

## St Helena Records 1696-1699

**Introduction:** This is the fifth volume in the series St Helena Records, which summarises the proceedings of official meetings held by the island's Governor and Council, during which matters of government, defence, supplies, justice and discipline were discussed and recorded.

**Source:** Images of the original records can be viewed on the British Library's website: <https://eap.bl.uk/archive-file/EAP1364-1-1-5>.

**Text Transcription** This transcription was produced by AI from handwritten document images held on the British Library's website, at about thirty pages per hour. Given the limitations described below, the text should be regarded as unreliable and used only as a search-and-find shortcut: once a relevant section has been located, it must always be checked against the source image via the hyperlinked Film Numbers listed in the main transcription table below.

Three specific problems affected the work. First, AI tends to prioritise meaning and readability at the expense of fidelity to the original, with a strong disposition to normalise spellings, expand abbreviations, and adjust grammar. It is particularly weak with unfamiliar surnames, and scrawled signatures often resist accurate transcription entirely. Transcriptions by eye of documents spanning four centuries have also shown that a single surname could be written in a wide variety of ways: the Crowie family name appears under six different spellings, and the Isaacs family name under sixteen. Searches for surnames are therefore hindered both by genuine variations in the originals and by mistranscriptions introduced by AI, and for this reason are best run phonetically. Second, the AI struggled with the late secretary hand, the script commonly used from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, in which the letter S appears in a form closely resembling a trailing L. Third, occasional passages in these volumes are written in a hand so obscure or poorly formed as to be difficult to read even by eye, sometimes compounded by heavy ink bleed-through from the reverse side or by the loss of sections of pages.

To mitigate these difficulties, a strict protocol was applied to each image, requiring the AI to rely solely on clearly visible ink strokes and to flag any uncertain reading, thereby reducing the risk of inferred or invented text. Two conventions are used. [...] marks text that could not be read with confidence; this may represent a single unreadable word, a full sentence, or occasionally an entire paragraph. Square brackets around letters or words indicate a conjectural reading supplied by the transcriber: brackets around a whole word, for example [Bazett], mean the entire word was unclear and a probable reading has been supplied, while brackets around individual letters within an otherwise readable word, for example B[a]z[e]tt, mean only those specific letters were unclear in the source and the unbracketed letters were legibly present.

**Modern Summary and Analysis** Each section of text was submitted for AI analysis in order to explain the archaic language in clear, modern UK English. These are not direct sentence by sentence replacements, but explanatory interpretations intended to clarify meaning while preserving the substance of the original. Where a specific individual is named within a section of the original text, that person will generally also be identified within the explanatory interpretation. However, where the original consists largely of lists of names, these are not usually repeated in the explanatory text.

Each text modern summary is followed by two forms of AI-generated analysis. The first, an Interpretations section, draws on wider information located on the internet to provide additional commentary on the material. The second, a Speculations section, offers one or more possible reflections on what the document might further suggest. The value of these notes ranges from the profound to the trivial or self-evident; time did not permit deletion of the latter.

**Text Loss:** Many pages have incomplete or missing edges, resulting in the loss of text and unnumbered pages throughout the document. A substantial number of pages also have extensive bleeding of ink from the verso. Likewise, many page corners with text are missing. The quality of the ink varies significantly, sometimes on the same page ranging from very bold ink to very faint.

**Referencing Text Locations:** A dual numbering system has been adopted, combining the British Library film number with the manuscript's original page number. These are presented in the format: British Library Film No. / Document Page No.

**Pagination:** Pagination begins at film No. 9 (9/1) and shows several gaps and irregularities. The first gap lies between 47/39 and 48/42, with pages 40 and 41 missing; it is unclear whether any content has been lost here. A second gap appears between 73/67 and 74/70, where pages 68 and 69 are absent, although the same subject matter continues. Around page 109 the numbering falters: the sequence moves back from 113/109 to 114/108, then resumes at 115/109 and proceeds, and this anomaly coincides with a change of subject. Finally, there is a jump from 227/221 to 228/223, though the subject matter remains consistent across this gap.

**Dates:** During the period covered by this volume, England and its colonies followed the Old-Style Julian calendar, under which the legal new year began on 25 March (Lady Day). When creating the modern interpretations of these texts, the AI has automatically adjusted the dates. For any date quoted in these early St Helena records falling in the period between January and 25 March, the year has been moved forward to the modern equivalent. Month names were frequently rendered using Roman calendar abbreviations such as 7ber, 8ber, 9ber and 10ber, in which September through to December were counted as the seventh to tenth months. The earliest date recorded in this volume is 3 July 1696 and the last is 6 July 1699.

The Council meetings were held during the administrations of Captain Richard Kelinge/Keeling (1693-1697) and Captain Stephen Poirier (1697-1707).

### **AI Generated Summary**

The proceedings summarised here run from a consultation held at Fort James on 13 Jul 1696 to a consultation held on 6 Jul 1699, a span of just under three years during which the government of St Helena passed from Richard Keeling to Stephen Poirier, the country church was agreed for rebuilding and then accounted for, a slave was hanged and quartered for murder, the wild goats of the island became the subject of a small constitutional crisis, and the East India Company's outpost was repeatedly drawn into the wider currents of European war and Indian Ocean piracy. The chronology is anchored by three figures: Keeling, already a dying man when the volume opens; his successor Stephen Poirier, who entered upon the government on 30 Nov 1697; and Thomas Goodwin, whose hand authenticates almost every record. Below them moved a community of planters, soldiers, free Black inhabitants, enslaved men, women and children, and the constantly changing population of seamen. The records were despatched to the Honourable East India Company by the ship *Anna*, commanded by Captain Sam Bridges, and they need to be read with attention both to what is recorded and to what the record cannot show. [Film Nos. 9, 87, 240, 255]

#### *Governance and administration*

The first consultation registers a government already weakened by illness. Keeling's clerk recorded that the Governor had suffered for a long time from a lingering disease which brought him to the grave, that he had been unable for some time to conduct business, and that this was the reason why neither the present consultation book nor part of the previous council book bore his signature. The fact that the Council had to record the reason for Keeling's missing signature shows how much the legitimacy of the record depended on gubernatorial authentication. The opening business of the same day was the practical disposition of Alexander Manning's estate after his widow Margaret declined to take it into her own hands, so that the Governor's incapacity and the disposition of the surgeon's estate sat side by side as if they belonged to the same problem of administrative continuity. [Film No. 9]

Keeling's death on 30 Nov 1697 was framed by reference to the providence of Almighty God and to the practical anxiety that the number of persons available to manage the affairs of the Honourable Company on the island was now very small. Poirier entered upon the government in accordance with arrangements made on 2 Jan 1694, when Keeling, Poirier himself and three garrison captains had appointed him to succeed. The very careful recital of these prior arrangements was almost certainly meant to forestall dispute. It also exposed an institutional truth that the civil government rested on the willingness of the men who

controlled the muskets, and that succession on St Helena was as much a military as a civil event. Poirier's expression of humility in accepting the burden was probably more strategic than personal. [Film No. 87]

Poirier's first administrative crisis concerned his clerk John Packnall, who had served Goodwin in writing duties since July 1697 and was sworn in to succeed John Vernon on the same salary. By 24 Feb 1698 the Council was forced to dismiss him after evidence emerged that he had given false intelligence and had written letters to the present Governor of Batavia, which the Council feared could cause serious harm to the Company's interests in India. The records do not preserve what Packnall actually wrote. They preserve the Council's framing of why he could not be allowed to write any more, a small but telling reminder that the official record systematically privileges the perspective of the body that produced it. John Alexander, judged most suitable, succeeded him and would serve as clerk of Council across the rest of the period. [Film Nos. 88, 99, 105]

Below the Governor and Council sat a parish-level administration of churchwardens for the east and west divisions, overseers of the highways, a surveyor and a sexton. The form of the oath taken by churchwardens was set out in detail on 14 Jul 1697 for Edward Edmunds and John Rich. They were required to safeguard church monies, keep registers of marriages, christenings and burials, organise the rebuilding of the country church, and report all open and notorious misconduct, including profane swearing, drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking and sexual immorality. They were also required to assemble the inhabitants on Easter Monday at the country church to choose by majority vote a minister and four candidates each for churchwarden and overseer of the highways, from whom the Governor and Council would select two of each. The order combined participatory selection with administrative confirmation. [Film Nos. 82, 83]

The system did not run unopposed. On 5 Apr 1697 two men named Edmunds, accompanied by several planters, returned only two names for churchwardens when eight had been required, declaring that the right to choose and nominate parish officers belonged to the planters and that the Company had no authority to issue such an order, and adding that the planters were greatly aggrieved by the Company. The Governor refused to accept the return on the grounds that too few had been nominated, required them to put their position in writing, and after further discussion produced enough additional names to make the appointments. The compromise drew the dissenters into office while preserving the Governor's authority over the form of nomination, a settlement characteristic of how Keeling's and later Poirier's administrations handled friction. The annual nominations system continued to be operated through 1698 and 1699 with the same handful of senior planters rotating between offices. [Film Nos. 58, 59, 69, 129, 155, 229]

The most direct early challenge to Poirier's authority came on 5 Apr 1698 when information was brought to the Governor that John Hemmerson had said that the present Governor was not a Governor but only a deputy governor. Richard Leach, sworn, testified that Hemmerson had said this in the context of complaining about the verdict of his cattle case against Burnham. The connection between Hemmerson's complaint about a courtroom defeat and his denial of Poirier's authority shows how disputes within the courtroom could spill over into challenges to the legitimacy of office, and how dissent over a particular ruling could be reframed by the Council as a challenge to government itself. The matter was settled in a single hearing the next day when Hemmon was placed in the marshal's custody, requested pardon, and was pardoned on his promise. [Film Nos. 124, 125]

The administration of Keeling's estate produced the most spectacular dispute of the period. On 16 May 1698 George Carne, who had married Keeling's widow Mercy, brought a sealed chest containing the inventory before the Council. After the receipt had been signed, Poirier asked Carne not to speak against him in his office. Carne replied dismissively, denied Poirier's claim to higher position, and challenged the Governor to fight. He stepped back as if to draw his sword, but the hilt came off in his hand, and Thomas Goodwin intervened to prevent further action. The guard disarmed Carne and brought him into the middle of the court, where he challenged anyone present to fight him in defence of the Governor. Edward Emund offered bail; Carne, after time, became calmer, stated that he did not deny the Governor's authority in office although he claimed to be his equal as a gentleman, and was dismissed on his promises. The case shows how thinly the difference between official rank and gentlemanly status could be maintained on a small

island, and how a single breakdown could be carried through into a sequence of certified depositions. [Film Nos. 130, 131, 132, 133, 134]

On 17 May 1698 the Council heard reports that Mr Edmunds had said on board the *Syone* that if he drew his sword no man on the island would dare face it. The testimony rested chiefly on hearsay among soldiers and shipboard companions, and the Council judged it insufficient and cleared Edmunds of the accusation. The contrast with Hemmerson's case shows how the same Council could move briskly when the offender confessed and conservatively when proof was thin. The volume's pattern is for authority to be defended by evidence rather than reflex, and although that pattern undoubtedly served the Council's own interests in legitimacy, it also limited the abuses to which a small executive could be tempted. [Film No. 135]

Refusal to serve as juror in the most serious capital case of the period exposed the limits of Poirier's authority over leading planters. After the proclamation of 25 Oct 1698 calling a court of justice to try Caesar for the murder of Jacob, Edward Edmunds and John Frith refused to serve. They had previously told the Governor that they believed he had no authority to call a court to try any person in matters of life and death, and that he had no proper authority to govern at all. Each was fined ten shillings to the Honourable Company and the matter was reported to the Company by the ship *Dorrill*. The case shows that Poirier's right to convene a capital court was not universally accepted by the leading planters and that local judicial legitimacy still depended in part on the willingness of inhabitants to participate in juries. [Film No. 181]

By 20 Jun 1699 the regulation of the Fort's general table had been received from the Honourable Company. The persons admitted to dine included Poirier as Governor, Thomas Bright as deputy governor, Goodwin as ensign and his wife, John Humphreys as minister, Hugh Yankeel as surgeon and his wife, and others. The list shows that by mid-1699 the senior administration had grown beyond the bare establishment of 1697 and that a minister had at last been appointed in addition to a soldier-reader. The arrival of Thomas Bright as deputy governor, named first in May 1699, signals a thickening of the senior structure of government, and the inclusion of two wives at the table marks a small but real domestic enlargement of the Company's establishment. [Film No. 240]

#### *Military affairs and defence*

Defence on St Helena combined a small permanent garrison, a network of out-forts, and a militia of planters who could be summoned in alarm. Discipline within the garrison was uneven and was enforced by visible, sometimes humiliating, punishment. Robert Cadman was charged in November 1696 with neglecting to execute a direct order by stopping at John Fuller's house to drink punch while sent to fetch John Young to mount guard. Cadman and Young were dismissed on a promise not to repeat the offence; Fuller was fined ten shillings to the Company for retailing strong liquor without licence and bound to good behaviour. Discipline of the soldier and discipline of the publican were inseparable, a pattern repeated whenever drink and duty crossed paths. [Film Nos. 26, 27]

In October and November 1696 the Council uncovered what it described as a Dutch conspiracy on board the *Mary*, commanded by Captain Thomas Hayes. Bertrand Audrard, a French smith permitted to remain on the island, learned from Gilbert Johnson, a Dutch cooper, that two countrymen had revealed an intention to kill all the Englishmen on board, throw them overboard, seize the ship and carry her to France. Audrard reported to the Governor; James Bowan, who understood Dutch, was placed at the house of James Rider to overhear the cooper repeat the design; Audrard's French statement was translated and certified by Matt Bazett. Eight Dutchmen were secured in the dungeon, the cooper was confined, and the men were ultimately despatched on the Company's ship *Fisher*. The references to France and to the ship being carried away there must be read against the backdrop of the Nine Years' War between England and France, which had only just ended at the Peace of Ryswick in October 1697; the depositions belonged to the previous year, when capture by a French port would still have been a wartime prize, and the Council's anxiety responded directly to that wider context. [Film Nos. 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40]

The case also raises difficult questions of evidence. The depositions rested heavily on punch-house conversations and on the testimony of an outsider acting under official direction. The instruction that Audrard should remain in company with the conspirators and arrange for Bowan to overhear them was a

deliberate method of converting suspect speech into formal proof, a method that could shape evidence as well as confirm it. The records do not allow a reader to test whether the threat was as advanced as the depositions claimed, but the Council's caution in requiring repeated confirmation before securing the suspects suggests its members were themselves conscious of the limits of what they had heard. [Film Nos. 33-40]

In January 1698 fresh intelligence arrived. Captain Mostyn, commander of the *Fortune* of New York, came in from Madagascar and reported that, shortly before he left, three French men-of-war had sailed for home, raising concern that they might attempt to take the island. Although the Treaty of Ryswick had formally ended the war the previous October, news travelled slowly, and the Council acted on the most recent voyage report rather than on confirmed news from Europe. An order was made that both soldiers and freemen should be immediately warned to repair to their posts on alarm, with arms ready, and an exact list was to be taken of the armory and of the guard, including the out-forts. The combination of cautious mobilisation and reliance on a passing captain illustrates how a small island settlement on the maritime route to and from the East Indies was always vulnerable to events whose timing it could not control. [Film No. 93]

Garrison discipline produced a steady flow of punishments. On 21 Mar 1698 Serjeant Samuel Hollebury was severely warned for having been drunk on guard, with most of his guard following him into the same condition. He was dismissed for the present with a severe warning, while Gilbert Johnson, the same Dutch cooper of the earlier conspiracy, was placed in irons and committed at the Council's pleasure after threats of revenge. The graded approach, lenient first-offence treatment for a sergeant and indefinite confinement for a foreign cooper with a record of disorder, exposes the calibration of severity that runs throughout the volume and the differential standards by which insiders and outsiders were judged. [Film No. 57]

Hamo Hocci and Anthony Baukand, soldiers in Company pay, were examined on 18 Mar 1698 after attempting to leave the island aboard the last Dutch ship. Both denied intending to desert and stated that the boatswain had invited them on board to drink, but Baukand's clothes had been found on board, which the Council took as clear proof of his plan. Both were ordered to ride the wooden horse at the guard relief for one hour, a punishment that combined physical discomfort with public humiliation. A separate case in the same period involved Simon Lenox, who had gone aboard a ship on a Saturday, remained all night, and returned on Sunday morning carrying merchandise. He was fined three shillings to the church. Soldiers lived close enough to the road that a single night on board could combine three concerns at once: leaving guard duty, contact with passing ships, and Sabbath-breaking. [Film Nos. 109, 110]

On 23 Jan 1699 several inhabitants complained that on the previous Thursday they had heard gunfire at Prosperous Bay, the main lookout, which caused the settlement to leave its work and hurry to assigned posts before the alarm proved false. William and John Mudge admitted that George Carne, John Long and others had visited the lookout, brought liquor, drunk together, and on departing fired guns from their own powder, and stated that this had been common practice with no order forbidding it. The Council recognised that no prior regulation existed and on the next day issued a proclamation forbidding any person from firing guns at Prosperous Bay lookout under any pretext, except in cases where a ship was sighted or to prevent an enemy landing. The episode shows how informal social activity at lookout posts could undermine the very signals on which defence depended, and how regulations were often issued retrospectively after a misuse came to public notice. [Film Nos. 195, 196]

The garrison's labour for public works was organised through an annual list of all white inhabitants, male servants and male slaves within the assigned divisions. The yearly account taken and certified by John Alexander for 1697 listed 50 white labourers and 92 slaves, allocated by household. The list shows the social structure of the island in summary: a senior administration with several slaves, a working planter class with one or two each, and a small number of households with no labour to contribute beyond the householder. The order of 9 Jul 1698 fixed payment rates at eighteen pence for a white man's day's work and twelve pence for a black man's day's work, and authorised overseers to seize goods to recover charges from defaulters; the differential rate written into law captures the racial economy of labour on the island in a single line. [Film Nos. 155, 156]

Soldier-on-soldier disputes form a recurring theme in the closing weeks of the volume. On 29 Jun 1699 John Henderson complained that Jonathan Midge and Richard Ray had pulled him by the legs from his bed in the long gallery, where soldiers usually gathered while on guard, leaving him injured by nails and splinters. The case was postponed because Henderson was not yet sober, and when later offered the oath he refused to take it. Midge was nevertheless punished by riding the wooden horse for one hour; Ray was released. On the same day Samuel Wrangham complained that Charles Steward had tried to stab him with a knife while drunk; Steward gave bond for good behaviour. The cases show how testimony was tested against the reliability of the witness and how soldiers' drinking continued to disrupt order in the long gallery and around the guard. [Film Nos. 243, 244, 251, 252]

#### *Settlement, land and agriculture*

Land on St Helena was held in tenure rather than in absolute property. The Honourable Company remained the proprietor; planters held leases or grants, often subject to reserved rights such as access to timber. A petition by Samuel Maxwell to lease 15 acres of waste land at Sandy Bay for 21 years from 25 Dec 1696 was granted at four shillings per acre, with the reservation that the Governor on behalf of the Company might take and use any timber tree on the land whenever occasion required. The same logic governed the exchange granted to Henry Cale on 2 Nov 1696, who swapped ten acres at High Hill for ten acres on the hills of Deep Valley but was nevertheless required to allow the Company to fell and cut any timber tree on the new parcel. Even after rent was paid, the Company kept its claim to particular resources. The recurring theme is that ownership was real but partial, and that final authority rested with the proprietor in London. [Film Nos. 22, 23, 25]

The most consequential land case of the early period is the dispute brought by Thomas Earle in August 1697. Earle's father-in-law, Richard Stacy, had sold 20 acres of land originally allotted by the Company to Earle's father John Earle. By the time the case reached the Council the 20 acres had passed into Company possession and formed part of a designated pasture. The Council acknowledged the claim but explained that the land could not easily be returned, and settled the matter by offering Earle land formerly held by John Hemmings at Deep Valley Head, which he was to sell to William Coale for fifteen pounds sterling, with calibrated payments to Earle and to the Company. Earle relinquished all claims in a comprehensive quitclaim. The case shows how a confiscation that the Company had effected for its own purposes could later be settled with calibrated payments and substituted parcels rather than restitution in kind, a settlement that protected the Company's territorial logic while keeping the affected planter inside the system. [Film Nos. 84, 85]

The recovery of confiscated land formed a separate strand. On 12 Apr 1698 John Nichols asked to recover ten acres at the Peaks which had been part of his father's twenty-acre holding, confiscated in 1688 for an offence against the Company. Although Nichols had lost his original title, supporting witnesses including the widow of William Rutter swore that he had purchased the land. The Council was satisfied of the justice of his claim and granted permission for him to hold and use the ten acres on a yearly rent to the Company, expressly reserving the Company's rights. The original deed of sale dated 30 Jan 1682, in the thirty-third year of the reign of King Charles II, was produced as further proof. The reservation of Company rights even in restitution shows the persistent priority of proprietary claim over private title. [Film Nos. 126, 127, 128]

Richard Gurling's water-damaged deeds were copied into the council books on 10 Aug 1698 to preserve them. The series ran across many film numbers and recorded in summary the layered transactions by which Gurling had built up his holdings: the purchase from Richard Griffith of land near Fort James, the purchase from Gabriel Lovell of two slaves named Jack and Jone for twenty-four pounds in 1689 and of thirty acres at Horse Pasture Plain for twenty pounds in the same year, the assignments from Richard Stacy, and the indentures with John George, James Wakefield, William Clifton and others. The Gurling papers form the most concentrated body of land transactions in the volume and reveal how, over fifteen years, a single planter could assemble holdings of nearly a hundred acres through combined sales, exchanges and assignments. The Council's books were the registry of last resort for a society without a proper land registry of its own. [Film Nos. 145-154]

New land sales continued throughout the period. On 5 Apr 1697 Thomas Dixon, a serjeant, was sold 40 acres of land, two houses and provisions for eighty-five pounds, with one year for full payment. On 7 Jun 1699 Thomas Gargen senior, a soldier with a family and no settled place, was granted a house and ten acres of gumwood land for forty-five pounds, with one year for full payment without interest and a further three years allowed at five per cent. The terms reveal an administration concerned to bring land into productive use rather than to extract immediate cash, and a credit-based market in which Company assets could be redistributed without large initial outlays from settlers. [Film Nos. 55, 90, 239]

Boundary disputes and cattle damage form a steady undertow in the records. John Hemmon and Thomas Burnham senior were repeatedly before the Council over poor fences, dogs that chased cattle, and disputed liability for animal deaths. Sworn witnesses testified that Burnham's dogs would chase cattle for half a mile and that his fences were inadequate, and yet the jury decided against Hemmon and ordered him to pay the court charges; the dogs and the inadequate fences were not enough to establish liability without direct proof. The same parties returned in June 1698 with the roles reversed, and the case was settled by mediated agreement in which Hemmon was required to dispose of the leading animal of his herd. The reasoning, that removing the dominant animal would reduce the herd's tendency to trespass, shows how mediated agreements drew on practical knowledge of livestock as well as on rules about fencing. [Film Nos. 121, 122, 137, 138]

The most extensive piece of agricultural regulation in the volume concerns the goat hunting crisis. On 30 Aug 1698 the Council recorded that several inhabitants had hunted and shot wild goats under the cover of an earlier proclamation, often killing tame goats they did not own. On 5 Oct 1698 the Council further considered the position. The Honourable Company had previously declared all wild goats on the island to be its property; over the past fifty-four years circumstances had changed, with domesticated goats increasing greatly, being forced inland, entering plantations and threatening cattle, while ships visited only rarely and many goats had lapsed back into the wild. After a general assembly of all freemen at Fort James, a unanimous decision was reached fixing Wednesday as the only day for goat hunting, forbidding solitary hunts, banning hunting in the kidding season, and treating any breach as felony. The classification of goat-hunting offences as felony shows how seriously the Council regarded the maintenance of the new arrangement, and how a question that might appear minor cut to the heart of property and livelihood on the island. [Film Nos. 158, 159, 174, 175, 176]

Enforcement followed swiftly. Robert Colgrave and the widow Sarah Junt were each fined three shillings to the poor of the island for hunting wild goats against the Council's order. The same day's proceedings recorded the related Brayne and Colgrave dispute, in which Edward Brayne, drunk at Mr Mosley's house, struck Colgrave by pulling at his cap, called him bastard and son of a whore, and said that if he had enough bacon and beef he would not eat so much goat. The jury fined Brayne five shillings, ordered him to pay Colgrave for the torn cap, and warned him not to abuse Colgrave again, with the explicit acknowledgement in the verdict that Colgrave was an honest man. The combined cases show how disputes over the goat regulation produced both formal charges and personal abuse, and how the Council preserved a sense of injured reputation by recording, in the verdict itself, that the injured party was honest. [Film Nos. 188, 189]

In early 1699 the Company's attention turned to food security. On 23 Jan 1699 the Council recorded that a long drought, understood as an act of divine providence, together with the neglect of several inhabitants over the past five or six years, had led to a shortage of staple crops. To ensure a reliable supply of yams for the fort, the Council purchased ten acres at the head of Prosperous Valley from Samuel Taylor, a free planter intending to leave on the next homeward-bound ship. The land already contained 35,000 yam plants and was sold for thirty-five pounds, credited to him in the Company's accounts. The response combines a religious framing of the drought with a practical assessment of agricultural neglect, and represents a direct intervention in food production by the administration that goes beyond the more usual reliance on private cultivation. [Film No. 196]

The case of Simon Whaley shows the other side of agricultural failure. On 21 Mar 1699 Thomas Goodwin and Edward Dunsdon, churchwardens, informed the Governor that Whaley, his wife and his family were in severe poverty, said to result from his failure to plant crops and improve his plantation. The

churchwardens were ordered to buy three bushels of yams and other provisions for the family, and Whaley was warned to take better care in planting. The case is one of the few entries that reveals the workings of parish poor relief, with food rather than money provided as immediate relief on condition of improved future conduct, a model that placed responsibility for present hunger on the past behaviour of the householder. [Film No. 206]

The land cases of Grace Coulson, widow, illustrate how a widow could secure both her son's inheritance and her own life interest. On 24 May 1698 Hugh Bodley transferred to her ten acres in Copped Valley, with plantation, houses, the slave woman Agu, hogs, more than twenty-two cattle, all tools and utensils, and an iron pot, in exchange for thirty-eight pounds in store payment. On the same day she made an indenture with her son John Coulson, placing him in possession of half of a house and plantation and reserving the remaining half for her lifetime. The Coulson papers, recorded together at her request to prevent loss or damage from moth, fire or water, show how the Council's books were used as a register of last resort for private agreements in a society without notarial infrastructure. [Film Nos. 232-237]

### *Supply and provisioning*

Supply on the island depended on plantations, on Company stores, and on the rare visits of ships. The most elaborate supply transaction came in March 1698, when Thomas Ellison, a planter intending to depart on His Majesty's ship the *Tringston*, offered the Council a working plantation: a Black man, a Black woman with her child, a Black boy of about ten years, thirty head of cattle, and a house at Fort James. The Council agreed to pay two thousand pounds by bill of exchange, payable by the Company in England, in return for the listed assets and a lodge with stores of provisions. The transaction shows the Company acting as both buyer and seller in the local market, the use of bills of exchange to defer payment to the metropole, and the integration of land, labour and livestock as a single estate, with people and cattle priced together on a single line. [Film Nos. 54, 55]

The remaining parts of the Ellison estate were sold by open outcry the next day. The Black man was secured by Joseph Badley acting for Rebecca Charlwood for thirty-four pounds; the Black woman and child by James Rider for eight pounds; the house known as Fortum Lodge by the Governor for fifteen pounds in settlement of debts owed to Ellison. The auction process used open competition to establish value; the use of bonds shifted payment risk into the future; and the Governor's purchase of Fortum Lodge in settlement of Company debt absorbed an asset against an outstanding liability. The integration of land, slaves, cattle and house in a single complex transaction shows how plantation economies could be assembled and disassembled rapidly within the operations of a chartered company. [Film No. 56]

On the same day the Council recorded the schedule of land, goods and cattle which had been left in the possession of Richard Gannon since the Company had taken control of the island. The schedule listed one Black man named Pedro at twenty pounds, one Black woman at sixteen pounds, thirty acres of land at forty-eight pounds, four cows, four calves, a heifer, and various goats, with a total of seventy-four pounds and fifteen shillings. The valuation by category, with people listed on the same schedule as cattle and goats, illustrates the administrative logic by which all assets were brought into a single financial framework, and exposes the abstraction by which the human beings on the schedule were rendered comparable to livestock for accounting purposes. [Film No. 81]

Imported goods were rationed and distributed under controlled allotment. Granny Jones, Higham, William Doveton and Peter Williams made a demand concerning corn goods that had recently arrived in the *Orange*, of which fifteen shares fell to the Company and the remainder was divided into four parts at one dollar per quart per man. The four men joined together, put their goods into saleable condition, and requested that payment be made out of their respective shares; the Council allowed credit accordingly. The episode shows credit-based settlement, joint action by inhabitants, and the use of imported goods as both consumable provisions and accounting instruments. [Film No. 91]

Maritime supply also required emergency response. On 26 Dec 1697 the Council recorded that the sea had been rough for three days, and that on the last night a longboat and a galley had broken loose. Two Company slaves were sent to swim out to the drifting boats and Thompson Wills and Richard Allen were

sent in the galley; the slaves overtook the drifting vessels and secured them. An order was made that the slaves should receive sixteen handkerchiefs to be distributed among them and others involved. The whole episode shows hazardous labour distributed across slaves and free men, deployed under direct council authority and rewarded with material goods rather than coin. The wages of risk on St Helena, in this case, were paid in handkerchiefs. [Film No. 92]

Subsequent reassessment showed how the Council adjusted resource use. On further consideration, the Council judged that the boat in question would, if kept for its original purpose, require the labour of many Company slaves and consume time that could not be spared from plantation work, and that the boats already kept for the use of the fort would be sufficient for plantation needs. The boat was sold by public outcry to Samuel Wrangham for seven pounds, and the proceeds were paid into the Company's stores. The episode is a small case of administrative recalibration: the same vessel that had been preserved with such effort in heavy seas was, when its labour cost outweighed its utility, sold off through the same market mechanism that had handled Ellison's plantation. [Film No. 95]

On 8 Jun 1698 Thomas Goodwin reported that he was in urgent need of assistance in managing the store, and Matthew Bartell was authorised to receive money in that role and was judged capable of performing the duties. The appointment shows the steady growth of administrative work at the store, and corresponds with Bartell's later inclusion as Goodwin's assistant in the order of 20 Jun 1699 regulating those admitted to the Fort table. [Film Nos. 136, 240]

Supply was placed under fresh strain by the drought, and the yam plantation purchased from Samuel Taylor was the central act of intervention. The same period saw the Council assigning Company-held labour to inhabitants in need: Jonathan Higham petitioned for a slave from the tonnage slaves held on the Company's account from a Madagascar ship, and the request was granted. The reference to tonnage slaves indicates a category of enslaved people brought on Company ships and held under the Company's account before being allocated, and the arrangement shows how labour shortage and the need to keep land in cultivation were addressed by direct grant of an enslaved person. [Film No. 238]

The detailed church accounts presented on 30 May 1699 by Thomas Goodwin and Edward Edmunds list payments for work done at the church and beyond it, including wages to the sexton, payments for the care of injured inhabitants such as Ralph Gates, the purchase of a cow, a heifer and a calf for John Hemmon's servant who had lost a hand, payments to John Bagley a carpenter and to John Bowman for a stone wall, totalling more than one hundred and twenty-seven pounds in expenditure. On the credit side were the Honourable Company's contribution towards rebuilding the church, sums collected on 2,218 acres assessed, head money, and gifts from passing captains. The accounts show how the church operated as both a religious and a welfare institution, with the rebuilding of the structure, the repair of roads, the care of injured and disabled inhabitants, and the support of the poor all financed through a single fund. [Film Nos. 230, 231, 232]

#### *Judiciary and legal process*

The judicial structure on the island combined two main forums. Routine matters and preliminary investigation belonged to the Governor and Council in consultation; serious or contested matters were referred to a Court of Justice or General Sessions held at the Sessions House near Fort James, where a jury of twelve sworn men, normally led by a foreman such as Orlando Bagley, would hear evidence and deliver a verdict. The structure was self-consciously modelled on English practice, and the same handful of senior planters served repeatedly across years as foremen and jurors, a feature that gave the courts continuity but also concentrated judicial authority in a small group. [Film Nos. 60, 119, 121, 180, 246]

Within this structure, evidence was secured by oath. The case of Richard Parnum and Nicholas Wilson over the price of potatoes turned on whether Wilson would swear an oath denying receipt of payment. The case of Henry Binn, surgeon of the island and former commander of the *Prudence*, over a ten pound apprenticeship debt for Thomas Sherwin, showed the willingness of the Council to enforce bonds even where no formal indenture had been executed. Sworn testimony, where written documents failed, was a substitute for documentary proof but was not a soft alternative; it carried legal weight precisely because the

oath imposed religious as well as legal obligation, and the Council's willingness to accept it speaks to a settler society in which paper proof was often unavailable. [Film No. 11]

The court was capable of trying cases of considerable evidentiary complexity. The case against Isabell Shayles, presented on 5 Apr 1697, involved her keeping idle persons at the house of Frewdale, drinking to drunkenness on a Sunday during divine service in the company of Dutchmen from the *Mary Ann*. Witnesses gave a layered account of comings and goings, and the licence was read before the jury so that they could decide whether Shayles had acted within its terms. The jury found her at fault on the breach of licence and ordered two days' labour towards the repair of the church; she later forfeited the five pounds sterling obligation given as security. The same day's proceedings ordered Mary Oliver, a free Black woman who had recently given birth to a bastard child, to receive twenty-one lashes on her bare body under the gallows, carried out immediately. The contrast between the formal jury process for a white woman keeping a disorderly house and the immediate flogging of a free Black woman for bastardy exposes the differential standards of proof and process applied to different categories of person. [Film Nos. 60, 61, 62, 63, 64]

The Council was also a probate court. The case of John Cleverlee, opened on 21 Dec 1696 with a sealed will produced by his father and brother, brought immediately into question the propriety of opening a sealed will after a husband's death; the Council accepted that any fault had been committed through ignorance and approved the will on sworn testimony. The wills of Edward Wilson, William Bowman, Fraise Rogers, Thomas Phillips, Jonathan Beale, Richard Souter and Thomas Tuesdale followed the same pattern of sworn proof and inventory. The verbal will of Mary Charlesworth's husband produced a contested debt against James Grandy, balanced into an order that he should pay two pounds with half a year for payment. The cluster of wills proved between December 1696 and July 1699 forms a continuous record of how property was transferred at death across the small population. [Film Nos. 49, 50, 68, 75, 76, 98, 111, 126, 203, 209, 248, 249]

Where guardianship was at issue, the Council exercised continuing supervision. Orphan estates were reviewed annually: Thomas Goodwin presented the account of Elizabeth Goring; Mary Manning produced that of Martha Hunt; John Goodwin presented the Greenlees orphans' account, and James Greenlees and Mary requested their portion in their own hands and gave receipts as discharge, marking a transition from guardianship to personal control. The Lovell children's estate was divided between Gabriel Lovell and Charles Nowell on condition of bond and good security in case the absent father returned. The orphan estate consultations of March 1699 followed the same form. The records show how the Council acted as a continuing fiduciary for orphans within a society where parents died young and remarriage rapidly altered domestic economies. [Film Nos. 117, 118, 207, 208]

Inquests followed sudden deaths. On 19 Jun 1697 news was brought to the Governor that John Lansdowne had hanged himself in his own house. An inquest of fourteen men was assembled without delay; Doctor Hoskinson testified that he had found no life remaining; Lansdowne's wife stated that her husband had shortly before been with Trench of the Company and had fetched drink from the store. The inquest's verdict, given upon oath, declared that Lansdowne had laid violent hands upon himself and had hanged himself. He was ordered to be buried at once in a hole at a crossway going up Peak Hill, with a stake driven through his body. The treatment combined a recognised English ritual condemnation of self-killing with practical haste; the question of his state of mind, only partly opened by the wife's account, was closed by the speed of burial, and the wife's testimony about a quarrel that morning was permitted no further investigation. [Film Nos. 77, 78]

The judicial process did not always end in conviction. The trial of Margaret, the wife of Thomas Burnham, accused of committing a lewd and unlawful act with the Dutch sailor Derick Denison, produced detailed sworn testimony from several witnesses including the Dutch sailor himself; nevertheless the jury, after a brief consideration, cleared her on the grounds that no proof of the act was found. The Governor's address to the jury beforehand had framed the offence in religious and moral language, drawing on Christian belief and on the destruction of past societies, and warning of the destructive consequences of adultery; the jury still required clear proof, which it did not find. The procedural caution of acquittal in a contested case, taken

with the immediate corporal punishment of free Black women for bastardy, exposes how the same court could move at very different speeds for different categories of person. [Film Nos. 106, 107, 108, 119, 120]

The will of John Cevelee the elder produced one of the volume's most contested cases. Around 14 Aug 1698 Richard Griffith, brother-in-law of John Facknald, asked the court to prove a verbal will. He had earlier attempted to present the deceased's written will for probate, the court had refused to accept it, and in anger he had torn it in pieces. Margaret Stich, Edward Edmunds, Samuel Maxwell and Richard Gurling all gave sworn evidence that the estate was to be divided equally between son and daughter. The court ruled the alleged will invalid, on the grounds that no documentary evidence existed and that Griffith had taken no legal action for seven or eight years. The case is exceptional in its length and in the fact that the central document had been destroyed by the very person who later sought to prove its existence; the Council's refusal to accept verbal substitution for a destroyed will protects probate from exactly the kind of post hoc reconstruction Griffith attempted. [Film Nos. 171, 172]

The Council also acted as a court of attorney. On 10 May 1699 Hugh Bodley appeared as attorney for John Vernon, who acted as attorney for Isaac Seafant, a widow, and demanded execution of the last will of John Canady. The same day Bodley acted as attorney for Mary Nicholson of London, demanding from Thomas Goodwin and William Facknald, executors of Thomas Phillips, the remaining part of the estate left to Ann Holmes and Mary Nicholson. Bodley further demanded eighty pounds as a legacy from Phillips for Mary Bird. When John Facknald refused to pay the money previously ordered, he was placed in prison until he paid the full sum or found two responsible men to act as sureties. The records show how London creditors and legatees pursued claims on St Helena estates through resident attorneys, and how imprisonment for debt was used in concert with a bond system to secure payment. [Film Nos. 224, 225, 226]

#### *Economy, currencies, bartering and accounting*

The economy of St Helena in this period operated through a layered mixture of currencies, goods, credit and labour. Sterling pounds, shillings and pence appeared in formal accounts. Dollars circulated alongside them, with the dollar treated as a recognisable unit of value. Arrack, sugar, cloth, cattle and timber were used as payment in kind. Bills of exchange linked the island to Company accounts in England, as in the two thousand pounds agreed with Thomas Ellison. Store payment functioned as an internal currency, and many transactions were settled by entry in the Company's books rather than by direct exchange of coin. The Coulson sale to Bodley of a slave woman, ten acres in Copped Valley and much else for thirty-eight pounds in store payment shows how a substantial transaction could be settled entirely through the Company's store accounts rather than through coin. [Film Nos. 24, 54, 233]

Margaret Ellison's claims, brought before the Council on 3 Mar 1698, illustrate the texture of an island credit economy. Her original claim that Thomas Gargan owed nine pounds was reassessed downwards to three pounds, with Gargan demonstrating that goods and barley already taken had reduced the obligation. Simon stated that he had partly paid Ellison through James Riden, who owed him that sum. The Council ordered the various parties to settle through a chain of timber, labour and coin, threading three layers of obligation together in a single ruling. Ellison's other small claims that day, against Robert Addi, Richard Evans and others for sums ranging from five shillings to two pounds and sixteen shillings, illustrate the same dispersed credit network at smaller scale. [Film Nos. 51, 52]

Barter and exchange in kind ran beneath the formal market. The slaves Roger and Margaret were involved in transactions in which Roger reportedly purchased a piece of striped fabric from John Bowman, with money said to have come from passing seamen. The Council ordered John Coulson to pay two dollars to the church for dealing in stolen goods contrary to its order, and John Bowman to pay the same offence at fourfold penalty. Other entries record the exchange of cuger hooks taken from the *Benjamin* for arrack, and of a handkerchief for a drink between Roger and Anthony, a slave belonging to Mrs Beale. Such transactions are visible in the record only when they intersect with offences, but their texture is unmistakable: punch, cloth, money, knives and silk passed through the same hands and fed the same evening's drinking. [Film Nos. 102, 103]

Currency and accounting also intersected in moments of administrative improvisation. In January 1698 the Governor opened a box containing plate belonging to Moore, recorded in an inventory of his goods, because Keeling's widow had taken with her almost all the movable goods on her departure from the fort, and Poirier was left without even enough pewter spoons to serve the Company's table. From the box the widow took a candlestick, a porringer, a large salt and a tumbler. The remaining plate weighed ninety ounces and was valued, as old, broken and worn silver, at twenty-two pounds and ten shillings. The total of thirty-one pounds and fifteen shillings was credited to Governor Blackmore's account. Both Poirier and the widow Keeling submitted themselves to the Company's decision and agreed that the plate should be returned if required. [Film Nos. 96, 97]

The legal recognition of mixed currency surfaced in the dispute between Thomas Davis and John Hacknald in February 1699. Hacknald acknowledged a bond for thirteen pounds and ten shillings originally owed by John Peirce, payable in lawful money of the island, defined as half silver and half copper bars. He had paid the silver half but had no copper bars, and offered Davis a bill drawn under Goodwin to cover the remaining half. Davis refused, saying that paper was not real payment as required by the bond. The jury ordered Hacknald to pay the remaining balance and the court charges. The case is one of the clearest illustrations of how the formal terms of a bond could over-ride the convenience of paper credit, and of how the choice between silver, copper bars and bills of exchange remained a matter of contractual specification. [Film No. 214]

The compensation levies on slave property are the volume's most striking demonstration of structured taxation. The first, recorded on 13 Sep 1698, related to the execution of James, a slave belonging to the late Governor Keeling, who had been found guilty of sorcery by a jury on 2 Jan 1694 and burned alive at the stake. The Council levied four shillings and twopence for each taxable slave owned by inhabitants at the time of the execution. The second levy followed Caesar's execution. On 19 Jan 1699 the Council valued the slave at twenty-three pounds and set a levy of three shillings for every ten pounds of value in slaves owned. The detailed list at film 193 records each owner with the number of slaves held, with totals running to ninety men and thirty-three women, total 179 slaves. The reference to the burning at the stake of a slave for sorcery is the gravest single act recorded in either part of the volume; its retrospective compensation through a fixed levy on slave property shows how the loss was treated administratively as a financial event rather than as a continuing question about the underlying offence, and the systematic enumeration of 1699 captures the slaveholding population in greater detail than any other entry. [Film Nos. 161, 162, 163, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194]

Several other financial cases illustrate the texture of the credit economy. On 30 May 1698 Richard Barram, preparing to leave the island, asked that several debts be entered in the Council books; on 7 Feb 1699 James Bruce complained that James Duffe, on leaving the island, had assigned to him debts owed by Thomas Atkins, William Bedle and others. On 20 Jun 1699 David Edmunds presented a petition concerning a bill of exchange for one hundred and ninety pounds, signed by the Governor and Council and payable by the Honourable East India Company in England, held by Jervell Walker, a former soldier on the island who had since died at sea. The claim was clear, but the Council could not settle so large a sum locally, and the petition was sent to the Company by the first ship bound home. The case shows the limits of the Council's financial authority and the position of the Company in London as the final arbiter of large bills. [Film Nos. 199, 200, 238]

#### *Social order, Sabbath observance and domestic disputes*

The Council and its courts exercised continuous oversight of behaviour judged to disturb public order. Many of these cases turn on the difficulty of distinguishing private misconduct from public offence in a settlement in which most people lived within a short walk of one another. Unlicensed sale of drink was punished consistently. John Fuller was found in November 1696 to be regularly selling punch without licence and was fined ten shillings; Isabell Shayles forfeited the five pound sterling obligation given as security for her licence. The system of licensed retail was supported by financial bonds and by the threat of public labour for breach. [Film Nos. 27, 60, 64]

The most notorious moral case of the period concerns Mary Hayles's house on 30 Nov 1696. Hayles complained that four Dutch lodgers from ships, together with two Englishmen, Joseph Hoston and John Gregory, had taken possession of her house during her absence in the country, locking her eleven-year-old daughter inside. The daughter cried out that they should not make a bawdy house of her father's house. Witnesses described the gathering at which Mary Feudales, the wife of Thomas Feudale, had quarrelled with her husband and gone to the Dutchmen; John Gregory's account, that he had found a Dutchman in carnal copulation with her, was supported by Elizabeth Birch and Pippin Wills. A warrant was issued for Feudales but she could not be found; she was finally traced to John Nicholls's house in the country, where she had spent two days drinking arrack and pawning gold rings before slipping away. The Council ordered ninety-nine lashes each for Hoston and Gregory, with Gregory's sentence later remitted by petition; the four Dutchmen were also ordered to receive ninety-nine lashes and were sent on board the *Mary*. [Film Nos. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33]

Domestic disputes were brought into the public record at every social level. The complaint of Joyce Huntley against her father-in-law James Grandy in April 1697 about abusive language and threats was remitted on condition of future good behaviour. On 25 Mar 1698 Joy Huntly appeared to prove that her husband John Huntly, a cooper in the army, was dead. The proof relied on the testimony of seafarers: Benjamin Seale and others had heard from various ship's quartermasters that Huntly had been whipped from ship to ship and had died. The Council, finding that Huntly had been absent for a long time and had not been heard from by any means, judged him to be dead on the strength of cumulative testimony, released his wife from the marriage and permitted her to remarry. The case shows how legal death could be established without direct proof on the basis of overlapping reports brought back by passing seamen, a method made necessary by the maritime geography of the settlement. [Film Nos. 67, 111, 112, 114]

Defamation cases formed a particular cluster. Samuel Taylor brought a complaint against John Mudge in March 1698, on behalf of his wife Katherine, whose former husband had been executed for rebellion. He alleged that Mudge had demanded twenty shillings from her, claiming to have been her former husband, and had said her former husband had been hanged. He requested judgement according to a proclamation issued by Governor Blackmore, his Council, and Sir John Weybourne at a court martial, which imposed a penalty of twenty shillings for insulting a woman in word or action in a public place. The jury found against Mudge. On the same day, the Council heard a slander case between John Coles and John Hensley, in which a small sum of money had been hidden in jest by Richard Searing and Hensley had wrongly accused Coles of taking it. The jury found Hensley partly at fault and required him to ask Coles for forgiveness in open court. [Film Nos. 120, 121, 122, 123, 124]

Childbirth and paternity outside marriage were treated through a combination of corporal punishment for the woman and an order for maintenance addressed to the named father. Martha Oliver, examined on oath in early 1698, stated that she had given birth to a bastard child and named Gabriel Towell as the father. An order was made that she should immediately receive thirty-nine lashes on her bare back, and that Towell should maintain the child and keep the parish free from any charge. The pairing of immediate corporal punishment for the mother with a lasting financial obligation on the named father shows the dual logic of moral discipline and parish welfare that characterised the Council's treatment of bastardy, and the gendered asymmetry of pain and money is unmistakable. [Film No. 90]

Sabbath enforcement was maintained through fines to the church account. On 21 Jun 1698 Henry Coales was fined six shillings to the church for sending his slave into the country from the fort on a Sunday with goods. On 13 Sep 1698 a complaint was brought against several slaves who had drunk arrack at Levi Morris's house on Sunday 11 Sep; the slaves were ordered whipped at the flagstaff for breaking the Sabbath, and Levi Morris was fined five shillings to the church for encouraging the behaviour by supplying alcohol. On 16 Jan 1699 a slave belonging to John Goodwin was fined for carrying goods on a Sunday. The differential treatment, with masters fined and slaves whipped, captures in administrative form the racial division built into Sabbath law on the island. [Film Nos. 138, 159, 160, 165, 186, 197]

The case between Henry Coales, the marshal, and Elizabeth Lansdowne, widow of John Lansdowne, opened on 5 Jul 1698 and ran for months. Coales complained that Lansdowne had told several people that

he had attempted to have sexual relations with her. The complaint was supported by his account of similar reported claims about Sarah Frining, attempted three weeks after she had given birth, and about Elizabeth, wife of John Long. Lansdowne, examined, stated that Coales had on several occasions asked her to have sexual relations with him both before and after her husband's suicide, and Sarah Frining supported her account in detail. Multiple corporals and gunner's mates testified to having found Coales hidden or attempting to grab the women, and Coales admitted one such act, calling it a moment of foolish behaviour. After half an hour the jury returned a verdict that Lansdowne had defamed Coales, fined her one shilling in damages, and ordered her to pay the costs of the court. The verdict, awarding only one shilling despite the formal finding of defamation, is striking in its modesty and may reflect the jury's recognition that there was substance to the complaints against Coales as well as to the formal defamation against him. [Film Nos. 140, 141, 142, 167, 168, 169, 170]

The Mudge and Taylor wall and water case shows how property disputes could be entangled with reputation. On 26 Dec 1698 John Mudge, a soldier, complained that Samuel Taylor had locked him in his own house, and that Taylor had told several people that Mudge had fired a gun whose shot passed through his garden into Taylor's. The wives of the two men exchanged insults; Grace Coulson described how Mudge had built a garden wall against Taylor's wall without paying half the cost. The Council found no clear proof and dismissed the case. The same day's proceedings produced Andrew Phillips's account of a gold ring sent to Elizabeth Hartling from England by her grandmother, and Katherine Taylor's complaint against John Long for calling her a whore at the house of Thomas Gorgen. The compression of property dispute, defamation and inheritance into a single day's business is characteristic of how a small court handled the contested relationships of a small settlement. [Film Nos. 182, 183, 184, 185, 186]

The defamation case between John Hemmon and Elizabeth, wife of John Johnson, in May 1699, shows the cumulative effect of a quarrel within a small community. Hemmon complained that Elizabeth Johnson had spread a report that he had tried to have sexual relations with her. Multiple witnesses described an exchange of mutual insults, with both wives calling each other whore and slut. Elizabeth Johnson admitted that Hemmon had first called her a whore. The Council fined her five shillings to the poor of the parish but did not punish her further, because the evidence showed that Hemmon's wife had used such language first. The verdict shows the Council weighing sequence and provocation in deciding penalty, and the fine to the poor rather than to the injured party converted private insult into parish revenue. [Film Nos. 227, 228]

#### *Religion and education*

Religious provision on the island was thin and resulted in continuous improvisation. After Keeling's death and Poirier's elevation, the first major religious decision recorded was the appointment of James Tuffe, a soldier in the garrison, to read public prayers morning and evening on weekdays, and on the Lord's Day to read prayers and a sermon both before noon and after at Fort James. He received an additional ten pounds per annum and a place at the Governor's table. The arrangement was provisional, made in the absence of a clergyman, and explicitly justified by reference to the Company's instructions that all Christian duties should be performed. The use of a soldier as lay reader is a measure of the limited reach of formal Anglican provision in this period. [Film No. 94]

The country church became the most concrete religious project of the period. The previous structure had fallen into decay, and on 19 Jul 1697 the inhabitants met at the country church and agreed that it should be rebuilt, with the cost of construction met by an assessment laid upon the land at a fixed rate per acre. A sexton was appointed at sixpence per family annually, with separate fees for digging graves. The Honourable Company was to contribute by allowing the use of existing stone borders, with the value set against its account. The building of a parish institution and the disciplining of disorder were thus financially fused: fines from offenders were directed to the church account, and inhabitants paid for their place in the rebuilt structure through assessment on their land, so that public worship and public order shared the same revenue base. [Film Nos. 80, 81]

Religious provision was strengthened by the arrival of an ordained minister. The Fort table list of 20 Jun 1699 includes John Humphreys as minister, suggesting that he had recently arrived. The departure of James

Tuffe is not recorded. The development is significant: throughout the earlier part of the period a soldier had read prayers and a sermon in the absence of a clergyman; with Humphreys's arrival the minister's office was once more in clerical hands, and the inclusion of his name in the senior establishment confirms the formal completion of a long improvised arrangement. [Film No. 240]

Education appeared mainly in private contracts. George Hoskinson promised in May 1697 to teach Phillips Jeseph to read and write in exchange for five years of covenanted service. When the boy's mother and her new husband Thomas Fewesdale objected, the Council accepted Hoskinson's offer to release the boy after part service and cancel the contract on payment of damages. The Council's flexibility in setting aside or modifying private contracts, while still requiring payment of damages, shows how delicate the balance between household authority, individual consent and Company supervision could become when minors were involved. The case of Sarah Enderby, who complained against Sarah Mudge for whipping her son when he was stealing green tobacco on Company land, exposed similar tensions: the Council found Enderby herself at fault and instructed her to discipline her son. [Film Nos. 68, 74]

### *Trade and shipping*

St Helena lay on the homeward and outward routes of the East India Company's shipping and at the eastern edge of an Atlantic and Indian Ocean trading system in which the line between authorised commerce, privateering and piracy was fluid. The records contain many ship names: the *Express*, *Thomas*, *Expedition*, *Mary*, *Mary Ann*, *Fisher*, *Prudence*, *Tringston*, *Antilope*, *America*, *Margaret*, *Resolution*, *Charming Mary*, *Sampson*, *Benjamin*, *Kingston*, *Amity*, *Seaqueen*, *Fortune*, *Orange*, *King William*, *Syone*, *Dorrill*, *Fame*, *Travellock*, *Armenian Merchant*, *Tavestock* and the *Anna* on which the consultations covering 1 Jun to 6 Jul 1699 were finally despatched to the Company. The presence of so many vessels in such a short period reveals an island that was both a watering and provisioning station and a place of intelligence, where every captain was a potential informant and every passenger a potential complication. [Film Nos. 10, 33, 53, 91, 92, 93, 99, 144, 181, 221, 240, 255]

The most extensive intelligence-gathering exercise concerns depositions brought from Madagascar by Captain Hayes on the *Mary* in November 1696. Edmund Baker and John Sivey had been shipped at New York on the *Margaret* under Samuel Burgess, who departed on 24 Oct 1696 with a commission from Benjamin Fletcher, Governor of New York, to seize French ships, but who told them at the outset that the voyage would proceed to Madagascar to trade for slaves. The *Margaret* carried French firearms, weapons identified as for pirates, along with rum, wine, sugar, coffee, cloves and salt. They named other captains, including Hoare, who had been at Johanna Island and the Red Sea, and Henry Every, who had taken control of cargoes of slaves from captured ships. The deposition opens a window onto the network of pirate captains operating in the Indian Ocean, and onto the role of New York in supplying privateers and pirates under colonial commissions. [Film Nos. 41, 42, 43, 44]

John Brown, brought back by Hayes, gave a parallel account from the *Resolution* under Robert Glover, who held a commission from the Governor of Antigua. Brown reported on Captain Ball, said to have been mate to Captain Dorring, who held a commission from Fletcher and had taken a Boston merchant ship, and that two of Ball's men told him Captain Kidd had recently been in the Red Sea in a sloop and had taken a French ship. Brown's testimony placed St Helena directly within the wider Indian Ocean and Atlantic system in which colonial governors such as Fletcher of New York issued commissions used as cover for activities indistinguishable from piracy. The report is contemporaneous with the events that would lead to Kidd's arrest and eventual trial in London, and the consultations at Fort James record the same names that would later resound in metropolitan legal proceedings. [Film Nos. 45, 46, 47]

Subsequent depositions in February and March 1698, from a Swedish boy, John Fisher and John Blacon, expanded this picture. They described the meeting at Saint Augustine Bay with the *Charming Mary* commanded by Captain Hacklington and the report that Captain Tew had been killed by a great shot during the capture of a ship. Fisher and Blacon described Captain Browne Bauldridge as a long-resident inhabitant of Madagascar trading with all nations, and his trade with named pirates. Further depositions described the establishment of Bauldridge's fort at St Mary's Island, the killing of all the white men by the Negroes during Bauldridge's absence, and the demolition of the fort. The wider history of late seventeenth century piracy

is reflected here in the fragments brought back by ordinary sailors and recorded under oath at Fort James, and the records form a contemporary supplement to the metropolitan history that has otherwise been written largely from London sources. [Film Nos. 99, 100, 101, 110]

Local commerce intersected with the same world. On 5 Mar 1698 Captain Laycock of the *America*, an interloper then lying in the road, was sued by Richard Harding for a Coffy slave who had been placed on board at Bombay. The status of the *America* as an interloper reflected the formal monopoly of the East India Company over English trade with the East Indies, which was contested through the 1690s and would be revised by the establishment of the New East India Company in 1698, the same year as this consultation. The case is a small but precise illustration of how the legal status of a vessel could become the framework for a personal dispute about a single enslaved person, with the wider question of monopoly hovering behind the local litigation. [Film Nos. 53, 54]

On 29 Oct 1697 the Council noted that several inhabitants had repeatedly requested permission to leave the island by the *Antilope*, described as an interloper, and ordered that no person whatsoever should be permitted to leave the island until further notice. The same day Hugh Bodley brought a complaint that Captain Heath owed him eighteen pounds from the last voyage; the Council ordered immediate payment of the remaining balance. Maritime accounts and local trade intersected in this way throughout the period, with single days of business mixing high politics over interlopers with small debts owed to resident planters. [Film Nos. 86, 110]

The conspiracy on the *Armenian Merchant*, reported on 6 May 1699, echoed the Dutch conspiracy on the *Mary*. Captain John presented William Lynd as a person whose life was in danger from some of the ship's seamen, who had conspired to seize the ship and its cargo. Thomas Hannan, the quartermaster, was the central accused. Witnesses had heard Hannan say that he would take her at night when the wind was easterly and set her adrift. Hannan and his fellow accused were placed in the magazine for safe custody and despatched to England under the care of the commander of the *Travellock*. The case is the second great conspiracy of the period and shows how the Council continued to use the formal mechanism of remand and removal to England in cases too serious for local trial. [Film Nos. 221, 222]

The case of John Worrall is one of the most striking. Worrall had left the island three years earlier on a ship of war and had since returned with a woman whom he claimed as his wife and two daughters. On inspection, the woman was identified as the wife of Thomas Usher, a soldier on the island, who had come with him on the *Amity*. Worrall claimed that he had married the woman in the Leeward Islands and that Usher was dead. The claim was found false on local enquiry. The Council ordered Worrall to return the woman and all her clothes to Usher and to be sent to England on the first ship bound home. He was eventually placed on board the *Anna*. The bigamy case is the closest the volume comes to an entirely metropolitan question of marriage law, settled locally on the basis of community memory and shipboard testimony rather than ecclesiastical authority, and it shows how a small island court could authoritatively dispose of a marital dispute by relying on the simple fact that everyone present remembered who had married whom. [Film Nos. 222, 223, 242, 243, 244, 245]

#### *Slavery and coerced labour*

Slavery is at the centre of the volume's economic, legal and moral life. Enslaved people appear by name and as numbered units of property: Pedro at twenty pounds on the schedule of Richard Gannon's possessions; the man, the woman with child and the boy of about ten years sold by Thomas Ellison and divided among Rebecca Charlwood, James Rider and the Company; Garrot, Antony, Jack, Moll, Roger, Margaret, Sam, Constance, Bess, Robin, Simon, Peter, Caesar, Jacob, Sommy, Anthony, Bellamay, Agu and others. The slave levy lists at films 162, 163, 193 and 194 contain dozens more named owners and unnamed enslaved people, with totals of 179 slaves on the island in 1699 split as ninety men and thirty-three women. The naming of some and the silence around others, with women in particular often appearing only by initial or as appendages to the men they were sold with, illustrates the asymmetry of the colonial archive. [Film Nos. 53, 54, 56, 81, 113, 162, 163, 192, 193, 194, 233, 247]

The most extensive case of theft and concealment within the records concerns the housebreaking of Sunday 28 Mar 1697. The houses of John Colgrave and John Goodwin in Fort James town were broken open. Colgrave lost a considerable quantity of sugar and liquors, and Goodwin lost eight pounds. Garrot, the slave of Elizabeth Gundling, and Antony, the slave of Thomas Goodwin, ran away on 9 Apr 1697 and were brought to the fort, where Garrot confessed in prison that he and Antony had committed the theft, with Franc the cooper as instigator. The Council ordered that all four, Garrot, Antony, Franc and his wife, be severely whipped at the whipping post; Colgrave was also fined eight shillings to the church for allowing drinking in his house. The case is unusual in its detailed reconstruction of slave testimony, and shows how the Council was prepared to act against a free white couple on the testimony of two enslaved men once their accounts had been corroborated. [Film Nos. 70, 71, 72, 73]

The case of Jack, slave of James Grandy, prosecuted by Sutton Isaack on 25 Mar 1698, illustrates the same pattern in miniature. Jack denied stealing seven dollars and three and a half yards of blue cloth from Isaack's chest. Moll, slave of Isaack, testified that she had seen Jack outside the house with the chest, and that Jack had promised her a quart of arrack to keep silent. Thomas Collier, aged about five years, said that Jack had taken the money and given him a piece of sugar to remain silent. The Council ordered Grandy to pay Isaack five dollars and return the cloth; Jack was punished at the flagstaff. The acceptance of testimony from a five-year-old child, and from two enslaved women, illustrates the flexibility of the evidentiary process when accounts converged, even though the formal weight given to such testimony was always less than to that of free white witnesses. [Film Nos. 113, 115, 116]

The case of Caesar is the most serious of the volume. On the morning of Sunday 16 Oct 1698, George Carne sent his Black servant Jacob to Sandy Bay beach. On the way Jacob met Caesar, slave of John Facknald, who had run away from his master on the previous Saturday. Jacob tried to make him return home; Caesar refused, and stabbed Jacob twice in the back with a Dutch knife. Jacob died from his wounds on the night of Friday 21 Oct 1698. At the trial of 1 Nov 1698, Caesar admitted the act, said that he had stabbed Jacob because Jacob tried to make him return to his master. The jury withdrew for half an hour and returned a verdict of wilful murder. Caesar was sentenced to be hanged by the neck until dead, his body cut into four parts and displayed on posts in different parts of the island. The decision to display the quartered body across the island, in the manner of English treason executions, marks the gravity with which the Council treated a slave-on-slave killing in which the victim was, in effect, attempting to enforce the runaway laws on behalf of his master. [Film Nos. 177, 178, 179, 180]

Less spectacular slave cases form a steady accompaniment to these gravest matters. On 20 Aug 1698 Henry Coales complained that arrack had been stolen from his house by his own slaves. Sommy gave evidence that on Sunday 21 Aug a group of slaves had gathered at Level Wood, drunk together, quarrelled and fought, until William Cales came upon them. The other slaves were ordered whipped at the garrison; Sommy was exempted because he had given his account freely. The connected case at Levi Morris's house followed in mid-September 1698, with whipping of slaves from Morris, Madam Johnson, Mr Lufkin and the Company, and with the Company slave Bellamay caught up in the case for joining the group on the road. Bellamay had earned rice from James Ryder and Jonathan Coales for watching their boat. The episode preserves a brief but unusually clear glimpse of the informal economy in which an enslaved man could earn rice by watching boats, and of how the Council rewarded informers among the enslaved population. [Film Nos. 157, 159, 160]

On 27 Sep 1698 William Seales, son of the planter, struck a slave belonging to John Mudge with a cane three times after the slave had set a dog on him. He was fined five shillings to the church for striking the slave instead of first informing Mudge; the slave was whipped at the flagstaff for using rude and defiant language towards a white man. The case shows how violence between slave and free could trigger a dual penalty. The case of Robin and Simon, slaves of John Lufkin and Madam Johnson respectively, in May 1699, illustrates the same pattern of master-slave responsibility: the slaves were whipped on their bare bodies for killing a goat belonging to John Lish, and Madam Johnson and Lufkin were each required to pay five shillings to Lish, plus the Council charges. [Film Nos. 164, 165, 229]

The case of Peter, slave of Mary Bowman, in early July 1699 brought together slave theft, gambling, drinking and unlicensed retail in a single chain of events. Peter was sent from the country to the fort to fetch salt. On his way back he met Thomas Fisher, a soldier, and was persuaded to share an arrack-and-sugar punch. Peter and Fisher played cards for half a dollar; Peter then bought a bottle of punch which they all drank; Peter became very drunk; Fisher took another dollar from his pocket. Peter then broke open a chest at his mistress's house, took a piece of silk belonging to John Harris, and sold it to Jonathan Higham at the house of Sarah Rogers, a widow, for two dollars. The Council fined Fisher four dollars, Higham two dollars, Stephen Kidd and Jonathan Mudge one dollar each for drinking with the slave, Margery Hayes forty shillings for selling punch without a licence, and Peter was whipped at the flagstaff. The case captures, in unusual detail, how a single afternoon could produce theft from a chest, the sale of stolen goods, gambling, the unlicensed sale of drink and the breach of the rule against trading with slaves, all of which were punished within the same hearing. [Film Nos. 252, 253, 254, 255]

The free Black population also appears, in less detail. Mary Oliver received twenty-one lashes under the gallows in April 1697 for bearing a bastard child. Martha Oliver, examined on 25 Mar 1698, received thirty-nine lashes for the same offence and named Gabriel Towell as the father. Mercy Oliver, the free Black woman whose mother Mary had been punished earlier, returned in the second period in the same role: after the trial of Thomas Swallow and Mary Bagley on 1 Jul 1699, she was brought before the court for having recently given birth to a child out of wedlock and was given thirty-one lashes on her bare body. She named Leavance, a Black man belonging to Thomas Earle, as the father. The free Black population on the island lived under the same moral regulation as the enslaved and the white inhabitants, but their position was distinct: they could give evidence under oath, could be paid, could request to leave service, and could pursue and be pursued in the courts. [Film Nos. 28, 29, 63, 90, 248]

The Council also organised forms of compulsory labour. The order of 14 Jul 1697 for the disposal of Company-owned Black children to George Hutchinson, Thimmeson, John Facknald and Matthew Bassett for three years' service shows how children, considered not yet useful for plantation labour, were placed in private hands as labour resources to be returned at the end of the term. The earlier sale of Thomas Ellison's plantation included a Black boy of about ten years, whom Thomas Dixon hired from the Company at three pounds per annum after the rest of the estate had been sold. The hiring of slaves at fixed annual rates by the Company, alongside outright sale to private individuals, shows how labour markets were assembled out of multiple legal forms, with the Company functioning as both proprietor and lessor of human beings. [Film Nos. 55, 83]

#### *Finance, estates and probate*

The Council's role as a probate jurisdiction is one of the most regular features of these records, running across the full period. The proving of wills required sworn testimony from named witnesses; inventories were sworn to by executors and overseers; copies were issued on request, and original documents were kept under seal. The cluster of wills proved between December 1696 and July 1699 forms a continuous record of how property was transferred at death across the small population, and the regularity with which the same names recur as witnesses and overseers, particularly Goodwin, Bagley, Rider and Bodley, illustrates how a small group of senior planters acted as the operational machinery of probate as much as the Council itself. [Film Nos. 49, 50, 68, 75, 76, 98, 111, 126, 203, 209, 248, 249, 250]

Estates connected to the wider Atlantic and Indian Ocean trades produced their own complications. The estate of Jervell Walker, a former soldier on the island who had left on a ship later lost at sea, included a bill of exchange for one hundred and ninety pounds signed by the Governor and Council. David Edmunds, holding a letter of attorney, presented the petition; the claim was clear, but the Council referred the matter to the Honourable East India Company in England. The estate of Lemuel Blackmore, son and heir of John Blackmore, who had died on 1 Dec 1690, was withheld and sent to the Company in England by Captain Rayner, because reports had reached the Council that Lemuel had not managed the trust faithfully. The decision shows that succession could be paused if management was questioned, and that the Company in London held the final authority over disputed estates. [Film Nos. 238, 240, 241]

Financial matters extended beyond probate to the regulation of small inheritance and gifts. On 12 Dec 1697 Doctor Hoskinson brought a complaint on behalf of Elizabeth Hemmons against her husband, after a Court of Justice had found that a heifer belonged to her. Hemmings had taken the animal in exchange for goods, the heifer had since produced a calf, and Hemmings kept both. The Council accepted his offer to deliver what was due. The case shows the Council's recognition of separate property held by a wife within marriage, a small but real concession to married women's property rights at a time when English common law gave the husband almost complete control over his wife's possessions. [Film Nos. 89, 91]

### *Crime and punishment*

The volume's punishments range from the small church fine for unlicensed punch to the hanging and quartering of Caesar. The most extreme penalty before Caesar was ninety-nine lashes under the gallows, ordered for Joseph Hoston and four Dutch sailors in the Mary Feudales case. Lashes at the flagstaff or under the gallows were the standard corporal punishment for slaves and free Black inhabitants, with twenty, twenty-one, thirty-one, thirty-nine and ninety-nine lashes recorded for various offences. Riding the wooden horse at the relief of the guard was the standard military punishment for soldiers. Public whipping at the cart's tail was used for slaves who received stolen liquor. Whipping at the whipping post was used for housebreaking by slaves. Imprisonment was usually preliminary, used either to secure attendance at trial or to compel payment of fines and debts. The buried-at-a-crossway-with-a-stake-through-the-body burial of John Lansdowne in June 1697 represented the punitive ritual condemnation of self-killing, applied within a single day of the inquest's verdict. [Film Nos. 24, 32, 63, 70, 78, 90, 109, 116, 159, 165, 229, 252, 254, 255]

The Caesar execution is in a class of its own. The detailed sentence reads as follows: Caesar was to be taken from the court to the place from which he came, then to the place of execution; he was to be hanged by the neck until dead; his body was then to be cut into four parts and displayed on posts in different parts of the island; a final prayer was made for mercy upon his soul. The sentence echoes English forms of punishment for treason and serious felonies, with the public display of body parts intended both as deterrent and as warning. The application of such a sentence to a slave who had killed another slave shows the Council's reading of the offence as not only an act of murder but as an act that threatened the wider system of slave control on the island, particularly in light of Jacob's role as a slave attempting to enforce the return of a runaway. [Film No. 180]

The volume's penalties were always graded by status. The summary execution of judgement, with twenty-one lashes for Mary Oliver immediately after the jury's withdrawal in 1697, or the immediate flogging at the flagstaff after a council finding, stands in marked contrast to the months of testimony, deferral and quarter sessions trial that characterised cases like Margaret Burnham's, or the long sequence of sworn testimony in the Lansdowne and Coales defamation, where a formal verdict went against the widow with damages of one shilling. The same tribunal moved at different speeds for different categories of person and for different categories of offence; reading the records carefully shows that what looked like equal justice was in fact strictly differential. [Film Nos. 63, 90, 119, 120, 167, 170]

### *Personalities*

Richard Keeling appears at the start only as a dying man whose signature could not be obtained; his absence from business and his death on 30 Nov 1697 frame the early part of the volume. The records reveal him posthumously through the goods his widow took with her on departing the fort, almost all the movable household items, leaving the new Governor without enough pewter spoons; through the box of plate belonging to Moore, opened by Poirier to provide the widow with a candlestick, a porringer, a salt and a tumbler; through the goats Keeling had granted to Poirier from the *Benjamin*; and through the contested administration of his estate by his widow and her second husband George Carne, with the levy for the executed slave James following on after his death. Even Keeling's pewter and his goats became subjects of accounting. [Film Nos. 9, 87, 96, 97, 130, 131, 161]

Stephen Poirier continued in office throughout the period and absorbed the new figure of Thomas Bright as deputy governor in May 1699. He showed a consistent combination of restraint and firmness: pardoning Hemmon when he submitted, asserting authority against Carne in the sword incident, calling for the marshal and guard when needed, accepting Carne's eventual submission and returning his sword, mobilising the

Council to issue the goat-hunting and Prosperous Bay regulations, and intervening personally in the night discipline of the garrison. He repeatedly accepted apologies and submissions where they could restore order, yet was prepared to use force when needed, as with the Dutch conspiracy, the punishment of ninety-nine lashes for the Mary Feudales accusations, and the dismissal of Packnall. His combination of personal command and procedural caution is consistent across the period. [Film Nos. 87, 88, 99, 105, 109, 125, 132, 133, 134, 173, 175, 176, 195, 196]

Thomas Goodwin authenticates the records of the period. He served as assistant to the Governor, and his witness signature appears on almost every order. He was also a property holder and slaveholder, with his slave Antony involved in the housebreaking of 1697 and with his ward Elizabeth Goring continuing in his household after the orphan account approval in March 1698. By June 1699 he was named at the Fort table as ensign with his wife. He served as churchwarden in 1698, presented the church accounts on 30 May 1699 with Edward Edmunds, was appointed Deputy Storekeeper to hold the Caesar levy money, and served as joint executor of Phillips's will with John Fawkner. His function in the administration was not chiefly intellectual but operational: he held the records, the money, and the trust. [Film Nos. 58, 69, 70, 77, 82, 126, 138, 191, 230, 240]

Edward Edmunds is similarly visible at multiple levels. He resisted parish nomination in April 1697, requested that the Governor write to England to clarify his duties before he would take the oath, and was nevertheless drawn into office as churchwarden, juror and member of the Lansdowne inquest. He eventually was fined ten shillings for refusing to serve on the jury that tried Caesar. His trajectory illustrates the ambivalence common among the leading planters between resistance to Company authority on procedural grounds and continued participation in the offices through which that authority was exercised, an ambivalence that gave the small administration both its friction and its workability. [Film Nos. 58, 69, 77, 82, 181]

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
<a href="#">1</a>		EAP 1364 St Helena Document Name and Date: St Helena Records 1696-1699 Photographer: Shelley Date photographed: 21 Oct 2021 Additional comments: [blank section]	
<a href="#">2</a>		Book cover	
<a href="#">3</a>		Blank page	
<a href="#">4</a>		Blank page	
<a href="#">5</a>		VOL. V. 17 28 1694 & 1699 Inventory the St Helena Islanders from the Islands — 3. Provisions & Cook not provided for maintenance. _____ 4 Six sailors for Dingbents establishment & account of the Compy 'round the galleon' Mary Armidah aforement'd do. 6 & Complimerry of seven forty sailors in board the Mary & replace the 5 left in St Helena _____ 40 Examination of sailors brought from Madraspass according truth a New York treader _____ 50 [Mention] made of the celebrated breath Query ___ 50 Mary Armidah body cast ashore dead in harbour day break by body I'd be turned at forty two feet . The measure sent to carry the measure _____ 60 Mary Kemp for [black] women & have 25 bodies search, the galleon for fruits of a bastard _____ 67 Queen Izzaree [publicized] in the company's [territories] & [handsome] [initially] buried in Rock till proper season [struck] 74 Country Claims to be [shall] by [a] measured not — white, appointed with [fees] _____ 74	

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Bullet for Cleaner Wardours _____ 78  Godsmore [billaage] debt Tuesday &amp; over 1695 —  Provision  account with poor humanity _____ 83  Master Clearer &amp; have 25 bodies in [&amp; live] back for  [will] of a  bastard _____ 84  Road met Robin examined _____ 87  Godsmore [offer] &amp; cleaner Clearer Wardoure  discharged -  Testament complaints that the planter are very  oppressed by the Company _____ 92</p>	
6		<p>An Computation for their days boat warned by  swimming 98  Jvilanz of two York haz with respect for their York  place Steven  of 2 thaw ban of over demarcated account _____ 107  Stone Hope white appointed &amp; said George way wash  the warning  not having a Steven and Prayer away York day — 98  for Alanque place commold by mother measurers do  present for  with barely home health Greene enough _____ 98  Wil Alexander appointed Chat of Council hereald  determined _____ 90  Account of Pirate = a Cast bar death  116  Dates velbo &amp; have 34 bodies for hedgehog Tyler  Brownion  shut for bred by a ferry _____ 104  Governour charge &amp; forry Connecticut Maforee better  &amp;  Cool brought Jamaica &amp; a [handland] appointed _____  113  Salleanus Kyge zebra [Greene] handhead were secured  for  twellon compliance of image for relating of us by _____  116  John Stanmore brought of by hoping for Steven was  met  for but Majesty bet _____ 119  for buy the board &amp; buy Kaienly [wat] ban a von tom  Pat  no thaw Mahigue one &amp; tyler _____ 126  Seat broad neaced _____ 119  Well put howled appeared walter said truuhe they  [practice]  tow met was has be loved by Steven web sake bad cry  of thaw 50. _____ 150  [blank] zebra on thaw make howls Kaat bar breeding  the eelbuy  and [consulting] of one [done] the Country</p>	
7		<p>Janvy slave of Capt Eav Malong having been burnt  above at a stake  for sorcery - communication allowed the widow - His  fine of  1 dollar for every slave 120 in all or by white drivers  _____ 161  Goats greatly increased so that plantation a Cattle were  encouraged  by a total ruin - All hunting of them prohibited except  on Wednesday &amp; company _____ 168  Cannes slaves Gavatt killed by Crown a convoy -  Defended  Bayly on Carrus _____ 171  Crown sentenced to be hung and quartered - &amp; be set in  4 plots  in different parts of the Islands _____ 176  Jury summoned by beat of drum - two Jurors dispute  Port  Juman of life &amp; death a power &amp; stake himself fort  _____ 175</p>	

