The Mariner's Mirror

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rmir20>

THE "MAYFLOWER."

J. W. Horrocks

Published online: 22 Mar 2013.

To cite this article: J. W. Horrocks (1922) THE "MAYFLOWER.", *The Mariner's Mirror*, 8:3, 81-88, DOI: [10.1080/00253359.1922.10655093](https://doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1922.10655093)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00253359.1922.10655093>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is

expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

due to the efforts of Drs. Blane and Harness. Besides Nelson, other Admirals bestowed great care on the health of their crews. In this brief survey I need merely mention Collingwood, who, during the blockade of Cadiz in the winter of 1797-8, wrote that he kept his wits at work how to amuse his men so as to maintain their health—"Every moonlight night the sailors dance; and there seems as much mirth and festivity as if we were in Wapping itself."⁶ Such were the Admirals who prepared their men for the final test. At Trafalgar British gunnery was thrice as effective as that of the combined fleet. But gunnery depends very largely on the condition of the man behind the gun.

THE "MAYFLOWER."

II.

BY J. W. HORROCKS.

CONCERNING the employment of the vessel between May, 1620, and the time of the Pilgrims' expedition, no details are available, and the only direct statements, of evidential value, in regard to the expedition itself, are those of Bradford's "History," and the other standard narratives. But some particulars may be added to the story with assurance, and others as fairly probable.

At the outset, it may be asked whether any of the merchants and other adventurers who helped to finance the undertaking had had anything previously to do with the ship that was hired with their assistance. I can find only two indications in this direction. One of the venturers, William Quarles, had sent, in February, 1606, a quantity of Wiltshire cloth to Middleburg in the *Mayflower* of Lee, which had Robert Bonner for master, and which, as I have suggested, was perhaps identical with the Pilgrim ship. The name of another of the venturers, Thomas Fletcher, is entered for a consignment of fletia lawns on the voyage made by the *Mayflower* of London to Hamburg in March, 1614, under the mastership of Christopher Jones. In none other of the

⁶Correspondence of Collingwood," p. 64. See, too, p. 111 for his care of his men before Trafalgar.

very numerous entries of cargo which undoubtedly relate to the Pilgrim ship does the name of any of the venturers appear. It may be that the merchants who put up money for the expedition were concerned less with the French trade in which the Pilgrim ship had been regularly engaged for years past than with traffic to other parts, including Holland and Germany, but this is a matter that requires further investigation.

As the master and part owner of the *Mayflower*, Christopher Jones, belonged to Rotherhithe, the ship may be regarded as a Rotherhithe vessel at that time, and it is to be presumed that much of the business of chartering her was transacted in that quarter. There arises another question. Did that parish supply any of the passengers, or any of the crew besides the master?

Now, it is an interesting fact—though I am not suggesting any necessarily relevant significance—that Puritan influence, of a moderate kind, was at work in Rotherhithe at this time in the ministry of Thomas Gataker, a future member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, who became rector of the parish in the year when, as I have conjectured, the *Mayflower* captain came to live there. Moreover, when preparations were being made in Holland and England for the Pilgrim expedition in his parishioner's ship, Gataker was travelling in Holland for the purpose of making himself acquainted with the condition of Dutch Protestantism, which he believed to be imperilled by the foreign policy of James I (Cf. accounts of Gataker in "D.N.B." and Beck, "History of Rotherhithe," pp. 44-53). With a comparatively friendly incumbent at Rotherhithe, Puritan emigration from that locality was perhaps the less to be expected. At any rate, none of Gataker's parishioners, so far as his register affords evidence of their existence, joined the *Mayflower* company as recorded in Bradford's famous list. There are two correspondences of name. Thomas English, who was hired as a sailor, died in the early days of the settlement. Richard Warren, one of the most active of the pioneers, died in the colony about seven years afterwards. A Thomas English is mentioned in the Rotherhithe register, but he was only born in 1610, and seems to have died when a few weeks old. A Richard Warren also is entered, but he was buried at Rotherhithe in 1624. All that can safely be suggested is the possibility of family connexions.

