to have been considered important, and Mr. Doughty "said that he knew more than he durst speak." Van der Donck finally succeeded in returning to New Amsterdam but died there in 1655, his widow married Hugh O'Neal of Maryland, and Mr. Doughty went with his daughter to Maryland and is said to have officiated as minister "at Patuxent," where he was seen by the Dutch Commissioners who went to remonstrate about Colonel Utie's action in the boundary dispute in 1659.<sup>1</sup>

After New Netherland was seized by the English, Mrs. O'Neal returned and claimed some property of which she appears to have been dispossessed.<sup>2</sup> She recovered Yonkers, her first husband's estate, but seems to have failed to recover a farm at Mespat — the one probably which her father is said to have given her at her marriage.

Mr. Doughty's ministrations in Maryland must have been brief, and his presence there in 1659 merely accidental. There were few ministers of any kind in Maryland at that time and little or no provision for the support of any, other than Roman Catholics.<sup>3</sup> He

<sup>1</sup> Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, ii. 93.

<sup>2</sup> "Van der Doncx' widow will enter again into possession of Nipperha. She claims also land in Mespadt" (Van Ruyven to Stuyvesant, 1666, in Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, ii. 473). O'Callaghan speaks of "the tract of land called Nepperhaem, but now known as Youkers" (History of New Netherland, i. 382, 383). It does not appear what became of Mrs. O'Neal and her children or of the Yonkers property. The O'Neals or Neales appear to have been birds of passage in Maryland. Capt. James O'Neal was made a member of the Council in 1638-39, was absent with his family for some years, and was Lord Baltimore's attorney in Holland in the dispute about the Dutch settlements on the Delaware. He returned and was again of the Council in 1661. Capt. Hugh Neale was put in command of a company in Charles County in 1661-62; and in 1674 there was some curious legislation about his importation of horses.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Doughty's brother-in-law, William Stone, an early settler in Accomack (Northampton) County, Virginia, was by commission of Lord Baltimore in 1648 made Governor of Maryland. He was a Protestant and clearly chosen on that account, and in accordance with previous agreement brought in the Puritan emigration from Virginia; he was, however, deposed by the Puritan Commissioners, then reinstated, then wounded in the battle of the Severn and condemned to be shot but respited and imprisoned and his Maryland property confiscated. He was in prison or recently released when Doughty went to Maryland.



was in New York in January, 1656, and in the same year was a "Minister and Preacher of ye Word" in Northampton County, Virginia. While there he married the widow Anne Eaton, who is thought to be the second wife of the Rev. Nathaniel Eaton of Harvard College who in 1639 "came in Nele's barque to Virginia, where he married Anne Graves, daughter of Thomas Graves, a member of the Dorchester Church, who emigrated to Virginia and died of climatic influence, leaving his daughter a fair patrimony."<sup>1</sup> So it is stated in the Virginia Magazine, but Mr. Graves's name does not appear in the Dorchester Church Records. The writer adds that Eaton became the assistant of Mr. John Rozier the minister of the parish, "but fled to England in 1646."

In view of his proposed marriage, Mr. Doughty, 8 June, 1657, issued the following notice :

To all xtian people to whome this present wrightinge shall come.

Knowe yee that whereas there is a marriage to bee had and solemnized between me ffrancis Doughty of Northampton County in Virginia & Ann Eaton of ye same County, and yt the s'd ffrancis Doughty may by virtue of marriage haue or expect to haue an interest [in her estate I] do Disowne and discharge all right, to her estate, and to her children.<sup>2</sup>

If Doughty married Nathaniel Eaton's widow in 1657, Mather is mistaken in saying that Eaton lived to the Restoration, conformed, and, as a beneficed clergyman became a persecutor of non-conformists.<sup>3</sup>

The collection of clerical dues was not easy in Northampton and Doughty soon removed to Rappahannock, where according to Bishop Meade he was the first minister of Sittingbourne parish. Here he remained until after the Restoration, not without some troubles as the following humble petition shows :

To the Wors'p<sup>n</sup> her Ma<sup>ties</sup> Justices for the County of Rappa. the Humble peticon of John Catlett & Humphrey Booth Sheweth, That Whereas yo<sup>r</sup> pet<sup>rs</sup> by Letters bearing date the 15th of Apr<sup>il</sup>, 1668, did make their humble addresse to our Hon<sup>ble</sup> Gov<sup>r</sup>, S<sup>r</sup> Wm. Berkeley, shewing that Mr. Francis Doughty, upon our desire of Communicating in

<sup>1</sup> Virginia Magazine, v. 130.