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Poll tax for £26 granted for Crown executed - some of the negroes slaves claims half - Slaves number 90 men 37 women 67 white drivers _____ 185  False alarm at Prosperous Bay by the two soldiers saluting  no came with their fusees _____ 189  Islands suffering from a sore drought - for five or six years  persons only minded by plant potatoes - Yams which ought to be built in or the meat stuff of the Island lysis to be extraordinary scarce _____ 190  Thomas Cooke &amp; Elizabeth Seale lovers of Juvernas _____ 192  Martha Blue free woman examined how she got such fine stout boy  "His house and Plantation these distilled" _____ 230  General Table - list of those admitted &amp; dyed - 13 in months 215  Mary Black receive 21 lashes for birth of a bastard _____ 242</p>	
8		Blank page	
9	1	<p>Island St Helena.  At a Consultation Held on Monday the 13 day of July 1696 at Fort James  Richard Keeling Esq  Prest Captn Stephen Poirier Depu  Alexr Manning Chirurgion to the garr  being Deceased Margaret his wife who have lived on for some time past yea parte from each other, and to know if she would take what Effects her Deceas was possesst with at his Decease in her hands and [...] was due from him to any other person, she made answer  she was not free nor willing but because she felt the the Governr and Council might dispose thereof as they It is Ordered  That an advertisemt be fixed up that any all the Creditor and Debtors to give their respective just accmpts between them and the said Margaret Monday the 3d day of August 1696  Gouernor Keelinge haueing been for a great while by this present sick under a lingring disease which at last hath brought to the Graue hath been since a long unable of performing any busines, And consequently is the true cause why this present book and some part of the former councill book, till his death hath not been signed by him.  Poirier  F Goodwin</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 13 July 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier and Alexander Manning present.  Alexander Manning, chirurgion to the garrison, was deceased. His wife, Margaret Manning, lived apart from him for some time before his death. She was asked whether she would take into her hands the effects that he possessed at his death and settle any debts owed by him to other persons. She answered that she was neither free nor willing to accept this responsibility, but acknowledged that the Governor and Council might dispose of the estate as they thought fit.  An order was made that a public notice be fixed. All creditors and debtors were required to present their just accounts concerning Margaret Manning by 3 August 1696.  By that date, Governor Richard Keeling suffered for a long time from a lingering disease which brought him to the grave. He was unable for some time to conduct business. This was given as the reason why the present consultation book, and part of the previous council book, were not signed by him before his death.  The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.  <b>Interpretations</b>  Margaret Manning's refusal to administer her husband's estate showed that responsibility for settling debts and distributing property did not automatically fall to a surviving spouse. Where a widow declined, authority was assumed by the Governor and Council, which revealed their role as a supervisory probate authority on the island.  The requirement for creditors and debtors to submit "just accounts" showed a formal process of debt verification. This acted as a mechanism of financial control, as all claims against the deceased's estate were publicly declared, examined, and settled under official oversight.  The posting of a public notice showed how administrative communication operated in practice. Such notices compelled participation in legal and financial processes within a small and contained settlement.  The note explaining the absence of Governor Keeling's signature clarified the administrative importance of authentication. His inability to sign because of prolonged illness showed that the validity of council records depended on gubernatorial confirmation, and that illness disrupted routine governance procedures.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
10	2	<p>Island St Helena  At a Consultation Held on Monday the 20th day of July 1696 At Fort James  Present Richd Keeling Govr  Capts Poirier Depu Govr  Whereas John L[...]ing Job Royall at the Court of Judic[...]  [...] on Monday the 6th Instant evidence for Blasphemy as  [...] for whereon more fully appears to be impious and scandalous words  he did proffer against his Majesties Island, now leaving opportunity to do on such a Blasphemous person by sending  him on board his Majesties Ships the Expre[...] to be whose Commander Capts Hinds being very willing to take  It is ordered  That the said L[...]ing be sent on board his Majesties ships the Expre[...] as first wind for England or so as to enjoy some other place without the the Inhabitants with the said Capts word so shall remain  One John Fr[...]n belonging to the said Capts Expre[...] being desirous to stay on this Island having  Discharge from his Command humbly requested that the Govr would  be pleased to Entertain him in the Honble Comps Service on pay of a  Souldier until the next acco[...] of the said Comman[...] and when he be Discharged from service from this Island  It is ordered  That the said Fr[...]n be accepted to remain and that he be Entertained in the Honble Comps Service as a Souldier  as from this day beginning from this day  Poirier  F Goodwin</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 20 July 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>John L[...]ing was brought before the Court of Judicature by Job Royall on Monday 6 July 1696. Evidence was given against him for blasphemy. The words he spoke were described as impious and scandalous, and were directed against His Majesty's island. An opportunity was then taken to remove him by sending him on board His Majesty's ship the <i>Expre[...]</i>, whose commander, Captain Hinds, agreed to receive him.</p> <p>An order was made that John L[...]ing be sent on board His Majesty's ship <i>Expre[...]</i> by the first wind for England, or otherwise be carried to another place so that he might be removed from the inhabitants. Captain Hinds gave his word that he would remain on board accordingly.</p> <p>John Fr[...]n, belonging to the same ship <i>Expre[...]</i>, expressed a desire to remain on the island. He produced a discharge from his commander and humbly requested that the Governor accept him into the Honourable Company's service as a soldier, to be paid as such until the next account of the commander, and until he should be discharged from service on the island.</p> <p>An order was made that John Fr[...]n be accepted to remain and that he be entertained in the Honourable Company's service as a soldier from that day.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The charge of blasphemy, framed as "impious and scandalous words" against the island, showed that speech was treated as a matter of public order and political loyalty. Authority was exercised to remove the offender rather than to punish him locally, which revealed a preference for expulsion as a means of control in a small settlement.</p> <p>The use of a royal ship to carry John L[...]ing away showed how naval resources were integrated into civil enforcement. The cooperation of Captain Hinds demonstrated that ship commanders acted as agents of governance when required, extending the island's authority beyond its shores.</p> <p>The phrase "by the first wind" reflected the practical dependence on weather for transport. Administrative action was therefore shaped by maritime conditions, which governed the timing of enforcement.</p> <p>John Fr[...]n's acceptance into the Honourable Company's service showed how labour needs were met through opportunistic recruitment. A discharged sailor was immediately absorbed into the garrison, which indicated a flexible approach to staffing and the value placed on available manpower.</p> <p>The requirement that he serve "until the next account" of his commander suggested that formal confirmation of his discharge was expected. This showed that even informal recruitment remained tied to external authority and documentation, ensuring that service obligations were properly transferred.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to remove John L[...]ing rather than impose a local penalty probably addressed the risk that his words might unsettle authority or provoke disorder among a small population. Expulsion eliminated that risk without the need for prolonged proceedings or confinement.</p> <p>The readiness of Captain Hinds to take John L[...]ing on board perhaps reflected a cooperative relationship between naval officers and the island government, where mutual assistance supported both discipline and logistical efficiency.</p> <p>The acceptance of John Fr[...]n into service from the same ship suggested a deliberate exchange of sorts. While one man was removed as a threat, another was</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			retained as a useful addition, which indicated a practical balancing of social control and labour supply.
11	3	<p>Island St Helena.  At a Consultation Held on Monday the 3  Day of August 1696 at Fort James  Prest Richd Keelinge Govr  Capts Poirier Depu Govr  Richard Parnum Planter complaining of  Parnum agt Nicho[...] Wilson Planter saying that he  bought of the said Nich[...]  abt Potatoes of Potatoes for which he had paid him for,  but now def[...]  him a Receipt saying that he had not paid him  And Wilson saith that he has not paid him  besides that, That a Head of 2 Bushells of Potatoes is  [...] is Taking two Bushells for one  It is ordered  That the further Tryall of this Matter  be left till the next Generall Sessions  Mr Henry Binn Chirurgeon of this Island  Mr Henry Binn late Comand now in the road humbly  Petitions to the  agt the Honourable Councill that whereas when last he  was at this Island in the  of Prudence Capts Bynn Comand, he took of Prudence  Thomas  Sherwin his apprentice for some Terme of Time in  Consideration  which he was to Receive in England the sum of 10[...]  which he should againe Come to this Island, but now  the said Sherwin  Sherwin being now a [...] humbly desired that Mr  Thomas  his attorney, who it seems has many Effects of his in his  hands be  Ordered him to pay him the said sumes according to  the said Moneys  obligation to him in which there was no Name of  Indenture but  any part thereof was said Debt notwithstanding he was  Sworne that he has not received any part of the said  Bond which  declared upon Oath that he never received the said on  the Contents  of the foresaid Bond Mr Sherwin gave him no effects  neither in England as is Specified in the said Bond nor  since  Receive, nor at any other place  It is ordered</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 3 August 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>Richard Parnum, a planter, complained against Nicholas Wilson. Parnum stated that he bought potatoes from Wilson and paid for them, but Wilson now denied payment and refused to give a receipt. Wilson answered that no payment was made. He further claimed that a measure described as a “head” of two bushels of potatoes was in dispute, and that two bushels were being taken for one.</p> <p>An order was made that further trial of this matter be deferred until the next General Sessions.</p> <p>Henry Binn, chirurgeon of the island, submitted a petition. He stated that on a previous visit to the island, when he commanded the <i>Prudence</i>, he took Thomas Sherwin as an apprentice for a term of years. In return, he was to receive in England the sum of £10 0s 0d when he returned to the island. Sherwin was now [...] and Binn requested that Thomas Sherwin, acting as attorney and holding many of his effects, be ordered to pay the agreed sum according to the obligation.</p> <p>The obligation contained no formal indenture, but the sum was claimed as a debt. Binn swore that he received no part of the bond. He declared on oath that he never received any of the contents of the bond, and that Sherwin gave him no effects either in England, as specified, or since, nor at any other place.</p> <p>An order was made.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The dispute between Richard Parnum and Nicholas Wilson showed that everyday transactions relied on informal proof such as receipts. The absence of a written receipt created uncertainty, which required formal adjudication. This reflected a system where documentation functioned as the primary safeguard in commercial exchange.</p> <p>The reference to a “head” of two bushels revealed ambiguity in local measures. Such variation allowed disputes over quantity and value to arise, showing that standardisation of measures was incomplete and open to manipulation.</p> <p>The deferral to the General Sessions showed the structured hierarchy of legal process. Minor disputes were first heard in council but were transferred to a higher, more formal court for full trial, which ensured procedural order and wider authority.</p> <p>Henry Binn’s claim rested on a bond rather than a formal indenture. This showed that contractual relationships, including apprenticeship arrangements, could be enforced through financial obligations even without full legal formalities. The bond acted as a substitute mechanism to secure performance.</p> <p>The repeated use of sworn statements showed the central role of oath-taking in establishing credibility. In the absence of documentary proof or witnesses, sworn testimony functioned as a key evidentiary tool in legal proceedings.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to defer the potato dispute probably reflected uncertainty over both payment and measurement. By moving the case to the General Sessions, a more thorough examination of evidence and local standards could be made, which reduced the risk of an unjust ruling.</p> <p>Henry Binn’s reliance on a bond without indenture suggested a deliberately flexible arrangement, perhaps made to avoid the constraints of formal apprenticeship contracts. This may have allowed both parties to proceed quickly, but later created difficulty in enforcement when obligations were disputed.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
12	4	<p>[...] Attorney of  [...]. Gover[...] do pay and satisfie  to the said Mr Hen[...] Bynn the full Contents of the  obligation he has as aforesaid from Mr Sherwin  Whereas by the Death of Hen[...] Manning our late  Chirurgion that place is now voide Therefore it was  thought fitt  to incourage George Harrison who has served some  part  of his apprenticeship with an Apothecary in London &amp;  hath  practised some time of Chirurgery on this Island if he  would be willing to accept of that place and Charge who  willingly accepted thereof declaring his willingness of  his  Diligence in the Discharge of that Trust  It is ordered  That the said George Harrison be put into the Chiru  geons Roome and act as such at the salary of 30 £  p month untill it shall please the Honble Comp to  send us a man more fitter for that Employ  Poirier  F Goodwin</p>	<p>An order was made that [...] attorney of [...] Gover[...] pay and satisfy to Henry Binn the full contents of the obligation which he held from Thomas Sherwin.</p> <p>Following the death of Alexander Manning, the office of chirurgion was vacant. It was considered proper to encourage George Harrison, who served part of his apprenticeship with an apothecary in London and practised surgery for some time on the island, to accept that position and responsibility. He agreed and declared his willingness to act with diligence in discharging the trust.</p> <p>An order was made that George Harrison be placed in the position of chirurgion and act in that role at a salary of £30 0s 0d per month until the Honourable Company should send a more suitable person for that employment.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The order compelling payment through an attorney showed that debts could be enforced not only against the original obligor but also through intermediaries who held authority or property on their behalf. This reflected a system where agency relationships enabled the recovery of financial obligations across distance.</p> <p>The reference to an “obligation” confirmed that the claim rested on a bond, which functioned as a legally binding financial instrument. Even without a formal indenture, such a bond carried enforceable weight and allowed the council to compel payment.</p> <p>The appointment of George Harrison revealed how essential offices were maintained in practice. In the absence of a formally trained replacement from the Honourable Company, a partially trained local practitioner was elevated to fill the role, which showed a pragmatic approach to governance and service provision.</p> <p>The stated salary of £30 0s 0d per month indicated the structured remuneration attached to official posts. This reflected the Company’s system of salaried service, where roles were formalised through fixed pay rather than informal reward.</p> <p>The qualification that Harrison would serve until a “more fitter” person arrived showed that authority over appointments ultimately rested with the Honourable Company. Local decisions were provisional and subject to replacement by centrally appointed personnel, which demonstrated the hierarchy between the island administration and the Company’s wider governance.</p>
13	5	<p>Island St Helena.  Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 31th day  of August 1696 Att Fort James  Prest Richd Keelinge Govern  Capts Poirier Depu Govern  Corprall Shields who is appointed to view the out  Forts in this quarter acquainted the Govern that those  Souldiers  at Prosperous Bay look out the place where the English  took this Island from the Dutch were by him found  remiss of their  Duty, Especially for Lord Day the 23th of this instant,  and whereas  they have bin found remiss in their giving timely Notice  of the Ships  lately arrived here vitz the Thomas Capts Geo: and the  Expedition  Capts Chittenden Dennett Comander, especially for  whom the Alarm  was made at least ½ an hour to the Councill before  Prosperous  Bay Guns fired and all this by order to make their  appearance  before Governr and Councill to answer for this great</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 31 August 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>Corporal Shields, who was appointed to inspect the out-forts in that quarter, reported that the soldiers stationed at Prosperous Bay, the place where the English took the island from the Dutch, were found negligent in their duty. This neglect was especially noted on Sunday 23 August 1696. They were also found careless in giving timely notice of the ships recently arrived, namely the <i>Thomas</i>, commanded by Captain Geo:[...], and the <i>Expedition</i>, commanded by Captain Chittenden Dennett. The alarm was given to the Council at least half an hour before the guns at Prosperous Bay were fired.</p> <p>By order, the men were required to appear before the Governor and Council to answer for this neglect. Those present were John Major, [...], Bridge, John Crofts, Samuel Cole and William Cale. They attempted to excuse themselves, but were all found guilty.</p> <p>An order was made that they be whipped at the next general rendezvous of the regiment, each receiving one punishment, with the planters among them being each dispensed one.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>neglect of their Duty who all accordingly did vizt John Major [...], Bridge  John Crofts, Saml Cole, &amp; Wm Cale who all endeavoured to Excuse themselves, but they all being found Guilty It is ordered That they all be by order whipt at the next Generall Rendezvous of the Regt, said planters being each of them dispensed one William French and James Duffe who upon some discontent absent themselves from the pay and service of the Honble Comp upon Action Consideration of their owne Affairs they made their humble Address to Governr &amp; Council that they would be pleased to Entertaine them as Souldiers in the said Companies pay promising due and faithfull their Duty as they ought to doe, Whereupon now being in want of Souldrs It is ordered That the said French &amp; Duffe Request be granted that they Commencing from Thursday next Thomas [...]</p>	<p>William French and James Duffe had previously withdrawn themselves from the pay and service of the Honourable Company due to dissatisfaction and attention to their own affairs. They made a humble address to the Governor and Council requesting to be taken back into service as soldiers, and promised to perform their duty faithfully. Because there was a present need for soldiers, an order was made that their request be granted, and that they be received into service from the following Thursday.</p> <p>Thomas [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The inspection of out-forts by a corporal showed a structured chain of military oversight. Responsibility for discipline and readiness was delegated downward, but enforcement remained centralised in the Governor and Council, which ensured that local failures were formally judged and punished.</p> <p>The failure to give timely notice of arriving ships revealed the strategic importance of early warning. Delays in signalling could expose the island to risk, especially given its recent history of capture, and showed that vigilance formed a core part of garrison duty.</p> <p>The punishment of whipping at a general rendezvous demonstrated how discipline was enforced publicly. This reinforced obedience through example, using collective visibility to maintain order among both soldiers and planters serving in military roles.</p> <p>The reference to planters among those punished indicated that civilian inhabitants could be required to perform military duties. This reflected a hybrid system in which defence relied on both professional soldiers and settler participation.</p> <p>The reinstatement of William French and James Duffe showed that military service operated within a flexible labour system. Men could leave and later be readmitted when needed, which revealed the practical balance between discipline and the colony's demand for manpower.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to punish the soldiers publicly at a general rendezvous probably aimed to restore discipline quickly after a visible failure. By choosing a collective setting, the authorities ensured that the consequences of neglect were widely understood and reinforced across the garrison.</p> <p>The acceptance of French and Duffe back into service despite their earlier withdrawal suggested that immediate manpower needs outweighed strict enforcement of prior misconduct. This indicated that maintaining sufficient defensive strength took priority over punishing absence in this instance.</p>
14	6	<p>Complaint of Hoskison &amp; Dixon agt Duffe for Debt — Paym[t] promised  Thomas Dixon and George Hoskison make complaint agt James Duffe was Indebted to them severall Sums of money wch the said Duffe owne vizt to George Hoskison £18: 0: 1 and to John Dixon 3: 10: 8 and promised to make paym[t] thereof as soone as conveniently he cou'd spare it out of his growing Sallary, which accordingly was ordered to be done  Poirier  F Goodwin</p>	<p>Thomas Dixon and George Hoskison made complaint against James Duffe for debt. Duffe acknowledged that he was indebted in several sums, namely £18 0s 1d to George Hoskison and £3 10s 8d to John Dixon. He promised to make payment as soon as he could spare it from his growing salary.</p> <p>An order was made that payment be carried out accordingly.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The acknowledgement of debt by James Duffe showed that liability could be established through admission without the need for extended proof. This allowed the council to proceed directly to enforcement, which streamlined the handling of financial disputes.</p> <p>The direction that payment be made from Duffe's "growing salary" revealed that wages earned in Company service were treated as a recoverable source for debt settlement. This functioned as a mechanism of</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>financial control, where earnings could be effectively attached to satisfy obligations.</p> <p>The presence of multiple creditors in a single complaint demonstrated that debts were aggregated and addressed together. This reduced repeated proceedings and ensured coordinated recovery under official supervision.</p>
15	7	<p>Island St Helena.</p> <p>Att a Court of Justice Held on Thursday the 5th Day of 8ber 1696 att the Sessions House Neare Fort James</p> <p>Prest Richd Keelinge Govr Capts Poirier Depu Govr</p> <p>After was opened according to the usuall manner the persons appointed for Jurors were Called and all appeared to their names and the persons whose names follow were appointed for</p> <p>Jurors vizt Orlando Bagley foreman ————— one Tho: Goodwin ————— 2 John Luffkin ————— 3 Robt Edmonds ————— 4 John Kidd ————— 5 Emanuel Sweling ————— 6 John Ricolls ————— 7 Tho: Smallwood ————— 8 Robt Avis ————— 9 John Lick ————— 10 Sam: Wrangham ————— 11 John Goodwin ————— 12</p> <p>John Coulson Complain of Wm Hayle Senr in an action of Assault and Battery</p> <p>The said Wm Hayle denies the action. This the Jury were sworn</p> <p>John Doveton Sworne saith that on Monday 2[ ]th day of 7ber Last past (being the Generall rendevou) John Coulson and him being in their way to goe to Fort James they overtook John Marsh on the said Hayle with others who were all setting at a place known by the name of the Little wood (being but a small Distance from Mr Coulsons House) and as soone as came nigh each other the said Marsh began to abuse the said Coulson by giving him ill Language insomuch that the said Coulson and Marsh fell to Blows, so that the said Wm Hayle Lift up his Stick as if he would strike the said Coulson but cannot tell if he did strike him or no, and further saith that he did not heare the said Coulson give the said Hayle any ill words.</p>	<p>A court of justice was held at the Sessions House near Fort James on 5 October 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>The court was opened in the usual manner. The persons appointed as jurors were called and all answered to their names. The following were sworn as jurors: Orlando Bagley as foreman, Thomas Goodwin, John Luffkin, Robert Edmonds, John Kidd, Emanuel Sweling, John Ricolls, Thomas Smallwood, Robert Avis, John Lick, Samuel Wrangham and John Goodwin.</p> <p>John Coulson brought an action of assault and battery against William Hayle Senior. Hayle denied the action. The jury was sworn to try the case.</p> <p>John Doveton was sworn and stated that on Monday 28 September 1696, being the general rendezvous, he and John Coulson were on their way to Fort James when they overtook John Marsh and William Hayle with others. They were sitting at a place known as the Little Wood, a short distance from Coulson's house. As they approached, John Marsh began to abuse Coulson with insulting language. Coulson and Marsh then came to blows. William Hayle raised his stick as if to strike Coulson, but the witness could not say whether he struck him or not. He further stated that he did not hear Coulson give any insulting words to Hayle.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The formal swearing of a jury of twelve, with a named foreman, showed that English legal procedures were reproduced on the island. This reflected the transplantation of metropolitan judicial structures, with collective judgement used to determine disputed facts.</p> <p>The action of "assault and battery" indicated a recognised legal category that separated verbal provocation from physical violence. The case turned on whether force was applied, which showed the law's focus on bodily harm and its proof.</p> <p>The use of sworn testimony demonstrated the central role of oath-based evidence. Witness credibility rested on sworn statements, which functioned as a primary means of establishing fact in the absence of written records or material proof.</p> <p>The reference to the "general rendezvous" showed how military organisation shaped civil life. Gatherings for defence purposes created occasions where disputes arose and were later adjudicated within the same governing framework.</p> <p>The identification of the Little Wood as a known location near Coulson's house showed that local geography formed part of evidentiary detail. Familiar landmarks were used to situate events and support the credibility of testimony.</p>
16	8	<p>Susannah the wife of Wm Dutton Sworne saith that Susannah Doveton being also in the p John Coulson Comp on the aforesaid Day heard the said Coulson and Marsh have very high words and at Length Blows passed between them so that the said Dutton went in endeavour to part them, and then saw the said Hayle strike the said Coulson</p> <p>Elizabeth the wife of Sutton Isaac Sworne saith Eliz: Isaac Sworne that she also being with the p Coulson when he overtook the said Marsh, Hayle also in the Little wood and there saw the</p>	<p>Susannah, the wife of William Dutton, was sworn. She stated that she was in the company of John Coulson on the same day. She heard Coulson and John Marsh exchange heated words, after which blows passed between them. She went forward to part them and then saw William Hayle Senior strike Coulson.</p> <p>Elizabeth, the wife of Sutton Isaac, was sworn. She stated that she was also present with Coulson when he came upon Marsh and Hayle at the Little Wood. She saw William Hayle strike Coulson two or three blows on the head while Coulson and Marsh were fighting. At the same time, Marsh's wife also struck Coulson. She declared her statement to be true.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>sd Wm  Hayle strike the sd John Coulson 2 or 3 Blows on the said  Coulson head as the said Marsh and Coulson were a fighting  at the same time she the said Marsh wife laid on John Coulson  the sd Coulson whom she declares to speak truth  Sutton Isaac Sworne saith to the same purpose as his wife hath declared only q [...] words past between them he heard  not being very Deafe  Wm Marsh Complaines of the said John Coulson in an action of Assault and Battery  John Coulson Denys the action  Dorothy the wife of Wm Hayle being Sworne saith  Dorothy Haine Sworne that on Monday the 28th day of 7ber last past coming to Towne  with her Husband went in to Mr Coulsons House (and her  Husband went forward) and after she had done the business  she went in there she came out againe with John Marsh her  son in law who she found there and overtook her husband &amp;  Marshes wife at the Little wood staying for them so all sate  downe and lighted a pipe of Tobacco, and before each man pipe  was lighted came John Coulson, John Dutton, Sutton Isaac  &amp; his wife, and Susannah the wife of Wm Dutton, and so soone  as the said John Coulson came near the said Marsh he tooke  his Gunn off his shoulder, and sett it on the Ground to rest  himselfe upon it and then Marsh spoke to him, Sworne saith  she cannot remember but at length John Coulson said to the said  Marsh God Damn you for a Son of a Whore if I please to  you Ile knock your Brains out so severall times still giving  each other ill Language and at length the said Coulson came  towards the said Marsh having said his Muskett down and the sd Marsh seeing the sd Coulson coming  towards  him lifted up his Muskett but did not strike him with it</p>	<p>Sutton Isaac was sworn and confirmed the same account as his wife, except that he did not hear the words exchanged between them because he was very deaf.  William Marsh then brought an action of assault and battery against John Coulson, which Coulson denied.  Dorothy, the wife of William Hayle, was sworn. She stated that on Monday 28 September 1696 she came to town with her husband. She entered Coulson's house while her husband went forward. After finishing her business, she came out again with John Marsh, her son in law, whom she found there. She overtook her husband and Marsh's wife at the Little Wood, where they waited, and all sat down and lit pipes of tobacco. Before they had finished, John Coulson, John Dutton, Sutton Isaac and his wife, and Susannah the wife of William Dutton came upon them.  She stated that as soon as Coulson came near Marsh, he took his gun from his shoulder and set it on the ground to rest upon it. Marsh then spoke to him, though she could not remember the words. She stated that Coulson said to Marsh, "God damn you for a son of a whore, if I please to you I will knock your brains out", and repeated such language several times. They continued to exchange insults. At length Coulson moved towards Marsh after setting down his musket, and Marsh, seeing him approach, lifted up his musket but did not strike him with it.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The multiple sworn testimonies, including those of women, showed that evidentiary practice did not exclude female witnesses. Their statements carried formal weight, which indicated that credibility rested on oath rather than gender in this setting.  The conflicting accounts of who struck first and how many blows were given revealed that the jury's role was to reconcile disputed facts. The legal process depended on weighing testimony rather than establishing certainty through physical evidence.  The emergence of a counter-complaint by William Marsh against John Coulson showed that violent encounters could produce reciprocal legal actions. This reflected a system in which both parties to a conflict could seek remedy, leaving the court to disentangle responsibility.  Dorothy Hayle's account introduced verbal provocation and threats involving a firearm. This demonstrated that escalation from insult to potential violence was central to the case, and that the presence of weapons heightened the seriousness of the encounter even where they were not used to strike.  The detailed reconstruction of movement, location, and sequence of actions showed that spatial and temporal precision formed a key part of legal reasoning. Familiar places such as the Little Wood were used to anchor testimony and support its plausibility.</p>
17	9	<p>[...] the said Coulson Closed with him &amp; strooke him severall  Blowes on the Face.  Wm Hayle Junr Sworne saith to the same purpose as Mrs Hayle hath now upon Oath Declared.  Grace Coulson being Sworne on the behalfe of her Son saith that on Monday the 21th day of 7ber last past Wm  Marsh came to her House where in the Interim came in Sutton  Isaac, his wife, and Susannah Dutton to whom the said John Coulson  said to him the said Marsh, Mr Marsh I was misinformed abt  the words as I told you last Saturday as you spake them wrong  upon the said Mrs Coulson took the words from his</p>	<p>[...] John Coulson then closed with John Marsh and struck him several blows to the face.  William Hayle Junior was sworn and confirmed the same account as Mrs Hayle.  Grace Coulson was sworn on behalf of her son. She stated that on Monday 21 September 1696 William Marsh came to her house. During that visit Sutton Isaac, his wife, and Susannah Dutton also entered. John Coulson then said to Marsh that he was misinformed about words previously spoken and that Marsh had reported them incorrectly. Grace Coulson intervened and expressed regret for the words. Marsh replied that this would not suffice, and she answered that it would not suffice then either. Marsh then left in a displeased manner, though she did not hear what he said.  John Doveton was sworn and stated that on 21 September 1696 he went to Coulson's house just as</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Mouth and she is sorry for it that will not doe now said the sd Marsh, nor will not doe then replied she, so the sd Marsh went away grum bling she not hearing what he said John Doveton Sworne saith that on the 21th day of 7ber last, he went to the said Coulsons House just as the sd Marsh went out of it, and some time after he with Mrs Marsh and his wife, John Coulson, and Susannah Dutton his mother in law followed them to goe to Fort, where they all overtook the sd Marsh and his wife, Hayle and his wife, Wm Hayle Junr and the sd Marshes son at a place knowne by the name of the Little wood, no sooner John Coulson came to the place were Marsh was but he began to vilify him saying that he was a foole a loggerhead, and that he would whip his arse for him and words being him fitt enough to all which Coulson replied, Mr Marsh dont abuse me, so but if you can whip my arse come and doe it, so the sd Coulson sett his piece downe, and then the sd Marsh went to lift up the sd piece against him but was hindred by his wife &amp; Mother Dorothy Hayle, so they went forewards calling him severall ill names to which the sd Coulson replied that he would not have him to abuse him so, for setting his Marriage aside he was as good a man as he, so the sd Marsh replied again You I am a better man then ever your Father was or ever will be, as long as you live then sd Coulson replied dont say nothing of my Father that is dead and gone, but if you have any thing to me come and doe it now so he laid downe his Stick thereupon Marsh lifted up his Musket the Butt end upwards</p>	<p>Marsh departed. Some time later, he, Mrs Marsh, his own wife, John Coulson, and Susannah Dutton, his mother in law, followed towards the fort. They overtook Marsh and his wife, William Hayle and his wife, William Hayle Junior, and Marsh's son at the Little Wood.</p> <p>He stated that as soon as Coulson approached Marsh, Marsh began to insult him, calling him a fool and a loggerhead, and threatening to whip him. Coulson replied that Marsh should not abuse him, but if he wished to carry out the threat he should do so. Coulson then set down his firearm. Marsh attempted to take up the firearm against him but was restrained by his wife and by Dorothy Hayle. They then moved forward while continuing to use insulting language. Coulson replied that he should not be abused in that manner and declared that, setting aside marriage, he was as good a man as Marsh. Marsh answered that he was a better man than Coulson's father ever was or would be. Coulson responded that his father was dead and should not be spoken of, and invited Marsh to act if he had anything further to say. He then laid down his stick. Marsh lifted his musket with the butt end raised upwards.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The continuation of witness testimony showed how the court assembled a sequence of events from multiple perspectives. Each account added detail to the same encounter, which allowed the jury to compare consistency and contradiction in determining fault.</p> <p>Grace Coulson's evidence introduced a prior attempt at reconciliation. This showed that disputes could develop over time from earlier verbal conflicts, and that efforts to resolve them informally did not prevent later escalation into violence.</p> <p>The repeated emphasis on insults and challenges demonstrated that verbal provocation played a central role in triggering physical confrontation. The law distinguished between words and actions, but such language shaped how responsibility for violence was assessed.</p> <p>The involvement of family members, including wives and a mother, revealed that disputes were embedded in household and kinship networks. These relationships influenced both the progression of the conflict and the testimony presented in court.</p> <p>The handling of weapons during the encounter, including muskets and sticks, showed that everyday objects carried the potential for violence. Their presence intensified the seriousness of the altercation and formed a key element in evaluating intent and threat.</p>
18	10	<p>Coulson perceiving [...] with him then this Depon saith the [...] fell betwixt the said Marsh and Coulson as they were scuffling which the Comp perceiving went to part them but John Marsh Junr Wm Hayle Senr and the said Marshes wife all struck him the sd Coulson, but saw none of them strike the sd Marsh Sutton Isaack Sworne saith that he being Extraordinary Deafe could not heare what past betwixt them with Coulson and Marsh, but saw the said Coulson lift up his piece at the said Coulson twice, and the second time the sd Coulson closed with the sd Marsh Elizabeth the wife of Sutton Isaack Sworne saith that she was sent on the 21th day of 7ber aforesd by John Coulson to the said Coulsons house, who accordingly went a little time after came in the said Marsh to whom John Coulson</p>	<p>Coulson, perceiving [...], closed with John Marsh. As they struggled, [...] fell between them. Others present moved to part them, but John Marsh Junior, William Hayle Senior, and Marsh's wife all struck John Coulson. No one was seen to strike Marsh.</p> <p>Sutton Isaac was sworn and stated that, being very deaf, he did not hear what passed between Coulson and Marsh, but saw Coulson lift up his firearm at Marsh twice. On the second occasion, Coulson closed with him.</p> <p>Elizabeth, the wife of Sutton Isaac, was sworn. She stated that on 21 September 1696 she was sent by John Coulson to his house. Shortly after, Marsh entered. Coulson told him that he was misinformed about the words previously spoken and that he was sorry. Mrs Coulson immediately expressed regret as well. Marsh replied that this would not suffice and asked what would suffice, then left the house in a displeased manner. She further confirmed the account already given on oath by John Doveton.</p> <p>Susannah, the wife of John Doveton, was sworn and confirmed the same account as Elizabeth and John Doveton.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>immediately said to him Mr Marsh I was misinformed abt the words as I told you upon the other day, and that I am sorry for it said Mrs Coulson immediately, but that will not doe now said Marsh what will doe then, so went away out of the house grumbling and further saith as she aforesd John Doveton had declared on Oath Susannah the wife of Mr Doveton Sworne saith the same as the sd Elizabeth and John Doveton had already declared</p> <p>John Coulson Complain Against the said Marsh in an Action of Assault and Battery</p> <p>Wm Marsh Denys the action</p> <p>Grace Coulson, John Doveton, Sutton Isaack &amp; Susannah</p> <p>Doveton and Susannah Dutton all being sworne deposed that as they have done in the former Tryall of Wm Hayle versus John Coulson</p> <p>Then the Jury withdrew to Consider the aforesd action and after some time returned and brought their verdict</p> <p>First That Wm Hayle was cast by John Coulson and to pay the said Coulson 3[.] Damage</p> <p>2ly That John Coulson was cast by Wm Marsh and to pay the sd Marsh Ten shillings Damage</p> <p>3ly That the said Marsh was cast by John Coulson &amp; to pay him five shillings Damage</p>	<p>John Coulson then brought an action of assault and battery against William Marsh, which Marsh denied. Grace Coulson, John Doveton, Sutton Isaac, Susannah Doveton, and Susannah Dutton were all sworn and repeated their earlier depositions as given in the previous trial between William Hayle and John Coulson.</p> <p>The jury withdrew to consider the matter and, after some time, returned with their verdict.</p> <p>First, William Hayle Senior was found liable to John Coulson and was ordered to pay him 3[...] in damages.</p> <p>Secondly, John Coulson was found liable to William Marsh and was ordered to pay him £0 10s 0d in damages.</p> <p>Thirdly, William Marsh was found liable to John Coulson and was ordered to pay him £0 5s 0d in damages.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The overlapping findings of liability showed that the court treated the altercation as a mutual affray rather than a single-sided offence. Responsibility was divided among participants, which reflected a legal approach that assessed each act of violence separately within a shared conflict.</p> <p>The award of monetary damages in differing amounts demonstrated how harm was quantified. Compensation functioned as the primary remedy, with sums calibrated to reflect degrees of injury or culpability rather than imposing uniform penalties.</p> <p>The repetition of earlier depositions in the second action showed procedural efficiency. Testimony given in one related case was reused in another, which avoided duplication while maintaining continuity in the evaluation of evidence.</p> <p>The involvement of multiple individuals striking Coulson illustrated how group violence was addressed. Each participant's action was considered within the broader disturbance, which allowed the court to assign liability across several actors rather than isolating a single offender.</p>
19	11	<p>It is ordered by the Bench That Wm Hayle be fined to the Rt Honble Compa forty Shillings for breach of the Lawes Five Shillings John Coulson for the same one [...] and Wm Marsh 5s Richd Parnum complains of Andw Wilson saying that he the said Wilson Three Dollars and a halfe Rupee which the sd Wilson denys to have received of him Andw Wilson saith that he never recd one farthing of the said Parnum on Acct of Potatoes Onesiphorus Steward Sworne saith that some time past being at the said Wilsons House, ye sd Wilson asked him if he had ever seen Potatoes measured who told him yes, but said Wilson, were they so heapt up as these are shewing him a measure extraordinarily filled up whereupon he replied no then Wilson sd to him stay here a little while and Parnum will come by and and you will see his measure, so Parnum at length came and measured a Bushell of Potatoes in which he put in more then a Bushell, and this Deponent being a Servant or accot of Parnum the said Wilson was to have of him which he had recd pvis for to allow the said Acct and for so had received his Due, which the sd Wilson denying over some other acct name whose they were</p>	<p>An order was made by the bench that William Hayle Senior be fined to the Right Honourable Company £2 0s 0d for breach of the laws, and £0 5s 0d. John Coulson was fined £1 [...] for the same offence, and William Marsh £0 5s 0d.</p> <p>Richard Parnum complained against Andrew Wilson, stating that Wilson owed him three dollars and a half and one rupee. Wilson denied that he received any such payment and stated that he never received any money from Parnum on account of potatoes.</p> <p>Onesiphorus Steward was sworn. He stated that some time earlier, while at Wilson's house, Wilson asked him whether he ever saw potatoes measured. He replied that he had. Wilson then showed him a measure filled excessively high and asked whether potatoes were usually heaped in that way. Steward replied that they were not. Wilson then told him to wait and observe Parnum's measure. When Parnum arrived, he measured a bushel of potatoes but put in more than a full bushel.</p> <p>Steward further stated that, as a servant or acting on account of Parnum, he knew that Wilson was to receive from him what was due, and that Wilson received payment previously for that account and had his due satisfied. Wilson denied this and referred to another account, disputing whose it was. During the exchange, Parnum threw [...]. Wilson stated that he would not strike out any score, saying that he had been paid or had money ready to pay. As Parnum was leaving, he offered payment for one bushel of potatoes that he then received, but Wilson refused to accept it unless the whole debt was paid.</p> <p>The court asked Wilson whether he would swear that he never received any sum from Parnum on account of potatoes. He refused to take the oath and</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>and at length Parnum throwing the sd Parnum said Wilson sd not any Score out for I have paid you or I have money in my Pocket to pay you, but when the said Parnum was going away he offerd paymt to the sd Wilson for one Bushell of Potatoes he then received, which the said Wilson refused, except he paid him the whole Debt he owed him</p> <p>The Court asked the sd Wilson if he would make oath that he never received one shilling of the sd Parnum on acct of Potatoes who refusing so to doe throwing upon the sd Parnum proof was asked if he was willing that Parnum oath should make a Decision of the matter to which the sd Wilson being very free, The said Parnum was sworne as followeth vizt</p>	<p>placed the burden of proof on Parnum. The court then asked whether he would accept Parnum's oath as decisive in the matter. Wilson agreed freely.</p> <p>Parnum was then sworn as follows.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The imposition of fines payable to the Right Honourable Company showed that breaches of public order were treated as offences against corporate authority. Financial penalties functioned as both punishment and revenue, reinforcing the Company's governing role.</p> <p>The dispute over payment in mixed currencies, including dollars and rupees, revealed the circulation of multiple monetary systems. This reflected the island's integration into wider trading networks, where different currencies were accepted and required conversion or recognition in local dealings.</p> <p>The disagreement over the measurement of potatoes demonstrated the absence of strict standardisation. The use of heaped measures created scope for manipulation, which directly affected pricing and fairness in exchange.</p> <p>The refusal of Andrew Wilson to swear an oath shifted the evidentiary burden. By declining to swear, he allowed the case to be decided by the opposing party's oath, which showed how oath-taking operated as a decisive legal mechanism when other proof was uncertain.</p> <p>The conditional refusal to accept partial payment unless the full debt was satisfied indicated that creditors could enforce payment terms strategically. This reflected a practice where control over acceptance of payment could be used to compel settlement of entire obligations rather than isolated transactions.</p>
20	12	<p>Rich: Parnams Oath I Richard Parnum doe hereby Solemnly Protest and Swear upon the Holy Evangelist that I have paid Andw Wilson of this Island Three Dollers and one halfe Rupee on acco of Potatoes bought of him to help me, and that Contents of this Book</p> <p>The Jury delivered their verdict that the said Wilson was cast and pay the sd Parnum halfe a Doller Damage The said Wilson declaring that he would Arrest the Parnum for the over measure of Potatoes he had of him the Court</p> <p>Advised each other to put their differences to Arbitration of two men who both agreed thereunto So Andw Wilson chose Robt Parnum and the sd Parnum Orlando Bagley who accordingly put an End</p> <p>to their Matter of Difference vizt</p> <p>That it appeared that Wilson told the sd Parnum to take wt measure he would which he bought Potatoes of him</p> <p>Therefore their award was that Parnum pay the said Wilson for so many Bushells of Potatoes he has received of the said Wilson, and to give each other Genl Releases from the begining of the world to this day</p> <p>Poirier F Goodwin</p>	<p>Richard Parnum was sworn and declared upon oath on the Holy Evangelists that he paid Andrew Wilson three dollars and one half rupee on account of potatoes bought from him, as recorded in the book.</p> <p>The jury delivered their verdict that Andrew Wilson was found liable and was to pay Richard Parnum half a dollar in damages.</p> <p>Andrew Wilson then declared that he would arrest Parnum for over-measure in the potatoes he received. The court advised both parties to submit their dispute to arbitration by two men, to which they agreed. Wilson chose Robert Parnum, and Parnum chose Orlando Bagley.</p> <p>The arbitrators determined that Wilson told Parnum to take what measure he wished when he bought the potatoes. They awarded that Parnum pay Wilson for as many bushels of potatoes as he received, and that both parties give each other general releases from the beginning of the world to that day.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The decisive use of Richard Parnum's oath showed that sworn testimony could resolve a dispute where other evidence remained uncertain. The legal process allowed one party's oath to determine liability when the opposing party declined to swear, which gave oath-taking a central evidentiary function.</p> <p>The award of damages in dollars rather than sterling reflected the coexistence of multiple currencies in local transactions. This indicated that the court recognised and enforced obligations in the currency in which they were contracted.</p> <p>Andrew Wilson's intention to arrest Parnum for over-measure showed that disputes could extend beyond a single claim into counterclaims based on related transactions. This reflected a fluid legal environment where interconnected obligations were contested within the same relationship.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The submission to arbitration demonstrated an alternative mechanism for dispute resolution endorsed by the court. By appointing chosen arbitrators, the parties shifted from formal judgement to negotiated settlement, which reduced further litigation.</p> <p>The requirement for “general releases from the beginning of the world to this day” functioned as a comprehensive discharge of all prior claims between the parties. This ensured that no further actions could arise from past dealings, which brought finality to their dispute.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The court’s encouragement of arbitration probably aimed to prevent ongoing litigation between Parnum and Wilson. By directing them toward a negotiated settlement, the authorities reduced the burden on the court while securing a practical resolution acceptable to both sides.</p> <p>The arbitrators’ decision that Parnum pay for all potatoes received, despite earlier disagreement over measure, suggested a compromise that balanced competing claims. This approach allowed both parties to concede part of their position while ending the dispute entirely.</p>
21	13	<p>Island St Helena.  Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 6th Day of 8ber 1696 att Fort James  Prest Richard Keelinge Govr  Capts Poirier Depu Govr  Thomas Serjt Dixon gave a Deed of Gift to Mary his wife now Deceased for some Slaves and by vertue of the sd Deed of  Gift she made a will of wch Robt Edmunds and John Luffkin were  Executors of the sd will which now they Come to prove with the sd  Deed of Gift and will  Serjt Dixon the Husband of the sd Mary his Deceased wife being in being was Sent for and was asked if he had given the sd  Deed of Gift produced by the sd Edmunds and Luffkin to his Deceased wife  and if he had given her Liberty to make her will and Dispose of the Slaves  belonging formerly to her as she had Disposed by will  The sd Serjt Dixon replied yt he had given his Deceased wife  the Deed of Gift now produced by the sd Edmunds and Luffkin &amp; did  give Liberty to his wife to make a will, and to Dispose as she  had Disposed by will, and that he had nothing to object against ye sd  will nor Deed of Gift  Mark Bagley and Tho: Cale Sworne saith yt they saw the sd Mary the wife of the sd Dixon Seale Deliver &amp; owne the  will now produced as her last will and Testament but her hands being  weake she desired some person to guide her hand as she made her mark  she then being in her perfect Sense and memory  It is ordered  That the sd will, and Deed of Gift be approved &amp; that Copy be given thereof as desired  Poirier  F Goodwin</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 6 October 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>Thomas Dixon gave a deed of gift to his wife Mary Dixon for certain slaves. By virtue of that deed, she made a will. Robert Edmonds and John Luffkin were named as executors and came forward to prove both the deed of gift and the will.</p> <p>Thomas Dixon, as husband of the deceased Mary Dixon and still living, was called and asked whether he gave the deed of gift and allowed his wife to make a will and dispose of the slaves as she had done. He replied that he did give the deed of gift and granted her liberty to make a will and dispose of the slaves accordingly. He stated that he made no objection to either the will or the deed of gift.</p> <p>Mark Bagley and Thomas Cale were sworn and stated that they saw Mary Dixon seal, deliver, and acknowledge the will now produced as her last will and testament. Because her hands were weak, she asked for assistance to guide her hand while she made her mark. She was declared to be in full sense and memory at that time.</p> <p>An order was made that the will and deed of gift be approved, and that copies be issued as requested.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The deed of gift from Thomas Dixon to his wife showed that property, including slaves, could be formally transferred within marriage through legal instruments. This enabled a wife to hold and later dispose of property independently, which reflected a recognised though limited form of separate ownership.</p> <p>The requirement that the husband confirm both the deed and the wife’s authority to make a will demonstrated the continuing legal weight of marital authority. His consent validated the transaction and ensured that no later challenge would arise from his position.</p> <p>The proving of the will by named executors showed the formal process of probate. Executors bore responsibility for presenting and authenticating the will before the council, which acted as the approving authority in place of a higher court.</p> <p>The witnesses’ statement that Mary Dixon was of sound mind at the time of making her will highlighted the legal requirement of testamentary capacity. Even physical weakness, such as inability to sign, did not</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>invalidate a will if mental competence and intent were clearly established.</p> <p>The approval and issuing of copies showed the administrative function of record-keeping. Certified copies allowed the will and deed to be enforced and recognised in future dealings, which secured the transfer and distribution of property.</p>
22	14	<p>Island St Helena.</p> <p>Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 19th Day of 8ber 1696 at Fort James  Prest Richd Keelinge Govern  Capts Poirier Depu Govern  John Hemen complains of Pippin Wills saying that the said Wills forbade him to fence his Land as Matthew Barrett the Govrs Depu Surveyor did measure his Land he having the Governrs warrant for the same and the will Encroach thereonto  Pippin Wills saith that on a Contract betweene the said Hemen and he, he would and Did give him Leave to fetch his Corner marke unto part of his ground he having Liberty to alter his owne measure provided he did not Stop up a Pathway that was in the Part of the said ground wherein the Corner marke was to be pitched which now he was going to doe  Matthew Barrett Depu Surveyor saith the same as the said Wills and that when he measured the sd Hemens Land he pitched a Corner marke for the said Hemens Land into Pippin Wills Land the sd parties Consented and that on Condition that the sd Hemen the said will path way not no other Lawfull Priviledge  It is ordered  That the sd will and Hemens Measure their Land again according to their first Measure on stand to their agreemts  as Matt Barrett has now Declared Samll Maxwell late Petitioned that he might hire and rent 15 Acres of Land of the Rt Honble waste Land Lying and being in Sandy Bay Between the Land of Thomas Swallow and Margaret Harrington now that hire of the Rt Honble Compa for the Terme of 21 years  It is ordered  That the said Maxwells request be granted his Lease beginning from the Birth of our Saviour Jesus Christ next Ensueing and therein be bound (besides the usuall obligation of 4s p Acre Rent) not to Cut any Timber Trees growing thereon</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 19 October 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>John Hemen complained against Pippin Wills. Hemen stated that Wills prevented him from fencing his land, although Matthew Barrett measured the land under the Governor's warrant. He claimed that Wills encroached upon it.</p> <p>Pippin Wills answered that, by agreement between them, he allowed Hemen to bring his corner mark into part of his ground. He stated that Hemen was given liberty to adjust his measure, provided that he did not obstruct a pathway that lay within that ground, where the corner mark was to be set. Wills claimed that Hemen was now attempting to block that pathway.</p> <p>Matthew Barrett, Deputy Surveyor, confirmed Wills's account. He stated that when he measured Hemen's land, he placed a corner mark within Wills's land with the consent of both parties. This was done on condition that Hemen did not obstruct the pathway or interfere with any other lawful privilege.</p> <p>An order was made that Wills and Hemen measure their land again according to the first measurement and abide by their agreement, as declared by Matthew Barrett.</p> <p>Samuel Maxwell petitioned to hire and rent 15 acres of waste land belonging to the Right Honourable Company in Sandy Bay, situated between the lands of Thomas Swallow and Margaret Harrington, for a term of 21 years.</p> <p>An order was made that Maxwell's request be granted. The lease was to begin from 25 December 1696 and required him, in addition to the usual rent of £0 4s 0d per acre, not to cut any timber trees growing on the land.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The dispute over boundary measurement showed the importance of the Deputy Surveyor in regulating land ownership. Measurement under official warrant established recognised boundaries, but these remained subject to agreement between neighbouring parties, which reflected a blend of formal authority and local negotiation.</p> <p>The condition regarding the pathway demonstrated that access rights were protected alongside land allocation. Such pathways functioned as shared infrastructure, and their preservation was treated as a legal obligation attached to land use.</p> <p>The order to remeasure the land according to the original agreement showed that prior consent carried binding force. The council enforced not only surveyed boundaries but also the conditions under which they were accepted, which maintained stability in landholding arrangements.</p> <p>The lease granted to Samuel Maxwell illustrated the Company's control over waste land. Land was allocated through fixed-term leases rather than outright ownership, which ensured continued oversight and revenue through rent.</p> <p>The restriction against cutting timber trees showed that natural resources were regulated as part of land tenure. This condition preserved valuable materials and indicated that environmental management formed part of the Company's administrative policy.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The requirement to remeasure the land probably aimed to prevent further conflict by restoring the</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>originally agreed boundary. By reinforcing the initial terms, the council avoided creating a new settlement that might provoke additional disputes.</p> <p>The condition imposed on Maxwell not to cut timber trees suggested concern over resource scarcity. The restriction probably aimed to conserve timber for strategic or communal use, rather than allowing unrestricted exploitation by individual tenants.</p>
23	15	<p>thereon and that the Govr might for the Rt Honble Compa use such any Timber Tree there if any his occasion shall require without Let hindrance or interruption Poirier F Goodwin Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 20th Day of 8ber 1696 att Fort James Prest Richd Keelinge Governr Cpts Poirier Depu Governr Orlando Bagley Smith Complains of Bertrant And[...] French Smith saying that he being in Compa with Hugh Bagley in Fort James Towne with two said Smiths and that he the said Smith took his Cloaths without any manner of provocation and now Denyes to give him any manner of Satisfaction Bertrant And[...] saith that it was not him that tore the neckcloth but it was John Nicholls who snatched it off out of his mouth, and a breaking of the sd shirt by pulling it off the sd Bagley neckcloth so tore it Severall persons being Examined att the busines but none able to give a true acct for the Difference except but most being apt to believe it was the Smith that tore it he, the feeling neck to him and being thought the same by us It is ordered</p>	<p>The lease further required that the Governor might, on behalf of the Right Honourable Company, take and use any timber tree growing on the land whenever occasion required, without any obstruction or interruption.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 20 October 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>Orlando Bagley complained against Bertrant And[...]. Bagley stated that while he was in company with Hugh Bagley in Fort James town, along with the two smiths, the defendant took his clothes without any provocation and now refused to give satisfaction.</p> <p>Bertrant And[...] replied that he did not tear the neckcloth. He stated that John Nicholls snatched it from Bagley's neck, and that the shirt was torn in the process of pulling it off.</p> <p>Several persons were examined concerning the matter, but none were able to give a clear account of the dispute. Most inclined to believe that the smith tore the neckcloth, as he handled it and was thought responsible.</p> <p>An order was made.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The reservation allowing the Governor to take timber from leased land showed that ultimate control over natural resources remained with the Company. Even where land was rented, tenants could not prevent the extraction of valuable materials for official use, which reinforced hierarchical control over property.</p> <p>The complaint by Orlando Bagley illustrated how personal disputes over property damage were brought before the council. Such matters, though minor, were formally adjudicated, which showed the extension of legal authority into everyday conflicts.</p> <p>The conflicting accounts regarding the tearing of the neckcloth demonstrated the difficulty of establishing fact in the absence of clear witnesses. The court relied on collective opinion and probability where direct evidence was lacking, which indicated a pragmatic approach to judgement.</p> <p>The involvement of multiple individuals in a public setting suggested that disputes often arose in communal spaces. This reflected the close social environment of the settlement, where interactions frequently led to conflict requiring official intervention.</p>
24	16	<p>and Bertrant to pay to Orldo Bagley one Doller That the said Berstrant And[...] pay to the said Orlando Bagley one Doller Damage for the Neckcloth It being also proved by severall attestations verball that the Dutch Cooper did Disturbe the said Compa and was going to Stabb Orlando Bagley with a knife upon the acc of the Difference betweene the said Bagley and French Smith he having no Leave to goe out of the Fort from his worke It is ordered That Tomorrow being the release of the Guard he ride the wooden horse and have no more Liberty to walke for any perticular person without some Extraordinary and speciall Businesse and speciall Leave from the Govr</p>	<p>An order was made that Bertrant And[...] pay to Orlando Bagley one dollar in damages for the neckcloth.</p> <p>It was also proved by several verbal attestations that Dutch Cooper disturbed the company and attempted to stab Orlando Bagley with a knife during the dispute between Bagley and the French smith. He had no leave to be out of the fort from his work at that time.</p> <p>An order was made that on the following day, being the relief of the guard, the Dutch cooper ride the wooden horse, and that he be denied liberty to walk abroad for any private purpose without extraordinary and special business and express leave from the Governor.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Poirier F Goodwin</p>	<p>The award of one dollar in damages showed that minor personal injuries or property damage were resolved through fixed monetary compensation. This reflected a practical system where small disputes were settled quickly without extended proceedings.</p> <p>The reliance on “verbal attestations” demonstrated that informal testimony, even without written record, was accepted as sufficient proof. The court acted on collective witness statements to establish disorderly conduct.</p> <p>The punishment of riding the wooden horse indicated a form of corporal discipline used within the garrison. This public and physically uncomfortable penalty functioned as both punishment and deterrent, reinforcing authority through visible enforcement.</p> <p>The restriction on movement without leave showed that labourers such as the cooper remained under strict control. Permission to leave assigned work or location was regulated, which reflected a system of labour discipline tied closely to military oversight.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The severity of the cooper’s punishment, compared with the relatively small fine imposed on the smith, probably reflected the perceived escalation from a minor dispute to a threat of serious violence. The use of a knife introduced a level of danger that required a more visible and deterrent response.</p> <p>The additional restriction on the cooper’s liberty suggested concern about further disorder. Limiting his movement probably aimed to prevent repeated incidents and maintain control over individuals considered disruptive within the fort.</p>
25	17	<p>Island St Helena. Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 2d Day of 9ber 1696 att Fort James Prest Richd Keelinge Governr Capts Poirier Depu Governr Hen: Cale Marshall humbly Petitions that the Govr and Councill would be pleased to Exchange Ten acres of Land he stands possessed off Scituation Lying at the High Hill where the Rt Honble Compa has great part of their Cattle Grazing for other Ten acres Land upon the Hills of Deep valley which in all probability Can be of no use to the Rt Honble Compa It is ordered That the said Cales request be granted and that Deeds of Exchange be Drawne accordingly, and that the said Cale be therein bound to permitt the Rt Honble Compa to fell and Cut any Timber trees that may be found on the said Land in Deep valley Aforesd Seeing it is no Detriment to the Rt Honble Compa but rather a convenien since great part of their Stock of Cattle range thereabout at the aforesaid High Hill Poirier F Goodwin</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 2 November 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>Henry Cale submitted a petition requesting an exchange of ten acres of land in his possession at High Hill, where the Right Honourable Company grazed much of its cattle, for ten acres on the hills of Deep Valley. He stated that the latter land would probably be of no use to the Company.</p> <p>An order was made that the request be granted and that deeds of exchange be drawn accordingly. Henry Cale was required to permit the Right Honourable Company to fell and cut any timber trees found on the land at Deep Valley. This condition was imposed on the grounds that it caused no detriment to the Company and instead served its convenience, since much of its cattle ranged about High Hill.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The exchange of land showed that property rights on the island were subject to negotiation under Company authority. Landholders could request adjustments, but final approval rested with the Governor and Council, which ensured that such changes aligned with broader administrative interests.</p> <p>The emphasis on cattle grazing at High Hill revealed the economic importance of pasture. Land use was evaluated in terms of its contribution to the Company’s livestock resources, which formed a key part of the island’s provisioning system.</p> <p>The requirement that Henry Cale allow the Company to cut timber on the exchanged land demonstrated retained rights over natural resources. Even after transfer, valuable materials such as timber remained under Company control, which limited the extent of private ownership.</p> <p>The formal drawing of deeds of exchange indicated the importance of written instruments in confirming land transactions. Such documentation secured the arrangement and provided a record for future reference and enforcement.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
26	18	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 8th  Day of 9ber 1696 att Fort James  Prest Richd Keelinge Governr  Capts Poirier Depu Governr  Whereas Robt Cadman Soldier was by the Govr  to fetch John Young Soldier who refused to mount the  Guard  when he was to Come on Duty last, and whereas the  said Cadman  remise in the performance of the said Order they both  with other  persons were Orderd to appeare they to Answer their  Contempts &amp;  other persons to Evidence against them,  Robt Cadman being Charged for the neglect of the due  Executing the Govrs orders he seemed to be very sorry  for what  allegding that if the said John Young would have come  towards  Evening that he would have come also he staying for  him till he  had Dranke a Bowe of Punch at the House of John  Fuller  The said Fuller having no Licence to retaile Strong  Liquors the said Cadman was asked if the sd Fuller did  sell him  a Bowe of Punch, who replied that the said Young  called for a  bottle of Punch and Mrs Fuller went and fetched it and  gave it  to him, and more over saith that when first he went up  in the Country  to looke for the said Young he calld at the House of Mr  Fuller  to see if the said Young was there, the Quartering there,  the said  Fullers wife asked him if he would Drink a Dram, he  said no  sr I had rather be a Shilling in a Bowe of punch  whereupon Mr  Fuller went and made a Bowe of Punch and Dranke to  the said  Cadman saying that it was for him, and he thought so  too, thinking  to pay for it accordingly, &amp; finding not the said Young  there went  to John Goodwins where he returned, so brought him  to Fuller where  the said Young calld for a Bowe of Punch, which Mrs  Fuller  brought to him, and when that was out the said Cadman  calld for  another saying to John Young that he would not splurge  upon him  The said Cadman being Sworne saith the same as now  he has declared</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 8 November 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>Robert Cadman was ordered by the Governor to fetch John Young, who refused to mount guard when required for duty. Cadman was found remiss in executing this order. Both men, along with other persons, were called to appear to answer their contempts, and witnesses were brought to give evidence.</p> <p>Robert Cadman, when charged with neglect in executing the Governor's order, expressed regret. He stated that he waited for John Young and that if Young came later in the evening, he would also have come. He admitted that he remained at the house of John Fuller, where he drank a bowl of punch.</p> <p>John Fuller held no licence to sell strong liquor. Cadman was asked whether Fuller sold him the punch. He replied that John Young called for a bottle of punch, which Mrs Fuller fetched and gave to him. He further stated that when he first went into the country to look for Young, he stopped at Fuller's house to ask whether Young was there. Mrs Fuller offered him a dram, which he declined, saying he would rather have a shilling's worth in a bowl of punch. Fuller then prepared a bowl of punch and drank to him, which Cadman understood as intended for him, and he expected to pay for it. Not finding Young there, he went to John Goodwin, and then returned, bringing Young back to Fuller's house. There, Young called for a bowl of punch, which Mrs Fuller brought. When that was finished, Cadman called for another, telling Young that he would not spare expense on him.</p> <p>Cadman was sworn and confirmed this account.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The charge against Robert Cadman showed that failure to execute a direct order was treated as contempt of authority. Military discipline required prompt compliance, and delay or diversion from duty was subject to formal inquiry.</p> <p>The refusal of John Young to mount guard illustrated the seriousness of neglecting military duty. Guard service formed a core obligation within the garrison, and refusal undermined the island's security.</p> <p>The involvement of John Fuller in providing drink without a licence showed that the sale or distribution of strong liquor was regulated. Licensing controlled both economic activity and social order, and breaches were drawn into official scrutiny.</p> <p>Cadman's account revealed how informal social interactions, such as drinking together, could interfere with duty. The expectation that he would pay for the punch indicated that such exchanges were treated as commercial even when framed as hospitality.</p> <p>The repeated movement between houses in search of John Young showed how duty enforcement depended on personal pursuit rather than formal systems. Soldiers were expected to locate and compel compliance directly, which reflected the practical limits of administrative control.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Cadman's explanation that he waited for John Young while drinking suggested that social obligation and leisure took precedence over strict duty in practice. This may indicate that enforcement relied heavily on individual discipline rather than constant supervision.</p> <p>The questioning about the supply of punch probably reflected concern over unlicensed drinking as a contributing factor to disorder. The authorities may have viewed the incident not only as a failure of duty but also as evidence of lax control over alcohol within the settlement.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
27	19	<p>The said Jonathan Young humbly acknowledgeth his fault and heartily begs pardon, and humbly alleadgeth that if Robt Cadman would have come along with him when he came for him, and not asked him to have given him a bottle of Punch for his pains he had then come sooner which punch both of them had of the said Fuller Corpl Barrett Sworne saith that he coming off the Guard when Cadman was sent up in the Country the Govr ordered him to goe and looke for the said Young and send him downe by the said Cadman, who accordingly went and past by the said Fuller asking if the said Young was there to whom answer was made that he had not bin there some dayes since, so stayed there the Drinking of a Bowle of punch that the said Mrs Fuller made for the sd Cadman, and then from thence went to John Goodwins House were he found the said Young whom he brought along with him as far as the sd Fullers where he stayd a Drinking almost spent of another Bowle of punch, John Young called for, so went away desiring Mr Fuller and his wife to make them no more punch for if they did he thought neither of them would goe to the Fort, but it seems as the said Cadman &amp; Young saith they had another Bowle Mary Eastlake Sworne saith that she being at the House of the said John Fuller heard Corpl Barrett speak to the said Fullers his wife not to make any more punch for the said Young and Cadman Upon the whole it appearing that the said Fuller has not onely now but at other times made it practice to sell punch having no Licence so to doe It is ordered That the said Fuller be fined to the Rt Honble Compa the sum of 10s for his retailing of strong Liquor and be bound to the good behaviour untill next Sessions And That the said Young and Cadman be now dismissed upon their promise never to Commit the Like Enormity againe Poirier F Goodwin</p>	<p>John Young acknowledged his fault, asked pardon, and stated that if Robert Cadman went with him when he first came for him, and did not ask for a bottle of punch as a reward, he would have come sooner. He added that both of them drank punch at the house of John Fuller.</p> <p>Corporal Matthew Barrett was sworn. He stated that after coming off guard, and when Cadman was sent into the country, the Governor ordered him to search for Young and send him down with Cadman. He went accordingly and passed by Fuller's house, asking whether Young was there, and was told he had not been there for several days. He remained there while Mrs Fuller prepared a bowl of punch for Cadman. He then went to the house of John Goodwin, where he found Young and brought him back as far as Fuller's house. There they stayed while Young called for another bowl of punch and drank most of it. Barrett then left, asking Fuller and his wife not to make any more punch for them, saying that if they did, neither man would return to the fort. Despite this, as Cadman and Young admitted, they had another bowl.</p> <p>Mary Eastlake was sworn and confirmed that she heard Corporal Barrett instruct Mrs Fuller not to prepare any more punch for Cadman and Young.</p> <p>It appeared from the whole matter that John Fuller not only on this occasion but at other times made it his practice to sell punch without a licence.</p> <p>An order was made that John Fuller be fined £0 10s 0d to the Right Honourable Company for retailing strong liquor without licence, and that he be bound to good behaviour until the next Sessions.</p> <p>A further order was made that John Young and Robert Cadman be dismissed upon their promise not to commit the same offence again.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>John Young's admission and request for pardon showed that confession could mitigate punishment. The council accepted acknowledgement of fault as sufficient to avoid harsher penalties, which indicated a flexible approach to discipline when contrition was shown.</p> <p>The repeated references to drinking punch during the execution of orders demonstrated how alcohol consumption interfered with military duty. Regulation of drinking was therefore closely linked to maintaining discipline and readiness within the garrison.</p> <p>The finding that John Fuller regularly sold liquor without licence showed that enforcement extended beyond isolated incidents to patterns of behaviour. Licensing operated as a control over both commerce and social order, and repeated breaches attracted formal sanction.</p> <p>The requirement that Fuller be "bound to good behaviour" imposed a continuing obligation beyond the immediate fine. This functioned as a preventive measure, placing him under ongoing scrutiny and subject to further penalty if he offended again before the next Sessions.</p> <p>The dismissal of Cadman and Young upon promise alone illustrated a system where discipline could be restored without punishment when the offence was not judged severe enough to require it. This reflected a balance between enforcement and the practical need to retain soldiers in service.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to fine Fuller while dismissing Cadman and Young probably reflected a judgement that the root of the disorder lay in the availability of unlicensed drink rather than solely in the soldiers' conduct. By targeting the supplier, the authorities addressed the source of the problem.</p> <p>The acceptance of a promise from Cadman and Young suggested that the council prioritised</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>maintaining manpower over imposing punishment. Their continued service was perhaps considered more valuable than enforcing stricter penalties in this instance.</p>
28	20	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 30th  Day of 9ber 1696 att Fort James  Prest Richd Keelinge Govr  Capts Poirier Depu Govr  Mary Hayles Complains of foure  Dutch men belonging to ships may be the sd Hayles husband  as also of two English men vizt Joseph Hoston &amp; John Gregory belonging  to the said ships may be taking her House in her absence  That is to say she having urgent occasion to goe to the Country  stays on Monday last left her Daughter to give victuals to  the aforesaid Dutch men who had bin there for some days  before as Lodgers, the next day being Tuesday she returned and  found a Doore George a slave of our Honble Comp Blackmore who  is put to her by Govr and Council acquainted her that those 4  Dutch men that went out of her house had made use of the key  of mary the wife of Thomas Swallow and also two English men  vizt Joseph Hoston and John Gregory came below staires upon  a chest and other up staires upon a bed &amp; Table, the Slave to  her great Greif her Daughter aged abt 11 yeares told her she not being permitted to goe out of Doores to tell any person that  said Dutch men having Locket the Doore and Kept the key in their pocket, so the Girl Cry out pray pray Gentlemen dont make a bawdy house of my Fathers House, for  He tell my father who'l cause you to be punished at ye Island  James Rider being Examined saith that he knowing the Mary Hayles is in Company with some Dutch men at the  Hayles House, and also knowing that she was up in the Country  and her husband also saith him to have some jealousies that there  would be some Debauchery between the said Dutch men and the  Mary Hayles, which caused him to say to George a slave belonging to the Honble Comp Blackmore (who came to his House  to borrow some Ring) what stirra what did you see the Dutch men doe with Moll Hayles, so not replied the sd slave, no what are you sure of it who Marsh (could not help  or hinder it, replied the said slave, so the Boy went his way  away</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 30 November 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>Mary Hayles complained against four Dutch men belonging to ships, who lodged at her house, and also against two Englishmen, Joseph Hoston and John Gregory, also belonging to those ships. She stated that they took possession of her house during her absence.</p> <p>She explained that, having urgent business in the country, she left her house on Monday, leaving her daughter, aged about eleven years, to provide victuals to the Dutch lodgers, who stayed there for several days. She returned on Tuesday and found the door secured. George, a slave belonging to the Honourable Company called Blackmore, who was assigned to her by the Governor and Council, informed her that the four Dutch men who left her house used the key of Mary, wife of Thomas Swallow. He further stated that Joseph Hoston and John Gregory entered, going downstairs upon a chest and upstairs upon a bed and table.</p> <p>To her great distress, her daughter told her that she was not permitted to leave the house to inform anyone, as the Dutch men locked the door and kept the key in their possession. The girl cried out to them not to make a bawdy house of her father's house, saying that she would tell her father, who would have them punished on the island.</p> <p>James Rider was examined and stated that he knew Mary Hayles was in company with Dutch men at her house, and that she was then in the country, as was her husband. He suspected that there would be debauchery between the Dutch men and Mary Hayles. This led him to question George, the Company's slave called Blackmore, when he came to borrow a ring. Rider asked what the Dutch men did with Moll Hayles. The slave replied that he did not know and could neither help nor prevent it, and then departed.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The complaint showed that lodging arrangements brought seamen into close contact with households, which created opportunities for disorder. Control over domestic space became a matter of public concern when it involved outsiders and potential misconduct.</p> <p>The confinement of Mary Hayles's daughter and the locking of the house indicated coercion and loss of household authority. This suggested that inhabitants, especially women and children, could be vulnerable to the actions of transient maritime populations.</p> <p>The involvement of a Company slave assigned to the household showed how labour and service were organised. Such individuals acted as intermediaries and witnesses, providing information to both householders and authorities.</p> <p>The use of a borrowed or alternative key demonstrated how access to property could be manipulated. Control over keys functioned as a practical means of authority over space, and its misuse became part of the offence.</p> <p>James Rider's testimony revealed how suspicion and reputation influenced proceedings. His concern about possible "debauchery" reflected moral regulation within the settlement, where perceived sexual misconduct was treated as a matter requiring oversight.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The locking of the house and restriction placed on the child probably aimed to prevent exposure of the men's actions. This suggested deliberate concealment, which heightened the seriousness of the complaint beyond simple trespass.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The presence of both Dutch and English seamen in the same incident suggested that disorder arose from mixed groups without strict discipline. The authorities may have viewed such gatherings as particularly risky, requiring intervention to maintain social control.</p>
29	21	<p>a very small time after saw the said Feudales wife goe up the Hill, and heard some Dutch men whistle after her and them meeting with the sd Hayles Daughter asked her what the Dutch men would Doe for their victualls, who answered she know not So he sd for her sake tell them to use her fine Doves bed night at your House, I refuse them for two men lay with me al along Feudales last night some below stairs, and two above stairs some upon the Bed some upon a Table &amp; some upon a Chest So he asked her if she was sure of it yes replied she, where left the window open to make his way saying there was fine Doings Pippin Wills examined saith that one John Gregory belonging to ships may told him on Tuesday morning last that he and another English man named Joseph Hoston a new English man had gone the night before to the said Hayles House for a Bowle of Punch, and as soone as they came in the house found a Dutch man in Carnall Copulation with the said Mary Feudales, &amp; the sd Gregory told him that he stayd there some time &amp; then went away leaving the sd Dutch men in Comp with the said Mary Feudales the said Joseph Hoston being gone before Elizabeth Birch the Daughter of the sd Hayles Examined saith that her Mother leaving her in the House on Monday last when she went up in the Country to give them some victualls she and in the evening George aforesd told her that two Dutch men had laine with the sd Feudales abt 9 of the clock &amp; in the night saw her wife two English men lay with her above stairs and also two Dutch men below stairs being in two rooms, lying upon a Bed and that one of the English mens name was Gregory Joseph Hoston Sworne saith that he knows nothing in nothing of the action that passed between the Dutch men &amp; the sd Mary Feudales, he then being drunk but remembers that on Monday last he and John Gregory went to the sd Hayles House to Drink a bowle of Punch which they had, &amp; a black Woman being and at length saw the sd Gregory very great with a woman that was there so went downe stairs, and then up again and saw the sd Gregory lying downe upon the Bed with the woman they both being a talkeing so asked him if he would goe away no sd he so both went their way after they had Kist her leaving</p>	<p>[...] Shortly after, he saw the wife of Mary Feudales go up the hill and heard some Dutch men whistle after her. Meeting Elizabeth Birch, he asked what the Dutch men would do for their victuals. She replied that she did not know. He then told her, for her own sake, to let them use her fine bed at night. She answered that she refused them, saying that two men lay with her all along the previous night, some below stairs and two above stairs, some upon the bed, some upon a table, and some upon a chest. When asked if she was certain, she replied that she was. He then left, noting that the window was left open and remarking that there were "fine doings".</p> <p>Pippin Wills was examined and stated that John Gregory told him on the Tuesday morning that he and another Englishman, Joseph Hoston, went the previous night to the house of Mary Hayles for a bowl of punch. Upon entering, they found a Dutch man in carnal copulation with Mary Feudales. Gregory said that he stayed for some time and then left, leaving the Dutch men there with her, while Joseph Hoston departed earlier.</p> <p>Elizabeth Birch was examined and stated that when her mother left her in the house on Monday, she gave victuals to the lodgers. That evening, George, the Company's slave, told her that two Dutch men lay with Mary Feudales about nine o'clock. During the night, she saw two English men lie with her upstairs and two Dutch men below stairs, in separate rooms, some upon a bed. She named one of the English men as John Gregory.</p> <p>Joseph Hoston was sworn and stated that he knew nothing of what passed between the Dutch men and Mary Feudales, as he was drunk. He remembered that on Monday he and John Gregory went to Mary Hayles's house to drink a bowl of punch. A black woman was present. He later saw John Gregory behaving closely with a woman there. He went downstairs and then returned, and saw Gregory lying on a bed with the woman, speaking together. He asked Gregory to leave, but Gregory refused. They later departed after kissing her, leaving the Dutch men there.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repeated references to sexual conduct within Mary Hayles's house showed that private domestic space was subject to public scrutiny when moral disorder was alleged. Such behaviour was treated as a matter for official intervention, reflecting the enforcement of social and moral regulation.</p> <p>The testimony of multiple witnesses, including a child, demonstrated that evidentiary practice extended to all who observed events, regardless of age or status. The court relied on cumulative accounts to establish patterns of behaviour rather than isolated acts.</p> <p>The involvement of seamen of different nationalities illustrated the challenges of regulating transient populations. Their presence within local households created opportunities for disorder that fell under the jurisdiction of the island's authorities.</p> <p>The reference to drunkenness in Joseph Hoston's testimony indicated that intoxication affected both behaviour and reliability of evidence. This reinforced earlier concerns about unlicensed alcohol as a contributing factor to disorder.</p> <p>The description of activity across different parts of the house showed how control over domestic environments could break down in the absence of the householder. Authority within the household depended on physical presence, and its absence allowed others to assume control.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		the Dutch men there	
30	22	<p>John Gregory Sworne Saith that on Monday last in the Evening being walking up in the valley he happened to goe into the said Hayles House, with Joseph Hoston, who said he had had a Bowle of Punch, for being a Drinking with Dutch men below stairs, &amp; then Joseph Hoston went up stairs, so a little time after he went up stairs and as he was reading in the words words against the sd Hoston, seate who gave him a kick saying God I will bone you the woman lying bare upon the bed and he upon her. A Warrant was Issued out to order the said Mary Feudale to make her Appearance next Monday before the Govr and Councill In order to her Examination &amp; punishment for such her great offence in the meane while the Dutch men were Examined who would none of them Confess anything of the matter of ye Fact so they with the English men were put into custody untill next Monday when a Decision of ye matter should be put to a finall Issue</p> <p>Poirier F. Goodwin</p>	<p>John Gregory was sworn. He stated that on Monday evening, while walking in the valley, he went into the house of Mary Hayles with Joseph Hoston, who said that he already drank a bowl of punch with Dutch men below stairs. Hoston then went upstairs. After a short time, Gregory followed and, while addressing him, was struck by Hoston, who gave him a kick and used threatening words. Gregory stated that a woman lay bare upon the bed and that Hoston was upon her.</p> <p>A warrant was issued requiring Mary Feudales to appear before the Governor and Council on the following Monday for examination and punishment for her offence. In the meantime, the Dutch men were examined but none confessed to the act. They, together with the Englishmen, were placed in custody until the next Monday, when the matter was to be brought to a final decision.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and F Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The issuance of a warrant showed that formal procedure governed the handling of serious moral offences. Appearance before the Governor and Council was required before punishment could be imposed, which reflected a structured process of examination.</p> <p>The refusal of the Dutch men to confess illustrated the limits of reliance on admission. In the absence of confession, the authorities depended on witness testimony and detention to secure further inquiry.</p> <p>The placing of both Dutch and English men into custody demonstrated that jurisdiction extended equally over all persons present on the island, regardless of nationality. Authority was exercised over transient seamen as well as inhabitants.</p> <p>The focus on Mary Feudales as the subject of examination and punishment indicated that responsibility for sexual misconduct was directed particularly at individuals identified within the household. This reflected the moral expectations placed upon women within the settlement and the role of the court in enforcing them.</p>
31	23	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 7th Day of Xber 1696 att Fort James Prest Richd Keeling Govr Capts Poirier Depu Govr Henry Coales Marshall made returnes of the warrant given him last Monday for the apprehending of the body of Mary the wife of Tho: Feudale in ord to bring her to answer the great enormity it appeares in the foregoing Consultation she is Guilty of, who said that he had made his Diligent search for ye said Mary Feudale but could not heare of her by any person nor neither could he learne that any person had seen her since Monday Morning last when she went from the House of John Nicholls in the Country where she was from Saturday morning the 28th day of the last month, untill the monday following Peter Williams who was at the sd Nicholls House when the said Mary Feudale Came there, and Continued untill Lords day Evening Examined saith that on Saturday the 28th</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 7 December 1696 under Richard Keeling, with Captain Stephen Poirier present.</p> <p>Henry Coales returned the warrant issued the previous Monday for the apprehension of Mary Feudales, who was required to answer for the offence recorded in the earlier consultation. He reported that he made diligent search for her but could not find her, nor learn from any person where she was. No one was known to have seen her since Monday morning, when she left the house of John Nicholls in the country, where she stayed from Saturday 28 November 1696 until the following Monday.</p> <p>Peter Williams, who was present at Nicholls's house, was examined. He stated that on Saturday 28 November 1696 at about seven in the morning, while at work, he saw Mary Feudales arrive. Upon entering, she asked for a bottle of arrack, having with her a quantity belonging to Nicholls, which she received. Nicholls then gave her a bowl of punch in friendship. While drinking, she said that she left her house early because she and her husband, Thomas Feudale, argued severely. She stated that he called her a whore and a bitch and used other abusive words. She further said that she did not know whether her husband was man or woman since the Wednesday after their marriage.</p> <p>After the first bowl was finished, she caused another to be made from her arrack, and more afterwards, which Nicholls prepared, so that they</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Day of 9ber last in the morning at 7 of the Clock being there at work he saw the said Mary Feudale come into the said Nicholls House, who as soon as she came in asked for a bottle of Arack she having a shank with her of the sd Mr Nicholls, which she had, then Mr Nicholls gave her a Bowe of Punch, in the way of Friendship &amp; in the Drinking of the said Punch, he said that the reason of her Comeing away so early from her House was that she &amp; her Husband had had very High words, he calling her whore, and Bitch and many such words, and further said that she did not know if her Husband was man or woman, since the Wednesday after they were married, and after the sd Punch was out, she Caused another to be made of her Arack, and then more which Mr Nicholls made, so that they were a Drinking very Late the Saturday night, and while a Drinking the said Mary Feudale shewed him a black Hood, which she said she would Sell, so he told Mr Nicholls thereof, who Bargained or allowed her two Doll[...]</p>	<p>continued drinking until late on Saturday night. During this time, she showed a black hood which she offered for sale. Nicholls then bargained for it and agreed to give her two doll[...]</p>
32	24	<p>for the said hood, and that then also he saw the sd Mary Feudale give the said Nicholls wife a Doller 2: 9 p[... ] a Six pence 3 Gold Rings with one Seale ring and two plain rings with 3 pair of Gold Buttons so went to sleep and when she awaked againe he demanded the said money Rings &amp; Buttons which were all delivered to her againe and when she had received the said particulars she the sd Mary Feudale gave the two Gold plaine Rings freely to the sd Nicholls wife, on the Munday they Dranke two or three Bowles of Punch, and Late in the night Robt Cadman (whom Mary John son Employed wt her Country businesse) came to the sd Nicholls House to see if a slave of Madam Johnson was there for he was gone from Home, but not being there stayed till morning, when he the said Williams and Cadman went both away (leaving the said Mary Feudale there) &amp; went to Madam Johnsons House, where some time after came in the Nicholls who told them that he Came as farr as the sd Robt House, with the said Mary Feudale she going a one side to Ease him selfe then he was done &amp; came in the path way againe he missed the said Mary Feudale, and could not see her no manner of way Upon The whole it is ordered That Joseph Horton and John Gregory two English belonging to the ship Mary who in the foregoing Confes[... ] had made Evidence (entituled a Bill of say[... ]) that the</p>	<p>For the hood, John Nicholls agreed to give two doll[...]. Mary Feudales then gave Nicholls's wife a dollar, £2 9s [...] and a sixpence, together with three gold rings, including one seal ring and two plain rings, and three pairs of gold buttons. They then went to sleep. When she awoke, she demanded the money, rings, and buttons, and all were returned to her. After receiving them, she freely gave the two plain gold rings to Nicholls's wife.</p> <p>On Monday, they drank two or three bowls of punch. Late that night, Robert Cadman, who was employed by Mary Feudales in her country business, came to Nicholls's house to enquire after a slave belonging to Madam Johnson, who was absent. Not finding him there, he stayed until morning. He and Peter Williams then left, leaving Mary Feudales behind, and went to Madam Johnson's house. After some time, Nicholls came and reported that he accompanied Mary Feudales part of the way from Robert Cadman's house. She went aside, and when he returned to the path, he could no longer find her and did not see her again.</p> <p>Upon the whole matter, an order was made that Joseph Hoston and John Gregory, two Englishmen belonging to the ship <i>Mary</i>, who in the earlier proceedings gave evidence described as a bill of say[...], receive ninety-nine lashes each under the gallows, and then be sent on board the ship <i>Mary</i>.</p> <p>Captain Ston: Hayles petitioned the Governor and Council that the punishment of John Gregory be remitted, stating that he was very young and now half distracted through fear of punishment.</p> <p>An order was made that, upon this request, John Gregory's punishment be remitted, but that he be kept at the gallows and then sent on board.</p> <p>A further order was made that [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The exchange of money, rings, and buttons showed that personal property circulated informally and could be pledged, transferred, and reclaimed within social interactions. Such exchanges blurred the line between</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>sd Mary Feudale Received under the Gallows 99 Lashes each of them &amp; to serve on board the said ship Mary But Capt Ston: Hayles Intreating the Govr &amp; Councill that they would remit the said Gregorys Punishmt he being a very Early Son of a fellow, and that now for feare of punishment he is half Distracted It is ordered That upon the said Capt Hayles request the said Gregorys Punishment be remitted but that he be kept in the Gallows and there have his Sentence to send on board Also It is ordered That [...]</p>	<p>sale, loan, and gift, and required later clarification through testimony.</p> <p>The repeated drinking of punch across several days indicated prolonged social disorder tied to alcohol consumption. This pattern reinforced earlier concerns about the role of drink in enabling misconduct and weakening control.</p> <p>The disappearance of Mary Feudales after leaving Nicholls's company showed the limits of enforcement. Even with a warrant issued, individuals could evade capture within the island's terrain, which complicated the administration of justice.</p> <p>The punishment of ninety-nine lashes under the gallows demonstrated a severe form of corporal discipline used to enforce moral and social order. Public punishment served both as retribution and deterrence within the community.</p> <p>The remission of John Gregory's punishment upon petition illustrated the discretionary power of the Governor and Council. Mitigation could be granted on grounds such as youth or mental distress, which showed that punishment was not fixed but subject to consideration of circumstance.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to punish Joseph Hoston while remitting John Gregory's sentence suggested a differentiation based on perceived culpability or condition. Gregory's reported distress may have led the authorities to treat him as less responsible, while still marking the offence through symbolic punishment at the gallows.</p> <p>The severity of the sentence, despite Mary Feudales's absence, probably aimed to reassert control after a highly visible breakdown of order. By punishing those present, the authorities addressed the wider impact of the incident even without securing the principal subject.</p>
33	25	<p>That the fower Dutchmen accused in the foregoing Consul[ta] tion to have Comitted Adultery with the said Mary Feudale of which we are fully satisfied That they deny the matter of Fact doe Receive under the Gallows 99 Lashes Each and then sent on Board the said ships Mary Information having bin given by Bertrand Audrard a French Smith that the Dutchmen belonging to the ships Mary had a Designe when gone from the Island to take the ships Mary and carry her to Frances, Capt Hayes was made acquainted therewith and this day brought to Examination, to the manifest of the said Businesse with the whole relation thereof is as followeth vizt A short Narrative how some Dutch men belonging to ship Mary had plotted to take the said ships and carry her to France and how the Discovery was made which Dutch men being away from the Cape into the said ships and are in 15, 14 which relation is as followeth vizt By the Divine Providence of God one Gilbert Johnston a Dutch man and Cooper that he when away from the Dutch fleet that departed hence in June last being in Company with one Bertrand Audrard a French Smith who was by Liberty Entertained by Govr and Councill out of ships Thomas Capt Geo Command in the House of John Lee told him the said French</p>	<p>An order was made that the four Dutch men accused in the previous consultation of committing adultery with Mary Feudales, and who denied the fact, receive ninety-nine lashes each under the gallows, and then be sent on board the ship <i>Mary</i>.</p> <p>Information was given by Bertrand Audrard that Dutch men belonging to the ship <i>Mary</i> formed a design, after leaving the island, to seize the ship and carry her to France. Thomas Hayes was informed and the matter was brought to examination. A full account of the business was then set out.</p> <p>A narrative was given explaining how certain Dutch men belonging to the ship <i>Mary</i> plotted to take the ship and carry her to France, and how the discovery was made.</p> <p>By what was described as divine providence, Gilbert Johnston, a Dutch cooper, who departed from the Dutch fleet that left the island in June, came into company with Bertrand Audrard. Audrard, a French smith, was permitted by the Governor and Council to remain on the island after leaving the ship <i>Thomas</i>, commanded by Captain Geo:[...], and lodged at the house of John Lee.</p> <p>Gilbert Johnston told Audrard that two of his countrymen revealed to him some days earlier their intention to kill all the English men on board the ship <i>Mary</i>, take possession of her, and carry her to France. Audrard understood some Spanish and a little Dutch, and was therefore able to converse with them. Because he kept close company with the Dutch men, it was supposed that Johnston confided in him believing that he would join their number.</p> <p>As soon as Audrard parted from Johnston, he went immediately to the house of Mr Denson and reported the design and treachery as it was declared to him. Early the next morning, he informed the Governor and</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Smith that two of the Country men had told him some days before that they Intended to kill all the English men on board the said ships Mary &amp; then make themselves masters thereof and to carry her to Frances some this French Smith speake spanish a little Dutch so that they have been the Smith has bin here ver very Intimate in frequenting each others Company so it is supposed the Dutch Cooper told it him thinking that he would make one of their number as soon as the said Smith parted with the said Cooper he Immediately went to Mr Denson House and acquainted him of the Designe Treachery as the Dutch Cooper had Declared to him just before the next morning early he acquainted the Govr &amp; Council thereof so the Command Capt Tho: Hayes was made acquainted also that he might take some measures accordingly, and the said Smith ordered to keep Company with the said Cooper to learne what further Discovery he could make of the sd wicked Designes which he Did on Fryday by Discovery of the names of the two persons That</p>	<p>Council. Captain Thomas Hayes was also informed so that he might take measures in response.</p> <p>Audrard was then ordered to continue in company with Johnston to learn further details of the design. He did so, and on Friday discovered the names of the two persons involved.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The punishment of the Dutch men despite their denial showed that conviction did not depend solely on confession. The authorities relied on accumulated testimony and judgement to impose severe corporal penalties, which reinforced their determination to enforce moral order.</p> <p>The report of a planned seizure of the ship revealed the vulnerability of maritime operations. Control of a vessel depended not only on command but also on the loyalty of its crew, which made plots of mutiny or piracy a serious threat.</p> <p>The role of Bertrand Audrard as an informant demonstrated how intelligence was gathered through informal networks. His linguistic ability and social proximity to the Dutch men enabled him to uncover and report the conspiracy.</p> <p>The immediate communication of the plot to both civil and naval authority showed coordination between island governance and ship command. This ensured that preventative action could be taken quickly to secure the vessel.</p> <p>The instruction for Audrard to continue associating with the conspirators illustrated a deliberate strategy of surveillance. Authorities used covert observation to confirm suspicions and gather further evidence before acting.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to punish the Dutch men for adultery while simultaneously investigating a plot against the ship probably reflected a broader concern about disorder among foreign seamen. The authorities may have viewed both moral misconduct and conspiracy as signs of the same breakdown in discipline.</p> <p>The use of Audrard to remain among the conspirators suggested a calculated effort to expose the full extent of the plot. By delaying immediate arrests, the authorities gained clearer knowledge of those involved, which reduced the risk of missing key participants.</p>
34	26	<p>That told the sd Cooper the said wicked Designes which was one John Roman and one Covell Johnson and that one John Dennis was to be the Navigator and accordingly gave acct thereof this was kept secret for to gett further knowledge of more, and their names that was concerned, so on Saturday the Cooper told the Smith againe as before that those two Dutch men aforesaid had told him that all the Dutch men on board was Concerned so on Munday following one James Bowan who speaks &amp; under[... ] good Dutch was privately placed at a publique House, &amp; the Smith ordered to invite the sd Cooper to a Bowle of Punch there, and then to speake to the said Cooper abt the former relation given to him, so that the said Bowan might heare their Discourse which he did and was as the said Bowan has given under his hand and upon oath as followeth vizt The Declaration of your Worships Servt Still Heath</p>	<p>[...] The Dutch cooper named those involved in the design as John Roman and Covell Johnson, and stated that John Dennis was to act as navigator. This information was reported but kept secret in order to discover further names of those concerned. On the following Saturday, the cooper again told Bertrand Audrard that all the Dutch men on board were involved.</p> <p>On the Monday following, James Bowan, who understood Dutch well, was placed privately in a public house. Audrard was instructed to invite the cooper to drink a bowl of punch there and to raise the earlier matter so that Bowan might hear their discourse. This was done, and Bowan later gave his declaration in writing and upon oath.</p> <p>Bowan declared that, while lying on a bed in the house of James Rider, he heard the French smith and the cooper speaking. The cooper openly declared that they intended to kill all the English men, cut their throats, and throw them overboard. The smith asked how one man could undertake such a task, to which the cooper replied that it would be easily done. When asked whether any of them could then carry the ship to harbour, the cooper answered that the man in the blue coat, identified as John Dennis, was capable of navigating a ship anywhere in the world.</p> <p>When the cooper suspected betrayal, he began to withdraw from his statements and said that he would</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Being as occasion did serve in the House of James Rider reclining upon my Bed did heare such words passed betwixt the French man and your Worships Cooper wch that the Cooper did openly Declare that they designed to kill all the English men to cutt their throats and heave them over board thereupon answer was made by the Smith how one man could undertake such a business who answered that it was easie to be Done whereupon the Smith asked when all the men are killed if there was any one of them that could carry the ships to an harbour, thereupon the Cooper made answer that the fellow in the Blew Coate (vizt John Dennis) was able to carry a ship through out the world, and finding himselfe betrayed did begining to fall from his purpose and did say to the Smiths hard that he would not reveale any thing nor to tell the mens names for both should be hanged if he told it further he declared that if he was once in the world he would Doe so and so with the Christians and that their Designe was in the night when all or most of the English men were a sleep, &amp; so to runn away with the ships with many such other Expre[...] This is what I am able to Declare upon oath &amp; is nothing but the Truth Yo[u]r Worships Servt Sti[ll] Hea[th] James Bowan</p>	<p>not reveal further details or names, as both would be hanged if he did. He added that once at sea he would act against Christians, and that the design was to act at night when most of the English men were asleep, and then sail away with the ship. Bowan affirmed upon oath that this account was true.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The identification of named individuals within the conspiracy showed that the authorities sought to establish personal responsibility rather than treat the matter as a vague threat. Naming specific participants allowed targeted action and reduced uncertainty in enforcement.</p> <p>The deliberate concealment of the initial information demonstrated a strategic approach to intelligence gathering. By withholding immediate action, the authorities aimed to uncover the full extent of the conspiracy before intervening.</p> <p>The use of James Bowan as a concealed listener revealed a structured method of surveillance. Linguistic ability was used as a tool of governance, allowing the authorities to penetrate communication among foreign seamen.</p> <p>The description of the intended attack, including timing at night and methods of killing, showed that the threat was detailed and practical rather than speculative. This increased the seriousness of the offence and justified pre-emptive intervention.</p> <p>The written and sworn declaration by Bowan illustrated the importance of formalising intelligence into admissible evidence. Oral information was converted into a documented statement under oath, which allowed it to be used in official proceedings.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to stage the conversation in a controlled setting suggested a calculated effort to confirm the conspiracy beyond hearsay. By arranging for Bowan to overhear the exchange, the authorities strengthened their case before taking action.</p> <p>The emphasis on the navigator's role indicated that control of the ship depended on specialised skill. The conspirators' reliance on John Dennis suggested that the success of the plot rested not only on violence but also on technical capability, which made his involvement central to the plan.</p>
35	27	<p>Bertrand Audovard also gave the following Declaration under his hand and oath in French &amp; Translated by Matheus Borel who made oath it was Truely Translated vizt La Declaration de Bertrand Audovard Touchant un Complot des Hollandois qui sont au service anglois appellé Mary Capt Thomas Hayes Commandeur du dit Navire Lundy Dernier le Troisieme de ce present mois avec les Hollandois qui sont au service de la Compagnie [...] je me trouvant boire du punch avec eux sur le soir dis ils me Declarent que les Hollandois qui sont au service du dit Navire ont dessein de couper la gorge a tous les Anglois qui sont sur le dit Navire &amp; de le Jetter dehors &amp; de s'emparer du dit navire &amp; de s'en mener en France sur quoy je leur demanday s'il y avoit quelqu'un des Hollandois capable de naviger le navire, ils me firent reponse que ouy qu'il y avoit un ange Hollandois appellé Denis nommé Copher habille a conduire le navire Hollandois et sur ce je luy demanday qui luy avoit dit cela, il me dit que c'estoit un Hollandois qui s'appelloit Jean Roman, Je luy demanday</p>	<p>Bertrand Audrard also gave a declaration under his hand and oath in French, which was translated by Matheus Borel, who swore that the translation was true.</p> <p>In this declaration, Audrard stated that on Monday 3 November 1696, while in company with Dutch men serving on the ship <i>Mary</i>, commanded by Thomas Hayes, he was drinking punch with them in the evening. During this time, they told him that the Dutch men serving on that ship intended to cut the throats of all the English men on board, throw them overboard, seize the ship, and carry her to France.</p> <p>He asked whether any among them was capable of navigating the ship. They answered that there was a Dutchman named John Dennis, also called Copher, who was skilled enough to conduct the ship. When he asked who told them this, he was informed that it was a Dutchman named John Roman, and that the conversation took place at the house of Mr Bradley while drinking a bottle of punch.</p> <p>Audrard stated that he challenged their account, telling them it was false, and declared that their design was dangerous and could not be allowed. He told them that the matter should be reported to the Governor. They refused and warned him to take care not to speak of it.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The sworn translation of a foreign-language declaration showed that legal proceedings incorporated multilingual evidence. The use of a translator under</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>son nom il me dit qu'il avoit dit cela, il me respondit que c'estoit chez le maison de Mr Bradley en Buvant une Bouteille de Punch, Dans la Deffense de la Compagnie de Monsieur mon aussy je leur quitte en passant qu'il estoit un mensonge donne si bien que pour les effrayer je feus en presence de quelques officiers que c'estoit les gens Heros et les ordres du Gouverneur Je leur dis que leurs desseins estoient tres mauvais et tres dangereux et que je ne le pourrais pas souffrir je luy dis qu'il falloit le Declarer au Gouverneur il me dit que non et que moy mesme devois prendre garde de parler</p>	<p>oath ensured that testimony from non-English speakers could be formally admitted and trusted within the court.</p> <p>The repeated mention of drinking punch during the disclosure of the plot indicated that informal social settings functioned as sites where sensitive information emerged. Alcohol facilitated conversation but also exposed intentions that could then be reported to authorities.</p> <p>The identification of John Dennis as navigator underlined the operational structure of maritime control. Navigation was a specialised skill, and possession of that expertise determined whether a seized vessel could be successfully taken to another port.</p> <p>The warning given to Audrard not to report the matter showed awareness among the conspirators of the consequences of disclosure. This reflected a conscious effort to maintain secrecy, which strengthened the credibility of the reported design.</p> <p>The involvement of multiple named individuals and locations demonstrated that the conspiracy was discussed openly among participants. This suggested that the plot was not isolated but circulated within a broader group, increasing the perceived threat to the ship and its crew.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The refusal of the conspirators to allow the matter to be reported, combined with their warning to Audrard, suggested that they recognised him as a potential outsider despite prior familiarity. This may indicate that trust within the group was conditional and fragile.</p> <p>The setting of the discussion at a private house while drinking implied that the conspirators relied on informal spaces to plan their actions. This choice probably reflected both convenience and an assumption that such environments were less subject to oversight, which ultimately proved mistaken.</p>
36	28	<p>Le Lundi Lundi ensuivie par le mesme mesme [...] troubler pour venir les voir les Mesmes et boire lesdits punch afin que le sr Astorige encore une fois touchant le mesme Dessein tout hautement affin que Jacques Brice qui avoit Esté Envoyé dans ceste maison par l'ordre ou il gouverneur le peut Entendre affin que moy aussi puisse declarer au Gouverneur avec Subtil &amp; Hardi Hartard. Il me Declara Comme auparavant, En suite de ce Discours il apparut en mesme Salle dans une Chambre au dessus de nous ou la Depuse [...] dit oh Dieu, Je suis perdu, mais n'importe quand on me tireroit tout vif je ne Declareray Jamais rien, la chose et luy demandant si c'estoit pour sa Preservation Il dit c'estoit une mechante chose et qu'il faut avoir un mechante Conscience pour faire un tel dessein il me dit que c'estoit moi mesme, ne soupçonnant pas cela Car il Supposé ne voir rien, il me dit aussi que c'estoit quelque des Hollandois qui declare quelque chose lors En Disant que la premiere fois que les Hollandois auront opportunité ils se jeteront des mers voila tout ce que je Connois de ceste affaire, Ce que Jay declaré par serment temoigne mon seing ce mardy huitieme du 9bre 1696 Bertrand Audovard In English Thus</p>	<p>Bertrand Audrard further declared under oath that on the following Monday he again sought out the same Dutch men and drank punch with them, so that the matter of their design might again be spoken openly. This was done so that James Bowan, who was placed there by order of the Governor, might overhear the discourse, and so that the matter might be reported with certainty.</p> <p>He stated that the Dutch cooper again spoke of the same design. During the conversation, the cooper realised that he might be exposed and declared that even if he were torn alive he would not reveal anything further. He admitted that the design was wicked and required a bad conscience to undertake. He suggested that some among the Dutch had already revealed part of the matter. He added that when the Dutch men had opportunity at sea, they would carry out their intention.</p> <p>Audrard affirmed that this was all he knew of the affair and swore to it on 8 November 1696.</p> <p>In the English version of his declaration, Audrard stated that on Thursday he was with the Dutch cooper at the house of John Long, drinking a bowl of punch. After drinking, the cooper declared that the Dutch men belonging to the ship <i>Mary</i>, commanded by Thomas Hayes, intended to kill all the English men, cut their throats, throw them overboard, seize the ship, and carry her to France.</p> <p>Audrard asked whether any of them understood navigation. The cooper answered that a man wearing a blue jacket and Dutch cap, identified as John Dennis, was capable. He added that this information came from John Roman, and that the conversation took place at the house of Mr Boley while drinking.</p> <p>Audrard stated that he immediately reported the matter to Mr Denson so that the Governor might be informed. By Saturday 5 November 1696, action was</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>The Declaration of Bertrand Audovard Touching a Conspiracy of the Dutch men belonging to the ship Mary now riding in the Road Capt Tho: Hayles Commander Thursday last being with the Dutch Cooper at John Longs House drinking Past for a Bowle of Punch and he and I together after he had Drank a Little he did Declare to me that the Dutch men belonging to the said ship did Designe to kill all the English throats and to throw them over board, and then to seize the ship and carry it into France I asked him if there were any of the Dutch men that understood navigation, he made answer why man cloathed with a Blew Jacket and a Dutch Cap, that understood it and he told me that it was John Roman and that he was at Mr Boleys House in Drink and that Immediately after that he told it to Mr Denson that he might acquaint the Govr with it, and as for the Governmt was informed of it, The Saturday following being the 5 of this Instant by order of the said Governmt did seizing of him</p>	<p>taken by order of the government to seize those involved.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The deliberate arrangement for the conspirators to repeat their statements in the presence of a concealed listener showed a calculated method of evidence gathering. This transformed informal conversation into corroborated testimony that could be used in official proceedings.</p> <p>The repeated emphasis on oath and written declaration demonstrated the importance of formalising intelligence. Information only became actionable when it was recorded, sworn, and attributed, which ensured its legal weight.</p> <p>The identification of clothing, such as the blue jacket and Dutch cap, showed how individuals were recognised in a setting where formal identification may be limited. Physical description functioned as a practical means of distinguishing persons within testimony.</p> <p>The immediate reporting of the plot to an intermediary, and then to the Governor, illustrated a chain of communication within the administration. Information passed quickly from private individuals to official authority, enabling prompt response.</p> <p>The seizure of suspects following the report showed that preventive action was taken before any overt act occurred. This reflected a system that acted on credible threat rather than waiting for the crime to be executed.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The insistence that the conspirators repeat their design aloud in a controlled setting suggested that the authorities required stronger proof than a single report. This approach probably aimed to eliminate doubt and ensure that action taken against the suspects could be justified.</p> <p>The conspirators' growing caution during the second conversation indicated that they sensed exposure. This may explain why the authorities acted quickly thereafter, recognising that delay could allow the plotters to withdraw or alter their plans.</p>
37	29	<p>[...] againe touching the aforesd Conspiracy to be [...] would Declare to me Some other things touching the same business, he told me the same thing he had told me before Upon that I desired the Dutch Cooper that he would bring me what Dutch man that had told him the thing at some place or other that we might Drink a Bowle of Punch together, and for that Effect by the same order I gott the Dutch Cooper yt had promised to goe along with him, yt he might Declare it to the Said Dutch men that had told him of it, so by that means I might understand all their Designs upon which he told me that he could not bring him to me because all the other Dutch men were acquainted therewith Then desired also the Dutch Cooper yt he would not Declare to the Govr he told me that he would not. And that my selfe must take great Care to not speake of it The Munday following being the 7th of this Instant (by the same order) I did invite the Dutch Cooper to Mr Densons to Drink part of a Bowle of Punch that Imight Examine him further touching the foresd Conspiracy, and also that he might Declare it also what James Brice (which was sent in the said House by order of the Govrmt) might heare it as well as I, then I made Inquiry to the</p>	<p>Bertrand Audrard further declared that he again spoke with the Dutch cooper about the conspiracy, who repeated the same account as before. Audrard asked him to bring the Dutch man who first revealed the design so that they might drink together and speak openly, allowing him to learn the full extent of the plan. The cooper refused, stating that all the Dutch men were already aware of the matter. He also urged Audrard not to report it to the Governor and warned him to take care not to speak of it.</p> <p>On Monday 7 November 1696, by order, Audrard invited the cooper to the house of Mr Denson to drink part of a bowl of punch. This was arranged so that James Bowan, who was placed there by order of the government, might overhear the conversation. During this meeting, Audrard questioned the cooper further, and he again declared the same design.</p> <p>After this disclosure, the cooper withdrew to a loft above the chamber and declared that he was undone. He stated that even if he were shot alive he would not reveal anything further. Audrard challenged him, asking whether he was a Christian and stating that such a design was wicked and required a corrupt conscience. The cooper replied that he was a Christian but did not care, and said that the English were of no value. He further stated that if any Dutch man was discovered or punished for this conspiracy, the others would at the first opportunity throw him overboard.</p> <p>Audrard affirmed that this was all he knew concerning the matter.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repeated attempts by Audrard to draw out further information showed an active role in intelligence</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Govr, with Safety, and with a Wittness, and he Declared the same things as before, after this Discovery he gott away up a loft above the Chamber where we were wth us and said I am undone, But I said (see) for they shoote Some me alive I will never Declare any thing, hearing him say these things I asked him if he was not a Christian, and what it was a very wicked thing to doe, and that their Conscience must be very wicked to Comitt so much murder, he told me that he was a Christian, But he did not Care for that, for the English were good for nothing, he told me also yt if any of the Dutch when this discovery was being touching the said Conspiracy or being punished, that the others at the first Opportunity they would Cast him over board, This is all that I doe know touching the said Business of it.</p>	<p>gathering under official direction. His actions demonstrated how private individuals could be used to extract evidence through conversation rather than formal interrogation.</p> <p>The refusal of the Dutch cooper to produce other conspirators indicated awareness of collective responsibility. The plot was treated as a shared undertaking, which made individual disclosure more dangerous and reinforced group secrecy.</p> <p>The use of a controlled setting, with a concealed listener, showed a deliberate method of corroborating testimony. This transformed informal speech into witnessed evidence, strengthening its reliability in legal proceedings.</p> <p>The cooper's statements about loyalty and willingness to kill both Englishmen and any informers revealed the depth of the perceived threat. The conspiracy extended beyond initial violence to include enforcement within the group, which indicated a structured and disciplined intent.</p> <p>The conversion of spoken exchanges into sworn declarations illustrated the process by which intelligence became actionable evidence. The authorities depended on this transformation to justify intervention and punishment.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The insistence on repeated confirmation of the conspiracy suggested that the authorities required certainty before acting against a group of seamen. This caution probably reflected the seriousness of the accusation and the potential consequences of acting on insufficient proof.</p> <p>The cooper's hostility towards the English and his dismissal of shared religion indicated that national allegiance outweighed other bonds. This may explain why the authorities treated foreign crews as a particular risk to security, especially when combined with opportunity at sea.</p>
38	30	<p>[...] que le Gouvern[...] apres serment de luy &amp; qu'il la interrogé sçavoir si le Joune hen hollandois ne luy avoit pas defendu de parler, Car s'il En parloit ce nommé Jean Roman &amp; luy Serroit tous deux pendus cequel a Declaré ouy que le Jounglien luy avoit dit les mesmes Paroles Et apres avoir Este Encore Interrogé par le Gouvern[...] sçavoir s'il ne fit pas quelques Demonstration de ses bras Comment il falloit tuer les Anglois, il a dit que ouy &amp; qu'il luy avoit Monstré de ses Bras comment il falloit leur couper la gorge &amp; que le nommé Bruce luy avoit fait ce mesme geste bien [...] luy Et Encores declare que luy ayant Esté dans la boutique apres que le Gouvern[...] Eut fait mettre En prison le dit Jounglien Il le menaça en luy montrant le poing au travers de la porte prison &amp; luy dit qu'il se Devoiroit Supposer que c'estoit accusé qu'il avoit Declaré cette affaire au Gouvern[...] Ce que Dessus Jay déclaré apres avoir pris serment &amp; la verité Temoin mon seing Bertrand Audouard In English Thus. After the Govern[...] had Given him his Oath to Examin him to know if the Dutch Cooper did not forbid him to speake any thing of it, for if he should speake any thing of it [...] [...] he and [...] that other Dutch man whose name is John Roman, would be both hanged which said Bertrand Audou[...]</p>	<p>Bertrand Audrard further declared under oath that, when examined by the Governor, he was asked whether the Dutch cooper forbade him to speak of the conspiracy. He confirmed that the cooper warned him that if he revealed it, he and another Dutch man, named John Roman, would both be hanged.</p> <p>He was also asked whether the cooper made any demonstration with his arms to show how the English were to be killed. He stated that this was true, and that the cooper showed by gesture how their throats were to be cut. He added that James Bowan saw the same motion.</p> <p>He further declared that on the previous Monday, while he was in his shop, after the Governor ordered the Dutch cooper to be imprisoned, the cooper threatened him. The cooper shook his fist through the prison door and indicated that he believed Audrard was the person who informed the Governor of the matter.</p> <p>Audrard affirmed that this declaration was true and signed it after taking oath.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The Governor's direct questioning of the witness showed an active investigative role in establishing the details of the conspiracy. Authority did not rely solely on passive testimony but engaged in structured examination to clarify key points.</p> <p>The warning that disclosure would lead to hanging demonstrated awareness among the conspirators of the legal consequences of treasonous intent. This threat functioned as an internal mechanism to enforce silence within the group.</p> <p>The physical demonstration of throat-cutting illustrated how intent was communicated not only through words but also through gesture. Such actions strengthened the evidentiary case by providing a clear indication of planned violence.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>had Declared yt it was true, that he had told him these things  And after having been againe Examined by the Gov[...] to know if he did [...] not make some Demonstration of his armes, how they did intend to kill the English, said that it was True, and that he made a motion of his armes how to cut their Throats, and that ye s.d Bruce did see him make ye motion as well as he  He further Declares that yesterday being Munday, being in his Shops, after that ye Gov[...] had Examined the said Dutch [...]</p>	<p>The threat made from prison showed that detention did not fully remove the influence of the accused. Even while confined, the cooper attempted to intimidate the witness, which highlighted the risks faced by informants.  The recording of the declaration under oath and signature reinforced its formal status. Written and sworn statements transformed personal testimony into official evidence that could support further action.  <b>Speculations</b>  The emphasis on gestures as well as spoken words probably aimed to remove any ambiguity about the conspirators' intentions. By documenting both, the authorities strengthened their case against denial or reinterpretation.  The cooper's threat from prison suggested that he quickly identified the source of the disclosure. This may indicate that the circle of trust among the conspirators was small, making betrayal easier to detect and increasing tension within the group.</p>
39	31	<p>Dutch Cooper unto the prison, the said Cooper did threaten the said Bertrand Audouard in showing him his fist through the Doore of the said Prison, and said to him many injuries, supposing that it was because he did declare the things to the Govr, what is here Declared is nothing but the Truth witness my hand this 8th day of 8ber 1696  The Translation of the Declaration and of the Interrogation sworne and subscribed by Bertrand Audouard  a French man is truely translated out of French into English according to the best of my skill and knowledge for which I give oath and subscribe it under my hand this 8th day of 8ber 1696  Matt Bazett  The True and perfect Declaration of Gilbert Johnson Concerning the businesse following  Mr Shippen to sell in the Company of two Seamen in the House of Mr Boddy, where I called for a bowle of Punch not drinking, these two men asked me if I had a mind to goe off the Island, answering them I should have little occasion this Hollander said I should never get away for my life, I gave him free to be whereupon I made an answer and said to him tell me how that any one would contrive or they began to speak this word, that ship that lyes in the road which had belong'd to her will be lost to our enemies, and when we are got from this Island we shall bring her to some place more, the ships to be safe, whereupon I told him that an abler with this that I would give them no answer they swore by God Almighty if I revealed this to any person for they said the English men has not so much spirit nor courage that if it fall out with we are safe enough and we shall make sport with them every day drinking among them, I confess that to me in this Case, to the intent being in drink I do declare it to him in Mr Longs House, whereupon the Smith asked me, what for a man this was that would so tell this business, and I shew him</p>	<p>The Dutch cooper, while confined in prison, threatened Bertrand Audard by shaking his fist through the prison door and speaking abusive words, believing that Audard revealed the matter to the Governor. Audard affirmed that this declaration was true and signed it on 8 October 1696.  The translation of Audard's declaration and examination was sworn and certified by Matt Bazett, who declared that it was faithfully rendered from French into English according to his best skill and knowledge, and signed it on the same date.  A further declaration was given by Gilbert Johnson. He stated that while in the company of two seamen at the house of Mr Boddy, he called for a bowl of punch. During their conversation, the two men asked whether he wished to leave the island. He replied that he had little occasion to do so. One of the Dutch men answered that he would never leave alive. When pressed further, they spoke of a ship lying in the road, stating that once they left the island they would take her and carry her elsewhere for their own safety.  Johnson replied cautiously and refused to commit himself. The men swore that if he revealed the matter to anyone, harm would follow. They claimed that the English lacked spirit and courage, and that if the plan succeeded they would be secure and make sport of them daily.  Johnson stated that he later repeated this account while drinking at the house of John Long, where the French smith asked him to identify the man who spoke of the design. He indicated the Dutch man concerned. He affirmed that this declaration was true and made his mark.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The continued threats issued from prison showed that confinement did not fully suppress the influence or intent of the accused. Intimidation of witnesses remained a risk even after arrest, which highlighted the need for controlled custody.  The formal certification of translation by oath demonstrated the administrative importance of accuracy in multilingual proceedings. Reliable translation ensured that foreign-language testimony could be treated as valid evidence within the legal process.  The declaration of Gilbert Johnson revealed how conspiratorial discussion emerged in informal settings such as drinking gatherings. Such environments facilitated the sharing of plans but also exposed them to disclosure.  The threats made against Johnson for revealing the plan showed that secrecy was enforced through intimidation. This internal discipline among conspirators reinforced the seriousness of the plot and the dangers faced by informants.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>the Dutchmans, this is also true as God is Almighty Gilbert Johnson his mark</p>	<p>The repeated reference to English weakness indicated a perceived imbalance of power. This perception may have encouraged the conspirators by suggesting that resistance would be minimal, which contributed to the formation of the plan.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> Johnson's cautious responses during the conversation suggested that he avoided direct involvement while still gathering information. This behaviour may indicate awareness of risk and a deliberate effort to protect himself while later cooperating with authorities.</p> <p>The repeated disclosure of the plot across different locations and witnesses suggested that the conspirators spoke with less restraint than intended. This may explain how the authorities obtained sufficient evidence, as the plan circulated widely enough to be overheard and reported.</p>