Though we do not know that any of the Pilgrims proper hailed from Rotherhithe, the entries which I have already cited establish the domicile of the *Mayflower* master,

Christopher Jones, in that parish, beyond question ; and I may now add that other records in the register, taken along with information derived from other sources, point to the possibility, if not probability, that the pilot, sometimes described as master's mate, was not only a resident, but a native, of Rotherhithe. In Cushman's letter, given by Bradford, he is described as " Mr. Clarke, who went last year to Virginia with a ship of cattle." He is easily to be identified with the John Clarke, about whom two important documents, transcribed by Miss Irene A. Wright, of Seville, were published in the *Amercian Historical Review* of April, 1920. These record depositions made by Clarke at Havanna in 1611, and at Madrid in 1613. In the first, he described himself as a native of London, thirty-five years of age. In the second, he said that he was forty. Though Clarke was under hostile examination, he can hardly have had any reason of policy for varying his statement of age. It may fairly be concluded that he was rather hazy on the subject ; but taking the range of possibility indicated by his answers, we may assume that he was born sometime during the period 1573-1576. Seeing that a Rotherhithe master and ship were engaged for the Pilgrim voyage, it is not unlikely, on the face of it, that a pilot or master's mate should have been obtained in that quarter, and in that case he may be identified with the John Clarke whose baptism at Rotherhithe Church is entered with the date 26th March, 1575, and possibly whose marriage is registered in April, 1610. Clarke seems to have been about thirty when he started a career as sailor in different parts of the world, which was to have an especially interesting connexion with the English colonisation of North America. He set up as a professional pilot about 1609—the year in which the association of Christopher Jones with the *Mayflower*, so far as we know it, began. When, in 1611, Sir Thomas Dale went out to Virginia as high marshal, Clarke sailed with him as pilot in a ship of 300 tons. While in Virginia, he was taken by the Spaniards, and he was detained as a prisoner in Havanna, where he was examined as aforesaid. In 1612 he was transferred to Spain, and in February of the following year he was examined at Madrid. He was released, and delivered to the English ambassador in Spain, Sir John Digby, early in 1616. Clarke made the voyage to Virginia referred to by Cushman in 1619. He was hired for the Pilgrims' voyage in June, 1620. On the other side, he was the first to step on the small island in Plymouth Bay which became known after him as Clarks Island.

"Hail to thee, poor little ship Mayflower of Delft-Haven," exclaimed Carlyle, in his well-known apostrophe. But though the emigrant band from Holland embarked at Delfshaven, it was in the *Speedwell*, not the *Mayflower*, which set out from the Thames, doubtless from Rotherhithe, to meet the smaller vessel in Southampton Water.

At Southampton, where most of the victualling was done, John Alden, who was to become one of the most notable of the colonists, was hired "for a cooper." It has been urged that *Mayflower* Alden was possibly or probably akin to one or more of certain Aldens in different counties who were men of some substance and standing in the early Stuart period, and in order the better to sustain argument upon this line it has been suggested that he was engaged not at Southampton, as Bradford tells us, but in London. There is, however, an utter lack of real evidence for any of these conjectured relationships, and the considerations advanced for the rejection of Bradford's account of the hiring—which is the only shred of testimony we possess on the matter—are based on a misapprehension of the law and its requirements at that time in regard to the shipment of beer and the employment of a cooper. We cannot reasonably doubt the accuracy of Bradford's statement. Further, we may reasonably infer that he belonged to the town where he was hired for the Pilgrim service; and, as I have shown elsewhere, if he was indeed a native of Southampton, it is just possible that he was a son of Richard Alden, huckster and tippler, of St. Michael's ward, who died in 1589, but most likely that his father was George Alden, fletcher or arrow-maker, of All Saints within the Bar, whose name appears in the stall and art lists for more than thirty years down to 1620 ("The Assembly Books of Southampton," II, pp. xxxviii-xlii).