<sup>2</sup> E. D. Neill, Virginia Carolorum, p. 407.

<sup>3</sup> Magnalia (1853), ii. 10.

the Blessed Ordinance of the L'ds Supper, did w<sup>th</sup>out any reason given to us [Besides that his conscience would not Suffer him Soe to do], advocate and Suspend us from p'ticipating in that holy Sacra<sup>mt</sup>, to the great Scandall of yo<sup>r</sup> pet<sup>rs</sup>; and Further wee, yo<sup>r</sup> pet<sup>rs</sup>, informed his Hon<sup>r</sup> of the s<sup>d</sup> Doughtie's non-conformity & Scandalous liveing, uppon which our comp<sup>ts</sup> the Hon<sup>ble</sup> Gov<sup>r</sup> & Counsell have ordered in case our comp<sup>ts</sup> bee grounded upon truth, that then his worship<sup>l</sup> Cor<sup>t</sup> bee empowered to putt out of the s<sup>d</sup> Doughty from being any longer Minis<sup>tr</sup> in the p'ish of Sittingborne. All w<sup>ch</sup> compl<sup>ts</sup> wee are ready to prove, & not onely those before menconed, But likewise that hee, the s<sup>d</sup> Doughty, did in the p'nce of this wors'p<sup>l</sup> Cort, impeach the Supremacy of his sacred Ma<sup>ty</sup>, the which & more (contrary to the Knowne Canons of the church of Engl<sup>d</sup>), wee are heer Ready to make appeare.<sup>1</sup>

That Mr. Doughty was guilty of non-conformity and lack of respect for his Sacred Majesty is not unlikely, but it would require some better evidence to incline one to believe that he took to evil living in his old age.

In March, 1668-69, Mr. Doughty executed the following curious deed of gift:

To all Christian people to whom these shall come, greeting in our L'd God Everlasting, know yee that I, Frances Doughty, for and in consid. of the good will, affeccon and love that I beare unto my well Beloved wife Anne Doughty, and in consid. that I the s<sup>d</sup> Francis am shortly intended, God willing to Transport myself out of the Colony of Virginia into some other country and clymate that may prove more favorable to my aged, infirm & decayed Body than the s<sup>d</sup> Country of Virginia wherein I now Reside, Doste and for that my wife the s<sup>d</sup> Anne is unwilling to Depart the s<sup>d</sup> country, shee finding the same Best agreeing with her health. Besides her loathness and unwillingness to Bid Farewell to her more Deare & Beloved children, and to her Beloved kindred & Relacons, all or least most of them Residing in the s<sup>d</sup> Colony of Virginia and in the Neighboring provinces of Maryl'd, as also for Divine [diverse?] good causes & consid. mee at this pr'sent Especially moving, I Have given granted & confirmed . . . unto Richard Boughton of Charles county in the Province of Mayl'd . . . two hundred acres, lying upon Rappa. River in the s<sup>d</sup> Colony of Virginia . . . together w<sup>th</sup> all Houses, *etc.*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Virginia Magazine, v. 288, 289.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 289.

The grantee seems to be the Boughton who was Secretary of Maryland, but what relation or connection he was of Doughty, I fail to discover.

In the calendar of the New York Assizes to be held beginning the first Wednesday in October, 1669, stands :

Francis Doughtey Pl't John Hicks, William Laurence &c Def'ts upon the suite & Request of Capt'a Underhill & Mr Laurence— By the ord'r of the Governo'r Ap'r 19 : 1669.<sup>1</sup>

It is said that he or his executor won the suit which was for salary at Flushing some twenty years before.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. WILLIAM LOGAN RODMAN GIFFORD of St. Louis, Missouri, was elected a Corresponding Member.

<sup>1</sup> Second Annual Report of the State Historian of the State of New York (1897), pp. 352, 353, 357. This suit first appears on the calendar 28 September, 1665. Under date of 1666, Onderdonk writes:

Mr. Francis Doughty was minister at Flushing, at 100 guilders a year. His contract for salary was burnt one year before his trial [1665 ?] by Wm. Lawrence's wife, who put it under a pye in an oven. . . . Underhill had ordered the church door shut up because Doughty preached against the Government. Thereafter Doughty was discharged. His son recovered 600 guilders; each party to pay their own costs. The defence was, that Gov. Stuyvesant, by calling each person into his room separately, had forced the town to sign a call to said Doughty (Queens County in Olden Times, p. 6).

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Doughty's two sons Francis and Elias, who came with him from England, married and remained in the Province of New York. Mrs. Bunker in her Long Island Genealogies seems possibly to have mistaken grandchildren for children in the list she gives of his sons.