40	32	<p>Upon which Depositions of the s.d Bruce Smith &amp;c on Oath, the Governr and Councell orders all the Dutch men on shore to be secured in the Dungeon, and the Dutch Cooper in the prison the number of the Dutch men secured were Eight and on Tuesday following the Cooper was Examined who upon his former Declaration acknowledged that what the Smith had Declared was True; for he had told him so &amp; was told by John Roman &amp; one Johnson; and the Day after being Wensday the 9th of 8ber 1696 the rest of the Dutch men were Examined, but none would Confess the fact, and John Dericks the person that was to be the man to go to write his name who wrote it very [...] which the aforesaid Dutch Cooper seeing who was there to Confront him said he could write very good hand, so some writings was produced which he had written on board &amp; appeared to be very Different for ought to the former and also a Bill of Debts which he and some of his Country men had Contracted on the Island was produced which he acknowle to be his own hand writing, was looked upon by some to be written by the pen of no ordinary Scribe; wherefore it being thought there was too much trust in the matter It was thought convenient to trust them all in the said ships but to detain Eight of them on shore here until an opportunity be presented for the sending of them off which happily happened in the Arrivall of the Honble the Ship Fisher, and accordingly they were sent on board there Captn Thomas Hayes Commander of the said ships Mary acquaints the Governr and Councell that he had there persons on board his ships he had taken off Madagascar and Cann give a full acct of the said Indian Pirates, and of their Insufficiency of Pirates that generally have been there so in order to this Examination the s.d orders the s.d persons whose names are vizt John Sking John Legrand and Edward Bacter to come on shore who Declared on Oath as followeth vizt</p>	<p>Upon the depositions of James Bowan, Bertrand Audrard and others given on oath, the Governor and Council ordered that all Dutch men on shore be secured in the dungeon, and that the Dutch cooper, Gilbert Johnson, be confined in prison. Eight Dutch men were secured.</p> <p>On the following Tuesday, the cooper was examined and acknowledged that what the French smith declared was true, stating that he was told so by John Roman and one Johnson. On Wednesday 9 October 1696, the remaining Dutch men were examined, but none confessed the matter.</p> <p>John Dericks was required to write his name, which he did poorly. The cooper, who was present to confront him, stated that Dericks could write a good hand. Writings previously made by Dericks on board were produced and appeared very different from his present writing. A bill of debts contracted on the island by him and some of his countrymen was also produced, which he acknowledged as his own hand. This writing was considered by some to be that of a capable writer, which raised suspicion.</p> <p>Because of this uncertainty and the perceived risk, it was decided that all the Dutch men be placed under control on board the ship <i>Mary</i>, but that eight of them be detained on shore until an opportunity arose to send them away. This occurred with the arrival of the Honourable Company's ship <i>Fisher</i>, on which they were sent.</p> <p>Captain Thomas Hayes then informed the Governor and Council that he had three persons on board his ship taken from Madagascar, who could give a full account of Indian pirates and their condition. An order was made that these men be brought ashore for examination.</p> <p>The following persons were named: John Sking, John Legrand and Edward Bacter, who were then sworn to declare their account.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The confinement of the Dutch men in both dungeon and prison showed a graded system of detention. Different levels of custody were applied depending on perceived responsibility, which reflected a structured approach to securing suspects.</p> <p>The partial confession by the Dutch cooper demonstrated the evidentiary weight of corroboration. His admission, supported by earlier testimony, strengthened the case even though others refused to confess.</p> <p>The examination of handwriting revealed the use of practical investigative methods. Comparison of written samples functioned as a means of testing identity and credibility, showing an early form of forensic reasoning.</p> <p>The decision to divide the prisoners between shipboard custody and detention on shore indicated concern over security and control. Authorities balanced</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>the risk of escape, mutiny, and confinement capacity in determining how to manage the suspects.</p> <p>The transfer of prisoners to another Company ship showed how maritime resources were used in legal enforcement. Ships served not only for transport but also as instruments of detention and removal.</p> <p>The examination of individuals from Madagascar demonstrated the gathering of intelligence beyond the immediate case. Information about piracy was treated as strategically valuable, reflecting the island's role within wider maritime security networks.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to remove the Dutch men from the island as soon as a ship became available probably aimed to reduce the immediate threat to local security. Keeping them together on the island may have risked further conspiracy or disorder.</p> <p>The use of handwriting comparison in questioning John Dericks suggests suspicion that he attempted to conceal his identity or ability. This may indicate that literacy was associated with particular roles within the conspiracy, making it a point of scrutiny.</p> <p>The prompt examination of the Madagascar men upon their arrival suggests that the authorities prioritised intelligence on piracy. This likely reflected concern that similar threats could affect Company shipping, making such information immediately relevant.</p>
41	33	<p>Examinations of Edmund Baker and John Sivey belonging to ship <i>Mary</i> Capts Tho: Hayes Comandr who</p> <p>tooke the said persons from Madagascar Concerning the Madagascar Trade of New Yorke and the Pirates yt Generally harbour there taken before Govr &amp; Councill and Capts Hayes Comandr of the s.d ship <i>Mary</i> &amp; Mr Saml Harman his Cheife mate being first duely sworne The said Edmund Baker and John Sivey Declare on oath that they were Shipped on board the <i>Margaret</i> of New Yorke by Capt Saml Burgess the master thereof New Yorke and Departed thence the 24th day of 8ber last past bound on</p> <p>the said Capt Burgess told them for the Island of Madagascar to Trade for Negroes which ship was Cleared at New Yorke by the Governr thereof Colonel Benjamin Fletcher, who gave the said Capt Burgess a Commission to take and seize all French ships he mett in his way, but Contrarie to that the said Burgess told them when first they went on board them with of their going to the said Island of Madagascar the said Burgess went ashore at a place Called Delagoa or the maine of Africa where he the said Burgess got his ships on board of Negroes and returned home and there traded with the natives thereof for Elephants Teeth for which he gave them in Exchange Cloth Beads and Glasses and other things and from thence he Came to the Island of Madagascar and in their way mett with two ships <i>Mary</i> Capts Thomas Hayes Comandr an East India ship and that in their voyage to Madagascar saw 10 sorts of arms in the ships which the Comanders in their hearing had often said that one sort was for the Piraters and the other to Trade for Negroes with from</p>	<p>Examinations were taken of Edmund Baker and John Sivey, belonging to the ship <i>Mary</i>, commanded by Thomas Hayes. These men were taken from Madagascar and were examined before the Governor and Council, in the presence of Captain Hayes and Samuel Harman, both first sworn.</p> <p>Edmund Baker and John Sivey declared on oath that they were shipped on board the <i>Margaret</i> of New York under Captain Samuel Burgess. They departed from New York on 24 October 1696, bound, as Burgess told them, for Madagascar to trade for slaves. The ship was cleared at New York by Benjamin Fletcher, who gave Burgess a commission to seize all French ships he met.</p> <p>Contrary to this commission, Burgess informed them at the outset that the voyage would proceed to Madagascar. He went ashore at a place called Delagoa on the mainland of Africa, where he loaded his ship with slaves and returned. He then traded with the inhabitants for elephant ivory, giving in exchange cloth, beads, glass, and other goods.</p> <p>From there he sailed to Madagascar. During the voyage they encountered the ship <i>Mary</i>. They observed that the <i>Margaret</i> carried several kinds of arms. The commanders stated in their hearing that one type was intended for pirates, and another for trading with Africans for slaves. French firearms were also used in trade for slaves. They further stated that Burgess carried large quantities of rum, wine, sugar, coffee, cloves, salt, and some bales [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The examination of witnesses under oath in the presence of senior officers showed a formal process for gathering intelligence. Testimony was taken within a structured setting to ensure reliability and authority.</p> <p>The commission granted by Benjamin Fletcher illustrated the blurred boundary between lawful privateering and illicit activity. Although authorised to seize French ships, Burgess used the voyage for trade and other purposes beyond the stated mission.</p> <p>The trading at Delagoa and Madagascar revealed the integration of slave trading and commodity exchange. Goods such as cloth, beads, and glass functioned as currency in exchange for slaves and ivory, demonstrating a commercial system based on barter and regional demand.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Leake arms were for the piraters and the third French Leake were for to Trade with the Negroes for Slaves as aforesd and also that Capt Burgess had a great quantity of Rum wine Sugar Coffee Cloves and Salt &amp; some Bales</p>	<p>The reference to different types of arms allocated for pirates and for trade showed the overlap between legitimate commerce and illicit networks. Weapons were distributed with distinct purposes, indicating preparation for both trade and cooperation with pirate groups.</p> <p>The presence of a wide range of goods, including rum and cloves, demonstrated the diversity of cargo in long-distance voyages. Ships operated as mobile trading platforms, carrying commodities suited for multiple markets and exchanges.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The contradiction between the official commission and Burgess's actual conduct suggested that the voyage was deliberately structured to combine legal cover with illicit trade. This may have allowed him to operate with reduced scrutiny while pursuing broader commercial gain.</p> <p>The allocation of arms for pirates implied an expectation of interaction or alliance rather than conflict. This suggests that cooperation with pirate groups formed part of the trading strategy, rather than being incidental or forced.</p>
42	34	<p>of which the greatest part thereof was designed for the pirats Therefore in order thereunto they have heard the said Capt Burgess say he would make the best of his way to Yorke for them in order to supply them with what necessaries they had for them as aforesd, and after the ships Mary had arrived at Madagascar they mett againe the said Burgess who seem came a shoar his Hoffer as if seeming he would have boarded the Mary to the said Capts Hayes fired a shott to the said Capt Burgess shoreupon the said Capt Burgess ordered his gunners to fire another shott at him againe, the gunner having fir hand one said what must I fire upon him to which Capt Burgess Replyed what must I shoot him askes of him that question fire or there fire so which the said Capt Burgess professed you Dogg you Son of a whore &amp; many such other names why are you so long abt it, and who had no sooner done (by reason of the Gun &amp; Delay) but took him and struck him up an Downe the ships and stampd on his face which caused to be swollen as much as two faces whereupon the said Burgess swore to do so by one Penalty of the 2 ships &amp; next name Joseph Eastwood that the Master which was Capt that he find at that ship they come to be st the said time mischief &amp; so that be forced to goe home, home, and after seeing that the Comanders shot by, Burgess that said fellow Ship to the said Eastwood told him so whereupon the said Capt Burgess tooke the said John Sivey &amp; kickt him very much all up &amp; downe the ships and when they had bin some days longer after that with the said Burgess the said Deposants with left at Madagascar and left the ship and runn away amongst the Negroes and some days after Capt Hayes tooke them up with one Joseph Horton and carryed them and tooke them on board the ships Mary but could not get the said and further they Declare that as soone as they came or arrived at Madagascar at a place Called Stellers an old Negro</p>	<p>They further declared that the greater part of the goods carried by Samuel Burgess was intended for pirates. Burgess stated that he would make the best of his way to Yorke to supply them with such necessities.</p> <p>After the ship <i>Mary</i>, commanded by Thomas Hayes, arrived at Madagascar, they again encountered Burgess. He came ashore with his boat as if intending to board the <i>Mary</i>. Captain Hayes fired a shot toward him, whereupon Burgess ordered his gunners to fire in return. When the gunner hesitated and asked whether he should fire, Burgess responded with anger, using abusive language and ordering him to shoot without delay. When the gun was not immediately discharged, Burgess struck the gunner violently, beating and stamping on him so severely that his face became greatly swollen.</p> <p>Burgess then swore further threats and behaved violently toward others. He seized John Sivey and kicked him repeatedly about the ship. After remaining some days longer with Burgess, the deponents left the ship at Madagascar and fled among the local inhabitants. Some days later, Captain Hayes recovered them, together with Joseph Hoston, and took them on board the <i>Mary</i>, though another person could not be found.</p> <p>They further declared that upon their arrival at Madagascar, at a place called Stellers, an elderly man there who spoke good English came to Burgess.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The statement that goods were intended for pirates showed that trade with pirate groups formed a planned part of the voyage. This indicated a structured commercial relationship between merchant captains and pirate networks rather than incidental contact.</p> <p>The exchange of gunfire between Burgess and Captain Hayes demonstrated the tension between lawful Company shipping and independent traders or privateers. Armed confrontation was used to assert authority and defend control at sea.</p> <p>Burgess's violent discipline of his crew showed the harsh enforcement of command aboard ship. Authority was maintained through physical punishment, which reflected the hierarchical and coercive nature of maritime labour.</p> <p>The desertion of the witnesses at Madagascar illustrated the risks faced by crew members under such command. Flight among local populations offered an alternative to continued service, showing the fluid movement between European and local societies.</p> <p>The recovery of the deserters by Captain Hayes demonstrated the extension of Company authority</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>there that speaks good English came to the said Capt Burgess</p>	<p>beyond the island. Ships acted as agents of enforcement, reclaiming individuals and incorporating them into their own command.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The intention to supply pirates with goods suggested that Burgess sought profit through cooperation rather than conflict. This may indicate that pirate settlements functioned as recognised trading partners within certain maritime networks.</p> <p>The extreme violence shown by Burgess toward his crew probably served both as punishment and as a deterrent against disobedience. However, it may also have contributed to desertion, which weakened his control and forced reliance on coercion.</p> <p>The confrontation with Captain Hayes suggested mutual suspicion between different maritime actors. Hayes's initial shot may have been intended as a warning, while Burgess's reaction indicated a readiness to escalate, reflecting unstable relations in contested waters.</p>
43	35	<p>To whom the s.d Capt Burgess asked him in their hearing when he expected any of the Piraters in those parts &amp; who had bin there, who said two or three with one Capt Hoare who had lately arrived there, and gone to the Red Sea &amp; was Expected there againe very shortly as the said Capt Hayes had told him at the departure from thence when he the said Hoare came out at an Island called Johanna Island, one week before the said Burgess when he beat up for volunteers he having a Commission from some of the Govrs of some of these Islands for the same but gott few men from thence so gott a rest of seamen in New York Further the said Edmund Baker and John Sivey Declares that the s.d Capt Burgess and Humphrey Freeman his mate had bin at Madagascar before in a Piratere, formerly in a ship called the James which is now sunke at Madagascar with which ship they tooke a shipp called the Rapham where he was quarter master for the ships Compa but doth not know in what office the s.d master Humphrey Freeman was, but they have heard them both for many times in their voyage to Madagascar, that when they were in the said ships they have bin at the takeing severall of the Mochos ships &amp; Portugees ships in those parts &amp; thereby Also Declares that the aforesd &amp; Negroes fellow that speaks good English which told the s.d Capt Burgess that one Capt Hoare has bin there with 2 ships more, and that they were gone to the Red Sea each of them having taken two ships belonging to Mochos, and in their returne Capt Every ran away with all the Negroes ship had taken which was put on board of him and that one Capt Goo that was Comandr of one of the said ships which was a Negroe had bin killed in the takeing of the said Mochoes ship and also they had information at Madagascar that one Capt Tewd who had come to Madagascar in a ship the last yeare had then a canoe</p>	<p>Samuel Burgess asked the English-speaking man at Stellers when any pirates were expected in those parts and which had lately been there. He was told that two or three had been present, including Captain Hoare, who had recently arrived and gone on to the Red Sea, and was expected to return shortly. It was also stated that when Hoare departed from Johanna Island about a week before Burgess arrived, he beat up for volunteers under a commission said to be granted by governors of certain islands, but obtained few men there and later recruited seamen in New York.</p> <p>Edmund Baker and John Sivey further declared that Burgess and his mate Humphrey Freeman had previously been at Madagascar as pirates in a ship called the <i>James</i>, now sunk there. In that vessel they took a ship named the <i>Rapham</i>, where Burgess acted as quartermaster. They did not know Freeman's role in that ship. They stated that during the voyage to Madagascar they heard both men speak frequently of taking several ships belonging to Mocha traders and Portuguese vessels in those waters.</p> <p>They further declared that the same English-speaking man at Madagascar told Burgess that Captain Hoare had been there with two other ships, and that they had gone to the Red Sea, each having taken two ships belonging to Mocha traders. On their return, Henry Every took possession of all the captured ships' cargoes of slaves and sailed away with them. It was also stated that Captain Goo, who commanded one of the ships and was described as a Negro, was killed during the taking of one of the Mocha ships.</p> <p>They also received information at Madagascar that Captain Tew, who came there the previous year in a ship, then possessed a canoe [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The questioning by Burgess about pirate movements showed an active effort to maintain contact with pirate networks. Information about their location and timing was treated as valuable for planning trade or cooperation.</p> <p>The reference to commissions issued by colonial governors illustrated the blurred boundary between piracy and sanctioned privateering. Such commissions could provide a legal cover for activities that closely resembled piracy.</p> <p>The prior experience of Burgess and Freeman as pirates revealed continuity between piracy and later commercial ventures. Individuals moved between roles, carrying knowledge, connections, and practices into subsequent voyages.</p> <p>The repeated taking of Mocha and Portuguese ships demonstrated the targeting of established trade routes. These actions disrupted international commerce</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>and redistributed goods through informal or illicit channels.</p> <p>The account of Henry Every seizing control of captured cargoes showed internal conflict within pirate groups. Alliances were unstable, and competition for spoils could lead to betrayal and fragmentation.</p> <p>The description of a commander identified as a Negro indicated the presence of diverse leadership within pirate enterprises. This reflected a fluid and inclusive structure compared to more rigid European hierarchies.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Burgess's detailed enquiries about pirate activity suggest that his voyage was structured to intersect with known pirate routes. This likely allowed him to maximise profit through trade or coordination with them.</p> <p>The circulation of information about multiple pirate captains at Madagascar indicates that the island functioned as a hub for maritime intelligence. Ships arriving there could quickly learn of opportunities and dangers across the wider Indian Ocean.</p> <p>The mention of Henry Every's actions suggests awareness of reputational risk among pirates. Such behaviour may have influenced how other captains, including Burgess, approached cooperation, balancing opportunity against the threat of betrayal.</p>
44	36	<p>[...] Hundred slaves were taken by the Piraters that have bin at Madagascar, and that they gave him an small sloop to carry him home, on hopes that would not goe with them, and that they find the s.d Burgess will be here at St Helena in next January from the s.d Island of Madagascar he having often said he was bound to touch at this place, The Names of the persons belonging to the said ship Mary of New York Frederick Phillips of New Yorke owner Saml Burgess Master are as followeth viz</p> <p>Saml Burgess Master  Humphery Jackson his mate  Robt Archbold  Andw Shinn  Saml Bernard  Joseph Wareing  John Steel  Joseph Baswell  Frederick Frankland Cooper  Alexander  Elias Piddington Carpenter</p> <p>Those persons remained on Board when they left him</p> <p>The Examination of John Brown who was Taken off from Madagascar by Capt Thomas Hayes Commander of the Mary and James who came in one Capt Glover a Privateer sent from New York, and run away from Madagascar is as followeth viz</p> <p>The said John Brown on oath Declares that he went shipt on board Capt Robt Glover in a privateer named Resolution who had a Commission from the Governor of Antigo, being a single Deck ship about 150 Tunn.</p>	<p>[...] They further declared that several hundred slaves were taken by the pirates who had been at Madagascar. These pirates gave the informant a small sloop to carry him home, as he refused to go with them. They also stated that Samuel Burgess intended to call at St Helena in January following, as he often declared that he was bound to touch there from Madagascar.</p> <p>The names of the persons belonging to the ship <i>Mary</i> of New York, owned by Frederick Phillips and commanded by Samuel Burgess, were listed as follows: Samuel Burgess, master; Humphrey Jackson; Robert Archbold; Andrew Shinn; Samuel Bernard; Joseph Wareing; John Steel; Joseph Baswell; Frederick Frankland; Alexander; and Elias Piddington. These persons remained on board when the witnesses left.</p> <p>The examination of John Brown was then taken. He was brought from Madagascar by Thomas Hayes. He stated on oath that he was shipped on board a privateer named <i>Resolution</i>, commanded by Robert Glover, who held a commission from the Governor of Antigua. The vessel was a single-deck ship of about 150 tons.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The report of several hundred slaves taken by pirates showed the scale of their operations. Piracy in this region extended beyond plunder of goods to include large-scale human trafficking, which linked it directly to wider systems of forced labour and trade.</p> <p>The expectation that Burgess would call at St Helena indicated that the island functioned as a regular stopping point within these maritime networks. This placed the settlement within a wider circuit of trade, intelligence, and potential threat.</p> <p>The detailed listing of crew members demonstrated the administrative importance of identifying individuals connected to suspect voyages. Naming each person allowed accountability and facilitated future action if required.</p> <p>The commission held by Captain Robert Glover showed again the overlap between authorised privateering and piracy. Official sanction from colonial governors provided a legal framework that could be used for ventures closely resembling piracy.</p> <p>The description of the vessel <i>Resolution</i> indicated the type of ship used in such activities. A relatively small, single-deck vessel of 150 tons suggested mobility</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>and suitability for both combat and pursuit, which were key characteristics of privateering and pirate ships.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The provision of a small sloop to return home suggested that pirates maintained selective cooperation with individuals who refused to join them. This may indicate an effort to preserve reputation or avoid unnecessary conflict with outsiders.</p> <p>The inclusion of a full crew list suggests that the authorities anticipated further investigation or interception. Recording these names likely prepared for Burgess's expected arrival at St Helena, allowing for pre-emptive action if needed.</p> <p>The repeated appearance of commissions from colonial governors suggests that privateering licences were used strategically to legitimise otherwise questionable activity. This may reflect a broader system in which legal authority was exploited to support profit-driven ventures in contested waters.</p>
45	37	<p>[...] with [...] in the without any Names of Neger [...] their owne ships. Here on the said Isle from the [...] the beginning of Nov: 1695; for Cape [...] Island from thence to the Coast of Guinea, where they arrived and found a prize ship, which but when they were thus in a making preparation to take her, they spied a ship which proved to be a Dutch ship, which Intercepted them, and when the said Dutch ships began to approach some coming nigh, the said Capt Robt Glover whipt and hoisted sails, and kept away some time Distance from that sloop and came againe to anchor in the Road, each said ships, and followed them like, they perceived the Dutch ships after which the said Glover hoisted sailes &amp; came towards the Dutch ships; the Dutch ships did the like, and when they came nigh each other, the Dutch ships hailed Capt Glover and asked him from whence he came, who answered from Whitehall, they asked the Dutch man from whence he came, who answered from Hamborough, and then the said Capt Glover Commanded his men on board of him, to resist for answer what he said, not would of his had men on board to send him, but, said to Capt Glover that if he did not send his boat on board, he would fire upon him, so that said Capt Glover sent his boat with his quarter master, and two men to send him a board, but still Dutch Commander was not satisfied with that, so he detained the quarter master, and one other men that Rowed him on board and sent one his men with the other on the boats to order the said Capt Glover to come on board and bring his Commission but would not goe, but commanded his Master to goe in his name who went but the said Commander was not satisfied with also, so sent another message, that if he came not himself bringing his Commission with him, he would sink him the</p>	<p>[...] John Brown further declared that the voyage proceeded from the island from about the beginning of November 1695 toward the Cape and then to the coast of Guinea. There they arrived and found a prize ship, but while preparing to take her they sighted another vessel, which proved to be Dutch.</p> <p>As the Dutch ship approached, Robert Glover hoisted sail and stood off for some distance before anchoring again in the road. The Dutch ship followed. When they came near each other, the Dutch commander hailed Glover and asked from where he came. Glover answered "Whitehall". Glover then asked the Dutch commander the same, who replied "Hamborough".</p> <p>Glover ordered his men to resist any attempt to board, but the Dutch commander demanded that he send his boat aboard and threatened to fire upon him if he refused. Glover then sent his boat with his quartermaster and two men. The Dutch commander detained the quartermaster and one of the men, and sent one of his own men back with the remaining sailor to order Glover to come aboard with his commission.</p> <p>Glover refused to go himself and sent his master in his place, but this did not satisfy the Dutch commander. A further message was sent that unless Glover came in person with his commission, his ship would be sunk. Glover still refused, though he feared that compliance would interfere with his intended voyage.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The encounter between the privateer and the Dutch ship showed how authority at sea depended on possession and recognition of commissions. The demand to produce a commission reflected a system where legality of action was tested through documentation.</p> <p>The detention of Glover's men demonstrated the use of coercion in maritime encounters. Control over personnel functioned as leverage to compel compliance without immediate resort to full engagement.</p> <p>The exchange of false or ambiguous place names, such as "Whitehall" and "Hamborough", indicated evasive tactics. Ships used misleading answers to obscure identity and intention, which reflected the uncertain and contested nature of maritime jurisdiction.</p> <p>The refusal of Glover to board the Dutch ship showed the limits of authority between competing powers. Even when threatened, he resisted submitting to another commander's demand, which highlighted the fragile balance between negotiation and conflict.</p> <p>The threat to sink the ship if the commission was not produced illustrated the escalation mechanisms at sea. Force or the threat of force underpinned enforcement of claims to authority, especially where legal jurisdiction overlapped.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>which Capt Glover would not do; if he had not feared that would have intercepted the Intended voyage.</p>	<p>Glover's refusal to produce his commission in person suggests that he feared scrutiny of its validity or scope. This may indicate that his activities exceeded the authority granted to him, making inspection risky.</p> <p>The Dutch commander's insistence on boarding and inspection likely aimed to assert control over suspected privateers operating near contested trade routes. This reflects broader competition between maritime powers for dominance and regulation of commerce.</p> <p>The initial withdrawal and later approach by Glover suggest a cautious strategy. He may have sought to avoid confrontation while assessing the strength and intent of the Dutch vessel before deciding how to respond.</p>
46	38	<p>[...] he went on board and carried his Commission with him &amp; as soon as he came on board, the said Dutch Commander sent a Master of the said Vessel &amp;c againe, Commanding him to send 13 of his men on board of his ship (which he did) and to follow him and his vessell in chase, but did not for in the night they went a head of him, leaving the Capts for Cape Coast, which the said Dutch ships perceiving the next morning fired a shott at him, but would not come a head that they on board of the said Capt Glover with them, said no body to do they came up to the Coast, and the Dutch ships went to the Mines with Capt Glover and Glover on board, and 13 of his men before who got leave of the said Dutch ship by the means of the Governour of Cape Coast and coming on board there from thence they went to Madagascar who in their way touched at the Island of Jo[...] from whence they took a man who had bin Left there by a Privateer Captain, they arrived the 1st April, and this Deponent understanding that the said Capt Glover was going upon the Piracy trade to the Red Sea (as he has often heard him say) Left the ship at Madagascar where when he arrived in the said ships came one Capt Ball who was Capt Dorrings Mate, who had a Commission from the Governour of New Yorke as he has bin often told by one of his men at Madagascar, and that he the said Capt Ball had since made a voyage to Madagascar, and has taken several the French mens ships also declare that two of the said Capt Balls men told him, that one Capt Kidd in a sloop had bin lately in the Red Sea in the taking of a French ship there, and that the said Capt Dorrings Mate carried the said man to New Yorke last year, and further that he might write those, and says that he had before the Deponent of the said expedition of Capt Wood, Glover, Commander from Madagascar one Capt Horne arrived in a ship of the same voyage he having also a Commission from the Governour of New Yorke Colonel Benjamin Fletcher. Moreover Depost that there arrived [...]</p>	<p>[...] John Brown further declared that Robert Glover at last went on board the Dutch ship carrying his commission. As soon as he arrived, the Dutch commander ordered that thirteen of Glover's men be sent aboard his vessel and commanded Glover to follow him in chase. Glover complied in sending the men, but during the night his ship sailed ahead and left the Dutch vessel, steering for Cape Coast.</p> <p>The Dutch ship, perceiving this the next morning, fired a shot at him but did not overtake him. Glover proceeded to the coast, while the Dutch ship went to the mines. Glover later recovered his men with the assistance of the Governor of Cape Coast and resumed his voyage.</p> <p>From there he sailed to Madagascar, touching on the way at the island of Jo[...], where he took on board a man left there by a privateer captain. They arrived at Madagascar on 1 April. Brown stated that he understood Glover intended to proceed on a piracy voyage to the Red Sea, as he heard him say repeatedly, and therefore he left the ship at Madagascar.</p> <p>He further declared that after his arrival there, a captain named Captain Ball came in a ship, who was said to have been mate to Captain Dorrings and to hold a commission from Benjamin Fletcher. It was reported to him by members of Ball's crew that Ball made a voyage to Madagascar and took several French ships.</p> <p>He also stated that two of Ball's men told him that Captain Kidd had recently been in the Red Sea in a sloop and had taken a French ship there. He added that Dorrings's mate carried one such man to New York the previous year.</p> <p>He further declared that he heard of an expedition under Captain Wood, and that a captain named Captain Horne arrived in a ship on the same voyage, also holding a commission from Governor Benjamin Fletcher.</p> <p>Moreover, he deposed that there arrived [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The requirement for Glover to produce his commission and submit men to the Dutch ship showed how maritime authority was contested and enforced through inspection. Possession of a valid commission determined whether a vessel's actions were considered lawful.</p> <p>The recovery of Glover's detained men through the Governor of Cape Coast demonstrated the role of coastal authorities in mediating disputes at sea. Local governors acted as intermediaries who could restore personnel and resolve conflicts between ships.</p> <p>The repeated references to commissions from Benjamin Fletcher showed the central role of colonial governors in authorising privateering ventures. These commissions provided legal cover for actions that closely resembled piracy.</p> <p>The testimony that several captains with such commissions engaged in taking ships indicated a network of privateers operating across the same regions. Their activities blurred the distinction between lawful</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>seizure and piracy, especially when directed against multiple nationalities.</p> <p>The mention of Captain Kidd connected these events to a wider pattern of Red Sea expeditions. Such voyages targeted established trade routes, particularly those associated with French and other European shipping.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Glover's decision to evade the Dutch commander during the night suggested an attempt to avoid scrutiny of his commission or cargo. This may indicate that his activities exceeded the limits of his official authority.</p> <p>The concentration of privateers with similar commissions at Madagascar suggests that the island functioned as a gathering point for such ventures. This likely facilitated exchange of information, recruitment, and coordination among them.</p> <p>The repeated involvement of New York-based commissions implies that colonial authorities may have tolerated or encouraged aggressive privateering as a means of extending influence and profit in distant waters.</p>
47	39	<p>Arrived also one Capt Richd Glover a Merchant ship from Boston abt 200 tons &amp; when she came into the River, as some of the men told him was to trade there, and from thence to the East Indies with power from the Governr of New Yorke to trade there as Interlopers, which said ship Capt Balb found took from him giving him a sloop to carry him home and a bond of 14 Thousand pounds Sterling, and that he heard Cap Balb tell of most of the particulars that concerne Madagascar when he had taken the said Capt Richard Glovers merchant ship, Likewise Deponent that one of Capt Balls men told him that one Capt Avery had taken a Dutch ship with the whole value of the prize, but knew not what ship it was, and also that since April last a small ship arrived at Madagascar, who had taken a prize, &amp; carried it to St Marys, where they left 45 men out of 70, and spent all the moneys &amp; goods they had taken out of the said prize, and that as soon as they came to St Augustines Bay took out all they could on shore there buryed &amp; put in boats (as it was then said the men remaining also going there, all Capt Avery men or such as where they could not Soame would not with them in body, Likewise saith that there is a white man who lives at St Marys and came there from New Yorke abt ten years since, where he has a small store, and all sorts of provisions to him from New Yorke for the supply of all privateers very often giving them credit. Just St Augustines made their voyage, being a place where Privateers touch in their homeward bound voyage from the Red Sea</p> <p>[signature] Poirier S. Goodwin</p>	<p>It was further declared that Richard Glover arrived at Madagascar in a merchant ship of about 200 tons from Boston. When she entered the river, it was said by some of her crew that she intended to trade there and then proceed to the East Indies, holding authority from Benjamin Fletcher to trade as an interloper. This ship was taken by Captain Ball, who gave Richard Glover a sloop to carry him home and took from him a bond of £14,000 0s 0d. It was also stated that Captain Ball spoke of many matters relating to Madagascar after seizing the ship.</p> <p>The deponent further stated that one of Captain Ball's men reported that Henry Every took a Dutch ship with its entire cargo, though the name of the vessel was not known. It was also reported that since April a small ship arrived at Madagascar having taken a prize, which it carried to St Mary's. There, forty-five of seventy men were left behind, and all the money and goods taken from the prize were spent.</p> <p>At St Augustine's Bay, the crew unloaded as much as they could, burying goods on shore and placing others in boats. The remaining men, many belonging to Henry Every, went there. Some did not go with them but stayed behind.</p> <p>It was also declared that a white man lived at St Mary's, who came from New York about ten years earlier. He maintained a small store and supplied provisions sent from New York for the use of privateers, often extending them credit. St Augustine's Bay was described as a place commonly used by privateers when returning from voyages to the Red Sea.</p> <p>The record was subscribed by Stephen Poirier and S Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The seizure of a merchant ship operating as an interloper showed how privateers enforced not only national rivalry but also commercial exclusivity. Trading without authorised Company licence exposed vessels to capture and financial penalty.</p> <p>The imposition of a bond of £14,000 0s 0d demonstrated the use of financial instruments to secure compliance and compensation. Such large sums reflected the high stakes of maritime trade and the value of seized cargo.</p> <p>The repeated accounts of ships being taken and goods dispersed showed the fluid movement of wealth through piracy. Captured cargo was quickly redistributed, spent, or hidden, making recovery difficult.</p> <p>The existence of a provisioning store at St Mary's indicated an organised support system for privateers. Supplies, credit, and infrastructure were maintained to</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>sustain ongoing operations, linking distant ports such as New York to pirate activity.</p> <p>The reference to burial of goods and dispersal of crews revealed practical methods used to conceal plunder and avoid detection. These actions showed a deliberate effort to manage risk and evade pursuit.</p> <p>The identification of St Augustine's Bay as a regular stopping point illustrated the existence of established maritime routes for privateers. Such locations functioned as hubs for resupply, coordination, and redistribution of goods.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The use of a bond rather than outright destruction of the captured merchant ship suggests that Captain Ball aimed to extract maximum financial benefit while allowing the voyage to continue in altered form. This may reflect a calculated balance between profit and maintaining relations with colonial networks.</p> <p>The presence of a long-established supplier at St Mary's implies that privateering operations were sustained by stable economic arrangements rather than ad hoc encounters. This suggests a semi-regularised system supporting piracy.</p> <p>The burial and dispersal of goods at St Augustine's Bay indicate anticipation of future recovery. This practice likely allowed privateers to store wealth securely while reducing the risk of immediate seizure, pointing to a longer-term strategy for managing plunder.</p>
48	42	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Thursday the 17th Day of Xber 1696 at Fort James Pre[...] Rich[...] Keeling Esq[...] Captn Poirier Dep[...]</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Thursday 17 December 1696 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. The meeting was attended by Pre[...] Rich[...] Keeling, Esquire, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p>
49	43	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Monday the 21th Day of Xber 1696 att Fort James Pres[...] Rich[...] Keeling Govr Capt Poirier Dep[...] Governr Margarett the wife of John Cleverlee Lately Deceased sent this day to Govr &amp; Council she being indispos'd where Father and Brother John Rob[...] and his wife, the said John Cleverlee last will and Testament which was left sealed by the said Cleverlee, but being now open the Sd Rich[...] and his wife declared that the sd will was broken open by the sd Margt Cleverlee after her husbands decease being the sd Cleverlee said when he delivered ye sd will to his wife that it should not be open till after he was dead Therefore if an Error was Comitted it was assuredly done by Ignorance and not wilfully, of which the Govr and Council being fully satisfied Received the Depos[...] Thomas [...] and James Rob[...] making oath they saw James Rob[...] deliver the sd will now produced by the sd John Cleverlee Lately Deceased &amp; that they know of no other will since by him made either by word or deed It is ordered That the sd will be Approved &amp; Confirmed Desire In as much as the said John Cleverlee has in his said will appointed no Executor nor Executrix It is ordered That the said James River and Thom[...] [...] with the Cleverlee widow be jointly overseers of this sd Cleverlee</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 21 December 1696 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Rich[...] Keeling, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>Margaret, the wife of John Cleverlee, who had died shortly before, sent word to the Governor and Council as she lay unwell. Present with her were her father and her brother John Rob[...] and his wife. A sealed will left by John Cleverlee was produced. It had now been opened. Rich[...] and his wife stated that the will had been broken open by Margaret Cleverlee after her husband's death. It was reported that when John Cleverlee handed the will to his wife, he instructed that it should not be opened until after his death. Any fault in opening it was judged to have been committed through ignorance rather than deliberate intent.</p> <p>The Governor and Council accepted this explanation. Depositions were then received from Thomas [...] and James Rob [...], who swore under oath that they had seen James Rob[...] deliver the will now presented by the late John Cleverlee. They also confirmed that no other will had been made by him, either verbally or in writing.</p> <p>The will was approved and confirmed.</p> <p>As John Cleverlee had appointed no executor or executrix in his will, an order was made that James River and Thom[...] [...] should act together with the widow Cleverlee as joint overseers of the will and its execution. [...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The requirement that witnesses swear they had seen the will delivered, and that no later will existed, showed the Council's role in validating testamentary succession and preventing disputes over property.</p> <p>The concern over the will being opened prematurely reflected the importance attached to maintaining the integrity of sealed documents. Such seals functioned as safeguards against tampering and ensured that testamentary intent remained unaltered until formally examined.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>last will and Testament [...] [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>The absence of an appointed executor required the Council to intervene directly. By assigning overseers, including the widow, authority over the estate was redistributed under official supervision, which ensured that property was administered in line with the deceased's intentions while maintaining public order.</p> <p>The designation of multiple overseers indicated a system of shared responsibility. This reduced the risk of mismanagement or fraud, especially where family members and associates held competing interests in the estate.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to treat the opening of the will as an act of ignorance rather than misconduct perhaps reflected a desire to avoid penalising the widow at a vulnerable moment, while still preserving the authority of formal legal procedure.</p> <p>The appointment of both James River and Thom[...] alongside the widow suggests that the Council sought to balance familial control with external oversight, perhaps in response to uncertainty about the widow's capacity or the potential for dispute among relatives.</p>
50	44	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Monday the 7th Day of Febry 1697 att Fort James Pres[...] Richard R[...]ing Govr Capt Poirier Dep[...] Govr Margarett Cleverlees widdow and James River and Tho[...] Swindon the two persons appointed to be jointly overseers of the sd Margt Cleverlee late husbands will as in the foregoing Consultation appear brought an Inventory of the said Cleverlees Estate who all made oath was a true and just Inventory to the best of their knowledge It is ordered That the said Inventory be received and approved and Copies given when desired [...] [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 7 February 1698 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>Margaret Cleverlee, widow of John Cleverlee, appeared with James River and Thomas Swindon, who had been appointed as joint overseers of her late husband's will in the earlier consultation. They presented an inventory of John Cleverlee's estate. Each swore under oath that the inventory was true and complete to the best of their knowledge.</p> <p>The inventory was received and approved. Copies were ordered to be issued when requested.</p> <p>[...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The submission of a sworn inventory showed the formal process by which estates were assessed and recorded. This created an official account of property, which formed the basis for distributing assets and settling any claims.</p> <p>The requirement that all overseers swear to the inventory reinforced collective accountability. Responsibility for accuracy did not rest with a single individual, which reduced the risk of concealment or misreporting.</p> <p>The Council's approval gave the inventory legal standing. By allowing copies to be issued, access to the record was enabled for interested parties, which supported transparency and helped prevent disputes over the estate.</p>
51	45	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Wednesday the 3d Day of March 1697 att Fort James Pres[...] Richard R[...]ing Govr Capt Poirier Deputy Governr Margarett Ellison who has Cleverlees to pay of the said John in his life tyme and she brings Captain [...] [...] this acco[...] Indebted to her viz Thomas Gargan is Charged for the summe of £ 9 [...] but on further perusing the acco[...] found that he was Indebted to her but the summe of £ 3 [...] which the said Gargan said he was Discharged of She having Taken some Goods to pay her £ 8 [...] and some barley £ 2 [...] which was more than she Could Demand of him The said Ellison and Simon [...] on oath Declares that Mrs Ellison was Satisfied with what Simon [...] further saith that he has paid her in part £ 8 [...] by James Riden 30 s who is Indebted to him so much</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Wednesday 3 March 1698 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>Margaret Ellison appeared. She claimed that money had been owed to her by John Cleverlee during his lifetime. An account was presented with Captain [...] to support her claim. In this account, Thomas Gargan was charged with a debt of £9 [...] to her. Upon closer examination, it was found that he had in fact owed only £3 [...]. Gargan stated that this smaller sum had already been settled, as Ellison had taken goods valued at £8 [...] and barley worth £2 [...], which exceeded what she could properly demand from him.</p> <p>Ellison and Simon [...] both swore under oath that she had been satisfied with what had been received. Simon [...] further stated that he had partly paid her £8 [...] through James Riden, who owed him that amount. James Riden declared that Simon [...] had taken a bond from him, which he had since repaid. He added that his labour had covered a value of 30s. He maintained that</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>James Riden saith that Simon [...] Took a Bond having made of him, which he say he pay him which he said done  his work that he has Done so much as Comes to 30 s  Therefore  if the said [...] promise is made an End of Saving his Amends  for which he say having a will for Indebted the said Mrs Ellison the said sum of 30 s  It is ordered  That the said Gargan be Discharged from the said Debt and that the said [...] bring or take her Leave an Allowance to receive it after her Departure and that the said James Riden pay her the sum of £ 3 [...] and Simon  [...] the said James Riden's Timber the first Opportunity that shall present after the Departure of the ships now in the road</p>	<p>this work settled his obligation, though he acknowledged a remaining debt of 30s to Mrs Ellison.  An order was made that Thomas Gargan should be discharged from the claimed debt. Margaret Ellison was permitted to depart, with an allowance granted so that she could receive what remained due to her after leaving the island. James Riden was ordered to pay her £3 [...]. Simon [...] was required to provide James Riden with timber at the first opportunity after the ships then in the road had departed.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The reassessment of the original £9 [...] claim down to £3 [...] showed the Council's active role in auditing private accounts. Claims were not accepted at face value but were examined against evidence, which ensured fairness in financial disputes.  The acceptance of goods and barley in settlement illustrated a mixed economy in which debts were often discharged through commodities rather than cash. The valuation of these goods against the claimed sum demonstrated how non-monetary payments were formally recognised.  The reference to a bond indicated a written financial obligation, enforceable by the holder. Its mention showed that formal credit instruments were in use and that labour could be counted towards repayment, converting work into a monetary equivalent.  The Council's order that Ellison could receive payment after her departure suggested administrative flexibility. Mechanisms existed to ensure that creditors could still collect debts even when leaving the island, which supported continuity in financial obligations across distance.  The instruction for Simon [...] to supply timber to James Riden linked debt settlement to material resources. Timber functioned as a valued asset within the island economy, and its allocation by order showed how the Council could direct the transfer of goods to resolve interconnected debts.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The decision to allow Ellison to depart while arranging for payment later perhaps addressed the practical constraint of ship movements. Her claim was settled in a way that did not delay her departure but still ensured enforcement of outstanding obligations.  The interconnected debts between Ellison, Simon [...], and James Riden suggest a chain of obligations that required coordinated resolution. The Council's structured order may have been designed to untangle these overlapping claims in a single ruling, preventing further dispute or delay.</p>
52	46	<p>The Said Margt Ellison Charge Robt Addi with 2£ 16s 6d which the sd Addi saith he owes her not so much  The said Margt Ellison saares saith that the sd Robt Addi owes her the full summe of 2£ 16s 6d  It is ordered  That the said Addi doe pay the said Ellison ye said summe of 2£ 16s 6d or to whom she shall appoint as her attorney  The Said Margt Ellison also Charges Richard Evans with 13s which he owes Peter Williams with five shillings Tho Harper Junr with 13s John Gunthres with 13s  more Tho Lane with 20s and James Castings with 18s which  all persons ownes to be Indebted to her but some alledges they are willing to make paymt but cannot at present  Therefore  It is ordered  That those persons that cannot pay the said Mrs Ellison she Leave them behind her, and that she doe appoint an attorney to Receive the said Debts</p>	<p>Margaret Ellison charged Robert Addi with a debt of £2 16s 6d. Addi denied owing the full amount. Ellison swore under oath that he owed her the entire sum of £2 16s 6d.  An order was made that Robert Addi should pay Margaret Ellison the sum of £2 16s 6d, or to any person she appointed as her attorney.  Margaret Ellison also brought claims against several others. Richard Evans was charged with 13s. Peter Williams owed 5s. Thomas Harper Junior owed 13s. John Gunthres owed 13s. Thomas Lane owed 20s. James Castings owed 18s. All acknowledged their debts, though some stated that they were willing to pay but were unable to do so at that time.  An order was made that those who could not pay immediately should remain liable after Ellison's departure. She was instructed to appoint an attorney to receive these debts on her behalf.  [...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The acceptance of Ellison's sworn statement over Addi's denial showed the evidentiary weight given to oath-taking. Formal swearing operated as a key</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>[...] [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>mechanism in resolving contested debts where documentary proof may have been limited.</p> <p>The provision allowing Ellison to appoint an attorney demonstrated the use of delegated legal authority. This enabled creditors to enforce claims in their absence, which was essential in a mobile colonial setting where individuals frequently departed by ship.</p> <p>The listing of multiple small debts revealed a dispersed credit network. Economic activity relied on numerous modest obligations between individuals, rather than large consolidated transactions.</p> <p>The Council's decision to allow delayed payment while preserving the debt reflected a balance between enforcement and practical constraint. Immediate insolvency did not cancel obligation, and liability was formally maintained until settlement could be made.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The insistence on full payment from Robert Addi despite his denial perhaps indicated that Ellison's sworn testimony was considered more credible or better supported, which suggests that personal reputation and standing may have influenced adjudication.</p> <p>The arrangement for appointing an attorney likely addressed the immediate problem of Ellison's departure from the island. This allowed the Council to resolve her claims without requiring her continued presence, while still ensuring that debtors remained accountable.</p>
53	47	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Friday the 5th Day of March 1697 att Fort James Pres[...] Richard R[...]ing Govr Capt Poirier Deputy Govr Richard Harding of the Island having Complained by way of Petition against Capt Laycock Commander of the America now in the road saying that he the said Harding received a Letter from one John Shrimpton of Bombay who makes his Brother he had put aboard of him a Coffy slave and that his said Brother Shrimpton in his said Letter that he should have a Certificate of his said Negro which the said Capt Laycock Denys to the saying he never recd Dispose of him The said Capt Laycock being Desired on the hearing and Interr with Concerning the said Harding Complaint who upon oath gave this following Declaration At the Island of Bombay in Janry Anno 1696 I doe acknowledge to have received aboard the ship America from Mr Thom Mason a Coffy slave which was to be sold by me at St Helena and any place where I come she find not in St Helena or in this Island of Bombay for the same money to be remitted to the said Island Bombay to his name and accordingly a Contract was drawn between the said Mason and Richd Laycock Master of the said America lying then at the Island of Bombay and in the above said Month that Coffy slave name Call[...] was taken by a Portuguese of said Island the said ship with from whom he Laycock was afterwards to receive mony according to his usual manner of dealing Now be it known unto all men by these presents that I Richd Laycock Commander of the America hath power and</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Friday 5 March 1698 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>Richard Harding of the island submitted a petition against Captain Laycock, commander of the <i>America</i>, then lying in the road. Harding stated that he had received a letter from John Shrimpton of Bombay, described as his brother, informing him that a Coffy slave had been placed aboard the ship with Laycock. The letter also stated that Harding was to receive a certificate for the slave. Laycock denied this claim and stated that he had never received or disposed of such a slave.</p> <p>Captain Laycock was examined under oath and gave a declaration. He stated that at the island of Bombay in January 1697, he had received aboard the <i>America</i> a Coffy slave from Mr Thomas Mason. The slave was to be sold at St Helena or elsewhere, and if not sold there or at Bombay, the money was to be remitted to Bombay in Mason's name. A contract had been drawn up between Mason and Richard Laycock, master of the <i>America</i>, at Bombay in that month.</p> <p>Laycock further declared that the slave, named Call[...], had been taken from the ship at Bombay by a Portuguese inhabitant of the island. Payment for the slave was to be received later according to his usual manner of dealing. He asserted that he had authority to take the slave on his own account if Shrimpton found it convenient, provided that the agreed payment was remitted to Mason in accordance with the contract made at Bombay. He added that the slave had not been disposed of at St Helena, and that if it proved convenient to sell him there, then he was to [...] his.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The petition process showed how private commercial disputes were brought before the Governor and Council. This forum functioned as both a court and an administrative body, capable of examining evidence and compelling sworn testimony.</p> <p>The reference to a contract made at Bombay demonstrated the formalisation of trade agreements across long-distance networks. Such contracts governed the handling, sale, and remittance of proceeds, linking St Helena to wider Indian Ocean commerce.</p> <p>The use of a ship's commander as an intermediary in the sale of a slave illustrated how maritime officers</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>authority to take the said slave upon my own acct if Shrimpton  it convenient only remitting the money to the said Mason according  to one agreement by Contract made at the sd Island and who know  slave are not disposed of the Island of St Helena &amp; if it may be  convenient to Dispose of him there then he to [...] his</p>	<p>operated as commercial agents. They carried goods, negotiated sales, and managed financial returns as part of routine trading practice.</p> <p>The mention of a certificate for the slave indicated a form of documentary proof of ownership or transaction. Such certification helped establish title and prevent disputes, especially when goods or persons were transferred across different jurisdictions.</p> <p>The removal of the slave by a Portuguese inhabitant at Bombay revealed the porous nature of control over cargo and persons in port. Recovery of payment depended on personal dealing rather than immediate enforcement, which exposed traders to risk.</p> <p>Laycock's claim that he could take the slave on his own account, subject to remitting payment, reflected flexible commercial arrangements. Authority over goods could shift between principal and agent depending on circumstances, provided financial obligations were met.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The dispute perhaps arose from conflicting expectations between Harding and Laycock over entitlement to the slave or its proceeds. Harding's reliance on Shrimpton's letter suggests that he believed himself to have a recognised claim, while Laycock's denial indicates either a breakdown in communication or competing interpretations of the agreement.</p> <p>The fact that the slave was taken at Bombay by a Portuguese inhabitant and payment deferred suggests a pragmatic acceptance of local trading conditions. Immediate enforcement may not have been feasible, so Laycock relied on established personal dealings to secure payment later.</p> <p>Laycock's emphasis on contractual authority and remittance terms suggests that he sought to protect himself from liability. By framing his actions within the agreement made with Mason, he positioned himself as acting within agreed commercial practice rather than engaging in unauthorised disposal.</p>
54	48	<p>his Brother in law Richard Harding was to have the Refusal of him. In witness whereof I have hereunto sett  my hand the Day and yeare abovementioned  Richd Laycock  St Helena  March 5th 1696  Sworne before us  Richd R[...]ing  J[...] Poirier  Thomas Ellison of this said Island Planter who is going off the said Island in his Majesties shipp the Tringston offered to  Govr and Councill to sell them for the use of the Honble Company  to serve the sd with a plantation a Black man a Black woman her Childe, and a black boy aged abt 10 yeares of age  30 head of Cattle, and a house in Fort James, wee Conferred with  the said Ellison, and after much Debate  It was Agreed  That the said Ellison doe Sell to ye Honble Company Lodg &amp; Store of  provisions &amp; goods effects all the particulars aforesd at the rate price to amount  of Two thousand pounds he having Bill of Exchange signed by Govr &amp; Councill payable by the Rt Honble Company in England  [...]  [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>Richard Laycock's declaration concluded by stating that Richard Harding, described as his brother-in-law, was to have the refusal of the slave. In witness of this, Laycock set his hand to the document dated 5 March 1696 at St Helena. The declaration was sworn before Richard R[...]ing and J[...] Poirier.</p> <p>Thomas Ellison, a planter of the island, who intended to depart on His Majesty's ship the <i>Tringston</i>, appeared before the Governor and Council. He offered to sell to them, for the use of the Honourable Company in maintaining a plantation, a group of assets consisting of a Black man, a Black woman with her child, a Black boy aged about 10 years, 30 head of cattle, and a house at Fort James.</p> <p>Discussion was held with Ellison, and after extended negotiation an agreement was reached. Ellison was to sell to the Honourable Company, including its lodge, stores of provisions, goods, and effects, all the items listed above for the total sum of £2,000 0s 0d. In return, he was to receive a bill of exchange signed by the Governor and Council, payable by the Right Honourable Company in England.</p> <p>[...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The clause granting Richard Harding the refusal established a right of first purchase. This gave Harding priority to acquire the slave before any sale to others, which functioned as a recognised commercial privilege within private agreements.</p> <p>The sworn declaration before the Governor and Council formalised Laycock's statement as legal evidence. Oath-taking converted a private account into an enforceable public record within the island's governing system.</p> <p>Thomas Ellison's transaction showed the Council acting as a purchasing authority on behalf of the</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>Honourable Company. This demonstrated how local government directly managed Company assets and provisioning.</p> <p>The inclusion of people, livestock, and property within a single sale illustrated the treatment of labour, land, and capital as integrated economic assets. Slaves were explicitly incorporated into plantation infrastructure alongside cattle and buildings.</p> <p>The use of a bill of exchange payable in England revealed a transnational financial system. Payment was not made locally in cash but deferred through a formal instrument that linked St Helena to the Company's metropolitan accounts.</p> <p>The reference to the Company's lodge, stores, provisions, goods, and effects indicated an organised institutional structure for managing supplies. The purchase was intended to support operational capacity rather than private use.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The agreement to pay £2,000 0s 0d by bill of exchange rather than immediate payment suggests that ready cash was perhaps limited on the island. The arrangement allowed the Company to secure valuable assets without requiring local liquidity.</p> <p>Ellison's decision to sell before departing on the <i>Tringston</i> indicates a deliberate liquidation of his holdings. This likely ensured that his assets were converted into a form that could be realised in England, rather than left exposed to local uncertainty.</p> <p>The inclusion of a house at Fort James alongside labour and livestock suggests that the Company sought to consolidate control over strategic property within the fort. This may have strengthened administrative or logistical operations tied to plantation management.</p> <p>The earlier provision granting Harding the refusal of the slave may have been intended to resolve or pre-empt dispute. By establishing priority rights in writing, Laycock reduced the risk of competing claims arising from overlapping commercial relationships.</p>
55	49	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 9th  Day of march 1697 att Fort James  Pres[...] Richd R[...]ing Governr  Capt Poirier Dep[...] govr  An advertisement having bin Issued out this day  that the Govr &amp; Councell would this afternoon treat  with all  such that were desirous either to purchase or hire all or  any part of the Estate lately bought of Thomas Ellison  as in the foregoing Consultation appears; Accordingly  severall  psons came amongst whom Tho Dixon Serjeant came  also to  Treat to buy the Land, house and provisions standing  thereon  with whom after much Debate  It is Agreed  That Thomas Dixon aforesd have 40 Acres of Land  2 Houses and Provisions standing thereon at ye rate  price and vallue of Eighty five pounds he having two  to pay the same in one year's time from the date  hereof; and at the Expiration of the said time of  one yeare from the day of the Date hereof any part of  the said Eighty five pounds remains unpaid then  the said Dixon shall have one yeare longer for  the payment which will still remain Due of the said  Eighty five pounds he paying all the Rents &amp; fines  for so much as shall remain Due at the Expira-  tion of the yeare as aforesaid  It is also agreed with the sd Dixon  That he have by hire of the Rt Honble Compy a  Black boy late the sd Tho Ellison for one yeare  at the rate and price of 3£ per Annum</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Tuesday 9 March 1698 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>An advertisement had been issued that day stating that the Governor and Council would meet in the afternoon with anyone wishing to purchase or hire all or part of the estate recently acquired from Thomas Ellison, as recorded in the previous consultation. Several persons attended. Among them was Thomas Dixon, a serjeant, who entered into negotiation to purchase land, houses, and provisions attached to the estate.</p> <p>After extended discussion, an agreement was reached. Thomas Dixon was granted 40 acres of land, two houses, and the provisions upon them, at a total value of £85 0s 0d. He was given one year from the date of the agreement to pay this sum. If any portion remained unpaid at the end of that year, he was allowed a further year to complete payment. During that extended period, he was required to pay rents and fines on whatever balance remained outstanding.</p> <p>A further agreement was made that Dixon should hire from the Right Honourable Company a Black boy, formerly belonging to Thomas Ellison, for one year at the rate of £3 0s 0d per annum.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The issuing of a public advertisement showed a structured method for disposing of Company assets. This ensured that opportunities to purchase or hire were openly communicated, which encouraged competition and transparency in transactions.</p> <p>The sale of land, buildings, and provisions to Thomas Dixon demonstrated how the Company redistributed acquired estates to private individuals. This</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>functioned as a mechanism for developing the island's agricultural and economic base while converting Company-held assets into revenue.</p> <p>The provision allowing staged payment over one or two years reflected a credit-based system. Purchasers were enabled to acquire substantial property without immediate full payment, which broadened access while maintaining obligation through deferred debt.</p> <p>The requirement to pay rents and fines on any outstanding balance indicated a dual system of obligation. Unpaid purchase money attracted continuing financial liabilities, which acted both as compensation to the Company and as pressure to complete payment.</p> <p>The hiring of a slave at an annual rate showed the existence of a labour market in which enslaved people were leased rather than sold outright. This allowed the Company to retain ownership while generating income and supplying labour to settlers.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to advertise the estate for sale or hire suggests that the Council sought to recover value quickly from the assets acquired from Thomas Ellison. Public offering may have been intended to maximise returns by attracting multiple interested parties.</p> <p>The extended payment terms granted to Dixon perhaps reflected either his limited immediate resources or the Council's desire to ensure the land was occupied and productive rather than left idle. Allowing time for payment may have encouraged settlement and cultivation.</p> <p>The inclusion of both sale and hire options indicates a flexible strategy in asset management. The Company may have aimed to balance immediate income from leases with longer-term capital recovery through sales.</p> <p>The hiring of the Black boy rather than selling him outright suggests a deliberate choice to retain control over labour resources. This allowed the Company to maintain a continuing role in the island's labour supply while still profiting from it.</p>
56	50	<p>These being a Black man, woman and Child with a House in Chappell valley as yet not Dispos'd It is ordered That the said perticulers be put to an out Crye and accordingly The Negroe man was Sett at 30£ severall persons bid and at Length Joseph Badley on the behalf of Rebecca Charlwood widow bid 34£ and no person out bidd him It is ordered That the said Rebecca Charlwood have the sd Negroe man slave at the Rate of 34£ wch was bid by Joseph Badley on her behalf she giving bond for the payment thereof in one yeares time from the Day of the Date hereof The woman slave and Child was Sett at [...] presently five pounds which severall persons bid and James Rider bid 8£ and no person out bidd him It is ordered That he have the said Black woman &amp; Child at the sd price and vullue of 8£ he giving bond for the payment thereof in one yeares time The House in Fort James Fortum Lodge the sd Tho Ellison was sett up at 5£ which severall persons bid &amp; the Govr bid 15£ &amp; no person bidding above him It is ordered That the Govr have the sd House at ye sd rate of 15£ on the acct of Debts with the Rt Honble Compy to Thomas Ellison It is also agreed &amp; ordered That all the Cattles the Govr &amp; Councell bought of the</p>	<p>The remaining parts of the estate, consisting of a Black man, a Black woman with her child, and a house in Chappell Valley, had not yet been disposed of.</p> <p>An order was made that these items should be put to open outcry. The Black man was first offered at £30 0s 0d. Several persons bid, and at length Joseph Badley, acting on behalf of Rebecca Charlwood, widow, bid £34 0s 0d. No higher bid was made. An order was issued that Rebecca Charlwood should have the slave at the price of £34 0s 0d, she giving bond to pay the sum within one year from the date.</p> <p>The Black woman and child were then offered, initially set at [...] and presently at £5 0s 0d. Several bids were made. James Rider bid £8 0s 0d, and no higher offer followed. An order was made that he should have the woman and child at that price, giving bond to pay within one year.</p> <p>The house in Fort James, known as Fortum Lodge and formerly belonging to Thomas Ellison, was then offered at £5 0s 0d. Several bids were made. The Governor bid £15 0s 0d, and no one offered more. An order was made that the Governor should have the house at that price, on account of debts owed by the Right Honourable Company to Thomas Ellison.</p> <p>A further agreement and order provided that all the cattle purchased by the Governor and Council from Thomas Ellison for the use of the Right Honourable Company should be maintained together in one place, as there was a need for cattle [...]</p> <p>[...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The use of open outcry demonstrated a formal auction mechanism. This method ensured that assets</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>sd Thoms Ellison for ye use of the Rt Honble Compy be all in point in what estate of those cattle may being in want of Cattle [...] [...]. Goodwin</p>	<p>were sold at competitive prices through public bidding, which maximised returns for the Company.</p> <p>The requirement that purchasers give bond for payment showed the use of secured credit. A bond created a legally enforceable obligation, allowing buyers to acquire property immediately while deferring payment.</p> <p>Joseph Badley's role in bidding on behalf of Rebecca Charwood illustrated agency in transactions. Individuals could act for others in acquiring property, which enabled participation even when the principal was not present.</p> <p>The Governor's purchase of Fortum Lodge on account of Company debt revealed a method of settling obligations through asset transfer rather than cash payment. Property was used to offset outstanding liabilities, integrating accounting with asset distribution.</p> <p>The instruction to keep the cattle together indicated centralised management of livestock. This suggests an organised approach to resource control, particularly where scarcity made coordinated oversight necessary.</p> <p>The pricing differences between the man, the woman with child, and other assets reflected a structured valuation system. Labour capacity, age, and reproductive potential were factored into the economic assessment of slaves within the plantation economy.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to sell by auction rather than private agreement suggests that the Council sought to establish clear market value and avoid disputes over favouritism or undervaluation.</p> <p>The acceptance of bonds with a year to pay indicates that immediate liquidity was limited among purchasers. The Council may have prioritised distributing assets quickly while securing future payment rather than delaying sales.</p> <p>The Governor's acquisition of Fortum Lodge in settlement of Company debt suggests an effort to regularise accounts without requiring immediate cash transfer. This may have helped stabilise financial obligations tied to the earlier large purchase from Thomas Ellison.</p> <p>The order to keep the cattle together likely responded to a practical shortage. Concentrating livestock may have been intended to preserve breeding stock or ensure a reliable supply of draught or food resources for the Company's operations.</p>
57	51	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Monday the 21th Day of March 1697 att Fort James Pres[...] Richard R[...]ing Govr Capt Poirier Dep[...] Govr Sam[...] Hollebury Serjt having been very much remiss when sett upon the guard being Drunk which caus'd most of the rest of his guard to take the same liberty was now orderd to appeare to answer this his great Crime wch he humbly acknowledged yr Ds Crymes and in a submissive manner Craved pardon &amp; promising never more to fall in such a like Enormity It is orderd That the said Serjt Hollebury be for this time dismiss'd only with a severe Charge but if he fall againe in such a like Enormity that then he be punished to Loss of Place Gilbert Johnson a Dutch Cooper having lately been found very remiss of his Duty and disorderly Comporting forth of wch he was not then to answer this he was committed</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 21 March 1698 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>Samuel Hollebury, a serjeant, was brought before the Governor and Council for serious neglect of duty while on guard. He had been drunk, which led most of his guard to follow the same behaviour. He appeared and admitted the offence, expressed remorse, and asked for pardon, promising not to repeat such conduct.</p> <p>An order was made that Serjeant Hollebury should be dismissed for the present with a severe warning. If he committed the same offence again, he would lose his position.</p> <p>Gilbert Johnson, a Dutch cooper, had recently been found negligent in his duties and disorderly in his behaviour. At that time, he had not been required to answer for it, but he had been committed upon proof that he had previously caused trouble, and had been sent off the island. A further complaint was now made that he intended to harm someone. Information had been given on several occasions, including a statement by James [...], who said that he had heard Johnson declare that he would not be satisfied until he had taken revenge on some man.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>upon proof that he formerly might be weary of him and so sent him off the sd Island &amp; now an Aspersion Complaint having bin made agt him that he would doe some mischief to some Person or other &amp; Information having been often given since that same James [...] saith that some time since he heard the sd Dutch Cooper say yt he should never be satisfied before he had his revenge of some man Upon this debate It is ordered That the said Gilbert Johnson be put in Irons &amp; Kept in prison during pleasure [...] [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>After consideration, an order was made that Gilbert Johnson should be put in irons and kept in prison during the Governor and Council's pleasure. [...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The charge against Serjeant Hollebury showed the enforcement of military discipline within the island's defensive structure. Drunkenness on guard duty was treated as a serious breach because it compromised collective security, especially as it influenced the behaviour of others under his command. The decision to issue a severe warning rather than immediate dismissal demonstrated graduated punishment. Authority was exercised with conditional leniency, allowing correction of behaviour while reserving harsher penalties for repeated offences. The case of Gilbert Johnson illustrated the use of preventative detention. Imprisonment was imposed not only for proven misconduct but also on the basis of perceived threat, supported by repeated reports and sworn statements. The reference to Johnson having been previously sent off the island showed that expulsion functioned as a disciplinary measure. Return after such removal, combined with renewed suspicion, heightened the severity of the response. The phrase "kept in prison during pleasure" indicated indefinite detention at the discretion of the Governor and Council. This reflected a system in which executive authority could override fixed sentencing in matters of security or disorder.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The lenient treatment of Hollebury perhaps reflected his rank and willingness to confess. His admission and submission may have been judged sufficient to restore discipline without the disruption caused by removing a serjeant from service. The harsher treatment of Gilbert Johnson suggests that he was viewed as a continuing risk rather than a single offender. The combination of past misconduct, reported threats, and his return to the island may have led the Council to act pre-emptively to prevent potential violence. The reliance on repeated informal reports, including statements attributed to James [...], indicates that reputation and circulating information played a significant role in decision-making. The Council may have acted less on a single proven act than on an accumulated perception of danger.</p>
58	52	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 5th Day of Aprill 1697 att Fort James Pres[...] Richd R[...]ing Govr Capt Poirier Dep[...] Govr Whereas a Proclamation has bin Issued for Chusing and Nominating of Parrish officers for this present 1697 this day in Fort James Respective and this day to make returns thereof accordingly Eight persons for Church wardens and 4 for overseers of the Highways But contrary to the sd Proclamation two Edmunds with many of the planters came to the Govr and Councill, the sd Edmunds bringing a copy of paper wherein were only sett downe two for Church wardens and the sd Edmunds declared to the Govr &amp; Councill that they had made choyce but of two and thought they had occasion to make choyce of no more, for it was their Right to</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 5 April 1698 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor. A proclamation had previously been issued for the choosing and nominating of parish officers for that year. Returns were to be made that day, with eight persons nominated for churchwardens and four for overseers of the highways. Contrary to this instruction, two men named Edmunds, accompanied by several planters, appeared before the Governor and Council. They produced a paper listing only two names for churchwardens. The Edmunds men declared that only two had been chosen, as they believed no more were required. They asserted that the right to choose and nominate such officers belonged to the planters, not to the Governor, and that the Company had no authority to issue such an order. The Governor refused to accept this return on the grounds that too few had been nominated. The Edmunds men further stated that the planters were greatly aggrieved by the Right Honourable Company. The Governor and Council responded that the matter would be formally considered, and required that the</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Chuse and Nominat such officers &amp; not the Govr and that the Company had no such power to give such an Order But the Govr would not Receive the sd acco because fewer were chosen, the sd Edmunds further said that all the planters were much aggrieved by the sd Rt Honble Compy whereupon the Govr &amp; Councill Declare that they would put in their appearance under their hands, and it should be considered what he designes to doe standing in the plannell Chamber, gave the sd much parsons Discouse given to the Governm by the sd Edmunds they brought in fewer persons for Church wardens &amp; fower persons for over seers of the Highways which now is Collected Edwd Edmunds Thom Goodwin John Deth Jo: Wadsye It is ordered That the sd Richd and Edwd Edmunds be appointed Church wardens for this present year 1697</p>	<p>planters present their position in writing under their hands.</p> <p>After further discussion in the council chamber, additional names were submitted. Four persons were returned as churchwardens and four as overseers of the highways. The names recorded were Edward Edmunds, Thomas Goodwin, John Deth, and Joseph Wadsye.</p> <p>An order was made that Richard Edmunds and Edward Edmunds should serve as churchwardens for the year 1697.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The proclamation for parish officers showed the extension of formal administrative structures into local society. Churchwardens and overseers of highways held responsibilities tied to both religious order and infrastructure maintenance, indicating organised governance at parish level.</p> <p>The planters' claim that they held the right to nominate officers revealed a contest over authority. This reflected tension between local inhabitants and the Company's centralised control, particularly regarding who exercised power over community administration.</p> <p>The Governor's refusal to accept an incomplete return demonstrated enforcement of procedural compliance. The requirement for a set number of nominees ensured that officeholding followed prescribed structures rather than informal selection.</p> <p>The instruction that the planters submit their position in writing under their hands indicated the use of formal petitioning. Written declarations created a record that could be reviewed and judged, reinforcing administrative control over disputes.</p> <p>The final appointment of Richard Edmunds and Edward Edmunds showed a compromise outcome. While the Governor asserted authority, members of the protesting group were still incorporated into officeholding, which helped stabilise governance.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The initial refusal to nominate the required number of officers suggests a deliberate act of resistance. By limiting nominations, the planters may have attempted to challenge the Company's authority or assert customary rights.</p> <p>The eventual submission of additional names indicates that pressure from the Governor and Council was effective. The planters likely adjusted their position to avoid further confrontation while still maintaining some influence over the outcome.</p> <p>The appointment of individuals from the Edmunds group suggests a calculated response by the Governor. Including them in office may have been intended to reduce dissent and integrate opposition figures into the administrative system.</p>
59	53	<p>[...] Matthew Bazett          [...] Marsh } East Division          Tho Fowdall } West Division          [...] Dixon          It is ordered          That Wm Marsh and Thom Fowdall be appointed overseers of the Highways for this present year 1697          Also It is ordered          That the sd Church wardens and overseers of the Highways do Summon all the Govr &amp; Councill that are absent to their appearance on Monday the 17th of this Instant in and that they be Sworne and invested in the said office &amp; then the sd Church wardens and overseers of the sd Highways returne their acct &amp; Discharge          [...]          [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>Further names were recorded for the parish divisions. Matthew Bazett and William Marsh were listed for the East Division, and Thomas Fowdall and [...] Dixon for the West Division.</p> <p>An order was made that William Marsh and Thomas Fowdall should serve as overseers of the highways for the year 1697.</p> <p>A further order required that the churchwardens and overseers of the highways should summon all members of the Governor and Council who were absent to appear on Monday 17 April 1697. On that day, the appointed officers were to be sworn and formally invested in their offices. After this, the churchwardens and overseers were to render their accounts and be discharged from their duties.</p> <p>[...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The division into East and West sectors showed a structured territorial organisation for administration. Responsibilities were allocated geographically, which</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>allowed oversight of local conditions and distribution of labour.</p> <p>The appointment of overseers of highways reflected the importance of maintaining infrastructure. These officers were responsible for organising labour and ensuring roads remained usable, which was essential for movement of goods and communication across the island.</p> <p>The requirement to summon absent members of the Governor and Council demonstrated the authority of parish officers to enforce attendance. This indicates that administrative functions could operate across different levels of governance, with local officers supporting central authority.</p> <p>The swearing and formal investiture of officers marked the legal activation of their roles. Authority was not fully recognised until this ceremony was completed, which reinforced the legitimacy of officeholding.</p> <p>The obligation to render accounts before discharge showed that officeholders were subject to financial and administrative accountability. Their duties included reporting on their actions, which enabled oversight and reduced the risk of misuse of authority.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The requirement to summon absent councillors suggests that attendance may have been inconsistent. Empowering parish officers to enforce presence may have been intended to ensure that governance operated with full participation at key moments.</p> <p>The instruction that officers should render accounts upon completion of their term indicates concern with proper record-keeping. This may reflect previous issues with incomplete reporting or disputes over how duties had been carried out.</p>
60	54	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Court of Justice held on Monday ye 5th  Day of Aprill in the afternoon at the  Session house near Fort James  Pres[...] Richd R[...]ing Govr  Capt Poirier Dep[...] Govr  After the Court was opened according to the usuall  manner the persons appointed for Jurors made their  personall appearance and their persons appointed are  whose names follow:  Orlando Bagley foreman  one  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12  Richard Griffen Churchwarden presented to the Court  Isabell Shayles Co[...] who had a Licentious Tongue [...]  for Keeping and Entertaining many the Idle people of  the  Frewdale Drinking to Drunkenness in her House on the  day of being a Sunday in Time of Divine Service in  Company  of some Dutch men belonging to the ship Mary Ann in  the  Road  The said Shayles saith that on the said Sunday  the said Mary the wife of the sd Tho Frewdale came  down  from the Country to the Fort and having forgotten the  key of  House went in to the sd Shayles house, and there stayed  till</p>	<p>A court of justice was held on Monday 5 April 1697 in the afternoon at the session house near Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>After the court was opened in the usual manner, the appointed jurors appeared in person. Orlando Bagley was named as foreman, with additional jurors listed as 2 through 12.</p> <p>Richard Griffen, a churchwarden, presented a complaint to the court against Isabell Shayles [...]. She was accused of having a licentious tongue and of keeping and entertaining many idle persons at the house of Frewdale. It was alleged that drinking to drunkenness had taken place there on a Sunday during the time of divine service, in the company of some Dutch men belonging to the ship <i>Mary Ann</i>, then lying in the road.</p> <p>Isabell Shayles responded that on that Sunday Mary, the wife of Thomas Frewdale, had come down from the country to the fort and, having forgotten the key of her house, had entered Shayles's house and remained there. Shayles stated that she later made a bowl of punch, and after some time another, but not during sermon time. She added that if Mary Frewdale drank excessively, she could not prevent it, and maintained that only two bowls of punch had been made that day.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The convening of a court of justice with a jury demonstrated the formal legal structure operating on the island. The presence of a foreman and multiple jurors reflected an organised system of trial procedure modelled on English practice.</p> <p>The role of the churchwarden in bringing the complaint showed the integration of moral oversight with legal enforcement. Churchwardens acted not only in ecclesiastical matters but also in policing behaviour that disrupted social and religious order.</p> <p>The accusation of misconduct during divine service indicated the enforcement of Sabbath observance.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>when she made a Bole of Punch and after a while more and but not in Sermon Time and if the Mary Frewdale would take such great Draughts she could not tell how to help it saying that he made out two bowles of Punch all that day</p>	<p>Attendance at worship and restraint from disorderly behaviour were treated as matters of public discipline.</p> <p>The reference to Dutch sailors from the <i>Mary Ann</i> highlighted the presence of foreign seamen within the island's social space. Their involvement in the incident suggested that interaction between local inhabitants and transient maritime populations could generate concerns about disorder.</p> <p>The defence offered by Shayles relied on limiting responsibility. By emphasising timing outside sermon hours and the voluntary behaviour of Mary Frewdale, she attempted to separate her actions from the alleged offence.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The complaint may have been driven as much by concern over disorder as by moral offence. The gathering of idle persons and foreign sailors in a private house could have been viewed as a threat to discipline within a small and controlled settlement.</p> <p>Shayles's emphasis that the drinking did not occur during sermon time suggests awareness of the legal boundary. Her defence appears structured to avoid the specific offence of violating Sabbath restrictions rather than denying all drinking.</p> <p>The involvement of a churchwarden in initiating the case suggests that local authorities were actively monitoring behaviour. This may reflect ongoing efforts to regulate social conduct and prevent the spread of disorder linked to visiting ships.</p>
61	55	<p>Richard Parrum Sworne saith that on Sunday the 22th day of 8ber Last past he went into the said Shayles House where he saw Mary the wife of Thoms Frewdale a Drinking of Punch in Company with some Dutch men belonging to the shipp Mary Ann in the Road, of which punch he Drank once &amp; so went his way and then the said Mary Frewdale seemed to be very sober The sayd aforesd Parrum no time of Night it was when he went into the said Shayles house and said it was for he tooke it betwixt morning &amp; Evening Prayers The said Parrum further saith that towards the Evening the sd Shayles wife seemed to shoue a signe of meate for supper and then he Desired the Parrums wife to make haste for saith he I am afeard the Dutch men at my house will Debauch Mary Frewdale but the truth of her business he knowes not Elizabeth the wife of the said Richard Parrum Sworne saith that on Sunday day Mrs Shayles came to her house and Desired to borrow a signe of meate for supper with her Sent her and her servants a giving her sd meate &amp; Mrs Shayles said to her pray make haste for I am afraid the Dutch men at my House will Debauch the sd Mary aforesd further saith not Tho: Easton Sworne saith that on the sd Lords day he was sitting towards ye evening upon the fort James Towne Hall staires &amp; observed the people to goe into ye sd Shayles House where were the sd Mary Frewdale Drunk and some Dutch men a Drinking to the Dutch men Drunk &amp; him within</p>	<p>Richard Parrum gave sworn evidence that on Sunday 22 October 1696 he went into the house of Isabell Shayles. There he saw Mary, the wife of Thomas Frewdale, drinking punch in the company of Dutch men belonging to the ship <i>Mary Ann</i> lying in the road. He drank once from the punch and then left. At that time Mary Frewdale appeared sober. Parrum could not state the exact time, but believed it was between morning and evening prayers.</p> <p>Parrum further stated that towards the evening Shayles appeared to be preparing food for supper. He told his own wife to make haste, as he feared that the Dutch men at Shayles's house would debauch Mary Frewdale, though he did not know the truth of what would occur.</p> <p>Elizabeth, the wife of Richard Parrum, also gave sworn evidence. She stated that on that Sunday Mrs Shayles came to her house and asked to borrow some food for supper. She sent food with her servant. Mrs Shayles urged haste, saying she feared that the Dutch men at her house would debauch Mary Frewdale.</p> <p>Thomas Easton gave sworn evidence that on that Lord's Day, towards evening, he was sitting on the steps of the town hall at Fort James. He observed people going into Shayles's house. He saw Mary Frewdale there in a drunken condition, with Dutch men drinking. Shortly after, Shayles called him to assist in carrying Mary Frewdale upstairs, as she was so drunk that she could not climb the stairs herself. He helped and laid her on a bed.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The use of multiple sworn testimonies showed the evidentiary process of the court. Judgement relied on corroboration from several witnesses, each providing a partial account that together formed a fuller picture of events.</p> <p>The identification of the date as 22 October 1696, months before the hearing, indicated that offences could be prosecuted retrospectively. This suggests that community memory and reputation played a role in bringing delayed complaints before the court.</p> <p>The emphasis on timing in relation to morning and evening prayers reflected the regulation of behaviour on Sundays. The distinction between acceptable and</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>the stages, and every little time after the sd Mrs Shayles wife him to help her to carry the sd Mrs Frewdale up stairs who was so Drunk could not goe up the staires which he did &amp; laid her downe upon the bed further saith not Then</p>	<p>punishable conduct depended on whether actions occurred during designated periods of worship.</p> <p>The repeated concern that Mary Frewdale might be “debauched” revealed a focus on protecting female reputation and sexual conduct. Such concerns were treated as matters of public order rather than purely private behaviour.</p> <p>The involvement of Dutch sailors again highlighted the interaction between local inhabitants and foreign crews. Their presence in domestic settings was framed as a source of disorder and moral risk.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The variation in witness accounts, with Parrum describing Mary as sober earlier and Easton describing her as drunk later, suggests that the court was presented with a sequence of events over the course of the day. This may have strengthened the case by showing progression from moderate behaviour to disorder.</p> <p>The repeated references to fear of debauchery indicate that concern extended beyond drinking itself to potential sexual misconduct. The case may have been pursued more vigorously because of this perceived threat to social norms.</p> <p>The summoning of witnesses who observed events at different times of day suggests a deliberate effort to build a comprehensive narrative. This may reflect the court’s intention to establish not only the occurrence of drinking but its extent and consequences.</p>
62	56	<p>Then the Licence Granted to the said Shayles was Read that the Jury might Consider if she acted according to his Licence or no</p> <p>The said Richd Grifer Churchwarden presented to this Court John Nicholls planter for Entertaining of Drunkenness the said Mary Frewdale in his House in the Country on Sunday the 30th day of 8ber last past</p> <p>The said John Nicholls Denys the said Churchwardens accusation</p> <p>Thom: Frewdale Sworne saith that his wife Mary Frewdale went from his House on Saturday Morning the 29th of last past, very betime, and heard nothing of her till Sunday, when he heard that he had bin at the sd Nicholls House where he went to see if she was there, but found her not, being then Told by sd Nicholls that she had bin there, and had gone away on Saturday before, and that he had gone with her as far the [?] where he went a one side to Ease himself, in which while she went he knows not where for he saw her no more since that time</p> <p>Peter Williams Sworne saith yt on Saturday the 29th day of 8ber last being at the House of John Nicholls at about 8 or 9 of the Clock in the Morning came the said Mary Frewdale, and asked for a Bottle of Arrack (she having a Stone Bottle with her) which she had, then the said Nicholls gave her a Boule of Punch, and in the Drinking of it, he told the said Nicholls she says why she had come away from her Husband in a huff, and that he and her Husband had very high words, he Calling her whore and Bitch, and many such other</p>	<p>The licence granted to Isabell Shayles was read before the jury so that they might consider whether she had acted within its terms.</p> <p>Richard Griffen, churchwarden, then presented John Nicholls, a planter, to the court for entertaining Mary Frewdale in a state of drunkenness at his house in the country on Sunday 30 October 1696. Nicholls denied the accusation.</p> <p>Thomas Frewdale gave sworn evidence that his wife Mary Frewdale had left his house early on Saturday 29 October 1696. He heard nothing of her until Sunday, when he was told she had been at the house of John Nicholls. He went there to find her but did not see her. Nicholls told him that she had been there but had left on the Saturday. He added that he had accompanied her part of the way, but while he stepped aside to relieve himself she went off, and he did not see her again.</p> <p>Peter Williams gave sworn evidence that on Saturday 29 October 1696, at about eight or nine in the morning, he was at the house of John Nicholls when Mary Frewdale arrived carrying a stone bottle. She asked for arrack and was given it. Nicholls then provided her with a bowl of punch. While drinking, she said that she had left her husband in anger after a quarrel in which he had called her “whore” and “bitch” and other such names. She also stated that she did not know whether her husband had been a man or a woman since the Wednesday night of their marriage. After the first bowl of punch was consumed, another was made, and further drink followed. The company remained together for most of the night into Sunday morning.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The reading of Shayles’s licence before the jury showed that licensed activity was subject to defined conditions. Compliance with those terms formed a legal standard against which conduct was judged.</p> <p>The charge against John Nicholls demonstrated that responsibility for disorder extended beyond public houses to private dwellings. Entertaining drunkenness, especially on a Sunday, was treated as an offence regardless of location.</p> <p>The sworn testimony of Thomas Frewdale and Peter Williams illustrated the court’s reliance on personal accounts to reconstruct events. Contradictions between witnesses were not resolved immediately but contributed to the overall evidentiary record.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>names, and that she knows not if her Husband was man or woman since the Wednesday night they were married, and after ye Boule of Punch the sd Nicholls had given her had bin Drank out, another was made, &amp; so more in so much yt they stayd up most part of the night on the Lords day morning</p>	<p>The reference to arrack, a distilled spirit, and the preparation of punch showed the circulation of imported alcohol within the island economy. Such commodities were central to social interaction but also to offences of disorder.</p> <p>Mary Frewdale's reported statements about her husband revealed how marital conflict could enter legal proceedings. Personal disputes became relevant where they were linked to public disorder or moral offence.</p> <p>The continuation of drinking into Sunday morning brought the activity within the prohibited period of the Lord's Day. This strengthened the charge by placing it in direct violation of Sabbath regulation.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The reading of Shayles's licence suggests that the court considered whether her conduct breached formal conditions, indicating a possible intention to revoke or sanction her licence depending on the verdict.</p> <p>The accusation against Nicholls, supported by detailed testimony about Saturday and Sunday drinking, suggests that authorities aimed to establish a pattern of behaviour rather than a single incident. This may have been intended to secure a stronger case for conviction.</p> <p>The inclusion of Mary Frewdale's remarks about her marriage may have served to explain her movements and behaviour, but it also introduced reputational issues. The court may have used such testimony to frame her conduct as disorderly and morally suspect.</p> <p>The detailed account of extended drinking suggests that the case was not limited to Sabbath observance alone. The authorities may have been concerned with broader issues of social control, including gatherings that blurred the boundary between private and public disorder.</p>
63	57	<p>they made another Bowle of Punch and then the sd Nicholls and his family went to reading in the Bible and other good Books, and the sd Mary Frewdale was not in the least concerned in Drinking all that Lords Day, and saith that late in the night Robt Adam who looked after the Mr Johnsons Concerns in the Country came there to see if a Black of the sd Mr Johnsons was there was he mist off of the House, who was not there so the sd Adam lay there till morning when this Deponent and Adam went away to the sd Mr Shofords house, leaving the sd Mary Frewdale in the sd Nicholls house, were some time after came in the sd Nicholls who said yt the sd Mary Frewdale went from his house presently after them and he followed her in a little time after who over took her almost by his old goat house he being a going to his Cabbage Tree Ground and said yt when he came to the sd old goats house he went a one side to ease himself of what he had done, in which time he looked if she had not gone the way but could not see her further saith not Then the Jury withdrew and stayed some considerable time and when they returned they brought in their verdict That the said Isabell Shayles was cast by the sd Church wardens he not having kept such orders as is Expressed in his Licence, and for to allow Two Dayes</p>	<p>Further sworn evidence stated that after additional drinking on Saturday, another bowl of punch was made. John Nicholls and his family then turned to reading the Bible and other religious books. Mary Frewdale was said not to have taken part in any drinking on the Lord's Day itself. Late that night, Robert Adam, who oversaw Mr Johnson's affairs in the country, came to the house searching for one of Johnson's slaves who had gone missing. The slave was not there, and Adam remained at the house until morning. At daybreak, this deponent and Adam went to Mr Shoford's house, leaving Mary Frewdale at Nicholls's house. Nicholls later reported that she had left shortly after them. He followed and caught up with her near his old goat house while on his way to his cabbage tree ground. He stepped aside briefly, and when he looked again, she had gone and he saw no more of her.</p> <p>The jury withdrew for some time and, upon returning, delivered their verdict. Isabell Shayles was found at fault on the presentation of the churchwarden for failing to observe the conditions set out in her licence. She was ordered to perform two days' labour towards the repair of the church. The jury also found that Richard Griffen had no cause to bring the charge against John Nicholls.</p> <p>Mary Oliver, a free Black woman, who had recently given birth to a bastard child, was ordered to appear for punishment according to the offence. An order was made that she should receive 21 lashes on her naked body under the gallows, which was carried out immediately.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The jury's role in withdrawing and returning with a verdict showed a formal deliberative process. Decision-making was separated from presentation of evidence, reinforcing a structured legal procedure.</p> <p>The finding against Shayles based on breach of licence conditions demonstrated regulatory control over licensed activity. Licences imposed enforceable</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>work towards the reparations of the Church  And that the sd Richd Griffin had no cause to make presentation agt the sd Nicholls  Mary Oliver a Black free woman having lately bin Delivered of a Bastard was this day ordered to make her appearance  in order to receive such punishment provided for such Offence  Therefore  It is ordered  That she receive immediately under the Gallows 21 lashes  on her naked body which was accordingly inflicted</p>	<p>behavioural standards, and failure to comply led to penalty rather than loss of licence in this instance.</p> <p>The sentence of two days' labour towards church repair reflected the use of corporal or service penalties tied to community benefit. Punishment was directed toward maintaining public infrastructure as well as correcting behaviour.</p> <p>The acquittal of John Nicholls showed that accusations required sufficient proof. Even when suspicion existed, the court could reject a charge if evidence did not meet the required standard.</p> <p>The punishment of Mary Oliver for bearing a bastard child illustrated the enforcement of moral and sexual regulation. Such offences were treated as matters of public discipline, with corporal punishment used to enforce social norms.</p> <p>The execution of punishment under the gallows in a public setting emphasised deterrence. The visibility of punishment reinforced authority and communicated expected behaviour to the wider community.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The relatively light penalty imposed on Shayles suggests that the court distinguished between disorderly conduct and more serious moral breaches. Her offence may have been treated as regulatory rather than deeply criminal.</p> <p>The jury's rejection of the case against Nicholls indicates that conflicting testimony weakened the accusation. The defence evidence that no drinking occurred on Sunday may have created sufficient doubt to avoid conviction.</p> <p>The immediate execution of punishment on Mary Oliver suggests an intention to act swiftly and publicly. This may have been designed to reinforce moral discipline and deter similar conduct without delay.</p> <p>The contrast between the procedural handling of Shayles and Nicholls and the summary punishment of Mary Oliver highlights differing standards. Formal evidentiary processes applied to disputes over conduct, while moral offences could trigger immediate and severe corporal punishment.</p>
64	58	<p>Whereas Israell Shayles being this day found that he had not followed the rules prescribed in his Licence granted to him for halfe a yeare  It is ordered  That the said Shayles forfaite his obligation which his obligation of five pound is of five pounds sterl for his liberty &amp;  upon his keeping ill order in his House &amp;c to be collected accordingly  [...]  [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>Isabell Shayles was found on that day to have failed to follow the rules set out in the licence granted to her for a term of half a year.</p> <p>An order was made that Shayles should forfeit the obligation attached to that licence. This obligation, amounting to £5 0s 0d sterling, had been given as security for the liberty to keep the house. As she had maintained disorder within it, the sum was to be collected accordingly.</p> <p>[...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The forfeiture of the £5 0s 0d obligation showed that licences were backed by financial security. This functioned as a bond, ensuring compliance with prescribed rules by attaching a monetary penalty to misconduct.</p> <p>The reference to "liberty" indicated that permission to keep such a house was conditional rather than inherent. Operation depended on formal approval, which could be regulated and enforced by the Governor and Council.</p> <p>The collection of the forfeited sum demonstrated administrative enforcement of penalties. Financial sanctions were actively pursued, not merely declared, which reinforced the authority of licensing conditions.</p> <p>This action followed the earlier finding against Shayles, showing continuity between judgement and enforcement. The system moved from verdict to penalty in a structured sequence.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to enforce the forfeiture after the earlier judgement suggests that the authorities intended to make an example of Shayles. This may have been</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>designed to deter others holding similar licences from allowing disorder.</p> <p>The use of a relatively modest but enforceable sum indicates a calibrated penalty. The amount was sufficient to impose consequence without permanently removing the ability to operate, suggesting an intention to correct behaviour rather than eliminate the activity altogether.</p>
<a href="#">65</a>	59	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 6th Day of Aprill 1697 att Fort James  Pres[...] Richd R[...]ing Govr  Capt Poirier Dep[...] Govr  Richd Leach Planter who held by Lease Ten acres Land of the Rt Honble Compy Scituate and being the same Parcell  which Land was formerly in the Possession of Mr Tho Smalley &amp;  was since granted to Frances his wife of the sd Leach in his  Chepstone a plantation he having married the sd Frances  under the sd Richd Leach which expired the 24th day of June next now desired that he might have a Grant of the sd  might be renewed to him at the sd of the sd time which his prior  the sd 24th day of June for one year longer  It is ordered  That the sd Richd Leach request be granted  and that his Lease be renewed for one year longer from the 24th day of June 1697 of the same Conditions provided for the sd Land as in the sd Lease is expressed [...]  [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 6 April 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>Richard Leach, a planter, appeared. He held a lease of ten acres of land from the Right Honourable Company. This parcel had formerly been in the possession of Mr Thomas Smalley and had later been granted to Frances, now the wife of Leach, at Chepstone plantation, following his marriage to her. The lease was due to expire on 24 June 1697. Leach requested that it be renewed for a further year from that date.</p> <p>An order was made that his request should be granted. The lease was renewed for one year from 24 June 1697 on the same conditions as previously set out.  [...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The lease of land from the Company showed that landholding operated through tenancy rather than outright ownership. The Company retained ultimate control while granting conditional use to settlers.</p> <p>The reference to the land passing from Thomas Smalley to Frances, and then to Richard Leach through marriage, demonstrated how property interests could transfer through marital relationships. Marriage functioned as a recognised mechanism for consolidating control over land.</p> <p>The renewal of the lease for a fixed term indicated that tenure was time-limited and subject to periodic review. Continued occupation depended on approval by the Governor and Council.</p> <p>The continuation of the same conditions emphasised contractual stability. Obligations attached to the land remained binding across renewals, ensuring continuity in rents, duties, or usage requirements.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to renew the lease for only one additional year suggests that the Council preferred to retain flexibility. Short-term renewal allowed continued oversight of Leach's use of the land before granting any longer tenure.</p> <p>The fact that Leach formally petitioned for renewal indicates that tenure was not automatic. This may reflect a system in which the Company actively managed land distribution to maintain control over settlement and productivity.</p>
<a href="#">66</a>	60	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Thursday the 8th Day of Aprill 1697 Att Fort James  Present Richd R[...]ing Govr  Capt Poirier Dep[...] Govr</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Thursday 8 April 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p>
<a href="#">67</a>	61	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 19th Day of Aprill 1697 att Fort James  Pres[...] Richd R[...]ing Governr  Capt Poirier Dep[...] Govr  Joyce Huntley Complain of James Grandy her Father in law with whom she has Dwelt for some time past saying  that the sd Grandy abused her in words &amp; often calling her  whore, slut, Bitch, &amp; that he had often Threatened her Life</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 19 April 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>Joyce Huntley brought a complaint against her father-in-law, James Grandy, with whom she had lived for some time. She stated that he had abused her verbally, frequently calling her “whore”, “slut”, and “bitch”, and that he had often threatened her life. Grandy admitted that not long before, when his wife, Huntley's mother, was living elsewhere, Huntley had come to the door and accused him of murdering her mother. He said that he went out, struck her, and called</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>The said Grandy saith that not long since the sd Huntleys mother his wife was living on the other side in the at the time, and the said Huntley came at the Doore, knocking and sayd to her have you murdered my mother, whereupon he went out &amp; struck her &amp; did call her whore and Bitch but now saith yt it was in his passion, for altho' he did then call her whore he knowes no witness against her After many words past between the sd Grandy &amp; Huntley his Daughter in law, and appearing to us that the sd Huntley complaint was and of great standing It is ordered That the sd Huntleys Complaint be this time remitted it being to both many occasions given &amp; confessed but if she give further occasion of Complaint that then he be bound to question not only for that, but for this also, &amp; that he be now cautioned to behave more regularly and that he be careful to give no more cause of Complaint, which he promised to doe so were Dismissed Mr Thom Goodwin Complain of Hatton Starling The sd Starling is presented for buying a knife from Garret a slave of Mrs Goodwin without leave The said Hatton Starling acknowledges that he had a knife of the sd Garret for which he did give him half a Dollar Whereas a proclamation has bin issued as appears in the Consultation held on that if any white person should be found to Traffick or barter any slave or commodity without any Bargain or Receipt in writing, should be accounted accessory to felony &amp; should pay a fine of 40 s for every such offence according to the Rules prescribed by the Rt Honble Company in such cases before a fine is to be paid to the Company</p>	<p>her “whore” and “bitch”, but claimed this was done in anger and that he knew of no evidence against her. After extended exchange between the parties, it appeared that Huntley’s complaint had been of long standing. An order was made that her complaint should for the present be remitted, as fault had been admitted on both sides. It was further ordered that if she gave further cause for complaint, Grandy would be bound to answer not only for any new offence but also for this one. He was cautioned to behave more regularly and to give no further cause for complaint, which he promised to do, and both were dismissed.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin then brought a complaint against Hatton Starling. Starling was presented for having bought a knife from Garret, a slave belonging to Mrs Goodwin, without permission. Starling admitted that he had received the knife from Garret and had given him half a dollar in return.</p> <p>Reference was made to a proclamation issued previously, which declared that any white person who trafficked or bartered with a slave for goods without a formal bargain or written receipt would be treated as accessory to felony and would incur a fine of 40s 0d for each such offence, in accordance with the rules set by the Right Honourable Company.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The handling of Joyce Huntley’s complaint showed the Council’s role in mediating domestic conflict. Rather than imposing immediate punishment, the matter was conditionally resolved, combining warning with the threat of future liability.</p> <p>The decision to remit the complaint while recording admitted misconduct created a form of suspended judgement. This allowed the authorities to retain leverage over Grandy, as past behaviour could be revived in future proceedings.</p> <p>The language of verbal abuse and threats being brought before the Council demonstrated that household disorder could become a matter of public governance. Private disputes were subject to oversight where they disturbed social order.</p> <p>The case against Hatton Starling illustrated strict regulation of trade with slaves. Transactions involving slaves required formal permission and documentation, reflecting concern over unauthorised exchange and control of property.</p> <p>The classification of such unauthorised barter as accessory to felony showed the severity attached to these interactions. It linked informal trade directly to criminal liability, reinforcing the Company’s authority over both labour and goods.</p> <p>The requirement for a written bargain or receipt indicated the importance of documentation in validating transactions. Written records functioned as proof of legitimacy and a safeguard against illicit dealing.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to dismiss the complaint between Huntley and Grandy despite admitted violence suggests that the Council aimed to contain the dispute without escalating it. Maintaining household stability may have been prioritised over formal punishment.</p> <p>The conditional warning imposed on Grandy indicates that the Council sought to deter further misconduct while avoiding immediate sanction. This may reflect a pragmatic approach to recurring domestic tensions.</p> <p>The enforcement of strict rules against trading with slaves suggests concern over loss of control. Unregulated exchange may have allowed slaves to acquire goods or influence outside authorised channels, which the Company sought to prevent.</p> <p>Starling’s admission and the clear reference to the proclamation indicate that this case may have been used to reinforce existing regulations. The Council may have</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			intended to remind others of the penalties attached to such behaviour.
68	62	<p>It is ordered  That the sd Hatton Starling pay to the sd Mr Goodwin 10 s and be fined to the Honble Compy 3 s which shall be  to the Church acct towards the rebuilding of a new Church in the Country, the sd Mr Goodwin also Declared that he gave the sd 10 s ordered to be paid to him  to the Church and that the sd Garret a slave be kept according to the sd Rules  Mar[...] Wilson Executrix of the last will and Testament of Edward Wilson her Father, and James Rider and Thomas Fowdall overseers thereof presented the sd Wilsons will to be  proved which was accordingly done by the Oathes of Mr Welling and Jo Cole  It is ordered  That the sd will be Received and Copy given thereof when desired  The sd persons also presented the Inventory of the sd Edward Wilson Estate, which made oath to the truth thereof  It is ordered  That the sd Inventory be Received and approved and Copy given thereof when desired  Sarah Enderby Complains of Sarah Mudge for that she the sd Mudge whipt her son as he was a stealing of  Green Tobacco on the Honble Compy ground  The sd Sarah Mudge saith that she did whip Enderbys son because he was by the said Enderbys House, but she saw him go to Call so often as said that Goods in a string were per same bag, does some boy Res and  is Troubles  And it appearing that the sd Sarah Enderby did Encourage her son to say the sd Sarah Mudge instead of  correcting him for it  It is ordered  That they be both Dismist &amp; she ordered to instruct her son (who is but a Child) better then to Call after such names to any man  Edwd Edmunds &amp; John Lughsin Executors of the last Will and Testament of Mary the Deceased wife of Thomas Dixon  Brought</p>	<p>An order was made that Hatton Starling should pay 10s 0d to Thomas Goodwin and be fined 3s 0d to the Honourable Company. This fine was to be applied to the church account towards the rebuilding of a new church in the country. Thomas Goodwin declared that he gave the 10s 0d awarded to him for the same purpose. It was further ordered that Garret, the slave, should be kept in accordance with the established rules.</p> <p>Mar[...] Wilson, executrix of the last will and testament of her father Edward Wilson, appeared together with James Rider and Thomas Fowdall, overseers of the will. They presented the will for probate. It was proved by the oaths of Mr Welling and Jo Cole. An order was made that the will should be received and that copies should be issued when requested.</p> <p>The same parties presented an inventory of Edward Wilson's estate and swore to its accuracy. An order was made that the inventory should be received and approved, with copies to be provided when required.</p> <p>Sarah Enderby brought a complaint against Sarah Mudge, alleging that Mudge had whipped her son when he had been stealing green tobacco on the Honourable Company's land. Sarah Mudge admitted that she had whipped the boy, stating that she had seen him near Enderby's house and believed he had repeatedly gone to take goods. It appeared that Sarah Enderby had encouraged her son to accuse Mudge rather than correcting him.</p> <p>An order was made that both women should be dismissed. Enderby was instructed to discipline her son, who was described as a child, and to teach him not to call others by offensive names.</p> <p>Edward Edmunds and John Lughsin, executors of the last will and testament of Mary, the deceased wife of Thomas Dixon, brought [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The allocation of fines to church rebuilding showed how penalties were redirected into communal projects. Financial sanctions served both punitive and constructive purposes within the settlement.</p> <p>The acceptance and proof of Edward Wilson's will demonstrated the formal probate process. Witnesses were required to swear to its validity, establishing legal authority for the distribution of the estate.</p> <p>The approval of the inventory alongside the will confirmed the structured administration of estates. Executors and overseers were required to account for property under oath, ensuring transparency and control.</p> <p>The complaint concerning the whipping of a child on Company land illustrated overlapping authority in discipline. Private individuals could enforce order in response to theft, particularly where Company property was involved.</p> <p>The dismissal of the case against Sarah Mudge, combined with the instruction to Enderby, showed that responsibility for a child's conduct rested with the parent. Parental oversight was treated as a mechanism of social control.</p> <p>The requirement that the slave Garret be kept according to established rules reinforced regulation over enslaved persons. Control extended not only to their labour but also to their conduct and interactions.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The redirection of both the fine and Goodwin's compensation to church rebuilding suggests that the authorities aimed to link enforcement with visible community benefit. This may have reinforced legitimacy for penalties imposed.</p> <p>The swift dismissal of the dispute between Enderby and Mudge indicates that the Council sought to avoid escalating minor conflicts. Responsibility was reassigned</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>rather than formally adjudicated, which reduced administrative burden.</p> <p>The emphasis on instructing the child suggests concern with early discipline. The authorities may have viewed correction at a young age as essential to maintaining order in a small and closely regulated community.</p>
69	63	<p>brought the Inventory of her Estate, of which they made oath to the truth thereof before us Learned &amp; accordingly It is ordered That the sd Inventory be received &amp; approved and Copy given when Desired. The Churchwardens for the Yeaer last past vizt Sam: Taylor and Richd Griffin Dd their acco of the two Last Years Collections of Six pence p head in which it appears that they have Entred the Office Last past for two years Collection the sume of [...] and also Delivered the sume of [...] they had in their hands which has bin given unto Ministers wch have bin here have administred ye Lords Supper wch sd acco were all Examined and approved It is ordered That the sd Sam: Taylor and Richd Griffin be Dischargd from ye sd office of Churchwardens. Edwd Edmunds &amp; John Dick according to order appeared in order to be Invested in the office of Churchward[...] but when they Came to be sworne for the Trust performing &amp; Executing the sd office, ye sd Edmunds Desyrd to be Excused Except the Govr would write home how farr in his office he must goe or else he would not be sworne, nor goe away without being Invested in the sd office upon wch this matter was referred to further consideration. [...] [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>Edward Edmunds and John Lughsin, executors of the last will and testament of Mary, the deceased wife of Thomas Dixon, brought an inventory of her estate. They swore to its truth before the Governor and Council. An order was made that the inventory should be received and approved, and that copies should be issued when requested.</p> <p>The churchwardens for the previous year, Samuel Taylor and Richard Griffin, presented their accounts for the last two years' collections of 6d per head. The accounts showed that they had received the sum of [...] and had also delivered the sum of [...] which had been given to ministers who had visited the island and administered the Lord's Supper. These accounts were examined and approved.</p> <p>An order was made that Samuel Taylor and Richard Griffin should be discharged from their office as churchwardens.</p> <p>Edward Edmunds and John Dick appeared in accordance with a prior order to be invested in the office of churchwardens. When they were required to be sworn for the proper execution of that office, Edmunds requested to be excused unless the Governor would write to England to clarify how far his duties extended. He stated that otherwise he would not take the oath, nor withdraw from the office without formal investment. The matter was then referred for further consideration.</p> <p>[...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The presentation and approval of the inventory showed continuity in the probate process. Executors were required to account formally for the estate, reinforcing oversight of property distribution.</p> <p>The churchwardens' accounts of collections at 6d per head indicated a structured system of parish taxation. This levy functioned as a regular contribution from inhabitants to support religious and communal expenses.</p> <p>The allocation of funds to visiting ministers demonstrated how religious services were financed. Payment was tied to specific functions, such as administering the Lord's Supper, reflecting an organised provision of ecclesiastical services.</p> <p>The discharge of churchwardens after approval of their accounts showed a system of term-limited office combined with financial accountability. Completion of duties required both service and proper accounting.</p> <p>The refusal of Edward Edmunds to take the oath without clarification revealed uncertainty over the scope of office. This indicated that the responsibilities of churchwardens were not always clearly defined in practice.</p> <p>The reference to writing to England showed the dependency of local governance on metropolitan authority. Final clarification of duties was expected to come from the Company rather than being resolved entirely on the island.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Edmunds's hesitation to take the oath suggests concern about potential liabilities attached to the office. He may have feared being held accountable for obligations that were not clearly defined.</p> <p>The insistence on formal investment despite reluctance indicates that holding office carried both obligation and status. Edmunds may have sought to</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>secure the position's authority while limiting his exposure to risk.</p> <p>The referral of the matter for further consideration suggests that the Governor and Council were unwilling to force compliance immediately. This may reflect sensitivity to local resistance or the need to maintain cooperation among leading inhabitants.</p>
70	64	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation held on Tuesday the 20th Day of Aprill 1697 att Fort James  Present – Richd R[...]ing Govr  Capt Poirier Dep[...] Govr  Whereas on Lords day the 28th day of March last past Discovery was made that the House of John Colgrave  and John Goodwin in Fort James Towne was broken open and  the said Colgrave had lost Considerable in Sugar Liquors and  Goodwin the vallue of Eight Dollars in English money wch  he had a warrant to Search any suspected place who accordingly  made a very strict Search but could find nothing, but on Friday the 9th of this Instant a Discovery was made that Garrot  a slave of Elizabeth Gundling orphan (who now Dwells with Mr  Tho Goodwin) and Anthony a slave of the said Goodwin had Runn  which sd slaves were sent to Fort James where said Master  having at no time given them no such sort of Liquor and  whilst in prison the said Garrot Confessed that he with ye sd  Anthony had Stolen a Slave of Goodwin of the Honble Compy had done  the Fact and accordingly returned most of the money they had  Taken from the said Goodwin (boul wch was in Garrots hand)  and also sd had a great flask full of Liquor but no keys the sd  Anthony was also sent in Custody who obstinately Denied his  being Concerned with the said Garrot and Antony or having  any knowledge thereof so this Day was appointed for their  Examination and punishment  Garrot was called &amp; Examined Confeseth that some time since meeting with Franc the Cooper the sd Franc asked him if he would doe some thing with him wch for him  he could not tell, till he knew what it was, so sd Frank then  to help to Breake open Mr Colgraves House in Fort James who  then Denied to help him but he meeting with the sd Franc  again the sd Franc asked him the 2d Time, who at that time after much perswasion Consented to goe with him &amp; then  he spoke to his fellow slave Antony the sd Mr Goodwin slave</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Tuesday 20 April 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard R[...]ing, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>It was reported that on Sunday 28 March 1697 the houses of John Colgrave and John Goodwin in Fort James Town had been broken open. Colgrave had lost a considerable quantity of sugar and liquors, and Goodwin had lost £8 0s 0d. A warrant had been issued to search suspected places, and a thorough search had been carried out, but nothing had been found.</p> <p>On Friday 9 April 1697, it was discovered that Garrot, a slave belonging to Elizabeth Gundling, an orphan residing with Thomas Goodwin, and Antony, a slave of the same Goodwin, had run away. These slaves were brought to Fort James. Their master stated that he had never given them such liquor. While in prison, Garrot confessed that he and Antony had committed the theft. He returned most of the money taken from Goodwin, which had been found in his possession, and admitted to having had a large flask of liquor, though no keys were recovered.</p> <p>Antony was also taken into custody but firmly denied any involvement or knowledge of the theft. This day had been appointed for their examination and punishment.</p> <p>Garrot was called and examined. He confessed that some time earlier he had met Franc the cooper. Franc had asked him to assist in an unspecified act. Garrot refused at first, as he did not know what was intended. Franc then proposed that they should break into the house of John Colgrave in Fort James. Garrot again refused. When they met a second time, Franc repeated the request, and after continued persuasion Garrot agreed. He then spoke to his fellow slave Antony, who belonged to Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The issuing of a warrant to search suspected places showed the use of formal investigative authority. The Governor and Council exercised powers to authorise searches in response to reported theft.</p> <p>The identification of stolen goods, including sugar, liquor, and £8 0s 0d, illustrated the range of valuable commodities within the settlement. Both goods and cash were treated as recoverable property under law.</p> <p>The imprisonment and examination of Garrot and Antony demonstrated custodial interrogation as part of the legal process. Confession formed a key element in establishing guilt.</p> <p>The distinction between Garrot's confession and Antony's denial showed that individual liability was assessed separately, even when suspects were associated. Admission of guilt carried evidentiary weight but did not automatically implicate others.</p> <p>The involvement of Franc the cooper indicated the participation of skilled labourers in criminal activity. Occupational roles did not exclude individuals from prosecution or suspicion.</p> <p>The reference to slaves belonging to different masters highlighted the structured system of ownership and responsibility. Masters were expected to account for the conduct of those under their control.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The initial failure to find stolen goods despite a thorough search suggests that the items may have been concealed effectively or dispersed quickly. This may</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>indicate some level of planning rather than opportunistic theft.</p> <p>Garrot's eventual confession after imprisonment suggests that custodial pressure may have influenced his statement. The timing implies that admission followed confinement rather than immediate arrest.</p> <p>The repeated persuasion by Franc before Garrot agreed to participate suggests that the crime required cooperation and was not impulsive. This may indicate that the break-in was premeditated and organised rather than spontaneous.</p> <p>Antony's continued denial despite Garrot's confession suggests either a genuine lack of involvement or an attempt to avoid punishment. The court would likely have weighed his denial against Garrot's testimony in determining responsibility.</p>