I have searched the extant books for each of the English ports—London, Southampton, Dartmouth, and Plymouth—that were concerned in the goings and comings of the Pilgrim ships, but can trace no entries whatsoever of any relevance. If the special character of the adventure is taken into account, the absence of such records can occasion no great surprise. It would seem, however, that the Virginia Company, from which the Pilgrims had received a patent, afterwards regarded the voyage of the *Mayflower*, which had been intended for Virginia, and not New England, as having been undertaken under its own auspices, for in a note preserved amongst the Duke of Manchester's MSS, she is mentioned as one of six ships, with

an aggregate of six hundred persons, despatched by the Company to Virginia during the months August, 1620—February, 1621 ("Hist. MSS., Com. Report VIII.," p. 37, number 291).

Beyond what is contained in the standard narratives, no definite information concerning the *Speedwell* has been procured. There are entries of *Speedwells* which were plying between England and the Continent, or along the English coast, but none of these presents any of the particulars that would be necessary to establish identity with the Pilgrims' ship. The behaviour of Thomas Weston, chief of the original merchant venturers, towards the Pilgrims, and of Reynolds, master of the *Speedwell*, who put back from Plymouth, has been the subject of much animadversion. We know that in 1622, Weston, breaking away from the original company of venturers, while still acting under pretext of the association, tried to found an independent plantation in the new country. One of the ships which he sent out on this enterprise was the *Charity*, of 100 tons, which presumably carried a quantity of ordnance for the defence of the proposed colony, and which was under the mastership of William Reynolds ("Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial Series, 1613—1680," pp. 50-1). If this was the *Speedwell* man, as is not unlikely, he ultimately, it would seem, made the trans-Atlantic voyage from which he had shrunk when in charge of a smaller vessel, and presumably was also in control of the *Charity* on her return, after a stay of three months on the other side.

The account of the *Mayflower's* voyage from the old Plymouth to the new is too familiar to need extended comment here; but one passage in Bradford's narrative has given rise to conflicting interpretations. He tells us that owing to the cross winds and fierce storms with which the vessel was shaken, one of the main beams amidships became "bowed and cracked." It was feared that she would not be able to go on with the voyage, but the master and others declared that they knew the ship to be strong and firm under water, "and for the buckling of the main beam," there was a great iron screw, brought by the passengers out of Holland, "which would raise the beam into its place." The beam could afterwards be made sufficient by means of a post placed under it and resting on the lower deck. Bradford surely intended to convey that, as a remedy for the "buckling," that is, bowing or bending, resort was made to a screw-press or screw-jack, by which the beam was restored to its proper alignment, and that when this had been done, and the screw had been withdrawn, the beam was kept up by a post

in the manner described. It has been suggested that "for the buckling of the main beam" means "in order to fasten the main beam," and that "buckling" in this connexion has the sense of 'fastening with a loop of iron.' But this is difficult to fit in with the context, especially with the stated specific application of the screw. Mr. Harold Spender, writing in the *Landmark* (October, 1921), purports to give the gist of Bradford's story of the device employed in saying that the Pilgrims "used that screw to clamp the beam—and so strengthened went on with their voyage"—a summary which seems to represent inaccurately what was done with the screw, and certainly ignores what was done with the post. I will consider at a later stage Dr. Rendel Harris's views on the point in question and its bearing on the Jordan's theory. As to the provenance of the screw, which has prompted some speculation, Dr. Harris has put forward the supposition that it was part of the printing press which the Pilgrims had used in Holland, and the remains of which, on this hypothesis, they were taking with them to America. This is quite possible, but at present it is only a matter of conjecture. I may add that the tercentenary has stimulated not only serious research, but the exercise of the imagination of the novelist; and in a *Mayflower* romance which was published not long ago in a leading boys' journal, the screw is produced, in the hour of need, from his box of treasures by a boy on board, of unhistorical identity, who had brought it with him from Leyder, where he had found it lying by the canal. "My screw," he is made to exclaim in after years, "had saved the ship, saved the voyage, saved our lives!"

After a stay of several months in New England waters, the *Mayflower* made the return to old England, accomplishing it in far less time than that of the outward voyage. She crossed, we are told, in barely more than a calendar month—5th April—6th May, 1621. She brought back no cargo, and her arrival finds no mention in the port books. With the master, Christopher Jones, returned also the mate, or pilot, John Clarke. We do not know whether Clarke ever sailed again in the same ship. Later in the year, she was once more occupied in the French traffic, and in the autumn we come upon her unloading bay salt from Rochelle. The last entry relating to this cargo, dated 31st October, 1621, is also the last undoubted record bearing upon what may be called the active service of the Pilgrim ship, a service which can thus be traced with assurance over the period August, 1609—October, 1621. In discussing her employ-

ment at sea outside these limits we are in the regions of more or less reasonable possibility, probability, and conjecture.