71	65	<p>slave, who also Consented to the Day was appointed by ye sd Franck to be on Saturday aforesd when all Three accordingly did breake open the said Colgraves House first from whence they Tooke a great Flaske of Rum a Bagge of Sugar and a Boxe of Sugar and Small handkerchiefs full of Sagoey from thence they went to the said John Goodwins House where they found a Chest unlockt the Key being in it and tooke from thence some money and also a small Bottle of S[...]itts so went up the Country againe Franck carrying the Bagge of Sugar Antony the Flask Arrack and the said Garrott the Boxe of Sugar and Sagoey and that he the said Garrott tooke ye money and the said Franck tooke some Rum to his House he living at ye sd House (who Brookes) but nothing could be gott out of him where the residue of ye sd Boxe of Sugar was save yt it was all Expended Antony Examined saith that he knows nothing of the matter (al[...] before he had Confessed the whole matter of Fact) but he [...] being a going to be punished said yt Franck had learned him to accuse him &amp; had bidden him not to Confess any thing to soe Confessed as the said Garrott has already Confessed and Declared Franck being Examined saith that he is Ignorant of the matter of Fact and that he knowes nothing of the business although Garrot and Antony confronted him to his face telling him that he helped them to breake open the Houses &amp; carryed some Sugar up in the Country notwithstanding wch he obstinately Denyes [...] knowledge of such matter or Fact saying that he was falsly accused although some small quantity of Sugar was found in his Custody The sd Sarah wife being Examined would neither Confess nothing, but also had obstinately that her Husband was not from her that Saturday nor no other time as she knows of, But saith that Garrot came to her House the other Day &amp; brought a Bottle of Rum wch Bottle was Cyder so that ye Rum</p>	<p>Garrot further stated that Antony agreed to join the plan, and that a day was appointed by Franc for the act, being the Saturday previously mentioned. On that day, all three went together and broke open the house of John Colgrave. From there they took a large flask of rum, a bag of sugar, a box of sugar, and several small handkerchiefs filled with sago.</p> <p>They then went to the house of John Goodwin, where they found a chest unlocked with the key in it. From this they took some money and a small bottle of spirits. They then went back up the country. Franc carried the bag of sugar, Antony carried the flask of arrack, and Garrot carried the box of sugar and the sago. Garrot stated that he took the money, and that Franc took some rum to his house, where he lived. When questioned, nothing further could be obtained from Franc about the remaining sugar, except that it had all been consumed.</p> <p>Antony, when examined, first stated that he knew nothing of the matter. However, before punishment was inflicted, he said that Franc had instructed him to deny involvement and had advised him not to confess. He then admitted the facts as Garrot had already described.</p> <p>Franc, when examined, stated that he knew nothing of the matter and denied all involvement, even when confronted by Garrot and Antony, who accused him directly of assisting in breaking open the houses and carrying sugar into the country. Despite this, he continued to deny any knowledge, although a small quantity of sugar was found in his possession.</p> <p>Franc's wife, Sarah, was also examined. She refused to confess anything and insisted that her husband had not left her on that Saturday or at any other time to her knowledge. She stated that Garrot had come to her house on another day and brought a bottle said to contain rum, but that it was in fact cider, as it tasted strongly of it. She also stated that on another occasion Garrot had brought to [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The detailed confession given by Garrot demonstrated the evidentiary weight placed on admission of guilt. His account provided a full narrative of the crime, including planning, execution, division of goods, and subsequent handling.</p> <p>The description of the theft showed coordinated criminal activity. The roles assigned to each participant indicated deliberate organisation, with distribution of both labour and stolen goods.</p> <p>The unlocked chest with the key left in it revealed vulnerability in property security. Such conditions may have facilitated theft and influenced how responsibility was assessed.</p> <p>Antony's initial denial followed by confession illustrated the dynamic of interrogation. Statements could change under the threat of punishment, and courts had to weigh such reversals carefully.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>tasted of Cyder very much &amp; that at another time the said Garrott brought to</p>	<p>Franc's continued denial despite confrontation and partial evidence highlighted the limits of proof. Possession of some stolen goods raised suspicion but did not automatically establish full participation.</p> <p>The examination of Franc's wife showed that household members could be drawn into legal inquiry. Their testimony could either support or undermine the accused, but refusal to confess was itself noted.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The structured distribution of stolen goods suggests that the participants planned in advance how the proceeds would be divided. This indicates more than opportunistic theft and points to a degree of organisation.</p> <p>Antony's shift in testimony under threat of punishment suggests that coercive pressure influenced confessions. The court may have relied on such pressure to secure admissions in the absence of independent evidence.</p> <p>Franc's refusal to admit involvement, even when confronted and partially implicated by physical evidence, suggests either a calculated attempt to avoid punishment or confidence that the evidence against him was insufficient for conviction.</p> <p>The involvement of Franc's household, including his wife's testimony, indicates that suspicion extended beyond the immediate perpetrators. This may reflect concern that stolen goods were being concealed or circulated within domestic networks.</p>
72	66	<p>to her House two Bottle of Rum &amp; some Sugar, but saith not how he came by it, and that ye sd Mr Goodwin's Antony brought some Eggs to her House Garrott saith was advised to Confess her fault that she often spoke not the Truth for she knew both how they came by the Liquor &amp; Sugar and that she knew that her Husband went out one night with them, But still she Confidently stood in the sd story before the Truth, and not Garrott so nothing could be gott from her Hanna Examined saith yt Mon: Comp saith that the Saturday before Easter Capt Poirier gave all the Blacks some Liquor wch a Bottle amongst five, wch Day she went to Francks House, and there they drank a Dram and Franck Invited her and her Husband &amp; her selfe to Diner ye next day wch was Easter Sunday and accordingly both went to ye sd Francks House the sd Easter Sunday and they had victuals and a Bowle of Rum Punch so the sd Franck went to fetch ye Rum wch to make another from Mr Bagleys presently after Garrott came in wch Called for a Bowle of Punch, so Franck made it &amp; when it was Dranke, Garrott Asked what he must have for the Punch Franck said Refuse a Bottle Garrott said no I will give you but 18d wch Sugar to make a Bowle of Punch, and further saith that after Garrott had fin[...] his bargain ye sd Franck gave to her a Bottle and then told her that the Bottle her Husband had not had the Rum of Mr Bagley as he had told her before &amp; now she knew that the Truth from him and that it was from Mr Bagley, so she then told him that Mr Goodwin's Antony had given it to her, Then Replied Hanna that her</p>	<p>Sarah, the wife of Franc, further stated that Garrot had at another time brought two bottles of rum and some sugar to her house, though she did not say how he had obtained them. She also said that Antony, belonging to Mr Goodwin, had brought eggs to her house.</p> <p>Garrot declared that she had been advised to confess, as she often failed to speak the truth. He asserted that she knew how the liquor and sugar had been obtained and that she was aware her husband had gone out with them on one night. Despite this, she continued firmly in her account, and nothing further could be obtained from her.</p> <p>Hanna was examined and stated that on the Saturday before Easter Captain Poirier had given liquor to the slaves, distributing one bottle among five. On that day she went to Franc's house, where they drank a dram. Franc then invited her, her husband, and herself to dine the next day, which was Easter Sunday. They attended and were given food and a bowl of rum punch. Franc went to fetch more rum from Mr Bagley to make another bowl. Shortly after, Garrot came in and asked for a bowl of punch. Franc made it, and when it was consumed Garrot asked what he must pay. Franc asked for a bottle in return. Garrot refused and instead offered 18d 0s 0d, together with sugar, for the making of the punch.</p> <p>Hanna further stated that after Garrot had concluded this bargain, Franc gave her a bottle and told her that the rum her husband had received had not come from Mr Bagley as he had previously claimed. She then said that Mr Goodwin's slave Antony had given it to her. Hanna replied that her husband was a dead man, as she knew there was wrongdoing, and questioned why she had not reported the matter to her master, Captain Poirier.</p> <p>Despite these statements, neither Franc nor his wife admitted any involvement or knowledge of the theft or the drinking. They maintained that all that had been said by Garrot, Antony, and Hanna was false.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The continued examination of multiple witnesses showed the court's effort to establish a coherent account from overlapping testimonies. Evidence was</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Husband was a Dead man for she knew well though there was some whole Spoons open, and why did not she go and tell her master Capt Poirier that Mr Goodwins Blackman Rumm Yet Notwithstanding neither Franck nor his wife would not Confess any thing, nor own as much as the knowledge of the sd Drinking and Theft Impudently saying yt all wch Either Garrott, Antony and Hanna had [...] false.</p>	<p>built through comparison of statements rather than reliance on a single source.</p> <p>The distribution of liquor by Captain Poirier to slaves illustrated controlled provision of goods by authority. Such distribution was structured, with measured quantities allocated among groups.</p> <p>The exchange of rum and sugar for punch demonstrated informal barter operating alongside regulated trade. These transactions occurred outside formal documentation, which brought them into conflict with Company rules.</p> <p>The insistence on confession as a means of establishing truth reflected the evidentiary importance of admission. Repeated urging to confess indicated that acknowledgement of guilt was central to resolution.</p> <p>The involvement of multiple slaves and free individuals in the circulation of goods showed how commodities moved through informal networks. This blurred the boundary between authorised and unauthorised exchange.</p> <p>The refusal of Franc and his wife to confess, despite testimony against them, demonstrated the limits of coercive examination. Denial could persist even when supported by circumstantial evidence.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The detailed account given by Hanna suggests that the court sought to trace not only the theft but also the subsequent distribution of stolen goods. This may have been intended to expose a wider network of exchange rather than isolate a single offence.</p> <p>The emphasis on whether the rum came from Mr Bagley or from another source indicates concern with provenance. Establishing origin may have been important in determining responsibility and distinguishing lawful from unlawful possession.</p> <p>Hanna's warning that her husband would be in danger if the matter were known suggests awareness of strict penalties. This implies that individuals understood the risks of association with illicit goods and may have shaped their testimony accordingly.</p> <p>The continued denial by Franc and his wife, despite multiple accusations, suggests a calculated strategy. They may have judged that without direct proof their position could still be maintained, even in the face of accumulating testimony.</p>
73	67	<p>And upon the whole Examination Garrott saith that for [...]</p> <p>Colgrave told Jeriff a Bowle of Punch when she last left was here, and that Richd Lavano Drank part of ye sd Bowle of Punch</p> <p>Mr Colgrave saith that it seem his wife was much then importune by the said Garrott and other Slaves to make a Bowle of Punch so to be rid of them made it the sd Richd Lavano being there &amp; Drank with them of ye sd Bowle of Punch</p> <p>It is ordered That the said Mr Colgrave be fined for ye use of ye Church Eight shillings, and ye sd Richd Lavano or whom, pay for the said ys</p> <p>Upon the whole matter it was thought by ye Govr &amp; Councell and his wife were both Deeply Concerned in the whole affair</p> <p>the said Richd Franck by actually Uplifting Goods and making a foresaid, &amp; his wife for having ye knowledge thereof &amp; that they obstinately and Confidently Deny it whereupon it was Thought Convenient &amp; accordingly</p>	<p>Garrot further stated that on one occasion he had urged Colgrave's household to make a bowl of punch, and that Richard Lavano had drunk part of it. John Colgrave explained that his wife had been pressed by Garrot and other slaves to make punch, and that to be rid of them she had complied. Richard Lavano had been present and had drunk with them.</p> <p>An order was made that John Colgrave should be fined 8s 0d for the use of the church. Richard Lavano was also held liable to pay for the same matter.</p> <p>Upon full consideration, the Governor and Council concluded that Franc and his wife were deeply involved in the affair. Franc was judged to have taken part in handling the stolen goods, and his wife to have had knowledge of the matter. Both were found to have denied their involvement obstinately. An order was made that Garrot, Antony, Franc, and his wife should all be severely punished by whipping at the whipping post. This punishment was carried out. Franc and his wife did not confess. Garrot and Antony, having been punished, were dismissed.</p> <p>John Colgrave and John Goodwin were then required to submit a bill detailing the losses they had suffered, together with the costs incurred. They complied and presented an account of the items taken from John Colgrave and the associated charges:</p> <p>Sugar at 1s 6d Iron pot 1 ivory comb</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>It is ordered  That they be all four vizt Garrott, Antony, Franck &amp; his wife be severely punished by being whipt at ye Whipping Post which was accordingly Done, the Franck nor his wife would Confess nothing, &amp; that Garrott &amp; Antony for denying Stealing, and the two Garrott and Antony to be Dismissed both this punishment  And the said Colgrave and John Goodwin was Desired to give in a Bill of the Particular of Damage done them from them together with the Damages they then Received wth the Charges they had bin at who accordingly did and their hands were Acct of Particulars Robed from John Colgrave together with the Charges he had bin at  Sugar at 18d  Iron pot  1 Ivory Comb  1 Dozen  Charges &amp; Damage done wch is  Glasses  1/2 Gallons of Rum  The above acct was Given by Jo Colgrave</p>	<p>1 dozen [...]  Charges and damages [...]  Glasses  ½ gallon of rum  The above account was submitted by John Colgrave.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The imposition of a fine on Colgrave for allowing drinking showed that liability extended beyond direct perpetrators. Permitting disorder within one's household could result in penalty, reflecting collective responsibility for maintaining order.  The simultaneous punishment of slaves and free individuals illustrated the breadth of enforcement. Corporal punishment was applied across different social positions where involvement in theft or concealment was established.  The finding against Franc and his wife despite their denial showed that judgement could rest on cumulative evidence rather than confession alone. Persistent denial did not prevent conviction where other testimony was considered sufficient.  The use of whipping at the whipping post indicated a standardised form of public corporal punishment. This served both as penalty and as visible enforcement of authority.  The requirement for a detailed bill of damages demonstrated a formal process for restitution. Victims were expected to itemise losses, which could then be used to assess compensation or record the extent of harm.  The listing of goods, including sugar, rum, and household items, reflected the material composition of property within the settlement. Such inventories formed part of the administrative record of loss.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The fine imposed on Colgrave suggests that the authorities sought to discourage informal gatherings involving slaves and alcohol. Responsibility may have been extended deliberately to householders to reinforce stricter control over access to drink.  The decision to punish all four individuals together indicates an intention to resolve the matter collectively. This may have been designed to prevent further dispute over individual roles by treating the group as jointly responsible.  The insistence on a written account of damages suggests preparation for further financial settlement. The Council may have intended to use this record to enforce compensation or to justify the severity of punishment already imposed.  The punishment of Garrot and Antony despite their confession suggests that admission did not mitigate penalty in this case. This may reflect the seriousness attached to theft from Company property and the need to deter similar offences.</p>
74	70	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 17th Day of May 1697 att Fort James  Present Richard Keling Govr  Capt Poirier Depy Govr  Phillips Jeseph Complains by Petition agt George Hoskinson for haveing inticed him to serve him fower years as his Covent boy  The said Hoskinson saith that it is True on ye 8th Inst he spoke to the said Phillips Jeseph if he would willing to serve him for some time and he would learne him to Read &amp; write, &amp; the sd Phillips and all though Consented to serve him five years an article of Agreement was made &amp; signed accordingly between them</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 17 May 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard Keeling, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.  Phillips Jeseph submitted a petition against George Hoskinson, alleging that Hoskinson had enticed him to bind himself to serve for four years as his covenanted boy. Hoskinson stated that on 8 May 1697 he had asked Jeseph whether he would willingly serve him for a period, promising to teach him to read and write. Jeseph had agreed, and a written article of agreement was drawn up and signed between them for a term of five years.  Thomas Fewesdale, who had recently married Jeseph's mother, appeared with his wife and requested that the Governor and Council should not allow the agreement to stand. They stated that Jeseph had bound himself through ignorance and without their consent.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Thomas Fewesdale who lately married the sd Jeseph's mother deposed with his wife that the Govr and Council would be pleased not to permit such agreement to stand he having bound himself to ye sd Hoskinson through ignorance &amp; without their Consent The said Hoskinson saith that he did not Delude ye sd Phillips Jeseph but the sd Thomas Fewesdale (ye said Jeseph's father in law) put him upon it to signe under pretence that the boy may learne a trade, he will Release him from him all soone as he had performed it &amp; he will Cancel what Contract there is between them It is ordered That the sd Hoskinson's proposition be accepted of the sd Council, paying all Damage wch he has promised [signed] [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>Hoskinson replied that he had not deceived Jeseph, and claimed that Thomas Fewesdale had encouraged the agreement under the belief that the boy would learn a trade. He offered to release Jeseph from the agreement once he had fulfilled part of the service, and to cancel the contract between them.</p> <p>An order was made that Hoskinson's proposal should be accepted by the Council, he undertaking to pay all damages, which he promised to do.</p> <p>[...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The use of a written article of agreement showed the formalisation of labour arrangements. Service contracts were legally binding instruments that defined the terms and duration of employment.</p> <p>The term "covenanted boy" indicated a structured form of bound service, often involving training in exchange for labour. Such arrangements placed the servant under the authority of the master for a fixed period.</p> <p>The intervention by Thomas Fewesdale and his wife demonstrated the role of family authority in regulating such agreements. Consent from guardians or household heads was treated as significant in validating a contract.</p> <p>The Council's willingness to set aside or modify the agreement showed its supervisory role over private contracts. Legal enforceability depended not only on consent between parties but also on approval by governing authority.</p> <p>Hoskinson's undertaking to pay damages reflected a mechanism for resolving disputes through compensation. Financial liability could be imposed to balance the interests of both parties when agreements were altered.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The claim that Jeseph agreed "through ignorance" suggests concern about unequal understanding in contract formation. The Council may have viewed the agreement as potentially exploitative due to the boy's limited capacity to consent.</p> <p>Hoskinson's offer to release Jeseph and cancel the contract indicates an attempt to avoid further dispute or sanction. This may reflect awareness that the agreement could be challenged successfully under local authority.</p> <p>The involvement of Fewesdale in encouraging the agreement, as alleged by Hoskinson, suggests conflicting motivations within the household. The arrangement may initially have been seen as beneficial for training, but later reconsidered due to its binding nature.</p> <p>The Council's acceptance of a negotiated resolution rather than strict enforcement of the contract suggests a preference for pragmatic settlement. Maintaining social stability may have been prioritised over rigid adherence to formal agreements.</p>
75	71	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 13th Day of June 1697 att Fort James Present Richd Keling Govr Capt Poirier Depy Govr John Veinon one of the Executors of the Last will and Testam of Rebecca Charlesworth Deceased widow Complain of James Grandy Consr saying that the sd Mr Charlesworth on her Death Bed left him Indebted to her the Sum of [...] which now the said Grandy Denys he is Indebt, Affirming saying that she forgave him in her Life Time The said Grandy saith that some time since in mrs Charlesworths Life time he went to her &amp; told her that he must Comply with his Credr so said her yt he then owing her 30s for the whole Debt with which she</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 13 June 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard Keeling, Governor, and Captain Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>John Veinon, one of the executors of the last will and testament of Rebecca Charlesworth, deceased widow, brought a complaint against James Grandy, a councillor. He stated that Mrs Charlesworth, on her deathbed, had declared that Grandy was indebted to her in the sum of [...], which Grandy now denied, claiming that she had forgiven the debt during her lifetime.</p> <p>Grandy stated that some time before her death he had gone to Mrs Charlesworth and told her that he needed to satisfy his creditors. He said that he then acknowledged owing her 30s 0d in full settlement of the debt, which she accepted. He added that Hugh Bodley had knowledge of this, though he admitted that he later owed her an additional 10s 0d.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>was well Satisfied &amp; saith that Hugh Bodley has knowledge thereof but since that he owned he had of her 10s more Hugh Bodley Sworne saith yt being one Day to mrs Charlesworth was desired to write a Bill for the said Grandy to give to Mr Charlesworth which he did accordingly but went home and fetched a penknife &amp; then wrote a Bill for 20s but knows not upon what acct it was not neither Did he heare mrs Charlesworth tell the said Grandy that he was Satisfied therewith</p> <p>The said John Veinon Sworne saith that 4 Days before mrs Charlesworths Decease this Informt she gave him acct of what Debts were Due to her from the persons &amp; then she gave him acct that the sd Grandy was Indebted to her the Sume of [...]</p> <p>£ 5 : 0 : [...] as by acc Books appears</p> <p>Upon the whole It is ordered That the sd Grandy pay the sd Mr Charlesworth Executor the Sum of £ 2 : [...] he having half a Yeares time for the payment thereof</p>	<p>Hugh Bodley gave sworn evidence that he had been asked by Mrs Charlesworth to write a bill for Grandy to give to her, which he did. He later rewrote the bill for 20s 0d, though he did not know on what account, and he had not heard Mrs Charlesworth state that she was satisfied with that sum.</p> <p>John Veinon also gave sworn evidence that four days before Mrs Charlesworth's death she had provided him with an account of debts owed to her. At that time she stated that Grandy was indebted to her in the sum of £5 0s [...], as recorded in her account books.</p> <p>Upon consideration of the matter, an order was made that James Grandy should pay to the executor the sum of £2 [...] he being allowed half a year for the payment.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The dispute over the debt showed the role of executors in recovering sums owed to the deceased. Executors acted as legal representatives responsible for securing assets and enforcing claims on behalf of the estate. The conflicting claims of forgiveness and continued obligation illustrated the importance of evidence in debt resolution. Verbal agreements could be challenged, and supporting testimony or written records were required to establish validity.</p> <p>The reference to a written bill demonstrated the use of documentary instruments in recording debts. Such documents provided formal proof of obligation, though their exact terms could still be contested.</p> <p>The reliance on account books kept by Mrs Charlesworth showed the evidentiary value of personal financial records. These records could be used to support claims after death, reinforcing their administrative significance.</p> <p>The Council's decision to award a reduced sum indicated a mediating role. Rather than fully accepting either claim, the Council determined a compromise figure based on the available evidence.</p> <p>The granting of six months for payment reflected the structured management of debt recovery. Time was allowed for settlement, balancing enforcement with practical capacity to pay.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The reduction of the claimed debt to £2 [...] suggests that the Council found the evidence inconclusive. This may indicate that neither the alleged forgiveness nor the full amount claimed could be fully substantiated.</p> <p>Grandy's admission of partial debt alongside denial of the full sum suggests an attempt to limit liability. The Council may have interpreted this as acknowledgement of some obligation while rejecting the total claimed.</p> <p>The reliance on testimony given shortly before Mrs Charlesworth's death indicates that deathbed statements carried weight. However, the variation between her recorded accounts and other evidence may have led the Council to seek a balanced resolution.</p> <p>The allowance of time for payment suggests that immediate enforcement was not deemed necessary. This may reflect consideration of Grandy's position or the practicalities of recovering the debt within the island's economy.</p>
76	72	<p>John Bowman Executor of the Last will and Testamt of his Deceased Father Wm Bowman now presents the sd will to be approved &amp; received</p> <p>Hen: Coates &amp; Matt Paratt made oath that they saw ye sd Wm Bowman signe, seale and Deliver this will now produced as his last will &amp; Testament and that they know of no other by him made since that</p> <p>It is ordered That the said will be received and approved and Copyy Given when desired</p>	<p>John Bowman, executor of the last will and testament of his deceased father William Bowman, presented the will for approval.</p> <p>Henry Coates and Matthew Paratt gave sworn evidence that they had seen William Bowman sign, seal, and deliver the will now produced as his last will and testament. They further stated that they knew of no other will made by him after that.</p> <p>An order was made that the will should be received and approved, and that copies should be issued when requested.</p> <p>The account of William Bowman was also presented. It was ordered that it should be received, and that copies should be provided when desired.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Bowman William his acctt will be Received and Coppy given when desired [...] Goodwin</p>	<p>[...] Goodwin <b>Interpretations</b> The requirement for witnesses to swear that they had seen the will signed, sealed, and delivered demonstrated the formal criteria for validating a testament. This process ensured that the document represented the genuine intention of the deceased. The statement that no later will existed showed the importance of establishing finality. Competing or subsequent wills could invalidate earlier ones, so confirmation of uniqueness was essential to probate. The executor's role in presenting the will indicated responsibility for initiating the legal process of estate administration. Authority to act depended on formal recognition of the will. The approval and provision of copies showed that probate created an official record. Copies enabled interested parties to refer to the terms, supporting transparency and enforcement. The presentation of the deceased's account alongside the will indicated integration of financial records into estate administration. Assets and obligations were documented as part of the same process. <b>Speculations</b> The straightforward acceptance of the will suggests that no dispute was raised over its validity. This may indicate that the witnesses were considered reliable and the document clear in form. The inclusion of the account alongside the will suggests preparation for orderly distribution. The executor may have aimed to ensure that both the legal authority and the financial details were established at the same time.</p>
77	73	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation held ye 19th of June 1697 Present Richd Keling Govr Steph Poirier Depy Govr Whereas Last night about 9 of the clock news was brought by the Lansdowne yt he had hanged himselfe in his one house It was then Immediately ordered yt an Inquest of 14 men shold be speedily called which is done to looke into the manner of his death Their names in order as followeth vizt 1 Ed Edmund C[...][...] 2 Tho Goodwin 3 Rich Leach 4 John Blacknall 5 Tho Scollay 6 Saml Taylor 7 Erasm: Gunnin[g] 8 James [...] 9 Jo Stokes 10 Sam Wrangham 11 Saml Maxwell 12 Tho Dixon 13 Georg Wright 14 Tho Earle Doctor Hoskinson saith yt being at ye Fort Charles Steward called him saying that the Lansdowne hath hanged himselfe but thought there might be life in him but found none Charles Steward saith that going up the Valley he heard that the Lansdowne had hanged himselfe whereupon he went to ye house where his wife told him that Lansdowne's wife had told him soe had bin found hanged that day the voice yt told him soe had bin James H[...]</p>	<p>A consultation was held on 19 June 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard Keeling, Governor, and Stephen Poirier, Deputy Governor. At about nine o'clock the previous night, news was brought by Lansdowne that he had hanged himself in his own house. An immediate order was made that an inquest of 14 men should be assembled without delay to examine the manner of his death. The following men were appointed: Edward Edmund C[...] Thomas Goodwin Richard Leach John Blacknall Thomas Scollay Samuel Taylor Erasmus Gunnin[g] James [...] John Stokes Samuel Wrangham Samuel Maxwell Thomas Dixon George Wright Thomas Earle Doctor Hoskinson gave evidence that he had been called by Charles Steward, who reported that Lansdowne had hanged himself and believed that some life might still remain. Upon examination, no life was found. Charles Steward stated that while going up the valley he heard that Lansdowne had hanged himself. He went to the house, where his wife told him that Lansdowne's wife had said the same. He added that the report had first come from James H[...]. The wife of Charles Steward stated that she had heard in the street that John Lansdowne had hanged himself, and that she had informed her husband when she met him. Lansdowne's wife stated that shortly before dusk her husband, a cooper, had been with one Trench of</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>The wife of ye sd Charles Steward saith that she heard in ye Street yt John Lansdowne had hanged himselfe and meeting with her husband she told him what she had heard Lansdownes wife saith yt a little before dusk her husband the Cooper with one Trench of the Company for Lanch or two fetched from the Store Drink but her husband who had gone towards the way her husband soone came againe and [...]</p>	<p>the Company and had fetched drink from the store. Her husband had then gone out, but soon returned and [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The immediate summoning of an inquest demonstrated a formal procedure for investigating sudden or suspicious death. A jury of local men was assembled to determine the circumstances and cause.</p> <p>The fixed number of 14 men showed a structured approach to communal judgement. The inquest operated as a collective body, reflecting established legal practice adapted to the island setting.</p> <p>The gathering of testimony from multiple witnesses illustrated the method of reconstructing events through reported observation and hearsay. Statements were taken from those who had direct or indirect knowledge of the incident.</p> <p>The involvement of a physician confirmed the role of medical examination in verifying death. Determination of whether life remained was treated as a necessary step before further legal consideration.</p> <p>The circulation of news through the street and among individuals demonstrated how information moved rapidly within the settlement. Informal reporting became part of the evidentiary record.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The rapid assembly of the inquest suggests concern to establish the cause of death promptly. In cases of suspected suicide, early determination may have been important for legal or religious reasons.</p> <p>The reliance on second-hand reports alongside direct observation indicates that the inquest sought to gather all available information, even where direct witnesses were limited. This may reflect the difficulty of establishing events in private spaces.</p> <p>The reference to Lansdowne having obtained drink shortly before his death may have been considered relevant to his state of mind. The inquiry may have been directed toward understanding whether intoxication contributed to the act.</p>
78	74	<p>saide what haue you told Willm French (nothing said she)  you know you saide heare you are alwayes talking people some thing of mee  The Inquest brought in their Verdict on oath that to ye best of their knowledge and judgment that the sd Lansdowne did lay Violent hands on himselfe and hanged himselfe It is ordered  That ye sd Lansdowne be forthwith buried in an hole, (Crosse way going up the Peake Hill and a stake drove in through his body)  [...]  Goodwin</p>	<p>Lansdowne's wife further stated that her husband had asked her what she had told William French. She replied that she had said nothing. He accused her of always speaking about him to others.</p> <p>The inquest returned its verdict upon oath, declaring that to the best of their knowledge and judgement John Lansdowne had laid violent hands upon himself and had hanged himself.</p> <p>An order was made that Lansdowne should be buried immediately in a hole at a crossway going up Peak Hill, and that a stake should be driven through his body.</p> <p>[...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The inquest's formal verdict established the legal classification of the death as self-killing. Such a finding carried specific consequences for burial and treatment of the body.</p> <p>The phrase "laid violent hands upon himself" functioned as the recognised legal formulation for suicide. Its use confirmed that the act was judged intentional rather than accidental.</p> <p>The ordered burial at a crossway with a stake driven through the body reflected a punitive and preventative practice. Such treatment marked the act as a serious offence and was intended to deny ordinary burial rites.</p> <p>The speed of burial indicated administrative enforcement following the verdict. Once the finding was made, action followed immediately without delay or further ceremony.</p> <p>The inclusion of domestic exchange between Lansdowne and his wife suggested that personal conflict formed part of the evidentiary context. Statements</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>about quarrel and suspicion were treated as relevant to understanding the act.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The severe form of burial suggests that the authorities intended to reinforce moral and religious condemnation of suicide. The method may have been chosen to deter others within a small and closely regulated community.</p> <p>The reference to suspicion and accusation between Lansdowne and his wife shortly before his death may indicate a state of agitation. The inquest may have considered this as contributing to his decision to take his own life.</p> <p>The prompt conclusion of the inquest and immediate burial suggest that the case was regarded as clear. The authorities may have sought to resolve the matter quickly to prevent further disturbance or speculation within the settlement.</p>
79	75	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation held on Munday ye 11th July 1697 att Fort James  Present  Rich Keeling Govr  Steph Poirier Dep Govr  A Warrant being issued out for all ye panish officers yt are now to be invested in their offices for this present yeare to appeare here this day in order thereunto and also ye overseers of ye high ways that have bin these two last yeares to give acco of their proceedings yt order might be given for ye payment of ye workes the Country sustained for  It is ordered  That a Vestry be Called on some day next weeke in order to ye building of a new Church in the Country and then to Consider Country affaires and bring in their returns ye next Councell day  [...]  S Goodwin</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 11 July 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard Keeling, Governor, and Stephen Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>A warrant had been issued requiring all parish officers appointed for that year to appear in order to be formally invested in their offices. The overseers of the highways for the previous two years were also required to attend and give an account of their proceedings, so that orders might be made for payment of the works carried out in the country.</p> <p>An order was made that a vestry should be called on a day in the following week to consider the building of a new church in the country. At that meeting, country affairs were also to be examined, and returns were to be presented at the next council day.</p> <p>[...] S Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The issuing of a warrant to summon parish officers showed formal administrative enforcement. Attendance for investiture was compulsory, indicating that officeholding required official confirmation.</p> <p>The requirement for overseers of highways to give account demonstrated retrospective accountability. Public works were subject to review before payment was authorised, linking expenditure to verified performance.</p> <p>The reference to payment for works carried out in the country indicated an organised system of infrastructure funding. Labour and materials were compensated through approved accounts rather than informal arrangement.</p> <p>The order to call a vestry reflected the role of parish assemblies in local governance. Such meetings provided a forum for collective decision-making on religious and civil matters.</p> <p>The planned consideration of church building alongside broader country affairs showed the integration of ecclesiastical and administrative functions. Parish structures operated as a key level of governance.</p> <p>The requirement to bring returns to the next council day indicated a reporting system. Decisions made at local level were subject to review and confirmation by central authority.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The emphasis on accounting for highway works suggests concern over expenditure or quality of labour. The Council may have sought to ensure that resources had been properly used before authorising payment.</p> <p>The calling of a vestry to address both church construction and wider affairs indicates an attempt to coordinate multiple issues within a single forum. This may reflect limited administrative capacity requiring consolidation of decision-making.</p> <p>The scheduling of returns for the next council day suggests a structured administrative cycle. The Council</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>may have aimed to regularise governance by linking local deliberation with central oversight in a predictable sequence.</p>
80	76	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation held on Munday ye 26th  Day of July 1697 att Fort James  Present  Rich Keeling Govr  Steph Poirier Dep Govr  According to order of ye foregoing Counsultation  The Church wardens brought in an abstract of what they had done on the 19th of this instant in the Country Church  Which is as followeth Viz  July ye 19th 1697  Wee ye Inhabitants of this Island being mett to consider about ye Church in ye Country do think it fitt to be made anew a new one Erected and ye charge thereof to be defrayed by an Assessment on ye Land in the Inhabitants possession so much p Acre and that the Church Wardens doe cause ye same finished and fitted with seats &amp;c  and then give an acco of their charges that the Assessment may be made  Tho Goodwin  Jn Luckin  George Hankinson  Samll Taylor  Samll Wrangham  John Long  Rich Leach  B Browne  Samll Maxwells  Hugh Hadley  Robert Addis  Tho Ranger  Matt Basset  Jn Colgrave  Henry Eoles  Trippin Wills  Jno Coles  Tho Goodall  Will Marsh  James Easthope  Will Doveton  Jn Gannon  Rich Paman  Jno Hammons</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 26 July 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard Keeling, Governor, and Stephen Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>In accordance with the order made in the previous consultation, the churchwardens presented an abstract of proceedings taken on 19 July 1697 at the country church.</p> <p>On that day, the inhabitants of the island met to consider the state of the country church. They agreed that it should be rebuilt and that a new structure should be erected. The cost of construction was to be met by an assessment laid upon the land held by the inhabitants, calculated at a fixed rate per acre. The churchwardens were to oversee the completion of the building, including the fitting of seats, and were then to present an account of the expenses so that the assessment could be properly levied.</p> <p>The agreement was subscribed by the following inhabitants:</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin  John Luckin  George Hankinson  Samuel Taylor  Samuel Wrangham  John Long  Richard Leach  B Browne  Samuel Maxwell  Hugh Hadley  Robert Addis  Thomas Ranger  Matthew Basset  John Colgrave  Henry Eoles  Trippin Wills  John Coles  Thomas Goodall  William Marsh  James Easthope  William Doveton  John Gannon  Richard Paman  John Hammons</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The collective meeting of inhabitants to decide on rebuilding the church showed participatory governance at the local level. Decisions affecting communal infrastructure were made through agreement among landholders.</p> <p>The use of an assessment based on acreage demonstrated a structured taxation system. Contributions were proportionate to landholding, linking financial obligation to property ownership.</p> <p>The delegation of responsibility to churchwardens indicated administrative execution following communal decision. They were charged with managing construction and maintaining financial records.</p> <p>The requirement to present accounts before levying the assessment showed a two-stage process of expenditure and verification. Costs were to be documented before being imposed, ensuring accountability.</p> <p>The inclusion of a subscribed list of inhabitants functioned as formal consent. Signing the agreement created a record of participation and obligation.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to rebuild rather than repair suggests that the existing church was considered inadequate or beyond effective maintenance. This may reflect growth in the population or deterioration of the structure.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The reliance on land-based assessment indicates that wealth and responsibility were closely tied to landholding. The system may have aimed to distribute cost according to capacity to pay.</p> <p>The requirement for churchwardens to complete the building before assessment suggests trust in their management but also a need for subsequent verification. This may reflect concern over accurate accounting or previous experience with disputed expenses.</p> <p>The broad participation of inhabitants implies general agreement, but it may also indicate pressure to conform. Refusal to subscribe could have carried social or administrative consequences within a small community.</p>
81	77	<p>Wee are also agreed that there be a Sexton to Cleane the Church and place ye seats &amp;c for wch he is to have 1/2 of each family yearly and for making a grave in ye Country 3 s 6 d att ye Fort 6 d And whereas it has bin thought fitt yt ye Honble Comp a should allow something towards ye Building of a new Church Therefore upon Mature Consideration It is ordered That ye sd Church when built shall have liberty to use ye Stone borders now towards ye defraying ye charge allowing ye acct of the Honble Comp a Mr Henry Eoles desires that he may be discharged from a bond he stands bound in for ye Widdow Guarron (late wife of her husband who hanged himself) untill ye Honble Companys pleasure be knowne and another suretie offering himselfe to become bound in his stead wth Jno Long who is bound with ye sd Eoles It is ordered That ye sd Eoles desires be granted and ye Guarrons bond be taken joyntly with Jno Long &amp;c A Schedule of ye Land goods and Cattle left in possession of Richd Gannon since ye Honble Comp a took possession of ye Island Viz 1 black man named Pedro 20 00 00 1 ditto woman 16 00 00 30 Acres Land 48 00 00 4 Cowes 11 00 00 4 Calves 03 15 00 1 Heifer 03 15 00 3 milk goates 03 00 00 7 male goates 03 10 00 6 milk goates 04 10 00 74 15 00</p>	<p>The inhabitants further agreed that a sexton should be appointed to clean the church and arrange the seating. For this service, he was to receive 6d from each family annually. For digging a grave in the country he was to receive 3s 6d, and at the fort 0s 6d.</p> <p>It was also considered that the Honourable Company should contribute towards the cost of building the new church. After deliberation, an order was made that when the church was completed it should be permitted to use the existing stone borders, with this allowance set against the Company's account towards the cost.</p> <p>Henry Eoles requested to be released from a bond in which he stood surety for the widow Guarron, whose husband had hanged himself, until the Company's pleasure was known. Another person offered to stand in his place together with John Long, who had been jointly bound with Eoles. An order was made that Eoles's request should be granted, and that a new bond for Guarron should be taken jointly with John Long and the new surety.</p> <p>A schedule was then presented of the land, goods, and cattle left in the possession of Richard Gannon since the Honourable Company had taken control of the island, as follows:</p> <p>1 Black man named Pedro valued at £20 0s 0d 1 Black woman valued at £16 0s 0d 30 acres of land valued at £48 0s 0d 4 cows valued at £11 0s 0d 4 calves valued at £3 15s 0d 1 heifer valued at £3 15s 0d 3 milk goats valued at £3 0s 0d 7 male goats valued at £3 10s 0d 6 milk goats valued at £4 10s 0d Total £74 15s 0d</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The appointment of a sexton with fixed payments showed the formal organisation of church maintenance. Regular contributions from each family created a structured system for supporting parish services.</p> <p>The differentiation in fees for grave digging between the country and the fort reflected spatial variation in labour and cost. Burial practices were regulated and monetised according to location.</p> <p>The decision to allow the use of stone borders as a contribution from the Company demonstrated non-monetary support for construction. Material resources were credited against financial obligation, showing flexible accounting practices.</p> <p>The handling of Henry Eoles's bond illustrated the system of surety. Individuals could stand financially responsible for others, and such obligations could be transferred with approval, maintaining continuity of liability.</p> <p>The reference to the widow Guarron in connection with a bond showed that widows could be subject to financial guarantees. This reflects oversight of individuals who might otherwise lack independent means or status.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The detailed schedule of Richard Gannon's property demonstrated formal valuation of assets under Company authority. Land, livestock, and slaves were recorded in monetary terms, allowing integration into administrative and financial systems.</p> <p>The inclusion of named individuals and precise valuations showed the importance of record-keeping. Such schedules supported control over property and facilitated future claims or redistribution.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The fixed payment for the sexton suggests an attempt to regularise church upkeep and avoid reliance on irregular contributions. This may reflect prior difficulties in maintaining the building or organising labour.</p> <p>The use of Company materials instead of direct financial contribution indicates possible limits on available funds. The arrangement allowed the Company to support the project without immediate expenditure.</p> <p>The request by Henry Eoles to be released from his bond suggests concern about the risk attached to surety. The death of Guarron's husband may have increased uncertainty about her financial position, prompting reconsideration of liability.</p> <p>The comprehensive listing of Gannon's assets suggests preparation for administrative review or redistribution. This may indicate that the Company intended to reassess holdings following its assumption of control over the island.</p>
82	78	<p>The forme of the oath taken of Ed: Edmunds and Jno Rich  Church Wardens for this present yeare  You and Each of you shall well and truly behave and discharge ye duty of Church wardens of this place according to the directions now read to you wch shall begin from us so help you god and the contents of this Booke  [...]  It is ordered that  That ye following Rules and methods be observed unto us to Governe themselves by Vizt  Island St Helena  Whereas Richard Griffin and Samll Taylor Church wardens  the yeare last past having Given up their accompts of their  Proceedings in their Executing their said office for the sd yeare  unto us wch we approved and allowed of and whereas they have sent  unto us Edward Edmunds and John Rich Thomas Goodwin &amp; Mr Madge  as persons by whom majority vote of ye Inhabitants appointed for  that purpose Church wardens for ye ensuing yeare, you are hereby  to Chosen who doe appoint and nominate you Edw Edmunds  and John Rich to be Church wardens for the yeare ensuing and  whereas you desire and signify to be instructed what is proper  Duty requisite for ye performance of that office and  Considering  ye Circumstances of this Island we think fitt that ye  Rules following  be ye Rules and methods for ye Church wardens (especially for ye  present) to Governe themselves and walk by  You are to take Care of ye Church monies and receive all money  to ye Church, seeing no Imbezlement be made of any of them  but shall be Delivered into ye Church Chest and</p>	<p>The form of the oath taken by Edward Edmunds and John Rich, appointed as churchwardens for the present year, was set out. They were required to swear that they would faithfully perform and discharge the duties of churchwardens according to the directions read to them, so help them God and the contents of the book.</p> <p>An order was made that the following rules and methods should be observed by them in the execution of their office.</p> <p>It was noted that Richard Griffin and Samuel Taylor, churchwardens for the previous year, had submitted their accounts, which had been examined and approved. They had returned the names of Edward Edmunds and John Rich, together with Thomas Goodwin and Mr Madge, as persons chosen by the majority of the inhabitants to serve as churchwardens for the ensuing year. Edward Edmunds and John Rich were therefore formally appointed to that office.</p> <p>As they had requested instruction regarding their duties, and in consideration of the circumstances of the island, the Governor and Council set out rules to guide their conduct.</p> <p>They were required to take care of all church monies, to receive all funds belonging to the church, and to ensure that no misappropriation occurred. All such monies were to be placed in the church chest under their custody. They were to keep a strict and accurate register of all marriages, christenings, and burials.</p> <p>They were also to keep a proper account of all gifts made to the church and to report their use to the Deputy Governor when required.</p> <p>As the former church in the country had fallen into decay and a new one was considered necessary, they were instructed to give timely notice to the inhabitants to assemble and choose a suitable place and method for building and erecting a new church, which was to be undertaken without delay, with provision made for meeting the cost.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The formal oath established a binding obligation grounded in both religious and administrative authority. Swearing upon a book gave the office a moral and legal foundation, reinforcing accountability.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Custody of you and shall keep a strict and true acco or Register of all marriages  Christning and Burials  You shall keep a good acco of all gifts dedicated to and for the use of the Church and give an acco to ye D: Governr if required for the use of ye Gifts so given  And whereas the Church formerly seated in ye Country is much fallen to decay so that a new one is very much wanted being very necessary and convenient to be now Erected in some therefore place shall be timely notice given to ye Inhabitants to assemble and make choice of some convenient place and method what shall be best for ye building  Erecting of the said Church which ought speedily to be done for ye Charge thereof</p>	<p>The codification of duties in written rules showed an effort to standardise officeholding. Responsibilities were defined explicitly, reducing ambiguity and enabling oversight.</p> <p>The requirement to safeguard church monies and prevent misappropriation indicated concern over financial integrity. Churchwardens functioned as custodians of communal funds, subject to scrutiny.</p> <p>The maintenance of registers of marriages, christenings, and burials demonstrated the administrative role of the church in recording vital events. These records formed an essential part of governance and social order.</p> <p>The obligation to account for gifts to the church showed structured management of donations. Such gifts were treated as assets requiring documentation and reporting.</p> <p>The instruction to organise the rebuilding of the church placed churchwardens at the centre of local infrastructure development. Their role extended beyond maintenance to active coordination of communal projects.</p> <p>The involvement of the majority of inhabitants in selecting churchwardens reflected participatory elements within the system. However, final authority remained with the Governor and Council, who confirmed appointments.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The detailed instructions suggest that previous officeholders may not have operated under clearly defined rules. The Council may have sought to prevent mismanagement by setting explicit expectations.</p> <p>The emphasis on financial control and record-keeping indicates concern over potential misuse of funds or incomplete accounts. The new rules may have been introduced to strengthen confidence in administration.</p> <p>The urgency attached to rebuilding the church suggests that its condition had become a pressing issue. The Council may have aimed to mobilise resources quickly to restore a central institution of community life.</p> <p>The combination of local selection and central appointment of churchwardens suggests a balance between community involvement and administrative control. This may have been designed to secure cooperation while maintaining authority.</p>
83	79	<p>[...] you shall wth the said Country assembled for ye purpose consider what way is most proper to raise ye same might be raised and applied incurring an acco thereof to us to be approved of and upon our approbation and warrant to affess and collect accordingly  You shall take care that both Churches be kept in good repair and make affessment for your reimbursement for the same  You shall take notice of all notorious and open profane swearers and drunkards  Sabbath breakers swearers drunkards and whore mongers and give notice of them unto us and as you are directed shall accordingly make presentment of them at ye usuall Quarter Sessions according to law  You shall upon Easter monday assemble ye Inhabitants from all parts of the Island in ye Church in ye Country and then make choyce of a minister by majority votes nominate 4 persons for Church wardens and 4 persons for overseers of the high wayes which you shall present unto us whereby we may make choyce of two out of ye foure for Church wardens and two out of ye foure for overseers of ye high wayes to succeed you and the present overseers of</p>	<p>The churchwardens were further instructed that, together with the inhabitants assembled for that purpose, they should consider the most suitable method for raising funds for the building of the church. They were to prepare an account of the proposed means and submit it for approval. Upon approval and warrant, they were to levy and collect the assessment accordingly.</p> <p>They were required to ensure that both churches were kept in good repair and to make assessments to reimburse themselves for expenses incurred in that maintenance.</p> <p>They were directed to observe and report all persons guilty of open and notorious misconduct, including profane swearing, drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, and sexual immorality. Such offenders were to be presented at the usual Quarter Sessions according to law.</p> <p>They were instructed that on Easter Monday they should assemble the inhabitants from all parts of the island at the country church. At that meeting, a minister was to be chosen by majority vote, and four persons were to be nominated for churchwardens and four for overseers of the highways. These names were to be submitted to the Governor and Council, who would select two from each group to serve in the following year. In the meantime, the churchwardens were to take account of the current overseers' proceedings and report their condition for review.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>the respective offices ye next yeare and in ye meane tyme you shall likewise take an account from ye present overseers of their proceedings and relate their conditions unto us yt ye same may be taken for their rendering accompt You shall take care yt there be no disorder in ye Church during the tyme of Divine Service for wch purpose you may if cause appoint one or more as a vestryman to assist him his duty and by salary and make allowance for ye same accordingly This is all at present we can thinke necessary and most proper for ye duty of Church wardens untill some other method shall be given which only take care by the persons we do not meane or offend any but ye good and service to this Island being in performance we have you and Councill of ye Island have hereunto set our hands this 14th Day of July 1697 Rich Keeling Step Poirier [...] Alexander It is ordered That all the officers of the high wayes be sworne in ye next Court Whereas there are severall small Children belonging to ye Right Honble Comp a not at all usefull in the plantation and wee being often Solicited by severall of our inhabitants freely to see or hire them Jno Eyers or Guiley It is ordered That George Hutchinson Thimmeson Jno Facknald and Matt Bassett shall each of them have a number of such Home Companys black or negroes as each for their service and to return them at three yeares [...]</p>	<p>They were also required to maintain order in the church during divine service. For this purpose, they could appoint one or more vestrymen to assist in enforcing discipline, with suitable allowance made for their service.</p> <p>These instructions were declared sufficient for the present, subject to future alteration. They were issued for the good and service of the island, and were signed on 14 July 1697 by Richard Keeling, Stephen Poirier, and [...] Alexander.</p> <p>An order was made that all overseers of the highways should be sworn at the next court.</p> <p>It was further noted that several small children belonging to the Right Honourable Company were not yet useful for plantation labour. As inhabitants had frequently requested to hire or take them into service, an order was made that George Hutchinson, Thimmeson, John Facknald, and Matthew Bassett should each receive a number of such Company-owned Black children for their service. These children were to be returned after three years.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The requirement to submit funding plans for approval before levying assessment showed central oversight of local taxation. Financial decisions required authorisation, linking local initiative with administrative control.</p> <p>The duty to maintain both churches and recover costs through assessment reflected a structured system of communal financing. Churchwardens acted as intermediaries between expenditure and collection.</p> <p>The obligation to report moral offences and present offenders at Quarter Sessions demonstrated the integration of ecclesiastical oversight with legal enforcement. Churchwardens functioned as agents of social discipline.</p> <p>The procedure for selecting officers and a minister combined local participation with central selection. While inhabitants nominated candidates, final authority remained with the Governor and Council, ensuring controlled governance.</p> <p>The instruction to supervise existing overseers and report on their performance indicated a system of hierarchical accountability. Officeholders were subject to review by their successors and by central authority.</p> <p>The appointment of vestrymen to maintain order during divine service showed delegated enforcement within the church. Discipline was actively managed through appointed assistants.</p> <p>The order to distribute Company-owned Black children among inhabitants for a fixed term demonstrated a labour allocation system. Children were treated as assignable labour resources, placed temporarily under private control but retained as Company property.</p> <p>The requirement to return these children after three years indicated regulated tenure of labour. Control over their service remained with the Company, preventing permanent transfer.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The detailed financial and administrative instructions suggest that previous practices may have lacked consistency. The Council may have aimed to impose clearer structure to prevent mismanagement.</p> <p>The emphasis on reporting moral offences indicates concern with maintaining discipline in a small and closely monitored society. The churchwardens' role may have been strengthened to extend surveillance.</p> <p>The system of nomination and selection of officers suggests an attempt to balance local influence with central authority. This arrangement may have been designed to reduce conflict while preserving control.</p> <p>The allocation of Company-owned children for service suggests a response to labour shortages. By placing them with settlers, the Council may have aimed</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>to increase productivity while retaining long-term ownership.</p> <p>The fixed term of three years indicates an intention to maintain flexibility in labour distribution. The Company may have sought to reassess their use once they became more productive or valuable.</p>
84	80	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation held on Munday ye 23 day of August 1697 att Fort James  Present  Rich Keeling Govr  Steph Poirier Dep Govr  Whereas Tho Earle hath petitioned us ye Govr and Councill of this Island shewing that his father in law Rich  Stacy who married his mother the widdow of Jno Earle his own father had disposed and sold to one Smollett and Will Ratcliff ye 20 Acres land allotted to them by the  Rt Honble Comp a at their first coming heare wch could not have done it lawfully being the petitioner sole heire to ye said Earle his father his mother enjoying it during the termes of her life she being now dead ye petitioner doth humbly claime his right yt he hath lawfully to it if ye Govr and Councill and that he may hereafter enjoy the same  Upon mature consideration wee being sensible of his Right to it and further considering that ye 20 acres land aforesaid disposed to the Smott and Will Ratcliff is now in the Rt Honble Comp a  possession and doth make part of some designed pasture wee have proposed to him severall ways to End that busines if so it deserves to be decided by ye Rt Honble Comp a or to lett a Jury decide it at an open Court and also to come to some composition or other wee  having allowed him time to consider he refuseth to stand to the  last</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 23 August 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard Keeling, Governor, and Stephen Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>Thomas Earle submitted a petition stating that his father-in-law, Richard Stacy, who had married his mother after the death of his father John Earle, had sold 20 acres of land to Smollett and William Ratcliff. This land had originally been allotted by the Right Honourable Company to his father. Earle claimed that the sale had not been lawful, as he was the sole heir, and his mother had only held the land for the duration of her life. As she was now dead, he asserted his right to the land and requested that he might be allowed to enjoy it.</p> <p>Upon consideration, the Governor and Council acknowledged his claim. They noted, however, that the 20 acres in question, having passed to Smollett and William Ratcliff, were now in the possession of the Right Honourable Company and formed part of a pasture that had been set aside for use.</p> <p>Several options were proposed to resolve the matter. The case might be referred to the Right Honourable Company for decision, or it might be tried before a jury at an open court. Alternatively, a settlement might be reached by agreement. Time was given to Thomas Earle to consider these options, but he refused to accept them.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The petition demonstrated the formal process for asserting inheritance rights. Individuals could bring claims before the Governor and Council to challenge prior transfers of property.</p> <p>The distinction between life interest and inheritance showed a structured understanding of property rights. The mother's possession was limited to her lifetime, after which the heir's claim became active.</p> <p>The involvement of Richard Stacy as a stepfather illustrated the complexity of property transfer within blended families. Authority to dispose of land was not automatically conferred by marriage.</p> <p>The fact that the land had passed into Company possession and was incorporated into a designated pasture showed the overriding authority of the Company. Private transactions could be absorbed into broader administrative planning.</p> <p>The range of proposed resolutions demonstrated flexibility in dispute handling. Matters could be referred to higher authority, decided by jury, or settled by agreement.</p> <p>The refusal of Thomas Earle to accept these options indicated that consent was required for negotiated settlement. The Council could propose but not compel agreement without further procedure.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The Council's acknowledgement of Earle's right alongside its emphasis on the land's current use suggests a tension between legal entitlement and administrative convenience. The land's incorporation into a pasture may have complicated restitution.</p> <p>The offer of multiple resolution methods indicates an attempt to avoid formal adjudication. The Council may have preferred a negotiated outcome to preserve resources or prevent disruption.</p> <p>Earle's refusal to accept the proposed options suggests that he sought full restoration rather than compromise. This may indicate that the value or</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>importance of the land to him outweighed alternative settlements.</p> <p>The reference to referral to the Company implies that final authority could lie outside the island. The Council may have sought to shift responsibility for a difficult decision to a higher level of governance.</p>
85	81	<p>Whereupon wee have proposed him to Exchange in time to Reap and taking in ye possession of Jno Hemmings and now in ye Rt Honble Comp a being at Deep Valley head to satisfy him of his said Right and pretence or claime wch he could pretend from both ye said Rt Honble Comp a and Jno Earle &amp; Wm Coale or others and in lieu thereof to take land in Butlers widdow (whereas ye sd Jno Hemmings land is far better then his fathers one) Considering further that Stacy his father in law had his mother have taken and received the vallens of ye aforesaid 20 acres Land already from ye said Ratton and Smott and to preserve as much as he ought to doe their right it is hereupon agreed as followeth Viz That he shall Sell and dispose ye said Hemmings land to William Coale who being present doth hereunto agree to pay to the said Earle fifteen pounds sterling five pounds pt to the said Earle to ye Rt Honble Comp a and five pounds to the said Earle at or before ye end and terme fifteen months if ye sd Coale leave the aforesaid estate if Also to pay to the said Earle five pounds more wch he is willing to doe rather then run to himself further trouble: that is occasioned by land Whereupon and in Consideration of these Conditions above mentioned he ye said Earle doth quit claime and doth remise release and for ever quit claime unto the Rt Honble Comp a and Wm Coale all and all manner of Right claime Demand and Interest whatsoever he could pretend against ye said Rt Honble Comp a and Coale for or by reason of ye said land by them purchased for him and for his heires Executors and administrators from the begining of the world unto the day of the date of these presents and for ever And further he the said present doth likewise give allow and grant unto the said Will Coale his heires and for ever all manner of Right title Interest use and possession of the said land before mentioned to him his heires and assigns for ever in witness whereof wee have hereunto sett our hands this 7th of August 1697 Thomas Earle Poirier Steph Goodwin a copy to be delivered when demanded Mem that Thomas Alby bought this land of John Hemmon for wch by agreement he took it to acres in Darys Valley</p>	<p>The Governor and Council proposed that Thomas Earle should take, in exchange, land formerly held by John Hemmings at Deep Valley Head, now in the possession of the Right Honourable Company. This land was considered of better quality than that originally held by his father. In return, he was to accept land at Butler's widow's holding. It was further considered that Richard Stacy, his father-in-law, and Earle's mother had already received the value of the original 20 acres from Ratton and Smott.</p> <p>To preserve the respective rights of all parties, an agreement was reached. Thomas Earle was to sell and dispose of the Hemmings land to William Coale. Coale, being present, agreed to pay £15 0s 0d sterling. Of this, £5 0s 0d was to be paid to Earle for the use of the Right Honourable Company, and a further £5 0s 0d was to be paid to Earle within 15 months if Coale retained the estate. Coale also agreed to pay an additional £5 0s 0d to Earle, preferring this settlement to further dispute.</p> <p>In consideration of these terms, Thomas Earle formally released and relinquished all claims, rights, demands, and interests in the disputed land against both the Right Honourable Company and William Coale. This release extended to himself, his heirs, executors, and administrators, and was to stand in perpetuity.</p> <p>He further granted to William Coale, his heirs and assigns, full title, interest, use, and possession of the land in question.</p> <p>This agreement was signed on 7 August 1697 by Thomas Earle, Stephen Poirier, and Stephen Goodwin. It was ordered that a copy should be provided when requested.</p> <p>A memorandum recorded that Thomas Alby had previously purchased this land from John Hemmon and had, by agreement, taken it in exchange for two acres in Darys Valley.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The proposed land exchange showed a mechanism for resolving property disputes through substitution rather than restitution. Alternative land of greater value was offered to satisfy the claimant's right without disturbing existing Company arrangements.</p> <p>The acknowledgement that Stacy and Earle's mother had already received value for the original land indicated consideration of prior transactions. Compensation previously received was treated as relevant in assessing current claims.</p> <p>The structured payment of £15 0s 0d in instalments demonstrated a negotiated financial settlement. Payment terms were conditional and staged, linking ownership to fulfilment of obligations.</p> <p>The inclusion of payment partly for the use of the Company showed that the Company retained financial interest in private land transactions. Its authority extended to benefiting from settlements involving disputed property.</p> <p>The formal quitclaim clause extinguished all future claims. Such clauses ensured finality by legally barring further dispute over the same land.</p> <p>The recording of signatures and provision for copies established the agreement as a binding document. Written form ensured enforceability and administrative record.</p> <p>The memorandum noting prior exchange involving Thomas Alby indicated layered transactions affecting the same land. Property history was tracked to support legitimacy of current arrangements.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The offer of superior land suggests that the Council sought to avoid disrupting Company-held pasture. Providing better land may have been intended to secure Earle's agreement without reopening earlier transfers.</p> <p>The inclusion of multiple payments and conditions indicates a carefully balanced settlement. The Council may have aimed to satisfy Earle while also preserving Company interests and recognising Coale's position.</p> <p>Earle's acceptance of the agreement suggests that the offered terms were considered sufficient compensation. His decision to release all claims indicates a preference for certainty over prolonged dispute.</p> <p>The detailed quitclaim and memorandum imply concern about future challenges. The Council may have intended to close the matter definitively by documenting every aspect of the transaction.</p>
86	82	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Con[...][...] held on Saturday ye 29th of 8ber  Att Fort James  Present  Rich Keling Govr  Steph Poirier Depy Govr  Whereas severall [...][...] and Inhabitants of ye said Island  have much writt us to give ye said Island refreshing by ye  Ship now for Europe vizt ye [...][...] and Antilope Interloper  But Considering that ye Island is very weakened by such importunities which have been heretofore granted and on Consideration of many Inconveniencys it produces  It is ordered  That no person what soever shall have liberty to goe off this Island till further notice be brought hereof appear  Memor Execu[...][...] who had liberty before the date of these presents  R Poiner  S Goodwin</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Saturday 29 October 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Richard Keeling, Governor, and Stephen Poirier, Deputy Governor.</p> <p>It was reported that several [...] and inhabitants of the island had made repeated requests to be allowed to leave the island by ships bound for Europe, namely the [...] and the <i>Antilope</i>, described as an interloper. The Governor and Council considered that the island had already been weakened by such requests being granted in the past, and that many inconveniences had arisen from them.</p> <p>An order was made that no person whatsoever should be permitted to leave the island until further notice.</p> <p>A memorandum noted that this order did not apply to those who had already been granted permission before the date of the present order.</p> <p>[...] R Poirier  [...] S Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The restriction on departure showed direct control over population movement. Permission to leave the island was regulated by the Governor and Council, indicating that inhabitants were subject to administrative authority in matters of mobility.</p> <p>The reference to the island being “weakened” by departures suggested concern over loss of labour or essential personnel. Retention of inhabitants was treated as necessary for maintaining the settlement.</p> <p>The mention of an interloping ship indicated tension with unauthorised trade or transport. Such vessels operated outside Company control, raising issues of regulation and authority.</p> <p>The general prohibition, combined with an exception for prior permissions, demonstrated formal rule-making with recognition of existing rights. Orders were applied prospectively while preserving earlier grants.</p> <p>The issuing of such an order in consultation reflected collective decision-making at the highest local level. Policy affecting the entire population was determined by the Governor and Council.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to prohibit departure suggests that the island may have been experiencing labour shortages or reduced capacity. Preventing further departures may have been intended to stabilise the workforce.</p> <p>The identification of the <i>Antilope</i> as an interloper indicates concern over unauthorised contact with external networks. The Council may have aimed to limit interaction with ships operating outside Company oversight.</p> <p>The exception for those already granted permission suggests an attempt to avoid dispute or resentment. The Council may have sought to enforce control without undermining its own prior decisions.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The reference to previous inconvenience implies that earlier permissions had caused disruption. This order may have been a corrective measure to prevent repetition of such effects.</p>
87	83	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Teusday ye 30th of Nov: 1697  att Fort James  Present  Stephn Poirier Govr  Mr Tho: Goodwin Assist  Whereas by providence of Almighty God our late Govr Kelinge is Removed from us by death to our unspeakable griefe and sorrow on ye said instant about five of the clock in the Morning: wee Cant but be greatly sensible of our great loss not only for want of his desirable presence but great Ability wch in him was so plentifully furnished for ye Reputable Discharge of the trust and office he had and hath been for severall years past the Consideration hereof gives much trouble to us The rather because of the paucity left to manage the Rt Hon Our Masters affaires in this Island Wherefore the said Co: Steph: Poirier doth according to his place of being before declared by succession of his place into ye government by ye Rt Honble English Comp a as president Ordained by ye last Indent as being next longest in succession brought Hitherto (in time passed) and also of his fitness sitting upon the Council An Oath of the Govr (Blackmore) and likewise hath on ye 2d day of Janry 1694: President Govr Keling: Capt Poirier Capt Robt Norvall Commander of the Ship [...] &amp; Capt Will: Wills Commander of ye Mocha and Capt Jno Branwell Commander of the Ship Transport have nominated and appointed to succeed him of this place after the decease of the then present lived Keling: all wch having conferred with all the officers of the Garrison who did all unanimously testify Consent thereunto And whereas it hath been ye said providence of Almighty God to order things so as to bring the said Co: Steph: Poirier into this station wch he doth Acknowledge is far beyond his deserte and considering that the said place is of a weighty and great Moment for one Person only he hath desired Mr Tho: Goodwin [...]</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Tuesday 30 November 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>It was recorded that by the providence of Almighty God the late Governor, Richard Keeling, had died on that day at about five o'clock in the morning. His death was described as a matter of great grief and loss, both for the absence of his presence and for the considerable ability he had shown in discharging the duties of his office over several years. Concern was expressed that the number of persons available to manage the affairs of the Right Honourable Company on the island was now very small.</p> <p>Stephen Poirier then entered upon the government in accordance with his place in the established order of succession under the authority of the Right Honourable English Company. His position was supported by his seniority on the Council and by prior arrangements. Reference was made to an oath connected with Governor Blackmore, and to a nomination made on 2 January 1694, when Governor Keeling, Captain Poirier, Captain Robert Norvall, Captain William Wills, and Captain John Branwell had appointed him to succeed upon Keeling's death. This succession was confirmed by consultation with the officers of the garrison, who unanimously gave their consent.</p> <p>Poirier acknowledged that his elevation to this office was beyond his merit and that the charge was of great weight. In view of the burden resting upon a single person, he requested the assistance of Thomas Goodwin [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The formal notice of Keeling's death within a consultation record showed the administrative handling of succession. Recognition of death triggered immediate reorganisation of authority.</p> <p>The emphasis on divine providence reflected the use of religious framing in official governance. Such language reinforced acceptance of events and the legitimacy of transition.</p> <p>The detailed reference to prior nomination and oath demonstrated reliance on pre-established succession mechanisms. Authority was grounded in earlier agreements rather than improvised decision.</p> <p>The confirmation by garrison officers indicated that military endorsement was integral to political authority. Governance required support from those controlling force on the island.</p> <p>The reference to seniority and prior service showed that rank and tenure structured eligibility for office. Succession followed an ordered hierarchy.</p> <p>The acknowledgment of limited personnel highlighted administrative constraints. Governance depended on a small number of individuals, making continuity difficult.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The careful recital of succession arrangements suggests concern to prevent dispute. The Council may have anticipated potential challenges and sought to establish Poirier's authority clearly.</p> <p>The emphasis on the small number of officials suggests anxiety about maintaining effective administration. The death of the Governor may have exposed institutional fragility.</p> <p>Poirier's expression of humility may have been intended to secure acceptance. Presenting the office as burdensome rather than desirable could strengthen his legitimacy.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The unanimous consent of the garrison officers suggests that their support was actively sought. This may indicate that authority depended not only on formal rules but also on practical backing from military leadership.</p>
88	84	<p>to be his assistance (hee is a man judged who doth stand his friend in hope and incouragement willingly chearfully faithfully and sincerely untill the Rt Honble Comp a shall dispose of this Island or himself think it otherwise to dispose of him) which is not to be expected  Provided also that the present Settlement given now the last assent or alteration to ye aforesaid Settlement Established by ye aforesaid Consultation held ye 26th June 1694 wch is to remaine in its force and vertue to the End to which it hath been dictated  Mr John [...] who hath served the Rt Honble the Comp as [...] even since Capt [...] his being hereon (which was in July 1697 and amidst the many great matters ensuing hath bin employed) doth request us yt he may succeed Mr Vernon in his place of Clarke to the Councill the said Vernon being gone home in the last ship Benjamin Whereupon after ye oath taken by him according to our Masters orders It is ordered  That he forthwith be installed in the same place and have the same Salary that Mr Vernon had that is to say Clerk of the Councill untill the said Rt Honble Comp a which is not to be expected have given no order otherwise  Poiner  S Goodwin</p>	<p>Stephen Poirier further declared that he had requested Thomas Goodwin to act as his assistant. Goodwin was described as a man considered capable, and willing to serve faithfully and sincerely in that role until the Right Honourable Company should otherwise determine, or until Poirier himself saw reason to alter the arrangement.</p> <p>It was also provided that the existing settlement, last confirmed or amended by the consultation of 26 June 1694, should remain in full force and effect for the purposes for which it had been established.</p> <p>Mr John [...] [...], who had served the Right Honourable Company in various capacities since July 1697 and had been employed in several important matters, requested to succeed Mr Vernon as clerk to the Council, Vernon having departed for England in the last ship, the <i>Benjamin</i>.</p> <p>After taking the required oath in accordance with Company orders, it was ordered that he should be immediately installed as clerk to the Council. He was to receive the same salary as Mr Vernon, that is, the office of clerk to the Council, until the Right Honourable Company should issue further instructions.</p> <p>[...] Poiner  [...] S Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The appointment of Thomas Goodwin as assistant to the Governor showed the delegation of authority within the administration. Governance was structured to distribute responsibility where the burden of office was considered too great for one individual.</p> <p>The confirmation that the settlement of 26 June 1694 remained in force demonstrated continuity of institutional arrangements. Existing frameworks were preserved to maintain stability during transition.</p> <p>The appointment of a clerk to the Council illustrated the importance of administrative record-keeping. The clerk's role was essential for documenting proceedings and maintaining official correspondence.</p> <p>The requirement that the new clerk take an oath before assuming office reflected formal procedures for legitimising administrative roles. Authority depended on adherence to prescribed forms.</p> <p>The continuation of salary at the previous rate showed standardisation of office. Remuneration was tied to position rather than individual negotiation, reinforcing institutional consistency.</p> <p>The reference to the Company's ultimate authority indicated that local appointments were provisional. Final control over offices remained with the metropolitan body.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The formal emphasis on Goodwin's reliability suggests that Poirier sought to secure trusted support in a period of uncertainty. This may reflect concern about limited personnel following Keeling's death.</p> <p>The decision to maintain the existing settlement without alteration indicates a preference for stability. Immediate change may have been avoided to prevent disruption during the transition of power.</p> <p>The swift appointment of a new clerk suggests that administrative continuity was a priority. The absence of a clerk may have risked interruption to governance, particularly in record-keeping.</p> <p>The repeated reference to the Company's authority implies sensitivity to oversight. The Council may have been careful to frame all actions as temporary or conditional to avoid exceeding its mandate.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
<a href="#">89</a>	85	<p>Att a Consultation Held on Monday ye 12th of Xber 1697  Att Fort James  Present  Stephn Poirier Govr  Tho Goodwin Assistants  Doct: Hoskinson complains on ye behalfe of Elizabeth Hemmons against one Hemmings her husband that he doth keep from her one Cow which belongs to her as doth appeare by a Court of Justices held ye 7th of 8ber 1697 and consequently the property was found in her of a heifer &amp; ye said Hemmings have her in Exchange for goods which hath now a calfe he doth com- plaine that when he bound her to the saddles doth lye in whose house she is now he did engage himself to find her a convenient Appartenance which things he doth refuse to comply with Whereupon the said Hemmings was called who sayeth that to avoyd further trouble he doth offer to give her a Consideration of what Allowed her by ye board and Council of this Island her Right to it he doth not deny ye said Hoskinson and call it as aforesaid but being her husband hath reason to keep them Untill Either she be married or goes off this Island and in ye mean time doth find himself to be accountable to her and every one for ye increase I allow what concern ye same and Elizabeth he doth pass his word to deliver it at next ships coming being from this Island he will performe it Therefore after mature Consideration It is ordered By ye Consent of both parties yt ye said Hemmings his offer be accepted he paying Court Charges James Ryder desiring to be freed The Allison Slave had given Mastery Possession by ye sale of ye to them by ye said Allison with his whole Estate doth appeare for ye same by 8ber 88 on the Conditions following Viz</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 12 December 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Stephen Poirier served as Governor, with Thomas Goodwin assisting.</p> <p>Doctor Hoskinson brought a complaint on behalf of Elizabeth Hemmons against her husband Hemmings. A Court of Justice held on 7 October 1697 had found that a heifer belonged to her. Hemmings had taken that animal in exchange for goods. The animal had since produced a calf. Hemmings kept the cow and the calf. It was also alleged that he had promised to provide her with proper maintenance when she was placed in another household, but he refused to do so.</p> <p>Hemmings appeared and did not deny her right to the animal. He stated that he wished to avoid further dispute. He offered compensation as the Governor and Council might allow. He claimed that, as her husband, he had reason to retain possession until she remarried or left the island. He stated that he would be answerable for the calf. He gave his word that he would deliver what was due at the departure of the next ship.</p> <p>After consideration, and with the consent of both parties, an order was made that his proposal should be accepted. He was required to pay the court charges.</p> <p>James Ryder then requested to be released from responsibility for a slave formerly belonging to Allison. He stated that he had received possession by purchase of the whole estate, as recorded in October 1688. The matter proceeded upon the following conditions:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>Doctor Hoskinson's role showed that claims could be brought through another person. This indicates that some individuals relied on others to act for them in formal proceedings.</p> <p>The earlier judgement on the heifer established legal ownership. That ruling remained in force even though possession had not yet passed.</p> <p>The dispute showed a separation between ownership and control. The wife held the right, but the husband kept the animal.</p> <p>The calf followed the ownership of the heifer. Livestock was treated as property that produced further property.</p> <p>The Council accepted a settlement rather than enforcing immediate transfer. This showed a preference for agreement over strict execution.</p> <p>The order to pay court charges showed that legal process carried a cost. Responsibility for that cost fell on the party in fault.</p> <p>The reference to the 1688 sale showed that earlier transactions remained valid evidence. Written records continued to govern later claims, especially in matters involving slaves.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Hemmings's offer suggests that he sought to delay surrender while keeping control. The promise tied to the next ship shows that timing mattered.</p> <p>The Council's acceptance of the offer suggests a wish to end the dispute quickly. Continued conflict may have been seen as more damaging than delay.</p> <p>Elizabeth Hemmons's reliance on Hoskinson suggests limited direct power. Support from others may have strengthened her position.</p> <p>The reference to the 1688 transaction suggests that old claims remained active. The Council may have faced repeated disputes arising from earlier sales.</p>
<a href="#">90</a>	86	<p>That he shall have 3 yeares for ye payment thereof: In ye first yeare he shall pay no Interest But afterwards if he doth not pay the Whole sum he shall pay for every ye twenty shillings a yeares Interest and it is further agreed yt paying any part of the</p>	<p>It was agreed that James [...] [...] should have three years to pay the sum. No interest was to be paid in the first year. If the full sum was not paid after that, interest was to be charged at 20s 0d per year for every £1 0s 0d remaining. Any partial payment was to reduce the interest proportionately.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>same sum the Interest shall be diminished proportionably It is ordered Given James [...] [...] That upon the conditions aforesaid he shall have the said land and be put in possession of it ye 25th of March next and have a deed for ye same as soon as may be provided he find good security Martha Oliver examined on oath saith that in as much as she was delivered of a bastard Child shee sayeth it is to Gabriel Towell acknowledging that he is Towells by her severall times: Shee also saith that the first time he lay with her was in Cannady house a little before ye Shipp Mary came in but on further Consideration shee remembereth he lay with her severall times before then and shee further saith that on a certaine time when Dick Allen and Wally was at her Masters House Towells promised her in ye Plantine walko that he would give something towards her maintaining her Child if shee would not name him as the father of it The said Martha further saith that when shee was labour shee told her Mistress that Gabriel Towell was the true father of the Child Mr Hoskinson Examined saith that the said Martha did at her labour told her that Gabriel Towell was the father of the said Child It is ordered That the said Martha be imediatly punished with 39 lashes on the bare back and that Towell maintaine the Child and keepe the parish harmeless</p>	<p>An order was made that James [...] [...] should, under these conditions, have the land. He was to be put in possession on 25 March 1698. A deed was to be prepared for him as soon as possible, provided that he gave good security.</p> <p>Martha Oliver was examined on oath. She stated that she had given birth to a bastard child and named Gabriel Towell as the father. She said that he had lain with her several times. She first stated that this began at Cannady House shortly before the arrival of the ship <i>Mary</i>, but then said that he had lain with her several times before that.</p> <p>She further stated that on one occasion, when Dick Allen and Wally were at her master's house, Towell promised her in the plantation walk that he would give something towards maintaining the child if she did not name him as the father.</p> <p>Martha Oliver also stated that during her labour she told her mistress that Gabriel Towell was the true father of the child.</p> <p>Mr Hoskinson gave evidence that Martha had said the same during her labour, naming Gabriel Towell as the father.</p> <p>An order was made that Martha Oliver should immediately receive 39 lashes on her bare back. It was further ordered that Gabriel Towell should maintain the child and keep the parish free from any charge.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The staged payment terms showed a structured credit arrangement. Deferred interest in the first year encouraged settlement while allowing time to pay.</p> <p>The requirement to provide security before receiving the deed demonstrated protection of the seller's interest. Possession depended on assurance of payment.</p> <p>The examination of Martha Oliver under oath showed the use of sworn testimony in establishing paternity. Her statement formed the basis for legal responsibility.</p> <p>The reference to a promise of support in exchange for silence indicated an attempt to avoid liability. Such conduct was treated as relevant evidence.</p> <p>The confirmation of her statement during labour gave additional weight to her claim. Statements made at that time were treated as credible.</p> <p>The punishment of Martha Oliver for bearing a bastard child reflected enforcement of moral discipline. Corporal punishment was used to regulate sexual conduct.</p> <p>The order that Towell should maintain the child and keep the parish harmless showed the transfer of financial responsibility. The parish was protected from the cost of support.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The allowance of three years without initial interest suggests an effort to make the sale viable. The Council may have aimed to ensure the land remained productive rather than forcing immediate payment.</p> <p>The insistence on security before granting possession indicates concern over default. The Council may have sought to avoid disputes over unpaid land.</p> <p>Martha's statement about Towell's offer suggests that he tried to avoid being named. This may indicate awareness of the financial and legal consequences.</p> <p>The immediate punishment of Martha alongside the order against Towell shows a dual approach. Moral offence was punished at once, while financial liability was assigned separately.</p>
91	87	<p>[...] Granny Jones Higham Wm Doveton and Peter Williams Demand for the Come goods yt is now come Oringe that Lord Keeling [...] them [...] equally was ye part of which fifteen fell to the Comp<sup>a</sup> &amp; ye Remainder divided by 4</p>	<p>Granny Jones, Higham, William Doveton, and Peter Williams made a demand concerning the corn goods that had recently arrived in the <i>Orange</i>. It was stated that Lord Keeling had allotted shares, of which fifteen fell to the Company, and the remainder was divided into four parts at a rate of one dollar per [...]</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>at a  Dollar per [...]: qts a man: foure being concerned they doe  joynly one themselves and put into good and saleable and  Desire ye may be paid out of their Shares: that ye being paid Share yt Doe to each man p<sup>a</sup>  It is ordered  That they have Credit accordingly and that Higham Doveton and Williams have each a ballon of Cyder at ye price of a Dollar a Hhd  Island St Helena  Att a Consultation held on Monday the 19 Day of X<sup>br</sup> 1697 att Fort James  Present  Stephn Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>  Mr Thomas Goodwin Assistant  Whereas John Hemmon did offer to give a Cow to his Daughter Elizabeth  as doth appeare by a Consultation held on Monday the 13 Day of this Instant  [...] but having none of his owne and knowing not where to buy one for  his said Daughter George Hopkinson being present offers to sell one already  a Cow for the said Elizabeth the said Hemmon paying for her the sume of 3 li  of good and saleable Cattle which the said Hemmon promises to Doe and was  Accordingly agreed upon  Memor That about a fortnight after it being then agreed yt the said Hopkinson for  a B[...] to said Hemmon being Ready to leave commonly feeding  in Back house pasture at the price of 8 which said Hopkinson valued [...]  [...] while after the Bargain was made and agreed upon</p>	<p>quarts per man. As four persons were concerned, they joined together and put their goods into saleable condition. They requested that payment should be made out of their respective shares.</p> <p>An order was made that they should be allowed credit accordingly. It was further ordered that Higham, Doveton, and Williams should each receive one gallon of cider at the price of one dollar per hogshead.</p> <p>A consultation was held on Monday 19 December 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>It was noted that John Hemmon had previously offered to give a cow to his daughter Elizabeth, as recorded in a consultation held on Monday 13 October 1699. As he did not possess a cow and did not know where to obtain one, George Hopkinson, being present, offered to sell a cow for Elizabeth. Hemmon agreed to pay £3 0s 0d in good and saleable cattle for the animal, and this arrangement was accepted.</p> <p>A memorandum recorded that about a fortnight later, Hopkinson, being ready to leave, had a [...] which was then feeding in Back House pasture and was valued at £8 0s 0d. This formed part of the agreement made between them.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The distribution of corn goods from the <i>Orange</i> showed organised allocation of imported provisions. Shares were calculated and assigned among individuals and the Company.</p> <p>The reference to shares measured by quantity and price indicated a structured system of distribution. Goods were divided according to fixed proportions and valued in monetary terms.</p> <p>The request for payment from shares demonstrated a system of credit and settlement. Individuals could offset obligations against their allotted portions.</p> <p>The provision of cider at a set price showed regulated trade in provisions. Commodities were priced in standard units, ensuring consistency in exchange.</p> <p>The arrangement for John Hemmon to obtain a cow for his daughter showed the use of mediated sale. A third party provided the animal when the original giver lacked the means.</p> <p>The agreement to pay in cattle rather than money reflected a mixed economy. Livestock functioned as a medium of exchange and measure of value.</p> <p>The memorandum noting a later valuation showed that transactions could evolve after initial agreement. Adjustments were recorded to reflect changing circumstances or additional terms.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The collective action of Jones, Higham, Doveton, and Williams suggests that cooperation was used to manage distribution. Pooling goods may have made it easier to prepare them for sale or settlement.</p> <p>The allowance of credit against shares indicates flexibility in the system. The Council may have aimed to facilitate trade without requiring immediate payment.</p> <p>The arrangement for Elizabeth Hemmon suggests concern for provision within families. The Council may have supported such transactions to ensure dependants were maintained.</p> <p>The later valuation of the animal at £8 0s 0d suggests a reassessment of worth. This may indicate that the original agreement did not fully reflect the market value, prompting adjustment.</p>
22	88	<p>Att a Con[...]ation Held y<sup>e</sup> 26<sup>th</sup> of X<sup>br</sup> 1697  att fort James  Present  S<sup>r</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>  T Goodwin Assistant  The Sea having bin tempestuouse 3 dayes together  The last of them nights brake loose a Long Boat</p>	<p>A consultation was held on 26 December 1697 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>The sea had been rough for three days. On the last night, a longboat and a galley broke loose. These vessels had recently been purchased, the longboat from Captain</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>and a galley that were lately bought viz<sup>t</sup> ye Long Boate of Capt Burton Comander of the Ship Seaqueen, and ye galley of Captn Jn<sup>o</sup> Brown Comander of the Benjamin</p> <p>In y<sup>e</sup> morning we found one Boate with 2 of the H H<sup>e</sup> Slaves to swim for them he which they willingly undertooke and performed w<sup>th</sup> the help of Thompson Wills and Rich<sup>d</sup> Allen who were sent to their assistance by order of the Gov<sup>r</sup> In ye galleys which the sd Slaves and Negroes overtooke by swimming and brought in to fetch them</p> <p>The said Boates were both brought in y<sup>t</sup> day and moored to a new Chaîne made by the Smith for y<sup>t</sup> purpose</p> <p>It is ordered That the said Slaves have as a reward 6 Handker[...] a piece Wills one D Steward one Allen one [...] one Harris one H Lushkin one J Dovelon one [...] one ones 2 Company Slaves a p<sup>e</sup> in all Sixteen ye aforesaid Lushkin a pair of pumps also and 3 Shillings for a paire of oares which he then bought [...]</p> <p>Goodwin</p>	<p>Burton, commander of the ship <i>Seaqueen</i>, and the galley from Captain John Brown, commander of the <i>Benjamin</i>.</p> <p>In the morning, one of the boats was found adrift. Two Company slaves were sent to swim out to it. They undertook the task willingly and succeeded. They were assisted by Thompson Wills and Richard Allen, who were sent by order of the Governor in the galley. The slaves overtook the drifting vessels by swimming and secured them so they could be brought back.</p> <p>Both boats were recovered that same day. They were moored using a new chain made by the smith for that purpose.</p> <p>An order was made that the slaves should receive a reward of 16 handkerchiefs, to be distributed among them and others involved. Wills, Steward, Allen, Harris, Lushkin, Dovelon, and [...] each received one. Two Company slaves received one each. Lushkin also received a pair of pumps and 3s 0d for a pair of oars which he had purchased.</p> <p>[...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The recovery of the boats showed reliance on labour drawn from both slaves and free men. Hazardous tasks could be assigned across different ranks when needed.</p> <p>The willingness of the slaves to undertake the task was recorded, suggesting that cooperation could be acknowledged in official proceedings. Their labour was essential to preserving Company property.</p> <p>The involvement of named individuals alongside slaves indicated mixed working groups. Coordination was directed by the Governor, showing central command in emergency response.</p> <p>The use of a newly made chain by the smith demonstrated local production of equipment. Skilled labour supported maritime operations on the island.</p> <p>The reward of handkerchiefs and small payments showed a system of material incentive. Non-monetary goods were used alongside coin to compensate service.</p> <p>The distribution of rewards by name reflected recognition of contribution. Individual effort was formally acknowledged in the record.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to send swimmers suggests urgency and lack of immediate alternatives. The boats may have been at risk of being lost if not recovered quickly.</p> <p>The use of slaves for the most dangerous part of the task suggests that risk was unevenly distributed. Their role may have been expected in such situations.</p> <p>The reward in goods rather than large sums of money suggests limited cash availability. The Council may have relied on trade goods as a practical form of compensation.</p> <p>The rapid recovery and immediate reward indicate that preserving maritime assets was a priority. Boats were essential to the functioning of the island and could not be easily replaced.</p>
23	89	<p>Att a Con[...]ation Held on Munday The 17<sup>th</sup> of Jan<sup>ry</sup> 1697 att fort James Present S<sup>r</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Goodwin Assistant Cap<sup>t</sup> Mostyn Comander of y<sup>e</sup> Ship Fortune of [...] Yorke [...] arrived into this Road on y<sup>e</sup> 11<sup>th</sup> of this Instant from madagascar Laden with negroes, and bound for y<sup>e</sup> aforesaid new Yorke, being amongst other questions asked him what posture Don Mascorine was in, said that it is still in y<sup>e</sup> possession of y<sup>e</sup> french, and that he had certaine advice and intelligence, that there was within he parted from madagascar 3 french men of warr homeward</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 17 January 1698 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Captain Mostyn, commander of the ship <i>Fortune</i> of [...] York, arrived in the road on 11 January 1698 from Madagascar. He carried slaves and was bound for New York. He was questioned about the state of Don Mascorine. He reported that it remained in the possession of the French. He also stated that, shortly before he left Madagascar, three French men-of-war had sailed for home. This intelligence raised concern that they might attempt to take the island.</p> <p>An order was made that both soldiers and freemen should be immediately warned. They were to repair to their posts as soon as any alarm was given, whether by</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>bound, w<sup>ch</sup> gives makes us jealous yt they will attempt Takeing of this Island Whereupon It is ordered That both Sould<sup>r</sup> and freemen be immediately warned and to repaire to their severall posts as soone as any allarm shall be given Either by y<sup>e</sup> guns Appointed for y<sup>t</sup> purpose or otherwise, their armes fixed, an Exact List shall be taken by y<sup>e</sup> of the Armory and of y<sup>e</sup> Guard not only at y<sup>e</sup> Guard but y<sup>e</sup> out forts also, so much that nothing shall be wanting on our parts to be in a readiness to oppose vigorously The enemy, should they [...] attempt our Island Being</p>	<p>the firing of guns appointed for that purpose or by other means. They were to have their arms ready.</p> <p>An exact list was to be taken of the armory and of the guard. This was to include not only the main guard but also the out-forts. All necessary measures were to be taken so that nothing would be lacking in readiness to oppose the enemy should they attempt the island.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The questioning of Captain Mostyn showed the use of incoming ships as sources of intelligence. Information gathered from maritime contacts informed defensive policy.</p> <p>The reference to French control of Don Mascorine indicated awareness of regional power. Strategic conditions beyond the island were treated as relevant to local security.</p> <p>The order to mobilise both soldiers and freemen showed that defence relied on the whole population. Military obligation extended beyond professional troops.</p> <p>The use of alarm signals by gunfire demonstrated an organised warning system. Communication of threat was structured and prearranged.</p> <p>The requirement to take lists of arms and personnel showed administrative control over military resources. Readiness depended on accurate accounting of men and equipment.</p> <p>The inclusion of out-forts in the inspection indicated a distributed defensive system. Protection of the island relied on multiple fortified positions.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The report of French ships suggests heightened fear of attack. The Council may have acted quickly to prepare in response to uncertain intelligence.</p> <p>The inclusion of freemen in defence indicates limited standing forces. The island likely depended on rapid mobilisation of civilians in emergencies.</p> <p>The emphasis on lists and readiness suggests concern about deficiencies. The Council may have suspected that arms or personnel were not fully accounted for.</p> <p>The reliance on information from a passing captain suggests limited independent intelligence. Decisions may have been based on incomplete or second-hand reports.</p>
24	90	<p>Being confident y<sup>t</sup> ye Rt Hon<sup>ble</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> our Masters have nothing nearer on earth to them then ye promotion of Gods Glory (as doth appeare by their Laws and Instructions given to their Servants, as by divers our Experiences, ordering them strictly to performe on all occasions all ye Duties that good Christians owe to Almighty God, being indeed ye only meanes to please him, and consequently to obtaine his Gracious blessing on their [...] affaires) Wee considering these goodly motives, and so concurring as much as in us lies to follow their orders, Wee have appointed James Tuffe a Sould<sup>r</sup> in this Garrison, to Read Publick Prayers Morning and Evening every weekdayes, and on The Lords day, Prayers and Sermon both before noone and After att Fort James, that our Soules might have that Holy Solace to be fed with angelic Bread, beseeching ye Lord, who of his Grace and free will, hath appointed us to plant and to Water to give the Increase, and to Encourage the said Tuffe to goe through with soe pious a Worke It is ordered That he have besides his Salary ten pounds p<sup>a</sup> annum and to Dine at the table (submitting our Selves to our</p>	<p>Being confident that the Right Honourable Company, their masters, placed nothing above the promotion of God's glory, as appeared by their laws and instructions, and by experience of their strict orders that all Christian duties should be performed, the Governor and Council resolved to follow those directions.</p> <p>James Tuffe, a soldier in the garrison, was appointed to read public prayers morning and evening on weekdays, and on the Lord's Day to read prayers and a sermon both before noon and after at Fort James. This was done so that the inhabitants might receive spiritual instruction and encouragement.</p> <p>An order was made that James Tuffe should receive, in addition to his salary, £10 0s 0d per annum. He was also to dine at the Governor's table. This arrangement was made subject to the approval or further direction of the Honourable Company. His additional salary was to be paid from 6 January 1698.</p> <p>It was expressed that the benefit of this arrangement was expected to be felt, and that the inhabitants should attend regularly at the appointed times, morning and evening.</p> <p>It was further noted that the late Governor Keeling had, at the request of the present Governor, granted him six goats for plantation use. These had been purchased from Captain Broadnes, commander of the <i>Benjamin</i>, which had recently been in the road. [...]</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Hon<sup>ble</sup>  Masters for a Confirmation or further pleasure) his  Salary of  ten pounds a yeare as aforesaid is to be paid him from  ye Sixth  day of Jan<sup>y</sup> 1697  The blessing thereof we hope to feele [...]  Chearfully Repairing at ye times appointed morning and  Evening  duly [...]  Whereas our late Gov<sup>t</sup> Keling hath bin soe kind as  The request of our present Gov<sup>t</sup>, when they went to  Dye and  allow him 6 Goates for plantation use, the which was  Brought of Cap<sup>t</sup> Broadnes Commander of the Benj<sup>a</sup>  lately in  this Road  But</p>	<p><b>Interpretations</b>  The appointment of a soldier to conduct prayers showed adaptation to limited clergy. Religious duties were assigned within the garrison when no ordained minister was available.  The emphasis on Company instructions demonstrated the integration of religious policy into governance. Spiritual discipline was treated as part of administrative responsibility.  The provision of £10 0s 0d and meals at the Governor's table showed formal remuneration. Religious service was recognised as labour deserving reward.  The requirement for public attendance at prayers indicated enforced communal observance. Participation in worship was expected as part of social order.  The reference to Company approval showed that even local religious arrangements remained subject to higher authority. Decisions were provisional pending confirmation.  The grant of goats for plantation use illustrated the allocation of resources to officials. Livestock functioned as productive assets tied to office and status.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The appointment of Tuffe suggests a lack of clergy on the island. The Council may have acted to fill a gap in religious provision.  The detailed justification in religious terms suggests an attempt to align local action with Company expectations. This may have been intended to secure approval.  The additional salary and privileges indicate that the role was considered important. The Council may have aimed to ensure commitment by offering incentive.  The expectation of regular attendance suggests concern about religious observance. The measure may have been intended to strengthen discipline and cohesion within the settlement.</p>
95	91	<p>But since allmighty providence hath placed him in y<sup>e</sup>  Go[...]  of this place, he hath mat[...]ly considered y<sup>e</sup> keeping of  them  for y<sup>e</sup> uses first intended, will employ many of the R.H.  Comp<sup>a</sup>  Slaves, and spend a great deale of time, which cannot  be well spared from y<sup>e</sup> Plantation busines, and that the  Boates  kept for y<sup>e</sup> Fort uses, will serve for y<sup>e</sup> plantation use also  It is ordered  That y<sup>e</sup> said Boat shall be sould att a publick  out Cry, and an advertisement issued forth for y<sup>t</sup>  purpose  which was done  The day appointed for y<sup>e</sup> sale, at the out Cry Sam<sup>l</sup>  Wrangham had seven pounds, and none Bidding more  It was ordered  That y<sup>e</sup> said Wrangham have her for seven pounds it  into the Stores  [...]  Goodwin</p>	<p>It was further considered that, since Providence had placed the present Governor in charge of the island, the keeping of the boat for its original purpose would require the labour of many Company slaves and consume time that could not be spared from plantation work. It was also judged that the boats already kept for the use of the fort would be sufficient for plantation needs.  An order was made that the said boat should be sold by public outcry, and that notice should be given for that purpose. This was done.  On the appointed day of sale, Samuel Wrangham bid £7 0s 0d, and no higher offer was made.  An order was made that Samuel Wrangham should have the boat for £7 0s 0d, and that the money should be paid into the Company's stores.  [...] Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The decision to sell the boat showed reassessment of resource use. Assets were disposed of when they were judged inefficient or burdensome.  The reference to the labour of Company slaves highlighted the cost of maintenance. Labour was treated as a finite resource to be directed toward plantation work.  The comparison between fort boats and plantation needs showed consolidation of resources. Existing assets were expected to serve multiple purposes.  The use of public outcry demonstrated a formal method of sale. Open bidding ensured transparency and allowed the market to determine value.  The payment into the Company's stores indicated centralised control of proceeds. Revenue from sales was absorbed into Company accounts.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The decision to sell the boat suggests pressure on labour resources. The Council may have sought to reduce demands on slaves to maintain agricultural output.</p> <p>The reliance on existing boats indicates an effort to minimise redundancy. Maintaining fewer vessels may have been seen as more efficient.</p> <p>The relatively low sale price suggests limited demand or constrained local means. The market may have been small, affecting valuation.</p> <p>The formal advertisement and auction process suggests concern for fairness. The Council may have aimed to avoid disputes by making the sale open and public.</p>
<p><a href="#">96</a></p>	<p>92</p>	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Con[...]ation Held on Tewesday y<sup>e</sup> 18<sup>th</sup> of Jan<sup>y</sup> 1697 att fort James  Present  Steph<sup>o</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>  Tho: Goodwin Assistant  [...] of our late Gov<sup>r</sup> [...] Keling: his Lady att her departure  from y<sup>e</sup> fort hath carryed away along w<sup>th</sup> her all y<sup>e</sup> Moveables and household stuff that were in it (very few Excepted) as belonging to her in so much as hardly the present Gov<sup>r</sup> could have pewter Spoons enough to serve y<sup>e</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> table and considering that noe Ship came from Europe w<sup>th</sup> a supply of those things soe absolutely necessary: In such distresse supposing that y<sup>e</sup> Rt Hon<sup>ble</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> would not take it ill he hath (on y<sup>e</sup> desire and for y<sup>e</sup> use of the said Lady) opened a Box wherein was [...] plate Moores plate as doth appeare by the Inventory of all his goods, out of which y<sup>e</sup> said Lady had one Candlesticke one porringer one large Salt and one Tumbler together weighing fifty seven ounces at five shillings p<sup>er</sup> ounce value nine pounds five shillings and odd pence upon the whole of the particulars weighing together ninety ounces vallued at five shillings p<sup>er</sup> ounce (which was thought the uttermost of its worth it being old fashion broken silvery twenty two pounds ten and six pence) soe that the total sum is one hundred twenty [...]</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Tuesday 18 January 1698 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>It was reported that, upon her departure from the fort, the widow of the late Governor Keeling had taken with her almost all the movable goods and household items, claiming them as her own. Very little remained. The present Governor was left without even enough pewter spoons to serve the Company's table. No ship had arrived from Europe with supplies of such necessary items.</p> <p>In this difficulty, and believing that the Right Honourable Company would not take offence, the Governor opened a box containing plate belonging to Moore, as recorded in an inventory of his goods. From this, the widow took one candlestick, one porringer, one large salt, and one tumbler. These items weighed 57 ounces and were valued at 5s 0d per ounce, amounting to £14 5s 0d.</p> <p>The remaining plate weighed 90 ounces and was also valued at 5s 0d per ounce. As it was old, broken, and worn silver, this was judged to be its full worth, amounting to £22 10s 6d.</p> <p>The total sum therefore came to £[...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The removal of household goods by the widow showed the assertion of personal property rights. Items within the Governor's residence were treated as belonging to the individual rather than the Company.</p> <p>The shortage of basic utensils revealed dependence on imported supplies. The island relied on ships from Europe to maintain essential household goods.</p> <p>The decision to open a box of plate without prior approval showed discretionary authority in urgent circumstances. The Governor acted in anticipation of Company consent.</p> <p>The valuation of silver by weight at a fixed rate demonstrated a standard method of assessing worth. Condition affected judgement, but price per ounce provided a baseline.</p> <p>The reference to an inventory showed the importance of recorded property lists. Such records allowed verification of ownership and value.</p> <p>The allocation of specific items to the widow indicated negotiated distribution rather than outright seizure. Transfer was framed as provision for her use.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The extensive removal of goods by the widow suggests that the Governor's household had been largely personal rather than institutional. This may have left the administration under-equipped after his death.</p> <p>The Governor's decision to open the box implies urgency. The lack of basic items may have made immediate action necessary to maintain daily function.</p> <p>The careful valuation of the plate suggests concern over accountability. The Governor may have anticipated the need to justify his actions to the Company.</p> <p>The distinction between items taken by the widow and those remaining suggests an attempt to balance her</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			claim with Company interests. This may have been intended to avoid dispute while preserving some assets.
<a href="#">97</a>	93	<p>To Thirty one pounds fifteen shillings and Six pence, for which Sum y<sup>e</sup> saide Gov<sup>r</sup> Blackmore Acct shall have Credit for y<sup>e</sup> same on the Comp<sup>a</sup> Bookes: Submitting w<sup>th</sup>all both y<sup>e</sup> saide Gov<sup>r</sup> Poirier and y<sup>e</sup> saide Lady to y<sup>e</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> pleasure to Returne y<sup>e</sup> same plate againe in Case they desire it</p> <p>And as for y<sup>e</sup> Rest Mentioned in the said Box: Gov<sup>r</sup> Poirier hath discharged Under his hand y<sup>e</sup> Lady Keling: and hath Charged himselfe to be accountable for y<sup>e</sup> same to whom it doth belong hereafter</p> <p>Poirier T Goodwin</p> <p>The foregoing Consultation have sent to y<sup>e</sup> Rt Hon<sup>ble</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> by y<sup>e</sup> good ship King William Capt Thomas Cownden and Coppys out of one John Alexander</p> <p>all the Consultations foresaid are to be found out Except that Concerning Mr Blackmore Dated the 24<sup>th</sup> day of February 1697 By me J Alexander</p> <p>Mem<sup>d</sup> y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Consultation for me is to be y<sup>e</sup> first following</p>	<p>The total value was set at £31 15s 6d. For this sum, Governor Blackmore's account was to be credited in the Company's books. Both Governor Poirier and the widow Keeling submitted themselves to the Company's decision, and agreed that the plate should be returned if required.</p> <p>As for the remaining plate contained in the box, Governor Poirier discharged the widow Keeling under his hand and took responsibility for it himself. He declared that he would be accountable for it to the proper owner in due course.</p> <p>Signed Poirier Thomas Goodwin</p> <p>The foregoing consultations were sent to the Right Honourable Company by the ship <i>King William</i>, commanded by Captain Thomas Cownden. Copies were also prepared.</p> <p>John Alexander recorded that all the consultations mentioned above were included, except that concerning Mr Blackmore dated 24 February 1698.</p> <p>A memorandum noted that the consultation relating to him was to follow first.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The credit entered in Governor Blackmore's account showed the use of formal bookkeeping. Financial adjustments were recorded against named individuals in Company records.</p> <p>The submission to the Company's decision demonstrated ultimate authority resting outside the island. Local actions remained subject to later approval or revision.</p> <p>The provision for return of the plate indicated that the transaction was conditional. Ownership was not fully transferred, but held pending confirmation.</p> <p>The discharge of the widow under Poirier's hand showed the use of written release. This formal act removed her liability and transferred responsibility to the Governor.</p> <p>The Governor's acceptance of accountability illustrated personal responsibility in office. Officials could assume liability for goods in order to regularise uncertain situations.</p> <p>The transmission of consultations to the Company by ship showed the communication system of governance. Decisions were reported to the metropolitan authority for oversight.</p> <p>The preparation of copies indicated concern for record preservation. Duplicate documentation ensured continuity in case of loss or dispute.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The careful accounting and conditional terms suggest concern about scrutiny from the Company. The Governor may have anticipated review of his actions.</p> <p>The transfer of responsibility from the widow to Poirier indicates an effort to protect her from future claims. This may reflect respect for her status as the former Governor's wife.</p> <p>The omission of one consultation from the packet suggests either loss or deliberate separation. This may indicate uncertainty about its relevance or completeness.</p> <p>The emphasis on copying and sending records suggests awareness of risk in communication. The Council may have sought to ensure that decisions reached England without omission.</p>
<a href="#">98</a>	94	<p>Island St Helena</p> <p>Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 13<sup>th</sup> Day of Decem<sup>r</sup> 1697 att Fort James</p> <p>Present Stephn Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin assistant</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Monday 13 December 1698 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Whereas Widdow [...]g[r][a][v][e] Came this Day to Gov<sup>r</sup> &amp; Council, In Order that she might have her Deceased Hus- bands Last Verba[] Will and Testament, Doct Hodgson being Sworne saith that, he being by his Bed side on munday Morning was Called by ye now De- ceased [...]g[r][a][v][e], and Desired him to take Notice, that he gave to his wife, all his Eff[...]n]t worldly Goods, that God had p[...]o][s]sed him withall, the aforesaid Doct Thinks all he had in ye world, saying he hop'd she would be a good mother to his Children, &amp; yt he made her whole &amp; sole Executrix, Richd Seale saith yt the said [...]g[r][a][v][e] Sent for him, by break of day, and when he Came, told him he sent for him, that he might take Notice, that he gave and bequeathed to his wife all his whole and Indivisible Estate, wherewith God had Endowed him withall, and yt he made his wife whole and sole Executrix, he hopes she would prove a good mother to his Children, being they were hers as well as his, John Alexander Saith, that his father in Law, was before he died Desired him to give him Notice, to make his will who was some wayes ill, and when he returned found him ye sd [...]g[r][a][v][e] not in a Condition to doe it. Richd Allen being Examined saith yt that morning ye sd [...]g[r][a][v][e] Died, he was sent for, found, and yt he heard him say, yt he had told those yt sd [...]g[r][a][v][e] told him yt others, and to take Notice, that I doe leave my Deceased wife my Executrix, of all my Estate to doe with what she shall think fitt, in hope she would be a mother to his Children, It is ordered That the Last Verball Will and Testament be approved According to the aforesaid Evidence Poirier Thomas Goodwin</p>	<p>The widow [...]grave appeared before the Governor and Council to have her deceased husband's last verbal will recognised.</p> <p>Doctor Hodgson, being sworn, stated that he had been at the bedside of the deceased on Monday morning. He was called and asked to take notice that the deceased gave to his wife all his worldly goods. He believed this included all that he possessed. The deceased also expressed hope that she would be a good mother to his children and declared her sole executrix.</p> <p>Richard Seale gave evidence that he had been sent for at daybreak. The deceased told him that he wished him to witness that he gave his entire and undivided estate to his wife. He again expressed hope that she would care properly for their children and confirmed that she was to be sole executrix.</p> <p>John Alexander stated that his father-in-law had earlier asked him to give notice so that a written will might be made, as he was unwell. When he returned, he found that the deceased was no longer in a condition to do so.</p> <p>Richard Allen, being examined, stated that on the morning of the death he had been called and heard the deceased declare that he left his wife executrix of all his estate, to dispose of as she thought fit. He also heard him express hope that she would care for their children.</p> <p>An order was made that the last verbal will and testament should be approved in accordance with the evidence given.</p> <p>Signed Poirier Thomas Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The recognition of a verbal will showed that testamentary intent could be accepted without written form. Oral declarations made at death were treated as legally valid when supported by witnesses.</p> <p>The requirement for multiple witnesses demonstrated the need for corroboration. Consistent testimony strengthened the authority of the will.</p> <p>The appointment of the wife as sole executrix showed concentration of control. She was granted full authority over the estate without division.</p> <p>The repeated emphasis on care for the children reflected the link between inheritance and family responsibility. Property transfer was tied to expected duties within the household.</p> <p>The reference to the failed attempt to create a written will showed the preference for written instruments. Oral wills were accepted only when formal documentation could not be completed.</p> <p>The Council's approval confirmed its role in validating testamentary acts. Legal force depended on official recognition.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The reliance on a verbal will suggests that death came quickly or unexpectedly. The deceased may not have had time to complete a written document.</p> <p>The presence of several witnesses at the bedside suggests awareness of impending death. Effort may have been made to secure the estate's disposition before it occurred.</p> <p>The consistent naming of the wife as sole executrix indicates a clear intention. The deceased may have wished to prevent dispute among heirs.</p> <p>The Council's acceptance of the will suggests that the evidence was strong and uncontested. This may indicate agreement within the household or absence of competing claims.</p>
29	95	<p>[...] Island St Helena Att a Consulta[...] Held on Wednesday the 2[...] Day of Feby 1697] at Fort James Present [...] Sleep</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 2 February 1698. Those present included [...] Sleep, [...] Poirier, Governor, and [...] Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>A Swedish boy named Sam[...] aged about 15 years, formerly belonging to Boston, was examined. He had</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>[...] Poirier Go[...]  [...]. Goodwin Assis[...]  Whereas Sam[...] a Swede abt 15 years of age  Late belonging to Boston Came from thence wth his  uncle  to the Island of Barbados Belonging to the Ship R[...]  of London where he had Commission from  the Governor of Antigoa with 18 Guns &amp; Ordinance  to Man the 16th day of August 1695 who sailed from  Cape Deverd, and from thence to the Coast of Guiney  from thence to the Cape Coast where met wth  a Dutch Ship who Commanded the aforesaid Cap[...]  Gouvernour and Master of his men on board of him,  who carried them to a Dutch factory at the mine and  Imprisoned y said Capt G[...] and his men two Dayes  after  and retook the said Cap[...] and nine men on Board his  said Ship, the other two the said Dutch Comander kept  as Hostages, for that they should recompence for any  Damage  to ye Dutch, which if they had they should be repaid  the said Gouvernour Departed from y said factory to y  Princes  and tooke from thence one man and from thence to a  place called Cape Coast on the same Coast, from  thence to Madagascar at a place called St Augustino,  where we found the Charming Mary Captn Hacklington  Comander, who sailed the next Day after, Designed for  St Marys, who said he had bin at Mombas, and had  taken  a Beggar Ship without prize and who told them that  [...] Too was killed by a great shot in taking of another  Ship; further saith yt after they had bin 5 months at St  [...] Augustine, they sailed for the Red Sea, and say  there there was an Island called Babos, where  they might see both sides of the said Island  Island St Helena  Febry ye 23d 169[...]  Whereas Mr John Packnall, for his misdemeanr having  been turned out of ye Compas  Service In ye place of Clarke to ye Councell, as is doth  appare by ye Consultation held the 24 day  of Febry 169[...] and being in want of another Clarke,  we Considering there was no person more fitter  then John Alexander, who hath bin formerly employed,  therefore after Oath taken by him, we  have Inrolled and put him in ye same place of Clarke,  hoping yt he will behave himself as  becoms an honest man so to doe  Alexander John appointed  Clerk of ye Councell</p>	<p>travelled from Boston with his uncle to Barbados  aboard the ship R[...] of London. That vessel had  carried a commission from the Governor of Antigua  and had been armed with 18 guns and ordnance, and  had been manned on 16 August 1695. From Cape  Verde the ship had sailed to the coast of Guinea and  then to Cape Coast.</p> <p>At Cape Coast a Dutch ship was encountered. Its  commander seized the captain, described as Governor  and master of his men, and carried him and his crew to  a Dutch factory at “the mine”. There the captain and  his men were imprisoned. Two days later the captain  and nine men were returned to their ship, while two  others were retained as hostages by the Dutch  commander to secure compensation for any damage  done to the Dutch, with repayment promised if none  were proven.</p> <p>The governor then departed from the factory to  Princes Island, where one man was taken. From there  the voyage continued again to Cape Coast and then  onward to Madagascar, anchoring at a place called Saint  Augustine Bay. There the ship <i>Charming Mary</i>,  commanded by Captain Hacklington, was found. That  vessel sailed the next day for St Mary’s Island. Captain  Hacklington reported that he had been at Mombasa,  where he had taken a “beggar ship” without prize, and  that [...] Too had been killed by a great shot during the  capture of another ship.</p> <p>After remaining five months at Saint Augustine, the  voyage proceeded to the Red Sea. There an island called  “Babos” was described, from which both sides of the  island could be seen.</p> <p>A further consultation was held on 23 February  1698 on St Helena. John Packnall had been removed  from the Company’s service for misconduct and  dismissed from his office as clerk to the council, as  recorded in the consultation of 24 February 1698. A  replacement was required. John Alexander, who had  previously been employed, was judged the most  suitable. After taking the required oath, he was  appointed and enrolled as clerk to the council, with the  expectation that he would conduct himself honestly in  that office.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The “commission from the Governor of Antigua”  functioned as a legal authorisation for maritime action,  probably permitting privateering or armed defence.  Such commissions placed vessels within a framework of  delegated imperial authority, where violence at sea could  be legitimised if conducted under recognised  jurisdiction.</p> <p>The seizure of the captain and crew by the Dutch  commander and the holding of two men as hostages  revealed a system of negotiated maritime enforcement  rather than immediate warfare. Hostages acted as  security for claims of damage, showing how disputes  between rival European powers on the West African  coast were managed through coercive detention and  conditional restitution rather than formal courts.</p> <p>The “Dutch factory at the mine” referred to a  fortified trading post, probably at a gold-trading centre.  Such factories operated as hubs of commerce,  imprisonment, and jurisdiction, combining mercantile  and quasi-governmental authority in overseas territories.</p> <p>The dismissal of John Packnall for  “misdemeanour” and the formal appointment of John  Alexander after an oath demonstrated administrative  discipline within the Company’s governance.  Officeholding depended on moral conduct as well as  competence, and the oath functioned as both a legal  and moral binding mechanism within the council’s  institutional structure.</p>
100	96	But finding No Purchase they sailed for ye Ethiopian Shoar for water, where they Left five men that went	No profitable trade was found. The ship then sailed to the Ethiopian shore to obtain water. Five men were

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>In the Country to buy Balos, [...] and the Boys of the boats from [...] came on board in the Evening making fires all the way as they came, and told ye Capt that they had seen Two Ships Coming Downe from Mocha, whereupon sett saile In hopes of meeting with ye said Two Ships, But a strong Current Contrary to their Expectation, carried them so far, that they Could not see them ye next morning; And Capt Hoare being at an anchor at another place, seeing ye said Two Ships, weighed and Toke both ye sd Ships; So wee sailed for Rigata Downe where wee tooke in water and Provisions, But in our way wee tooke a small Moorish [...] Laden with Rice, but we only tooke Carryd her to a small Island and Landed by her, and tooke some Rice and wood out of her, and so left her againe about her businesse, then we sailed for [...], where wee met with Nine English Ships at an anchor, one of ye Guiny which wee tooke first and wth her Commanded all the Rest that lay wth out her and the Rest Ran a shoare, so leaving them at a little Distance to sea and tooke what they had Occasion for, as wood and small arms etc and sett fire of the Ship on fire, and [...] up ye value of ye Goods belonging to ye Rest that we tooke, and after three dayes, sailed towards [...], where we mett wth two Dutch Ships, but did not attempt ye taking of them, and so finding nothing for our use, sayld for Madagascar to fit the Ship for another Voyage, and the aforesaid Capt Glover was killed by a great shot the Negroes threw wth Ship was fitted and one Capt [...] was made Commander, also Capt Baudridge, being at St Marys where he had a Fort, and store of all sorts with about 10 white men and 2 or three hundred Negroes, where he traded with the Pirates that Comes there, but making a voyage to Majescine In a Brigantine, left his house etc and in the meane time ye negroes killed all the white men he left, and demolished his Fort, and Seized all goods yt was there,</p>	<p>left behind there, having gone inland to purchase balos. In the evening, boys from the boats came aboard, having lit fires along their route. They reported that two ships had been seen sailing down from Mocha.</p> <p>Sail was immediately set in hopes of intercepting those vessels. A strong contrary current carried the ship off course, and by the next morning no sight of them remained. Captain Hoare, who lay at anchor elsewhere, sighted the same two ships and captured both.</p> <p>The voyage then continued to Rigata, where water and provisions were taken in. During this passage, a small Moorish vessel laden with rice was seized. That vessel was taken to a small island, where part of its rice and wood was removed. It was then released to continue its course.</p> <p>Sailing onward to [...], nine English ships were found lying at anchor. One, described as belonging to the Guinea trade, was first taken. Control of that vessel enabled command over the others lying outside. The remaining ships ran aground. From them, such items as were needed were taken, including wood and small arms. One ship was then set on fire. The value of goods taken from the others was [...] up. After three days, the fleet sailed towards [...], where two Dutch ships were encountered but not attacked. Finding nothing useful, the voyage continued to Madagascar to refit for another expedition.</p> <p>During these events, Captain Glover was killed by a great shot thrown by Negroes. After the ship had been refitted, Captain [...] was appointed commander.</p> <p>At St Mary's Island, Captain Baudridge was established with a fort and a store of various goods. About ten white men and between 200 and 300 Negroes were under his control. Trade was conducted there with pirates who frequented the place. While undertaking a voyage to Majescine in a brigantine, Captain Baudridge left his house and establishment. In his absence, the Negroes killed all the white men who had been left behind, demolished the fort, and seized all the goods stored there.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The failure to secure "purchase" showed the dependence of such voyages on opportunistic trade or plunder. Ships shifted rapidly between lawful commerce and coercive acquisition, reflecting a fluid boundary between merchant activity and piracy.</p> <p>The report of fires lit by boat crews indicated a signalling method used along coasts. Such practices enabled rapid communication of sightings and threats, forming an informal intelligence network among seafarers.</p> <p>The capture and partial plundering of the Moorish vessel, followed by its release, revealed a selective extraction strategy. Goods of immediate value were removed while avoiding the burden of manning or disposing of the captured ship, suggesting efficiency in resource acquisition.</p> <p>The seizure of one English Guinea trader to command others demonstrated tactical use of a captured vessel to exert authority over nearby shipping. This reflected knowledge of anchorage patterns and the vulnerability of clustered vessels.</p> <p>The destruction of ships after removing supplies showed a denial strategy. By burning vessels, competitors were prevented from reusing them, reinforcing control over maritime space without the need to retain prizes.</p> <p>The death of Captain Glover by a projectile thrown from shore highlighted the risks posed by coastal populations. Maritime expeditions operated within contested zones where local resistance could inflict significant losses.</p> <p>Captain Baudridge's fortified settlement at St Mary's functioned as a trading post integrated into pirate networks. His reliance on a small number of</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>white overseers and a large enslaved workforce exposed a fragile hierarchy. The uprising and killing of the white men, followed by the destruction of the fort and seizure of goods, revealed the instability of such arrangements and the constant risk of revolt when coercive control weakened.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to abandon pursuit of the two ships from Mocha after losing sight of them was shaped by the strong current, which disrupted navigation and forced reliance on chance encounters rather than sustained pursuit.</p> <p>The release of the Moorish vessel after removing selected goods probably reflected a calculation that retaining it would strain manpower and slow the voyage, especially when the crew prioritised mobility and speed over accumulating prizes.</p> <p>The burning of one captured ship after stripping supplies suggested an intention to eliminate competition while avoiding the logistical burden of managing multiple captured vessels, especially in a region crowded with rival traders.</p> <p>Captain Baudridge's absence during his voyage to Majescine created an opportunity for revolt. The scale of the uprising indicated that authority depended heavily on his personal presence, and that his departure removed the immediate constraint that had suppressed resistance among the enslaved population.</p>
101	97	<p>also saith that Capt Moslyn with his Ship and Capt Baudridge with the Brigantine went into four Depths, where they surprized Himself wth Negroes, and further saith that the aforesaid Brigantine Did belong to one Johnson, and that the said Johnson sold it part to Capt Baudridge, if he could pay him for it, and that Capt Moslyn And also saith yt said Dolphin he heard him confess afterwards in the said Capt Baudridge's Boat he would come from the negroes to save his life [...] and when he was said Brigantines Company to Albemarle from away, seafaring that was mad some time would say that I should one day come to see in Rasands, and other time he would see me somewhere, whereupon The said Baudridge saith he did on his departure signed over to John Hamilton, who left him as his servant, wherefore</p> <p>Upon Consideration of the premises it is ordered that the said Boy Doe live with the said Packnall till further Consideration of the matter, Martha Oliver desired that she might be free to goe and serve where she please on Condition, And The Doct discharged from her,</p> <p>Att a Consultation held on Monday the 28th Day of Febr'y 1697/8 at Fort James</p> <p>P[...] Step Poinier Govr</p> <p>Pres[...] Tho: Goodwin Assis[...]</p> <p>M[...] Coulson Complaines of her Black woman, That she had stole from her arack and Linning, Considerable, Alice Barnaby the woman saith that Black Sam was at her Mistris house, where the said Sam a Drinking of Liq[...] which Roger a slave of ye sd Coulson gave him,</p> <p>[...] saith that John Coulson gave him 2 Bitt[...] two quarts more to Carry home, and both men yt John Coulson brought him to Drink more,</p> <p>John Coulson saith that Sam had 2 quarts of him, but promised</p>	<p>Captain Moslyn, with his ship, and Captain Baudridge, with a brigantine, sailed into "four Depths", where they were surprised by Negroes. The brigantine was reported to have belonged to one Johnson, who had sold part of it to Captain Baudridge on condition that payment could be made.</p> <p>A man referred to as Dolphin was later heard to confess, while in Captain Baudridge's boat, that he had come away from the Negroes in order to save his life [...]. He was described as having been of the brigantine's company and later at Albemarle. At times he was described as behaving irrationally, saying that he would one day be seen at Rasands and at other times elsewhere.</p> <p>Before departing, Captain Baudridge had formally assigned his interest to John Hamilton, who had remained with him as a servant. Upon consideration of these matters, it was ordered that the boy should remain with John Packnall until further decision had been made.</p> <p>Martha Oliver requested permission to be free to go and serve where she pleased under certain conditions. She was discharged from her doctor.</p> <p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 28 February 1698. Those present included [...] Step Poinier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>M[...] Coulson brought a complaint against her Black woman, alleging theft of a considerable quantity of arrack and linen. Alice Barnaby stated that Black Sam had been at her mistress's house, where he had been drinking liquor supplied by Roger, a slave belonging to Coulson. [...] stated that John Coulson had given him two bitt[...] and two quarts more to carry home, and that both men had encouraged him to drink further.</p> <p>John Coulson stated that Sam had received two quarts from him but that no further drink had been promised. The woman added that Roger had carried two quarts of arrack to Mr Monger's house and had drunk them there with Sam during the night.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The conditional sale of the brigantine by Johnson to Captain Baudridge indicated a credit-based transfer of property. Ownership depended on future payment, showing how maritime assets could be partially transferred under deferred financial arrangements rather than immediate settlement.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>him no more, The said woman saith that Roger carryed 2 quarts of Arack with him when he went to Mr Monger's house, and did Drinke them wth Sam at ye Night,</p>	<p>The formal assignment made by Captain Baudridge to John Hamilton before departure reflected a recognised practice of transferring legal or economic interest in property or command. Such acts ensured continuity of authority and claims in the absence of the principal.</p> <p>The order placing the boy with John Packnall demonstrated the council's role in allocating custody and labour. Such decisions functioned as mechanisms of social control, especially over unattached or vulnerable individuals, by binding them into supervised service.</p> <p>Martha Oliver's request to "serve where she pleased" suggested negotiation over labour obligations. Her discharge by the doctor implied the end of a medical or contractual dependency, allowing her to seek employment elsewhere under agreed conditions.</p> <p>The complaint concerning theft of arrack and linen revealed the council's involvement in regulating household discipline and property disputes. Enslaved individuals and servants were examined through testimony, showing how domestic infractions were brought into a formal adjudicative setting tied to authority and ownership.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to keep the boy with John Packnall until further consideration suggested uncertainty over his status or ownership. Temporary placement allowed the council to maintain control while additional information or claims were assessed.</p> <p>The conflicting statements about the distribution of arrack indicated an attempt to limit liability. John Coulson's admission of supplying two quarts, while denying further provision, perhaps aimed to reduce responsibility for the alleged theft and disorder associated with the drinking.</p>
102	98	<p>M<sup>r</sup> Nudge saith that Roger Lay at his House, that night he was at work, at which time the sd M<sup>r</sup> Coulson woman said he Lay at ye Hut w<sup>th</sup> the sd Sam. The sd woman saith that Margaret a Slave of the sd Coulson had Received of her, the Cloaths which she stole from her Mistris Marg<sup>t</sup> Saith yt she Did not Receive any of the sd Cloaths neither Did see any, nor ye sd woman at any time to offer her any Cloaths Jn<sup>r</sup> Alexander Saith yt when he Caught ye sd woman when she was Run away upon his ground, that she told him she had a Bundle of Cloaths up in ye wood, who Immediately Sent his Black to fetch them, but Could not finde any, The sd woman saith yt the sd Sam had some Arrack of Roger, who Doth both deny it that they had any Liquor at no time, Roger saith yt Anthony a Slave of M<sup>r</sup>m Beale gave him a Handkerchife for a Drink of Arrack, w<sup>ch</sup> Anthony said he gave ye sd Roger no handkerchife neither had any Liquor but afterwards Confessed that it was so, The sd woman saith that he had a Three pint bottle full of Arrack when they Dranke it, Jack a Slave of James Gardiner Saith that Edward Barbarant Sent him for a bottle of Liquor to John Coulson, and had one Quart for himselfe of the sd Coulson for 2 Cuger Hooks he had out of ye Benjamin Constance a Slave of Saml [...] Saith he was not at M<sup>r</sup> Coulsons house neither Did he Drink any Liquor that the sd M<sup>r</sup> Coulson woman said he had,</p>	<p>Mr Nudge stated that Roger had lain at his house on the night in question while he himself was at work. This contradicted the statement of Mr Coulson's woman, who had claimed that Roger lay in the hut with Sam.</p> <p>That same woman alleged that Margaret, a slave belonging to Coulson, had received from her the clothes that had been stolen from her mistress. Margaret denied receiving any such clothes and denied ever seeing either the items or the woman offering them.</p> <p>John Alexander stated that he had apprehended the woman when she had run away onto his land. At that time she had told him that a bundle of clothes had been hidden in the wood. He immediately sent one of his slaves to retrieve them, but nothing was found.</p> <p>The woman further claimed that Sam had received arrack from Roger, which both Sam and Roger denied, stating that no liquor had been shared at any time.</p> <p>Roger stated that Anthony, a slave belonging to Mrs Beale, had given him a handkerchief in exchange for a drink of arrack. Anthony initially denied both giving the handkerchief and receiving any liquor, but later admitted that this had occurred.</p> <p>The woman asserted that a three-pint bottle of arrack had been present when it was consumed.</p> <p>Jack, a slave belonging to James Gardiner, stated that Edward Barbarant had sent him to John Coulson for a bottle of liquor. He said that he had received one quart for himself from Coulson in exchange for two "Cuger Hooks" taken from the <i>Benjamin</i>.</p> <p>Constance, a slave belonging to Samuel [...], stated that he had not been at Mr Coulson's house and had not consumed any liquor there, despite the claim made by Coulson's woman.</p> <p>Barbarant confirmed that he had sent Jack to John Coulson for the quart of arrack.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Barbarant saith he Sent ye sd Jack to John Coulson for ye Quart of arrack  John Coulson Doth say yt Jack had two Quarts of arrack one of which for Barbarant and yt Jack had ye arrack for 2 Cuger Hooks, M<sup>r</sup> Coulson saith yt her Roger bought ap[...] of Stripe of John Bowman, w<sup>th</sup> out her knowledge and Doth not know where he had ye money to purchase it.</p>	<p>John Coulson stated that Jack had received two quarts of arrack, one intended for Barbarant. He added that Jack had obtained the arrack in exchange for two “Cuger Hooks”. Mrs Coulson further stated that her slave Roger had purchased a piece of striped fabric from John Bowman without her knowledge, and that she did not know how he had obtained the money for it.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The conflicting testimonies about Roger’s whereabouts illustrated the reliance on witness statements in resolving disputes. Contradictions were examined to test credibility, showing how informal evidentiary processes operated in the absence of structured legal procedure.</p> <p>The allegation that stolen clothes had been passed to another slave revealed concern over secondary distribution of stolen property. The denial by Margaret demonstrated the difficulty of proving transfer within enslaved networks, where possession and concealment could be fluid.</p> <p>John Alexander’s account of sending his slave to search for hidden goods showed how masters used enslaved labour to enforce property recovery. The failure to find the bundle indicated either concealment elsewhere or fabrication, highlighting the limits of such enforcement.</p> <p>The exchange of goods such as a handkerchief or “Cuger Hooks” for arrack reflected a barter economy operating alongside formal currency. Enslaved individuals participated actively in these exchanges, though often without their owners’ knowledge or consent.</p> <p>Mrs Coulson’s statement about Roger purchasing striped fabric without her knowledge revealed anxiety over enslaved access to independent resources. Control over money and goods formed part of household authority, and unexplained purchases raised suspicion of theft or illicit trade.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  Anthony’s initial denial followed by admission suggested an attempt to avoid punishment for unauthorised exchange. His eventual confession perhaps resulted from pressure during questioning or the weight of contradictory testimony.</p> <p>The inability to locate the hidden bundle of clothes may indicate that the woman misdirected the search to protect the true location, or that the claim had been invented to deflect suspicion and delay consequences.</p>
103	99	<p>Roger saith he had yt money yt he bought the ps of Strip[els] w<sup>th</sup> of some Sea men yt came by his M<sup>r</sup> house from Livo[r]ne for money and victualls, and what he had Remaining he D[...] to his Mistris,  M<sup>r</sup> Coulson saith that after she saw the ps of stripes, she Examined her woman where she had it, who told her yt Roger had it of a Dutch man  It is ordered  That John Coulson shall pay Two Dollars to ye Church for dealing w<sup>th</sup> Stolen Goods contrary to the Order of Councill,  And also  John Bowman pay also for said Cryme four fold being Twelve Dollars, to ye Church, said M<sup>r</sup> Coulson, also that Black Sam: Jack: and Anthony be Immediately whipt at ye Carts Tayle  Riperin Wills Complaines of Henry Coales, That his Black did Strike his Son, and abuse his Daughter.  Willless Son being Examined saith that he went to Drive some Cattle out of M<sup>r</sup> Coales Plantation,</p>	<p>Roger stated that the money used to buy the piece of stripes had been earned from seamen who had come by his master’s house from Livorno, in exchange for money and victuals. He added that what remained had been given to his mistress.</p> <p>Mr Coulson stated that after seeing the piece of stripes, he had questioned his woman about its origin. She had replied that Roger had obtained it from a Dutchman.</p> <p>An order was made that John Coulson should pay two dollars to the church for dealing in stolen goods contrary to the council’s order. John Bowman was also ordered to pay for the same offence at fourfold penalty, amounting to twelve dollars, to the church. It was further ordered that Black Sam, Jack, and Anthony should be immediately whipped at the cart’s tail.</p> <p>Riperin Wills brought a complaint against Henry Coales, alleging that Coales’s slave had struck his son and abused his daughter.</p> <p>Wills’s son, when examined, stated that he had gone to drive cattle out of Mr Coales’s plantation. At that time, Coales’s slave had come, thrown him down, and struck him with his hand.</p> <p>Thomas Burnham senior stated that he had been sent and had passed by Roger Wills’s house. There he</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>where  M<sup>r</sup> Coales Black came and threw the sd Willess Son down and  Struck him w<sup>th</sup> his hand,  Tho: Burnham sen<sup>r</sup> saith being sent  he being by ye sd Roger Wills house, where he saw and heard mention that the sd brother Joseph came to M<sup>r</sup> Coales farm  Ground to Drive out ye Cattle yt was his, and when ye sd Coales  Black take hold of ye sd Joseph Wills and fling him down, which  mercy for and he afterwards went Downe towards the sd ground  who mett w<sup>th</sup> ye sd Joseph Going who told ym that M<sup>r</sup> Coales Black had  Struck him, so went night to ye sd Black and asked ym why he did  abuse his brother, w<sup>th</sup> Coales gave them very Ill Language  and said as they were agoing back there goes a whore and a  Rogue together,</p>	<p>had heard that Joseph, the brother, had gone to Mr Coales's farm to drive out cattle that belonged to him. He reported that Coales's slave had seized Joseph Wills, thrown him down, and struck him. He later met Joseph, who confirmed that he had been struck. Burnham then went to the slave and questioned him about the assault. Henry Coales responded with abusive language and declared, as they were leaving, that "there goes a whore and a rogue together".</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The payment of fines to the church for dealing in stolen goods showed that ecclesiastical institutions functioned as recipients of penalties, linking moral regulation with financial enforcement. The fourfold penalty imposed on John Bowman reflected a punitive multiplier designed to deter participation in illicit trade.</p> <p>The punishment of whipping at the cart's tail represented a public disciplinary measure. Such punishments reinforced social hierarchy by subjecting enslaved individuals to visible physical correction, thereby asserting authority and deterrence within the community.</p> <p>Roger's account of earning money from passing seamen indicated informal economic activity by enslaved individuals. Masters' households acted as points of exchange, where labour, provisions, and small-scale trade could generate independent income, though this activity remained subject to scrutiny and control.</p> <p>The dispute over cattle on Coales's plantation revealed tensions over property boundaries and grazing rights. The violent response by Coales's slave demonstrated how enforcement of these claims could be delegated to enslaved labourers, who acted as agents of their master's authority.</p> <p>Thomas Burnham senior's testimony illustrated the role of community witnesses in establishing facts. His account connected separate encounters into a coherent narrative, showing how interpersonal networks supported informal adjudication.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The imposition of a fourfold fine on John Bowman, compared to the lesser penalty on John Coulson, suggested that Bowman may have been considered more directly involved in the circulation of stolen goods, prompting a harsher financial sanction.</p> <p>The decision to whip Black Sam, Jack, and Anthony immediately indicated a desire to enforce discipline without delay. Swift punishment perhaps aimed to prevent further disorder following the widespread unauthorised exchange of liquor and goods.</p>
104	100	<p>Mercy Fox being Sworne saith, that her father Hogg and Cattle being in M<sup>r</sup> Coales ground, sent her two Brothers Downe, to Drive out ye Hogg etc one of her  brothers Coming up againe met her Going, who told her yt  M<sup>r</sup> Coales Black had taken hold of his brother, and did run  after him, and said they would knock out his braines, and  beate him dogs, so she and Tho: Burnham went to ye sd Black and asked them ye Reason of their so doing w<sup>th</sup> her brother, and Abusing ye other Negro, Which Blacks Refused, they would give her father Blacks named George  a marke, if he had or Did Come Downe to them, and thought that they would have refused to have her had not Tho: Burnham come there, and her father saith yt  she thought yt Blacks sd here must Come a whore and a Rogue to us, upon our ground/  The said Black being Examined saith he Did not Strike nor medle w<sup>th</sup> ye said Hoggs, nor any to hurt him/</p>	<p>Mercy Fox, being sworn, stated that her father's hogs and cattle had strayed into Mr Coales's ground. She had sent her two brothers to drive them out. One brother returned and met her on the way, telling her that Mr Coales's slave had seized the other, run after him, threatened to knock out his brains, and beaten him like a dog. Mercy Fox, accompanied by Thomas Burnham, went to the slave and asked the reason for this treatment and for abusing the other Negro. The slaves refused to give an answer. They declared that her father's slave, named George, would be marked if he came down to them. She believed they would not have let her pass had Thomas Burnham not been present. She added that her father had reported that the slaves had said that "a whore and a rogue" had come onto their ground.</p> <p>The slave, when examined, denied striking or interfering with the hogs or causing harm.</p> <p>An order was made that Mr Coales's two slaves should each receive 20 lashes on their naked bodies at the flagstaff.</p> <p>Thomas Hayes and John Jeffrey submitted a petition requesting to be entered into the service and pay of the Honourable Company. The request was</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>It is ordered That M<sup>r</sup> Coales Two Blacks, shall Receive on their naked bodys at ye flagg Staffe 20 Lashes Each, Tho: Hayes and John Jeffrey Petitioned That They might be Entred In the service, and pay of the Hon<sup>bl</sup> Company, It is ordered That the said Hayes and Jefreys Request be granted and Entertained in ye service and pay of the said Company beginning from ye third Day of march 1697 Poirier Tho: Goodwin</p>	<p>granted, and both men were accepted into service and pay beginning on 3 March 1698. Poirier Thomas Goodwin <b>Interpretations</b> The punishment of 20 lashes at the flagstaff represented a formal and public disciplinary action. The specified location emphasised visibility and authority, reinforcing social control through physical punishment carried out in a central place. The reference to marking George, Mercy Fox's father's slave, suggested a threat of physical punishment or identification. Such marking functioned as a means of control, signalling both ownership and the consequences of perceived trespass or resistance. The complaint over livestock entering Mr Coales's ground revealed ongoing disputes over land use and property boundaries. Enslaved individuals acted as enforcers of these claims, demonstrating how authority was delegated and exercised at a local level. The admission of Thomas Hayes and John Jeffrey into the Company's service showed a formal process of recruitment. Entry into "service and pay" indicated incorporation into a structured labour system governed by the Company, with fixed commencement dates marking the beginning of obligation and entitlement. <b>Speculations</b> The presence of Thomas Burnham during Mercy Fox's confrontation with the slaves probably deterred further violence. His role as a witness and companion may have altered the balance of power, preventing escalation in a tense encounter. The council's decision to punish both slaves despite conflicting testimony suggested a precautionary approach. Maintaining order and reinforcing authority may have been prioritised over establishing precise fault in a disputed incident.</p>
105	101	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held att Fort James, the 24<sup>th</sup> Day of Februry 1697 Present Step<sup>b</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin Assistant Whereas on the 20<sup>th</sup> of this Instant Febr a Consultation was had moved by the Earnest Desire of M<sup>r</sup> John Packnall, who was before Employed only to write on M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin, In Pursuance of w<sup>ch</sup> Order joynly by y<sup>e</sup> Govern<sup>r</sup> and Councill, that he might have Leave to come home of England, w<sup>ch</sup> he had in order from him had Leave by Capt Winder, In allowing him 30<sup>th</sup> day, w<sup>ch</sup> if safe opportunity to transport him to Madagasc[ar], and then he himself did Declare to us it was his mind However after ye Death of Geo: Geling, Confessing he did behave himselfe well enough in the said Service when he was put into, being as much as we can know of, and being then in want of a Clark, M<sup>r</sup> John Fennon being gone off home by ye Good Ship the Benjamin, Capt Browne Commander, Expecting that he would Continue and be faithfull to the Trust Committed to his Charge, which is of high Concernment to our masters Concerns, but to our Griefes, being Deprived of our Expectation, having Given a false Intelligence</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 24 February 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant. Reference was made to a consultation held on 20 February 1698, [NOTE THIS IS OUT OF ORDER THE PREVIOUS CONSULTATION BEING HELD ON 28 FEBRUARY 1698] which had been initiated at the urgent request of John Packnall. He had previously been employed only to write under Thomas Goodwin. By order of the Governor and Council, leave had been granted for him to return to England. Captain Winder had allowed him 30 days for this purpose, with provision for safe passage as far as Madagascar if opportunity arose. Packnall had declared that it remained his intention to depart. After the death of George Geling, it had been acknowledged that Packnall had behaved sufficiently well in the service when placed in office. At that time, there had been a need for a clerk, as John Fennon had already departed for England aboard the <i>Benjamin</i>, commanded by Captain Browne. Expectation had been placed on Packnall to continue faithfully in that role, which concerned matters of importance to the Company's interests. That expectation had not been fulfilled. He had been found to have given false intelligence and to have been implicated in matters recorded both in the council's books and in the wharves. Doubt had arisen regarding his conduct, particularly in relation to information that could cause significant damage in India across multiple nations. It was reported that he had acknowledged this himself in letters written to the present Governor of Batavia. Concern was expressed that, if such information were sent to the Right Honourable Company, it would expose serious harm to their interests.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>and Guilty of what was Provided, In both ye Councils books and in the Wharr[av]es, left us by Doubt whether concerning ye same who doth perpetuate so great Damage in India against all Nations, amongst w<sup>ch</sup> we have bin Informed since they are gone, and which he knows as he doth acknowledge in himself by his Letters wrote to the present Gov<sup>r</sup> of Batavia then w<sup>ch</sup> if his Informations should be sent home to the Rt Hon<sup>bl</sup> Company The truth first is Evidenced by M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwins Declaration to the Govern<sup>r</sup> under his hand, as also by ye said M<sup>r</sup> Packnall, and Confession Verball, and by his Letters hereof mentioned, and desires what wrong or Secret of our Masters affairs doth suffer by such Ungratefull Dealing, it might come to ye worlds view Should pass such high things by, that our Seav[en] hath bin abused and given us Consent to it/ Therefore on these Considerations, and many others, and to vindicate our Honor Goods, we have Dismissed ye said Packnall from the Hon<sup>bl</sup> Companys Service/ Poirier Tho: Goodwin</p>	<p>Evidence of these matters had been provided by a written declaration from Thomas Goodwin to the Governor, by statements from Packnall himself, and by his letters. His actions had been described as ungrateful and damaging to his masters' affairs, raising the question of whether such conduct should be made publicly known.</p> <p>On these grounds, and to defend their honour and property, the Governor and Council dismissed John Packnall from the service of the Honourable Company.</p> <p>Poirier Thomas Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The granting of leave to return to England under a fixed period, with conditional passage via Madagascar, showed how movement of Company servants was regulated. Travel depended on available shipping routes and required formal approval, reflecting logistical constraints and administrative oversight.</p> <p>The role of clerk to the council carried responsibility for maintaining official records and correspondence. The emphasis on trust highlighted the sensitivity of information handled in that office, particularly regarding trade, governance, and inter-imperial relations.</p> <p>The accusation of giving "false intelligence" indicated the circulation of information as a critical element of Company operations. Misreporting or unauthorised disclosure could disrupt trade and diplomacy, especially in regions such as India where multiple European powers competed.</p> <p>The reference to letters sent to the Governor of Batavia revealed concern over communication with foreign authorities. Such correspondence could transmit confidential knowledge beyond Company control, raising fears of strategic or commercial disadvantage.</p> <p>The formal dismissal of Packnall demonstrated the council's authority to remove officials for misconduct. This action functioned as both punishment and protection, aimed at preserving institutional integrity and safeguarding Company interests.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The emphasis on Packnall's letters to Batavia suggested that the council feared disclosure of sensitive commercial or strategic information. His dismissal may have been intended to prevent further communication that could benefit rival powers.</p> <p>The decision to document multiple forms of evidence, including written declarations and personal confessions, indicated a deliberate effort to justify the dismissal. This suggests concern that the case might be reviewed or contested beyond the island, requiring a clear record of wrongdoing.</p>
106	102	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Thursday the 10<sup>th</sup> Day of March 1697 at Fort James, Present Step<sup>b</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin assistant</p> <p>Whereas Information having been brought to Gov<sup>r</sup> that a Dutch man lately here in ye Last Dutch Ship did carnally lye w<sup>th</sup> one who ye wife of Tho: Burnham who was all warned to appeare before Gov<sup>r</sup> &amp; Councell this Day, Tho: Freesdale being Sworne, saith yt he being Setting at his doore in ye valley on Saturday night at a late houre, Tho: Burnham Sen<sup>r</sup> came to him by [...] Name[...] make me a bowle of punch, which he did make, and carryed ye said bowle to ye said Burnham house, where there was no light, but saw the said Burnham standing behind ye Table by himselfe, who asked him if he</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 10 March 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Information had been brought that a Dutch man from the last Dutch ship had lain carnally with the wife of Thomas Burnham. All parties were ordered to appear.</p> <p>Thomas Freesdale, being sworn, stated that he had been sitting at his door in the valley late on a Saturday night when Thomas Burnham senior came to him and asked for a bowl of punch. He prepared it and carried it to Burnham's house. No light was seen there, and Burnham was found standing alone behind a table. When asked about light, Burnham said there was none. Freesdale went to fetch candles and returned with them lit. He was then told that a lamp stood on a table in the back room. Entering with the candles, he saw Mrs Burnham with the Dutch man on the bed. She cried that she was undone and ran out of the house, followed by him. Freesdale then returned to the room and saw the Dutch man pressed against the wall on the bed.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>had any light in ye house, ye said Burnham answered no, then the said Freesdale said he goe home to fetch a p[...] of Candles lighted, which when he came was told</p> <p>by ye said Burnham yt there was a Lamp on ye Table in ye back roome, who went in w<sup>th</sup> ye Candles lighted in his hand, and saw M<sup>r</sup> Burnham w<sup>th</sup> ye aforesaid Dutch man on ye bed, she observing lamps off ye bed saying she was undone, and went out of the House who came out of ye Roome after her, then he fully went into ye back roome againe and saw ye Dutch Close against ye wall on ye bed, and asked him what he did there, who replied that yt ye old woman meaning M<sup>r</sup> Burnham had 4 Dollars and a Gold Ring of his whereupon went to ye said M<sup>r</sup> Burnham, who had gone to his house, &amp; asked her if she had ye Dutch mans money and Ring, who at first denyed she had any, But afterwards after confessed she had ye Ring and two Dollars which she tooke of ye Table as she came out of ye house, which she gave to ye said Freesdale, who carryed ye ring and Money to ye Dutch man againe, to M<sup>r</sup> Burnham house,</p> <p>further Declares that M<sup>r</sup> Burnham told him yt ye Dutch man Stops her mouth, and afoone as he saw ye Light that that he Caught In tooke his hand away from her mouth/ Katherine the wife of the said Tho: Freesdale being Sworne saith, that when M<sup>r</sup> Burnham came In to their house, she said she was undone, she was undone, who asked her what was the matter, she answered that your Husband had found a Dutch man upon ye Bed w<sup>th</sup> her, and the said Dutch man Stopd her mouth, presently after came her husband, and asked M<sup>r</sup> Burnham where was the Dutch mans money and Ring, who at first Denyed she had any, but presently after said she had the Ring and Two Dollars, which I tooke off the Table, as she came out, so Delivered the same to the said Tho: Freesdale who Carryed them to the Dutch man againe, The Dutch mans Examination, whose name is Derick Denison, Declares that he being Coming over the Bridge on Saturday Evening, M<sup>r</sup> Burnham Tooke him by the hand, and asked him to goe into his house, who did, and had not bin Long there, but he asked the sd Burnham whether he could help him to a black woman, who told him he had None, but bid him say what he could Doe w<sup>th</sup> his wife So the said Burnham went out of the house, and M<sup>r</sup> Burnham wife went into a Back Roome to lye downe upon a Bed and he went and lay downe by her, and that the sd Burnham speed to M<sup>r</sup> Freesdale for a Bottle of Punch, which when the sd Freesdale brought, found him upon the Bed w<sup>th</sup> M<sup>r</sup> Burnham so, he left off.</p> <p>M<sup>r</sup> Burnham saith that the Dutch man came in with her Husband, who presently went out againe to fetch a Bowle of punch from Tho: Freesdale, and after he was gone, the Dutch man blew out the lampe, as she was</p>	<p>When questioned, the man said that the woman had four dollars and a gold ring belonging to him. Freesdale went to Mrs Burnham at her house and asked about the money and ring. She first denied having them, then admitted taking the ring and two dollars from the table as she left. She handed them to Freesdale, who returned them to the Dutch man at Burnham's house. Freesdale further stated that Mrs Burnham had told him that the Dutch man had stopped her mouth, and that when he saw the light he removed his hand.</p> <p>Katherine Freesdale, wife of Thomas Freesdale, being sworn, stated that Mrs Burnham had come into her house saying she was undone. When asked the cause, she said that her husband had found a Dutch man on the bed with her, and that the man had stopped her mouth. Shortly after, her husband arrived and asked about the Dutch man's money and ring. Mrs Burnham first denied having them, then admitted taking the ring and two dollars from the table as she came out, and gave them to Thomas Freesdale, who returned them.</p> <p>The Dutch man, named Derick Denison, stated that he had been crossing the bridge on Saturday evening when Thomas Burnham took him by the hand and invited him into his house. After a short time, he asked Burnham whether he could provide a black woman. Burnham replied that he had none, and told him to consider what he might do with his wife. Burnham then left the house. Mrs Burnham went into a back room and lay down on a bed, and Denison lay down beside her. Burnham went to Thomas Freesdale for punch. When Freesdale entered and found them on the bed, Denison stopped.</p> <p>Mrs Burnham stated that the Dutch man had come in with her husband, who then left to fetch punch. After he had gone, the Dutch man extinguished the lamp while she sat on the bedside. He then threw her backwards onto the bed, stopped her mouth, and attempted further action. When Thomas Freesdale entered the house, the Dutch man ceased. She went to Freesdale's house and stated that, had her husband not come in as he did, the Dutch man would have overcome her because of her weakness.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The examination of multiple sworn testimonies showed the council's method of inquiry, relying on corroboration and contradiction between witnesses. Statements were formally taken under oath to establish credibility and to construct a narrative of events.</p> <p>The presence of a Dutch sailor from a visiting ship highlighted the interaction between transient maritime populations and the island's inhabitants. Such encounters created opportunities for disorder, especially in domestic spaces beyond direct supervision.</p> <p>The reference to payment in dollars and possession of a gold ring indicated portable wealth carried by sailors. These items functioned both as personal property and as objects vulnerable to dispute in moments of confusion or alleged misconduct.</p> <p>Thomas Burnham's reported suggestion that the Dutch man might lie with his wife revealed a breakdown of expected household authority. The household, ordinarily a controlled space, was here opened to external intrusion, complicating the boundary between consent, coercion, and responsibility.</p> <p>Mrs Burnham's claim that her mouth had been stopped and that force had been used pointed to the council's need to distinguish between voluntary and forced sexual conduct. The testimony suggested the difficulty of establishing intent and consent within confined domestic settings.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Thomas Burnham's decision to leave the house after inviting the Dutch man inside and directing him towards his wife suggested a deliberate arrangement, possibly motivated by expectation of gain or favour. His</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>setting upon the Bed side, and the Dutch man came and threw her backwards upon the bed, and stopd her mouth and offered after the sd Tho: Freesdale came In the house, and thereupon the Dutch man left off his further attempt, and she went to M<sup>r</sup> Freesdale house, and told M<sup>r</sup> Freesdale, That had not her Husband came In as he did, then Dutch man would have bin too hard for her, by reason of her weakness,</p>	<p>absence created the conditions in which the encounter took place.</p> <p>The Dutch man's claim regarding missing money and a ring, followed by Mrs Burnham's admission of taking part of it, indicated that the incident involved both sexual misconduct and opportunistic appropriation. The confusion of the moment perhaps allowed property to be taken under cover of distress.</p> <p>Mrs Burnham's appeal to weakness and force may have been intended to protect her reputation within the community. Emphasising coercion would reduce suspicion of willing participation in an act that carried moral and social consequences.</p>
107	103	<p>further Declares that M<sup>r</sup> Burnham told him yt ye Dutch man Stops her mouth, and afoone as he saw ye Light that that he Caught In tooke his hand away from her mouth/ Katherine the wife of the said Tho: Freesdale being Sworne saith, that when M<sup>r</sup> Burnham came In to their house, she said she was undone, she was undone, who asked her what was the matter, she answered that your Husband had found a Dutch man upon ye Bed w<sup>th</sup> her, and the said Dutch man Stopped her mouth, presently after came her husband, and asked M<sup>r</sup> Burnham where was the Dutch mans money and Ring, who at first Denied she had any, but presently after said she had the Ring and Two Dollars, which I tooke off the Table, as she came out, so Delivered the same to the said Tho: Freesdale who Carried them to the Dutch man againe, The Dutch mans Examination, whose name is Derick Denison, Declares that he being Coming over the Bridge on Saturday Evening, M<sup>r</sup> Burnham Tooke him by the hand, and asked him to goe into his house, who did, and had not bin Long there, but he asked the sd Burnham whether he could help him to a black woman, who told him he had None, but bid him say what he could Doe w<sup>th</sup> his wife So the said Burnham went out of the house, and M<sup>r</sup> Burnham wife went into a Back Roome to lye downe upon a Bed and he went and lay downe by her, and that the sd Burnham speed to M<sup>r</sup> Freesdale for a Bottle of Punch, which when the sd Freesdale brought, found him upon the Bed w<sup>th</sup> M<sup>r</sup> Burnham so, he left off. M<sup>r</sup> Burnham saith that the Dutch man came in with her Husband, who presently went out againe to fetch a Bowle of punch from Tho: Freesdale, and after he was gone, the Dutch man blew out the lampe, as she was setting upon the Bed side, and the Dutch man came and threw her backwards upon the bed, and stopd her mouth, and offered after the sd Tho: Freesdale came In the house, and thereupon the Dutch man left off his further attempt, and she went to M<sup>r</sup> Freesdale house, and told M<sup>r</sup> Freesdale, That had</p>	<p>Further evidence was given that Mrs Burnham had stated that the Dutch man had held his hand over her mouth, and that as soon as he saw the light he withdrew it.</p> <p>Katherine, the wife of Thomas Freesdale, being sworn, stated that when Mrs Burnham came into their house she cried out that she was undone. When asked the cause, she replied that her husband had found a Dutch man on the bed with her, and that the man had held his hand over her mouth. Shortly afterwards, Thomas Freesdale returned and asked Mrs Burnham where the Dutch man's money and ring were. She first denied having them, but then admitted taking the ring and two dollars from the table as she left, and gave them to Freesdale, who returned them to the Dutch man.</p> <p>The Dutch man, named Derick Denison, stated that he had been crossing the bridge on Saturday evening when Thomas Burnham took him by the hand and invited him into his house. After a short time, he asked Burnham whether he could provide a black woman. Burnham replied that he had none, and told him to consider what he might do with his wife. Burnham then left the house. Mrs Burnham went into a back room and lay down on a bed, and Denison lay beside her. Burnham went to Thomas Freesdale to obtain a bowl of punch. When Freesdale entered and found them on the bed, Denison stopped.</p> <p>Mrs Burnham stated that the Dutch man had entered with her husband, who soon left to fetch punch from Thomas Freesdale. After he had gone, the Dutch man extinguished the lamp while she sat on the bedside. He then threw her backwards onto the bed, held his hand over her mouth, and attempted further action. When Thomas Freesdale entered the house, the Dutch man stopped. She then went to Freesdale's house and stated that, had her husband not returned when he did, the Dutch man would have overpowered her because of her weakness.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repetition of sworn testimony from multiple witnesses showed the council's reliance on corroboration. Consistent details, such as the covering of the woman's mouth and the timing of interruption, were used to establish sequence and credibility.</p> <p>The Dutch man's statement that he had been invited into the house and directed towards the wife revealed a breach of expected household authority. The husband's role in initiating the encounter complicated the distinction between consent and coercion and brought the domestic space under formal scrutiny.</p> <p>The taking and return of the ring and two dollars showed how disputes over personal property were intertwined with allegations of sexual misconduct. Restitution of these items formed part of restoring order after the incident.</p> <p>The extinguishing of the lamp and the use of physical force highlighted the vulnerability of individuals within enclosed domestic settings. The council was required to assess such claims within a</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>not her Husband came In as he did, then Dutch man would have bin too hard for her, by reason of her weakness,</p>	<p>framework shaped by testimony, reputation, and circumstance.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The agreement between accounts that the Dutch man stopped when light appeared suggested that concealment was necessary for the act. The arrival of witnesses disrupted the situation and prevented further escalation.</p> <p>The husband's departure to obtain punch at the moment of the encounter suggested a deliberate action that created the opportunity for what followed. This sequence indicated a possible arrangement that later became contested when events did not unfold as intended.</p>
108	104	<p>Tho: Burnham Confess[eth] he was Drunke, and Doth not know any thing of the matter, so It is ordered That the said Tho: Burnham be fined for Swilling Also upon the Whole, It is ordered.</p> <p>That In respect of Burnham wife, Considering that not withstanding She may say and plead of her Justify that She tooke and Secured very carefully, the Money and Ring which the said Dutch man had laid upon the Table before he went upon the bed w<sup>th</sup> her, &amp; That when the sd Freesdale, asked her whether she had the money and Ring She had wit Enough to Deny it at first In fine Suppose She was not willing to suffer the said Dutch man to lye with her, She would have Come the next morning to the fort, To make her Complaint, which She did not, so these Circumstances Considered, with the Evidence above Sayning, wee think her Guilty of that Fact and haynous fault, But however we doe Refer the finall Decision of it, To the Jury at next Court/ Also That the Dutch man, be Immediately put Into prison untill Tomorrow, and then be put Into his Commanders hands, That he Doth order, That he Doth Receive 20 Lashes on his body, Then which hath been Executed/ John Heme[... ]on Complaines against Tho: Burnham that he ye said Burnham Did abuse him, The said Burnham saith that ye sd Heme[... ]on stroke him in his house, Katherin Leech saith that she saw John Heme[... ]on Standing at M<sup>r</sup> Fountaine Doore, where M<sup>r</sup> Burnham Came to him and said to ye sd Heme[... ]on You Dog give me yo<sup>r</sup> Thumb, and knowes not what Difference he had before, So Struck the said Heme[... ]on, and threw him downe, and beat him when he was downe, whereupon M<sup>r</sup> Burnham Comand tooke up his hat, yt was on the ground, so he helped his wife being she Came to part them, etc,</p>	<p>Thomas Burnham admitted that he had been drunk and stated that he knew nothing of the matter. An order was made that he should be fined for excessive drinking.</p> <p>A further order addressed the conduct of Burnham's wife. It was considered that she claimed to have taken and secured the Dutch man's money and ring, which he had placed on the table before getting onto the bed with her. When Thomas Freesdale asked whether she had the money and ring, she had initially denied it, despite later admitting that she had taken them. It was also noted that, even if she had been unwilling to allow the Dutch man to lie with her, she did not come to the fort the following morning to make a complaint. These circumstances, together with the earlier evidence, led to the view that she was guilty of the act and of a serious offence. The final judgement was referred to a jury at the next court.</p> <p>It was also ordered that the Dutch man should be placed in prison immediately until the next day. He was then to be handed over to his commander, who was to ensure that he received 20 lashes on his body. This punishment was carried out.</p> <p>John Heme[... ]on brought a complaint against Thomas Burnham, alleging that Burnham had assaulted him. Burnham replied that Heme[... ]on had struck him in his own house.</p> <p>Katherine Leech stated that she had seen John Heme[... ]on standing at Mr Fountaine's door when Burnham approached him and demanded his thumb, though the cause of the dispute was unknown to her. Burnham then struck Heme[... ]on, threw him to the ground, and beat him while he lay there. Burnham's servant was ordered to pick up his hat from the ground, and assistance was given to his wife when she came forward to separate them.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The fine imposed on Thomas Burnham for excessive drinking showed that personal misconduct such as drunkenness was subject to formal penalty. Regulation of behaviour extended beyond major offences to include conduct seen as disruptive to order.</p> <p>The reasoning applied to Burnham's wife demonstrated how the council assessed credibility and responsibility. Her initial denial of holding the money and her failure to report the incident promptly were treated as indicators of guilt. This reflected an expectation that victims should report offences quickly to authority, and failure to do so could undermine their position.</p> <p>The decision to refer the final judgement to a jury showed the layered structure of legal process on the island. The council conducted preliminary examination and judgement, but more serious or disputed cases could be passed to a jury for formal determination.</p> <p>The imprisonment and corporal punishment of the Dutch man illustrated the handling of foreign offenders. Authority was asserted through immediate confinement and physical punishment, but he was then returned to</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>his commander, indicating cooperation between local governance and visiting ships.</p> <p>The assault case between John Heme[...]on and Thomas Burnham showed how interpersonal violence was brought before the council. Witness testimony, such as that of Katherine Leech, was used to establish events, while the involvement of Burnham's servant revealed how household hierarchy operated even during moments of conflict.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to delay final judgement on Burnham's wife and refer it to a jury suggested uncertainty or division within the council. The conflicting accounts and sensitive nature of the accusation perhaps required a broader body to confirm the outcome.</p> <p>The immediate punishment of the Dutch man before returning him to his commander indicated a desire to demonstrate authority while avoiding prolonged detention of a foreign sailor. This approach balanced local enforcement with the practical need to maintain relations with visiting ships.</p>
109	105	<p>Katherine, the wife of Tho: Freesdale saith she saw M<sup>r</sup> Burnham John Heme[...]on standing at M<sup>r</sup> Desfontaines Doore, and presently came Tho: Burnham, who said something to the said Heme[...]on, and so went to fighting, and then M<sup>r</sup> Burnham Came to part them whereupon the said Burnham Cursed his wife, It is ordered That the said Burnham Doe pay the Charges of Councill and for the rude Affront by Execu[...] being yt first time/ Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Friday the 18<sup>th</sup> Day of March 1697 at Fort James, Present Step: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin assistant Whereas Hamo Hocci and Anthony Baukand, souldiers in the service and pay of the Rt Hon<sup>bl</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> made their attempt to Run away In the Last Dutch Ship, who went both off their Guard on board, that was found to be on shoare and put Into Prison, 3 Dayes, and this Day was Examined They both Denied that they were Intended to Run away, But that the boatswaines of the said Ship Invited them on board to Drinke w<sup>th</sup> him before ye Ship sayled/ But It was plainly seen that Anthony Baukand was minded to Leave ye Comp<sup>a</sup> Service, being that his Cloaths were on board, and that they were brought a shoare by some of the Boates Crew, which was as plaine Evidence of their Designe/ It is ordered That they Doe both Ride the wooden horse at the Reliefe of the Guard one hour wherewithall was executed</p>	<p>Katherine, the wife of Thomas Freesdale, stated that she had seen Mrs Burnham and John Heme[...]on standing at Mr Desfontaine's door. Thomas Burnham then arrived, spoke to Heme[...]on, and a fight began. Mrs Burnham attempted to separate them, at which point Burnham cursed his wife.</p> <p>An order was made that Burnham should pay the costs of the council and be punished for this disorderly offence, it being his first such offence.</p> <p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 18 March 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Hamo Hocci and Anthony Baukand, soldiers in the service and pay of the Right Honourable Company, were examined. They had attempted to leave the island aboard the last Dutch ship. They had gone off their guard duty and boarded the vessel, but were later found on shore and placed in prison for three days.</p> <p>When examined, both denied intending to desert. They stated that the boatswain of the ship had invited them on board to drink before the ship sailed.</p> <p>Evidence showed that Anthony Baukand had intended to leave the Company's service. His clothes had been found on board the ship and had been brought back ashore by members of the boat's crew. This was taken as clear proof of their plan.</p> <p>An order was made that both men should be punished by riding the wooden horse at the guard relief for one hour. This punishment was carried out.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The requirement that Burnham pay the council's charges showed that disorderly conduct could incur financial penalties in addition to reputational damage. The note that this was his first offence indicated a graded system of discipline, where repeated misconduct might lead to harsher punishment.</p> <p>The case of Hamo Hocci and Anthony Baukand demonstrated strict control over soldiers' movement. Leaving guard duty and boarding a ship without permission was treated as an attempt to desert, even when alternative explanations were offered.</p> <p>The use of physical evidence, such as Baukand's clothes found on board, showed how intent was inferred from material facts rather than relying solely on verbal testimony.</p> <p>The punishment of riding the wooden horse represented a formal military discipline. This method inflicted physical discomfort and public humiliation, reinforcing obedience and deterring further attempts to abandon service.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The claim that the boatswain had invited the soldiers to drink may have been used to reduce the seriousness of their actions. This explanation shifted responsibility away from deliberate desertion and towards casual misconduct.</p> <p>The decision to punish both men equally, despite stronger evidence against Baukand, suggested that collective discipline was applied to maintain order within the ranks. Treating the incident as a joint offence reinforced the expectation of mutual accountability among soldiers.</p>
110	106	<p>Simon Lenox Sould<sup>r</sup> who had bin on board a Ship on Saturday, who also stayed all night and Come a shore on Lords Day morning, w<sup>th</sup> some Merchandise w<sup>ch</sup> him/  It is ordered  That the said Lenox doe pay 3 s as a fine to the Church.  Hugh Bodley Complaines, That Capt Heath owed him 18<sup>l</sup> last voyage  Capt Heath saith that he doth owne and acknowledge that he did promise to pay the said Bodley the sd sume upon one Baynell Acc<sup>t</sup> But further saith that he left 11-5 in the Compa as Bookes, on acc<sup>t</sup> a Dutch man that  lay at his house, But understanding that ye Dutch Man himselfe had paid the said Bodley, doth Reackon yt aforesaid sume of 11-5 is to be part of ye 18<sup>l</sup>  Demanded by  Bodley and am Willing to pay ye Ballance of sd acc<sup>t</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> is 6-7  It is ordered  That the said Bodley be paid Immediately the aforesaid sume of 6-7 and it Reackond accordingly/  The Declaration of M<sup>r</sup> John Fisher Concerning the Pyrate being Examined saith that one Capt Browne Bau[...].loge, being Inhabitant on ye Island of Madagascar Did reside and Trade w<sup>th</sup> all nations that Came there, namely Capt Nose, who brought in a fine Laden with Moores Goods, and also Traded w<sup>th</sup> the French on the  and on the same Isle of Bonnaforeson (our Enemy) yt all w<sup>ch</sup> the sd  John Fisher Doth Depose upon Oath, Witness my hand the  14<sup>th</sup> Day of march 1697  John Fisher  John Blacon Deposeth that Capt Bauldeyage did Deale w<sup>th</sup> the Pirates at Madagascar, Cheifely w<sup>th</sup> Edward Taylor  John Lead, Tho: Williams, John Cole, and Tho: Langford, who  bought and Sold to them, and that he went to Bonnaforeson  where he further saith that he knowes, Saml Banks found  Cloathes he himselfe apprentice to Capt Bauldeyage, for ye preservation  of his life, who was amongst ye negroes w<sup>ch</sup> he had the Day and yeare above written  John Blacon</p>	<p>Simon Lenox, a soldier, had gone aboard a ship on Saturday, remained there all night, and returned ashore on Sunday morning carrying merchandise with him. An order was made that Lenox should pay a fine of 3 shillings to the church.</p> <p>Hugh Bodley brought a complaint that Captain Heath owed him £18 0s 0d from the last voyage. Captain Heath acknowledged the debt and stated that he had promised to pay Bodley that sum on the account of one Baynell. He further stated that he had left £11 5s 0d in the Company's books on account of a Dutch man who had stayed at his house. He added that he had since understood that the Dutch man had already paid Bodley, and therefore that £11 5s 0d should be counted as part of the £18 0s 0d owed. He declared himself willing to pay the remaining balance of £6 7s 0d. An order was made that Bodley should be paid immediately the sum of £6 7s 0d, and the account was settled accordingly.</p> <p>A declaration was given by John Fisher concerning pirates. He stated on oath that Captain Browne Bau[...].loge, an inhabitant of Madagascar, resided there and traded with all nations that came to the island. He named Captain Nose, who had brought in a vessel richly laden with goods taken from Moors. He also stated that Browne traded with the French on the same island of Bonnaforeson, described as an enemy. This declaration was signed on 14 March 1698.</p> <p>John Blacon also gave a sworn statement that Captain Bauldeyage traded with pirates at Madagascar, chiefly with Edward Taylor, John Lead, Thomas Williams, John Cole, and Thomas Langford. He stated that Bauldeyage bought from and sold to them. He added that he had gone to Bonnaforeson and further declared that Samuel Banks had found clothes. Blacon stated that he himself had become apprentice to Captain Bauldeyage in order to preserve his life while among the Negroes. This statement was also dated to the same day and year.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The fine imposed on Simon Lenox for remaining aboard a ship overnight with merchandise showed strict regulation of contact between soldiers and visiting vessels. Such control aimed to prevent unauthorised trade and limit the movement of goods outside official oversight.</p> <p>The settlement of the debt between Hugh Bodley and Captain Heath demonstrated the use of accounting practices within the Company's system. Recognition of partial payment through third-party transactions showed how obligations could be adjusted based on prior dealings recorded in Company books.</p> <p>The sworn declarations of John Fisher and John Blacon illustrated the role of testimony in gathering intelligence about piracy and trade networks. Information about individuals and their dealings was formally recorded to inform Company policy and protect its commercial interests.</p> <p>The references to trade with pirates and multiple European nations at Madagascar revealed the fluid and competitive nature of commerce in the region. Individuals such as Captain Browne and Captain Bauldeyage operated across formal and informal</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>networks, engaging with both recognised traders and outlaw groups.</p> <p>Blacon's statement that he entered into service with Captain Bauldeyage to preserve his life indicated the coercive environment in which individuals could be compelled into service. Survival could depend on aligning with powerful figures within these trading and pirate networks.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The immediate settlement of Bodley's claim at the reduced balance suggested a practical approach to dispute resolution. By recognising partial payment already made, the council avoided prolonging the dispute and ensured quick closure.</p> <p>The detailed naming of pirate associates in Blacon's statement indicated an effort to expose and document a network of illicit trade. This information may have been intended to support future action against those involved or to warn Company authorities of ongoing risks.</p>
111	107	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 25<sup>th</sup> Day of March 1697 at Fort James  Present  Step: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>  Tho: Goodwin assistant  Sarah the wife of Fraise Rogers Deceased, and Remains being Executrix of the said Rogers Last Will and Testament  came this Day to Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councill in order to have it approved,  which was accordingly Done by the Oath of M<sup>th</sup>w Baker and  Tho: Seale,  It is ordered  That the said Fraise Rogers his Will be approved, and Allowed, And a Copy given her when Desired.  Joy Huntly came to Govern<sup>r</sup> and Councill this Day, That she might  prove that her Husband was Dead, who Left his Kitts on ye Island  Cooper of the army Named John Huntly,  Benj<sup>m</sup> Seale being Sworne saith, That he being In Company with  one Richard Haslewood Quarter master of the Ship Kingston, heard  him Say that he went to Sea, the said Huntly, who told him  he was of Comp<sup>a</sup> of the army, and that he had a wife at St Helena,  but because he should never see her, and In short after a month  time after, went In ye sd John Huntly businesse at Barrobon/  M<sup>r</sup> Barret being Sworne saith That she heard the sd Richard  Haslewood say that he knew one John Huntly, who said he had  a wife at St Helena, and wished he was there w<sup>th</sup> her, and In a little  time after was at his buisnesse at Barrobon.  Martha Coles being Sworne saith the same as M<sup>r</sup> Barret hath Deposited, further, saith that she heard ye sd Haslewood say that  the sd Huntly was whipt, and thought that might be the Cause  of his Death/  Simon Lenox being Sworne saith that he heard one  Tho: Watson  belonging to the Ship Amity, say that the said Huntly was whipt  from Ship to Ship, and after one month was Dead, by the same/</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 25 March 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Sarah, the widow of Fraise Rogers, who had been named executrix in his last will and testament, appeared before the Governor and Council to have the will approved. The will was confirmed on the sworn testimony of Matthew Baker and Thomas Seale. An order was made that the will of Fraise Rogers should be approved and allowed, and that a copy should be given to her when requested.</p> <p>Joy Huntly appeared before the Governor and Council seeking to prove that her husband, John Huntly, a cooper in the army, was dead. She stated that he had left his tools on the island.</p> <p>Benjamin Seale, being sworn, stated that he had been in company with Richard Haslewood, quartermaster of the ship <i>Kingston</i>. He had heard Haslewood say that John Huntly had gone to sea and had told him that he served in the Company's army and had a wife at St Helena. Huntly had said that he would never see her again. About a month later, Haslewood reported that Huntly was at his work at Barrobon.</p> <p>Mr Barret, being sworn, stated that she had heard Haslewood say that he knew John Huntly, who had said that he had a wife at St Helena and wished to be with her. She added that soon afterwards he had been at his work at Barrobon.</p> <p>Martha Coles, being sworn, confirmed the same account as Mr Barret. She further stated that she had heard Haslewood say that Huntly had been whipped, and that this might have caused his death.</p> <p>Simon Lenox, being sworn, stated that he had heard Thomas Watson, a crew member of the ship <i>Amity</i>, say that John Huntly had been whipped from ship to ship and had died about a month later as a result.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The formal approval of Fraise Rogers's will by oath demonstrated the council's role in probate matters. Validation by witnesses ensured legal recognition of the document and enabled the executrix to administer the estate under official authority.</p> <p>Joy Huntly's petition showed the need to establish death through testimony when no formal record existed. The council relied on indirect evidence from seafarers and witnesses, reflecting the difficulty of confirming deaths that occurred at sea or abroad.</p> <p>The repeated references to statements made by Richard Haslewood and Thomas Watson illustrated how information circulated through maritime networks. Testimony was often second-hand, yet it was treated as sufficient to establish probable fact in the absence of direct proof.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The account of John Huntly being whipped from ship to ship indicated a severe form of maritime punishment. Such treatment suggested a system of discipline that could extend across multiple vessels, reinforcing authority but also exposing individuals to fatal consequences.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The reliance on multiple overlapping testimonies about John Huntly's fate suggested that no single account was considered fully reliable. The council appears to have built a cumulative case from consistent details to support the conclusion of his death.</p> <p>The emphasis on whipping as the cause of death indicated concern about excessive punishment at sea. The repetition of this detail across accounts suggests that it was regarded as the most credible explanation for his death, even without direct confirmation.</p>
<a href="#">112</a>	108	<p>It is ordered upon Consideration, That being the said John Huntly hath bin from his wife so long time and never heard from by any manner and that It is thought he is Dead by ye Oath of the Evidence, Also That she the said Joy Huntly be free from her said Husband, and is free to Contract Matrimony w<sup>th</sup> who she is minded/ Tho: Earle having Dismist himselfe out of the Comp<sup>a</sup> service, It is ordered That W<sup>m</sup> French be put Into the same place of Quarter Gunn<sup>r</sup> his pay Commencing from the Day of his Dismission march 1697 Rich<sup>d</sup> Alexander, Petitioned to Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councill, that he might hire 10 acres of the Rt Hon<sup>bl</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> wast Land Lying in Sandy Bay/ It is ordered That the said Rich<sup>d</sup> Alexander, Request be Granted and that he have a Lease for the same for the terme of 2 yeares Commencing from ye 25<sup>th</sup> of this Instant March 1697 Tho: Goodwin</p>	<p>An order was made, after consideration, that John Huntly had been absent from his wife for a long time and had not been heard from by any means. On the sworn evidence presented, he was judged to be dead. Joy Huntly was therefore released from her marriage and was permitted to marry again if she chose.</p> <p>Thomas Earle had removed himself from the Company's service. An order was made that William French should take his place as quarter gunner, with his pay to begin from the day of Earle's departure in March 1698.</p> <p>Richard Alexander submitted a petition to the Governor and Council requesting permission to rent 10 acres of the Right Honourable Company's waste land at Sandy Bay. An order was made granting his request. A lease was to be issued for a term of two years, beginning on 25 March 1698.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The declaration of John Huntly's death based on prolonged absence and sworn testimony showed how legal death could be established without direct proof. This allowed the council to resolve marital status and property matters in cases where individuals disappeared overseas.</p> <p>The release of Joy Huntly from her marriage demonstrated the council's authority over marital status in the absence of ecclesiastical courts. Permission to remarry restored her legal and social position within the settlement.</p> <p>The appointment of William French as quarter gunner illustrated the structured replacement of roles within the Company's service. Pay beginning from the date of vacancy ensured continuity of both labour and compensation.</p> <p>The grant of a two-year lease of Company land to Richard Alexander showed the controlled distribution of land resources. Such leases enabled cultivation while maintaining Company ownership, reflecting a system of regulated access to land for economic use.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to declare John Huntly dead and release his wife from the marriage suggests a practical response to uncertainty. Prolonged absence without communication was treated as sufficient grounds to resolve her status, allowing her to reintegrate fully into social and economic life.</p> <p>The short two-year lease granted to Richard Alexander indicates a cautious approach to land allocation. The limited term allowed the Company to retain flexibility while still encouraging use of otherwise unproductive land.</p>
<a href="#">113</a>	109	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Fryday the 25<sup>th</sup> Day of March 1698 att Fort James</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 25 March 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Present  Steph Poirier Governo<sup>r</sup>  Tho: Goodwin assistant  Sutton Isaack Planter, Complaines of Jack a Slave of James Grandy's by saying that the said Jack Stole 7 Dowlas  In Cloth and 3½ yards of Blew Cloath, out of his House,  and that he Broake open a Chest from whence he tooke the said particulars,  Jack being Examined saith that he knowes nothing of the matter, nor to his Charge, and that he is falsly accused/  Moll a Slave of the said Isaack saith She was at her Masters Cabbage field ground, at the time ye said Jack stole the Goods, But came home, before yt the sd Jack was apprehending  to know what he had before tooke, and saw the said Jack out of the house  with a Chest, and after she came, she carried the Chest to ye house againe,  but cannot say whether doth know he tooke any thing out of ye Chest nor no other place, further saith yt the said Jack promised her a Quart of arrack to Conceale that he was there, and yt he tooke ye Chest  out of the house/  Thomas Collier aged ab' 5 yeares, saith that Jack tooke some money and Blew Cloath out of ye Chest, w<sup>ch</sup> was his Grand mother, and gave him a Piece of Sugar, that he might hold his tongue,  Merry Mann a Slave of M<sup>m</sup> Haste saith that on ye same Day yt said Jack was at M<sup>r</sup> Isaacks he met w<sup>th</sup> ye sd Moll who told him that Jack had bin at her master house when nobody was at home (Excepting ye said Isaack and Son) and she being at ye Cabbage field ground, that when she Returned found ye sd Jack there w<sup>th</sup> a Chest of her Master out of ye house, and that he promised her a Quart of Arrack not to tell he was there,</p>	<p>Sutton Isaack, a planter, brought a complaint against Jack, a slave belonging to James Grandy. He alleged that Jack had stolen seven dowlas of cloth and three and a half yards of blue cloth from his house, and that he had broken open a chest to take these items.  Jack, when examined, denied all knowledge of the matter and stated that he was falsely accused.  Moll, a slave belonging to Isaack, stated that she had been at her master's cabbage field at the time of the theft. She returned home before Jack was apprehended in order to see what he had taken. She saw Jack outside the house with a chest and later carried the chest back into the house herself. She stated that she did not know whether he had taken anything from it or from elsewhere. She added that Jack had promised her a quart of arrack to keep silent about his presence and the removal of the chest.  Thomas Collier, aged about five years, stated that Jack had taken money and blue cloth from the chest, which belonged to his grandmother, and had given him a piece of sugar so that he would remain silent.  Merry Mann, a slave belonging to Mrs Haste, stated that on the same day he had met Moll, who told him that Jack had been at her master's house when no one was there except Isaack and his son. She said that she had been at the cabbage field and, on returning, had found Jack there with her master's chest outside the house. She reported that Jack had promised her a quart of arrack in exchange for silence about his presence.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The allegation that Jack broke open a chest to take cloth and goods showed the importance of secured storage within households. Chests functioned as key repositories of valuable items, and forced entry signalled a serious breach of property protection.  The testimony of Moll and Merry Mann demonstrated how enslaved individuals participated in the detection and reporting of theft. Their statements showed the role of informal observation networks within plantations and households, where movements and actions were monitored and relayed.  The promise of arrack in exchange for silence revealed the use of small rewards to influence testimony and conceal wrongdoing. Such exchanges reflected a parallel system of negotiation operating outside formal authority.  The inclusion of testimony from a young child, Thomas Collier, indicated that evidence was accepted from a wide range of witnesses. His statement linked the act of theft with an attempt to secure silence through a gift, reinforcing the pattern described by others.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The consistency between Moll's account and Merry Mann's report suggested that Jack's presence at the house and removal of the chest were widely known among nearby individuals. This may have increased pressure on witnesses to speak, as concealment became difficult.  The offering of both arrack and sugar to secure silence indicated a deliberate effort to manage risk. Different incentives were directed at different individuals, suggesting that Jack adjusted his actions according to the age and position of those who observed him.</p>
114	108	<p>It is ordered upon Consideration,  That being the said John Huntly hath bin from his wife a Long Time and never heard from by any manner and that It is thought he is Dead by ye Oath of the Evidence, Also  That she the said Joy Huntly be free from her said Husband, and is free to Contract Matrimony w<sup>th</sup> who she is minded/</p>	<p>An order was made, after consideration, that John Huntly had been absent from his wife for a long period and had not been heard from in any way. On the sworn evidence presented, he was judged to be dead. Joy Huntly was therefore released from her marriage and was permitted to marry again if she chose.  Thomas Earle had left the Company's service. An order was made that William French should take his</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Tho: Earle having Dismist himselfe out of the Comp<sup>a</sup> service, It is ordered That W<sup>m</sup> French be put Into the same place of Quarter Gunner his pay Commencing from the Day of his Dismission march 1697 Rich<sup>d</sup> Alexander, Petitioned to Gov<sup>t</sup> and Councell, that he might hire 10 acres of the Rt Hon<sup>bl</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> wast Land Lying In Sandy Bay/ It is ordered That the said Rich<sup>d</sup> Alexander, Request be Granted and that he have a Lease for the same, for the terme of 2 yeares Commencing from ye 25<sup>th</sup> of this Instant March 1698 Poirier Tho: Goodwin</p>	<p>place as quarter gunner, with his pay to begin from the date of Earle's departure in March 1698. Richard Alexander submitted a petition to the Governor and Council requesting permission to rent 10 acres of the Right Honourable Company's waste land at Sandy Bay. An order was made granting his request. A lease was to be issued for a term of two years, beginning on 25 March 1698. Poirier Thomas Goodwin <b>Interpretations</b> The declaration of John Huntly's death based on prolonged absence and sworn testimony showed how legal death could be established without direct proof. This enabled the council to resolve marital status and related legal matters in cases where individuals disappeared overseas. The release of Joy Huntly from her marriage demonstrated the council's authority to alter marital status in such circumstances. Permission to remarry restored her legal standing and allowed her to form a new household. The appointment of William French as quarter gunner illustrated the structured reassignment of roles within the Company's service. The alignment of pay with the date of vacancy ensured continuity of both labour and remuneration. The grant of a two-year lease of Company land to Richard Alexander showed the controlled allocation of land. Such leases allowed cultivation while maintaining Company ownership, reflecting a system that balanced economic use with institutional control.</p>
115	109	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Fryday the 25<sup>th</sup> Day of March 1698 att Fort James Present Step<sup>h</sup> Poirier Govern<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin assistant Sutton Isaack Planter, Complaines of Jack a Slave of James Grandy's by saying that the said Jack Stole 7 Dowlas In Cloth and 3½ yards of Blew Cloath, out of his House, and that he Broake open a Chest from whence he tooke the said particulars, Jack being Examined saith that he knowes nothing of the matter, nor to his Charge, and that he is falsly accused/ Moll a Slave of the said Isaack saith She was at her Masters Cabbage field ground, at the time ye said Jack stole the Goods, But came home, before yt the sd Jack was apprehending to know what he had before tooke, and saw the said Jack out of the house with a Chest, and after she came, she carried the Chest to ye house againe, but cannot say whether doth know he tooke any thing out of ye Chest nor no other place, further saith yt the said Jack promised her a Quart of arrack to Conceale that he was there, and yt he tooke ye Chest out of the house/ Thomas Collier aged ab' 5 years, saith that Jack tooke some money and Blew Cloath out of ye Chest, w<sup>th</sup> was his Grand mother, and gave him a Piece of Sugar, that he might hold his tongue, Merry Mann a Slave of M<sup>m</sup> Haste saith that on ye same Day yt said Jack was at M<sup>f</sup> Isaacks he met w<sup>th</sup> ye sd Moll who told him that Jack had bin at her master house when</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 25 March 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant. Sutton Isaack, a planter, brought a complaint against Jack, a slave belonging to James Grandy. It was alleged that Jack had stolen seven dowlas of cloth and three and a half yards of blue cloth from Isaack's house. It was further stated that he had forced open a chest and taken these items from it. Jack was examined and denied all knowledge of the matter. He stated that the accusation against him was false. Moll, a slave belonging to Isaack, stated that she had been at her master's cabbage field at the time the goods were taken. She returned home before Jack was apprehended in order to see what he had taken. She saw him outside the house with a chest. After he left, she carried the chest back into the house. She stated that she did not know whether he had taken anything from it or from elsewhere. She added that Jack had promised her a quart of arrack in exchange for her silence about his presence and his removal of the chest. Thomas Collier, aged about five years, stated that Jack had taken money and blue cloth from the chest, which belonged to his grandmother. He added that Jack had given him a piece of sugar so that he would remain silent. Merry Mann, a slave belonging to Mrs Haste, stated that on the same day he had met Moll. She told him that Jack had been at her master's house when no one was there except Isaack and his son. She said that she had been at the cabbage field and, when she returned, found Jack there with her master's chest outside the house. She reported that Jack had promised her a quart of arrack in exchange for silence about his presence. <b>Interpretations</b> The allegation that the chest was forced open showed the importance of locked storage as a primary means of protecting property. Breaking into such a container marked the act as a serious offence rather than simple opportunistic taking.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>nobody was at home (Excepting ye said Isaack and Son) and she being at ye Cabbage field ground, that when she Returned found ye sd Jack there w<sup>th</sup> a Chest of her Master out of ye house, and that he promised her a Quart of Arrack not to tell he was there,</p>	<p>The testimonies of Moll and Merry Mann demonstrated how information moved through enslaved communities. Observations were shared quickly, creating informal networks that could expose wrongdoing even before formal investigation began.</p> <p>The promise of arrack in return for silence revealed an attempt to interfere with the flow of information. Such exchanges showed how individuals could try to manage risk by influencing witnesses outside formal authority.</p> <p>The statement of Thomas Collier, despite his young age, was accepted as evidence. This reflected a flexible approach to testimony, where even very young witnesses could contribute to establishing events if their account aligned with other reports.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The repetition of similar details in Moll's and Merry Mann's accounts suggested that the incident became known rapidly. This probably limited Jack's ability to conceal his actions, as multiple witnesses were aware of his presence and movements.</p> <p>The use of different incentives, such as arrack for an adult and sugar for a child, indicated a deliberate attempt to silence witnesses according to their circumstances. This suggested a calculated effort to prevent the theft from being reported.</p>
<a href="#">116</a>	110	<p>Will<sup>m</sup> Hayes Sen<sup>r</sup> saith, That he being at worke In his plantation w<sup>ch</sup> is but a small Distance from ye sd Isaacks heard a hue &amp; cry at ye sd Isaacks house But could not see any body there, on the same Day that the house was said Robbed was at ye sd Isaacks House,</p> <p>M<sup>r</sup> Isaack being Sworne saith, that on Tuesday the first Day of March, himselfe and his wife went from home to M<sup>r</sup> Lewys, and left their negro man and Boy at home, all w<sup>ch</sup> Time he Left 7 Dollars in Chest and 3½ yards of Blew, and after he came home was made acquainted yt Jack had bin there, and opened a Chest and took ye same out of ye house, who Immediately Sent for James Grandy and told him what he had lost and shewed him ye Chest yt was broken open,</p> <p>Edward Barbarant being Sworne saith, that he was at ye Fort when the said Jack stole ye money and Cloath, but went up the next Day, and was told by his father In Law M<sup>r</sup> Isaack, that he had lost 7 Dollars in Chest, and his 3½ yards of Blew, and that he thought Jack had stole ye same, being Jack was there/</p> <p>Upon the Whole, It is ordered That the said James Grandy Doe pay to the said M<sup>r</sup> Isaack five Dollars, and Returne the sd 3½ yards of Blew, and Charges of Councill, also That the said Jack be punished at the flagg Staff, w<sup>ch</sup> was Executed Immediately/</p> <p>Poirier Tho: Goodwin</p>	<p>William Hayes senior stated that he had been working at his plantation, which lay a short distance from Isaack's house. He heard a raised alarm at Isaack's house but saw no one there. On the same day that the house was reported to have been robbed, he went to Isaack's house.</p> <p>Sutton Isaack, being sworn, stated that on Tuesday 1 March 1698 he and his wife left their home to visit Mr Lewys. They left their slave man and a boy at the house. At that time, he had left 7 dollars in a chest and three and a half yards of blue cloth. When he returned, he was told that Jack had been there, had opened the chest, and had taken the items out of the house. He immediately sent for James Grandy, informed him of the loss, and showed him the chest that had been forced open.</p> <p>Edward Barbarant, being sworn, stated that he had been at the fort when Jack took the money and cloth. He went up the next day and was told by his father-in-law, Sutton Isaack, that 7 dollars from the chest and three and a half yards of blue cloth had been taken, and that Jack was suspected because he had been there.</p> <p>After considering all the evidence, an order was made that James Grandy should pay Sutton Isaack 5 dollars, return the three and a half yards of blue cloth, and pay the costs of the council. It was further ordered that Jack should be punished at the flagstaff. This punishment was carried out immediately.</p> <p>Poirier Thomas Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The decision to require James Grandy to compensate Isaack showed that responsibility for a slave's actions rested with the owner. Financial liability extended beyond direct involvement and operated as a mechanism to enforce supervision and discipline.</p> <p>The partial repayment of 5 dollars, rather than the full 7 dollars claimed, indicated that the council assessed the value or certainty of the loss before determining compensation. This reflected a discretionary approach rather than strict restitution.</p> <p>The order to return the blue cloth alongside monetary payment showed that goods and money were treated as distinct forms of property. Restoration aimed to recover both where possible.</p> <p>The punishment carried out at the flagstaff demonstrated the use of public corporal discipline to</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>enforce authority. Such punishment reinforced social hierarchy and served as a visible warning to others.</p> <p>The reference to a “hue and cry” indicated a communal response to suspected theft. This practice functioned as an immediate alert system, mobilising nearby individuals to respond to wrongdoing and assist in its detection.</p>
<a href="#">117</a>	111	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on the aforesaid  Day att Fort James (for orphans)  Present  St: Poirier Governo<sup>r</sup>  Tho: Goodwin assistant  M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin, brought, and Read the Book and Estate of Elizabeth Goring, which was Examined and approved, It is ordered  That ye said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Goring Doe Continue w<sup>th</sup> the said M<sup>r</sup> Goodwin, ye yeare ensuing upon the Same termes as She did ye yeare last past/  Orlando Bagley Jun<sup>r</sup> Delivered the Estate of Mary Overton, which was Examined and approved, and that he ye said Bagley, yeare ensuing on ye same Condition as he did ye yeare past  Mary Manning Delivered ye acc<sup>t</sup> of Martha Hunt Estate, which was Examined and Read, It is ordered  That the said Martha Hunt doe Continue in the said Mary Manning, ye yeare next ensuing upon the same Condition as she did ye yeare last past/  John Goodwin Delivered ye acc<sup>t</sup> of Greenlees orphans and Effects from ye yeare past, wherein it did appeare yt the said John Goodwin had laid out for Cloathing James Greenlees, and Mary ye sume of £7-07-0 which was to be deducted out of ye said Estate, Also James Greenlees, and Mary Requested that they might have their Portion in their owne possession, which was granted  they giving Receipts as Discharge for ye same/</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on the same day for matters concerning orphans. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin presented and read the account book and estate of Elizabeth Goring. It was examined and approved. An order was made that Elizabeth Goring should remain with Thomas Goodwin for the following year on the same terms as in the previous year.</p> <p>Orlando Bagley junior submitted the estate of Mary Overton. It was examined and approved. An order was made that Bagley should continue in charge of the estate for the next year under the same conditions as before.</p> <p>Mary Manning submitted the account of Martha Hunt’s estate. It was examined and read. An order was made that Martha Hunt should remain with Mary Manning for the following year on the same terms as in the previous year.</p> <p>John Goodwin submitted the account of the Greenlees orphans and their effects for the past year. It was shown that he had spent £7 7s 0d on clothing for James Greenlees and Mary, which was to be deducted from their estate. James Greenlees and Mary requested that they be given their portion into their own possession. This was granted, and they provided receipts as discharge for the same.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The review and approval of estate accounts showed the council’s role in supervising the property of orphans. Guardians or overseers were required to present accounts regularly, ensuring that estates were managed under official oversight.</p> <p>The continuation of Elizabeth Goring, Martha Hunt, and the estate of Mary Overton under the same arrangements indicated a system of annual renewal. This allowed the council to reassess each case while maintaining stability in care and administration.</p> <p>The deduction of £7 7s 0d for clothing from the Greenlees estate showed that maintenance costs were charged against the orphan’s own assets. Guardians could recover necessary expenses, demonstrating how care was financed directly from estate resources.</p> <p>The request by James Greenlees and Mary to receive their portions into their own possession indicated a transition from guardianship to personal control. The requirement that they provide receipts showed the formal discharge of the guardian’s responsibility and the completion of that administrative relationship.</p>
<a href="#">118</a>	112	<p>Jona<sup>th</sup> Beale brought and Delivered the Estate of Mores orphan, [...], which was Examined &amp; proved wherein it did appeare that the said Jona<sup>th</sup> Beale stood Indebted unto the said Estate the Sume of 30 pounds, It is ordered  That ye said M<sup>r</sup> Beale have ye Estate in his Custody as he had the yeare last past/  Gab<sup>r</sup> Lovell son and heire of G<sup>o</sup> Lovell absent and Charles Nowell, who married Elizabeth ye said Lovells Daughter, Delivered the Estate of the said Lovells Children Estate, which was Read &amp; Examined, And also  The above said C Nowell and his Brother In Law Gab<sup>r</sup> Lovell made their humble request to ye Gov<sup>r</sup></p>	<p>Jonathan Beale presented and delivered the estate of Moore’s orphan, [...]. It was examined and approved. It was shown that Jonathan Beale owed the estate the sum of £30 0s 0d. An order was made that Mr Beale should retain custody of the estate, as he had done in the previous year.</p> <p>Gabriel Lovell, son and heir of Gabriel Lovell senior, who was absent, and Charles Nowell, who had married Elizabeth, Lovell’s daughter, submitted the estate of the Lovell children. It was read and examined. Charles Nowell and Gabriel Lovell requested that the estate be divided equally among them. An order was made granting this request, on condition that they provide bond and good security to ensure the estate would be available if Gabriel Lovell senior returned or</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>and Council, setting forth that they might have ye said Estate Divided Equally Between all of them, It is ordered That the said Nowell and Lovell Request be Granted, provided they doe [...] Give bond &amp; Good Security, for ye forth Coming of the said Estate after their father Gab<sup>r</sup> Lovell sen<sup>r</sup> Doth [...] and or come for it, and also to Save ye Gov<sup>r</sup> &amp; Council harmelesse/ M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin &amp; M<sup>r</sup> John [...], Executors of the Estate of Tho: Phillips, Delivered his Acco<sup>t</sup>, which was Received and Approved, and accordingly done by ye oath of Joseph Wills, Richard Leach, &amp; John Alexander, who all Deposed that they knew of no other Acco<sup>t</sup> made by ye said Thomas Phillips either by word of [...], also that ye Executors will be obliged to secure all ye Legacies mentioned in ye will according to their order, in case ye Heire come hereafter, to save ye Estate from ye said Phillips having bin suspected of piracy, It is ordered That the said will be Recorded upon Oath, when required/</p>	<p>claimed it, and to indemnify the Governor and Council from any liability.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin and Mr John [...], executors of the estate of Thomas Phillips, presented the account. It was received and approved. Joseph Wills, Richard Leach, and John Alexander gave sworn testimony that they knew of no other account made by Thomas Phillips, either spoken or written. It was further required that the executors should secure all legacies named in the will according to their terms, in case the heir should appear later. This precaution was taken because Thomas Phillips had been suspected of piracy. An order was made that the will should be recorded upon oath when required.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The requirement that Jonathan Beale retain custody of an estate despite owing it £30 0s 0d showed that debt to an estate did not automatically disqualify a guardian. Instead, oversight continued through formal accounting, reflecting reliance on continuity rather than immediate replacement.</p> <p>The condition that Nowell and Lovell provide bond and security before dividing the estate demonstrated a legal safeguard. This ensured that assets could be recovered if the absent father returned, and protected the council from responsibility for any loss arising from the division.</p> <p>The sworn statements confirming that no additional accounts existed illustrated the importance of closing financial records formally. Testimony functioned as a substitute for complete documentation where records might be incomplete or uncertain.</p> <p>The instruction that executors secure legacies in case an heir appeared reflected caution in estate administration. The suspicion of piracy attached to Thomas Phillips introduced legal risk, requiring safeguards to preserve claims against the estate if challenged in future.</p>
119	113	<p>Island St Helena. Att a Court of Justice Held on Monday att the Sessions House Neare Fort James, [...] Steph<sup>m</sup> Poirier Governo<sup>r</sup> Pres<sup>t</sup>; Tho: Goodwin assistant The Court was opened according to the accustomed manner and these persons appointed for Jurors, were Called, whose names hereafter follow viz' Orlando Bagley foreman . . . 1 Edward Bennett . . . 2 John Field . . . 3 John Lincham . . . 4 Emanuel P[...][...] . . . 5 Tho: Dixon . . . 6 [...] . . . 7 James Ryder . . . 8 Hugh Bodley . . . 9 Thom: Rach . . . 10 [...] Burnham . . . 11 [...] Meling . . . 12 Judge – Gentlemen Last quarter (Thanks God) I had no occasion to Call you hither, being no occasion of Committing the Offenders and very Glad to leave you amongst yo<sup>r</sup> families, and not Disquiet you of Continuing the Imprisonment of Prisoners, but now it is [...] So, We having of late been to be Disposed by you (Gentlemen) and the Chiefest Case is Concerning Tho: Burnham wife, who hath bin accused of [...] and Adultery, and to my sorrow I doe feare</p>	<p>A court of justice was held at the Sessions House near Fort James on Monday. Stephen Poirier, Governor, presided, with Thomas Goodwin as assistant.</p> <p>The court was opened in the usual manner. The following men were called and appointed as jurors: Orlando Bagley, foreman; Edward Bennett; John Field; John Lincham; Emanuel P[...][...]; Thomas Dixon; [...]; James Ryder; Hugh Bodley; Thomas Rach; [...] Burnham; and [...] Meling.</p> <p>The Governor addressed the jury. He stated that in the previous quarter there had been no need to summon them, as no offenders had required trial. He expressed satisfaction that they had been able to remain with their families without disturbance or the need to oversee prisoners. He then stated that circumstances had changed and that their judgement was now required.</p> <p>He explained that the principal case concerned the wife of Thomas Burnham, who stood accused of sexual misconduct and adultery. He stated that there appeared to be strong grounds for the accusation, though the matter was to be judged by those present according to their conscience.</p> <p>He continued by referring to the seriousness of the offence within Christian belief. He described it as a grave matter to judge and warned of its destructive consequences, drawing on religious examples of punishment for such behaviour. He stated that this offence had caused ruin in past societies and had spread widely, bringing severe harm and decline.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The formal calling of a jury showed the operation of a structured legal process in which judgement was delegated to a group of local men. The selection of</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>there is much ground to believe it, However there are some present persons whose Conscience is to Judge of the Case Though the Christian Religion doth require of her Believers to perform, who speaks about it as Offending, and saith that it is a heavy Body to meddle with such weighty affaires, It is as you know which hath caused the totall Destruction of Adam and Gomorrah and the wicked to you fetch so far Following such [...] Examples it is (Iam Confident) they very same sin which hath long brought [...] into such a Lamentable Condition, and almost all over spread it, Therefore</p>	<p>named individuals reflected a system of community-based adjudication under official authority.</p> <p>The Governor's address demonstrated how legal proceedings were framed within religious and moral language. References to sin and divine punishment reinforced the seriousness of the charge and shaped the expectations placed upon the jury.</p> <p>The emphasis on the jury's conscience indicated that their role extended beyond factual assessment to moral judgement. This reflected a legal culture in which personal responsibility and religious belief influenced verdicts.</p> <p>The identification of adultery as the central offence showed the regulation of sexual behaviour as a matter of public concern. Such cases were treated not only as private misconduct but as threats to social and moral order.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The Governor's extended moral warning before the case was heard suggested an attempt to influence the jury's perspective. By emphasising the severity of the offence and its consequences, he may have sought to guide their judgement towards a particular outcome.</p> <p>The reference to the absence of cases in the previous quarter may have been used to contrast past order with present disorder. This framing perhaps reinforced the importance of addressing the current case firmly to prevent further decline.</p>