It is very likely that the Rochelle voyage aforesaid marked the end of the sea-faring career of Christopher Jones, for he died a few months afterwards. Wherever the timbers of the Pilgrim ship may lie, the entry, under the year 1621[2]—"Christopher Jones, bur. 5 March," in the register of St. Mary's, Rotherhithe, leaves no room for doubt as to the last resting place of her captain in the great adventure. He left no will, and a commission of administration was granted to his widow, Joan (26th August, 1622).

The pilot, John Clarke, was still interested in colonial enterprise. In the year of Christopher Jones's death, he became a member of the Virginia Company, and in 1623 he made another voyage to Virginia—only, however, to die shortly afterwards.

There are numerous entries concerning *Mayflowers* during these years, but after the disappearance of the name of Christopher Jones from the Port Books, we are left with little guidance as to whether any one of these was the vessel of which he had been the master. In some cases the ship is demonstrably another vessel. In others the particulars furnished are not sufficient to enable us to form a definite conclusion. But there are two connected records which, if they refer to the Pilgrim ship—and they may do so—show that another voyage to New England in her was contemplated, even if it was not actually carried out. In 1623, Edmond Brudenell, of Stoke Mandevill, Buckinghamshire, a newly-admitted member of the Council for New England, and holder of a venturer's patent, addressed the Privy Council in a petition in which he spoke of his resolve "to making voyage to New England for the furtherance and good of the plantation there, and with him to carry over a company of forty men or thereabouts." His suit was that their lordships would "grant him liberty to ship 3 or 4 pieces of ordnance and 200*l.* in money, for the buying and providing of some provisions and necessaries for himself and his company before they set on wards of their intended voyage, he laying out and bestowing all the same 200*l.* before he depart out of his Majesty's kingdoms of England and Ireland" (S. P. Colonial, 1574-1660, II., 31). What followed is not clear, but on the 4th and 5th March, 1624, a *Mayflower* of London, with John Barker as master, was loading in the Thames a miscellaneous cargo for Ireland and New England, entered in the name of "Edward Brudnell." It is perhaps to be inferred that "Edward Brudnell" of the Port Book

was a relative of "Edmond Brudenell" of the petition, and that the voyage which was being undertaken in 1624 was in some sort of sequel to the petition. The question arises—Was the Barker *Mayflower* the Pilgrim ship? This is not at all impossible, but if she was, it is hardly probable that she reached New England again. We know that she was "*in ruinis*" at Rotherhithe on the 26th May, 1624, and in spite of the quick passage which she had made from New England in 1621, it is scarcely likely, in view of this description, that she performed the double voyage within the period 5th March—26th May, 1624. If the Barker ship was not the Pilgrim vessel, she may well have completed the voyage to New England, though the usual authorities make no mention of the arrival of a *Mayflower* there between 1620 and 1629. Her master was probably identical with the John Barker who in 1638 was in charge of the *John and Barbara*, one of three ships that were being sent out by London merchants to Virginia with provisions of bedding, linen, woollen, shoes, candles, stockings, apparel, powder, shot, butter, cheese, and divers other necessities for their plantations there ("Acts of Privy Council, Colonial Series, 1613-1680" p. 238).

(*To be continued.*)

CORRECTIONS FOR ARTICLE IN JANUARY NUMBER.

P. 4.—For "*Samuel and Solomon*" read "*Samuel or Solomon*."

P. 5, l. 3 from bottom.—For "This" read "His."

Pp. 6-7.—In the particulars of voyages the query mark in each case should be made to refer, not to the date, but to the port for which the ship was bound or from which she had come. In each case the port was pretty certainly Bordeaux or Rochelle, but in the absence of a definite entry, it is impossible to say with assurance which of them it was. For "Enland" read "England."

P. 7, l. 7 from bottom.—For "tons" read "tuns."