120	114	<p>Gentlemn beleive me it is no sin to be Just amongst us, If she is not guilty, Shee be very glad, She might be cleared, if she be so, Shee be punished according to her demerit, I have therefore you will Examine the Evidence, which I have be presented heard before you unpartially, and Return yo<sup>r</sup> verdict, according to the integrity you have, I thought it needfull/ The Governo<sup>r</sup> &amp; Councell Offended to the Jury on the Tryall of Marg<sup>t</sup> ye wife of Tho: Burnham, for Committing a Lewd and Vnjust Action w<sup>th</sup> a Dutchman. The said Burnham wife, Denyes her Accusation laid to her Charge/ Tho: Freesdale plant<sup>t</sup> being Sworne saith, the same that he hath already Deposed In the Consultation held the 10<sup>th</sup> Day of march 1697/8 also, Katherine the said Freesdale wife as she did at the same time, aforesaid/ The Jury Considered ye matter in a little time, and returned their verdict, That the said Marg<sup>t</sup> Burnham, be Cleared, having no Cause of matter of fact, John Coles laid Complaint against John Hensley In an Action of Slander, saying that he tooke and stole out of his pocket 3 or 4 Dollars in Gold, The said Hensley doth answer &amp; say no, Rich<sup>d</sup> Searing, being sworne, saith that he was at the house of John Mudge, at ye same time yt the said Hensley say yt ye said Coles stole his money, but doth not know any thing of ye matter, John Mudge being sworne saith, that when Hensley Rich<sup>d</sup> Searing and John Hensley, were at his house, who asked his wife if she had any money, which she said no, and the said Hensley went downe and then proffered to [...] for some drink money, whereupon the said Hensley said Then have you no money then the said Coles, who then Replyed more than was aware of, so tooke out [...]</p>	<p>The Governor addressed the jury and stated that justice must be upheld. He said that if Margaret Burnham was not guilty, she should be cleared, and if she was guilty, she should be punished according to her offence. The jury was instructed to examine the evidence fairly and give their verdict according to their judgement.</p> <p>The Governor and Council then proceeded with the trial of Margaret, the wife of Thomas Burnham, who was accused of committing a lewd and unlawful act with a Dutch man. She denied the accusation.</p> <p>Thomas Freesdale, a planter, gave sworn evidence and repeated the same account he had given at the consultation held on 10 March 1698. Katherine Freesdale, his wife, also gave sworn evidence and confirmed her earlier statement from that same time.</p> <p>The jury considered the matter briefly and gave their verdict. Margaret Burnham was cleared, as no proof of the act was found.</p> <p>John Coles brought a complaint against John Hensley for slander. He said that Hensley had accused him of stealing three or four dollars in gold from his pocket. Hensley denied the accusation.</p> <p>Richard Searing, being sworn, stated that he had been at the house of John Mudge when Hensley said that Coles had stolen his money, but he did not know anything about the matter.</p> <p>John Mudge, being sworn, stated that Hensley, Richard Searing, and John Coles had been at his house. Hensley asked his wife whether she had any money, and she said that she did not. Hensley then went outside and offered to [...] for some drink money. He then said to Coles that he had no money. Coles replied [...] and took out [...].</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The direction given by the Governor showed that the jury was expected to decide the case on what could be proved. Even in a case involving moral accusation, the decision depended on clear evidence rather than suspicion.</p> <p>The verdict clearing Margaret Burnham showed that the jury did not accept the charge without proof. Earlier claims and suspicion were not enough to convict, which shows that the court required a clear account of the act itself.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The action for slander showed that spoken accusations could be brought before the court. A claim that someone had stolen money was treated as a serious matter that could damage reputation and required formal answer.</p> <p>The witness statements in the slander case showed the limits of proof. Presence at the scene did not always produce clear knowledge, and uncertainty in testimony weakened the case.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The quick decision by the jury suggests that the evidence was not strong enough to persuade them. The earlier statements may have raised suspicion, but they did not establish the act clearly enough to support a guilty verdict.</p> <p>The dispute between Coles and Hensley appears to have arisen from a remark made during conversation about money. The lack of clear evidence suggests that the accusation may have been made loosely and then challenged once its effect became serious.</p>
121	115	<p>his Breeches some small money to ye quantity of Three or 4 Shillings, who put it in his pocket againe, presently after this Deponent [...] in a jesting manner tooke the said Money and hid it upon a Table, which lay there awhile, Tho: Hensley being in a passion would not believe it againe, So upon these termes, laid ye so much money to the sd Coles Charge,</p> <p>The wife of the said John Mudge upon oath saith the same as her husband hath sworne already/</p> <p>The Jury Considered a small time, and Delivered their Verdict, That the said John Hensley was guilty in some sort, and that he offer John Coles forgiveness in the open Court and to acknowledge that he hath wrongfully accused Him, and pay Court Charges/</p> <p>It is ordered by ye Court That John Hensley be fined five shillings for being Drunke, The Jury Refused ye Court to remit ye sd Hensley fine which was granted/</p> <p>John Hemmon Complaines of Thomas Burnham Sen<sup>r</sup> saying that he, said Tho: Burnham, doth keep very bad fences, and I thought it Memes his Cattle goes into his plantation, and had found one of his Cow a little below ye said Burnhams Ground, and thought that by suspition Burnhams Doggs had caused ye Cow to fall</p> <p>Downe, Tho: Burnham Denyes ye action, saying he doth not know how ye Cow came dead, he being atto ye fort when ye said Hemmon found ye sd Cow/</p> <p>Ripin Willis being sworne saith that he being at ye Two Gun Ridge when ye alarm was made for ye Dutch ship, where he did heare Tho: Burnham Jun<sup>r</sup> say something concerning Coles to his father, who Replyed to his son, saying, Come here then up, and Ile shew in thy Defence, further saith that the said Burnham Doggs will run after Cattle without setting on [...] after Cattle for halfe a mile without any body after them,</p> <p>John Mudge being sworne saith the same as Ripin Willis hath Above Declared, he being at ye place aforesaid and at the same time/</p>	<p>Further evidence was given by Richard Searing. He stated that John Coles had taken off his breeches and had a small sum of money, about three or four shillings, which he put into his pocket again. Shortly after, Searing took the money in a joking manner and hid it on a table, where it remained for some time. Thomas Hensley, being angry, refused to accept this and instead accused Coles of taking the money.</p> <p>The wife of John Mudge, being sworn, confirmed the same account as her husband.</p> <p>The jury considered the matter briefly and delivered their verdict. John Hensley was found partly at fault. He was required to ask John Coles for forgiveness in open court, to admit that he had wrongly accused him, and to pay the court charges.</p> <p>An order was made that John Hensley should also be fined five shillings for drunkenness. The jury refused to allow the court to remit this fine, and this refusal was accepted.</p> <p>John Hemmon brought a complaint against Thomas Burnham senior, stating that Burnham kept poor fences. He believed that Burnham's cattle entered his plantation. He said that he had found one of his cows dead a short distance below Burnham's land and suspected that Burnham's dogs had caused the animal to fall.</p> <p>Thomas Burnham denied the claim. He stated that he did not know how the cow had died, and that he had been at the fort when Hemmon found it.</p> <p>Ripin Willis, being sworn, stated that he had been at Two Gun Ridge when the alarm was raised for the Dutch ship. He heard Thomas Burnham junior say something about Coles to his father. Burnham replied to his son, telling him to come forward and that he would show him how to defend himself. Willis also stated that Burnham's dogs would chase cattle without being set on them and would pursue them for half a mile without anyone following.</p> <p>John Mudge, being sworn, confirmed the same account as Ripin Willis, stating that he had been at the same place and time.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The resolution of the slander case showed that partial fault could be recognised. Hensley was not treated as wholly malicious, but he was still required to repair the damage by public apology and payment of costs, which restored Coles's reputation.</p> <p>The additional fine for drunkenness showed that disorderly behaviour was punished separately from the main dispute. The jury's refusal to reduce the fine indicated that they took such conduct seriously and supported firm discipline.</p> <p>The complaint about fences and wandering cattle showed the importance of boundary maintenance.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>Responsibility for enclosing land fell on the occupier, and failure could lead to disputes over damage or loss.</p> <p>The testimony about dogs chasing cattle showed how liability could extend beyond direct human action. Animals under a person's control could cause harm, and their behaviour became relevant evidence in determining responsibility.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The escalation of the dispute between Hensley and Coles appears to have arisen from a misunderstanding that turned into anger. The initial act of hiding the money as a joke created confusion, which Hensley interpreted as theft.</p> <p>The suspicion that Burnham's dogs caused the cow's death suggests that indirect harm was difficult to prove. Without direct observation, the case depended on patterns of behaviour, such as dogs chasing cattle, rather than clear evidence of the event itself.</p>
122	116	<p>Richard Allen sworne saith that when he and some of brigands  Departed from this place, to went up in ye Country, and over tooke in his way Tho: Burnham Jun<sup>r</sup> who went as fare as the Hutt with him, and yt the said Burnham went home afterward, and Hensley yt said Hemmon Cattle out of his fathers plantation, and following ye Cattle, met then  yt Burnham did yt Mr Hemmon was there also, who asked him what made him hunt their Cattle so, who replied that he would Shoot them and Hamstring them, if that he caught them in his fathers plantation againe, if you Stand and Looks on,  Edward Brayne being sworne saith that he know Burnhams doggs very apt to Run after Cattle, and that his fences is not sufficient,  The Jury Consulted a little time and Deliver their verdict That John Hemmon, be Cast in suite and pay Court Charges/  Sam<sup>l</sup> Taylor Complaines of John Mudge  In an action of defamation saying that the aforesaid Mudge reproached him  Sam<sup>l</sup> Taylor on ye behalfe of Katherine his wife whose former husband was executed for Rebellion and com-  plices of John Mudge for saying that he did Demand twenty shillings of her, he being her former husband, In saying you Dogg Taylor, I will say ye wife former husband was hanged speaking it on several times for which he ye said Taylor Desired Judgmt might be passed  on him, according to a Proclamation sett forth by Governor  Blackmore and his Councell, and Sr John Weybourne, at a Court  martiall, for doing any affront, either in word or action to women whatsoever, on ye Platform  That receive Imprisonment or shame or their Relation upon  ye penalty of Twenty shillings, Ten of it to be paid to the  person Injured, and ye other Ten to ye Rt Honble Lords Propr<sup>tes</sup>/  John Mudge Denyes ye Action, and what ye said Taylor hath sett forth in his Declaration/</p>	<p>Richard Allen, being sworn, stated that he and some brigands had left the settlement and gone inland. On the way, they met Thomas Burnham junior, who went with them as far as the hut and then returned home. Allen further stated that John Hemmon had driven his cattle out of Burnham's father's plantation. While following the cattle, Hemmon met Burnham, who was also there. Hemmon asked why he was chasing the cattle. Burnham replied that he would shoot them and cut their legs if he caught them again in his father's plantation, even if Hemmon stood by and watched.</p> <p>Edward Brayne, being sworn, stated that he knew Burnham's dogs were prone to chase cattle and that his fences were not adequate.</p> <p>The jury considered the matter briefly and delivered their verdict. John Hemmon lost the case and was ordered to pay the court charges.</p> <p>Samuel Taylor brought a complaint against John Mudge in an action for defamation. He stated that Mudge had insulted him. Taylor spoke on behalf of his wife Katherine, whose former husband had been executed for rebellion. He alleged that Mudge had demanded twenty shillings from her, claiming to have been her former husband. He also stated that Mudge had repeatedly called him "dog Taylor" and had said that his wife's former husband had been hanged. Taylor requested judgement according to a proclamation issued by Governor Blackmore, his Council, and Sir John Weybourne at a court martial. That proclamation imposed a penalty of twenty shillings for insulting a woman in word or action in a public place, with ten shillings to be paid to the injured party and ten shillings to the Right Honourable Lords Proprietors, along with imprisonment or public shame.</p> <p>John Mudge denied the accusation and rejected the claims set out by Taylor.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The verdict against John Hemmon showed that suspicion and indirect evidence were not enough to establish liability. Despite testimony about dogs and fences, the jury did not accept that Burnham was responsible for the cow's death.</p> <p>The statements about Burnham's threats to shoot or maim cattle revealed how disputes over land and livestock could escalate into threats of violence. Control of grazing boundaries was enforced both through physical barriers and intimidation.</p> <p>The defamation case brought by Samuel Taylor showed that insults affecting family reputation, especially those tied to past execution for rebellion, could be pursued formally. Reputation remained closely linked to legal standing and social position.</p> <p>The reference to a proclamation issued by Governor Blackmore and Sir John Weybourne demonstrated the use of formal regulations to protect women from verbal and physical insult. The specified</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>penalty and division of fines showed how authority, compensation, and revenue were combined in enforcement.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The jury’s decision against Hemmon may have reflected uncertainty about the cause of the cow’s death. Without direct proof, the evidence about dogs and fences may have been seen as insufficient to support the claim.</p> <p>Samuel Taylor’s reliance on a formal proclamation suggests that he sought to strengthen his case by invoking established authority. The repeated nature of the alleged insults may have increased their seriousness, prompting him to pursue the matter through the court.</p>
123	117	<p>Mr Edmonds being sworne saith that she heard ye said John Mudge say to Sam<sup>u</sup> Taylor, You dogg Taylor, Dont say yt yo<sup>r</sup> wifes former Husband was hangd/ Margarett Belgrove Widdow being sworne saith that she hearing a great noyse towards Taylers house, went nigh ye house, and heard ye sd Mudge say, Dont say yo<sup>r</sup> wifes former husband was hangd, which Mr Mudge having gone into her husbands house, But did not stay long in ye house but came out againe, and then also ye sd Taylor, why he did offer his children to fling stones at his doore, ye sd Taylor told him it was none that belonged to him, Whereupon ye sd Mudge went to his house againe and went up stairs, and came into his Hallway, and said you Taylor, You and yo<sup>r</sup> family are so proude that I cannot live by you, But Doth Care for you nor none of the Hang men/ Marg<sup>r</sup> Hayes being sworne saith, yt her husband being at the sd Taylors house, she went there to him, and presently after came ye sd Mudge, and sd Rudings in Intercepting some Company yt was at ye sd Taylers house, In so much that ye Company in Company Desired ye sd Taylor to Take ye sd Mudge out of their Company, who Desired according the sd Mudge to goe out of his house, But was not willing thereto, Whereupon the sd Taylor tooke him by ye hand and turned him out of Doores, upon which termes ye sd Mudge said, Dam<sup>n</sup> all for you, Nor None of the Hang Men/ John Harris being sworne saith yt ye said John Mudge Came into ye said Sam<sup>u</sup> Taylors house, and Interrupted ye Company that was there, who was Disposed to be Merry, Who Desired the sd Taylor to Take ye sd Mudge from them, Who accordingly did, and when the sd Mudge was out of ye sd Taylors house he did strike two or three blowes, he knows Nothing more, touching what is alleadged against ye sd Mudge/ The Jury Considered ye whole Circumstance of ye Business, and brought in their Verdict That the sd Mudge was Cast, and Pay Charges of Court/</p>	<p>Mrs Edmonds, being sworn, stated that she heard John Mudge say to Samuel Taylor, “You dog Taylor, do not say that your wife’s former husband was hanged.”</p> <p>Margaret Belgrove, a widow, being sworn, stated that she heard loud noise near Taylor’s house and went closer. She heard Mudge repeat that Taylor should not say his wife’s former husband had been hanged. Mudge then went into her husband’s house but did not stay long. When he came out again, he accused Taylor of setting children to throw stones at his door. Taylor replied that they were not his. Mudge then returned to his house, went upstairs, and came back into the hall, where he said that Taylor and his family were so proud that he could not live near them, and that he did not care for them or for any “hangmen”.</p> <p>Margaret Hayes, being sworn, stated that she went to Taylor’s house to meet her husband. Soon after, Mudge arrived and behaved disruptively among the people gathered there. Those present asked Taylor to remove him. Taylor asked Mudge to leave, but he refused. Taylor then took him by the hand and led him out of the house. At that point, Mudge said that he cared nothing for Taylor or any “hangmen”.</p> <p>John Harris, being sworn, stated that Mudge entered Taylor’s house and disturbed the company, who had been in good spirits. They asked Taylor to remove him, which he did. After being put out, Mudge struck two or three blows, though Harris did not know anything further about the matter.</p> <p>The jury considered all the circumstances and delivered their verdict. John Mudge was found against and was ordered to pay the court charges.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The repeated testimony from several witnesses showed how public speech was assessed through corroboration. Multiple accounts of similar words strengthened the case and established that the insults were openly made.</p> <p>The focus on references to Taylor’s wife’s former husband, who had been executed, showed how past punishment could affect present reputation. Repeating such facts in a hostile manner was treated as an injury to honour rather than simple statement.</p> <p>The disturbance at Taylor’s house illustrated expectations of order within domestic gatherings. A host was responsible for maintaining peace, and removal of a disruptive person was considered appropriate action.</p> <p>The verdict against Mudge showed that verbal abuse, especially when repeated and public, could result in formal penalty. The requirement to pay court charges acted as both punishment and a means of enforcing accountability.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The repeated use of the term “hangman” suggests that Mudge aimed to provoke by linking Taylor’s household to disgrace. The persistence of this language indicates that the insult was deliberate rather than casual.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The escalation from verbal abuse to physical blows after removal from the house suggests that Mudge resisted loss of status in front of others. Being forced out may have triggered further aggression as a response to public humiliation.</p>
<a href="#">124</a>	118	<p>[...] is ordered by the Court  [...]. That the said John Mudge, be fined to the Right  [...]. Company as is Expressed in ye Proclamation 10 and to the said Sam<sup>u</sup> Taylor 10 more./  [...]  [...]  Island St Helena  Att a Consultation held on Tuesday ye 5th Day of Aprill 1698 att Fort James  Present Steph: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>  Tho: Goodwin assistant  Whereas information having bin brought to ye Gov<sup>r</sup> that  John Hemmerson did say yt the present Governor Poirier was  not a Gov<sup>r</sup> but a Deputy Gov<sup>r</sup> Upon which the sd John Hemmerson was sent for and Examined, who Denys the  which is alledged against him, and saith he doth not Remember any thing of ye Matter,  Richard Leach being sworne saith, yt he and the sd Hemmerson having some Discourse abt his action which he  had against Burnham which was Tryed ye day before at a Court of Judicature, That he had not Evidence done him  and yt ye Gov<sup>r</sup> heard nothing of it, nor was in his Decla[ra]  tion, and yt ye present Gov<sup>r</sup> was not Gov<sup>r</sup> but Deputy Gov<sup>r</sup> and doth think heard ye sd Hemmerson say yt he would  tell him so to his face ye next Morning after/</p>	<p>An order was made by the court that John Mudge should pay a fine of 10 shillings to the Right Honourable Company, as set out in the proclamation, and a further 10 shillings to Samuel Taylor.</p> <p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 5 April 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Information had been brought to the Governor that John Hemmerson had said that the present Governor, Poirier, was not a governor but only a deputy governor. Hemmerson was summoned and examined. He denied the accusation and stated that he did not remember saying anything of the kind.</p> <p>Richard Leach, being sworn, stated that he had been speaking with Hemmerson about his case against Burnham, which had been tried the previous day at the court of justice. Hemmerson had said that he had not been properly heard, that the Governor had taken no notice of it, and that this had not been included in his statement. Leach further stated that Hemmerson had said that the present Governor was not a governor but only a deputy governor, and that he believed Hemmerson had said he would tell him so to his face the following morning.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The fine imposed on John Mudge followed the terms of an existing proclamation, showing that penalties for verbal offences were governed by established rules rather than decided case by case. The division of the fine between the Company and the injured party combined punishment with compensation.</p> <p>The complaint against John Hemmerson concerned a statement that challenged the authority of the Governor. Such words were treated as serious, as they questioned the legitimacy of office and could weaken obedience within the settlement.</p> <p>The examination of Hemmerson showed that denial and claimed lack of memory were accepted responses, but they were weighed against sworn testimony from others. The process relied on comparing statements to establish what had been said.</p> <p>Richard Leach's testimony linked the alleged statement to dissatisfaction with a recent court decision. This showed how disputes in legal proceedings could extend into challenges to authority beyond the courtroom.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Hemmerson's denial may have been an attempt to avoid punishment for challenging the Governor's authority. Claiming not to remember the statement provided a way to avoid direct contradiction while limiting admission of fault.</p> <p>The connection between Hemmerson's complaint about his case and his remarks about the Governor suggests that frustration with the court's decision led him to question the Governor's position. The statement may have been made in anger following the earlier judgement.</p>
<a href="#">125</a>	119	<p>James Ryden, being sworne saith, he and Hemmon being  a Discourseing of ye aforesaid action, ye said Hemmon said there  was Errors mentioned in his Declaration, who answered that he  did not remember he heard ye Gov<sup>r</sup> said any thing concerning former,  ye said Hemmon answered yt ye sd Gov<sup>r</sup> Poirier was not</p>	<p>James Ryden, being sworn, stated that he had been speaking with John Hemmon about the earlier case. Hemmon said that there were errors in his statement. Ryden replied that he did not remember hearing the Governor say anything about the matter. Hemmon then said that Governor Poirier was not fully established as governor but was only a deputy, and that he would say this to him directly the following morning.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Settled Gov<sup>r</sup> but Deputy Gov<sup>r</sup> and he would tell him so In the Morning/ It is ordered That ye said Hemmon be put into ye Marshall Custody Immediately, untill further Consideracion may be had/ The said John Hemmon made his humble Request to Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councill, Desiring ye Gov<sup>r</sup> etc to pardon him for his late offence and was heartily sorry for what he hath said against ye Gov<sup>r</sup> etc promise never to Committ the like againe, which was granted him/ [...] Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Wednesday ye 6th Day of Aprill 1698 att Fort James Present Steph: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin assistant Tho: Burnham Jun<sup>r</sup> Complaines of Ralph Gates, saying he tooke out of his fathers house one [...] one gun, one piece, one or two bells of him, and a Copper pan, which he found againe Ralph Gates saith yt the said Burnham hath him no [?] and as for all ye rest of ye particulars, doth Deny yt ever he had or saw any, Tho: Burnham was asked whether he would make oath yt he did not lend ye said Gates ye said Goods, who refused so to doe therefore It is ordered That ye said Tho: Burnham pay Court Charges, he having no Cause of Complaint [...]</p>	<p>An order was made that Hemmon should be placed immediatly in the custody of the marshal until further consideration. John Hemmon then made a formal request to the Governor and Council for pardon. He expressed regret for what he had said and promised not to repeat such conduct. His request was granted. A consultation was held at Fort James on 6 April 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant. Thomas Burnham junior brought a complaint against Ralph Gates. He alleged that Gates had taken from his father's house a gun, another firearm, one or two bells, and a copper pan, which he later recovered. Ralph Gates denied the claim. He stated that Burnham had no claim against him and denied ever having or seeing any of the items mentioned. Thomas Burnham was asked whether he would swear that he had not lent the goods to Gates. He refused to take such an oath. An order was then made that Burnham should pay the court charges, as he had no valid cause for complaint. <b>Interpretations</b> The statements made by Hemmon questioning the Governor's authority were treated as a serious offence. Immediate custody showed that challenges to official status were acted upon quickly to maintain authority. The granting of pardon after Hemmon's apology showed that submission and acknowledgment of fault could lead to leniency. Public expression of regret restored order without the need for further punishment. The requirement that Burnham swear he had not lent the goods showed the importance of oath in establishing claims. Refusal to swear weakened his case and led directly to dismissal. The order that Burnham pay court charges demonstrated that unsuccessful complaints carried financial consequences. This discouraged unfounded accusations and reinforced the need for clear proof before bringing a case. <b>Speculations</b> Hemmon's quick request for pardon suggests that he recognised the seriousness of his words once formal action was taken. The threat of continued custody may have prompted his submission. Burnham's refusal to swear that he had not lent the goods may indicate uncertainty in his claim. Without that oath, the case could not be supported, leading to its dismissal.</p>
126	120	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Saturday ye 9th Day of Aprill 1698 att Fort James. Present Steph: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin assistant M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin &amp; M<sup>r</sup> John Fawkner Execu<sup>r</sup>s of the Last Will and Testament of Tho: Phillips Deceased Brought an Inventory of ye said Phillips Estate that he was possessed off at ye time of his Death; which Margary Hayes (widow in whose house he died) made oath that ye Inventory was true, to ye best of her know- ledge, also yt ye said Tho: Phillips promised George Hodgson 40 Dollars for his trouble and pains, and other medicines he used, which ye Court accordingly paid [...] Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Tuesday ye 12th Day of Aprill 1698 att Fort James. Present Steph: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin assistant Whereas John Nichols of ye said Island Planter who hath given forth unto ye Court that he might have againe 10 acres Land belonging to him lying at the peaks Joyning to his fathers formerly 20 acres,</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 9 April 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant. Thomas Goodwin and John Fawkner, executors of the last will and testament of Thomas Phillips, brought forward an inventory of the estate that Phillips possessed at the time of his death. Margery Hayes, a widow in whose house he died, swore that the inventory was true to the best of her knowledge. She also stated that Thomas Phillips had promised George Hodgson 40 dollars for his labour, care, and the medicines he had provided. This sum was paid by order of the court. A consultation was held at Fort James on 12 April 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant. John Nichols, a planter of the island, submitted a request to the court to recover 10 acres of land at the Peaks, which had formerly formed part of his father's holding of 20 acres. These 10 acres had been confiscated by order of the Governor and Council in 1688 for an offence committed by his father, John [...]. The Governor and Council found that a large sum of money had been owed to the Honourable Company by the same [...]. Nichols had argued against the confiscation and had attempted to persuade the</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>which 10 acres of Land have bin Confiscated by order of ye said father John by Governor and Council as doth appeare by the Councill Books Dated ye day of 1688 for some offence, the said Gov<sup>r</sup> and Council found the Greater Sume of money due to ye Honble Company by the said Smouth (although the said Nichols said, and did then what he could to the Gov<sup>r</sup> etc In hopes to hinder them to doe it, but could not prevail)</p>	<p>Governor and Council not to enforce it, but he had not succeeded.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The presentation and approval of the inventory of Thomas Phillips's estate showed the formal process of verifying assets after death. Sworn confirmation by a household witness ensured that the estate record was accepted as accurate.</p> <p>The payment of 40 dollars to George Hodgson demonstrated that debts for care and medical treatment were recognised and settled from the estate. This showed how personal services were formally valued and compensated through legal process.</p> <p>The request by John Nichols to recover confiscated land highlighted the lasting effect of earlier penalties. Land taken for an offence remained under Company control unless formally restored, showing how punishment could extend across generations.</p> <p>The reference to debt owed to the Company explained the basis for confiscation. Financial liability could justify the seizure of land, linking property rights directly to obligations owed to the governing authority.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Nichols's attempt to recover the land suggests that he sought to restore his family's economic position. The prior confiscation likely reduced the value and productivity of the original holding.</p> <p>The failure of Nichols to persuade the Governor and Council indicates that financial obligations to the Company carried greater weight than personal appeals. The decision suggests that recovery of debt remained a priority over restoring land to former holders.</p>
127	121	<p>[...] by reason he had Lost his Contract or Title, by which he might prove that he had purchased the said 10 acres of Land, from William Rutter &amp; Edward Seaford Execu's of ye Last Will &amp; Testament of one John Coper, But hath procured all Names, w<sup>ch</sup> which he hath produced to Governor [...] and desired of him, that he might Recover ye said 10 acres of Land, of which wee are Satisfyed he did/ Therefore Considering manestly ye said Title Dated ye 19th day of Jan<sup>y</sup> 1681, and Taken of Mr Rutter, now ye wife of Sam<sup>l</sup> Taylor, upon Oath she did declare yt ye said Nichols did truly purchase ye said Land from her Husband William Rutter Deceas<sup>d</sup>, This act likewise Taken from himself, who doth swear without Equivocation and any manner reservation, yt his said father Samuel did duly and Rightly be- long to him, Wee in a manner being willing to Satisfy him in so apparent Justice, Wee have allowed him Liberty to enjoy the said 10 acres of Land, paying yearly ye Rent thereof to ye Hon<sup>tbl</sup> Company; but provided alwayes yt such Liberty may not Cause dis- turbance or hurt to ye said Company's Right, In Case they have any to it as their owne, Wee ye said Hon<sup>tbl</sup> Company Reserve to our selves that Right/ Further yt the said John Nichols hath sett forth before us, yt the said 10 acres of Land being broken off his Estate, Deprived of us, he hath now 10 acres of Land higher to his owne</p>	<p>It was stated that John Nichols had lost his contract or title by which he could prove that he had purchased the 10 acres of land from William Rutter and Edward Seaford, executors of the last will and testament of John Coper. He had, however, obtained supporting names and presented them to the Governor, requesting that he might recover the land. The Governor and Council were satisfied that he had made this purchase.</p> <p>Consideration was given to the title dated 19 January 1682. Evidence was taken from Mrs Rutter, now the wife of Samuel Taylor, who declared on oath that Nichols had indeed purchased the land from her late husband, William Rutter. Nichols himself also swore clearly and without reservation that the land had properly belonged to him through his father Samuel.</p> <p>On this basis, and being satisfied of the justice of his claim, permission was granted for Nichols to hold and use the 10 acres of land, provided that he paid a yearly rent to the Honourable Company. This grant was made on the condition that it should not interfere with or damage any claim the Company might have to the land. The Company expressly reserved its rights in the matter.</p> <p>It was further stated by Nichols that, because the 10 acres had previously been taken from his estate, he had since taken 10 acres of land elsewhere in place of it. This arrangement was also granted on the same terms as above.</p> <p>A deed of sale relating to the 10 acres of land was then produced. It recorded the transfer from William Rutter and Edward Seaford, executors of John Coper, to John Nichols.</p> <p>The indenture was dated 30 January 1682, in the thirty-third year of the reign of King Charles the Second of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith. It was made between William Rutter of St Helena, free planter, and Edward Seaford of the same place, free planter, acting as executors of John Coper, deceased, on the one part, and John Nichols of St Helena, free planter, on the other part. It recorded that William Rutter and [...] conveyed the land to Nichols.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>In stead of ye above said, which we have Granted him at ye same Condition aforesaid/  John Nicholls Deed of Sale, from W<sup>m</sup> Rutter and Edw<sup>d</sup> Seaford  Execu's of ye Last Will and Testament of John Coper (Deceas<sup>d</sup>) for the above said 10 acres of Land/  This Indenture made ye Thirtieth Day of January Anno Dni 1681, and in ye Three and thirtieth Yeare of ye Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord Charles the Second, of England Scotland France and Ireland King Defender of ye Faith &amp;c Between William Rutter of ye Island St Helena free planter, and Edward Seaford of ye said Island free planter Execu's of ye Last Will &amp; Testament of John Coper deceased of the one part, and John Nicholls of the said Island free planter of ye other part, Witnesseth that ye said W<sup>m</sup> Rutter and [...]</p>	<p>The acceptance of witness testimony in place of a lost written title showed that ownership could be proven through sworn evidence when documents were missing. This allowed property claims to be restored without requiring the original deed.</p> <p>The requirement that Nichols pay yearly rent to the Company demonstrated that ultimate ownership remained with the Company, even when private individuals held land. Tenure depended on continued payment and recognition of Company authority.</p> <p>The reservation of the Company's rights showed that grants of land were conditional. Even when a claim was accepted, it did not remove the Company's ability to assert ownership in future if grounds existed.</p> <p>The involvement of executors in the original sale highlighted the role of estate administration in transferring property. Land held by a deceased person could be sold by executors to settle or distribute the estate, forming a lawful basis for later claims.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The loss of the original title suggests that record-keeping was fragile, and that ownership could depend on memory and testimony. Nichols's effort to gather witnesses indicates that he needed to reconstruct proof to regain his claim.</p> <p>The decision to grant Nichols use of the land while reserving Company rights suggests a compromise. The council recognised his claim but protected itself against any future dispute over ownership or prior obligations attached to the land.</p>
128	122	<p>Edward Seaford Execu<sup>r</sup> of the Last Will and Testament of ye said John Coper, by vertue of which said Will, for and in consideration of the Sume of Eight pounds to the said W<sup>m</sup> Rutter &amp; Edward Seaford Execu's of the Last will and Testam<sup>t</sup> of the said John Coper, In hand paid att or before the Ensealing &amp; Delivery hereof and for Divers other good Causes and Consideracons, them hereunto movinge have Granted Alienated Bargained &amp; Sold and by these presents doe Alienate Bargaine and Sell unto the said John Nicholls all ye piece or parcell of Land Containing by Estimation Ten acres, be it more or less, lying and being within the high peaks situate and bounding as in any of ye Easterne bounds of the said Island it doth and may more fully appeare together with all and singular ye appurtenances thereunto belonging and appertaining, To have &amp; to hold the said pcell or parcell of Land with all ye appurtenances from ye day of ye date hereof unto the said John Nicholls his heires and Assignes for Ever, And the said W<sup>m</sup> Rutter and Edward Seaford Execu's of ye Last Will and Testam<sup>t</sup> of ye said John Coper for themselves their Execu's Adm's and Assignes, doe Covenant promise and agree to and with ye said John Nicholls his heires Execu's Adm's and Assignes by these presents that the said W<sup>m</sup> Rutter and Edward Seaford shall and will Save Keepe</p>	<p>Edward Seaford, acting as executor of the last will and testament of John Coper, together with William Rutter, sold a parcel of land to John Nichols. This sale was made under the authority of Coper's will.</p> <p>The transfer was made in return for the sum of £8 0s 0d, which had been paid to William Rutter and Edward Seaford before the agreement was completed. It was also stated that other valid reasons supported the sale.</p> <p>The land was described as a piece or parcel containing about 10 acres, whether more or less, located within the high peaks on the eastern side of St Helena. All rights and attachments connected to the land were included in the transfer.</p> <p>Full possession of the land was granted to John Nichols, his heirs, and assigns in perpetuity from the date of the agreement.</p> <p>William Rutter and Edward Seaford, acting as executors, gave a formal guarantee. They promised that John Nichols and his successors would be protected from any future claims made by others to the land through them. They also declared that the land was free from any debts or legal burdens.</p> <p>The agreement was completed with the signatures and seals of the parties. William Rutter signed in the presence of John Blackmore junior and John Poole. Edward Seaford signed in the presence of Gabriel Powell and Frances Howard.</p> <p>A certified copy of the document was prepared by John Alexander.</p> <p>Poirier Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The sale made by executors under the authority of a will showed how property of the deceased could be legally transferred. Executors acted with recognised authority to dispose of assets, ensuring that transactions remained valid after death.</p> <p>The payment of £8 0s 0d as consideration demonstrated the formal requirement that land transfers be supported by a stated price. This confirmed the transaction as a lawful sale rather than an informal arrangement.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>harmless and indemprnifie the said John Nicholls from any person or persons whatsoever lawfully Claiming or to Claime anything in or to the premises by from by or under them or any of them and that the hereby bargained premises are free and Cleare of all Incumbrances anything to the Contrary hereof in any wise notwithstanding, In Witnesse whereof the parties have hereunto Interchangeably sett their hands and Seales the Day and yeare first above written/ Sealed &amp; Deliv<sup>r</sup>ed by the said W<sup>m</sup> Rutter in the presence of Jn<sup>r</sup> Blackmore Jun<sup>r</sup> John Poole Sealed &amp; Deliv<sup>r</sup>ed by the said Edw<sup>d</sup> Seaford in presence of Gab<sup>r</sup> Powell Fra<sup>ce</sup> Howard Attest Copy pr me J Alexander Poirier Goodwin</p>	<p>The grant of the land “for ever” to Nichols and his heirs showed the creation of a permanent property right. This established long-term ownership, subject only to higher authority such as that of the Company.</p> <p>The guarantee against future claims functioned as a legal protection. It ensured that the buyer would not face disputes arising from earlier ownership, placing responsibility on the sellers to defend the title.</p> <p>The witnessing and sealing of the document demonstrated the formal process required to validate property transactions. Independent witnesses confirmed the act, and the sealed document served as enduring proof of ownership.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The detailed guarantees included in the agreement suggest concern about potential disputes over ownership. Given that the land formed part of a deceased estate, there may have been uncertainty about competing claims.</p> <p>The preparation of an attested copy indicates the importance of preserving evidence of ownership. This may reflect awareness that original documents could be lost, making copies essential for future claims or disputes.</p>
129	123	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Tuesday the 3 Day of May 1698 Att Fort James Pres<sup>t</sup> Steph: Poirier Gover<sup>o</sup> Tho: Goodwin Assist<sup>t</sup> According to a Proclamation sent out, Dated the 14<sup>th</sup> day of Aprill 1698 to Require and Comand all ye male Inhabitants of ye sd Island that have Plantations of their owne, To Assemble and meet together at the Church in ye Country on Monday the 9<sup>th</sup> of may. There by majority of voyces to Nominate and appoint 4 pson[s] for Church wardens and 4 for Surveyors of ye high ways, that ye Gov<sup>r</sup> might Choose Two pson[s] for Each Office, which Inhabitants met and Elected the pson[s] hereafter following/ Church wardens { M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin } for ye west { Matt<sup>h</sup> Bartell { Daniell Emund } Jonat<sup>h</sup> Beale } for ye East Overseers of { [...][...][...] } for ye west { John Field ye high way { [...][...][...] } Tho: Dixon } for ye East It is ordered That M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin and M<sup>r</sup> Daniell Emund, nominated, were not to be Church wardens for ye p[rese]nt yeare 1698 and be made Choice of but by reasoning by reason of Exe[c]using of their office, and that M<sup>r</sup> Rich[ard] be Discharged/ also That Tho: Dixon and [...][...][...] be appointed overseers of ye high ways and accordingly sworne, to Execute their office, and that they have warrant accordingly/ Richard Gurling Petitioned to what he might have of Land and Estate of his Brother John Gurling being now absent which the Garison gave bond for he having had sd Estate in his possession/ It is ordered That the said Richard Gurling request be granted, On Condition to give Bond and security, for his said Brothers stock and</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 3 May 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>A proclamation dated 14 April 1698 had required all male inhabitants of the island who held plantations to assemble at the country church on Monday 9 May. They were to choose, by majority vote, four persons for church wardens and four for overseers of the highways, from whom the Governor would select two for each office.</p> <p>The inhabitants met and nominated the following persons. For church wardens, Thomas Goodwin and Matthew Bartell were chosen for the west, and Daniel Emund and Jonathan Beale for the east. For overseers of the highways, [...] and John Field were chosen for the west, and [...] and Thomas Dixon for the east.</p> <p>An order was made that Thomas Goodwin and Daniel Emund should not serve as church wardens for the present year 1698. Their earlier service in that office was accepted as sufficient reason for their exemption, and Richard [...] was discharged.</p> <p>A further order was made that Thomas Dixon and [...] should be appointed as overseers of the highways. They were sworn to carry out their duties and were given formal authority to act.</p> <p>Richard Gurling submitted a petition requesting control of the land and estate of his brother John Gurling, who was absent. The garrison had previously provided bond, as Richard had already held the estate in his possession.</p> <p>An order was made granting Richard Gurling's request, on condition that he provide bond and security for his brother's stock and estate. If John Gurling returned or sent for it, the estate was to be restored to him.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The requirement for plantation holders to assemble and vote showed a form of local participation in administration. Selection by majority vote gave inhabitants a role in choosing officials, though final appointment remained with the Governor.</p> <p>The offices of church warden and overseer of highways reflected key areas of local governance. Church wardens managed religious and communal affairs, while highway overseers were responsible for maintaining infrastructure essential to movement and trade.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Estate; that if ever the sd John Gurling Come or Send for it, that he Surrender up ye Estate againe/</p>	<p>The exemption of Goodwin and Emund from service indicated a system that recognised prior service. Officeholding was rotated, preventing repeated burden on the same individuals and distributing responsibility across the community.</p> <p>The requirement that highway overseers be sworn and given authority showed the formalisation of local duties. Oath-taking bound them to perform their role under official oversight.</p> <p>The granting of Richard Gurling's request, subject to bond, demonstrated control over property in cases of absence. The requirement to return the estate if claimed preserved the rights of the absent owner while allowing its use in the meantime.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The structured nomination process suggests an attempt to balance local choice with central control. Allowing inhabitants to nominate candidates may have encouraged cooperation while ensuring that final authority remained with the Governor.</p> <p>The requirement for Richard Gurling to provide security indicates concern over misuse of property. The arrangement allowed temporary control but protected against permanent loss if the rightful owner returned.</p>
130	124	<p>[...] [...] [...] and [...] [...]  [...] in the Consultation held [...] day of march 1698 gave bond and Security for ye Estate which they were and a Dividend was made accordingly  It is agreed  With the said [...] that he have his sister in law [...] for one yeare [...] and that he finde her with [...] and teaching her to write and [...]  [...] for which he is to have the Labour of [...] and 2 milke of her Cattle for keeping after [...] yeare ensuing  [...]  [...] Richard [...] being one of the late [...] in or abt now 1698 and hath Departed this life on or abt [...]  [...] George [...] and Mr [...]  [...] deceased, and upon the Petition of the said [...] and desired to be admitted to administer [...] and if they might have a Letter of Administration Whereupon It is ordered  That the said Mr George [...] and Mr Mercy [...] have a Letter of administration granted to them under the [...] signed by the Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councill, which Letter of Administration hereafter followeth In haec verba  Island St Helena  Wee the Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councill of the said Island, on behalf of the Right Honble East India Comp<sup>y</sup>, the absolute Lords and Proprietors of the said Island, To Mr George [...]  and Mr Mercy [...] the Relict of Richard [...] deceased, late Gov<sup>r</sup> of the said Island Greeting Administration of all and singular the goods and Chattels Rights and Debts which were the said Richard [...] who died Intestate, as is affirmed at the time of his death, and since within the Jurisdiction of the said Rt Honble Lords propr of the said Island, To you we doe  Committee and you doe make ordain and appoint by these presents Administration of the said Goods, and</p>	<p>Reference was made to a prior consultation held in March 1698, in which [...] had provided bond and security for an estate, and a division had been made accordingly.</p> <p>An agreement was then made with [...] that he should take his sister-in-law into his household for one year. He was to provide her with [...] and to teach her to write and [...]. In return, he was to have the benefit of her labour and two milk cows for her maintenance during that year.</p> <p>It was further reported that Richard [...], who had formerly held office in or about the year 1698, had died on or about [...]. A petition was presented by Mr George [...] and Mr Mercy [...], the widow of the deceased, requesting permission to administer his estate and to receive formal authority to do so.</p> <p>An order was made granting their request. A letter of administration was issued to them under the seal of the island, signed by the Governor and Council.</p> <p>The letter declared that the Governor and Council of St Helena, acting on behalf of the Right Honourable East India Company as the proprietors of the island, granted authority to Mr George [...] and Mr Mercy [...], the widow of Richard [...], formerly Governor of the island. They were given full power to administer all goods, property, and debts belonging to Richard [...], who had died without a will, within the jurisdiction of the island. This authority empowered them to take control of the estate and manage its affairs accordingly.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The requirement that bond and security be given before dividing an estate showed the council's concern to protect property where claims might later arise. This ensured that assets could be recovered if needed and reduced risk to the administration.</p> <p>The arrangement placing a sister-in-law in a household in exchange for labour and provision showed how family responsibility and economic utility were combined. Care, instruction, and maintenance were balanced against the expectation of productive work.</p> <p>The granting of letters of administration demonstrated the formal process used when a person died without a will. Authority to manage the estate was transferred by official document, allowing the administrators to act legally on behalf of the deceased.</p> <p>The involvement of both a male associate and the widow in administering the estate showed a shared responsibility. This reflected a practical approach to estate management, combining familial claim with recognised oversight.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The statement that the East India Company acted as proprietor of the island confirmed that all legal authority, including estate administration, ultimately derived from Company governance.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The inclusion of instruction in writing within the household agreement suggests an intention to prepare the woman for a more independent or skilled role. This may indicate an effort to improve her prospects while still securing her labour.</p> <p>The appointment of two administrators for the estate of the deceased governor suggests concern over the size or importance of the estate. Shared administration may have been intended to prevent dispute or mismanagement in a case of high status.</p>
131	125	<p>and other the premises Charging you (by ye Oath Taken in this behalfe) that a true full &amp; faire and faithfull Inventory you make of all and singular the goods and premises of the said [...] deceased, that [...] be found on the sd Island in or before the 20<sup>th</sup> day of May 1698 all the debts on the said Island in which he was indebtedly obliged, at the time of his death, you well and truly pay and satisfy all such debts as he was owing them, as aforesaid all the Law will Charge you, And that you deliver an acco of your Administration here unto us, when you shall be thereunto [...] and that we you save harmless for Ever against all psons by reason of the sd Administration In Testimony whereof wee have to these presents set our seale of the Island of St Helena to keep the same to be affixed this day of [...] 1698 Step: Poirier Tho: Goodwin A true Copy pr me Jno Alexander Whereas Mr Edward Emund, and Mr John Taverall have bin Chosen by the aforesaid Mr George Carne and Mercy Keling (Relict of the said Richard Keling deceased) to make a true Just and faithfull Inventory of all ye goods and Chattels of the said Richard Keling, who have bin sworne accordingly to the truth of their knowledge this 7<sup>th</sup> day of May 1698 [...] Goodwin Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Monday the 16<sup>th</sup> of May 1698 att Fort James Pres<sup>s</sup> Steph: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin Assistant The Deposition of Mr Tho: Goodwin saith that Mr George Carne having brought to ye Councill a Tuckboote sealed up [...] Seales Intact, An Inventory of the personal Estate of the late deceased Gov<sup>r</sup> Richard Keling, which before he with his wife was sworne to according to the purport of the Letter of Administration Demanded of the said Gov<sup>r</sup> Poirier to signe a receipt</p>	<p>The letter of administration required that a full, fair, and accurate inventory be made of all goods and property belonging to the deceased. This inventory was to include everything found on the island and was to be completed by 20 May 1698. All debts owed by the deceased at the time of his death were to be properly paid and settled according to law. The administrators were also required to present an account of their administration when called upon and to indemnify the Governor and Council against any claims arising from their actions. The document was sealed with the seal of St Helena and signed by Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin. A certified copy was made by John Alexander.</p> <p>Edward Emund and John Taverall were chosen by George Carne and Mercy Keling, widow of Richard Keling, to prepare a full and accurate inventory of the goods and property of Richard Keling. They were sworn to carry out this task faithfully on 7 May 1698.</p> <p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 16 May 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin gave a formal statement. He said that George Carne had brought before the Council a small chest, sealed and with the seals unbroken, containing the inventory of the personal estate of the late Governor Richard Keling. Before presenting it, Carne and his wife had sworn to the accuracy of the inventory in accordance with the terms of the letter of administration.</p> <p>Carne then requested that Governor Poirier sign a receipt for the chest and its contents. He had prepared the document himself and brought it with him. After consideration, the Governor signed and delivered the receipt, and the chest was handed over accordingly.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The requirement to produce a full inventory by a fixed date showed the strict timetable imposed on estate administration. This ensured that property was quickly identified and brought under control following a death.</p> <p>The obligation to settle all debts before distributing the estate demonstrated the priority of creditors. Estate assets were first used to satisfy outstanding obligations, reflecting a structured order of financial responsibility.</p> <p>The clause requiring the administrators to indemnify the Governor and Council showed how risk was managed. Responsibility for any dispute or loss arising from the administration was placed on those appointed, protecting the governing authority.</p> <p>The use of a sealed chest to hold the inventory indicated concern for security and integrity of records. Unbroken seals served as proof that the contents had not been altered before official examination.</p> <p>The requirement that the inventory be sworn by both the administrator and witnesses reinforced the importance of truthfulness. Oath-taking provided a formal guarantee of accuracy in the absence of independent verification.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>for ye same  which he the said George Carne had writ and brought with him, which  upon some Consideration of the Gov<sup>r</sup> was signed and Delivered as  Likewise the said Tuckboote  After—</p>	<p>The insistence on sealed documents and formal receipts suggests concern about tampering or dispute over the estate. These precautions may have been heightened because the deceased had held high office.</p> <p>The preparation of a receipt by George Carne in advance indicates that he anticipated the need to document transfer formally. This suggests awareness of the potential for later challenge and a desire to secure proof of proper procedure.</p>
132	126	<p>[...] which the Gov<sup>r</sup> said to M<sup>r</sup> Carne Now you and I have done,  I drink all the Love friendly and don't you speake so much against  me in my place, and affront me as you have done heretofore, you  are so brag to say I am not Gov<sup>r</sup> here I shew you a receipt from  [...] Donall a Comp<sup>y</sup> Servant as well as you say you are, and  Commander of a great Ship Wherein you see he Insults me Gov<sup>r</sup>,  Upon which M<sup>r</sup> Carne made a [...] and said what do I care for  [...] Donall he is but a simple fellow, said the Gov<sup>r</sup> if you doe  still Continue to affront me Ile make you know my power for  I am above you, you lye said M<sup>r</sup> Carne and bound it w<sup>th</sup> an oath  severall times over and Challenged the Gov<sup>r</sup> to fight him, the Gov<sup>r</sup> said  if you will not be Civill I will lay you fast though, M<sup>r</sup> Carne was  so rude and did use such Language that the Gov<sup>r</sup> Called for ye Marshall  M<sup>r</sup> Carne said who shall take my sword from me, to whom the  Marshall demanded his sword, he stept back to draw it, but ye  hilt of his sword slipt off upon w<sup>th</sup> the Guard was Called, so some  Disarmed and taken all of him Hale into ye middle of ye Court,  Where he Challenged to fight any one that would take the  Gov<sup>r</sup> part, and behaved himself like a mad Man, at Length  Edward Emund being there asked whether bailes would not  be good for him, the Gov<sup>r</sup> answered yes it might if he would  be bound to his good behaviour, M<sup>r</sup> Carne answered No by God  he would not give bailes, But after some time M<sup>r</sup> Carne came more to himself, so then the Gov<sup>r</sup> suffered him to come  up into ye Hall againe, where then he said he did not dishonor the  Gov<sup>r</sup> to be above him in his place, But said he was as good  a Gentleman as he, And upon his faire promises yt he would  not trouble him any manner of wayes, the Gov<sup>r</sup> gave him his  sword and Dismissed him/  A True Copy James Wm Esq<sup>r</sup>  Jno Alexander Cler<sup>k</sup>  T. Goodwin</p>	<p>After the receipt had been signed and delivered, the Governor spoke to Mr George Carne. He said that their business was now finished and that he wished to maintain friendly relations. He asked Carne not to speak against him in his office or insult him as he had done before. He accused Carne of boasting that he was not the Governor and showed him a receipt from [...] Donall, a Company servant and commander of a large ship, as evidence that others had also spoken disrespectfully.</p> <p>Carne replied dismissively, saying that he did not care for [...] Donall and called him a simple man. The Governor warned him that if he continued to insult him, he would be made to recognise his authority, stating that he held a higher position. Carne denied this and repeated the claim with several oaths. He then challenged the Governor to fight.</p> <p>The Governor warned that if Carne would not behave civilly, he would be restrained. Carne continued to use abusive language. The Governor then called for the marshal. Carne resisted, asking who would take his sword. When the marshal demanded it, Carne stepped back as if to draw it, but the hilt came off in his hand. The guard was called. They disarmed him and brought him into the middle of the court. There he challenged anyone present to fight him in defence of the Governor and behaved in a disorderly and uncontrolled manner.</p> <p>Edward Emund, who was present, asked whether bail would be accepted for him. The Governor replied that it would be allowed if Carne agreed to be bound to good behaviour. Carne refused at first. After some time, he became calmer. The Governor then allowed him to return to the hall.</p> <p>Carne then stated that he did not deny the Governor's authority in office, though he claimed that he was equal to him in status as a gentleman. He gave assurances that he would not cause further trouble. On these promises, the Governor returned his sword and dismissed him.</p> <p>A certified copy of this account was made by James Wm Esq and John Alexander, clerk, and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The confrontation showed how challenges to authority were treated as serious breaches of order. Public denial of the Governor's position was met with immediate assertion of control through the threat of restraint.</p> <p>The calling of the marshal and guard demonstrated the enforcement powers available to the Governor. Physical disarmament and detention could be used to restore order when verbal authority failed.</p> <p>The offer of bail on condition of good behaviour reflected a structured response to disorder. Submission and agreement to future compliance provided a path to avoid further punishment.</p> <p>The return of Carne's sword after his assurances showed that reconciliation was possible once authority had been acknowledged. Restoration of status depended on outward compliance and respect for office.</p> <p>The distinction made by Carne between official authority and personal status illustrated the social hierarchy at work. While he accepted the Governor's position, he asserted equality in gentlemanly rank,</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>revealing tension between formal office and personal standing.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Carne's initial refusal to give bail suggests that he sought to maintain his standing by resisting authority in public. His later change in behaviour indicates that the presence of force and the risk of detention led him to reconsider.</p> <p>The Governor's decision to release him after an apology suggests a preference for restoring order without prolonged conflict. Allowing Carne to retain his status after submission may have been intended to prevent further division within the community.</p>
133	127	<p>The Deposition of Jno Alexander, saith that on Monday ye 16<sup>th</sup> of this Instant may 1698 in ye afternoone ye Gov<sup>r</sup> Sent him to ye House of mad<sup>m</sup> Beale, where M<sup>r</sup> Carne was, and perswaded to desire him to bring ye sealed Inventory of ye personall Estate of ye Deceased Gov<sup>r</sup> Richard Kelinge; The said M<sup>r</sup> Carne told me he would not come to ye Gov<sup>r</sup> unless he sent him his Discharge; for he would not Waite on him; Whereupon I returned and acquainted ye Gov<sup>r</sup> therewith; But presently M<sup>r</sup> Carne Came and brought the said Inventory with him, and Delivered the same to ye Gov<sup>r</sup>, who immediately gave him his Discharge, when ye Gov<sup>r</sup> said to M<sup>r</sup> Carne now you and I have done; pray let us live friendly together, and told him that he had heard of his saying that he was Governour, and slighted and abused him very much; M<sup>r</sup> Carne answered that he did never say that he was not Gov<sup>r</sup>, and that he was misinformed; And speaking other high words, M<sup>r</sup> Carne said if ye Gov<sup>r</sup> affronted him, he was a coward if he did not answer him; I demanded the Gov<sup>r</sup> told him that since now he had put him [...] in the place of Gov<sup>r</sup> he would not have him think to be above him; but that he was in place above him; M<sup>r</sup> Carne replied that his Master [...] he was not, and that he told a lye two or three times over, and gave ye Gov<sup>r</sup> very base and abusive language; insomuch that the Gov<sup>r</sup> told him he would put him in prison if he continued his ill language; he replyed do and if you dare, you dare not do it; and Challenged the Governour to fight him, or any Man else yt would take his part; Upon which ye Gov<sup>r</sup> called for ye Marshall and ordered him to take ye said Carne's sword from him and put him in prison; who accordingly demanded his sword but he refused to deliver it and said who shall take my sword from me stepping back and would have drawne his sword had not the hilt of it slipt off, but was soone prevented by M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin of doing any further damage; which the Gov<sup>r</sup> perceiving Called for some of the Guard to Secure ye said M<sup>r</sup> Carne, and tooke him downe stairs out of ye Hall; but soone after ye Gov<sup>r</sup> suffered him to come up into ye Hall againe,</p>	<p>John Alexander gave a sworn statement concerning events on the afternoon of 16 May 1698.</p> <p>He stated that the Governor sent him to the house of Madam Beale, where Mr George Carne was present. He was instructed to ask Carne to bring the sealed inventory of the personal estate of the late Governor Richard Kelinge. Carne replied that he would not attend the Governor unless he first received his discharge, and said that he would not wait upon him. Alexander returned and reported this to the Governor. Shortly afterwards, Carne came in person, brought the sealed inventory, and delivered it to the Governor, who immediately gave him his discharge.</p> <p>The Governor then told Carne that their business was finished and that he wished them to live in a friendly manner. He said that he had heard that Carne had claimed to be Governor and had spoken against him with disrespect. Carne denied this and said the report was false. The exchange then grew heated. Carne stated that if the Governor insulted him, he would answer him and would not submit. The Governor replied that since he held the office, he would not allow Carne to think himself above him, as he held higher authority. Carne rejected this and repeatedly called him a liar, using abusive language.</p> <p>The Governor warned that he would imprison him if he continued. Carne answered that he would not dare and challenged him to fight, or any other man who would support him. The Governor then called for the marshal and ordered that Carne's sword be taken and that he be imprisoned. When the marshal demanded the sword, Carne refused and asked who would take it from him. He stepped back and attempted to draw it, but the hilt came off. Thomas Goodwin intervened and prevented further action. The Governor then called the guard, who secured Carne and took him downstairs out of the hall.</p> <p>Shortly afterwards, the Governor allowed Carne to return to the hall. Carne then gave assurances that he would not disturb or obstruct the Governor in his duties. On these promises, he was dismissed.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The demand that Carne deliver the sealed inventory showed that control over estate records was closely supervised. Even those involved in administration were required to comply directly with the Governor's authority.</p> <p>Carne's refusal to attend without receiving his discharge first indicated the importance of formal release from obligation. Service to the administration created duties that could not be ended informally.</p> <p>The confrontation demonstrated the limits of acceptable conduct toward authority. Verbal denial of rank, combined with abusive language and a challenge to fight, was treated as a serious breach requiring immediate response.</p> <p>The intervention of the marshal and guard showed the enforcement structure available to the Governor. Authority could be backed by force when necessary to maintain order.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>and upon his faire promises never to Molest or Interrupt ye Gov<sup>r</sup> upon any duet was Dismissed; further saith not, Jno Alexander</p>	<p>The acceptance of Carne's assurances and his release showed that submission restored standing. Agreement to respect authority allowed the matter to be settled without further punishment.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> Carne's insistence on receiving his discharge before attending suggests that he sought to assert independence from official authority. This may have contributed to the later conflict once he appeared in person.</p> <p>The escalation from verbal dispute to attempted use of a weapon indicates that the conflict became personal as well as official. The failure to draw the sword, followed by intervention, prevented the situation from turning into physical violence.</p> <p>The Governor's decision to release Carne after his assurances suggests a deliberate choice to restore order quickly. Continued detention may have risked wider unrest or division within the community.</p>
134	128	<p>The Deposition of Henry Coales Saith that on the [...] day of May 1698 he heard M<sup>r</sup> Carne Say in the Gov<sup>r</sup> Hall Damme you Sr I am as good as you, then replied the Gov<sup>r</sup> Sr I owne you to be a Gentleman, But since providence hath put me above you I will not be so much abused, M<sup>r</sup> Carne said dam you; you are not and tooke his sword in his hand, and said he would Maintain with his sword what he had said against any Man, and many more froward words, further saith not/ Henry Coales A True copy pr me Jno Alexander The Declaration of Thomas Gargen Concerning M<sup>r</sup> Carne, Saith that he heard him say Challenge the Governo<sup>r</sup> in the Hall to fight him and any person belonging to the Garrison, and after that the Governo<sup>r</sup> had ordered him to be confined, he said we will all go together Tho: Gargen Vera Copia pr me [...] Poirier Goodwin</p>	<p>Henry Coales gave a sworn statement that on a day in May 1698 he heard Mr George Carne speak in the Governor's hall. Carne said that he was as good as the Governor. The Governor replied that he acknowledged Carne as a gentleman, but that he held higher office and would not accept such abuse. Carne denied this and again used insulting language. He took his sword in his hand and declared that he would defend his words against any man. Coales stated that Carne continued with further angry and hostile speech.</p> <p>A certified copy of this statement was made by John Alexander.</p> <p>Thomas Gargen gave a declaration concerning Mr Carne. He stated that he heard Carne challenge the Governor in the hall to fight him, and also to fight any person belonging to the garrison. After the Governor ordered that Carne be confined, Gargen stated that Carne said they would all go together.</p> <p>This statement was recorded as a true copy and signed by Poirier and Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The testimony confirmed that Carne openly challenged the Governor's authority in a public setting. Such behaviour was treated as a direct affront to office and required formal record through sworn statements.</p> <p>The Governor's response showed the distinction between personal status and official rank. While he acknowledged Carne as a gentleman, he asserted that authority rested in office, not in social equality.</p> <p>The act of taking hold of a sword during the dispute demonstrated how quickly verbal conflict could move toward violence. Possession of weapons in such settings increased the seriousness of disorder.</p> <p>The recording and certification of multiple depositions showed the importance of building a consistent account. Written statements under oath formed the basis for any further action and ensured that events were formally documented.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> Carne's insistence that he was equal to the Governor suggests that he rejected the authority of office in favour of personal status. This tension may have driven the escalation of the dispute.</p> <p>The statement that "we will all go together" after the order for confinement may indicate an attempt to draw others into the conflict. This could suggest concern that the dispute might spread beyond a personal quarrel into a wider challenge to authority.</p>
135	129	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday ye 17 day of May 1698 att Fort James Pres<sup>t</sup> Steph<sup>m</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin Assistant</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 17 May 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Thomas Dixon senior informed the Governor that he had heard Mr Edmunds speak certain words on</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Thomas Dixon Sen<sup>r</sup> acquainted the Gov<sup>r</sup> that he heard M<sup>r</sup> Edmunds speake some words on board the Ship Syone today to Dixon and several and that he would prove it George Hoskison being Sworne saith that he being on board the Ship Syone, heard M<sup>r</sup> Edmunds say that if he drew his sword there was none on the Island that durst see ye points of it Robert Addis being Sworne saith that he being also on board the Ship Syone at the same time that the Doctor was, he saw ye said M<sup>r</sup> Edmunds with some others, and said him say that there was not a man on the Island that dare see ye points of his sword if he drew it John Sheils being Sworne saith that he and some others being a Talking aboute M<sup>r</sup> Edmunds heard Rob<sup>t</sup> Addis say that he being on board the Ship Syone heard him say the same as he hath already proved Upon the whole it is ordered That the said M<sup>r</sup> Edmunds be Cleared from what the said Dixon hath alledged against him According to the Consultation held on Tuesday the third day of May 1698 wherein is appointed Church wardens and overseers of High ways for this Instant yeare, was accordingly Sworne as followeth Likewise Tho: Dixon and Rich<sup>d</sup> Garram Surveyors of ye high ways for this Instant yeare was Sworne accordingly Poirier Goodwin</p>	<p>board the ship <i>Syone</i> that day, in the presence of Dixon and others, and that he could prove it.</p> <p>George Hoskison, being sworn, stated that he had been on board the <i>Syone</i> and heard Mr Edmunds say that if he drew his sword, no one on the island would dare face it.</p> <p>Robert Addis, being sworn, stated that he had also been on board the <i>Syone</i> at the same time. He said that he saw Mr Edmunds among others and heard him say that no man on the island would dare face his sword if he drew it.</p> <p>John Sheils, being sworn, stated that he had been speaking with others about Mr Edmunds and heard Robert Addis say that he had been on board the <i>Syone</i> and had heard Edmunds make the same statement.</p> <p>After considering the matter, an order was made that Mr Edmunds should be cleared of the accusation brought by Thomas Dixon.</p> <p>In accordance with the consultation held on 3 May 1698, the persons appointed as church wardens and overseers of the highways for the present year were sworn into their offices.</p> <p>Thomas Dixon and Richard Garram, appointed as surveyors of the highways for the present year, were also sworn to carry out their duties.</p> <p>Poirier Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The reliance on direct witness testimony showed that spoken words had to be proved by those who heard them firsthand. Indirect repetition, such as Sheils reporting Addis's account, carried less weight than direct evidence.</p> <p>The decision to clear Mr Edmunds indicated that the statements were not considered sufficient to support the accusation. Even when multiple witnesses reported similar words, the court required clear and reliable proof.</p> <p>The swearing of church wardens and highway surveyors demonstrated the formal confirmation of local officials. Taking an oath marked the beginning of their authority and bound them to perform their duties.</p> <p>The inclusion of shipboard conversation in formal proceedings showed that behaviour outside the immediate settlement, including on visiting ships, still fell under scrutiny when it affected order or reputation within the island community.</p>
136	130	<p>Island St Helena May ye 30 1698 Richard Barram being [...] upon his Departure from the sd Island made his Complaint to us that Several persons stood Indebted to him, insomuch that he could not receive ye sd Debts, wherefore Intreats us to have those that were Indebted to him to be Examined and that it might be Entered in ye Councill bookes w<sup>ch</sup> was Granted him, and those persons Indebted unto him are hereafter mentioned, viz<sup>t</sup> Tho: Boore the sume of one pound ten shillings, which Wm French ye said Boore saith he doth know to be due, Sam<sup>n</sup> Boore the sume of Two pounds three Shillings, Wm<sup>m</sup> French the sume of Twenty shillings It is ordered That the above said Persons yt stand Indebted to the said Barram, doe pay ye aforesaid summes unto the said Barram accordingly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [...]*</li> </ul>	<p>On 30 May 1698 at St Helena, Richard Barram, preparing to leave the island, made a complaint that several people owed him money and that he had been unable to recover these debts. He requested that the debtors be examined and that the matter be entered in the council books. This request was granted.</p> <p>The following debts were recorded. Thomas Boore owed £1 10s 0d, which William French confirmed was due. Samuel Boore owed £2 3s 0d. William French owed £1 0s 0d.</p> <p>An order was made that all those named should pay the sums they owed to Richard Barram.</p> <p>Richard Gurling then gave bond and security for the personal estate of his brother John Gurling, who was absent, and whose property had recently been in the possession of Thomas Gargen.</p> <p>An order was made that Richard Gurling should present to the Governor and Council, on Tuesday 28 May 1698, a full inventory of all goods and property belonging to his brother. This was carried out as required.</p> <p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 8 June 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin reported that he was in urgent need of assistance in managing the store, as the work had become too burdensome without help. It was</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Richard Gurling gave bond and security for the personall Estate of his Brother John Gurling (being absent) which was late in ye possession of Thomas Gargen, It is ordered That the said Richard Gurling doe bring and deliver to ye Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councill on Tuesday ye 28 of this Instant an Inventory of all ye goods and Chattels belonging to his said Brother John Gurling, which accordingly he did Poirier Goodwin Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Wednesday the 8 day of June att Fort James 1698 Pres<sup>s</sup> Steph<sup>l</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin Assistant Whereas M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin [...] being greatly in want of an assistant to keep him in his store affairs it being very troublesome for himself having no assistance in ye same Employ we have thought fitt to Employ Mat<sup>l</sup> [...] as his assistant allowing him to receive money this standing [...] w<sup>ch</sup> he is able to perform accordingly Poirier Goodwin</p>	<p>decided that Matthew [...] should be employed as his assistant. He was authorised to receive money in that role and was judged capable of performing the duties. Poirier Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The recording of Barram's debts in the council books showed that official registration could be used to enforce private obligations. Entry into the record gave the claim formal standing and enabled the council to compel payment.</p> <p>The confirmation of Thomas Boore's debt by William French indicated that third-party acknowledgement could support a claim. Such recognition strengthened the evidence when direct payment had not been made.</p> <p>The requirement that Richard Gurling provide bond before managing his brother's estate showed the continued use of financial guarantees to protect absent owners. This ensured that the estate could be restored if the owner returned.</p> <p>The order to produce a full inventory demonstrated ongoing oversight of property held in trust. Administrators were required to account for all goods under their control within a fixed timeframe.</p> <p>The appointment of an assistant to the store showed the administrative demands of supply management. Authorising the assistant to handle money indicated a position of trust within the Company's operations.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Barram's decision to secure his debts before departure suggests concern that they would otherwise remain unpaid once he left the island. Formal intervention by the council increased the likelihood of recovery.</p> <p>The appointment of Matthew [...] may reflect increased pressure on the store, possibly due to growing activity or shortages. Providing assistance ensured that essential supplies and financial transactions continued without disruption.</p>
137	131	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Tuesday the 21<sup>th</sup> of June att Fort James 1698 Pres<sup>s</sup> Steph<sup>l</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin Assistant Thomas Burnham enters Complaint of Jn<sup>o</sup> Hemmon [...] saying that the said Hemmon's Cattle hath done him much Damage, affirming that his fences about his Plantation were according to the Statute, and that the said Hemmons fences and that the sd Hemmons Cattle were very unruly, John Hemmon saith that he doth owne his Cattle hath bin in the said Burnhams Plantation, through badness of his fences, who saith they are not by some Act according he made for such Case, Richard Alexander saith that on the 14<sup>th</sup> instant he was with Thomas Burnham upon the said Burnhams land, at which time they both saw the said Hemmons Cattle in the said Burnhams Plantation and the said Tho: Burnham did prove and brand all the said Cattle which John Hemmon hearing came out of his house, and said to the said Burnham, that he would kill his Dogg, if he found any Cattle so much, and said that he would Thresh him, if he met him, or words to that purpose, further saith not,</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 21 June 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Thomas Burnham brought a complaint against John Hemmon, stating that Hemmon's cattle had caused him significant damage. He stated that his fences around his plantation met the required standard and that Hemmon's cattle were unruly.</p> <p>John Hemmon admitted that his cattle had entered Burnham's plantation but claimed this had happened because Burnham's fences were defective. He argued that the fences did not meet the required standard under the relevant rule made for such cases.</p> <p>Richard Alexander, being sworn, stated that on 14 June 1698 he had been with Thomas Burnham on Burnham's land. At that time they both saw Hemmon's cattle inside the plantation. Burnham then marked and branded the cattle. When Hemmon heard of this, he came out of his house and said that he would kill Burnham's dog if he found it among his cattle, and that he would beat Burnham if he met him, or words to that effect.</p> <p>Mr Brayne stated that while walking home with Thomas Burnham, they met Hemmon's slave driving cattle near Burnham's plantation. The slave was driving the cattle close to Burnham's land. Knowing that the cattle often entered the plantation, he drove them away in another direction.</p> <p>Sutton Isaack and William Marsh, both planters, were asked by Burnham to inspect the damage caused by the cattle. They did so, but did not examine the fences. They were then asked to inspect the fences and</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>M<sup>r</sup> Brayne saith that he going with Tho: Burnham home going homewards, they met the said Hemmons Black a driving his Cattle a little past about his Burnhams Plantation, where him where he was driving those Cattle, he espyd the said Burnhams ground, is Just by the said Burnhams ground, they knowing that the said Cattle doth frequently goe in the said Burnhams Plantation, by the said Black drives them some other way, which he did, Sutton Isaak and W<sup>m</sup> Marsh planters, was desired of M<sup>r</sup> Burnham to view the Damage he had sustained by the aforesaid Cattle, who accordingly did, but did not view the fences, wherefore they were both desired to goe to view the fences and bring an Account thereof on Tuesday following to the Gov<sup>r</sup> and Council After which [...]</p>	<p>report their findings to the Governor and Council on the following Tuesday.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The dispute centred on responsibility for damage caused by livestock. Liability depended on whether fences met the required standard, showing that landholders were expected to maintain proper boundaries to protect their crops. Hemmon's defence showed that entry of cattle alone was not enough to establish fault. Responsibility could shift if the damaged party failed to maintain adequate fencing. The marking and branding of cattle within the plantation showed a practical method of identifying ownership and asserting a claim. This acted as evidence that the animals had trespassed. The involvement of appointed viewers to assess damage and later inspect fences showed a structured process of fact-finding. Independent inspection supported the council in reaching a decision. The reference to driving cattle away indicated active management of livestock movement. Control of animals was expected, and failure to restrain them could lead to dispute.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> Burnham's decision to brand the cattle immediately suggests an attempt to secure proof of trespass before dispute arose. This action strengthened his claim by linking the animals directly to the damage. The instruction to inspect the fences after the damage had been viewed indicates that the condition of boundaries was central to the case. The outcome likely depended on whether Burnham's fences met the required standard.</p>
138	132	<p>The Governor and Council, advised the said Thomas Burnham, to award Business in hand, who promised to Con- [...] thereto, and accordingly four men were chosen, viz<sup>t</sup> the said Burnham and two of John Hemmons, which Officers with ye Gov<sup>r</sup> and Council, being moved by the said Burnham, earnest desire; It was agreed That the said John Hemmon do dispose of a Cow which is the ring leader of his Cattle, for which the said Burnham acquitted the said Hemmon from all Damages he had sustained by ye aforesaid Cattle, and ye sd Hemmon to pay all the Charges M<sup>r</sup> Thomas Goodwin &amp; M<sup>r</sup> Edward Edmunds being Church wardens for this present year 1698 Complained to the Gov<sup>r</sup> that Henry Coales Marshall did on the Lords day send his Black up in the Country from ye fort, with fowthens [...] being contrary to the Laws of God and of this place, upon which Complaint ye sd Coales was Examined, who Confessed the Offence, Whereupon It is ordered That the said Henry Coales be fined six shillings as a fine to the Church Coales Henry [...] Poirier Goodwin</p>	<p>The Governor and Council advised Thomas Burnham to resolve the matter. He agreed to proceed in that way. Four men were then chosen, including Burnham and two men for John Hemmon, to settle the dispute with the involvement of the Governor and Council. At Burnham's request, an agreement was reached. John Hemmon was required to dispose of a cow identified as the leading animal of his herd. In return, Burnham released Hemmon from all claims for the damage caused by the cattle. Hemmon was also required to pay all court charges. Thomas Goodwin and Edward Edmunds, serving as church wardens for the year 1698, brought a complaint to the Governor against Henry Coales, the marshal. They stated that on a Sunday he had sent his slave into the country from the fort with [...], which was against the laws of the place and religious observance. Henry Coales was examined and admitted the offence. An order was made that he should pay a fine of 6 shillings to the church. Poirier Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The decision to settle the dispute through selected men showed the use of mediated resolution. Instead of continuing formal proceedings, the parties agreed to a practical arrangement overseen by the authorities. The requirement that Hemmon remove the leading cow showed recognition of animal behaviour in managing disputes. Removing the dominant animal was intended to reduce further trespass and damage. Burnham's agreement to release his claim in return demonstrated negotiated settlement. Compensation was replaced by a practical remedy and payment of costs. The complaint against the marshal showed that officials were subject to the same rules as others. Religious observance, especially on Sundays, was enforced as part of public order.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The fine paid to the church indicated that offences against religious rules were treated as communal matters. Payment to the church combined punishment with support for local institutions.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The choice to remove a single cow rather than impose wider penalties suggests that the parties sought a quick and workable solution. This may have been seen as more effective than prolonged dispute over damages. The enforcement of rules against Sunday labour, even against the marshal, suggests concern to maintain visible discipline. Public example by punishing an officer may have been intended to reinforce compliance among others.</p>
139	133	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation held on Tuesday the 23d day of June 1698 att Fort James Pres<sup>t</sup> Steph<sup>t</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin assistant Will<sup>m</sup> Marsh made his Complaint to the Gov<sup>r</sup> &amp; Council, That he had lost about 4 or 5 more Dockars in his Cell out of his house, at severall times, which he doth Suppose to be stoln by John Johnson, who lives in his house; The said Johnson was Examined saith, whether or no he knows any thing of any money his said Master who said he never saw any money of his said Land Lord, neither knows not of any one else; Upon which It is ordered That the said John Johnson be [...] and discharged of this his Accusation, the said Marsh having no manner of proof, and that the said Marsh pay Charges of Council Likewise John Hemmon, complained, that he had lost a piece of Chalico out of his house at the fort, but had found it againe by reason of a speedy search, in the said Will<sup>m</sup> Marshes house at the fort, and doth suspect the said Johnson to have stoln it out of his house, he having the key of his Land Lords Marshes house; The said John Johnson was Examined, who saith he did not see ye said Chalico which he is accused of taking nor did he see any Chalico within the said Hemmons doore, that any which he said he saw set up the said Chalico Rob<sup>t</sup> Wills sworne, saith that he saw the said John Johnson at the said Hemmons doore, but did not see him goe within doores, further saith not,</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 23 June 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>William Marsh brought a complaint to the Governor and Council, stating that he had lost about four or five dollars from a chest in his house at various times. He suspected that John Johnson, who lived in his house, had stolen the money.</p> <p>John Johnson was examined and asked whether he knew anything about the missing money. He stated that he had never seen any money belonging to his landlord and knew nothing about it or about any other person taking it.</p> <p>An order was made that John Johnson should be cleared and discharged from the accusation, as Marsh had no proof. Marsh was ordered to pay the council charges.</p> <p>John Hemmon then made a complaint that he had lost a piece of calico from his house at the fort. He stated that he had recovered it after a quick search in William Marsh's house at the fort. He suspected that John Johnson had taken it, as Johnson had access to Marsh's house and held a key.</p> <p>John Johnson was examined again. He stated that he had not seen the calico he was accused of taking and had not seen any such cloth inside Hemmon's house.</p> <p>Robert Wills, being sworn, stated that he had seen John Johnson at Hemmon's door, but had not seen him go inside. He gave no further evidence.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The dismissal of Marsh's complaint showed that suspicion alone was not enough to support a charge. Proof was required before action could be taken, and failure to provide it led to costs being imposed on the accuser.</p> <p>The repeated accusation against Johnson in a separate matter showed how suspicion could carry across disputes. However, each claim was treated independently and required its own evidence.</p> <p>The recovery of the calico through search showed that immediate action could be taken to locate missing goods. Physical recovery reduced the need for further claim unless responsibility could be proven.</p> <p>The statement that Johnson held a key to Marsh's house highlighted issues of access and trust within shared households. Control of keys created opportunity, but did not in itself establish guilt.</p> <p>The reliance on witness testimony, such as seeing Johnson at the door but not entering, showed the limits of evidence. Presence near a place was not treated as proof of wrongdoing.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The repeated suspicion directed at Johnson suggests that his position within Marsh's household made him vulnerable to accusation. Access to property may have led others to assume responsibility without firm proof.</p> <p>The failure to prove either accusation may indicate that losses within households were difficult to trace. Without direct observation, cases depended on</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			circumstantial evidence that often did not meet the required standard.
140	134	<p>After Serious Consideration not finding Sufficient proof against the said John Johnson, was required  John Hemmon whether he would prosecute the said Johnson at an open Court, who answered no he could not prove it against him  Wherefore It is ordered  That the said John Johnson be Cleared from this his Accusation,  his Accuser with Admonition to be Carefull for what Company he keeps and  not to frequent the said John Hemmon to pay Court Charges  Richard Barram who was nominated and appointed one of the Overseers of the high wayes for this present yeare  being gone for England, It is thought fitt that William Doveton  being one of the 4 persons chosen by majority doe succeed the said  Barrams office, who was sworne accordingly to the same Effect  as the said Barram was  Poirier  Goodwin  Island St Helena  Att a Consultation held on Tuesday the 5<sup>th</sup> Day of July 1698 att Fort James  Pres<sup>t</sup> Steph<sup>t</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>  Tho: Goodwin Assistant  Henry Coales Marshall Complained of Eliz<sup>h</sup> Lansdowne  saying that she hath scandalized him very grosly and exposed to  severall persons, that he would have carnally committed adultery  with her, and also made the same Report that he would have  done the like to Sarah Frining, three weeks after she had lync  in, in the fields in the road coming down to the fort, and likewise  with Elizabeth the wife of John Longville which he doth  alledge is much to his Disgrace etc<sup>a</sup>  Elizabeth</p>	<p>After careful consideration, no proof was found against John Johnson. John Hemmon was asked whether he would pursue the case at an open court. He replied that he could not prove it. An order was made that John Johnson should be cleared of the accusation. Hemmon was warned to be more careful in his conduct and not to associate so freely with Johnson. Hemmon was also ordered to pay the court charges.</p> <p>Richard Barram, who had been appointed as one of the overseers of the highways for the present year, had departed for England. It was decided that William Doveton, being one of the four persons previously chosen by majority vote, should take his place. He was sworn into the office under the same terms as Barram.</p> <p>Poirier  Goodwin</p> <p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 5 July 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant.</p> <p>Henry Coales, the marshal, brought a complaint against Elizabeth Lansdowne. He stated that she had seriously damaged his reputation by telling several people that he had tried to have sexual relations with her. He also claimed that she had said he had attempted the same with Sarah Frining three weeks after she had given birth, in the fields along the road leading to the fort. He further alleged that she had made similar claims about Elizabeth, the wife of John Longville. He stated that these reports had caused him great harm.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The clearing of John Johnson after Hemmon admitted he could not prove the charge showed that the court required clear proof before proceeding. Admission of inability to prove the claim ended the case.</p> <p>The warning given to Hemmon showed that repeated suspicion without proof was discouraged. Social conduct, including association and accusation, was subject to oversight.</p> <p>The replacement of Barram with Doveton demonstrated continuity in public office. When an official left the island, another previously nominated person could be appointed without repeating the full selection process.</p> <p>The complaint by Henry Coales showed that accusations of sexual misconduct could be treated as defamation. Such claims, when publicly repeated, were considered damaging to reputation and could be pursued formally.</p> <p>The mention of multiple women in the accusation indicated that repeated allegations increased the seriousness of the claim. Harm to reputation was measured not only by content but by spread and repetition.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Hemmon's withdrawal from pursuing the case suggests that he recognised the weakness of his claim. Rather than risk further cost or penalty, he chose to end the matter.</p> <p>The appointment of Doveton from the original list suggests that the earlier vote was designed to provide replacements if needed. This avoided delay in maintaining essential roles.</p> <p>Coales's complaint suggests that the accusations had spread widely enough to affect his standing. Bringing the matter to the council indicates an attempt to restore his reputation through formal judgement.</p>
141	135	Elizabeth Lansdowne being Examined about what M <sup>r</sup> Coales hath Complain'd of, saith that the said Henry Coales severall times offer'd to lye with her, both since	Elizabeth Lansdowne was examined regarding the complaint made by Henry Coales. She stated that Coales had on several occasions asked her to have

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>her Husband Tho: Lansdowne hanged himself, and also before,  Sarah Frining upon Oath saith that Eliz'h Lansdowne told her that when she lived at M<sup>r</sup> Jewsters, M<sup>r</sup> Coales came there to her, severall times, under pretence to light his pipe, with  M<sup>r</sup> Jewster perceiving asked the said Eliz'h Lansdowne why  M<sup>r</sup> Coales came there so often, and told her it was a foolish thing  for his wife, when her Husband being she was not minded to see him,  but some time after told the said M<sup>r</sup> Jewster, that the said Coales had invited the said Eliz'h Lansdowne about a month ago to come and lye at his house, and told her that he had a good feather Bed, which he would lend her, she refused the had a flock Bed of her owne that would serve her well enough,  further saith that Eliz'h Lansdowne told her that the said Henry Coales would have put his hand upon her petticoats for the getting out of something unlawful or no, and that he did dogge her one Evening round the Island route with a cane from superstitious, his Bosome, saith that she also saw him one time at M<sup>r</sup> Homers coming and stood before her on monday Evening last that the said Coales did ask her to let him lye with her, but she who had him, no master you are a wicked man, I am a black woman,  M<sup>r</sup> Dwight her mother saith the same upon Oath, further saith that Eliz'h Lansdowne told her that she could never be at Quiet for M<sup>r</sup> Coales, for he came severall times to her, and asked her to let him lye with her, but did not, and that she said Coales might not know she was at home, also saith that she heard Coales say Betty, I am an old man, I cannot get with Child, to which the said Betty Lansdowne replied, if you [...] Coales should not know, they would have broken him, or you children, they would stone me to death, M<sup>r</sup> Jewster having been called and Examined according to M<sup>r</sup> Coales desire saith that he knows nothing to the matter, she being very forgetfull as an old woman,</p>	<p>sexual relations with him, both before and after her husband Thomas Lansdowne had taken his own life.  Sarah Frining, being sworn, stated that Elizabeth Lansdowne had told her that while she was living at Mr Jewster's house, Coales had come there several times, using the excuse of lighting his pipe. Mr Jewster noticed this and asked Lansdowne why Coales came so often. He warned her that it was improper for him to visit her in this way when she did not wish to see him. Frining further stated that about a month earlier, Lansdowne had said that Coales had invited her to sleep at his house and offered her the use of a feather bed. She refused, saying that her own bed was sufficient.  Frining also stated that Lansdowne had told her that Coales had tried to put his hand under her clothing with improper intent. She added that Coales had followed Lansdowne one evening along the road around the island, carrying a cane. Frining further stated that she herself had seen Coales approach Lansdowne at Mr Homer's house on the previous Monday evening, where he asked to sleep with her. Lansdowne refused and said that he was a wicked man.  Mrs Dwight, Lansdowne's mother, confirmed this account on oath. She stated that Lansdowne had told her that she could not live in peace because Coales came to her repeatedly and asked to sleep with her. She also said that Lansdowne tried to avoid him by hiding when he came. Mrs Dwight further stated that she had heard Coales say to Lansdowne that he was an old man and could not make her pregnant. Lansdowne replied that if such behaviour became known, people would harm him and she herself would suffer punishment.  Mr Jewster was called and examined at Coales's request. He stated that he knew nothing of the matter and added that Lansdowne was forgetful due to her age.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The testimony showed how accusations of sexual misconduct were examined through multiple witnesses. Statements from the woman herself, along with supporting accounts from others, were used to establish a pattern of behaviour.  The repeated visits by Coales under pretext indicated how access to women could be gained through ordinary social contact. Such behaviour was scrutinised when it appeared to conceal improper intent.  The references to refusal and avoidance showed that consent was a central issue. Persistent approaches after refusal were treated as serious misconduct.  The mention of fear of public reaction showed the social risks attached to such situations. Exposure could lead to punishment or violence, affecting both the accused and the woman involved.  Mr Jewster's dismissal of the claims based on Lansdowne's memory highlighted how credibility could be challenged. Age and reliability of testimony were factors considered in assessing evidence.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The consistency of Lansdowne's statements across different witnesses suggests that her account was repeated and known within her circle. This may have strengthened the perception of a pattern of behaviour.  The emphasis on secrecy and fear of discovery indicates that both parties were aware of the consequences of such conduct. This may explain Lansdowne's attempts to avoid Coales rather than confront him openly.</p>
142	136	<p>John Sheiles Corp<sup>t</sup> sworn saith that about three months agoe, he and some others was in Company with the aforesaid M<sup>r</sup> Coales, who went away from them, and he wanting him, to speak him, Enquired of Severalls if they saw him, at Length he mett with Eliz'h Lansdowne, and asked her if she knew</p>	<p>John Sheiles, a corporal, being sworn, stated that about three months earlier he had been in company with Henry Coales and others. Coales left them. Sheiles wished to speak with him and asked several people if they had seen him. He then met Elizabeth Lansdowne and asked if she knew where Coales was. She said that she did not, although Coales was in her house asleep. Sheiles went up into a gallery and then came down again</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>where M<sup>r</sup> Coales was, who told him she could not Tell, altho: he was in her house in a Sleepe, so he went up in a Gallery, and a Coming downe againe with M<sup>r</sup> Coales he met the Church yard and the Sessions house, who told them he had bin at Betty Lansdownes house a Sleep a purpose to Sleep some Company, Joseph Field being sworn saith that when the said Eliz<sup>h</sup> Lansdownes house was a building, she told him she could not be at Quiet, for M<sup>r</sup> Coales, who asked her why it she said he would let me alone, and would have layn with me, and proffered to lye on the floore of her house, and some time since, in an Evening wanted M<sup>r</sup> Coales to speak with him, and asked Eliz<sup>h</sup> Lansdowne if she could tell where he was, who told him she said he was at her house, so went there and found him [...] lying downe upon a Bench/ Upon the Whole It is ordered. That the final Decision of this Matter be refered and decided by the Jury at next Generall Sessions, which is on the 3 Day of Sept<sup>r</sup> next Ensuing/ Poirier Goodwin</p>	<p>with Coales. Later, near the churchyard and the Sessions House, Coales told them that he had been at Betty Lansdowne's house, where he had gone to sleep. Joseph Field, being sworn, stated that when Elizabeth Lansdowne's house was being built, she told him that she could not live in peace because of Coales. When he asked why, she said that Coales would not leave her alone and had asked to sleep with her. He had even offered to lie on the floor of her house. Field also stated that on a later evening he wished to speak with Coales and asked Lansdowne where he was. She told him that Coales was at her house. He went there and found Coales lying on a bench. After considering the whole matter, an order was made that the final decision should be left to a jury at the next general sessions, which was set for 3 September 1698. Poirier Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The testimony showed that Coales had been present at Lansdowne's house on several occasions, sometimes without being openly acknowledged. This supported the claim that he visited her frequently. The contradiction between Lansdowne's statement and Coales's presence in her house showed how concealment affected the case. Attempts to hide visits raised suspicion and required explanation. The repeated accounts from different witnesses helped to establish a pattern of behaviour rather than a single incident. This strengthened the case by showing consistency over time. The decision to refer the case to a jury at a general session showed that the matter was considered serious and required formal trial. More complex disputes involving reputation and conduct were not settled immediately by the council.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The decision to delay judgement until the next general session suggests that the council considered the evidence significant but not conclusive. A full jury trial would allow broader examination and a more authoritative decision. The repeated presence of Coales at Lansdowne's house, combined with efforts to conceal it, suggests that the relationship was sensitive and contested. The case may have turned on whether these visits were seen as improper or misrepresented.</p>
143	137	<p>Island of St Helena Att a Consultation held on Tuesday the 12<sup>th</sup> Day of July 1698 att Fort James Pres<sup>r</sup>: Stephen Poirier Govern<sup>or</sup> Tho: Goodwin Assistant Whereas News was brought to y<sup>e</sup> Govern<sup>or</sup> that there was Two Sheep Kins found a little below Thomas Coales under a Water fall, and at the Last parning the Honourable Comp<sup>o</sup> of Sheep there was Two missing, and that the Coales and William Seales were seen very nigh the place where the Kins lay, and that there was Meate seen in both their Houses which were like Mutton it being very fatt, and after an Exact Search was made in both their houses, but none found, They were ordered appeare to that forth In order to their Examination before y<sup>e</sup> Gov<sup>or</sup> &amp; Councill who were this day Examined/</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on 12 July 1698. Those present were Stephen Poirier, Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Assistant. Information had been brought to the Governor that two sheep skins had been found below Thomas Coales's land, near a waterfall. At the last counting of the Honourable Company's sheep, two had been missing. It was also reported that Thomas Coales and William Seales had been seen near the place where the skins were found, and that meat resembling mutton, and very fat, had been seen in both their houses. A careful search was made in both houses, but nothing was found. They were ordered to appear for examination before the Governor and Council. Thomas Coales, being examined, stated that he and William Seales had killed a wild goat about six weeks earlier. William Seales stated that he had gone alone to look for his own goats and had killed one. John Marsh stated that on Sunday 3 July 1698 he and John Orchard had gone to Thomas Allis's house. As they left and walked towards the place called Coales the Gravel, near Orchard's father-in-law's land, they saw Thomas Coales and William Coales coming up from the waterside, near where one of the sheep skins had been found. The other skin was found a short distance away.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Tho: Coales being Examined saith that he [...] Will<sup>m</sup> Sealer about Six weeks agoe killed a Wild goat, Will<sup>m</sup> Seales saith he went by himselfe after some Goats of his owne and killed One, John Marsh saith that on Sunday last the 3<sup>d</sup> of Instant he and John Orchard went to Thomas Allis house, and going from thence towards the place Coales the Gravel where John Orchard father in law, and as they were againe Sam Thomas Coales, and W<sup>m</sup> Coales, Coming up from y<sup>e</sup> Water side with which Sheep Kins was found, and some little Distance from y<sup>e</sup> Other, John Orchard saith y<sup>e</sup> same as John marsh hath/ Penna[...] Allis a girle about 12 years saith that on Monday the 4<sup>th</sup> of Instant she and her sister Mary and her brother Thomas went a looking for a heifer, and happened to finde the Two Kins neare y<sup>e</sup> water fall below Tho: Coales, and saw the haunch of Two sheep, that burnt just by y<sup>e</sup> side, and doth think that they burnt both but did see them further saith that same day she went up to William Seales house, where she saw some meat a boyling which was Extraordinarily fatt, [...]</p>	<p>John Orchard confirmed the same account as John Marsh.</p> <p>Penna[...] Allis, a girl about 12 years old, stated that on Monday 4 July 1698 she, her sister Mary, and her brother Thomas had been searching for a heifer. They found two sheep skins near the waterfall below Thomas Coales's land. She also saw what appeared to be the haunches of two sheep that had been burned nearby and believed that both had been burned. She further stated that on the same day she went to William Seales's house, where she saw meat boiling that was unusually fat.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The discovery of sheep skins near Coales's land linked the loss of Company livestock to a specific location. Physical remains such as skins and burned meat were treated as key evidence in identifying possible theft.</p> <p>The mention of the Company's sheep showed that livestock was managed as a collective resource. Loss of animals was therefore treated as an offence against Company property rather than a private dispute.</p> <p>The examination of both Coales and Seales showed that proximity to the site and possession of similar meat raised suspicion. However, direct proof was still required to establish responsibility.</p> <p>The statements from multiple witnesses, including children, showed that all available testimony was considered. Age did not prevent evidence from being heard, though its weight may have been judged carefully.</p> <p>The search of the houses demonstrated an effort to find physical proof. The absence of meat at the time of search weakened the case, despite earlier reports.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The claim that the meat had already been cooked and possibly consumed suggests that any evidence may have been quickly removed. This may explain why nothing was found during the search.</p> <p>The proximity of Coales and Seales to the site, combined with their explanation of killing goats, suggests that they may have sought to account for the presence of meat before suspicion increased. The explanation may have been given to deflect attention from the missing sheep.</p>
144	138	<p>Margarets Allis aged aboute 10 years saith that she saw the Two Sheep skind, and the said Water fall below Thomas Coales, and saw [...] of the Two men which went [...] the said Sheep skinned, Thomas Allis Jun<sup>or</sup> aged ab<sup>t</sup> 9 years, saith that he went with his Sisters on the day aforesaid, and saw the water fall a little below the [...], and did see the said Sheeps skinn, and saw Thomas Coales and Will<sup>m</sup> Seale a little above the said water fall, further saith he went to Thomas Coales house and saw some meat boyling in a pot over the fire, and [...] for Henry aged about 7 years, saith he supposed [...] which James [...]</p> <p>Lawrence a slave of Thomas Allin saith, when he [...] to look after a Cow, he saw William Seale and Thomas Coales coming up from the water side below the [...] Coales and [...] sheep skinn,</p> <p>After mature Consideration on this matter, altho we are in a manner Convinced, that the said Two offenders, viz<sup>t</sup> Thomas Coales and William Seale are Guilty of the fact, But the Evidence being Indirect, and no [...] [...] have bin sufficiently Evidenced, the said Tho:</p>	<p>Margaret Allis, aged about 10 years, stated that she saw the two sheep after they had been skinned near the waterfall below Thomas Coales's land. She also saw [...] of the two men who had been there when the sheep were skinned.</p> <p>Thomas Allis junior, aged about 9 years, stated that he went with his sisters on that same day and saw the waterfall below [...]. He saw the sheep skins and also saw Thomas Coales and William Seale a short distance above the place. He further stated that he went to Coales's house and saw meat boiling in a pot over the fire. He added that [...] Henry, aged about 7 years, thought that [...].</p> <p>Lawrence, a slave of Thomas Allin, stated that when he went out to look for a cow, he saw William Seale and Thomas Coales coming up from the waterside below Coales's land, and saw [...] sheep skins.</p> <p>After careful consideration, it was judged that although there was strong suspicion that Thomas Coales and William Seale were guilty, the evidence was indirect and no clear proof had been established. For this reason, both men were discharged until better and more lawful evidence should be presented.</p> <p>Stephen Field, a seaman who had been left ashore from the ship <i>Sampson</i>, commanded by Captain Parle, had now recovered sufficiently. He made a request to the Governor and Council that he might be taken into service as a soldier in the St Helena Company, as he had</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Coales and Will<sup>m</sup> Seales have bin Discharged, until better and more lawfull prooffe and Evidence doth appeare. Stephen Field a Seaman having bin left on shoare of the Ship Sampson Cap<sup>t</sup> Parle Commander, who is now so decently recovered, made his humble request to the Gov<sup>or</sup> &amp; Council that he might be pleased to Entertaine him as a Souldier in St Helena Company pay and service, he having no other meanes to maintaine himselfe, The which was granted his pay Commencing from the 14<sup>th</sup> of Instant</p> <p>Poirier Tho: Goodwin</p>	<p>no other means to support himself. This request was granted, and his pay was to begin from 14 July 1698.</p> <p>Poirier Tho: Goodwin</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The reliance on testimony from children showed that all available witnesses were used, even when their evidence might be uncertain. Their accounts helped to build a picture of events but required support from stronger proof.</p> <p>The decision to release Coales and Seale showed that suspicion alone was not enough to convict. Even when several witnesses pointed to the same individuals, the absence of direct proof prevented punishment.</p> <p>The distinction between suspicion and proof reflected a working standard of evidence. The council required a clear link between the accused and the act before taking action.</p> <p>The admission of Stephen Field into Company service showed how labour needs were met from available persons. Men without means of support could be absorbed into military roles, providing both livelihood and service to the Company.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The presence of multiple witnesses placing Coales and Seale near the scene suggests that the council strongly suspected them but could not prove the act. The discharge may have been temporary, pending stronger evidence.</p> <p>The acceptance of Stephen Field into service suggests that the island required additional manpower. His recovery and lack of other support made him a suitable candidate for immediate employment.</p>
145	139	<p>St Helena Aug<sup>t</sup> the 10<sup>th</sup> 1698 Richard Gurling delivered to the Gov<sup>t</sup> &amp; Council setting forth that he had lately received some writings Concerning Land &amp;c<sup>a</sup> from M<sup>r</sup> Edmunds, who had the same on his [...] his mothers Executors which writings were very much damnified through neglect of Water, Insomuch that some of them are scarce to be read or made sense of, Whereof he suspects he might have all his said writings Coppied out, and also Entred in the bookes of record &amp;c<sup>a</sup> where they might be Secure, which Petition was granted, and also the writings are as followeth viz<sup>t</sup> A Bill of Sale Know all men by these presents, That I Richard Griffith of the said Island free planter, do acknowledge to have received of M<sup>r</sup> Richard Gurling of the said Island free planter the full sum of foure pounds in good and lawfull money, at five shillings p<sup>r</sup> Dollar, being in full Satisfaction for the whole part of fifty three foote of Ground front and one hundred and twenty foote in length back, which is Scituate lying and being in Capt<sup>t</sup> Batts Valley neare James on the said Island, which is belonging unto by marriage to Elizabeth Gurling deceased, who had the same from the Grand Council of the said Island, who purchased afterwards, which said one half</p>	<p>On 10 August 1698 at St Helena, Richard Gurling presented a petition to the Governor and Council. He stated that he had recently received several legal documents concerning land from Mr Edmunds, who had held them on behalf of his mother's executors. These documents had been badly damaged by water through neglect, so that some were now barely legible or could not be properly understood.</p> <p>He requested that all the documents be copied out and entered into the council books so that they could be preserved securely. This request was granted.</p> <p>The first document recorded was a bill of sale. In it, Richard Griffith, a free planter of the island, acknowledged receipt of £4 0s 0d in lawful money, valued at five shillings per dollar, from Richard Gurling, also a free planter. This payment was made in full for a portion of land measuring fifty-three feet in frontage and one hundred and twenty feet in depth, situated in Captain Batt's Valley near James on St Helena.</p> <p>The land had belonged, through marriage, to Elizabeth Gurling, now deceased, who had originally received it from the Grand Council of the island and later acquired it by purchase. Richard Griffith transferred and released his half share of this land to Richard Gurling and his heirs forever.</p> <p>The agreement granted full possession of the land, including all houses, yards, gardens and associated rights. Richard Griffith promised that Richard Gurling and his heirs would be able to hold, use and enjoy the property without interference from him or anyone acting on his behalf. He further agreed to protect Gurling's title against any claims arising through him or his successors.</p> <p>Provision was also made that if any dispute should arise between the Governor and Council of the island and [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The request to copy and record the documents showed the importance of official record-keeping in securing property rights. Entry into the council books</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>part of the Ground aforesaid, I hereby Release and acquit unto the said M<sup>r</sup> Richard Gurling his heires and assignes for ever To HAVE &amp; to HOLD the said piece or parcell of Land as aforesaid, with all and singular the houses yards gardens and appurtenances thereunto belonging, to the said Richard Gurling his heires and assignes for ever And for his better Security of the said Land Houses and Inclosures thereon, I the said Richard Griffith do hereby Covenant promise and grant to and with the said Richard Gurling his heires Executors and Administrators, That he the said Richard Gurling his heires and assignes shall and will from hence forth have hold use occupie possesse and enjoy the same, without any manner of lett molestation or Interruption from me the said Richard Griffith my heires Executors Administrators or assignes, him them or any of them thereunto or by their act means privily or openly [...] or any And further if any Difference or any Disputes should happen or arise between the Governor and Council of the said Island and</p>	<p>protected ownership where original documents had been damaged or lost.</p> <p>The reference to water damage highlighted the vulnerability of paper records in the island environment. Preservation through duplication was a practical administrative response.</p> <p>The bill of sale demonstrated the formal transfer of land through written agreement, supported by payment and recorded acknowledgment. This process ensured legal recognition of ownership.</p> <p>The mention of the Grand Council as the original grantor showed that land titles could originate from official allocation and then pass through private transactions.</p> <p>The covenant to guarantee possession without interference illustrated how sellers were required to protect buyers against future claims. This strengthened confidence in land transactions.</p> <p>The valuation of currency at five shillings per dollar showed the use of mixed monetary systems. Conversion into sterling terms ensured clarity in accounting and legal records.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to copy the documents suggests concern that damaged originals could lead to disputes over ownership. Recording them centrally may have been intended to prevent future legal challenges.</p> <p>The detailed assurances in the bill of sale indicate that land ownership could be contested. The inclusion of guarantees suggests that both parties sought to secure the transaction against possible claims from others.</p>
146	140	<p>and him the said Richard Griffith his heires or assignes aboute his or their proper Right and Title to the Land Houses and fences as aforesaid, so that it should happen to be his wife, and engage to pay the said sumes pounds of like good and Lawfull money of the said Island as aforesaid, and again unto the said Richard Gurling or his assignes on Demand, In Wittness whereof I have hereunto Sett my hand and Seale this third day of July 168. Rich<sup>d</sup> Griffith Signed Sealed &amp; In the presence of us Edward Brayne John Long Hugh Bodley St Helena A Copy of a Bill of Sale from Gabriell Lovell, sen<sup>or</sup> to Richard Gurling Deceased for 2 Negroes Know all men by these presents that I Gabriell Lovell of this said Island free planter, for and in Consideration of the sume of Twenty foure pounds Currant money to him in hand paid at or before the Sealeing and Delivery of these presents, the receipt whereof I do hereby acknowledge, and him thereof do clearly satisfied, hath granted bargained and sold, and by these presents do fully grant bargain and sell unto Rich<sup>d</sup> Gurling free planter of the said Island aforesaid, Two negroes named by the names of Jack and Jone To have and to hold the said Two negroes unto the said Richard Gurling his heires Executors Adminis<sup>ts</sup> and assignes for ever, and I the said Gabriell Lovell for</p>	<p>The bill of sale further stated that if any dispute arose between the Governor and Council and Richard Griffith, or his heirs or assigns, concerning their rightful claim to the land, houses or fences, and if it proved that the property properly belonged to his wife, then Griffith bound himself to repay the same sum of £4 0s 0d in lawful money of the island to Richard Gurling or his assigns on demand.</p> <p>This document was signed and sealed by Richard Griffith on 3 July 168[...], in the presence of Edward Brayne, John Long and Hugh Bodley.</p> <p>A second document was then recorded. It was a copy of a bill of sale from Gabriel Lovell senior to Richard Gurling, now deceased, for two slaves.</p> <p>In this document, Gabriel Lovell, a free planter of St Helena, acknowledged receipt of £24 0s 0d in current money, paid in full at the time of the agreement. In return, he transferred ownership of two slaves named Jack and Jone to Richard Gurling.</p> <p>The agreement granted full and permanent ownership of the two slaves to Richard Gurling, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns. Gabriel Lovell guaranteed that Gurling and his successors would hold and use the slaves without interference, claim or disturbance from him or from anyone acting through him.</p> <p>This document was signed and sealed by Gabriel Lovell on 21 April 1689, in the presence of Henry Jackson and John Lipson.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repayment clause in the land sale showed that sellers could be required to guarantee title against competing claims, including those arising from family rights such as a wife's interest. This functioned as a financial safeguard for the buyer.</p> <p>The formal witnessing of the documents demonstrated the role of third parties in validating transactions. Witnesses provided legal support in case of later dispute.</p> <p>The sale of slaves as named individuals showed that enslaved people were treated as transferable property within the legal system. Their inclusion in formal</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>him  selfe his heires Executors Administrators and assignes  doth hereby  Covenant promise and grant to and with the said Rich<sup>d</sup>  Gurling  that he the said Richard Gurling shall have hold and  Enjoy the  said hereby bargained negroes without any trouble  Molest-  ation or Eviction of his the said Gabriell Lovell his  Executors or  Administrators or of any other person or persons  whatsoever by  from or under them or any of them, In Witness  whereof I  the said Gabriell Lovell have hereunto Sett my hand and  Seale this Twenty first Day  of Aprill one thousand six hundred eighty and nine  Gabriell Lovell  Signed Sealed &amp;  Deliv<sup>d</sup> in the presence of us  Henry Jackson  John Lipson</p>	<p>contracts placed them within the same framework as  land and goods.  The guarantee against interference in the slave sale  reflected the same legal protections used in land  transactions. Ownership rights were secured through  contractual promises backed by liability.  The recording of these documents in the council  books showed that private transactions could be  reinforced by public authority. Registration provided  durability and legal recognition beyond the original  agreement.  <b>Speculations</b>  The inclusion of a repayment clause tied to  potential claims by a wife suggests that property rights  within marriage could create uncertainty. The clause  may have been included to prevent future disputes over  inheritance or marital entitlement.  The detailed guarantees in both documents indicate  concern about contested ownership. Recording and  copying these agreements may have been intended to  prevent loss of rights due to damaged originals or  competing claims.</p>
147	141	<p>Gabriell Lovell Bill of sale for 30 acres of  Land  Know all men by these presents That I Gabriell  Lovell of the Island of St Helena free planter for an in  considera-  tion of the sume of Twenty pounds sterl to be paid to  me  by Richard Gurling of the Island aforesaid free planter  on or  before the first Day of may in the yeare of our Lord one  Thousand  six Hundred ninety and one Have granted bargained  and  sold and do by these presents grant bargain and sell  unto  Richard Gurling aforesaid all that piece or parcell of  Land  containing estimation Thirty Acres be the same more or  Less lying scituate and being on the Horse pasture  plaine  the Northerly part thereof being exchanged with  Company for the  Land which was form<sup>er</sup> William Gowers and belonging  to  hold to him said thirty Acres of Land with all and  singular Appur-  tenances thereunto belonging unto the said Richard  Gurling  his heires Executors Administrators and assignes for  ever to use and dispose  of the said parcell of Land at his or their wills and  pleasures  the said Gabriell Lovell for himselfe his heires  Executors Administrators  doth Covenant and promise to and with the said Rich<sup>d</sup>  Gurling  his heires Executors Administrators assignes That he  the Rich<sup>d</sup> Gurling  shall have hold occupie possesse and Enjoy the said  bargained  premisses without any the Lawfull lett Eviction or  molestation  of the said Gabriell Lovell his heires Executors  Administrators  or assignes or of any other person or persons  whatsoever In  Witness whereof I have hereunto sett my hand and  Seale  this Sixth day of may One Thousand six hundred  Eighty and  Nine</p>	<p>A further document was recorded concerning a sale  of land by Gabriel Lovell.  In this agreement, Gabriel Lovell, a free planter of St  Helena, undertook to sell to Richard Gurling, also a free  planter, a parcel of land estimated at thirty acres. The  agreed price was £20 0s 0d sterling, to be paid on or  before 1 May 1691.  The land was described as lying on Horse Pasture  Plain. Its northern boundary had been adjusted through  an exchange with the Company for land that had  formerly belonged to William Gower.  Full ownership of the thirty acres, together with all  associated rights and appurtenances, was granted to  Richard Gurling, his heirs, executors, administrators and  assigns forever. He was given full authority to use and  dispose of the land as he wished.  Gabriel Lovell bound himself, and his successors, to  guarantee that Gurling and his heirs would hold and  enjoy the land without any lawful challenge, interference  or disturbance from him or from any other person  claiming through him.  The document was signed and sealed by Gabriel  Lovell on 6 May 1689, in the presence of Henry Jackson  and William Lipson.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The requirement that payment be made by a fixed  future date showed that land sales could be agreed in  advance with deferred payment. This created a binding  obligation before full payment was completed.  The reference to an exchange with the Company  demonstrated that boundaries could be formally adjusted  through negotiation with the governing authority. The  Company acted as a controlling body over land  distribution.  The grant of perpetual rights to Gurling and his heirs  reflected the establishment of stable, inheritable property  ownership. Such arrangements reinforced long-term  settlement and investment.  The covenant to protect the buyer from claims  showed the importance of secure title. Sellers were  expected to guarantee that no competing rights would  disrupt possession.  The detailed identification of the land, including its  location and prior ownership, ensured that the property  could be clearly recognised. This reduced the risk of  dispute over boundaries or entitlement.  <b>Speculations</b>  The inclusion of land exchanged with the Company  suggests that earlier boundaries may have been uncertain  or contested. The adjustment may have been intended to  regularise ownership before sale.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Gabriell Lovell Sealed signed and deliv<sup>d</sup> in the presence of us Henry Jackson Will<sup>m</sup> Lipson</p>	<p>The deferred payment date indicates that Gurling may not have paid immediately. The agreement may have allowed time to gather funds while securing the land in advance.</p>
148	142	<p>Will<sup>m</sup> Medling Indenture for 10 Acres Land This Indenture made the Seventh day of August Anno Dom<sup>d</sup> 1683 and in the five and Thirtieth yeare of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord King Charles the Second by the Grace of God of England Scotland France and Ireland King Defender of the Faith &amp;c<sup>a</sup> Between William medling of the Island of St Helena free planter of the one part and Richard Stacy of the said Island free planter of the other part Witnesseth That the said William medling for and in Consideration of the summe of Eight pounds Tenn Shillings To the said W<sup>m</sup> medling in hand paid at or before the Ensealing and Delivery hereof by the said Richard Stacy the receipt whereof he doth hereby acknowledge and thereof and of every part and parcell thereof doth clearly acquitt exonerate and discharge the said Richard Stacy his heires Executors Administrators and assignes Hath granted bargained and sold and by these presents doth grant bargaine and sell unto the said Richard Stacy all that parcell or peece of Land Containing by Estimation Tenn Acres be it the same more or less lying and being at the head of Chapel Valley Butting and bounding as on the Register Booke of the said Island doth and may more fully appeare together with all and singular the appurtenances thereunto belonging or in any wise appertaining To have and to hold the said parcell or peece of Land with all the appurtenances from the day of the date hereof unto the said Richard Stacy his heires and assignes for ever And the said William medling for himselfe his heires Executors Administrators and assignes doth Covenant promise and agree to and with the said Richard Stacy his heires Executors Administrators and assignes that he the aforesaid William medling shall and will have and keep harmless and Indempnified the said Richard Stacy his heires and assignes of from all person or persons whatsoever lawfully claiming or to claime the same or any part thereof by from or under him or them And that he hereby bargained and sold is free and cleare of all Incumbrances any thing to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding In Witness whereof the said William medling hath hereunto sett his hand and seale</p>	<p>A further document was recorded as an indenture dated 7 August 1683.</p> <p>In this agreement, William Medling, a free planter of St Helena, sold to Richard Stacy, also a free planter, a parcel of land estimated at ten acres for the sum of £8 10s 0d. Payment was made in full at or before the sealing and delivery of the document, and Medling formally acknowledged receipt.</p> <p>The land was described as lying at the head of Chapel Valley, with its boundaries recorded in the island's register book. Full possession, together with all associated rights, was granted to Richard Stacy and his heirs forever.</p> <p>William Medling bound himself and his successors to protect Stacy and his heirs from any claims to the land arising through him or others connected to him. He further guaranteed that the land was free from all encumbrances and that no competing claims would affect Stacy's ownership.</p> <p>The document was signed and sealed by William Medling on the same date, in the presence of Henry Francis, Thomas Markham and William Rutter.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The reference to the register book showed that land boundaries were formally recorded in an official system. This allowed property to be identified and verified against a central record.</p> <p>The acknowledgment of full payment at the time of sealing indicated that many transactions required immediate settlement. This reduced the risk of dispute over unpaid sums.</p> <p>The guarantee against encumbrances showed that land could carry hidden claims or obligations. Sellers were required to confirm that none existed to ensure a clear transfer.</p> <p>The use of indenture reflected a formal legal instrument for property transfer. Such documents structured ownership rights in a standardised and enforceable way.</p> <p>The involvement of multiple witnesses reinforced the validity of the agreement. Their presence provided support in case the transaction was later challenged.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The reliance on the register book for boundary description suggests that physical markers alone may not have been sufficient. Written records may have been necessary to resolve disputes over land limits.</p> <p>The strong guarantees given by Medling indicate that ownership could be contested. Including these assurances may have been intended to prevent future legal conflict over the property.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>the day and yeare first above written W<sup>m</sup> Medling Sealed signed &amp; deliv<sup>d</sup> in the presence of Henry Francis Tho: markham W<sup>m</sup> Rutter</p>	
149	143	<p>Island St Helena Richard Stacey's Assignment for the aforesaid Land To whom this may concerne Know ye that I Richard Stacy of the Island of St Helena planter Doe hereby Assigne and make over all the Right Title and Interest of these presents have made Over all the Right Title and Interest unto Richard Gurling his heires Executors Administrat[ors] &amp; assignes for Ever That I the said Richard Stacy my heires Executors and Administrat[ors] or any of us have or may have all within mentioned writing Indented Indenture and in all and singular the premises therein mentioned In Witness whereof I have here unto sett my hand and Seale this [...] day of January 169[...] Sealed &amp; Delivered In the presence of us Edward Brest J Vernon Richard Stacey his marke This Indenture made the Nineteenth day of march 1691 and in the second yeare of the Raigne of our Soveraigne Lord and Lady William and Mary by the Grace of God King and Queene over England Scotland France and Ireland Defenders of the faith &amp;c Between John George of the Island of St Helena free planter of the one part and Richard Gurling planter of the other part Witnesseth That the said John George for and in Consideration of the summe of Eight pounds sterling to him in hand paid before the Ensealing and Delivery of these presents Hath granted bargained and sold and by these presents Doth grant bargaine and sell unto the said Richard Gurling his heires Executors Administrators and assignes all that peece or parcell of Land Containing by Estimation Twenty Acres situate and being and lyeing at the head of Lemon Valley on the Island aforesaid also neere the Land of John Greenhill deceased Tenn Acres thereof was formerly the Land of John Medebone Late planter of this Island and Tenn Acres more one Thomas Carter Deceased Lying in the possession and Occupation of James Wakefield tenant or farmer the same more or less with all profits commodities advantages and appurtenances whatsoever to the same belonging or in any wise apper- taining To have &amp; to hold the said Twenty Acres of Land</p>	<p>A further document recorded the assignment of land by Richard Stacy. In this instrument, Richard Stacy, a planter of St Helena, transferred all his right, title and interest in the previously described indenture and the land it concerned to Richard Gurling, his heires, executors, administrators and assigns forever. This assignment covered the full benefit of the earlier agreement and all property rights contained within it. The document was signed by Richard Stacy, marked with his sign, and witnessed by Edward Brest and J Vernon. It was dated [...] January 169[...]. Another indenture followed, dated 19 March 1692, in the second year of the reign of King William and Queen Mary. In this agreement, John George, a free planter of St Helena, sold to Richard Gurling a parcel of land estimated at twenty acres for the sum of £8 0s 0d sterling, paid in full at the time of the agreement. The land was situated at the head of Lemon Valley. Ten acres had previously belonged to John Medebone, a former planter of the island, and a further ten acres had belonged to Thomas Carter, also deceased. At the time of the sale, the land was in the possession of James Wakefield, who held it as a tenant or farmer. Full ownership of the twenty acres, together with all profits, advantages and appurtenances, was granted to Richard Gurling and his heires. <b>Interpretations</b> The assignment by Stacy showed that land rights could be transferred not only by original sale but also by later reassignment. This allowed ownership to pass through multiple hands without repeating the original transaction. The use of a mark instead of a signature indicated that not all parties were literate. Legal validity did not depend on writing ability but on formal witnessing. The identification of earlier owners of the land in Lemon Valley demonstrated how property history was recorded to support claims. Tracing prior ownership helped confirm legitimacy. The mention of a tenant in occupation showed that land could be sold while under lease. Ownership and use were treated as separate rights within the legal system. The full transfer of profits and advantages highlighted that land ownership included economic benefit, not just physical possession. <b>Speculations</b> The assignment from Stacy to Gurling suggests that Gurling may have been consolidating land holdings. Acquiring existing rights may have been more efficient than negotiating new grants. The relatively low price for twenty acres compared to earlier sales may reflect differences in land quality, location or existing tenancies. The presence of a tenant may also have influenced the valuation.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		with the aforesaid premises unto the said Richard Gurling his	
<a href="#">150</a>	144	<p>[...] heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assigns from the date hereof for Ever and the said George doth covenant and agree to and with the said Gurling that he the said Gurling his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assigns shall have hold occupie possess and enjoy the said Land &amp;c without any Lett Suite Trouble Disturbance or Contradiction of the said George his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assigns or from or by any other person or persons by his or their meanes Title or pro- curement In Witness whereof the said John George hath hereunto sett his hand and seale the day and yeare above written Signed Sealed &amp; Delivered in presence of us Henry Lundie Sarah [...] Wm Clifton John George his marke</p> <p>This Indenture made the 18 day of may Anno Domini 1686 and in the second year of the raigne of our Sovereigne Lord James the second by the Grace of God of England Scotland France and Ireland King Defender of the faith &amp;c Between James Wakefield of the Island St Helena free planter of the one part and Richard Gurling of the said Island free planter of the other part Witnesseth That the said James Wakefield for and in Consideration of the sume of Eight pounds Six shillings of Currant money to him in hand paid at or before the ensealing and delivery of these presents The receipt whereof doth hereby acknowledge and himselfe therewith to be fully satisfied and thereof and every part thereof doth exonerate acquit and discharge the said Richard Gurling his heires Execu[...] and Administrators Hath granted aliened bargained and sold and by these presents doth grant alien bargaine and sell unto the said Richard Gurling all that peece or parcell of Land Contayning [...] Two acres adjoining unto the said James Wakefields Plantation scituate lying and being in Sandy [...] and bounding as [...] [...] on the said Island with all woods trees hedges and ditches Together with [...] of the said Island To have &amp; to hold the same unto the said Richard Gurling his heires and assigns for ever [...]</p>	<p>The indenture concerning the twenty acres in Lemon Valley continued by confirming that Richard Gurling, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns were to hold the land forever from the date of the agreement. John George bound himself and his successors to guarantee that Gurling and his heirs would possess and enjoy the land without any legal claim, dispute or interference from him or from any other person acting through him.</p> <p>The document was signed and sealed by John George, marked with his sign, in the presence of Henry Lundie, Sarah [...] and William Clifton.</p> <p>A further indenture was then recorded, dated 18 May 1686, in the second year of the reign of King James II.</p> <p>In this agreement, James Wakefield, a free planter of St Helena, sold to Richard Gurling a parcel of land for £8 6s 0d in current money, paid in full at or before the completion of the document.</p> <p>The land was described as a piece adjoining Wakefield's plantation, situated in Sandy [...], with its boundaries recorded as [...]. It included all woods, trees, hedges and ditches belonging to it, together with [...] of the island.</p> <p>Full possession of this land was granted to Richard Gurling and his heirs forever.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repeated use of covenants guaranteeing possession without interference showed the importance placed on secure title. Each transaction reinforced the buyer's protection against future claims.</p> <p>The use of marks instead of signatures again demonstrated that legal agreements accommodated varying levels of literacy, relying on witnesses to confirm authenticity.</p> <p>The inclusion of natural features such as trees, hedges and ditches showed that land ownership extended to all productive and boundary elements. These features had both economic and practical value.</p> <p>The reference to adjoining land indicated that property was often defined in relation to neighbouring holdings. This reflected a landscape organised through individual plots rather than fixed surveyed grids.</p> <p>The consistent transfer of land to Richard Gurling across multiple documents showed the accumulation of property through successive purchases and assignments.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The repeated acquisitions by Gurling suggest a deliberate effort to expand and consolidate land holdings. This pattern indicates that Lansdownership could be built gradually through multiple smaller transactions.</p> <p>The emphasis on guarantees against disputes may reflect a context where competing claims were common. Strong contractual language may have been intended to prevent future challenges to ownership.</p>
<a href="#">151</a>	145	<p>and appurtenances to the said Two acres of Land or any part or parcell thereof belonging or in any wise appertaining To have &amp; To hold the said two acres of Land with all and singular other the premises from the day of the date hereof unto the said Richard Gurling his heires and assigns for ever And the said James Wakefield for himselfe his Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assigns doth hereby promise grant unto and with the said Richard Gurling his heires and Ad- ministrat[...] that he the said James Wakefield is at the sealing hereof lawfully seised of the premises and hath</p>	<p>The indenture concerning the two acres continued by granting Richard Gurling full and permanent possession of the land, together with all rights and appurtenances attached to it.</p> <p>James Wakefield declared that he held lawful ownership of the land at the time of the agreement and had full authority to sell it. He bound himself and his successors to protect Richard Gurling and his heirs from any prior claims, grants or sales affecting the land, and from any person asserting a right through him. The agreement was signed and sealed by both parties and witnessed by Matthew Conney, Lester Sexton and Stephen Marsh. James Wakefield marked the document with his sign.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>power to alien or sell the same and shall and will save Keepe harmeles and [...] the said Richard Gurling his heires Execu[...] and Administrat[...] and from all former and other Gifts Grants Bargaines and sales whatsoever and from any person or persons Claiming or to Claime any thing in the premises by from or under him them or any of them or by his their or any of their act means or consents or procurements In Witness whereof the parties above have hereunto interchangeably sett their hands &amp; Seales the day and yeare first above written Witnessed  Matt: Conney  Lester Sexton  Steph: Marsh  The marke of  James W Wakefield  To all Christian People To whome these presents shall come I Robert Carter of this Island St Helena planter send greeting in the Lord God Know ye that I the said Robert Carter for and in Consideration of the sume of ten pounds to me already paid by William Phipson of this said Island for the receipt whereof I do acknowledge and my selfe therewith to be fully satisfied contented and paid have given granted bargained sold and by these presents doe Give and absolutely grant bargain sell and Deliver unto him the said William Phipson his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assignes all that piece or parcell of Land Containing by Estimation Tenn acres lying and being that head of Corvells Valley on this said Island abutting &amp; bounding [...] or Tenn acres of Land belonging to the Orphanes of Robert Carter (deceased) and the Land now possessed by John Hammond of this said Island planter With all and singular the</p>	<p>A further document was then recorded.  In this instrument, Robert Carter, a planter of St Helena, declared that he had received £10 0s 0d from William Phipson of the same island. In return, he transferred to Phipson a parcel of land estimated at ten acres, situated at the head of Corvells Valley.  The land was described as adjoining or near ten acres belonging to the orphans of Robert Carter, deceased, and land then held by John Hammond, a planter of the island. Full possession of the land, together with all associated rights and appurtenances, was granted to William Phipson and his heirs.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The repeated confirmation that the seller was lawfully entitled to the land showed the importance of proving ownership at the moment of transfer. This reduced the risk of later disputes.  The protection against prior grants or sales demonstrated that land could carry hidden claims. Sellers were required to guarantee that no earlier transaction would undermine the buyer's title.  The reference to land held by orphans indicated that estates of deceased persons were actively managed and recognised in property boundaries. Such estates formed part of the wider system of landholding.  The use of marks in place of signatures continued to show that formal agreements did not depend on literacy. Witnesses ensured the validity of such acts.  The careful description of neighbouring Lansdowners showed that boundaries were defined relationally. This method relied on local knowledge and recognition rather than fixed measurement alone.  <b>Speculations</b>  The emphasis on clearing prior claims suggests that overlapping rights to land may have been common. Strong guarantees may have been necessary to secure confidence in transactions.  The mention of land belonging to orphans implies that property could remain in transitional ownership after death. This may have created uncertainty in adjoining boundaries, prompting detailed description in new sales.</p>
152	146	<p>and all other appurtenances thereunto belonging or appertaining To have and to hold the said Tenn acres of Land and appurtenances as aforesaid To him the said Willm Clifton his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assignes from the day of the date hereof for Ever To have and dispose thereof at his and theirs owne wills and pleasures And the said Robert Carter for himselfe his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assignes doth covenant grant and agree to and with the said Willm Clifton that he the said Willm Clifton or his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assignes shall and may from time to time and at all times hereafter have hold occupie possesse and enjoy the said hereby bargained premisses without any lawfull let suite trouble eviction ejection interruption disturbance or contradiction of him the said Robert Carter his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assignes or by or from him or any of his meanes consent</p>	<p>The document concerning the ten acres continued by granting William Clifton full and permanent possession of the land, together with all associated rights. He and his heirs were given complete authority to use and dispose of the land as they chose.  Robert Carter bound himself and his successors to guarantee that Clifton and his heirs would hold and enjoy the land without any lawful claim, dispute or interference from him or from any person acting through him. He further agreed that if the Right Honourable English East India Company should take all or part of the land, he would repay Clifton or his heirs a specified sum of money [...] without delay or dispute.  This agreement was signed and sealed by Robert Carter on 3 January 1693, in the presence of Thomas Swallow, Robert Addis and Thomas Nairne. Carter marked the document with his sign.  A further document was then recorded.  In this instrument, William Clifton, a planter of St Helena, declared that he had received £10 0s 0d in current island money from Richard Gurling, also a planter. In return, he transferred to Gurling a parcel of land estimated at ten acres.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>or procurement And further know ye that I the said Robert Carter do covenant with the said William Clifton or his heires that if the Right Honourable English East India Company doe take in whole or in part the premisses that then the summe of [...] pounds shall be paid unto the said Willm Clifton his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assigns by him the said Robert Carter his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assigns without any equivocation or further trouble In Witness whereof the said Robert Carter hath hereunto sett his hand and seale this third day of January in the yeare of God One Thousand six hundred ninety and two Sealed &amp; Delivd in presence of us  Tho: Swallow  Robt Addis  Tho: Nairne  Robert T Carter his marke  To all Christian People to whome these presents shall come William Clifton of the Island St Helena sendeth greeting  in the Lord God Know ye that I the said Willm Clifton for and in Consideration of the sume of Tenn pounds money current of this said Island to me in hand paid by Richard Gurling of the said Island Planter whereof I doe acknowledge my selfe therewith to be fully satisfied contented and paid have given granted bargained sold and delivered and by these presents doe fully and absolutely give grant bargain sell &amp; deliver unto the said Richard Gurling his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assigns all that piece or parcell of Land Containing by estimation Tenn Acres lying and being neare the head of Corvells Valley abutting and bounding between Land now in possession of Gregory Orchard and the Land now possessed by John Hammond of the said Island Planter To have &amp; to hold the said Tenn Acres of Land with all and singular the provisions advantages growings or being thereon</p>	<p>The land was situated near the head of Corvells Valley, bounded between land held by Gregory Orchard and land held by John Hammond. Full possession of the land, together with all produce, advantages and appurtenances, was granted to Richard Gurling and his heirs.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The clause requiring repayment if the Company reclaimed the land showed that ultimate authority over land remained with the Company. Private ownership existed within this overarching control.  The guarantee of compensation in such a case acted as protection for the buyer. It shifted the financial risk of Company intervention onto the seller.  The repeated transfer of the same parcel of land through successive owners demonstrated how property circulated through sale. Ownership could change hands multiple times within a short period.  The inclusion of natural produce and advantages in the grant showed that economic use of the land was central to its value. Ownership included rights to all resources derived from it.  The detailed boundary description using neighbouring landholders reflected a system based on local recognition. Property limits were defined through known occupants rather than abstract measurement.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The inclusion of a compensation clause tied to Company action suggests that such interventions were a real concern. Buyers may have demanded this protection to reduce uncertainty in holding land.  The resale of the same ten acres by Clifton to Gurling indicates that Gurling may have been consolidating nearby plots. This pattern suggests a deliberate effort to expand holdings in a specific area.</p>
153	147	<p>and all other the appurtenances whatsoever belonging or appertaining thereunto unto him the said Richard Gurling his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assigns from the day of the date hereof for ever to dispose of the said Land or any part thereof at his or their owne wills and pleasures And the said Willm Clifton for himselfe his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assigns doth covenant grant and agree to and with the said Richard Gurling that he the said Richard Gurling his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assigns shall and may from time to time and at all times hereafter have hold occupie possesse and enjoy the said premisses and every part thereof without any the lawfull let suite trouble eviction ejection interruption or contradiction of him</p>	<p>The conveyance from William Clifton to Richard Gurling continued by confirming that Gurling, his heirs, executors, administrators and assigns were to hold the ten acres of land and all its appurtenances forever, with full authority to use or dispose of it as they wished.  William Clifton bound himself and his successors to guarantee that Gurling and his heirs would possess and enjoy the land without any lawful claim, dispute or interference from him or from any person acting through him. He further confirmed and ratified the transfer in full.  This document was signed and sealed by William Clifton on 26 December 1692, in the presence of Henry Jackson, Hugh Bodey and Samuel Wrangham.  A further indenture was then recorded, dated 20 December 1681, in the thirty-third year of the reign of King Charles II.  In this agreement, James Larsson, a free planter of St Helena, sold to Thomas Davis, also a free planter, a parcel of land for £8 0s 0d or an equivalent value, paid or secured at the time of the agreement. Receipt of the sum was acknowledged, and the seller declared himself</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>the said Willm Clifton his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assignes or of any other person or persons by his meanes consent or procurement And further know ye that I the said Willm Clifton doe hereby ratifie confirm and establish unto the said Richard Gurling the premisses aforesaid In Witness whereof the said Willm Clifton hath hereunto sett his hand and seale this twenty sixth day of December [...] in the yeare of our Lord God One thousand six hundred ninety and two Sealed &amp; Delivd in the presence of us Henry Jackson Hugh Bodey Sam: Wrangham Wm Clifton</p> <p>This Indenture made the Twentyeth day of December Anno Domini 1681 and in the three and thirtieth yeare of the Raigne of our Sovereigne Lord Charles the second by the Grace of God of England Scotland France and Ireland King Defender of the faith &amp;c Between James Larsson of the Island of St Helena free planter of the one part and Thomas Davis of the said Island free planter of the other part Witnesseth that the said James Larsson for and in Consideration of the sume of Eight pounds money or value to him in hand paid or secured to be paid by the said Thomas Davis at or before the Ensealing and Delivery hereof the receipt whereof he doth hereby acknowledge and himselfe to be therewith fully satisfied and for divers other good causes and considerations him thereunto moving hath given granted aliened bargained and sold and by these presents doth grant alien bargaine and sell unto the said Thomas</p>	<p>satisfied. The transfer was made for that payment and for other stated considerations.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repeated confirmation and ratification of the transfer showed the importance of reinforcing legal certainty. Formal restatement of ownership reduced the risk of later challenge.</p> <p>The guarantee against interference again reflected the expectation that sellers must protect buyers from claims. Such clauses formed a standard safeguard in property transactions.</p> <p>The acceptance of payment either made or secured showed flexibility in financial arrangements. Land could be transferred even where payment was guaranteed rather than immediately completed.</p> <p>The continuation of detailed written agreements indicated a structured legal framework for property exchange. These instruments ensured that rights could be enforced and recognised.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The need to reaffirm and ratify the transfer suggests that ownership might otherwise have been questioned. Repetition of guarantees may have been intended to strengthen Gurling's position against possible disputes.</p> <p>The allowance for payment to be secured rather than fully paid may indicate limited availability of ready money. Agreements may have accommodated delayed or staged payment to complete transactions.</p>
154	148	<p>Thomas Davis all that piece or parcell of Land Contayning by Estimation Tenn Acres be the same more or Lesse scituate being at Lemon Valley head Butting and bounding on the one side of Thomas Allisons land Joyning to Richard Gurlings Land as by the Register booke of this Island doth and may more fully and at large appeare being part of formerly Land of the said Larsons Ten[...] which is now being five Acres in length and in breadth three Rodds in breadth the Moiety whereof Joyning to the said Richard Gurling to be measured with the said Thomas Davis Triangular wise together with all and singular the appurtenances thereunto belonging or in any wise appertaining To have &amp; to hold the said piece or parcell of Land with the appurtenances from the Day of the Date hereof unto the Thomas Davis his heires and assignes for ever And the said</p>	<p>The indenture of 20 December 1681 continued by conveying to Thomas Davis a parcel of land estimated at ten acres, situated at the head of Lemon Valley. The land bordered Thomas Allison's land on one side and joined land held by Richard Gurling. Its boundaries and extent were recorded in the island's register book.</p> <p>The land formed part of a larger holding formerly belonging to James Larson. It measured about five acres in length and three rods in breadth. A portion of it, adjoining Richard Gurling's land, was to be measured in a triangular form together with Thomas Davis.</p> <p>Full possession of the land, together with all associated rights, was granted to Thomas Davis and his heirs forever. James Larson bound himself and his successors to guarantee that Davis and his heirs would hold and enjoy the land without any lawful claim, dispute or interference from him or from any person claiming through him.</p> <p>The document was signed and sealed in the presence of Isabell[...] Ing, Robert Tomps, Isaac Hayle, Lawrence Larson and [...].</p> <p>A memorandum was then added stating that Richard Gurling had received copies of all the recorded documents, as well as the original writings. This was confirmed by his mark and attested by John Alexander on 15 [...] November 1698.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>James Larson for himselfe his Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assignes doth Covenant promise and Grant to and with the said Thomas Davis by these presents that he the said Thomas Davis his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] shall have hold occupie possesse and Enjoy the said hereby bargained premisses without any the lawfull Let suite Trouble Molestation or Eviction of the said James Larson his Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assignes or of any other or persons whatsoever lawfully claiming or to claime any thing in the premisses by from or under him or any of them any thing to the Contrary hereof in any wise Notwithstanding In Witness whereof the said parties hereunto have Interchangeably sett their hands and Seales the Day and yeare first above written Sealed &amp; Delivd in the presence of us Isabell[...] Ing Robert Tomps Isaac Hayle Lawrence Larson C[...]</p> <p>Tho: Goodwin Memor[...]</p> <p>That I Richard Gurling have received Coppies of the aforesaid writings, also the originals Witness my hand this 15th Day of [...] November 1698</p> <p>p me J Alexander Richard Gurling</p>	<p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The detailed description of measurements, including rods and triangular division, showed that land could be subdivided with precision. Irregular shapes were formally recognised and recorded.</p> <p>The reference to the register book again demonstrated reliance on central records to confirm boundaries. Written documentation supported physical identification of land.</p> <p>The guarantee against claims reinforced the expectation that sellers must secure the buyer's title. Such assurances were repeated across transactions to prevent disputes.</p> <p>The memorandum confirming receipt of copies and originals showed administrative control over documentation. Possession of both forms strengthened legal security for the owner.</p> <p>The involvement of John Alexander as clerk indicated the role of officials in certifying transactions. Their attestation gave authority to the record.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The need to define part of the land in a triangular form suggests that boundaries may have been irregular or contested. Formal measurement may have been required to prevent later disagreement.</p> <p>The recording that Gurling held both copies and originals suggests concern over document loss or damage. This may reflect earlier problems, such as water damage, that prompted careful preservation.</p>
155	149	<p>Island St Helena</p> <p>You Thomas Dixon and Wm Doveton are appointed Overseers of high wayes for this present yeare 1698 which Office you are hereby Required Carefully and Diligently to Execute, which that you may the better and more Impartially performe here- unto is a List annexed of the names of all the white men Inhabitants, together with all men servants in the respective Divisions and of Negroes and Slaves, men servants hath excepting the said R of the said Comp[...].</p> <p>These are therefore to will and require you Thomas Dixon and William Doveton to cause all persons both whites and Blacks to worke one day and no more, in the mending making and repairing of such high wayes as seemeth best in your Judgments to be necessary and Convenient, so as all and every the white Inhabitants and Male Slaves do worke at the Highwayes this present yeare one day and no more as aforesaid.</p> <p>Also if any person or persons after due warning shall absent him selfe, and shall not come or send his Slave or Slaves by the dayes and times by you appointed, Then and there to have to labour</p>	<p>An order was issued on 9 July 1698 at St Helena appointing Thomas Dixon and William Doveton as overseers of the highways for that year.</p> <p>They were instructed to carry out their duties carefully and impartially. A list was provided of all white male inhabitants, male servants, and male slaves within their divisions, excluding those belonging to the Company.</p> <p>They were required to organise the repair and maintenance of the highways. Every white inhabitant and every male slave was to work for one day only during the year on these tasks, at times and places determined by the overseers.</p> <p>If any person failed to attend after proper notice, or did not send a substitute slave, the overseers were authorised to appoint another person in their place. The overseers were required to pay that substitute according to fixed rates, set at 18 for a white man's day's work and 12 for a black man's day's work.</p> <p>Any person who failed to attend or provide labour was required to repay the overseers for these costs. The overseers were given authority to seize goods from defaulters to recover the expenses, and to retain those goods until repayment was made, allowing for reasonable charges.</p> <p>This order was issued under the authority of Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The requirement that all white inhabitants and male slaves contribute labour showed the use of compulsory service for public works. Maintenance of infrastructure was organised through enforced participation rather than paid labour alone.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>you are to cause in some other Man or men, Master or Slaves in the absent persons Roome to worke one day as aforesaid, which person so put in you are to pay according to the Rates become of Orders  viz 18 for a white man dayes worke and 12 for a black mans dayes worke  And such person or persons so absenting or refusing or not sending as aforesaid are forthwith to repay you  such disbursements so done, you are hereby impowered to seize or distresse any Goods from such person or persons, and keep the same and a publique bill of Delivery the Goods seized  (if any) to the Owners after you are allowed and Reasonable Charges Deducted.  For all which this shall be your sufficient Warrant Given under our hand this 9th day of July 1698  To Tho: Dixon  Wm Doveton Survey.  Teste  St: Poirier  Tho: Goodwin</p>	<p>The distinction in payment rates between white and black labour revealed a structured hierarchy in valuation of work. This reflected broader social and economic inequalities within the system.</p> <p>The authority to seize goods demonstrated a coercive enforcement mechanism. Overseers were given direct power to compel compliance and recover costs without requiring further legal process.</p> <p>The use of lists of inhabitants and slaves indicated systematic record-keeping for labour obligations. Administrative control extended to tracking individuals and assigning duties.</p> <p>The limitation to one day's labour per year showed an attempt to regulate burden. Obligations were standardised to ensure fairness while still meeting communal needs.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The structured system of compulsory labour suggests that maintaining roads was considered essential but could not be supported by voluntary effort alone. Enforced participation ensured that necessary work was completed.</p> <p>The power granted to overseers to seize goods indicates concern about non-compliance. Strong enforcement measures may have been needed to ensure that individuals fulfilled their obligations.</p>
156	150	<p>A List of Persons both whites and Blacks that are to worke at the Repair of the high wayes one day this present yeare 1698  Whites Blacks  M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin . . . . . 3  George H[.]son . . . . . 2  Edward Edmunds . . . . . 3  J: Alexander . . . . . 1  Andw: Sheires . . . . . 1  John Feild . . . . . 2  Edw: Burling . . . . . 2  Rob<sup>t</sup> Addis . . . . . 1  Tho: Gurling . . . . . 1  Mathew Bazett . . . . . 1  James Hardy . . . . . 1  Sam: Macdall . . . . . 1  Henry Pa[.] . . . . . 3  John Pa[.] . . . . . 1  James De[.]jaine . . . . . 2  John H[.]jon . . . . . 1  John Mudge . . . . . 1  Geo: Shaw . . . . . 1  Chris: Stewart . . . . . 2  Benj: Beal . . . . . 1  Rich: Wills . . . . . 1  Thomas Allis . . . . . 1 . 1  Rich<sup>d</sup> Alexander . . . . . 1 . 1  John Bowman . . . . . 1 . 2  Widdow Bowman . . . . . 1  Tho: Dov[.]t Serv<sup>t</sup> . . 2 . 1  Tho: Burnham Serv<sup>t</sup> . . 2 . .  Edward Brayne Serv<sup>t</sup> . . 2 . .  Orlando Bagley Serv<sup>t</sup> . . 1 . .  John Bayes . . . . . 1 . .  Mr Alexander Beale . . . . 3  Jonas Beale . . . . . 1 . 2  Wm: Bevin . . . . . 1 . 0  John Bagley . . . . . 1 . 0  Widd Bagley . . . . . 1 . 0  Mr George Erne . . . . . 1 . 2  Widd Gregories son Gibl<sup>t</sup> . . 1 . 1  Grace Pac[.]'s son John . . 1 . 3  Edward Grobey . . . . . 1  Brought Over . . . . . 19</p>	<p>A list was recorded of all persons, both white inhabitants and slaves, required to work one day in the repair of the highways during the year 1698.</p> <p>The following were named, with the number of white labourers and slaves attributed to each:  Mr Thomas Goodwin: 3 slaves  George H[.]son: 2 slaves  Edward Edmunds: 3 slaves  John Alexander: 1 slave  Andrew Sheires: 1 slave  John Field: 2 slaves  Edward Burling: 2 slaves  Robert Addis: 1 slave  Thomas Gurling: 1 slave  Matthew Bazett: 1 slave  James Hardy: 1 slave  Samuel Macdall: 1 slave  Henry Pa[.]: 3 slaves  John Pa[.]: 1 slave  James De[.]jaine: 2 slaves  John H[.]jon: 1 slave  John Mudge: 1 slave  George Shaw: 1 slave  Christopher Stewart: 2 slaves  Benjamin Beal: 1 slave  Richard Wills: 1 slave  Thomas Allis: 1 white, 1 slave  Richard Alexander: 1 white, 1 slave  John Bowman: 1 white, 2 slaves  Widow Bowman: 1 white  Thomas Dov[.]t servant: 2 whites, 1 slave  Thomas Burnham servant: 2 whites  Edward Brayne servant: 2 whites  Orlando Bagley servant: 1 white  John Bayes: 1 white  Mr Alexander Beale: 3 slaves  Jonas Beale: 1 white, 2 slaves  William Bevin: 1 white, 0 slaves  John Bagley: 1 white, 0 slaves  Widow Bagley: 1 white, 0 slaves  Mr George Erne: 1 white, 2 slaves  Widow Gregory's son Gilbert: 1 white, 1 slave  Grace Pac[.]'s son John: 1 white, 3 slaves  Edward Grobey: 1 white  Brought forward: 19  Jasper Draper: 1 white, 1 slave  Thomas Pa[.]y: 1 white, 1 slave</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Jasper Draper . . . . . 1 . 1  Tho: Pa[...y] . . . . . 1 . 1  Henry Francis . . . . . 1 . 0  John Fuller . . . . . 1 . 1  John Haux[...]. . . . . 1 . 2  Tho: Fu[...]ale . . . . . 1 . 0  Richard Gurling . . . . . 1 .  John Goodwin . . . . . 1 . 2  John Greenh[...]. . . . . 1 . 1  James Greentree . . . . . 1 . 0  Richard Griffith . . . . . 1 . 0  Wm: Hayse senr . . . . . 1 . 1  Richard Harding . . . . . 1 . 0  Leonard H[...]. . . . . 1 . 0  Sutton Isaac . . . . . 1 . 0  Madm Johnson . . . . . 3  Mary Jewster . . . . . 1  Margaret Hayles . . . . . 1  Richard Leach his son . . 2 . 3  Mary Leach widd . . . . . 1  John King . . . . . 1 . 1  John Leach his wife son . . 2 . 4  Ye of Gurling (Robens child) . . .  Levi Morris . . . . . 1 . 3  Wm Marsh &amp; his son John . . 2 . 2  John Nicholl . . . . . 1 . 0  John Orchard . . . . . 1 . 0  James Pyke . . . . . 1 . 2  Tho: Warlow . . . . . 1 . 2  Mary Smith . . . . . 1  John Sick his wife son . . 2 . 3  Sarah S[...]ges . . . . . 1  Lamb Gayer . . . . . 1 . 2  Sam: Stringham . . . . . 1 . 3  50 : 92  To the above List is a True Copy of the yearly  accmpts for  the yeare 1697 taken from me  J Alexander</p>	<p>Henry Francis: 1 white, 0 slaves  John Fuller: 1 white, 1 slave  John Haux[...]: 1 white, 2 slaves  Thomas Fu[...]ale: 1 white, 0 slaves  Richard Gurling: 1 white  John Goodwin: 1 white, 2 slaves  John Greenh[...]: 1 white, 1 slave  James Greentree: 1 white, 0 slaves  Richard Griffith: 1 white, 0 slaves  William Hayes senior: 1 white, 1 slave  Richard Harding: 1 white, 0 slaves  Leonard H[...]: 1 white, 0 slaves  Sutton Isaac: 1 white, 0 slaves  Madam Johnson: 3 slaves  Mary Jewster: 1 slave  Margaret Hayles: 1 slave  Richard Leach's son: 2 whites, 3 slaves  Mary Leach, widow: 1 white  John King: 1 white, 1 slave  John Leach, his wife and son: 2 whites, 4 slaves  [...] of Gurling (Robens child): [...]  Levi Morris: 1 white, 3 slaves  William Marsh and his son John: 2 whites, 2 slaves  John Nicholl: 1 white, 0 slaves  John Orchard: 1 white, 0 slaves  James Pyke: 1 white, 2 slaves  Thomas Warlow: 1 white, 2 slaves  Mary Smith: 1 slave  John Sick, his wife and son: 2 whites, 3 slaves  Sarah S[...]ges: 1 slave  Lamb Gayer: 1 white, 2 slaves  Samuel Stringham: 1 white, 3 slaves  The total recorded was 50 white labourers and 92 slaves.  It was noted that this list was a true copy of the yearly account for 1697, as taken and certified by John Alexander.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The list showed a structured allocation of labour obligations across the population. Each household or individual was responsible for providing a specific number of workers.</p> <p>The separation between white labourers and slaves demonstrated a dual labour system. Both groups were required to contribute, but they were counted and managed distinctly.</p> <p>The inclusion of widows and households indicated that obligations were tied to property or household status rather than only to individual adult males. Responsibility extended across family units.</p> <p>The recording of exact numbers for each person reflected detailed administrative oversight. Labour capacity was measured and documented systematically.</p> <p>The final totals showed the scale of available labour for public works. The use of both white and slave labour ensured sufficient workforce for maintaining infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The detailed enumeration suggests that labour shortages or uneven participation may have been a concern. Recording contributions precisely may have been intended to ensure fairness and prevent avoidance.</p> <p>The reliance on slaves to provide a large proportion of the labour indicates that the system depended heavily on coerced work. This may have reduced the burden on white inhabitants while maintaining necessary public works.</p>
157	151	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Monday  the 20<sup>th</sup> of August 1698 Att Fort James  Prs<sup>t</sup>: Step: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>  Tho: Goodwin, assistant  Henry Cales made his Complaint That on  the 11<sup>th</sup> of August last past he had some Arrack Stolen</p>	<p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 20 August 1698. Stephen Poirier served as governor, with Thomas Goodwin present as assistant.</p> <p>A complaint was brought by Henry Cales. He stated that on the night of 11 August 1698, a quantity of arrack was stolen from his house by his own slaves. A</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>out of his house at night by his owne Blacks, who broke open a Chest came at the said Arrack with Anthony &amp; Benjamine  the said Cales names that stole the Arrack  Sommy one of the said Henry Cales his Blacks saith that on Sunday  being the 21<sup>th</sup> Instant, a parcell of Blacks himselfe  Sommy  Benjamin Peels Black Laurence Tho: Allins Black Jacob James Grady Blacks &amp; Blackwells Danamore Cookes Blacks  were all Drinking together att a place called the Levell wood  (which is not far from the said Cales house) And after they  had Dranke pretty well they began to Quarrell, but William  Cales going to the place where he is going to meet them in his way  Just as they were going to fight, he hindred them of their  designe; however after he was gone they yet began to Quarrell  and did fight and wrastell, and the said Samy Smelling as he  thought the Arrack that was drunke there was his masters Arrack  so he was resolved to finde it out, and when the Arrack that  was there were all drunk up, he urged Anthony to finde another  Bottle of Arrack who had brought one a little before, so he  went and fetcht another Bottle of Arrack and the said Samy  mind not where he went, and by his Track found the remainder  of the Arrack in the aforesaid Blacks store, and that which was  one Bottle of a Pinte, Who presently acquainted his master thereof  It is ordered  That all the above Blacks be Immediately whipt at the Garrison  (Sammy Excepted) he Confessing ingenuously without being forced, which  as he knows, we are awarding, because the first procurer of a bottle  and of meeting together against order of the said Island and to pay  the Charges</p>	<p>chest was broken open, and the arrack was taken. He named Anthony and Benjamin as those responsible.  Evidence was given by Sommy, one of Henry Cales's slaves. He stated that on Sunday 21 August 1698, a group of slaves gathered at a place called Level Wood, not far from Cales's house. Those present included Sommy himself, Laurence, who belonged to Benjamin Peel, Jacob, who belonged to Thomas Allin, slaves belonging to James Grady, and slaves belonging to Blackwell and Danamore Cooke. They drank together.  After drinking heavily, a quarrel began. William Cales came upon them as they were about to fight and stopped them. After he left, the quarrel resumed, and they fought and wrestled.  Sommy suspected that the arrack being consumed belonged to his master. After all the drink had been finished, he pressed Anthony to produce more. Anthony went away and returned with another bottle. Sommy did not see where he went, but later followed his tracks and found the remaining arrack stored among the slaves' belongings. The quantity found was one bottle of a pint. He then informed his master.  An order was issued that all the slaves involved were to be whipped at the garrison, except Sommy. His exemption was granted because he gave his account freely without coercion. The others were also required to pay the associated charges.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The term "arrack" referred to a strong distilled spirit that circulated as a valuable commodity. Its theft showed both its economic value and its role in informal social gatherings among slaves.  The breaking open of a chest indicated forced entry into secured private property. This act treated the offence as both theft and a breach of household order, which justified formal punishment.  The gathering at Level Wood "against order of the said Island" showed that assemblies of slaves were regulated. Such meetings were treated as a threat to control, especially when combined with drinking and fighting.  The punishment of whipping at the garrison demonstrated centralised enforcement. Discipline was carried out in a public military space, which reinforced authority and deterrence.  Sommy's exemption revealed the use of incentives within the slave system. Cooperation with authorities was rewarded, which encouraged surveillance and reporting among slaves themselves.  The requirement to pay charges imposed a financial penalty alongside physical punishment. This combined economic and bodily sanctions to enforce discipline and recover costs incurred by the authorities.</p>
158	152	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 30<sup>th</sup> Day of August 1698 att Fort James  Prs<sup>t</sup>: Stephen Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>  Thomas Goodwin Assistant  Whereas Complaint having bin made to the Governo<sup>r</sup> and Council, that there are Severalls persons on this Island,  who doth take the Liberty of going a Hunting and Shooting  of Wild Goats, which is against former Orders, and publique  Notice given by Proclamation for the same bearing date and under that pretence have many times killed Tame Goats, altho such persons never had any  of their owne; Mr John Orchard Lineman was particularly Complained of by Mr John Fawkner who hath lost Severall Goats out of his stock, saying that he did on Fryday the 26<sup>th</sup> Instant last past, see the said</p>	<p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 30 August 1698. Stephen Poirier served as governor, with Thomas Goodwin present as assistant.  A complaint had been brought to the governor and council that several people on the island had taken it upon themselves to hunt and shoot wild goats. This activity had already been forbidden by earlier orders and publicly announced by proclamation. Under the excuse of hunting wild goats, these individuals had often killed tame goats, even though they owned none themselves.  A specific accusation was made against John Orchard, a lineman, by John Fawkner. Fawkner reported that he had lost several goats from his stock. He stated that on Friday 26 August 1698, he saw Orchard returning home carrying a dead goat on his back, with a gun and dogs.  John Orchard was called in for examination. He stated that on that day he went hunting with John Cales, who claimed to be searching for his own goats that had gone wild. Together they killed four goats.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Orchard with a dead Goate on his back going home, and a Gun, &amp; Dogs with him; Upon which Complaint the said John Orchard was sent for in order to his Examination; Who saith that on the day aforesaid he went a Hunting with John Cales who told after some of his said Cales Goats that was wild, and they killed four, John Cales being Examined saith that as he was going after some of his Goates, there met him Mr J said Orchard in his way, and asked him where he was going who told him after the Wild Goats, the said Cales answered him he had none, Neither had he any business after any but afterward said he might goe along with him if he would, to help him kill some of the, who accordingly and between them killed 4 goats, of which two was marked and two was not, but alledge them unmarked were some of his that were marked Wherefore.</p>	<p>John Cales was then examined. He stated that while he was going to look for his goats, Orchard met him on the way and asked where he was going. Cales replied that he was looking for wild goats and said he had none of his own, nor any reason to pursue them. He later allowed Orchard to accompany him to help kill some goats. Together they killed four goats. Two of these were marked, and two were unmarked. Cales claimed that the unmarked goats were originally his but had lost their marks.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The prohibition on hunting wild goats, reinforced by proclamation, showed that the council regulated access to shared natural resources. This control aimed to prevent cover for theft of privately owned livestock. Marked goats functioned as proof of ownership. The presence or absence of a mark determined whether an animal could be claimed as private property or treated as unowned. Disputes over marks exposed the limits of this system when identification became unclear.</p> <p>The role of proclamation indicated formal public communication of law. Orders were not only issued but also broadcast to ensure that violations could not be excused by ignorance.</p> <p>The examination of both Orchard and Cales showed a procedural approach to evidence. Testimony was taken separately to test consistency and assign responsibility.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The claim that unmarked goats had once been marked perhaps served as a defence to convert doubtful animals into private property. This explanation addressed the problem of being found with goats that could not be clearly identified as wild or owned.</p> <p>The rule against hunting wild goats was probably enforced because it created an easy pretext for theft. By restricting hunting altogether, the council reduced opportunities for individuals to disguise the killing of tame animals as legitimate activity.</p>
159	153	<p>Wherefore It is ordered. That the said John Cales be dismiss with only a Rebu[...] and the said John Orchard to be fined five Shillings to y<sup>e</sup> Church for this his offence, being that he hath not, nor never had any of his Goates of his owne, with Admonition for the future not to goe a Hunting or Shooting on any pretence whatsoever, without first had from y<sup>e</sup> Gov<sup>or</sup>, and pay the Charges [...]</p> <p>Island St Helena</p> <p>Att a consultation Held on Tuesday the 13<sup>th</sup> day of September 1698 att Fort James</p> <p>Prs<sup>t</sup>: Stephen Poirier Gov<sup>t</sup> Thomas Goodwin assistant</p> <p>Whereas on Sunday last being the 11<sup>th</sup> of this Instant: There was a vacced of Blacks consisting of M<sup>r</sup> Johnsons Two, Mr Morris's one of M<sup>r</sup> Lufkin and one of the Honble Comp<sup>as</sup> were all drinking of Liquor at the house of the said Morris; which M<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin having bin made acquainted w<sup>th</sup> sent them all downe to the Fort, who this day have bin Examined. The said Morris Blackes saith That their master gave each of them a Quart of arrack about a week ago, w<sup>ch</sup> they dranke on Sunday last with one Mr Johnsons Black abt four a Clock afternoon, and after that they had drun- en eight of the said arrack in the house (which was hid</p>	<p>An order was issued following the previous examination. John Cales was dismissed with only a reprimand. John Orchard was fined 5 shillings, recorded as £0 5s 0d, to be paid to the church for his offence. This penalty was imposed because he had never owned any goats. He was warned not to hunt or shoot under any pretext without first obtaining permission from the governor. He was also required to pay the associated charges.</p> <p>A council meeting was then held at Fort James on 13 September 1698. Stephen Poirier served as governor, with Thomas Goodwin present as assistant.</p> <p>A report was made concerning an incident on Sunday 11 September 1698. A group of slaves had gathered and drunk alcohol at the house of Morris. The group included two slaves belonging to Mr Johnson, one belonging to Mr Morris, one belonging to Mr Lufkin, and one belonging to the Honourable Company.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin was informed of this gathering and ordered all those involved to be brought down to the fort. They were examined that day.</p> <p>The slaves belonging to Morris stated that their master had given each of them one quart of arrack about a week earlier. They kept it and drank it together on Sunday with one of Mr Johnson's slaves at about four in the afternoon. They stated that they consumed eight quarts of arrack in total inside the house, where it had been hidden in the plantation. The account ended before the full statement was completed.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The fine paid to the church showed that penalties could serve both moral and institutional purposes.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>out in the Plantation) the said Morris's Blacks master [...]</p>	<p>Funds were directed to the church, linking discipline with religious authority and community order.</p> <p>The requirement to obtain the governor's permission before hunting confirmed that access to weapons and game was tightly controlled. This regulation limited both resource use and the risk of disorder.</p> <p>The gathering of slaves from different owners showed that social interaction across households occurred despite restrictions. Such meetings were treated as breaches of control, especially when alcohol was involved.</p> <p>The transport of the slaves to the fort for examination showed that the garrison functioned as the centre of enforcement. Authority was exercised through immediate detention and questioning.</p> <p>The distribution of arrack by a master revealed that alcohol could be provided within controlled settings. However, its later collective consumption outside supervision became an offence, indicating a distinction between permitted provision and prohibited use.</p>
160	154	<p>Tooke the bottle of arrack that he gave one of his Black[s] as they said, and drank a dram, and gave the rest to them againe, which they dranke up with y<sup>e</sup> aforesaid Mad<sup>m</sup> Johnsons Black[s] James Washope examined saith that on Sunday last, he being going by the said Morris's house, saw one of the said Morris's Blacks take a bottle from a man's weed, but cannot tell whether there was any arrack in it or not Mad<sup>m</sup> Johnsons Blacks saith that they had no arrack but they came to the said Morris's house expecting to get some there, and when they came to the house could not get any, but dranke some arrack with the said Morris Blacks, and after they had stayed there a little time, they went homewards againe and in their way met Bellamay the Hon<sup>ble</sup> Comp<sup>na</sup> negro, who went home with them Bellamay the said Comp<sup>na</sup> Black saith that he went to Madam Johnsons house to be asked to her son to go a fishing with them, who said desired to acquaint when, Cooks and Boats going a fishing, and he went to James Ryders and Jonathan Coales for some Rice w<sup>ch</sup> they had before promised for the looking after their boat which is moored at y<sup>e</sup> fort by Comp<sup>na</sup> boats, which the said Ryder &amp; Coales being accidentally at y<sup>e</sup> fort was examined, whether they had what Bellamay saith, who hath said it was It is ordered That all the above said Blacks be immediately Whipt on their naked backs at y<sup>e</sup> flagg staffe, both for breaking the Sabbath day, and assembling up and downe the Country from house to house Also That M<sup>r</sup> Thomas Goodwin, when he doth goe up in the Country, shall call at y<sup>e</sup> said Morris's house, he being incapable of coming downe to y<sup>e</sup> fort, to inquire of the truth of what his Blacks hath said Eliza the said Morris wife being examined about what their Blacks hath said, saith that she doth know but of one quart of arrack that her husband gave y<sup>e</sup> Blacks, and doth confess that y<sup>e</sup> greatest part of y<sup>e</sup> said arrack was dranke in their presence,</p>	<p>Further evidence was taken.</p> <p>The slaves of Morris stated that their master had taken back the bottle of arrack he had given to one of them, drank a small measure, and then returned the rest to them. They then drank it with the slaves belonging to Madam Johnson.</p> <p>James Washope was examined. He stated that on Sunday 11 September 1698, as he passed Morris's house, he saw one of Morris's slaves take a bottle from a patch of weeds. He could not say whether it contained arrack.</p> <p>The slaves of Madam Johnson stated that they had no arrack of their own. They went to Morris's house expecting to obtain some. When they arrived, none was given to them at first, but they later drank arrack with Morris's slaves. After staying a short time, they set off home. On their way, they met Bellamay, a slave belonging to the Honourable Company, who joined them.</p> <p>Bellamay stated that he had gone to Madam Johnson's house to invite her son to go fishing. The son asked to be told when Cooke's and Boatswain's parties would go fishing. Bellamay then went to James Ryder and Jonathan Coales to collect rice that they had promised him in return for watching their boat, which lay moored at the fort among the Company's boats. Ryder and Coales were present at the fort and were examined. They confirmed that Bellamay's statement was true.</p> <p>An order was issued that all the slaves involved were to be whipped on their bare backs at the flagstaff. The punishment was imposed both for breaking the Sabbath and for moving about the countryside from house to house in groups.</p> <p>A further order directed that Thomas Goodwin, when he next travelled into the countryside, was to call at Morris's house, as Morris was unable to come down to the fort. He was to investigate the truth of the statements given by Morris's slaves.</p> <p>Eliza, the wife of Morris, was examined. She stated that she knew of only one quart of arrack given by her husband to the slaves. She admitted that most of that arrack was drunk in their presence.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The reference to breaking the Sabbath showed that religious observance formed part of the legal framework. Behaviour on Sundays was regulated, and breaches carried formal punishment.</p> <p>Whipping at the flagstaff placed punishment in a visible and symbolic location. This setting reinforced authority through public display and deterrence.</p> <p>The movement of slaves between households without permission was treated as a serious offence.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>Control over mobility formed a central part of labour discipline and social order on the island.</p> <p>Bellamay's task of watching a boat in return for rice showed informal labour arrangements among slaves and free individuals. Such exchanges operated alongside formal systems and were acknowledged when verified.</p> <p>The examination of multiple witnesses, including Ryder and Coales, showed that testimony could be corroborated across different individuals. This process strengthened the authority of decisions by grounding them in confirmed statements.</p> <p>The instruction for Thomas Goodwin to investigate Morris's household showed administrative follow-up beyond the fort. Authority extended into private residences, especially when the master could not attend in person.</p>
161	155	<p>[...]</p> <p>M<sup>r</sup> George Carne hath Desired of us the Gov<sup>t</sup> &amp; Council a Warrant for the Collection of pole money of every Inhabitant that possesseth any payable Negroes at the time that our Late Deceased Govern<sup>r</sup> Pellings Negro was Executed, who was found Guilty of Sorcery at a Court of Justice held the Second day of January 169[3] by a Jury of 12 men, which upon Mature Consideration Taken of this matt<sup>e</sup> Considering that 'tis accustomed in such cases, that if any Negro be Executed, all the Inhabitants that have any payable Negroes are to Disburse so much as will make full Satisfaction for any such Negro which we have Granted, and is hereby now Mentioned; Wherefore it is ordered That a warrant be Issued to the said m<sup>r</sup> Carne accordingly Whereas Information was given to the Governour that John Fuller free planter hath been Lately found Drunke, at his owne house on the Sabbath Day Evening his Black was seen to digg yams on the aforesaid day, who was summoned before us, and Examined this day, to whom being Demanded whether those reports were true, and he said all were Committed both by himselfe and his Black, who Confessed ye whole truth, with promise never to commit the like offence any more, Whereupon being no[e] des to heare any further [...] Evidence; It is ordered, That the said John fuller for this once be fined Six Shillings towards the Rebuilding of the Church, Admonition for the future Not to fall in such like unchristian ways, under paine of Severe punishment.</p>	<p>A request was made by George Carne to the governor and council for a warrant to collect poll money from every inhabitant who owned taxable slaves at the time when a slave belonging to the late Governor Pelling was executed. That slave had been found guilty of sorcery at a court of justice held on 2 January 1694, following a trial by a jury of twelve men.</p> <p>The council considered the matter and noted that it was customary in such cases for all inhabitants who owned taxable slaves to contribute funds. This payment was intended to compensate for the loss when a slave was executed. The request was approved.</p> <p>An order was issued that a warrant be granted to George Carne to collect this poll money accordingly.</p> <p>A separate report was then considered. Information had been given that John Fuller, a free planter, had recently been found drunk at his own house on the evening of a Sunday. His slave had also been seen digging yams on that same day. Fuller was summoned and examined. When questioned, he admitted that both actions had taken place, committed by himself and his slave. He confessed fully and promised not to offend in this way again. No further evidence was presented.</p> <p>An order was issued that John Fuller be fined 6 shillings, recorded as £0 6s 0d, to be paid towards the rebuilding of the church. He was warned not to repeat such behaviour, which was described as unchristian, under threat of severe punishment if it occurred again.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The collection of poll money from slave owners showed a shared financial system that spread the economic loss of executing a slave across the community. This mechanism treated slaves as valuable property and ensured that individual owners did not bear the full cost of judicial punishment.</p> <p>The reference to "payable Negroes" indicated slaves who were counted for taxation or levies. This classification revealed an administrative system that assessed human property as part of the island's fiscal structure.</p> <p>The trial of Governor Pelling's slave by a jury of twelve men demonstrated the formal legal process applied even in cases involving slaves. The charge of sorcery showed that certain offences combined legal and moral judgement.</p> <p>The fine imposed on John Fuller and directed to the rebuilding of the church linked moral discipline with institutional funding. Penalties reinforced religious observance while also supporting public infrastructure.</p> <p>The punishment for working and drinking on the Sabbath showed that religious rules were enforced through civil authority. Both the actions of Fuller and his slave were treated as offences within the same framework of control.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The requirement for all slave owners to contribute after an execution perhaps served to maintain stability within the slave-owning community. By sharing the</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>financial loss, the system reduced resistance to enforcing capital punishment on slaves, even when it destroyed valuable property.</p> <p>The decision to fine Fuller rather than impose harsher punishment was probably influenced by his confession and promise to reform. This response allowed the council to enforce Sabbath discipline while avoiding escalation in a case where compliance was quickly secured.</p>
162	156	<p>Island St Helena  Wher[e]as James one of the Late Dece[a]s[e]d Govern[o]r Richard Keeling[s] Negro[e] was formerly found Guilty of Sorcery etc by a Verdict of a Jury of Twelve men and was accordingly Condemned to be burnt alive at a Stake Sentanced at a Court of Justice held the Second Day of January 169[3] which Sentence because he was according Law put in Execution although the said Geo<sup>r</sup> Keeling while he lived, who departed this life the 30<sup>th</sup> day of November last past Did never make any motion or Demand towards the Satisfaction or and Reimbursement for the loss thereof which he might have done according to the Constitutions and Government of this Place; However M<sup>r</sup> George Carne who married last the said Govern[o]r Keelings Lady hath Desired of us the Govern[o]r and Councill a Warrant that he might recover the Vallue of the said Negroe, and after Consideration of this Matter, wee have thought fitt that four Shillings and Two pence be for all payable Negroes the Inhabitants of this Island at the aforesaid time Did possess will but Just make Satisfaction for the aforesaid Negroe Warrant for the Collecting money for the Black[e] murdered by witchcraft Wherefore in order that Satisfaction be made accordingly, Wee doe hereby in his Majesties Name Charge and Command you whose names are hereunto Subscribed to pay and Satisfie the said M<sup>r</sup> George Carne the Respective Summe of money as is placed against yo<sup>r</sup> Respective Names being as afore said four Shillings and Two pence p pole for Every payable Negroe you Did then possess at the time aforesaid Also this war-rant Doth hereby Impower you M<sup>r</sup> George Carne to make Collection according[y] for the full Satisfaction for the loss of the said Govern[o]r Keelings Negroe, and to Sue and arrest those persons whome shall refuse and Deny payment before the Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councill, in order that they might be heard on their Defences Given under our hands and Seale this 13 day of Sept<sup>er</sup> 1698  Steph<sup>er</sup> Poirier  Tho: Goodwin</p>	<p>A formal order was issued on St Helena concerning compensation for the execution of a slave.</p> <p>James, a slave belonging to the late Governor Richard Keeling, had earlier been found guilty of sorcery by a jury of twelve men. He had been sentenced at a court of justice held on 2 January 1694 and was burned alive at the stake in accordance with that sentence.</p> <p>Governor Keeling, who died on 30 November 1697, did not seek compensation during his lifetime, although he had the right to do so under the laws and government of the island. After his death, George Carne, who married his widow, requested a warrant from the governor and council to recover the value of the executed slave.</p> <p>The council considered the matter and decided that a levy of 4 shillings and 2 pence, recorded as £0 4s 2d, should be charged for each taxable slave owned by inhabitants at the time of the execution in 1694. This rate was judged sufficient to provide full compensation for the loss.</p> <p>An order was issued in the name of the Crown requiring all named inhabitants to pay George Carne the sums assigned to them, calculated at £0 4s 2d per taxable slave they owned at that time. George Carne was authorised to collect these payments and to bring legal action, including arrest, against anyone who refused to pay. Such individuals were to be brought before the governor and council to answer for their refusal.</p> <p>The warrant was issued under the hands and seal of Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin on 13 September 1698.</p> <p>A list was then recorded of taxable slaves for the year 1694, with the corresponding sums due:</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Andrew Phillips held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Robert Adis held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Some Over held 4 slaves and owed £0 16s 8d.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The execution of a slave for sorcery showed that criminal law extended fully to slaves, with capital punishment applied through formal judicial process. The method of execution by burning reflected the perceived severity of the offence.</p> <p>The system of compensation distributed the financial loss of executing a slave across all slave owners. This arrangement treated slaves as taxable property and ensured that enforcing the law did not impose a disproportionate burden on a single owner.</p> <p>The delay between the execution in 1694 and the compensation order in 1698 showed that claims could be made retrospectively, especially when rights passed through marriage. George Carne's claim depended on his marriage to Keeling's widow, which transferred the financial interest.</p> <p>The authority granted to George Carne to sue and arrest defaulters demonstrated that private individuals could be empowered to enforce public financial orders. Enforcement combined personal initiative with official backing from the governor and council.</p> <p>The list of "payable Negroes" revealed a structured fiscal system in which slaves were counted, recorded, and taxed. This system allowed the council to calculate</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>A True list of all the payable Negroes for yeare 1693  M<sup>r</sup> Thomas Goodwin - 1 . 0 . 4 2  And<sup>w</sup> Phillips - 2 . 0 . 8 4  Rob<sup>t</sup> Adis - 1 . 0 . 4 2  Some Ove[r] - 4 . 2 . 16 8</p>	<p>levies precisely and enforce collective financial obligations.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The decision to set a fixed rate per slave rather than assess individual wealth probably simplified collection and reduced disputes. A uniform charge ensured that compensation could be raised quickly without complex valuation of each contributor's means.</p> <p>The granting of enforcement powers to George Carne himself perhaps reflected limited administrative capacity. By allowing him to pursue payment directly, the council ensured that the burden of collection did not fall entirely on its own officers while still maintaining oversight through the requirement to bring disputes before them.</p>
163	157	<p>Brought over . . . . 4 . 0 . 16 . 8  Thomas Birch . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Henry Coales . . . . 3 . 0 . 12 . 6  Sam<sup>l</sup> McDowell . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  John Mudge . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Benjamin Seale . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Rich<sup>d</sup> Wills . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Thomas Allis . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Will<sup>m</sup> Bowman . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Thomas Blox . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Edward Brayne . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  M<sup>r</sup> Leac[ ]r Beale . . . . 4 . 0 . 16 . 8  Owin Bevin . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Orlando Bagley . . . . 4 . 0 . 16 . 8  John C[ ]yarde . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Josiah Chalisworth . . . . 3 . 0 . 12 . 6  John [ ]eale . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  John Cannady . . . . 3 . 0 . 12 . 6  Grace Budson . . . . 4 . 0 . 16 . 8  Margarett Manning . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  James Draper . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Mercy Draper . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Edward Damends . . . . 3 . 0 . 12 . 6  John Fuller . . . . 3 . 0 . 12 . 6  Thomas Tu[ ]dale . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Richard Gu[ ]ling Jun<sup>r</sup> . . . . 6 . 1 . 5 . 0  John Goodwin . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Richard Griffin . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  William Hayes . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Richard Harding . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Mary Seavester . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  S[ ] Isaac . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Govern<sup>r</sup> Johnson . . . . 3 . 0 . 12 . 6  John [ ]ineo . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Richard Leach . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  John Long . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  John [ ]u[ ] . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Michael Morris . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  John Nichols . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Ernest Dierney . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  James Ryder . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Brought hither . . . . 86 . 17 . 18 . 9  Thomas Swallow . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Prudence Sherman . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  John Lick . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Sarah Liniers . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Samuell Taylor . . . . 3 . 0 . 12 . 6  Andrew Wilson . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  James W[ ]ngham . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Gabriell Bowell [ ]n<sup>r</sup> . . . . 2 . 0 . 8 . 4  Moores Orphans . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  A List of those persons  that are gone off the I[ ]  I[ ]eade since the said  Negroe was Executed  Thomas Gro[ ]y . . . . 1 . 0 . 4 . 2  Tho: [ ]lain . . . . 0 . 12 . 0 . 3  Hugh Boddy . . . . 0 . 12 . 6 . 3</p>	<p>A continued account was recorded of payments due for compensation relating to the executed slave.</p> <p>A previous total was carried forward as £0 16s 8d.</p> <p>The following inhabitants and their liabilities were listed:</p> <p>Thomas Birch held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Henry Coales held 3 slaves and owed £0 12s 6d.  Samuel McDowell held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  John Mudge held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Benjamin Seale held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Richard Wills held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Thomas Allis held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  William Bowman held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Thomas Blox held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Edward Brayne held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Mr Lea[... ]r Beale held 4 slaves and owed £0 16s 8d.  Owin Bevin held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Orlando Bagley held 4 slaves and owed £0 8s 8d.  John C[... ]yarde held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Josiah Chalisworth held 3 slaves and owed £0 12s 6d.  John [... ]eale held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  John Cannady held 3 slaves and owed £0 12s 6d.  Grace Budson held 4 slaves and owed £0 16s 8d.  Margarett Manning held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  James Draper held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Mercy Draper held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Edward Damends held 3 slaves and owed £0 12s 6d.  John Fuller held 3 slaves and owed £0 12s 6d.  Thomas Tu[... ]dale held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Richard Gu[... ]ling Junior held 6 slaves and owed £1 5s 0d.</p> <p>John Goodwin held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Richard Griffin held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  William Hayes held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Richard Harding held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Mary Seavester held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  S[... ] Isaac held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Governor Johnson held 3 slaves and owed £0 12s 6d.  John [... ]ineo held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Richard Leach held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  John Long held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  John [... ]u[... ] held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Michael Morris held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  John Nichols held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Ernest Dierney held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  James Ryder held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.</p> <p>A further total was brought forward as £86 17s 18d [...].</p> <p>Additional entries were recorded:  Thomas Swallow held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Prudence Sherman held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  John Lick held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Sarah Liniers held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Samuel Taylor held 3 slaves and owed £0 12s 6d.  Andrew Wilson held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  James W[... ]ngham held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Gabriel Bowell Junior held 2 slaves and owed £0 8s 4d.  Moore's Orphans held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Tho: Garth . . . . 0 . 4 . 2 . 1  Tho: Hayes . . . . 0 . 4 . 2 . 1  Rich<sup>d</sup> Caram . . . . 0 . 12 . 6 . 3  [] Davers . . . . 0 . 8 . 4 . 2  Richard Stacy . . . . 0 . 4 . 2 . 1  John Worrall . . . . 0 . 4 . 2 . 1  Rich<sup>d</sup> Keelinge . . . . 0 . 4 . 2 . 1  Totall . . . . 120 . 25 . 00 . 0  Zera Copia  James Alexander  Borne Over . . . . 86 . 17 . 18 . 9  B[]ner  Goodwin</p>	<p>A separate list was then made of those who had left the island since the execution of the slave:  Thomas Gro[...ly held 1 slave and owed £0 4s 2d.  Thomas [...lain owed £0 12s 0d.  Hugh Boddy owed £0 12s 6d.  Thomas Garth owed £0 4s 2d.  Thomas Hayes owed £0 4s 2d.  Richard Caram owed £0 12s 6d.  [...] Davers owed £0 8s 4d.  Richard Stacy owed £0 4s 2d.  John Worrall owed £0 4s 2d.  Richard Keelinge owed £0 4s 2d.  A total sum was recorded as £120 25s 0d.  The account was certified as a true copy by James Alexander. A further total of £86 17s 18d [...] was again carried forward.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The detailed listing of individuals, including women and orphans, showed that liability for the levy followed ownership rather than gender or household structure. Any holder of taxable slaves was required to contribute. The inclusion of those who had left the island indicated that financial obligations persisted beyond residence. Debts remained enforceable even after departure, reflecting a system that sought to preserve revenue despite mobility.  The classification of “Moore’s Orphans” as liable owners showed that estates or inherited property were treated as continuing legal entities. Responsibility for payment attached to the estate rather than an individual adult.  The repeated carrying forward of totals demonstrated formal accounting practice. Running totals ensured that the full sum could be tracked and verified across multiple entries.  The certification of the list as a “true copy” by James Alexander showed the importance of record authentication. Such certification supported the legal enforceability of the account.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The separate listing of those who had left the island was probably intended to preserve claims for future recovery. By recording their debts, the council ensured that payment could be pursued if they returned or if their assets could be traced.  The inclusion of multiple carried totals suggests that the account may have been compiled in stages or from different lists. This method allowed officials to assemble a complete financial record from dispersed information while maintaining oversight of the final sum.</p>
164	158	<p>Island St Helena  Att a consultation held on Tuesday the 27 day of September 1698 att fort James  Pres<sup>t</sup> Steph<sup>r</sup>, Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>  Tho: Goodwin assistant  John Mudge foote made his Complaint to the Gov<sup>r</sup> that William Seales son to the said Seales whose house he had gone to his baddeges stole and [] some Cattle in his Plantation sett a dog at him which the said William Seales hearing came unto him and struck him severall blowes some Cutts about him w<sup>ch</sup> said Seales being there  W<sup>m</sup> Seales being Examined saith that he being att his fathers house heard a dogg worry which he supposed to go downe towards the said Mudge Plantation and above as he came nigh the said Plantation saw the said Mudge dogg upon a way w<sup>ch</sup> he set on by the above said Seales Black as aforesaid he came to the said Blacke gave him three</p>	<p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 27 September 1698. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.  A complaint was made by John Mudge Foote against William Seales, the son of William Seales. Mudge stated that he went to Seales’s house to recover his livestock. While there, a dog was set on him at his plantation. William Seales then came to him and struck him several times, leaving cuts on his body.  William Seales was examined. He stated that he was at his father’s house when he heard a dog attacking something. He believed it had gone towards Mudge’s plantation. As he approached, he saw Mudge’s dog on the path and said it had been set on a Black man belonging to him. He then went to that man and struck him three times with his cane. He admitted the blows were severe and said that, if he had continued, he would have killed him.  Anthony Bazett stated that he stood at his own door and had a clear view of Mudge’s plantation. He saw several Black people there. Shortly after, Mudge’s Black servant came with a dog and set it on a man belonging to Seales at the plantation. The dog bit a boy.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>blowes of his Cane giving him very ill or heavy blowes and if he had stayed a while more should have killed him outright</p> <p>Anthony Bazett saith that being standing at his owne doore being in sight of the said mudgets Plantation saw some Blacks and presently came the said Mudge Black with a dogg and set him at Seales [ ] man in his Plantation which dogg bit upon a Boy and William Seales coming up the said dogg bit him in the arme and as he came to the Black he struck him three blowes with a stick</p> <p>Elizabeth Seales saith that she being at Mudge house the same time the said Mudge sent his Black to [ ] she heard William Seales wife bid the said Mudge Black leave his Cattle and heard the said Black say to said W<sup>m</sup> Seales if he had a master on him a man a wood strike him againe said that he gave him very saucy Language and she tooke away from him and bid the said W<sup>m</sup> Seales goe to his master for he had sent him about his business</p>	<p>When William Seales arrived, the dog bit him on the arm. He then struck the Black man three times with a stick.</p> <p>Elizabeth Seales stated that she was at Mudge's house at the same time. Mudge sent his Black servant to [...]. She heard William Seales's wife tell the servant to leave the cattle alone. She also heard the servant say to William Seales that, if he had a master over him, a man would strike him again. She said he spoke in a rude and defiant manner. She then pulled him away and told William Seales to go to his master, as he had already been sent on his business.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repeated reference to "Black" individuals showed that enslaved labourers were treated as property and instruments within disputes between European settlers. Their actions triggered the conflict, yet punishment and retaliation were directed through systems of ownership and control rather than personal legal standing.</p> <p>The use of dogs as weapons revealed an accepted method of enforcing authority over both people and livestock. Setting a dog on a person functioned as a form of coercion and violence that could escalate disputes quickly.</p> <p>The instruction for William Seales to "go to his master" indicated that he remained under the authority of his father or household head. This reflected a hierarchical household structure in which adult sons could still be subject to paternal control, especially in matters that risked legal or disciplinary consequences.</p> <p>Testimony from multiple witnesses, including Anthony Bazett and Elizabeth Seales, showed that the council relied on direct observation from neighbours to establish facts. This reflected a local system of justice grounded in community surveillance and verbal evidence rather than formal investigation.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The escalation from a dispute over cattle to physical violence with sticks and dogs suggested that control over livestock formed a key economic concern. The readiness to use force indicated that protection of property took priority over restraint.</p> <p>The severity of William Seales's admission that he could have killed the man suggested either an attempt to justify extreme anger or to emphasise the seriousness of the provocation. This may have been intended to influence how the council judged responsibility for the violence.</p>
165	159	<p>It is ordered That the said Will<sup>m</sup> Seales be fined five shills towards the rebuilding of a new Church, for being so rash as to have struck the said mudgets Black, he having had rather gone and acquainted the said mudge, And to pay Charges, also: That the said Black be Immediately whipt at the flagg staffe on his bare back for using such ill and saucy language to a white man;</p> <p>M<sup>r</sup> Thomas Goodwin, having bin at Levi morris house, according as 'twas Referr[e]d, in the Consultation held the 13 of this Instant [ ] acquaints the Gov<sup>r</sup> that the said Levi Morris told him that he gave some arrack to his blacks, and that he dranke a dram of it the same time that Mad<sup>m</sup> Johnsons blacks were at his house, who with his owne black dranke it, Whereupon It is ordered That the said Levi Morris shall be fined five Shillings towards the rebuilding of y<sup>e</sup> Church, for giving such ill Encouragement to the abovementioned blacks</p>	<p>William Seales was ordered to pay a fine of £0 5s 0d towards the rebuilding of the new church. This penalty was imposed because he acted rashly in striking John Mudge's Black servant instead of first informing Mudge. He was also ordered to pay the costs of the case.</p> <p>The Black servant belonging to Mudge was ordered to be whipped immediately at the flagstaff on his bare back. This punishment was imposed for using rude and defiant language towards a white man.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin reported that he had visited the house of Levi Morris, as had been assigned in the consultation of 13 September 1698. He informed the Governor that Levi Morris admitted giving arrack to his own Black servants. He also admitted that he drank some of it himself at the same time that the Black servants of Madam Johnson were present at his house, and that they drank it together with his own servant.</p> <p>Levi Morris was ordered to pay a fine of £0 5s 0d towards the rebuilding of the church. This penalty was imposed for encouraging the behaviour of the Black servants by supplying them with alcohol.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>Fines directed towards the rebuilding of the church showed how financial penalties were used to support</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>B  ]ner Goodwin</p>	<p>public projects. Punishment therefore served both as discipline and as a source of revenue for communal infrastructure.</p> <p>The whipping at the flagstaff functioned as a public punishment. Its location ensured visibility, which reinforced social hierarchy and acted as a warning to others. The focus on “ill and saucy language” showed that verbal defiance by a slave towards a white person was treated as a serious breach of order.</p> <p>The reference to arrack, a distilled alcoholic drink, highlighted concerns about controlling the behaviour of enslaved labourers. Providing alcohol to them was treated as a form of misconduct because it reduced discipline and could disrupt labour and authority.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin’s role in visiting Levi Morris’s house showed the council’s use of delegated inspection. This reflected a system where officials gathered evidence directly rather than relying solely on formal complaints.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to fine both William Seales and Levi Morris the same amount suggested that the council aimed to treat different forms of disorder, physical violence and encouragement of indiscipline, as equally damaging to social stability.</p> <p>The punishment of the Black servant, combined with the fine imposed on Seales, indicated an effort to assign blame on both sides of the incident. This approach perhaps aimed to restore order without allowing either a white settler’s violence or a slave’s defiance to go unchecked.</p>
166	160	<p>Island St Helena At a Court of Justice Held att the Sess sions House Right fort James on Monday the 3 day of Octo<sup>br</sup> 1698 Pres: Steph<sup>m</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin Assistant The Court was opened According to y<sup>e</sup> accustomed manner, Those persons appointed for Jurors are as followeth 1 John Leech foreman 2 John [L][e][c][h] 3 Edward Edmunds 4 Sam<sup>m</sup> Hasselbury 5 Erasmus Purling 6 James Ryder 7 Tho: Dixon 8 Rich<sup>d</sup> Leach 9 John Long 10 Sam<sup>m</sup> Taylor 11 Sam<sup>m</sup> Wrangham 12 W<sup>m</sup> Medling also which were all sworn Henry Coales Marshall Complaines against Eliz<sup>th</sup> Lansdorne In an Action of Defamations, saying that she hath openly and falsely reported to severall persons that he would have Carnally laine w<sup>th</sup> Sarah Jennings, in the way Coming downe to fort James three weeks after she had bin delivered of a Child: also she y<sup>e</sup> said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Lansdorne hath further reported That the Coales would have laine w<sup>th</sup> Eliz<sup>th</sup> the wife of John Long and that y<sup>e</sup> said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Long told y<sup>e</sup> s<sup>d</sup> Eliz<sup>th</sup> Lansdorne y<sup>t</sup> She knew of two white women more that he would have laine w<sup>th</sup> also further she hath reported that he did lye w<sup>th</sup> Jenners house whilst she lived there more then he Ever did before</p>	<p>A Court of Justice was held at the Sessions House at Fort James on 3 October 1698. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p>The court opened in the usual manner. Twelve jurors were appointed and sworn: John Leech, who served as foreman, John Leech, Edward Edmunds, Samuel Hasselbury, Erasmus Purling, James Ryder, Thomas Dixon, Richard Leach, John Long, Samuel Taylor, Samuel Wrangham and William Medling.</p> <p>Henry Coales, the Marshal, brought an action for defamation against Elizabeth Lansdorne. He alleged that she had openly and falsely told several people that he had tried to have sexual relations with Sarah Jennings while they were on the road to Fort James, three weeks after she had given birth to a child. He also claimed that Elizabeth Lansdorne had said he had tried to have sexual relations with Elizabeth, the wife of John Long. She further reported that Elizabeth Long told her that she knew of two other white women with whom he had tried to have sexual relations. In addition, she claimed that he had sexual relations at Jennings’s house while she lived there more often than he had ever done before.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>An action for defamation showed that spoken reputation carried legal weight. Public accusations of sexual misconduct could damage a man’s standing, and the court provided a formal process to challenge and punish such claims.</p> <p>The role of the Marshal, held by Henry Coales, placed him within the enforcement structure of the island’s administration. His decision to bring the case indicated that even officials relied on the court to defend personal honour and authority.</p> <p>The presence of a sworn jury demonstrated that judgement relied on a group of local men rather than solely on the Governor and council. This reflected a participatory legal process rooted in the settler community.</p> <p>The emphasis on alleged sexual conduct with named women, including Sarah Jennings and Elizabeth Long, showed that moral behaviour was closely tied to reputation and social order. Claims involving multiple</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			women increased the seriousness of the accusation by suggesting a pattern rather than a single act.
167	161	<p>Matthen Bazett being sworne saith that some time since the said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne saith yt a fownd sport him seefe and his wife went to her a bushing house aboute some business, and they Discoursing aboute ye said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landornes scan dalising ye said Henry Coales, he heard ye said Sarah Sinnigs say that Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne told her that she had heard that he would have layne with her three weeks after she had bin delivered of a Child, and also with Eliz<sup>th</sup> Long ye wife of John Long; further saith that he heard ye said Sarah Sinnigs say that ye said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne told her she must mentioned her name to bring all they things in the matter to passe and to prove her selfe, and that she told ye said Sarah Sinnigs that the said Henry Coales would have layne with two white women more, Sarah Sinnigs being sworne saith that Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne told her that she had heard that the said Henry Coales would have bin nough[t] with her three weeks after she had layne in, a Coming downe to the fort out of ye Countrey M<sup>s</sup> Dweight saith that Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne told her that the said Henry Coales Invited her to Come and live at his house at the fort, and bring her Children with her, and then would lend her a feather bed to whome as she said she had a flock bed of her owne which would serve her well enough further saith not, Eliz<sup>th</sup> the wife of John Long being sworne saith that she and Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne being a talking aboute ye said Henry Coales, she told her that she went one day to ye said Coales one purpose to desire him to Cut out some worke for her but he refused and would not, unless she would Let him lye with her, who left ye said worke in his house and went away from him Brig<sup>th</sup> the wife of Matthen Bazett being sworne saith that she heard the above said Sarah Sinnig say that she heard ye said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne say that ye said Coales would have layne with her, and yt he offered it several times and if he would have done ye like to Sarah Sinnigs three weeks after she had layne in, further saith that ye said Sarah Sinnigs told her yt ye said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne said she must make use of her name to bring it aboute, or else she could not handsomely Convince her business/</p>	<p>Matthen Bazett gave sworn evidence. He stated that some time earlier he and his wife went to Elizabeth Lansdorne's house at Bushing on business. During their conversation about her accusations against Henry Coales, he heard Sarah Sinnigs say that Elizabeth Lansdorne had told her that Coales had tried to have sexual relations with her three weeks after she had given birth to a child. He also heard that Lansdorne said Coales had tried to have sexual relations with Elizabeth, the wife of John Long. He further stated that Sarah Sinnigs said Lansdorne told her she must allow her name to be used to support these claims and to help prove the matter. He added that Lansdorne also said Coales had tried to have sexual relations with two other white women.</p> <p>Sarah Sinnigs gave sworn evidence. She stated that Elizabeth Lansdorne told her that she had heard Henry Coales had attempted to have sexual relations with her three weeks after she had given birth, while she was travelling down from the countryside to the fort.</p> <p>Mrs Dweight gave sworn evidence. She stated that Elizabeth Lansdorne told her that Henry Coales had invited her to come and live at his house at the fort with her children, and that he would lend her a feather bed. She replied that she already had a flock bed which was sufficient for her needs.</p> <p>Elizabeth, the wife of John Long, gave sworn evidence. She stated that during a conversation with Elizabeth Lansdorne about Henry Coales, she said that she once went to Coales to ask him to cut out some work for her. He refused unless she agreed to have sexual relations with him. She left the work at his house and went away.</p> <p>Bridget, the wife of Matthen Bazett, gave sworn evidence. She stated that she heard Sarah Sinnigs say that Elizabeth Lansdorne had claimed Henry Coales tried to have sexual relations with her and had made several attempts. She also heard that Lansdorne said Coales would have done the same to Sarah Sinnigs three weeks after she had given birth. She added that Sarah Sinnigs told her that Lansdorne said her name must be used to support the accusation, otherwise the matter could not be properly proved.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repeated insistence that Sarah Sinnigs's name be used showed an attempt to strengthen an accusation by attaching it to identifiable witnesses. This reflected the importance of named testimony in establishing credibility within the court.</p> <p>The distinction between a feather bed and a flock bed revealed differences in material status. A feather bed represented a higher level of comfort and wealth, while a flock bed, filled with scraps, indicated more modest means. The offer to lend a feather bed formed part of a proposed domestic arrangement that may have implied dependency.</p> <p>The reference to cutting out work indicated a form of skilled labour arrangement, where cloth or garments were prepared for making. Refusal of such work unless sexual access was granted suggested an abuse of economic position to exert personal control.</p> <p>The use of multiple sworn statements from both men and women showed that the court relied on layered testimony to assess reputation and truth. Women's voices, especially in matters of sexual conduct, played a central role in establishing or contesting claims.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The instruction that Sarah Sinnigs's name must be used suggested a deliberate effort by Elizabeth Lansdorne to construct a stronger case by linking separate accusations into a single narrative. This may</p>



Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>substance but also as a form of informal payment or persuasion. Its use in this context pointed to attempts to secure compliance through material incentives.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The claim that Elizabeth Lansdorne feared she would not be allowed to return home safely suggested that movement within the settlement could be influenced by personal power and intimidation. This implied that authority could be exercised informally outside official structures.</p> <p>The repetition of accusations involving multiple women may have been used to present Henry Coales's behaviour as habitual rather than isolated. This could have strengthened the case by framing it as a pattern of conduct rather than a single disputed incident.</p> <p>The reported promise of arrack in exchange for compliance indicated a possible attempt to convert economic goods into personal advantage. This suggested that access to scarce or controlled resources could be used strategically in interpersonal relations.</p>
169	163	<p>John Peill Serj<sup>t</sup> sworne saith that when Elizabeth Landornes house was a building he went there, where she told him that she Coales never be at Quiets for ye said Coales, and the coming him about mending her Kitchen floore, he professed to make it for her, some time since he was running said Coales to speake w<sup>th</sup> him, Came out of ye valley downe to ye fort to Enquire for him, which ye said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne hearing alittle while after, She said she had bin a looking for m<sup>r</sup> Coales he is at m<sup>s</sup> house, whereupon Immediatly went to her house and found ye said Coales lying downe upon a bench behind her Table, further saith that one Evening he being on ye guard saw ye said Coales Endeavouring to Catch at her in the privy passage, and that she sitten so very earnestly, which ye said Coales doth own, Saying he did it out of waygh nesse Robert Addis Gun mate sworne saith much to the same purpose as ye abovesaid testified hath already John Sheiles Corporall being sworne saith that some time since he and ye aforesaid John Peill went to ye house of ye said Henry Coales Intending to drinke abroad of punch w<sup>th</sup> him, but he was not home, so they both returned to our Fort, and asked Severall of the house where Coales was, but none could tell, at length asked ye said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne, who told them she did not know where he was, and about two houres afterwards they both went up ye valley and in coming downe again met the Coales between the Country guard and Goffeons house, who told them that he had bin at Sleep at Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landornes house a purpose to shun some Company which he did not like Elizabeth Landornes saith that she carried some worke to the said Henry Coales, desiring him to Cut a gowne out, who refused and would not unless she would lett him feele her by her privy parts, and some time since when her husbands ship made proposal to put his hand under her</p>	<p>John Peill, a sergeant, gave sworn evidence. He stated that when Elizabeth Lansdorne's house was being built, he visited her there. She told him that she could never live in peace because of Henry Coales. When Coales came to speak with him about repairing her kitchen floor, he promised to do the work. On another occasion, Peill ran down from the valley to the fort to look for Coales. Soon after, Lansdorne said she had been searching for Coales and believed he was at her house. Peill went there immediately and found Coales lying on a bench behind her table. He also stated that one evening, while on guard, he saw Coales trying to grab Lansdorne in a narrow passage. She resisted strongly. Coales admitted this act but said he did it in a moment of foolish behaviour.</p> <p>Robert Addis, a gunner's mate, gave sworn evidence and confirmed much the same account.</p> <p>John Sheiles, a corporal, gave sworn evidence. He stated that he and John Peill once went to Henry Coales's house intending to drink punch with him, but he was not there. They returned to the fort and asked several people where he was, but no one knew. They then asked Elizabeth Lansdorne, who said she did not know either. About two hours later, they went up the valley and, on their return, met Coales between the Country Guard and Goffeons house. Coales told them he had been asleep at Lansdorne's house to avoid company he did not wish to meet.</p> <p>Elizabeth Lansdorne gave further evidence. She stated that she once took work to Henry Coales and asked him to cut out a gown for her. He refused unless she allowed him to touch her in an intimate manner. She also stated that on another occasion, when her husband's ship was present, Coales attempted to put his hand under her petticoats and spoke to her in a sexually explicit and offensive way several times.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The admission by Henry Coales that he attempted to grab Elizabeth Lansdorne, even while minimising it as foolish behaviour, showed that partial confession could be used to reduce the seriousness of an act. This reflected a legal culture in which acknowledgement of misconduct might influence judgement.</p> <p>The repeated references to cutting out garments and repairing a kitchen floor showed that skilled labour formed a key part of everyday exchange. Control over such services gave men like Coales opportunities to exert influence over women who depended on them.</p> <p>The description of specific locations, including the valley, the fort, the Country Guard and Goffeons house, showed how movement and encounters were closely observed within a small settlement. Testimony relied on tracing where individuals had been and when,</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>petty Coates speaking very Lewd words to her severall times</p>	<p>which functioned as a practical method of establishing credibility.</p> <p>The mention of Lansdorne's husband's ship indicated that her husband was absent for periods, which may have reduced her protection within the household structure. This absence could affect her vulnerability and her ability to resist or report unwanted advances.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Coales's statement that he had stayed at Lansdorne's house to avoid unwanted company suggested that he used her house as a place of concealment. This may have increased suspicion about his presence there and contributed to the spread of rumours.</p> <p>The repeated pattern of offering or withholding work in exchange for sexual access suggested a deliberate use of economic leverage. This indicated that control over labour and resources could be used strategically to pressure women within the settlement.</p> <p>The claim that Lansdorne could not live in peace because of Coales suggested a continuing pattern of unwanted attention rather than isolated incidents. This may have strengthened her position by presenting the behaviour as persistent and intrusive.</p>
170	164	<p>The Jury withdrew to Consider ye aforesaid Action and stayed about halfe an hour, and afterward brought in there verdict; That Eliz<sup>th</sup> Landorne was [...] by the said Henry Coales, and fined to him one shilling Damage, and pay Charges of Court James Wilson Complaines of Thomas Carles in an Action of the Case Tho: Carles Denyes the Action, &amp; Argues the Contrary thereof Wherefore having no Occasion for any Witness in this matter the Jury soone decided there Difference and Delivered there verdict, after That the said James Wilson be Cast in suite, and pay ye Charges of Court John Facknall Complaines of Richard Gurling, In an action of ye Case Edward Edmunds the said Rich<sup>d</sup> Gurling Attorney, Denyes the Action The said John Facknall Desired of the Court That a Paragraph of the Records might be read Concerning Lands etc which was The said Richard Gurlings attorney doth make an objection against the said John Facknall, saying he hath no right to sue and answer, the said Gurling but joynly with the overseers of the Deceased John Cleverlee who (viz<sup>d</sup>) Tho: Swallow and James Ryders, which was unanimously approved and Consented to by both the Bench and Jury</p>	<p>The jury withdrew to consider the case between Henry Coales and Elizabeth Lansdorne. After about half an hour, they returned with their verdict. They found that Elizabeth Lansdorne had defamed Henry Coales. She was fined £0 1s 0d in damages to him and was ordered to pay the costs of the court.</p> <p>James Wilson brought an action against Thomas Carles. Carles denied the claim and argued against it. No witnesses were called. The jury quickly reached a decision and found against James Wilson. He was ordered to pay the costs of the court.</p> <p>John Facknall brought an action against Richard Gurling. Edward Edmunds acted as attorney for Gurling and denied the claim. Facknall asked the court to read a paragraph from the records concerning land. Gurling's attorney objected, arguing that Facknall had no right to bring or answer the suit alone. He stated that the case should be brought jointly with the overseers of the deceased John Cleverlee, namely Thomas Swallow and James Ryders. This objection was accepted by both the bench and the jury.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The award of £0 1s 0d in damages showed that defamation was recognised as a legal injury, but the small sum indicated that the court treated reputational harm as limited in financial terms. The requirement to pay court costs added a further penalty and reinforced the authority of the legal process.</p> <p>An "action of the case" referred to a flexible form of civil claim used to address wrongs that did not fall under more rigid legal categories. Its use in multiple disputes showed how the court handled a wide range of grievances within a single procedural framework.</p> <p>The absence of witnesses in the dispute between James Wilson and Thomas Carles demonstrated that the jury could decide a case based on the arguments presented alone. This reflected a practical approach where formal evidence was not always required.</p> <p>The objection raised by Edward Edmunds showed the importance of legal standing. Claims involving the property or affairs of a deceased person had to be brought by recognised overseers or representatives. This ensured that authority over estates was exercised collectively and according to established roles.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The quick verdict against James Wilson suggested that his claim lacked sufficient substance or clarity to persuade the jury. The absence of witnesses may have weakened his position and led to a rapid dismissal.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The insistence that John Facknall act jointly with the overseers of John Clevelee's estate indicated a concern to prevent unauthorised control over property claims. This requirement may have aimed to protect the estate from partial or self-interested litigation by a single party.</p>
171	165	<p>Richard Griffith the said John Facknalds Brother in law Humbly Desired of the Court that he might have the verball will of his Brother Cevelee since late of this Island  Deceas<sup>d</sup> proved and produce same in Judgement, that the said Deceas<sup>d</sup> Cevelee made a verball Will  It is ordered &amp; agreed  That the said Richard Griffith offers  That the said John Cevelee sone of the said Deceas<sup>d</sup> Cevelee  by his Evidences hereafter sworne, which the Jury and Bench agreed and ordered to be heard with  Richard Griffith who hath since the Decease of the abovenamed John Cevelee sone married his Daughter Saith that there being specified and particular mentioned  In the Hon<sup>ble</sup> Companys Acts and Instructions, which was brought  heither In ye time of ye said Cevelees Death, that no Single man in ye Companies service should have any Lands  or Cattle, He being then upon marriage with the said John  Cevelees Daughter, he Presented to prove afterwards his De  ceas<sup>d</sup> fathers last Will and Testament, which ye Court would not Receive in order to the proving thereof, for the Reasons above mentioned, and some Evidence also given the Gov<sup>r</sup> borne him testified, Whereupon the said Richard Griffith being much vexed, tore ye said will and Testament made by ye said Cevelee to peices  Margarett the wife of John Stich being sworne saith that the Deceas<sup>d</sup> John Cevelee sone when he lay sick that he took on Richard Griffith to be an hon  est man and one that feared God, And that he had appointed  him to be overseer of his Children, over his Two children, his  wife now being one of them  Edward Edmunds Deposeth that he having some Discourse  at the house of m<sup>r</sup> Stich with John Cevelee Jun<sup>r</sup>, the said Edmunds asked him the said John Cevelee whether his father  had made a will or no, he answered no, and if he did make  out of spite or malice his Estate should be Equally Divided  betwixt him ye said Cevelee and his sister  Sam<sup>m</sup>.</p>	<p>Richard Griffith, the brother-in-law of John Facknall, asked the court for permission to prove a verbal will made by his late brother, John Cevelee of St Helena, and to present it in judgement. He claimed that the deceased had made such a will.</p> <p>The court agreed that evidence should be heard. It was proposed that John Cevelee the son of the deceased would support the claim through sworn testimony, together with Richard Griffith, who had since married the daughter of the deceased.</p> <p>Richard Griffith stated that the Company's Acts and Instructions, which had arrived on the island at the time of John Cevelee's death, specified that no unmarried man in the Company's service could hold land or cattle. He explained that, as he was then about to marry Cevelee's daughter, he later attempted to present the deceased's written will for probate. The court refused to accept it because of these regulations, and additional testimony had been given before the Governor against him. In anger at this refusal, Griffith tore the will into pieces.</p> <p>Margaret, the wife of John Stich, gave sworn evidence. She stated that John Cevelee the son, while ill, said that he considered Richard Griffith an honest man who feared God. He also said that he had appointed Griffith to oversee his children, who were two in number, one of whom was his wife.</p> <p>Edward Edmunds gave sworn evidence. He stated that during a conversation at the house of Mr Stich with John Cevelee the younger, he asked whether his father had made a will. Cevelee replied that he had not. He added that if a will had been made out of spite or malice, the estate should instead be divided equally between himself and his sister.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>A verbal will referred to an unwritten declaration of a person's wishes regarding their estate. Its acceptance depended on witness testimony, which made proof uncertain and open to dispute, especially when a written will no longer existed.</p> <p>The Company's Acts and Instructions functioned as governing regulations imposed by the East India Company. The rule that unmarried men could not hold land or cattle showed how property rights were tied to marital status, reinforcing social order and settlement stability.</p> <p>The refusal to accept the written will for probate demonstrated the court's adherence to Company regulations over personal arrangements. Legal recognition depended not only on the wishes of the deceased but also on conformity with administrative rules.</p> <p>The act of tearing the will into pieces removed key written evidence. This shifted the dispute into reliance on memory and testimony, increasing uncertainty and conflict over the estate.</p> <p>The appointment of an overseer for children showed a mechanism for managing inheritance and guardianship. This role combined responsibility for property and care of dependants, reflecting how family, property and authority were closely linked.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The destruction of the written will suggested that Richard Griffith acted in frustration at the court's refusal, but it also removed evidence that might have conflicted with his later claims about a verbal will. This may have altered the balance of the case in his favour.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The emphasis on the rule against unmarried men holding property indicated that marriage to Cevelee's daughter may have been used as a strategy to secure control over the estate. This suggested that marital arrangements could be closely tied to property claims.</p> <p>The statement by John Cevelee the younger that no will existed, combined with his preference for equal division, indicated a potential conflict of interest. His denial may have been intended to protect his own share of the estate against competing claims.</p>
172	166	<p>Sam<sup>s</sup> Maxwell Corporall being Sworne Saith that [...] at John Cevelees Jun<sup>r</sup>s House [...] some time that his Deceased father John Cevelee Sen<sup>r</sup> Estate was Divided between him the said Cevelee and his Sister, wherunto he what was given for him and not all his fathers Houses &amp; Lands the said John Cevelee Jun<sup>r</sup> replied that his father had willed his Estate to be Equally divided betwixt him &amp; his sister, further Deposeth that he knows of Two head of Cattle that the said Jo<sup>r</sup> Cevelee gave to his Cousen W<sup>m</sup> Robert Lightfoot and some silver at a portion of ye said Estate Richard Gurling Deposeth that on ye 14<sup>th</sup> of August last past Mr Facknald whose son John Cevelee Jun<sup>r</sup> told say that his hath heard his Deceased Husband say severall times that his father John Cevelee Sen<sup>r</sup> left his whole and sole Estate to be equally divided betwixt him and his Sister John Facknald Desired of ye Court that he may be to go forward with his Action against Richard Gurling by reason of the objection made already mentioned he might Demurr untill the next Quarterly Sessions which was granted him, also paying the Charges of Richard Gurling for this present Action Also It is ordered &amp; agreed That considering ye aforesaid Richard Griffiths Evidence produced to him and ye Generall acknowledgement Not only of ye Jury but of most of ye Inhabitants resident who know Doth say that the Deceased John Cevelee Jun<sup>r</sup>s Last Will and Testament together with the law and writing from ye said John Cevelee Sen<sup>r</sup> was not in being the said Richard Griffith shewing that the 2 Day of January he Lived it was, seven or eight years after, Neverthesse did make any Motion in Justice to prove or Recover any part of his fathers Estate that the said Court do Ordain and Conclude that the said pretended will is void accordingly as aforesaid, and copies of all these premisses concerning the said will shall be Delivered to them desired Poirier Th<sup>o</sup> Goodwin</p>	<p>Samuel Maxwell, a corporal, gave sworn evidence. He stated that [...] at the house of John Cevelee the younger, some time after the estate of his deceased father, John Cevelee the elder, had been divided between him and his sister. He said that Cevelee the younger acknowledged what had been given to him, and that it did not include all his father's houses and lands. Cevelee the younger then stated that his father had directed that his estate should be divided equally between himself and his sister. Maxwell also stated that he knew of two head of cattle that John Cevelee had given to his cousin William Robert Lightfoot, along with some silver, as part of the estate.</p> <p>Richard Gurling gave sworn evidence. He stated that on 14 August 1698 Mr Facknald's son, John Cevelee the younger, said that he had heard his deceased father state several times that his estate was to be divided equally between himself and his sister.</p> <p>John Facknald asked the court for permission to continue his action against Richard Gurling. Because of the earlier objection, he requested a delay until the next Quarterly Sessions. This was granted on condition that he paid Richard Gurling's costs for the present action.</p> <p>The court then considered the evidence presented by Richard Griffith and the general agreement of the jury and many inhabitants of the island. It was widely accepted that the alleged last will and testament of John Cevelee the younger, together with any written instruction from John Cevelee the elder, no longer existed. It was also noted that although Richard Griffith claimed the will had existed on 2 January, he had taken no legal action for seven or eight years to prove or recover any part of the estate.</p> <p>The court therefore ruled that the supposed will was invalid. It was ordered that copies of all proceedings concerning this will should be provided to those who requested them.</p> <p>The decision was recorded by Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repeated statements that the estate was to be divided equally between John Cevelee the younger and his sister showed that inheritance could proceed without a surviving written will, based instead on acknowledged intention and community recognition. This reflected a practical approach to property distribution in the absence of formal documentation.</p> <p>The reference to cattle and silver as part of the estate showed the mixed nature of property, combining land, livestock and movable wealth. Distribution of such assets formed a central concern of legal proceedings.</p> <p>The requirement that John Facknald pay costs before delaying his case showed that procedural requests carried financial consequences. This discouraged unnecessary delay and ensured compensation for the opposing party.</p> <p>The court's decision to declare the will void relied not only on missing documentation but also on the long delay in bringing a claim. This demonstrated that failure to assert a right within a reasonable time could undermine its validity.</p> <p>The order to provide copies of the proceedings indicated the importance of written records. These</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>documents allowed decisions to be preserved and referred to in future disputes, strengthening administrative control.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The emphasis on the long delay of seven or eight years before any attempt to prove the will suggested that the court viewed this inaction as evidence against its authenticity. This delay may have been interpreted as inconsistent with a genuine claim to inheritance.</p> <p>The reliance on general agreement among inhabitants indicated that community knowledge played a role in resolving disputes. This suggested that informal consensus could influence formal legal outcomes when documentary evidence was lacking.</p> <p>The dismissal of the alleged will, combined with acceptance of equal division, suggested that the court preferred a clear and stable settlement over reopening contested claims. This may have been intended to prevent prolonged disputes over property within the small community.</p>
173	167	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Thursday the 6<sup>th</sup>  Day of [...] 1698 at Fort James  Pres<sup>t</sup> Steph<sup>m</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>e</sup>  Tho: Goodwin Assistant  [...]  [...] John fuller, and Benj<sup>s</sup> Seales  hath bin both drunk and Swearing in ye fort Gates  Yesterday  But Confesseth the said fuller who voluntarily to his  words yt promise  which he affectionately gave in this Consultation held  this 13<sup>th</sup> day of  Sept<sup>r</sup> last promises not to Comitt any fault that shou<sup>d</sup>  be [...]  to ye Gov<sup>e</sup> and Councell admonition did through his  profanely abuse  held Gov<sup>e</sup> in very [...] words and some of them  belonging to the garrison  also, which the Gov<sup>e</sup> was a suffering both [...]  which many and great affronts ye Gov<sup>e</sup> were at present  provoked to  pass by, [...]  this same day at night about ye time of Retreat of ye  Clock  walking the Guard round found the said fuller  Staggering in the  House of the Guard place who hath a long time bin a so  staying  Strong liquors yt above said Benjamin Seales, wherefore  the Gov<sup>e</sup> Commands to see that all night in disorder  there houses in order to be sober and quiet, but  the said John fuller did not would not obey ye Gov<sup>e</sup>  Command  fell in a Swearing and unmannerly rageing, which ye  Gov<sup>e</sup> causing  order'd ye Serj<sup>t</sup> of ye Guard who was with him to take  in his  Custody the said fuller and secure him in ye fort untill  ye next  morning, who were Called and examined before us, and  Confess'd  of ye said fullers Coming in an humble posture as was  expected still  Swearing as before mentioned. Therefore Considering  ye many  guilty Submissions of him We have thought fitt to  order and fine  The said fuller Twenty shill<sup>s</sup> to ye poore of ye parish  and be kept prisoner untill he is sober, also yt Benj<sup>s</sup>  Seales  [...]</p>	<p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 6 [...] 1698. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p>It was reported that John Fuller and Benjamin Seales had both been drunk and swearing at the fort gates on the previous day. Fuller admitted the behaviour. He had previously given a voluntary promise at the consultation held on 13 September 1698 that he would not commit any offence that would bring him under the notice of the Governor and Council. Despite this, he had used profane and abusive language towards the Governor and others belonging to the garrison. These insults were serious, but the Governor chose at that time to overlook them.</p> <p>Later that same night, around the time of the evening retreat, the Governor was walking the guard rounds and found Fuller staggering in the guardhouse. He had been drinking strong liquor for a long period, which had been supplied by Benjamin Seales. The Governor ordered that all people in the fort should remain orderly, sober and quiet during the night. Fuller refused to obey. He continued swearing and behaved in a disorderly and aggressive manner. The Governor then ordered the sergeant of the guard to take Fuller into custody and secure him in the fort until the following morning.</p> <p>Fuller was brought forward and examined. He confessed his behaviour, though he continued swearing even while presenting himself in a submissive manner. Given his repeated offences, the council ordered that he be fined £1 0s 0d for the benefit of the poor of the parish. He was also to remain in custody until he became sober. Benjamin Seales [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The earlier promise made by John Fuller showed that formal warnings were recorded and could be used to justify harsher punishment for repeated misconduct. This reflected a system of escalating discipline based on prior behaviour.</p> <p>The reference to the retreat marked a set time in the daily routine of the garrison, when order and accountability were enforced. Disorder at this time was treated as especially serious because it disrupted military regulation.</p> <p>The Governor's decision to overlook the initial insults demonstrated discretionary authority. He could delay punishment, but continued misconduct removed that leniency and led to formal penalties.</p> <p>The fine directed to the poor of the parish showed that penalties could serve a charitable function. This linked discipline within the garrison to broader social welfare on the island.</p> <p>The involvement of the sergeant of the guard showed how enforcement relied on military structure.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>Orders were carried out immediately through ranks responsible for maintaining discipline.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The repeated drunken behaviour, combined with defiance after a prior warning, suggested that Fuller's conduct had become a persistent problem. The escalation to fines and imprisonment indicated an attempt to reassert control and deter further disorder.</p> <p>The supply of strong liquor by Benjamin Seales suggested that responsibility extended beyond the individual offender. This implied that those who enabled misconduct could also face consequences, even if details of Seales's punishment were not fully recorded here.</p> <p>The Governor's initial tolerance followed by decisive action suggested a calculated approach. Restraint may have been used to avoid immediate conflict, while later punishment reinforced authority once the behaviour continued.</p>
174	168	<p>[...] be fined five Shillings for being drunk, to ye poore also and be Imprisoned with the said fuller, during pleasure The said Thomas Freesdale was also Sent for for keeping unseasonable houres in houses Contrary to ye Directions of his Lycence, which being ye first offence It is ordered That the said Freesdale be fined five shill<sup>s</sup> to ye poore with admonition for the future to keep better and more seasonable houres in his house, Especially in night time after ye Tapp too hath beaten Poirier Goodwin Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Wednesday ye 5<sup>th</sup> Day of October 1698 att Fort James Pres<sup>s</sup> Steph<sup>s</sup> Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup> Tho: Goodwin Assistant Although the Right Hono<sup>bl</sup>. Comp<sup>y</sup> by their former orders doth Stile all wilde Goates on this Island to be theirs none, However Considering that since yt time the Case is quite altered, fifty four yeares since where there are so many tame goats that the Island Defires very often the Govern<sup>or</sup> and Councill to advise a means to Destroy great part of them, because hardly finding food on the rocks (that is the uttermost parts of the Island) were forced by a naturall necessity to Come Nigher Inland, and to their plantations and Cattle Endangered by a totall ruine. Joynt to this that having ships Coming here, but very seldom, [...]</p>	<p>Benjamin Seales was fined £0 5s 0d for being drunk. This sum was to be paid to the poor. He was also ordered to be imprisoned with John Fuller at the Governor's pleasure.</p> <p>Thomas Freesdale was brought before the council for keeping his house open at improper hours, contrary to the conditions of his licence. As this was his first offence, he was fined £0 5s 0d for the poor and warned to keep better order in future, especially at night after the taptoo had sounded.</p> <p>A consultation was then held at Fort James on 5 October 1698. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p>It was noted that the Honourable Company had previously declared all wild goats on the island to be its property. However, circumstances had changed over the past fifty four years. The number of domesticated goats had increased greatly. These animals struggled to find food on the rocky outer parts of the island and were forced inland by necessity. They entered plantations and threatened cattle, creating a risk of serious damage.</p> <p>It was also noted that ships visited the island only rarely [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The imprisonment of Benjamin Seales alongside John Fuller showed that responsibility extended to those who contributed to disorder. Supplying alcohol and participating in misconduct led to direct punishment, reinforcing shared accountability.</p> <p>The requirement that Thomas Freesdale keep "seasonable hours" reflected regulation of licensed premises. A licence imposed conditions on operating times, especially at night, to control behaviour and prevent disorder within the settlement.</p> <p>The reference to the taptoo marked a regulated signal for closing activity at night. This military routine structured civilian life within the fort and reinforced discipline beyond the garrison.</p> <p>The Company's claim over wild goats showed central control over natural resources. Such ownership allowed the administration to regulate hunting, supply and use of animals on the island.</p> <p>The shift from scarcity to overpopulation of goats demonstrated how environmental conditions could change over time. Management of livestock became necessary to protect agriculture and prevent damage to plantations.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to fine rather than impose harsher punishment on Thomas Freesdale suggested that the council aimed to correct behaviour without disrupting his role as a licence holder. This indicated a balance between enforcement and maintaining necessary services within the settlement.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The concern over goats entering plantations suggested that the increase in domesticated animals had exceeded the island's carrying capacity. This may have prompted the council to consider organised culling or regulation to protect food supplies and livestock.</p> <p>The mention of infrequent ship visits implied limited external supply. This likely increased dependence on local resources, making the management of animals and crops more urgent and shaping the council's response.</p>
175	169	<p>the owners thereof, had no wayes to dispose of them but was spent amongst their families, Insomuch that this great plenty made them Neglect providing of them; and Cons[eq]uently the most part thereof Return wild, which gave way to a Greater Inconveniency as bad if not worse) than the first, that is almost every body, and the most part ill disposed persons went Every often under pretence of Either killing their owne or their friends Goats w<sup>ch</sup> runn wild as aforesaid (came home Laden with dead Goats besides what was Clan-Destinely Conveyed, Which in truth the most part were stale same, Insomuch that at last, almost all the freemen believing at once that their flocks were wonderfully Decreased, and Many quite destroyed, but to this End such unreasonable and ill use might be prevented for ye future;</p> <p>And Complaint having bin lately made to the Govern<sup>or</sup> and Councill, desiring that they would be pleased to Consider seriously the Matter, which done It was agreed That a Proclamation be Issued forthwith strictly forbidding all person whatsoever should go any more a Hunting of Goats under pretence of killing their owne, unless Next Sessions and generall Rendezvouse, where with the whole freemen, a means should be found out to hinder such Disorders, which was done accordingly, as doth appeare by the aforesaid Proclamation</p> <p>Published and Dated the 30<sup>th</sup> Day of august Last past; And therefore this Day of this Instant at Consultation to the above said Proclamation, all planters Inhabitants for the said Generall Rendezvouse, were all ordered Downe Into Fort James House Hall, Where after severall Debates It was Unanimously agreed &amp; Concluded as followeth</p> <p>That no person or persons whatsoever should go a Hunting of wild Goats, in the walleys and wild and same Range of other mens Goats But that all that had or may have Goats together, whereby some may be, or getteth hereafter Wild; No single person Shall go out their Neighbours that have Goats with them, so that and wednesday is the day appointed for such Hunting and no Other in the week, and if all persons Concerned doth<sup>tt</sup></p>	<p>The owners of goats had no proper way to dispose of them. Most were consumed within their own households. This abundance led to neglect in managing the herds. As a result, many goats became wild again. This created a greater problem than before. Many people, especially those of bad character, regularly went out under the pretence of killing their own goats or those of friends that had turned wild. They returned carrying dead goats, and more were taken secretly. In truth, most of these animals were stolen. Over time, many freemen believed their flocks had greatly declined, and in some cases were entirely lost.</p> <p>Complaints were made to the Governor and Council, asking for action. After consideration, it was agreed that a proclamation should be issued. This proclamation strictly forbade anyone from hunting goats under the pretence of killing their own until the next Sessions and a general assembly of all freemen, where a solution could be found. This order was issued and published on 30 August 1698.</p> <p>At the present consultation, all planters and inhabitants were ordered to gather in the hall at Fort James for this general assembly. After several debates, a unanimous decision was reached.</p> <p>No person was allowed to hunt wild goats in the valleys or in areas where other people's goats ranged. Those who owned goats jointly, or whose animals had become mixed or gone wild, were required to act together. No individual was permitted to hunt alone. Instead, neighbours who owned goats had to go together. Wednesday was fixed as the only day for such hunting, and no other day of the week was allowed.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The shift from domesticated goats back to wild animals showed how weak control over livestock could undermine property rights. Once animals roamed freely, ownership became uncertain, which enabled theft under the cover of legitimate hunting.</p> <p>The proclamation functioned as a temporary legal restriction to halt ongoing abuse. It suspended individual claims to hunt goats until a collective solution could be organised, demonstrating central intervention to stabilise disorder.</p> <p>The general rendezvous brought together all freemen to decide policy. This showed a form of participatory governance, where property holders collectively shaped regulations affecting shared resources.</p> <p>The rule requiring joint hunting and limiting it to a fixed day imposed collective oversight. By forcing neighbours to act together, it reduced opportunities for theft and created mutual accountability.</p> <p>The restriction on hunting in areas where goats from different owners mixed recognised the practical difficulty of distinguishing ownership. Regulation focused on controlling behaviour rather than resolving individual claims to specific animals.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to restrict hunting to a single day each week suggested an attempt to concentrate activity under observation. This likely made it easier to monitor behaviour and detect theft.</p> <p>The requirement for neighbours to hunt together implied distrust of individuals acting alone. This</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>measure appears designed to prevent false claims of ownership and reduce clandestine killing.</p> <p>The earlier failure to manage surplus goats indicated that abundance had weakened discipline over resources. The new rules suggest a deliberate effort to reimpose control by converting a private activity into a supervised, collective one.</p>
176	170	<p>Doth not meet at the place appointed by them, But the Major part of them doth, they may go forward after the said Goates, and nott loose their Labour (if they are missing thereto) for the absence of the other party that may not come in Comp<sup>ysse</sup>, whose said meet, also that no person in Ripping time presume to goe a Hunting the said Wild Goates,</p> <p>And in respect of the same was it is afo- (as above said) agreed that none are to pound without the knowledge of all those Concerned, or most part of them that have Goates in their flocks, nor to drive an other mans flock to their pound on pretence of having some, few of theirs a mongst them, But if some few of another flock gett a mong theirs, they are to give notice to the true owners thereof, and in so doing the owners are to fetch them the next pounding day, or Else it is Lawfull for the others to keepe them and send them to the owner thereof,</p> <p>And if any person or persons whatsoever do Contrary to the abovesaid rules unanimously agreed they are to be accounted as felons, and to be prosecuted accordingly</p> <p>Likewise Complaint having bin made to the Gov<sup>e</sup> by the Church wardens, that they had seen a Black of James Ryders bring downe to the fort on Sunday last, a Large budgett full of Cloaths on upon which Complaint the said Ryder was sent for and Examined, who Confesst the whole truth, and said he was heartily sorry for it, and expressed he had sent the Black after he was separated from him</p> <p>Wherefore It is ordered That the said James Ryder be fined five shill<sup>s</sup> towards the rebuilding of the Church Poirier Goodwin</p>	<p>If some members of a group failed to attend the agreed meeting place for goat hunting, those who formed the majority and were present were allowed to proceed without losing their effort. The absence of others did not prevent the hunt from going ahead.</p> <p>No person was allowed to hunt wild goats during the kidding season.</p> <p>It was also agreed that no one could enclose or seize goats without the knowledge of all, or at least most, of those who shared ownership of the flock. No one was permitted to drive another person's flock into their own enclosure on the pretence that a few of their goats were among them. If a small number of goats from one flock entered another, notice had to be given to the true owners. Those owners were required to collect them on the next appointed day for enclosing. If they failed to do so, the others could keep the goats and then send them to the rightful owner.</p> <p>Any person who broke these rules was to be treated as a felon and prosecuted accordingly.</p> <p>A further complaint was made by the churchwardens. They reported that they had seen a Black servant belonging to James Ryders bring a large bundle of clothes into the fort on the previous Sunday. Ryders was summoned and examined. He admitted the offence, expressed regret, and stated that he had sent the servant after they had separated.</p> <p>It was ordered that James Ryders be fined £0 5s 0d towards the rebuilding of the church.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The rule allowing the majority present to proceed with the hunt ensured that collective action could continue despite partial absence. This prevented obstruction by non-attendance and reinforced practical decision-making within shared ownership.</p> <p>The prohibition on hunting during the kidding season protected the breeding cycle of goats. This showed an awareness of resource sustainability and the need to preserve future livestock.</p> <p>The restriction on enclosing or seizing goats without shared knowledge regulated the use of pounds as a legal tool. Enclosure functioned as a method of asserting control over animals, but required collective agreement to prevent abuse.</p> <p>The requirement to notify owners and return stray animals established a system of recognised property rights even when herds mixed. This balanced practical realities with legal ownership.</p> <p>The classification of rule-breaking as felony raised these offences to a serious criminal level. This demonstrated the importance placed on controlling livestock disputes and preventing theft within the community.</p> <p>The complaint by the churchwardens showed their role in monitoring behaviour, including observance of Sunday norms. Bringing goods into the fort on that day was treated as improper conduct.</p> <p>The fine imposed on James Ryders for his servant's actions showed that masters were held responsible for those under their control. This reinforced hierarchical accountability within households.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The detailed coordination required for goat hunting suggested that earlier disorder had made individual action unreliable. The system of fixed days and group participation appears designed to restore trust and prevent conflict.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The rule allowing others to keep uncollected goats after notice indicated a practical solution to disputes over straying animals. This may have encouraged prompt action by owners while reducing ongoing quarrels.</p> <p>The penalty imposed on James Ryders, despite his apology, suggested that maintaining public order, especially on Sundays, took precedence over personal explanation. This may have aimed to reinforce visible compliance with social and religious expectations.</p>
177	171	<p>Island St Helena  By the Gov<sup>er</sup> and Council  A Proclamation  Whereas Mr George Carne sent or gave leave to one of his Blacks Named Jacob to go to Sandy Bay beach  on the 16<sup>th</sup> of this Instant (being Lords day) in the forenoon, who mett in his way Cæsar a Black of John Facknalds, at w<sup>ch</sup> night  the said place aforesaid, and the said Jacob Endeavouring to  Cause the said Cæsar to goe home to his master, from whom he had Rann away on Saturday before, But the said Cæsar refused to go home w<sup>ch</sup> the said Jacob, and Stabed  him with a Dutch knife in the Back in Two severall places, of which wounds he died on fryday last at night and Although it is against our owne Inclinations to put the Country to any trouble whatsoever, But however  being in a manner forced to do it by reason of this sad Accident, we hope they the said Assembly will take it on them Willingly and Cheerfully  These are therefore to give Notice that the Gov<sup>er</sup> and Council doth Intend to meet on Tuesday the first day of November next Ensueing, at the Sessions house near fort James, as a Court of Justice, In order to the tryall of Cæsar the said John Facknalds Slave, Therefore all persons Concerned are to Take Notice  Accordingly, Dated att fort James this 25<sup>th</sup> day of Octo<sup>br</sup> 1698  Signed by ord<sup>r</sup> of Gov<sup>er</sup> and Council  by me J: Alexander Clk</p>	<p>A proclamation was issued by the Governor and Council at Fort James on 25 October 1698.</p> <p>It was reported that Mr George Carne had sent, or allowed, one of his Black servants named Jacob to go to Sandy Bay beach on the morning of Sunday 16 October 1698. On the way, Jacob met Caesar, a Black servant belonging to John Facknald, at that place. Caesar had run away from his master on the previous Saturday. Jacob tried to make him return home, but Caesar refused. During the encounter, Caesar stabbed Jacob twice in the back with a Dutch knife. Jacob later died from these wounds on the night of Friday 21 October 1698.</p> <p>The Governor and Council stated that they did not wish to burden the inhabitants, but felt compelled to act because of the seriousness of the incident. They expressed the expectation that the assembly would cooperate willingly.</p> <p>It was announced that the Governor and Council would meet as a Court of Justice on Tuesday 1 November 1698 at the Sessions House near Fort James. The purpose was to try Caesar, the slave belonging to John Facknald, for the killing of Jacob. All persons concerned were instructed to take notice and attend as required.</p> <p>The proclamation was issued by order of the Governor and Council and recorded by John Alexander, clerk.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The formal proclamation showed how serious criminal cases were announced publicly. This ensured that the community was informed and that those required to attend the trial could be present.</p> <p>The description of Caesar as a runaway highlighted the legal status of enslaved people as property under control of a master. Returning a runaway was treated as an expected duty, even by another slave acting on behalf of authority.</p> <p>The use of a Dutch knife indicated a specific type of weapon, suggesting that tools in everyday use could become instruments of violence. Its mention helped define the nature of the offence.</p> <p>The decision to convene a Court of Justice for the trial demonstrated that even cases involving enslaved people followed a formal legal process. This reflected the structured administration of justice on the island.</p> <p>The statement that the Governor and Council were reluctant to trouble the inhabitants suggested that assembling a court required the participation of local people, possibly as jurors or witnesses, which placed demands on the community.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The fact that Jacob attempted to force Caesar to return suggested that informal enforcement of control over runaway slaves could be delegated beyond the master. This may have contributed to the confrontation that led to violence.</p> <p>The emphasis on the Governor's reluctance to convene the court indicated awareness of the burden on the small population. This suggests that legal proceedings required collective involvement and could disrupt daily activity.</p> <p>The rapid move to trial following Jacob's death showed an effort to address the incident promptly. This</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			likely aimed to maintain order and deter further resistance or violence among the enslaved population.
<a href="#">178</a>	172	Blank page	
<a href="#">179</a>	173	<p>Island St Helena 173</p> <p>Whereas Cæsam a Slave of John facknald did wound Jacob a slave of Mr George Carne with a Dutch knife in the body in Two severall places, on Sunday the 16<sup>th</sup> day of October last, of which wounds the said Jacob died on the 21 day of Instant following;</p> <p>These are in his Majesties name to Authorize and Impower you Orlando Bagley Sen<sup>r</sup> to act in the office and station of Coroner in this particular affaire,</p> <p>and upon receipt of this you do repaire unto the house of the said Mr Geo: Carne, and Cause to be warned Twelve men to be aiding and assisting you as Jurors, whom you are to sweare as such and to Enquire into and after the manner of the said Jacobs death,</p> <p>and you are strictly to view the body and wounds, and an account thereof you are hereby required to returne with all speed unto us the Governor and Councill, with your opinion and verdict under all your hands. Given under our hands and seales this 22<sup>d</sup> day of octo<sup>br</sup> 1698</p> <p>Tho: Poirier Tho: Goodwin Zera Copia p me J Alexander Clk Wee the Jury of Inquest being Summoned by orlando Bagley Sen<sup>r</sup> Coron<sup>r</sup> to Inquire into and after the manner of the death of Jacob a slave of Mr Geo: Carne of the said Island, Brought in there verdict as followeth, That the wounds that the said Jacob recd of his body, which he received was the occasion of his Death: Witness our hands this 22 day of 8ber 1698</p> <p>1 Orlando Bagley Sen<sup>r</sup> 2 Thomas Greendale 3 John Orchard 4 John Long 5 Edward Bagley 6 Rich: Curling 1 Edward Edmunds foreman 2 John Field 3 Sam: Wrangham 4 Henry Francis 5 John Bowman 6 Kipin Wills</p>	<p>An order was issued in the name of the Crown concerning the death of Jacob, a slave belonging to Mr George Carne. Jacob had been wounded by Caesar, a slave of John Facknald, who stabbed him twice in the body with a Dutch knife on Sunday 16 October 1698. Jacob died from these wounds on 21 October 1698.</p> <p>Orlando Bagley the elder was authorised and appointed to act as coroner for this case. He was instructed to go to the house of Mr George Carne and summon twelve men to serve as jurors. These men were to be sworn in and required to investigate the cause and manner of Jacob's death. The coroner was ordered to examine the body and the wounds closely, and to report his findings, together with the jury's opinion and verdict, back to the Governor and Council without delay.</p> <p>This order was issued under the authority of Thomas Poirier and Thomas Goodwin on 22 October 1698 and recorded by John Alexander, clerk.</p> <p>The jury of inquest, summoned by Orlando Bagley the elder, carried out the investigation. They returned a verdict that the wounds Jacob received to his body were the cause of his death.</p> <p>The inquest was signed by Orlando Bagley the elder, Thomas Greendale, John Orchard, John Long, Edward Bagley, Richard Curling, Edward Edmunds, who acted as foreman, John Field, Samuel Wrangham, Henry Francis, John Bowman and Kipin Wills.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The appointment of a coroner showed a formal process for investigating deaths. This role required an official examination of the body and the gathering of sworn testimony to establish cause of death.</p> <p>The summoning of twelve jurors for the inquest reflected a structured legal procedure similar to a jury system. Their collective verdict gave authority to the findings and supported later judicial action.</p> <p>The requirement to inspect the body and wounds demonstrated an early form of forensic inquiry. Physical evidence was treated as essential to determining responsibility.</p> <p>The phrase "in his Majesty's name" showed that authority for legal action derived from the Crown. This reinforced the legitimacy of the proceedings within the wider framework of English law.</p> <p>The identification of Jacob and Caesar as slaves emphasised their legal status as property, yet the formal investigation showed that violent death, even among enslaved people, required official scrutiny.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The rapid organisation of the inquest, within a day of Jacob's death, suggested urgency in establishing the facts. This may have been intended to support the forthcoming trial and prevent uncertainty or dispute over the cause of death.</p> <p>The clear verdict that the wounds caused the death indicated that the jury found direct responsibility without complication. This likely simplified the legal case against Caesar and strengthened the basis for prosecution.</p> <p>The use of a full jury and formal procedure in this case suggested that the authorities aimed to demonstrate order and fairness. This may have been important in maintaining control and legitimacy in a small and closely connected community.</p>
<a href="#">180</a>	174	<p>Island St Helena</p> <p>Att a Court of Justice held on Tuesday the first day of 9ber 1698 at the Sessions House Neare fort James</p>	<p>A Court of Justice was held at the Sessions House near Fort James on 1 November 1698. Governor Stephen Poirier presided as judge, with Thomas Goodwin assisting.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Pres: Step: Poirier Govr &amp; Judge  Tho: Goodwin Assistant  After the Court was opened according to the accustomed manner those persons appointed for Jurors are as followeth  7 John Goodwin  8 Sam Wrangham  9 John Mudge  10 Sam<sup>m</sup> Jacobells  11 W<sup>m</sup> Mellins  12 Charles Broward  1 Orlando Bagley Sen<sup>r</sup> foreman  2 John ffrith  3 Robert Addis  4 James Rider  5 Richard Beale  6 Sam<sup>m</sup> Taylor  Who being all Sworne to Give a True verdict, the Prisoner was brought forth and set to the barr, Who Confessed that he did Stab Jacob  Mr Geo: Carnes Slave, by Reason he would not have raised him to go home to his master, and his being not willing stabbed him the sd Jacob in Two places in the Back with a Dutch knife  Chirurgion  Geo: Hoskisson Sworne saith that he viewed the said Jacobs wounds, and upon his skilles according to his opinion &amp; Judgement that the wounds the said Caesam gave the sd Jacob is the Occasion of his Death  James Wilson Sould<sup>r</sup> Sworne saith that the sd Blacks George being de-sirous by means to assist for the sd Black and told them in there meeting the sd Jacob, and told them that he had met with Caesam who Stabed him with a knife in Two places in the back being he would have him gone home to his master  Rich: Griffin Sworne saith that the night before he brought the sd Caesam down to the fort, he came to his house in the night, and came into his house who asked him why he Stabed Jacob, saying was the Devill in you to fall on a Black, to which the sd Caesam made no reply, further saith the sd Caesam then drew his hand and showed his knife which was Bloody two and showed him his knife the sd Jacob Stabed it was Bloody, and further saith he told him that the knife stuck in the sd Jacobs back so fast he could hardly get it out  Then the Jury withdrew and stayed about halfe an houer, then returned and brought a verdict that the said Caesam was Guilty of wilfull murder according to the Evidence and his own Confession  According to wch verdict the Judge pronounced Sentence that you shall be Conveyed from hence to the place from whence you came and from thence to the place of Execution where you be hanged by the Neck untill you be Dead, and your body to be severed from your body, and to be divided into 4 Quarters, and to be set upon 4 posts in the severall places of this Island, and the God of Infinite mercy be mercifull unto yor Soule.</p>	<p>The court opened in the usual manner. Twelve jurors were appointed and sworn: Orlando Bagley the elder, who served as foreman, John Frith, Robert Addis, James Ryders, Richard Beale, Samuel Taylor, John Goodwin, Samuel Wrangham, John Mudge, Samuel Jacobells, William Mellins and Charles Broward.</p> <p>The prisoner, Caesar, a slave belonging to John Facknald, was brought before the court. He admitted that he stabbed Jacob, a slave of Mr George Carne. He stated that he did so because Jacob tried to make him return to his master, and he refused. He then stabbed Jacob twice in the back with a Dutch knife.</p> <p>George Hoskisson, a surgeon, gave sworn evidence. He stated that he examined Jacob's wounds and, based on his professional judgement, concluded that the wounds inflicted by Caesar caused Jacob's death.</p> <p>James Wilson, a soldier, gave sworn evidence. He stated that Jacob reported the attack after it happened. Jacob said he had met Caesar, who stabbed him twice in the back with a knife because he tried to make him return to his master.</p> <p>Richard Griffin gave sworn evidence. He stated that on the night before he brought Caesar to the fort, Caesar came to his house. Griffin asked him why he had stabbed Jacob. Caesar gave no answer. Griffin stated that Caesar showed him the knife, which was covered in blood, and said that it had been used in the attack. He also said that the knife had stuck in Jacob's back and was difficult to remove.</p> <p>The jury withdrew to consider the case. After about half an hour, they returned with a verdict that Caesar was guilty of wilful murder, based on the evidence and his own confession.</p> <p>Following this verdict, the judge pronounced sentence. Caesar was to be taken from the court to the place from which he came, and then to the place of execution. He was to be hanged by the neck until dead. His body was then to be cut into four parts and displayed on posts in different parts of the island. A final prayer was made for mercy upon his soul.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The presence of a full jury and sworn witnesses showed that even capital cases involving slaves followed a formal judicial process. This reinforced the authority of the court and the legitimacy of its decisions.</p> <p>The prisoner's confession carried significant weight. Combined with witness testimony and medical evidence, it formed a complete case that left little room for dispute.</p> <p>The surgeon's examination of the wounds provided expert confirmation of the cause of death. This demonstrated the importance of professional judgement in supporting legal conclusions.</p> <p>The sentence of execution followed by dismemberment and public display served as a severe deterrent. The distribution of the body across the island was intended to reinforce authority and warn others against similar acts.</p> <p>The involvement of soldiers and local inhabitants as witnesses showed that the enforcement of order depended on both military and civilian participation.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The speed of the trial and the short time taken by the jury to reach a verdict suggested that the case was considered clear and uncontested. The confession and physical evidence likely removed any uncertainty.</p> <p>The extreme nature of the punishment indicated a desire to make an example of Caesar. This may have been intended to discourage resistance among the enslaved population and reinforce control after a violent incident.</p> <p>The inclusion of a prayer at the end of the sentence reflected the integration of religious practice into</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			judicial proceedings. This may have served to frame the punishment within a moral as well as legal order.
181	175	<p>Island St Helena (174)  Att a Consultation Held on wensday the 2<sup>d</sup>  Day of November 1698 att fort James  Pres<sup>t</sup> Step: Poirier Governo:  Tho: Goodwin Assistant  Whereas yesterday a Court of Justice was held  at the Sessions House In order to the Tryall of Cæsam  a Slave of John facknald, who murdered Jacob a Slave  of Mr George Carnes, In vertue of a Proclamation  issued  forth the 25<sup>th</sup> day of 8ber last past and for this Instant  12 men  were Summoned to be Jurors in the said Tryall,  amongst  whome was Edward Edmunds and John ffrith, both of  this  Island free planters; But when all those Summoned for  Jurors  were called by the Clarke they were both found missing  which Caused the Governor to Offer another list of 12  Jurors  to be Sworne againe, at which only appeared Edw<sup>d</sup>  Edmunds  who then said he would not stand a Juror, for some  reasons  which he in Conscience forbad him so to doe; which  pretended  reasons they both delivered on munday last to the  Governor  himsel<sup>f</sup>e (that is) that they were perswaded that the  Gov<sup>r</sup>  hath no power to Call a Court to try any body  whatsoever upon  Life and Death, and to be plaine no power neither to  Rule  himsel<sup>f</sup>e Gov<sup>r</sup>, which words and proceedings tend only  to Mutiny  and has not the other Freeman been of late minded  which to give  them here due; this blame very much the said Edmunds  and ffrith, and said openly they would stand to the Gov<sup>r</sup>  upon any Acc<sup>t</sup> whatsoever Considering therefore that  such  Insolent speeches come but out of an unjust ambition  to be  either Gov<sup>r</sup>, or have the greatest right and share in it  Wherefore It is ordered  That for this first publique fault they be fined each the  Sume of Tenn shillings to the Right Honoble Comp<sup>a</sup>  Thus farr hath bin Sent  to the Rt Honoble Comp<sup>a</sup>  p Ship Dorrill Capt Sam<sup>l</sup>l Gee  Commander  vide Consult<sup>on</sup> the 5<sup>th</sup> day of 7ber  Poirier  Goodwin</p>	<p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 2 November 1698. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p>It was recorded that on the previous day a Court of Justice had been held at the Sessions House for the trial of Caesar, a slave belonging to John Facknald, for the murder of Jacob, a slave of Mr George Carne. This trial had followed a proclamation issued on 25 October 1698.</p> <p>Twelve men had been summoned to serve as jurors, including Edward Edmunds and John Frith, both free planters of the island. When the jurors were called, both men were absent. A second list of twelve jurors was then proposed, but only Edward Edmunds appeared. He refused to serve, stating that his conscience would not allow it. He and John Frith had previously told the Governor on Monday that they believed the Governor had no authority to call a court to try any person in matters of life and death, and that he had no proper authority to govern at all.</p> <p>These statements were judged to promote disorder and challenge authority. It was noted that such views could influence other freemen. Edmunds and Frith were accused of acting out of ambition, seeking either to assume the role of Governor or to claim a greater share in authority.</p> <p>It was therefore ordered that, for this first public offence, both Edward Edmunds and John Frith be fined £(0) 10s 0d each, payable to the Honourable Company.</p> <p>It was further recorded that this matter had been reported to the Honourable Company by the ship <i>Dorrill</i>, commanded by Captain Samuel Gee, with reference made to a previous consultation held on 5 September 1698.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The refusal to serve as jurors showed that participation in the court was considered a duty of free planters. Failure to comply, especially in a capital case, was treated as a serious breach of obligation.</p> <p>The claim that the Governor lacked authority to hold a court for matters of life and death directly challenged the legal foundation of colonial governance. Such statements were treated as threats to order rather than legitimate legal debate.</p> <p>The fine imposed on Edmunds and Frith demonstrated the use of financial penalties to discipline dissent. Payment to the Honourable Company reinforced its position as the ultimate authority over the island.</p> <p>The reference to reporting the matter to the Company by ship showed the link between local governance and central oversight. Communication depended on maritime routes, which limited how quickly disputes could be escalated.</p> <p>The identification of Edmunds and Frith as free planters highlighted their status within the colony. Their resistance carried greater weight because they were members of the governing community rather than subordinate labourers.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The refusal to act as jurors in a capital case suggested concern about the legitimacy of the trial. This may have reflected fear of participating in a death sentence without clear legal authority.</p> <p>The accusation that Edmunds and Frith sought greater power indicated that the Governor interpreted their challenge as political rather than purely legal. This may have been intended to discredit their objections and reinforce his position.</p> <p>The decision to treat this as a first offence and impose a fine rather than harsher punishment suggested</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			an attempt to contain dissent without escalating conflict among the island's free population.
182	176	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the  26<sup>th</sup> Day of December 1698 Att fort James  Pres<sup>t</sup> Step: Poirier Governo:  Tho: Goodwin Assistant  John Mudge Sould, made his Complaint to us  the Gov<sup>r</sup>, and Councill, saying that on the Eleventh or  12<sup>th</sup>  day of November Samuel Taylor free Planter Lockt  him up in his owne house, and kept him there some  time  before he gott out, further Declares that the said Taylor  had  expressed unto severall persons that he the said Mudge  had  Shott a Kunn which went through his Garden, and  went into the  said Taylors Garden, also that the wife of the sd Samuel  Taylor and his wife having some words concerning the  shooting of the Gunn aforesaid the wife called Mr  Taylors base  face, to which she readily replied Not so base as you  to be in the bakehouse w<sup>h</sup> Caesar  Sam<sup>l</sup> Taylor saith that the said midge hath falsely  Accused him in saying he Lockt him up in his owne  house, and as for the bullet being shott from running  into  his Garden, he saith it went through the sd mudge his  house think that it was shott by the sd mudge or his son  (but will not positively say it) further saith yt what the  sd mudge hath said concerning his wife being in the  bakehouse the Prisoner doth owne his wife said as  aforesd  Grace Coulson being Sworne saith that the sd Mudge  as he came from the fort one day Came into her house  and being Discoursing about building, the sd midge  said he would willingly build to, but his neighbours  would not permit him, the occasion is because he being  a building a Garden wall in the fort walls, and the  sd Taylor having built before him, the sd mudge  layd his wall to the sd Taylors wall in both Gardens  without any manner of Satisfaction for halfe of the</p>	<p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 26 December 1698. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p>John Mudge, a soldier, brought a complaint. He stated that on 11 or 12 November 1698 Samuel Taylor, a free planter, locked him inside his own house and kept him there for some time before he managed to get out. He also claimed that Taylor had told several people that Mudge had fired a gun, and that the shot passed through his garden and entered Taylor's garden. Mudge further reported that an argument took place between Taylor's wife and his own wife about the shooting. During this dispute, his wife called Taylor's wife "base-faced", and Taylor's wife replied that she was not as base as Mudge's wife, whom she accused of being in the bakehouse with Caesar.</p> <p>Samuel Taylor responded that Mudge had falsely accused him of locking him in his house. Regarding the gunshot, he stated that the bullet passed through Mudge's house and into his own garden, and he believed it was fired by Mudge or his son, though he would not state this with certainty. He also confirmed that his wife had spoken the words attributed to her during the argument.</p> <p>Grace Coulson gave sworn evidence. She stated that Mudge came to her house one day after returning from the fort. During a discussion about building, Mudge said he would willingly build, but his neighbours would not allow it. This dispute arose because Mudge had been building a garden wall within the fort boundaries. Taylor had already built his wall there, and Mudge had joined his own wall to Taylor's wall in both gardens without giving any compensation for half of the [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The allegation that Samuel Taylor locked John Mudge in his own house showed how personal disputes could escalate into claims of unlawful restraint. Such actions, if proven, would represent a direct interference with personal liberty within the settlement.</p> <p>The dispute over the gunshot revealed the risks posed by firearms in a confined community. Damage to property could easily occur, and responsibility for such incidents became a matter of contention between neighbours.</p> <p>The exchange of insults between the two women showed how reputational attacks, especially involving accusations of improper sexual conduct, formed part of wider household conflicts. These verbal disputes could carry serious social consequences.</p> <p>The issue of the garden wall highlighted the importance of property boundaries and shared structures. Building against another person's wall without compensation raised questions of ownership and rights over improvements.</p> <p>Grace Coulson's testimony demonstrated how informal conversations were used as evidence. Statements made in private settings could later be introduced to clarify motives and ongoing disputes.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The claim that Mudge was prevented from building suggested an underlying dispute over land use within the fort. This may have been driven by competition for limited space and resources.</p> <p>The accusation involving the bakehouse and Caesar indicated that personal conflicts were reinforced by attempts to damage reputation. Such claims may have been used strategically to undermine the opposing household.</p> <p>The disagreement over the shared wall suggested that physical proximity between properties increased the likelihood of conflict. The lack of clear boundaries or</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			agreements may have contributed to repeated disputes between neighbours.
183	177	<p>[...] Taylers wall, w<sup>ch</sup> he understanding perswaded y<sup>e</sup> said mudge to joyne to his wall unless he would pay him for y<sup>e</sup> halfe, at w<sup>ch</sup> the said mudge told Mr Coulson whom she informed, thinke it but a jest that you should satisfie Mr Tayler for halfe his wall, and that she has heard that he had stopt or turned the water that should run into the said Taylers Garden, w<sup>ch</sup> the said mudge denied, and also he vexeth that he had been by Mr Tayler say any thing of his wife, she suppose she heard her say that he was willing so base face, as to be in the bakehouse w<sup>th</sup> Cæsar, Mr mudge having called Mr Tayler brazen face before; Henry Coles being sworne saith, that he knowes nothing of the Matter now in Question, only Declares that about Eleven or 12 yeares agoe W<sup>m</sup> Price Deceased came into his house at the fort, who told him and his wife that he had thought before that the said mudge to sett him free from Imprisonment he may be judged eternall w<sup>th</sup> was on the teaching roade being nigh the bakehouse, but she would not let him, and mentioned some part of Scripture to him, which almost amazed him, he having not a word to say for himselfe The said Coles wife being sworne saith the same, as her husband hath already Thomas Fruisdale being sworne saith that he being Coming downe from his house in the valley towards the fort, the said John mudge called to him and told him he was lockt up in his house, and could not gett out, but doth not remember that the said mudge mentioned any body, to whom he desired to go out att the back doore M<sup>r</sup> Jewster saith that she heard Mr Tayler say as she was passing by their doore, that they had stopt the water that comes into their Garden, but did not heare her name any body upon.</p>	<p>Grace Coulson continued her evidence. She stated that Samuel Taylor had urged John Mudge not to join his wall to Taylor's unless he paid for half of it. Mudge replied, in a conversation reported to Mr Coulson, that it was unreasonable to expect payment for half the wall. She also said she had heard that Mudge had blocked or diverted the water that should have flowed into Taylor's garden, which Mudge denied. She added that she believed Taylor had complained about Mudge speaking about his wife, and she understood that Mudge had earlier called Taylor "brazen-faced", while Taylor's wife had replied by accusing Mudge's wife of improper conduct with Caesar in the bakehouse.</p> <p>Henry Coales gave sworn evidence. He stated that he had no knowledge of the present dispute. He added that about eleven or twelve years earlier William Price, now deceased, came to his house at the fort and said that he had once thought to free Mudge from confinement near the bakehouse, but had been prevented. He said that a passage of scripture had been spoken to him at the time, which left him unable to respond.</p> <p>The wife of Henry Coales gave sworn evidence and confirmed the same account.</p> <p>Thomas Freesdale gave sworn evidence. He stated that while coming down from his house in the valley towards the fort, John Mudge called out to him and said that he had been locked inside his house and could not get out. Freesdale did not recall Mudge naming the person responsible. He advised Mudge to leave by the back door.</p> <p>Mrs Jewster gave evidence. She stated that as she passed by Samuel Taylor's house, she heard him say that someone had stopped the water that flowed into his garden, but she did not hear him name any person.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The dispute over the shared wall showed that construction within the fort required agreement between neighbours. Payment for half a wall reflected a recognised principle of shared cost where structures were used jointly.</p> <p>The allegation of diverting water revealed the importance of water access in garden management. Control over water supply formed a practical and contested aspect of property rights.</p> <p>The exchange of insults, including accusations of sexual misconduct, demonstrated how personal reputation became entangled with disputes over property and boundaries. Such remarks could escalate conflict beyond the original issue.</p> <p>The testimony about Mudge being locked in his house relied on indirect evidence. Freesdale's account showed that complaints could be reported without naming a perpetrator, which weakened the certainty of the claim.</p> <p>The reference to an earlier incident involving William Price introduced older events into the case. This showed that past behaviour and reputation could be invoked even when not directly relevant to the immediate dispute.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The disagreement over payment for the wall suggested that both parties sought to assert control over shared space. The refusal to pay may have been interpreted as a challenge to Taylor's prior claim or investment.</p> <p>The claim about water being diverted indicated a possible tactic to disadvantage a neighbour's garden. If true, this would have been a subtle form of interference with property rather than direct confrontation.</p> <p>The inability of witnesses to confirm who locked Mudge in his house suggested that the allegation may</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>have lacked clear support. This uncertainty may have made it difficult for the council to assign responsibility.</p> <p>The inclusion of older and loosely connected testimony implied an attempt to influence the case through character and past events. This suggested that personal standing and reputation played a role alongside factual evidence in resolving disputes.</p>
184	178	<p>Upon which It is ordered That not having any punctuall proofes Concerning the Complaint now made by the aforesaid John Mudge against the said Samuell Tayler, that he the said mudge be cast, and pay Charges of Councill Elizabeth Hartling singlewoman made her Complaint to the Governor and Councill informing them that her Grand mother had sent her a gold ring out of England by her own mother, when she Came safe from thence, since her married to Andrew Phillips Junr, and being now Deceased she hath made Demand severall times for the same of her who is said he have it, saying that he knowes no such ring, or that her grand mother sent it or no, and that his wife oft times hath made use of such ring, which he never had before he was married John Hemmon sould, being sworne saith that he hath severall times heard the said Elizabeth Hartling mother say that she had a gold ring of her Daughter w<sup>ch</sup> her grand mother sent her out of England, and that when she died her Daughter Elizabeth should have it Mary the wife of the sd John Hemmon being also sworne saith that she was at the said Andrew Phillips house when his wife lay sick (which was two or three Dayes before she dyed) at which time the sd Phillips wife called him into the roome where she lay and on her hearing she said John deliver you to give my Daughter Elizabeth have this gold ring (which was then upon her finger) which her grand mother sent by her out of England, for her grand Daughter, at which time made use of further saith she hath had it some ring in pawn, and was an Innans (??) Upon which Enquired of the said Phillips where it was, and he had the said ring, who said he had a gold ring was his wives, and delivered it to the Govr Councill</p>	<p>The council found that there was no clear proof to support John Mudge's complaint against Samuel Taylor. The case was dismissed, and Mudge was ordered to pay the costs of the council.</p> <p>Elizabeth Hartling, a single woman, then brought a complaint. She stated that her grandmother had sent her a gold ring from England through her mother. After her marriage to Andrew Phillips the younger, and following her mother's death, she demanded the ring from Phillips, who was said to have it. He denied any knowledge of the ring or that it had been sent. She also claimed that his wife had often used such a ring, which he had not possessed before his marriage.</p> <p>John Hemmon, a soldier, gave sworn evidence. He stated that he had often heard Elizabeth Hartling's mother say that she had received a gold ring from her daughter, sent from England by her grandmother, and that on her death the ring should pass to her daughter Elizabeth.</p> <p>Mary, the wife of John Hemmon, gave sworn evidence. She stated that she was present at the house of Andrew Phillips when his wife lay sick, two or three days before her death. She heard Phillips's wife call him into the room and say, in her presence, that he should give the gold ring to her daughter Elizabeth. She said the ring was then on her finger and had been sent from England by her grandmother for her granddaughter. She added that the ring had been pledged at some point. When she later asked Phillips about it, he admitted he had a gold ring that belonged to his wife and handed it over to the Governor and Council.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The dismissal of John Mudge's case showed that the council required clear and direct evidence before upholding a complaint. Without firm proof, the burden of costs fell on the complainant.</p> <p>The dispute over the gold ring demonstrated how personal property, especially items sent from England, retained both material and sentimental value. Such objects could become the subject of formal legal claims.</p> <p>The testimony concerning statements made on a deathbed showed that spoken instructions at the point of death were treated as significant evidence of intent. This functioned as a form of informal testamentary direction in the absence of a written will.</p> <p>The involvement of witnesses such as John Hemmon and his wife showed that repeated statements and observed actions were used to establish ownership. This reflected reliance on community memory in resolving disputes over property.</p> <p>The admission by Andrew Phillips and his delivery of the ring to the council indicated that the authorities could take custody of disputed property while determining rightful ownership.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The denial by Andrew Phillips, followed by his later admission, suggested that he may have initially attempted to retain the ring. The weight of witness testimony may have forced him to acknowledge possession.</p> <p>The reference to the ring being pledged indicated that it may have been used as security for a debt. This suggested that personal valuables circulated within informal credit arrangements.</p> <p>The emphasis on the ring's origin from England highlighted its importance as a family heirloom. This</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>may have strengthened Elizabeth Hartling's claim by linking the object to a clear line of inheritance.</p>
185	179	<p>[...] the aforesaid Evidence said that was [...] ring his wife desired him to let her Daughter have, The said [...] said he had no other ring that was his wife, which he could make oath of however  It is ordered  That the said Andrew Phillips do deliver the ring now produced unto the said Eliz Hartling in the said that his wife brought from England, which he accordingly  [...] and also to pay the Charges of Councill  Katherine the wife of Sam<sup>ts</sup> Tayler Planter  Came this morning in Court making her Complaint agst John Long Planter saying that he the said Long had abused and Defamed her very grosly in Calling her whore  with many other Scandalous words at the House wherein  Tho: Gorgen Gun mate dwelleth, which her husband hearing that the said Long had visited her so to turne her out of Doores, and would not Entertaine her unless such time the said Long were secured, upon which a warrant was Immediately Delivered unto the Marshall to the end that the said Long might be brought downe to the fort, who accordingly was, and Denied what the said Kath:  Tayler alledged against him, whereupon the Evidence were Examined as followeth  Tho: Gorgen Gun mate being sworne saith that on yesterday the said John Long was in his house with some other Company, who being a Discoursing something of the said Katherine Tayler, he heard him the said John say that the said Kath: Tayler was a whore, which her husband had Reproached her to her face with some other ill Language  John Field Se,<sup>l</sup> being sworne saith he being at the time and place aforesaid, heard the said John Long say the said Katherine Tayler was a whore, which he had told her severall times to her face, but she would not say any thing to [...] him  John Sheiles being sworne saith the same as the above said Evidence, and further adds yt he heard the sd Long say something tending to Mr Tayler, being [...] the Robe[r]t a man named Conr[...]</p>	<p>Andrew Phillips stated that the ring produced was the same ring his wife had asked him to give to her daughter. He said he had no other ring belonging to his wife and declared he could swear to this if required.  It was ordered that Andrew Phillips deliver the ring to Elizabeth Hartling, as the ring brought from England for her. He complied with the order and was also required to pay the costs of the council.  Katherine, the wife of Samuel Taylor, a planter, then appeared in court and made a complaint against John Long, also a planter. She stated that Long had seriously abused and defamed her by calling her a whore and using other insulting and scandalous words at the house where Thomas Gorgen, a gunner's mate, lived. Her husband, having heard of this, refused to allow her back into his house until Long had been secured.  A warrant was immediately issued to the marshal to bring John Long to the fort. He was brought in and denied the accusation. Witnesses were then examined.  Thomas Gorgen gave sworn evidence. He stated that on the previous day John Long was at his house with others. During a conversation about Katherine Taylor, he heard Long say that she was a whore. He added that Samuel Taylor had also reproached his wife to her face with other harsh words.  John Field, a sergeant, gave sworn evidence. He stated that he was present at the same time and place and heard John Long say that Katherine Taylor was a whore. He added that Long said he had told her this several times to her face, and that she did not respond.  John Sheiles gave sworn evidence and confirmed the same account as the previous witnesses. He further stated that he heard Long make additional remarks directed at Samuel Taylor, though [...]</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The order requiring Andrew Phillips to hand over the ring showed that the council could directly enforce the transfer of disputed personal property. This demonstrated its authority to settle inheritance disputes based on testimony.</p> <p>The requirement that Phillips pay costs reinforced the principle that a party who resisted a valid claim bore financial responsibility for the proceedings.</p> <p>The accusation of defamation against Katherine Taylor showed that damage to reputation, especially through allegations of sexual misconduct, was treated as a serious matter. Such claims could affect marital relations and social standing.</p> <p>The immediate issue of a warrant for John Long's arrest demonstrated the council's readiness to act quickly in cases of public insult. This reflected a system where order and reputation were actively protected.</p> <p>The reliance on multiple witnesses who heard the same words showed the importance of corroboration. Consistent testimony from several individuals strengthened the case against the accused.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Samuel Taylor's refusal to admit his wife back into the house until John Long was secured suggested that accusations of sexual misconduct could threaten the stability of a household. This may have created pressure for rapid legal action to restore reputation.</p> <p>The repeated statements attributed to John Long indicated that his remarks were not isolated. This may have made the accusation more damaging and more difficult to dismiss as casual speech.</p> <p>The involvement of several men in the same setting suggested that such remarks were made publicly rather than in private. This likely increased their impact and contributed to the formal complaint.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
<a href="#">186</a>	180	<p>Upon the whole matter It is ordered That [...] final Decision of this matter be referred untill the next Generall Court to be kept (being by the Earnest Desire of the sd Katherine Tayler and her Husband) And also that the said Long be kept in prison, or Else give Security for his good behaviour untill the said Court day</p> <p>But Immediately after they all came againe to the Gov: and the said Kath: Tayler said that the said Long had asked her pardon, saying that he was somewhat in Drinke, and doth owne her to be an honest woman upon which she was willing to have the said Long released from his Confinement which her husband was very free to, and was accordingly Island St Helena</p> <p>Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 3 Day of January 1698/9 Att Fort James</p> <p>Prs<sup>t</sup> Step: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup></p> <p>Tho: Goodwin assistant</p> <p>Whereas mr Thomas Goodwin and Edm<sup>d</sup> Church wardens for this present yeare complained to the Gov<sup>r</sup> that when Mr Harrison was buried John Tucker being then there was very Drunke, Whome abused the said Edmund very basely, for his kind Admonition, and also did unrespectfully take the holy name of God in vaine, w<sup>th</sup> severall other wicked Oaths, the Gov<sup>r</sup> having then also heard the Defullers babs and wild Expressions, whereupon ordered him to be taken out of all the peoples Company and Secured</p>	<p>After reviewing the case, the council decided to delay a final judgement in the dispute between Katherine Taylor and John Long until the next General Court, as requested by Katherine Taylor and her husband. In the meantime, John Long was to remain in prison or provide security for his good behaviour until that court date.</p> <p>Shortly afterwards, all parties returned to the Governor. Katherine Taylor stated that John Long had asked her forgiveness. He admitted he had been drinking and acknowledged that she was an honest woman. She agreed to his release, and her husband also consented. John Long was then released from confinement.</p> <p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 3 January 1699. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin and Edmund [...], serving as churchwardens for that year, complained to the Governor about John Tucker. They stated that during the burial of Mr Harrison, Tucker was very drunk. He behaved abusively towards Edmund in response to a warning and used the name of God in a disrespectful manner, along with several other offensive oaths. The Governor confirmed that he had heard Tucker's disorderly and offensive speech at the time. He ordered that Tucker be removed from the company of others and taken into custody.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The decision to delay judgement showed that the council could defer cases when requested by the parties involved. This allowed time for resolution or further consideration without immediate punishment.</p> <p>The option for John Long to provide security for good behaviour reflected a preventive measure. It allowed release from custody under the condition of future compliance, reducing the need for continued imprisonment.</p> <p>The acceptance of an apology as grounds for release showed that reconciliation could resolve disputes without formal judgement. Restoration of reputation and agreement between parties could override the need for further legal action.</p> <p>The role of churchwardens in reporting misconduct during a burial highlighted their responsibility for maintaining moral and social order, especially during religious observances.</p> <p>The offence of drunkenness and blasphemy at a burial was treated seriously. Such behaviour violated both social norms and religious expectations, justifying immediate intervention by the authorities.</p> <p>The Governor's direct observation of the misconduct strengthened the case. His authority allowed immediate action without reliance solely on witness testimony.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The willingness of Katherine Taylor to accept an apology suggested that restoring her public reputation was more important than pursuing formal punishment. The admission by John Long may have been sufficient to repair the damage.</p> <p>The emphasis on Tucker's behaviour at a burial indicated that public disorder in a religious setting was seen as especially disruptive. This may have prompted a stronger response than similar conduct elsewhere.</p> <p>The immediate removal and confinement of Tucker suggested that visible enforcement was intended to deter similar behaviour during communal gatherings.</p>
<a href="#">187</a>	181	<p>The said Fuller being asked could not Deny the his wicked Actions Whereupon It was ordered That the said Fuller be fined the sum of three Dollars, for his said Offences with Admonition for</p>	<p>John Fuller was questioned and could not deny his misconduct. It was therefore ordered that he be fined three dollars for his offences. He was warned not to repeat such behaviour, on pain of more severe punishment.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>the future not to Committ any such Crimes, upon paine of severe punishment  Margaret Colgrave widdow made her Complaint to the Govr, and Councell, setting forth that Edward Brayne Planter Did at the House of William Mason abuse her Eldest son named Robert Colgrave in calling him Bastard, and son of a whore, and Thieve, Saying he stole his goats, To whom the said Gilbert replied Can you prove me a Thieve, yes said he said Brayne Then Simon Whaley told me that Robinson you have stolen some of my Goats, upon which word the said Gilbert bid Robert go and shoot by to bear witnesse further said Brayne that if he had good Tobacco and Beefe enough he would never steale his Goats  The said Edward Brayne Denyes that he called the said Gilbert Colgrave any names as aforesaid, Only that him who he went a Hunting after his goats, with Simon Whaley, saying that Simon Whaley told him so William Marsh being sworn saith that he heard the said Edward Brayne at his house say to the said Gilbert Colgrave that he had shotten some of his Goates which Simon Whaley would testify  Simon Whaley saith that James Draper told him that the said Gilbert Colgrave &amp; the aforesaid Simon goats him was a shooting and had killed one goate but did not know whose it was</p>	<p>Margaret Colgrave, a widow, then brought a complaint to the Governor and Council. She stated that Edward Brayne, a planter, had insulted her eldest son, Robert Colgrave, at the house of William Mason. Brayne was accused of calling him a bastard, the son of a whore, and a thief, and of saying that he had stolen his goats. In response, Robert Colgrave challenged him to prove the accusation. Brayne replied that Simon Whaley had told him that Robert had stolen some of his goats. Brayne further said that if he had enough tobacco and beef, he would not need to steal goats.</p> <p>Edward Brayne denied calling Robert Colgrave these names. He stated only that when he went hunting for his goats with Simon Whaley, Whaley told him that Robert had taken some of them.</p> <p>William Marsh gave sworn evidence. He stated that he heard Edward Brayne at his house say to Robert Colgrave that he had shot some of his goats, and that Simon Whaley would confirm this.</p> <p>Simon Whaley gave evidence. He stated that James Draper told him that Robert Colgrave had been out shooting and had killed a goat, though he did not know whose goat it was.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The fine of three dollars showed the use of non-sterling currency alongside sterling penalties. This indicated the circulation of mixed monetary systems within the island's economy, likely influenced by trade.</p> <p>The accusation of theft of goats reflected the continuing importance of livestock as a form of property. Disputes over animals frequently led to claims of dishonesty and damage to reputation.</p> <p>The use of severe insults, including accusations of illegitimacy and theft, demonstrated how verbal abuse could combine personal and economic accusations. Such statements could harm both social standing and perceived trustworthiness.</p> <p>The reliance on second-hand statements, such as what Simon Whaley was said to have reported, showed that evidence could be indirect. This weakened certainty and made disputes harder to resolve definitively.</p> <p>The involvement of multiple witnesses across different households showed how information circulated within the community. Testimony often depended on shared conversations rather than direct observation.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The reference to tobacco and beef suggested that access to provisions influenced behaviour. The statement may have implied that scarcity could drive theft, or was used to deflect the accusation.</p> <p>The dependence on reports passed through several individuals indicated that the accusation may have spread informally before reaching the court. This may have intensified the dispute before formal resolution was sought.</p> <p>The uncertainty over ownership of the goat that was shot suggested that unclear boundaries between herds continued to create conflict. This reflects ongoing difficulties in distinguishing property in a shared environment.</p>
188	182	<p>John Marsh being sworne saith that he heard the Edward Brayne say at his fathers House, that give him good Bacon enough he would not eate goate, meaning the said Gilb<sup>l</sup> Colgrave And that he saw the said Brayne strike the said Gilbert Colgrave, and Pull him downe by the Cap w<sup>ch</sup> was on his head  Thomas Burnham Jun<sup>r</sup> sworne saith that on the day he and severall others worked at the High wayes, they went to Mr Mosleys where he heard Edward Brayne say something about goates to the said Gilbert Colgrave, but doth not know what, he then being gone into the house, but a little after heard the said Brayne</p>	<p>John Marsh gave sworn evidence. He stated that he heard Edward Brayne say at his father's house that if he had enough bacon he would not eat goat, referring to Robert Colgrave. He also said he saw Brayne strike Robert Colgrave and pull him down by the cap he was wearing.</p> <p>Thomas Burnham the younger gave sworn evidence. He stated that on a day when he and others were working on the highways, they went to Mr Mosley's house. There he heard Brayne speaking to Robert Colgrave about goats, though he did not hear the full exchange as he had gone inside. Shortly after, he heard Brayne say that if he had enough bacon and beef</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>say give him Bacon and beefe, he would not eate so much  Goate, and heard the said Brayne call the said Gilbert Colgrave  either Bastard or son of a whore, The said Brayne being much in Drinke  Mary the wife of the said Thomas Burnham being sworne saith that she heard the said Edward Brayne say  to the said Gilbert Colgrave at Mr Mosleys, if you had bacon  and Beef enough you would not eate so much Goate, and saw  him strike the said Gilbert Colgrave by his Cap w<sup>ch</sup> was on his head  upon which he would have stricke the said Brayne had she not hindered him, and heard the said Brayne call the said Gilbert Colgrave son of a whore and Bastard  he being in Drinke  Upon the whole matter It is ordered  That the said Brayne be fined five shillings for being Drunke, and for Calling the said Gilbert Colgrave those unseemely Names aforesaid, to pay him two shillings more  and the value of his Capp w<sup>ch</sup> was torne, with Admonition for future Not to abuse the said Gilbert Colgrave nor his brother knowing him to be an honest woman Also to pay the Charges of Councill</p>	<p>he would not eat so much goat. He also heard Brayne call Robert Colgrave either a bastard or the son of a whore. He noted that Brayne was drunk at the time.  Mary, the wife of Thomas Burnham, gave sworn evidence. She stated that at Mr Mosley's house she heard Brayne say to Robert Colgrave that if he had enough bacon and beef he would not eat so much goat. She saw Brayne strike Colgrave by pulling at his cap. She said that Colgrave would have struck Brayne in return if she had not stopped him. She also heard Brayne call him a bastard and the son of a whore. She confirmed that Brayne was drunk.  After considering the case, it was ordered that Edward Brayne be fined £0 5s 0d for being drunk and for using abusive language towards Robert Colgrave. He was also ordered to pay £0 2s 0d to Colgrave and to compensate him for the value of his torn cap. He was warned not to abuse Robert Colgrave or his brother again, and acknowledged that Colgrave was an honest man. He was further required to pay the costs of the council.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The combination of a fine to the authorities and compensation to the injured party showed a dual approach to justice. Punishment addressed public disorder, while payment to Colgrave repaired personal harm.  The reference to the torn cap indicated that even minor damage to personal property was recognised and compensated. This reflected attention to everyday material losses within disputes.  The repeated mention of drunkenness showed that intoxication was treated as an aggravating factor. It contributed both to disorderly conduct and to the severity of the penalty.  The use of multiple witnesses who confirmed both the language and the physical assault demonstrated the importance of corroboration. Consistent testimony strengthened the case and justified the ruling.  The warning not to abuse Colgrave or his brother again showed an attempt to prevent further conflict. The council acted not only to punish past behaviour but also to manage future relations between individuals.  <b>Speculations</b>  The emphasis on Brayne's drunken state suggested that alcohol played a central role in escalating the confrontation. The penalty may have aimed to discourage similar behaviour linked to drinking.  The statement that Colgrave was an honest man, included in the judgement, indicated an effort to restore his reputation publicly. This may have been as important as the financial compensation.  The involvement of several witnesses in a social setting suggested that the incident occurred in a communal environment. This likely increased its seriousness, as the insults and violence were seen by many and affected broader social relations.</p>
189	183	<p>And whereas it doth appeare by the witnesses before mentioned, that the said Gilbert Colgrave, and widow Sarah  Jun<sup>d</sup> did Contrary to an ord<sup>r</sup> of Councill go a Hunting and killed the wild goates, whereupon  It is ordered  That both the said Colgrave &amp; Sarah be fined each the sume of three shillings to th[e] poor of the Island it being  the first offence in breach of the said order  Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Fryday the  5<sup>th</sup> Day of January 1698/9 Att Fort James  Prs<sup>t</sup> Step: Poirier Govern<sup>r</sup>,  Thomas Goodwin assistant  Whereas we have lately parted from one James Duffe, who had some skill in Chirurgery, unto Capt</p>	<p>It was established from the witness testimony that Robert Colgrave and Widow Sarah Jun<sup>d</sup> had acted against a previous order of the council by going out to hunt and kill wild goats.  It was therefore ordered that both Robert Colgrave and Sarah Jun<sup>d</sup> be fined £0 3s 0d each, to be paid to the poor of the island. This was treated as a first offence.  A council meeting was held at Fort James on 5 January 1699. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.  It was recorded that James Duffe, who had some medical skill, had recently been allowed to leave the island with Captain Sam [...] at the captain's urgent request. The captain lacked any doctor or surgeon's mate for himself, his officers or his ship's company. As a result, the island was left with only George Hoskisson,</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Sam [...] at his Earnest Desire, being absolute Destitute of any help Incase himselfe, his officers, or any of his Ships Comp<sup>a</sup> should have Occasion for a Doctor having neither Doctor nor Doctors mate, And considering now we have but George Hoskison (whome hath been some years entertained as a Doctor) to serve our Masters Garrison also Considering that our said Hon<sup>ble</sup> Masters Affaires at home probably hinders them of providing us sad Condition wherein we live for want of Chirurgion &amp;c: And that we might Encourage the said Doct: Hoskison the better to stay with us</p>	<p>who had been employed for several years as a doctor to serve the garrison. It was further noted that the Honourable Company had not yet provided additional medical support, probably due to its commitments in England. This left the island in a difficult condition, with insufficient medical care. The council therefore considered how to encourage George Hoskisson to remain in service on the island. <b>Interpretations</b> The fine imposed on Colgrave and Sarah Jun<sup>t</sup> showed continued enforcement of earlier regulations controlling goat hunting. Even after new rules were introduced, breaches were punished to maintain order over shared resources. The payment of fines to the poor indicated that penalties continued to serve both disciplinary and charitable purposes within the community. The departure of James Duffe highlighted the dependence on a very small number of skilled individuals. Loss of even one practitioner created immediate risk for both the garrison and inhabitants. The reference to the Honourable Company's failure to supply a surgeon showed the limits of central support. Local authorities had to manage shortages and adapt to conditions without timely assistance. The role of George Hoskisson as the only remaining doctor demonstrated the concentration of essential services in a single individual. His retention became a matter of administrative priority. <b>Speculations</b> The decision to release James Duffe to a passing ship suggested that maritime needs could take precedence over local requirements. This may have reflected obligations to ships or the strategic importance of maintaining good relations with captains. The emphasis on encouraging Hoskisson to remain indicated concern that he might leave, which would leave the island without medical care. This suggests that incentives, possibly financial or social, were being considered to secure his service. The repeated mention of shortages implied that the island operated under constant constraints. The council's actions suggest a reactive approach, addressing immediate gaps rather than relying on steady external support.</p>
190	184	<p>who is very apt at Every turne to go off this Island we have by his Request granted him fourty shill<sup>st</sup> p month till the Rt Hon<sup>ble</sup> Comp<sup>a</sup> think fitt to send an other, Who doth Accept it with thanks and Solemn promises not to offer any more to go off this Island, nor to go out of the fort Hereafter as he hath Done heretofore, untill the Comp<sup>a</sup> shall think fitt to send another Wherefore It is ordered That the said Doct, Hoskison shall have forthwith fourty shillings p month Salary as aforesaid Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 19 Day of January 1698 Att Fort James Prs<sup>t</sup> Step: Poirier Governor Tho: Goodwin assistant Whereas John Facknald who hath married John Ceverlee's widdow, hath Desired of us to Grant him a warrant, that he might Recover the sume of money to the value of a negro belonging to the Estate of the said John Ceverlee, who was murdered Lately, for Murder, according to the Constitutions and rules of this Island, which we have done, Accordingly, being valued according to our Judgm<sup>t</sup></p>	<p>George Hoskisson, the doctor, had shown a strong tendency to leave the island. To prevent this, and at his own request, he was granted a salary of £2 0s 0d per month until the Honourable Company provided a replacement. In return, he accepted the payment with thanks and made a formal promise not to attempt to leave the island again, and not to go outside the fort as he had previously done, until another surgeon was sent. It was therefore ordered that Hoskisson be paid £2 0s 0d per month as his salary. A council meeting was then held at Fort James on 19 January 1699. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin. John Facknald, who had married the widow of John Ceverlee, requested a warrant to recover a sum of money equal to the value of a slave belonging to Ceverlee's estate who had recently been killed. This claim was made under the island's established rules concerning compensation for such a death. The council agreed and valued the slave at £23 0s 0d. This amount was to be raised through a levy calculated at three shillings for every £10 0s 0d of value in slaves owned by the inhabitants at that time. The council prepared to issue a warrant to Facknald to collect this sum on behalf of the Ceverlee estate. <b>Interpretations</b> The grant of £2 0s 0d per month to George Hoskisson showed how essential services were secured</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>at £23:00:00 being three shillings p Ten pounds poole for Every payable negro the Inhabitant Posseseth and Enjoyeth at this time, And we being Ready to Deliver the said warrant into the hands of the said Facknald and to order him with him, In the said Ceverlee Estate.</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Hoskison to have forty shillings p month as Chirurgeon</p>	<p>through financial incentives. Retention of a single skilled practitioner was treated as critical to the survival of the garrison and settlement.</p> <p>Hoskisson's promise not to leave the island or the fort indicated that mobility of key personnel was subject to control. This reflected the dependency of the community on limited expertise.</p> <p>The valuation of the slave at £23 0s 0d demonstrated how enslaved people were treated as financial assets. Compensation for their death followed a fixed monetary assessment.</p> <p>The levy of three shillings per £10 0s 0d of slave value showed a structured system of collective contribution. Slave owners were required to fund compensation proportionally, spreading the financial burden across the community.</p> <p>The issue of a warrant to John Facknald showed that private individuals could be authorised to collect funds under official order. This linked personal claims to formal administrative enforcement.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The need to pay Hoskisson suggests that previous arrangements had not been sufficient to keep him on the island. The council likely acted to prevent a sudden loss of medical care.</p> <p>The compensation scheme for the killed slave indicates that the community treated such losses as shared risk. This may have been designed to maintain stability among slave owners and reduce disputes over liability.</p> <p>John Facknald's position as husband to the widow of John Ceverlee suggests that marriage provided a route to manage and claim rights over an estate. His request for a warrant indicates an active effort to secure financial recovery from that position.</p>
<a href="#">191</a>	185	<p>M<sup>r</sup> George Carne ffor his opposition In the Clarke office against the Delivery of the said warrant, Saying that the Govern<sup>r</sup> releasing Childrens black having bin murder<sup>d</sup> by the said Ceverlees Childrens black It is but Just that he be Equall Sharers In the said money Whereupon Considering that his Demands was an act of Justice, It is Desired that the Country might Desire the busyness It is ordered That the Query be Referred to a Jury next Quarter Sessions and In the meane while Considering further that In Deferring so long the Execution of the said warrant Some freemen being going off this Island might Sell their Blacks, without paying what they are Rated w<sup>ch</sup> in the said warrant, wherefore to prevent any Controversie w<sup>ch</sup> might happen In this Respect It is further ordered That M<sup>r</sup> Thomas Goodwin Deputy store keeper be fully Impowered to Collect the said money according to the said warrant, and keep it In his Custody untill the Busyness be Decided, he first giving his hand for what he shall Receive Tho: Goodwin</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Deferred till next Sessions Goodwin Thomas to Collect the Money</p>	<p>George Carne objected in the clerk's office to the issue of the warrant. He argued that since the slave belonging to the children of John Ceverlee had committed the murder, and had then been released by the Governor, it was only just that he should share equally in the compensation money.</p> <p>The council considered this claim and accepted that it raised a question of justice. It was therefore decided that the matter should be examined further.</p> <p>It was ordered that the issue be referred to a jury at the next Quarter Sessions. In the meantime, concern was raised that delaying execution of the warrant might allow some freemen, who were preparing to leave the island, to sell their slaves without paying the sums assessed under the levy. This could lead to disputes or loss of funds.</p> <p>It was therefore further ordered that Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Storekeeper, be fully authorised to collect the money according to the warrant and to keep it in his custody until the matter was resolved. He was required to give a formal guarantee for any sums he received.</p> <p>The margin notes added that Thomas Goodwin was to collect the money.</p>
<a href="#">192</a>	186	<p>Island S<sup>t</sup> Helena Whereas there hath bin lately Executed one negroe Slave appertayning and belonging unto the Estate of John Ceverlees Jun<sup>r</sup> Late of this Island free Planter Deceased for murdering a Slave belonging unto M<sup>r</sup> George Carne of the said Island which Slave being Executed for the</p>	<p>A warrant was issued on St Helena concerning compensation for the loss of a slave belonging to the estate of John Ceverlee the younger, a free planter of the island who was deceased.</p> <p>The slave had recently been executed for the murder of a slave belonging to Mr George Carne. Following this, John Facknald, who had married the</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>aforesaid murder John Facknald who hath married the Relict of the said Deceased John Ceverlees Jun<sup>r</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> Thomas Swallow and James Rider of the said Island free Planters who being Legatees or part of the said Ceverlees Estate w<sup>ch</sup> the said Facknalds wife as is mentioned and may appeare in the Consultation Held the 21<sup>th</sup> Day of Octo<sup>br</sup> 1698 Hath Desired of us the Govern<sup>r</sup> &amp; Councill a warrant to Levy Reimbursement and Satisfaction for the loss of the said negroe, as he should be valued by y<sup>e</sup> Govern<sup>r</sup> &amp; Councill according to the Constitutions and Government of this place Notwithstanding the said Govern<sup>r</sup> &amp; Councill have according to the best of our Judgement valued the said negroe and doth Compute that Three Shillings &amp; Ten pence p Cent for all payable negroes possessed by the Inhabitants of the said Island at the time that the said negroe was Executed will but Just make Satisfaction for the Loss thereof Wherefore in order that Satisfaction be made accordingly We do hereby In his Majesties Name Straigh tly Charge and Command you whose names are hereunto written to pay and satisfie the aforesaid John Facknald Tho: Swallow &amp; James Rider for the use Benni[fi]te and behoofe of the above mentioned Deceased John Ceverlees Estate the respective sumes of money placed against your respective names being after Three Shillings &amp; Ten pence p Cent for the negroes you possesse and Enjoy And this warrant doth hereby Impower you the said John Facknald Thomas Swallow and James Rider to make Collection Accordingly being for the full Satisfaction for the Loss of the above said negroe Slave and to Impound those persons that shall</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Warr<sup>t</sup> for p<sup>t</sup> collecting money for a negroe man Executed of M<sup>r</sup> Facknald</p>	<p>widow of John Cevelee the younger, together with Thomas Swallow and James Ryders, free planters and legatees of the estate, requested a warrant from the Governor and Council to recover compensation for this loss, in accordance with the island's established rules. The Governor and Council assessed the value of the slave and determined that a levy of £0 3s 10d per £1 0s 0d of value on all slaves owned by the inhabitants at the time of the execution would be sufficient to make full reimbursement. It was therefore ordered, in the name of the Crown, that all persons named were required to pay the sums set against their names to John Facknald, Thomas Swallow and James Ryders, for the benefit of the estate of John Cevelee the younger. The sums were calculated at the rate of £0 3s 10d per £1 0s 0d of slave property each person possessed. The warrant authorised John Facknald, Thomas Swallow and James Ryders to collect these payments and to enforce them, including by seizing property from those who refused to pay.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The levy of £0 3s 10d per £1 0s 0d of slave property showed a structured system of collective compensation. Loss of a slave through execution was treated as a shared financial risk among slave owners, who were required to contribute proportionally. The designation of Facknald, Swallow and Ryders as collectors demonstrated how private individuals connected to an estate could be formally empowered to enforce financial claims. This linked inheritance rights to administrative authority. The authority to seize property from those who refused to pay showed that enforcement extended beyond voluntary compliance. Legal power was used to ensure that contributions were made. The involvement of legatees indicated that rights to compensation were tied to inheritance structures. Estates continued to function as legal and financial units after death, managed by those entitled to shares. The margin note confirmed that the warrant concerned the collection of money to compensate for the executed slave connected to Facknald's interest.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The use of a collective levy suggested that individual owners were protected against sudden financial loss. This system may have been designed to maintain stability among slaveholders by spreading the cost of execution. The need to empower collectors to enforce payment indicated concern that some inhabitants might resist contributing. This suggests that such levies could be contested or difficult to collect without formal authority. The connection between marriage and control of the estate implied that Facknald's position was strengthened through his relationship to the widow. This may have enabled him to act in securing compensation on behalf of the estate.</p>
193	187	<p>Deny and Refuse to Pay and make Satisfaction as aforesaid, Given under our hands and Seale this 22<sup>d</sup> Day of January 1698</p> <p>men. wom. totals.    £    s    d</p> <p>M<sup>r</sup> Thomas Goodwin    2   1   3    0   11   6</p> <p>George Hoskison      1   1   2    0   7   8</p> <p>Edward Edmunds      3   0   3    0   11   6</p> <p>John Alexander      1   0   1    0   3   10</p> <p>Andrew Phillips     1   0   1    0   3   10</p> <p>John Ellis            2   2   0   7   8</p> <p>Rasmus Purcing      2   2   0   7   8</p> <p>Thomas Dixon        1   1   0   3   10</p> <p>Robert Adis          1   1   0   3   10</p> <p>Thomas Gargon      1   1   0   3   10</p> <p>Matthew Barret      1   1   0   3   10</p>	<p>The order stated that any person who refused or failed to pay the required sums for compensation would be subject to enforcement. The warrant was issued under the authority of the Governor and Council on 22 January 1699. A detailed list recorded each inhabitant, the number of slaves they held, divided into men and women, with totals, and the sum each person was required to pay at the fixed rate. Thomas Goodwin held 2 men and 1 woman, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d. George Hoskison held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d. Edward Edmunds held 3 men, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>James Grady 1 1 0 3 10  James Morrell 1 1 0 3 10  Henry Cales 4 4 0 15 4  Orlando Bagley Junr 1 1 0 3 10  John Gee 1 1 0 3 10  Thomas Cales 1 1 0 3 10  Sam<sup>e</sup> Donetaine 2 1 3 0 11 6  William Crofton 0 1 1 0 3 10  John Hemmon 1 1 0 3 10  John Mudge 1 1 0 3 10  Gabriell Correll 1 1 0 3 10  Charles Steward 2 2 0 7 8  Charles Steward 1 1 0 3 10  Benj: Seales 1 1 0 3 10  Simon Whaley 1 1 0 3 10  Riphill Wells 1 1 2 0 7 8  Thomas Gillis 1 1 2 0 7 8  Rich<sup>d</sup> Alexander 1 1 0 3 10  Orlando Bagley Seno<sup>r</sup> 1 1 0 3 10  John Beale 2 1 3 0 11 6  Eleanor Beale 3 1 4 0 15 4  Wm Beman 0 2 2 0 7 8  John Borman 2 1 3 0 11 6  Rich<sup>d</sup> Borman 1 1 0 3 10  Mary Bagley 1 1 0 3 10  Borne over £74:17:59</p>	<p>John Alexander held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Andrew Phillips held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  John Ellis held 2 slaves, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.  Rasmus Purcing held 2 slaves, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.  Thomas Dixon held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Robert Adis held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Thomas Gargon held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Matthew Barret held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  James Grady held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  James Morrell held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Henry Cales held 4 slaves, total 4, and was charged £0 15s 4d.  Orlando Bagley Junior held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  John Gee held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Thomas Cales held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Samuel Donetaine held 2 men and 1 woman, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.  William Crofton held 1 woman, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  John Hemmon held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  John Mudge held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Gabriel Correll held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Charles Steward held 2 slaves, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.  Charles Steward also held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Benjamin Seales held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Simon Whaley held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Riphill Wells held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.  Thomas Gillis held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.  Richard Alexander held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Orlando Bagley Senior held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  John Beale held 2 men and 1 woman, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.  Eleanor Beale held 3 men and 1 woman, total 4, and was charged £0 15s 4d.  William Beman held 2 women, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.  John Borman held 2 men and 1 woman, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.  Richard Borman held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Mary Bagley held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  The total sum carried forward came to £74 17s 5d.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The tabulated list functioned as a formal tax roll. Each inhabitant's liability was calculated according to the number of slaves they owned, showing a structured and quantified system for raising revenue to meet a specific legal obligation.  The distinction between men and women in the count indicated that all slaves, regardless of sex, were</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>included equally in the levy. This reflected a uniform valuation system in which each person counted as a taxable unit of property.</p> <p>The repetition of names, such as Charles Steward appearing twice, suggested either separate holdings or accounting entries recorded independently. This pointed to a flexible administrative practice that recorded liabilities by holding rather than strictly by individual identity.</p> <p>The inclusion of women such as Eleanor Beale and Mary Bagley as liable payers demonstrated that property ownership, including slaves, could be held and taxed in their own names. This revealed that widows or independent women participated directly in the island's economic and legal systems.</p> <p>The "borne over" total showed that the account extended beyond this page. It functioned as a running balance, indicating that further names and sums followed in continuation of the same levy.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The detailed breakdown of slave numbers and corresponding payments suggests that the administration aimed to ensure transparency and reduce disputes. By fixing each person's liability in writing, the government probably sought to prevent later challenges over assessment or fairness.</p> <p>The presence of both small and larger slaveholders in the same list indicates that the levy was designed to scale proportionally with ownership. This approach probably helped maintain acceptance of the tax by aligning contribution with capacity to pay, reducing resistance among inhabitants.</p>
194	188	<p>men. wom: totals. £ s d  Brought over.  Mr Geo Carne . . . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  Grace Colson widd . . . 3 . 4 . 0 . 15 . 4  Margaret Carne . . . 1 . 1 . 2 . 0 . 7 . 8  James Draper . . . 2 . 2 . 0 . 7 . 8  Thomas Earle . . . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  John Pullen . . . 1 . 1 . 2 . 0 . 7 . 8  Thomas Feesdale . . . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  John Goodwin . . . 2 . 1 . 3 . 0 . 11 . 6  John Greentree . . . 1 . 0 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  Richard Griffins . . . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  Wm Hayle Snr . . . 1 . 0 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  Richard Harding . . . 0 . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  Richard Leach . . . 3 . 0 . 3 . 0 . 11 . 6  Andrew Leach . . . 1 . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  John Long . . . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  John Lufkin . . . 2 . 2 . 0 . 7 . 8  Eliz Johnson . . . 3 . 1 . 4 . 0 . 15 . 4  Mary Jewster . . . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  Molly Hayle . . . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  Michael Monnies . . . 3 . 1 . 4 . 0 . 15 . 4  William Marsh . . . 2 . 2 . 0 . 7 . 8  John Nicholls . . . 0 . 2 . 2 . 0 . 7 . 8  James Rider . . . 1 . 2 . 3 . 0 . 11 . 6  Thomas Swallow . . . 2 . 1 . 3 . 0 . 11 . 6  John Sich . . . 3 . 0 . 3 . 0 . 11 . 6  Sarah Sinnings . . . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  Mary Smith . . . 1 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  Sam: Wrangham . . . 3 . 1 . 4 . 0 . 15 . 4  Sam: Taylor . . . 2 . 1 . 3 . 0 . 11 . 6  Sarah Dodson . . . 0 . 2 . 2 . 0 . 7 . 8  Gunning Rider . . . 3 . 1 . 4 . 0 . 15 . 4  Mary Oneill . . . 1 . 0 . 1 . 0 . 3 . 10  John Blackmore . . . 1 . 1 . 2 . 0 . 7 . 8  Totall . . . 90 . 33 . 179 . 24 . 06 . 10</p>	<p>The account continued with further inhabitants whose payments were carried forward under the same levy.</p> <p>George Carne held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>Grace Colson, a widow, held 3 men and 1 woman, total 4, and was charged £0 15s 4d.</p> <p>Margaret Carne held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.</p> <p>James Draper held 2 slaves, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.</p> <p>Thomas Earle held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>John Pullen held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.</p> <p>Thomas Feesdale held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>John Goodwin held 2 men and 1 woman, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.</p> <p>John Greentree held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>Richard Griffins held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>William Hayle Senior held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>Richard Harding held 1 woman, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>Richard Leach held 3 men, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.</p> <p>Andrew Leach held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>John Long held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>John Lufkin held 2 slaves, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.</p> <p>Elizabeth Johnson held 3 men and 1 woman, total 4, and was charged £0 15s 4d.</p> <p>Mary Jewster held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>Molly Hayle held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.</p> <p>Michael Monnies held 3 men and 1 woman, total 4, and</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>was charged £0 15s 4d.  William Marsh held 2 slaves, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.  John Nicholls held 2 women, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.  James Rider held 1 man and 2 women, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.  Thomas Swallow held 2 men and 1 woman, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.  John Sich held 3 men, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.  Sarah Sinnings held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Mary Smith held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  Samuel Wrangham held 3 men and 1 woman, total 4, and was charged £0 15s 4d.  Samuel Taylor held 2 men and 1 woman, total 3, and was charged £0 11s 6d.  Sarah Dodson held 2 women, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.  Gunning Rider held 3 men and 1 woman, total 4, and was charged £0 15s 4d.  Mary Oneill held 1 man, total 1, and was charged £0 3s 10d.  John Blackmore held 1 man and 1 woman, total 2, and was charged £0 7s 8d.</p> <p>The full total of the levy recorded 90 men and 33 women, making 179 slaves in total. The total sum assessed for payment came to £24 6s 10d.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The final total consolidated all entries into a complete fiscal account. It confirmed that the levy operated as a comprehensive census of slave property on the island, combining population counting with taxation in a single administrative process.</p> <p>The identification of Grace Colson as a widow showed that marital status was formally recorded where relevant to property holding. This indicated that widows retained recognised legal control over property and were taxed independently.</p> <p>The repeated appearance of the Carne name, including George Carne and Margaret Carne, suggested that members of the same family held separate property and were assessed individually. This reflected a system where liability attached to personal ownership rather than to households as a single unit.</p> <p>The inclusion of both high and low totals across individuals demonstrated a clear range of wealth measured through slave ownership. The levy therefore functioned not only as compensation but also as a record of economic distribution among inhabitants.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The careful calculation of a total number of slaves alongside the total monetary assessment suggests that the administration aimed to verify that the levy rate produced the required compensation. By matching the number of taxable slaves with the final sum, the authorities probably checked that the imposed rate achieved the intended financial target without shortfall or excess.</p> <p>The inclusion of those directly connected to the original dispute, such as George Carne and James Rider, within the levy implies that no exemption was granted even to involved parties. This suggests that the system prioritised uniform application over individual circumstance, perhaps to avoid disputes or claims of unequal treatment.</p>
<a href="#">195</a>	189	Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 23 Day of January 1698 Att Fort James, Pres: Steph: Poirier Governo: Tho: Goodwin assistant	<p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 23 January 1699. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p>It was reported that on the previous Friday several inhabitants of the island, both officers and free men, complained that on Thursday they had heard gunfire at</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Wheras on Fryday Last Complaint was made to the Governo from Severall Inhabitants of this Island both officers and free men That on Thursday Last was heard the noise of some Guns fired at Prosperous Bay the Praise and maine Lookout of this Place, which did allarme all the said Island, Insomuch that Immediately they left Each one their Different Employments and affaires, but they were then abate, that they might the sooner repaire to their Severall Posts, But coming along did learne that it was but a false alarme, Whereupon the Governo ordered the Sodrs Posted on the said Lookout to be brought at the fort this day, that they might Give an acco of the Cause of such Disorder, which proved to be Wm [...], and John Mudge, who being Examined doth Confess that on the said Day aforesaid Mr George Carne Accompanied with John Long, Edward [...], and Bagley all of them safe and Sea persons Came to See the Place and brought with them some Liquors to be merry with them, And at his Returneing home againe, though no shame to say him Such Civility as giveing some fowles, offering withall to make oath, that the Powder which they did expend there was there owne, And further sayeth that he hath been an usuall way before, and never heard of any order to the Contrary, After a long Examina- tion of them they were ordered to Withdraw, which done the Governo and Councill Considering that it was too true, that never no orders hath bin made to Prevent Such Inconveniency of firing Small Guns, although we are Confident that both officers and free men have learn to a times at such Trouble through such foolishnes Dealing the which to prevent for the future,</p>	<p>Prosperous Bay, the main lookout of the island. This caused alarm across the settlement. People immediately left their work and hurried towards their assigned posts. As they moved, they learned that the alarm was false.</p> <p>The Governor ordered the soldiers stationed at the lookout to be brought to the fort to explain the cause of the disturbance. William [...] and John Mudge were examined. They admitted that on that day Mr George Carne, accompanied by John Long, Edward [...] and Bagley, all sailors, had come to visit the place. They brought liquor with them and drank together. When they left, they fired guns. They stated that the powder used was their own. They also said that this had been common practice in the past and that they had never known of any order forbidding it.</p> <p>After examination, they were ordered to withdraw. The Governor and Council then considered the matter. They accepted that no previous order had been issued to prevent such behaviour, even though it had caused repeated disturbance and alarm among both officers and free men. They resolved to prevent such incidents in future.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The false alarm showed how closely the island relied on lookout signals for security. Gunfire at a key observation point triggered an immediate defensive response, demonstrating the vulnerability of the settlement to perceived threats.</p> <p>The participation of both soldiers and visiting sailors indicated that informal social activity could take place at strategic locations. This blurred the boundary between military duty and private conduct.</p> <p>The absence of a prior regulation revealed a gap in administrative control. The council recognised that repeated disturbance had occurred without formal prohibition, which required corrective action.</p> <p>The rapid mobilisation of inhabitants in response to the alarm showed that defence depended on collective readiness. Both military and civilian members of the community were expected to respond quickly to potential danger.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The claim that firing guns had been a common practice suggested that the lookout had been used informally for recreation. This may have gradually normalised behaviour that later proved disruptive.</p> <p>The presence of liquor indicated that the incident arose from social gathering rather than official duty. This likely contributed to careless behaviour and disregard for its consequences.</p> <p>The decision to act after repeated disturbances suggested that earlier incidents had been tolerated. The council may have been prompted to intervene only once the disruption affected the wider community in a noticeable way.</p>
196	190	<p>It is commanded &amp; ordered that no person or persons on any pretence whatsoever doe fire or Cause Guns to be fired any Guns at the said Prosperous bay Look out hill, and the sodrs there ordered are to hinder any body to do it (Except it is at the sight of Ship or Ships or to Prevent an Enemy Landing, Upon paine of being Prosecuted against to the utmost severity both by fine, and Corporall Punishment upon such offenders as the Gov: and Councill shall think fitt) Considering that both by the Long Drought, it hath [...] the providence of God Almighty, to Inflict on this Island, and the neglect of severall persons thereof whome ever since five or six years, hath minded only the planting of Potatoes and yams (which ought to be looked on as the main staff of this Island) begin to be extraordinary scarce, and that the fort may henceforth be supplied with very good yams without the help from the Masters Grand Plantation, We have</p>	<p>It was ordered that no person should fire, or cause to be fired, any guns at Prosperous Bay lookout hill under any pretext. The soldiers stationed there were instructed to prevent this, except in cases where a ship was sighted or to prevent an enemy landing. Any offender would be prosecuted with the utmost severity, including fines and corporal punishment, as the Governor and Council considered appropriate.</p> <p>It was further noted that a long drought, understood as an act of divine providence, together with the neglect of several inhabitants over the past five or six years, had led to a shortage of staple crops. Many had focused only on planting potatoes and yams, which were regarded as the main food supply of the island, and these had now become very scarce.</p> <p>To ensure a reliable supply of yams for the fort without depending on the Company's main plantation, the council arranged to purchase land from Samuel Taylor, a free planter who intended to leave the island</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Desired Sam Taylor of this Island free Planter (who does intend to go off this place by the first homeward bound Ship) to Sell us Ten acres of Land now in his Possession, Lying at the Head of Prosperous Valley Neare the maine Ridge, formerly belonging to Thomas Earle, upon which is planted Thirty five Thousand of yames already, which the said Taylor being very willing to sell, we have agreed with him for the said Ten acres of Land and the fruits thereon growing for the sume of Thirty five pounds. It is therefore ordered That the said Taylor shall have Credit for the said sume of Thirty five pounds in the Rt Hon: Compas Bookes of accompts</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Persons firing Guns to be fined &amp; punished Taylor to have Credit for 35<sup>l</sup> for Plantation for the Honble Comp.</p>	<p>on the next homeward-bound ship. The land consisted of ten acres at the head of Prosperous Valley near the main ridge, formerly owned by Thomas Earle. It already contained 35,000 yam plants.</p> <p>Taylor agreed to sell the land and the growing crops for £35 0s 0d. It was ordered that this sum be credited to him in the Honourable Company's accounts.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The prohibition on firing guns at the lookout formalised control over a key defensive site. Signals from this location had direct consequences for the island's security, so misuse was treated as a serious offence.</p> <p>The allowance for gunfire only in cases of ship sighting or defence against an enemy showed that communication and warning systems relied on such signals. Regulation ensured that these signals retained their meaning.</p> <p>The reference to drought as an act of divine providence reflected a religious interpretation of environmental hardship. At the same time, blame was also placed on agricultural neglect, indicating a practical assessment of human responsibility.</p> <p>The emphasis on yams as the "main staff" of the island showed their central role in subsistence. Food security depended heavily on a limited range of crops.</p> <p>The purchase of land by the Company demonstrated direct intervention in food production. By acquiring cultivated land, the administration sought to secure supply for the garrison.</p> <p>The use of Company credit rather than immediate payment showed how transactions were recorded and settled through central accounts. This linked local economic activity to the Company's financial system.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The strict penalties for firing guns suggest that earlier false alarms had caused significant disruption. The council likely aimed to prevent unnecessary mobilisation and maintain readiness for real threats.</p> <p>The combination of drought and poor crop management indicates that the island faced a serious risk of food shortage. The purchase of land appears to have been a targeted response to stabilise supply.</p> <p>Samuel Taylor's intention to leave the island may have created an opportunity for the Company to acquire productive land. This suggests that departures were used to consolidate resources under administrative control.</p>
197	191	<p>Whereas Complaint haveing bin made to the Governo. that John Goodwins Black was seen on Sunday the 16th of this Instant, Comeing downe to ye fort with but three</p> <p>The said John Goodwin being Examined why he suffered his Black to do so, he said that they only brought with them some victualls and Tooles, being to worke at ye fort the next day: wherefore</p> <p>It is ordered That the said Goodwin be find five shillings for the use of the Church for this offence Island St Helena</p> <p>Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 31 Day of January 1698 att Fort James, Pres: Steph: Poirier Governo Thom: Goodwin assistant William Cales told made his Complaint to the Governo and Councill that Elizabeth the Daughter of Benjamin Seales had Contracted Matrimony with him some time ago, which she doth now Deny to performe; Wor Seales saith she Cannot Deny but that she did Promise the said Wm Cales to have him, that is to say to make him her Husband (provided he could get her friends Consent, if it was to her Guide,</p>	<p>A complaint was made to the Governor that a slave belonging to John Goodwin was seen coming down to the fort on Sunday 16 January 1699 carrying goods. When examined, John Goodwin stated that the slave had only brought provisions and tools in preparation for work at the fort on the following day.</p> <p>It was ordered that John Goodwin be fined £0 5s 0d for the use of the church for this offence.</p> <p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 31 January 1699. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p>William Cales brought a complaint that Elizabeth, the daughter of Benjamin Seales, had previously agreed to marry him but now refused to fulfil that agreement.</p> <p>Elizabeth Seales admitted that she had promised to marry William Cales, on the condition that he obtained the consent of her friends if required. Despite this, she stated that she would not proceed with the marriage.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The fine imposed on John Goodwin showed enforcement of Sunday observance. Movement and labour connected to the fort on that day were restricted, and masters were held responsible for the actions of their slaves.</p> <p>The payment of the fine to the church reflected the link between moral regulation and ecclesiastical</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Notwithstanding she saith she will not performe,</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Goodwin John fined five shillings for Suffering his black to come to the fort on Sunday Cales Wm Complaint of Eliz: Seales</p>	<p>authority. Offences against religious norms were treated as matters for both discipline and church support.</p> <p>The complaint by William Cales demonstrated that a promise of marriage could be treated as a binding agreement. Failure to fulfil such a promise could be brought before the council.</p> <p>Elizabeth Seales's conditional promise highlighted the role of family consent in marriage. Approval from relatives formed an important part of the process, influencing whether an agreement was considered valid.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> John Goodwin's explanation suggested that practical needs, such as preparing for work, could conflict with religious restrictions. The fine indicates that the council prioritised observance over convenience.</p> <p>Elizabeth Seales's refusal, despite admitting the promise, suggested that she may have reconsidered the match or lacked support from her family. This implies that personal and social considerations could override earlier commitments.</p> <p>The requirement for consent from her friends indicates that marriage decisions were not solely individual. This may have provided a basis for her withdrawal, even after making a promise.</p>
198	192	<p>Benjamin Seales saith that the said William Cales did aske him wheather he would give him his Consent to have his Daughter Eliz<sup>th</sup> which he did consent to; But did it provided his wife was as willing as he was;</p> <p>Mary Smith saith she heard her Brother William Cales, aske the said Benjamin Seales, to give him his Consent to have his Daughter Eliz<sup>th</sup> at her house, to which the said Seales freely and willingly consented to, and he Elected her to wites the same, and said to her I believe a womans oath will stand in law, as all was done in St: [...],</p> <p>Thomas Cales being Sworne saith yt about the latter end of Septr last, he being at the house of Benj<sup>m</sup> Seales, at which time the said William Cales was there also and after that he was a bed, he heard his mother in law Mr Seales Call for her Daughter Eliz<sup>th</sup> who was then only in company w<sup>th</sup> the said W<sup>m</sup> Cales, his mother being then in bed in another Room, the said Eliz<sup>th</sup> Refused to come presently, however did not, so about an houre after she Called for her againe and asked her if was not time to come to bed, it being then about 12 a Clock, and after she went to bed, her mother asked her wheather or no she had made w<sup>th</sup> the said W<sup>m</sup> Cales a promise, she Replied yes, why said her mother you promised me not to do it without my Consent, She Replied againe it is to late now;</p> <p>The said Seales wife saith she did never give her Consent to ye said William Cales of haveing her Daughter and saith yt the said W<sup>m</sup> Cales hath asked her severall times to give her consent, which she Refused Upon the whole it is ordered That the said William Cales take his Course on this matter, seeming to us that there was a plaine Engagement betwixt them</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Cales William to take his Course</p>	<p>Benjamin Seales stated that William Cales had asked for his consent to marry his daughter Elizabeth. He said that he gave his consent, on the condition that his wife also agreed.</p> <p>Mary Smith gave evidence that she heard her brother, William Cales, ask Benjamin Seales for consent to marry Elizabeth at her house. She stated that Seales agreed freely and willingly and asked her to witness it. He remarked that a woman's oath would stand in law, and that the agreement had been made at St [...].</p> <p>Thomas Cales gave sworn evidence. He stated that towards the end of September 1698 he was at the house of Benjamin Seales, where William Cales was also present. After he had gone to bed, he heard his mother-in-law call for her daughter Elizabeth, who was then alone with William Cales. Elizabeth did not come at once. About an hour later, her mother called again and asked if it was not time for her to come to bed, it then being about midnight. After Elizabeth went to bed, her mother asked whether she had made a promise to William Cales. Elizabeth replied that she had. Her mother reminded her that she had been told not to make such a promise without her consent. Elizabeth answered that it was now too late.</p> <p>The wife of Benjamin Seales stated that she had never given consent for William Cales to marry her daughter. She added that William Cales had asked her several times for permission, which she had refused.</p> <p>After considering the matter, it was ordered that William Cales should pursue the case through the appropriate legal process, as it appeared that a clear agreement had been made between the parties.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The distinction between the father's consent and the mother's refusal showed that approval from both parents could be treated as necessary for a valid marriage agreement. Parental authority operated jointly rather than individually.</p> <p>The reference to witnessing the consent indicated that verbal agreements were strengthened by the presence of witnesses. Such testimony provided legal support in disputes over promises.</p> <p>Elizabeth's admission that she made the promise despite prior instruction not to do so without consent showed tension between individual choice and family authority. This reflected the expectation that marriage decisions were subject to household control.</p> <p>The instruction that William Cales should "take his course" indicated that the council declined to impose an</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>immediate resolution. Instead, the matter was left to formal legal proceedings, suggesting that breach of a marriage promise could be pursued through established legal channels.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  Elizabeth's statement that it was "too late" suggested that she believed the promise had already created an obligation that could not easily be withdrawn. This may indicate that such agreements carried social or legal weight once made.</p> <p>The repeated refusals by her mother implied sustained opposition to the match. This suggests that family disagreement, rather than uncertainty about the promise itself, was the central issue.</p> <p>The decision not to settle the matter directly indicates that the council may have viewed the case as too contested or sensitive for summary judgement. Allowing William Cales to proceed legally suggests reliance on a more formal process to resolve conflicting claims.</p>
199	193	<p>Gabrael Cornill told give Information to the Gov<sup>o</sup> and Council that Thomas Swallow Seno: had severall years and doth particularly this present years Drive or Cause to be Driven some of his Cattle on ye Hon<sup>ble</sup> Comp<sup>as</sup></p> <p>Comon and had Given a false acc<sup>t</sup> thereof in which say ing Neate Cattle Grazed on his owne Inclosed Land The said Swallow being Examined about the matr doth Confess that some of his Cattle hath feed on the said Hon<sup>ble</sup> Comp<sup>as</sup> Comon, but very few, and that but Seldome, however It is ordered That according to the Rt Hon<sup>ble</sup> Comp<sup>as</sup> orders The said Swallow be fined fourty shillings to ye said Hon<sup>ble</sup> Comp<sup>as</sup> for giving In a false acc<sup>t</sup> Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 7<sup>th</sup> Day of February 1698 att Fort James Pres: Steph: Poirier Governo Thomas Goodwin assistant James Bruce told made Complaint to ye Gov<sup>o</sup> that James Duffe at ye time of his going off this Island left him some money due from severall persons, amongst whome were Thomas Atkins and William Bedle both who Day to make any satisfaction accordingly, But they both being Examined saith they did not owe ye said James Bruce so much as he doth demand some of them John Keils Corp<sup>al</sup> saith he heard James Duffe say 1 day before he went of ye said Isle and Island stood Indebted to him of a Considerable Summe produced by ye said Bruce Thomas Gargon Gun, mate saith the same as the said Corporall Keils hath already</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b>  Swallow fined fourty shillings for giving a false acc<sup>t</sup></p>	<p>Gabriel Cornill reported to the Governor and Council that Thomas Swallow the elder had, for several years and again in the present year, driven or caused some of his cattle to graze on the Honourable Company's common land. He also stated that Swallow had submitted a false account by claiming that his cattle had grazed on his own enclosed land.</p> <p>Thomas Swallow was examined and admitted that some of his cattle had grazed on the Company's common land, though he claimed this happened only rarely and involved very few animals.</p> <p>It was ordered, in accordance with the Honourable Company's regulations, that Thomas Swallow be fined £2 0s 0d for submitting a false account.</p> <p>A council meeting was held at Fort James on 7 February 1699. Present were Governor Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin.</p> <p>James Bruce made a complaint that James Duffe, at the time he left the island, had assigned to him certain debts owed by several persons, including Thomas Atkins and William Bedle. These men had refused to pay the sums demanded.</p> <p>When examined, Thomas Atkins and William Bedle denied owing as much as James Bruce claimed.</p> <p>John Keils, a corporal, gave sworn evidence. He stated that one day before leaving the island, James Duffe said that the island owed him a considerable sum of money, which Bruce had now presented as his claim.</p> <p>Thomas Gargon, a gunner's mate, gave sworn evidence and confirmed the same account as Corporal Keils.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The fine imposed on Thomas Swallow showed that use of common land was regulated and that false reporting of grazing locations was treated as a financial offence. Accurate declaration of land use formed part of administrative control over shared resources.</p> <p>The distinction between enclosed land and the Company's common land reflected different categories of property. Use of the common without proper accounting infringed Company rights.</p> <p>The transfer of debts from James Duffe to James Bruce showed that financial claims could be assigned to another person. This allowed debts to be pursued even after the original creditor had left the island.</p> <p>The denial by Thomas Atkins and William Bedle highlighted the difficulty of enforcing such claims without clear records. Disputes over the amount owed required supporting testimony.</p> <p>The reliance on statements made before Duffe's departure showed that verbal acknowledgement of debt could be used as evidence. Testimony from witnesses served to support claims in the absence of written accounts.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>Swallow's admission that some cattle had grazed on the common, combined with his claim that it was minimal, suggests an attempt to reduce the severity of the offence. This may indicate that such use of common land was not uncommon but only punished when formally reported.</p> <p>The assignment of Duffe's debts to Bruce suggests that Duffe sought to recover value from outstanding claims before leaving. This may reflect the difficulty of collecting debts once a creditor departed the island.</p> <p>The disagreement over the amount owed indicates that records of debt may have been incomplete or contested. This suggests that financial dealings often relied on personal trust rather than formal documentation.</p>
200	194	<p>Whereupon It is ordered That the said Thomas Allis, William Bales Pay—and satisfye the said James Bruer the said sumes left by—  [...]  of Councell said James Duff Vizt  Thomas allis . . . 0:06:0  William Bales . . . 0:04:0  0:10:0  And also the Charges of Councell.  James Rider Taylor made his Complaint to y<sup>e</sup>—  Governor That Richard Alexander his apprentice whom—  hath served him four years and upwards, Did now absent—  himselfe some Time from his said Service, Wherefore—  Desired that he might have y<sup>e</sup> said Richard Alexander Examined,  who was, and Did alledge nothing against his said master, but that he is Desirous to be Cleare from him, Wherefore after much Debate on both sides—  It was agreed &amp; accordingly ordered, by both their—  consents, &amp; likewise That the said Rider Deliuier y<sup>e</sup> said Richard Alexander his said apprentice and Deliuier him  his Indenture, and that he should allow y<sup>e</sup> said Richard Alexander for the—  Loss of his Time yt he hath bin absent and the remainder  of his said Agreement being two months, Pay unto the said Rider y<sup>e</sup> sume of five Pounds, in store Pay in y<sup>e</sup> Honble Companys bookes of Accompt.  Whereas John Orchard came to the Governor who made—  Complaint that on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of this Instant he lost one—  peece of Leather vizt one Hide of Sole Leather one side of  over Leather, and a Calfe skin, and did verily suspect the said  to be stolen by James Draper Planter, wherefore desired a warrant for search thereupon which being Deliuiered to Henry  Bales marshall who after search made found all aforesaid  Leather, where one side of Leather more of sort parcell with the  said John Orchard his marke of [...] on the outside of the said  James Drapers dwelling house Chimney, which is a Quarter distance  from his Dwelling House.  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  Rider James Complaint  agst Richd Alexander his  Apprentice</p>	<p>Thomas Allis and William Bales were ordered to pay James Bruer the sums previously assigned by the Council through James Duff. Thomas Allis was required to pay £0 6s 0d and William Bales £0 4s 0d, making a total of £0 10s 0d. They were also required to cover the Council's charges.</p> <p>James Rider, a tailor, brought a complaint before the Governor against his apprentice, Richard Alexander. Richard Alexander had served him for more than four years but had recently absented himself from service for a period of time. Richard Alexander was examined and offered no complaint against his master, stating only that he wished to be released from his apprenticeship.</p> <p>After discussion, an agreement was reached with the consent of both parties. James Rider was required to release Richard Alexander from his apprenticeship and return his indenture. Compensation was arranged for the time Richard Alexander had been absent and for the remaining two months of his contract. Richard Alexander was required to pay James Rider £5 0s 0d, to be credited as store pay in the Honourable Company's accounts.</p> <p>John Orchard then complained to the Governor that on 8 January 1699 he lost several items of leather: one hide of sole leather, one side of upper leather, and a calfskin. He strongly suspected that these goods had been stolen by James Draper, a planter, and requested a warrant to search his property. The warrant was issued to Henry Bales, the marshal, who carried out the search. The missing leather was found, along with an additional piece of leather of the same type marked with John Orchard's mark. These items were discovered on the outside of the chimney of James Draper's dwelling house, at a short distance from the main building.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The payment ordered from Thomas Allis and William Bales reflected a Council-enforced settlement of a prior obligation. The reference to Council charges indicated that administrative costs were routinely added to such orders, showing that legal processes generated recoverable expenses.</p> <p>The apprenticeship between James Rider and Richard Alexander operated under a binding labour contract enforced by the colonial administration. The indenture served as the legal document defining the term and obligations of service. Its return formally ended the contractual relationship.</p> <p>The requirement that Richard Alexander pay £5 0s 0d in store pay, recorded in the Honourable Company's books, showed that compensation could be settled through the Company's internal accounting system rather than in cash. This indicated a controlled economic structure in which credit and goods were centrally managed.</p> <p>The marshal, Henry Bales, acted as an enforcement officer responsible for executing search warrants. His authority to enter property and recover suspected stolen</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>John Orchard Complaint agst James Draper about Leather stolen</p>	<p>goods demonstrated the formal policing powers exercised under the island's legal system.</p> <p>The identification of John Orchard's mark on the leather established a recognised system of property marking. Such marks functioned as evidence of ownership in disputes over goods and were accepted by authorities in determining possession.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The agreement to release Richard Alexander before the full term of his apprenticeship, combined with the payment of £5 0s 0d, suggests that both parties sought to avoid further conflict or disruption. The financial settlement probably balanced the master's loss of labour against the apprentice's desire for freedom, providing a practical resolution without prolonged enforcement.</p> <p>The discovery of the leather outside the chimney of James Draper's house, rather than inside, suggests that the goods may have been concealed in a semi-public or less secure location. This placement perhaps indicated an attempt to hide the items while avoiding direct possession within the house, or a hurried effort to remove or obscure evidence.</p>
<p><a href="#">201</a></p>	<p>195</p>	<p>The said James Draper Denys y<sup>e</sup> fact, saying he knowes— not how the said Leather came on y<sup>e</sup> outside of his [...] house Chimney, and that he is wrongfully accused, John orchard saith that a little before he lost his Leather he was at y<sup>e</sup> said James Drapers house, where was Simon Whaley also, and they having some Discourse about Leather, the said Simon Whaley asked this Deponent if he Tann'd Goods store of Leather, he Replied he Tann'd a little sometimes, the said Whaley said he wanted some, and had but very little Which Caused him to suspect the said Whaley or Draper to have Stolen y<sup>e</sup> Leather further saith he saw a Black fellow, which he thought was [...] y<sup>e</sup> said Whaley or Drapers And that the side of sole Leather that was found with his Leather was very Curious he was sure being a very Large Hide, and that he helpt Tan it, Simon Whaley Examined saith that on wednesday the— Day before y<sup>e</sup> Leather was found he and James Draper were together all the afternoon at his house, and lay there all that same night, that the said orchard saith he lost his Leather, And that the same night that ser[...] saith he lost his Leather both himselfe and James Draper were a fishing all that night and as they came home the next Day, they went into Sarah Pledgers house, Mercy the wife of the said Simon Whaley saith the same as her Husband hath already, Sarah Pledger saith that on the 22<sup>th</sup> Day in y<sup>e</sup> Evening James Draper and Simon Whaley had bin a fishing and as they came home, they came into her house, and said there Cloaths was gone before or at their fish, James Wilson saith that the weeke before last musterday, John orchard proffered to sell him a Hide of Sole Leather, who went to him for it on Tuesday after he lost his Leather, But when he came the said orchard said he had none, and said he did not know when he should have any: John orchard saith that y<sup>e</sup> Leather</p>	<p>James Draper denied the accusation. He stated that he did not know how the leather came to be placed on the outside of his house chimney and insisted that he had been wrongly accused.</p> <p>John Orchard stated that shortly before the loss of his leather he had been at James Draper's house, where Simon Whaley was also present. During a discussion about leather, Simon Whaley asked whether he tanned a large quantity. John Orchard replied that he tanned only a small amount at times. Simon Whaley then said that he needed some leather and had very little. This conversation caused John Orchard to suspect either Simon Whaley or James Draper of the theft.</p> <p>John Orchard further stated that he had seen a black man, whom he believed belonged to either Simon Whaley or James Draper. He also stated that the side of sole leather found with his goods was of very fine quality and that he was certain of it because it came from a large hide that he had personally helped to tan.</p> <p>Simon Whaley was examined. He stated that on the Wednesday, the day before the leather was found, he and James Draper had spent the entire afternoon together at his house and had stayed there overnight. On the same night that John Orchard claimed to have lost his leather, both men had gone fishing and remained out all night. The following day, as they returned, they went into the house of Sarah Pledger.</p> <p>Mercy, the wife of Simon Whaley, gave the same account as her husband.</p> <p>Sarah Pledger stated that on 22 January 1699 in the evening, James Draper and Simon Whaley came to her house after fishing. They said that their clothes had been lost earlier or at the place where they had been fishing.</p> <p>James Wilson stated that during the previous week, before muster day, John Orchard had offered to sell him a hide of sole leather. He went to collect it on the Tuesday after the reported loss, but John Orchard told him that he had none and did not know when he would have any.</p> <p>John Orchard replied that the leather he had promised to James Wilson belonged to Robert Griffins and had been given to him for tanning. He stated that he had been asked to sell it once it was finished, and that he had instead sold it to Orlando Bagley.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The examination of multiple witnesses showed a formal evidentiary process in which testimony was collected and compared. Statements from different individuals, including spouses and neighbours, were used to establish timelines and assess credibility.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>he promised y<sup>e</sup> said Wilson, was Robt Griffins, that he had to Tan, and that he desired him to sell for him after was Drest, which he Lett Orlando Bodgey have,</p>	<p>The reference to a black man belonging to Simon Whaley or James Draper indicated the use of slaves as labour and their potential involvement in movement of goods. Ownership of such individuals was treated as relevant to suspicion and responsibility.</p> <p>The mention of tanning and handling leather showed that John Orchard operated within a small-scale production and exchange system. Tanning services and resale arrangements formed part of the local economy, with goods often passing through several hands before sale.</p> <p>The account given by Simon Whaley and supported by Mercy Whaley functioned as an alibi. Their claim to have been fishing throughout the night established a defence based on absence from the location where the goods were found.</p> <p>The statement from James Wilson introduced a commercial inconsistency. It showed that John Orchard had recently offered similar goods for sale but later denied having them, raising questions about the origin and ownership of the leather in dispute.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The emphasis on the fishing trip and overnight absence suggests a deliberate attempt by Simon Whaley and James Draper to establish a clear alibi. The detail of their movements, supported by multiple witnesses, was probably intended to counter the physical evidence of the leather found near Draper's house.</p> <p>The discovery of the leather outside rather than inside the house, combined with Draper's denial, suggests that the goods may have been placed there without his knowledge or moved there temporarily. This placement may have been intended either to conceal the items or to distance them from direct possession.</p> <p>The conflicting statements about the leather offered for sale indicate that John Orchard's role was not entirely straightforward. His involvement in tanning and selling goods for others suggests that ownership could be complex, which may have contributed to confusion or dispute over the specific items recovered.</p>
<p><a href="#">202</a></p>	<p>196</p>	<p>Mary orchard, y<sup>e</sup> said John orchards Sister saith yt the same night, that her brother had his Leather Stolen she and he Supp together, and aboute 9 of y<sup>e</sup> Clock she went to bed, and left her said Brother Sitting downe upon a Bench behind the Stable. But aboute halfe an houre after she came downe Staires againe, and asked her brother to go to bed, but Did not, and aboute 12 a Clock he called to her and told her that somebody had Robbed the Hen Ruist, being he heard the fowles cry, and yt the Doggs barked at them, But he had bin out of Doores but could not see any Body, she said she heard nothing all that night,</p> <p>James Rider saith yt after he heard yt y<sup>e</sup> said Orchard had Lost some Leather, he went to orlando Bageley house where the said orchard &amp; his Sister Liveth wth Henry Bales, who both asked the said mary orchard, whether her brother was at home all that night he Lost his Leather, she told them that when she went to bed it was abt 9 a Clock she left her brother Sitting downe upon y<sup>e</sup> Bench behind Stable, and aboute 1/2 a Clock she came downe Staires to make up the fire and then would have her brother gone to Bed, but he did not all that night as she knowes of/ Henry Bales saith the same as y<sup>e</sup> said Rider hath already,</p> <p>Bartland Audovert armour saith that that night as the said John orchard saith he Lost his Leather his father In Law Sutton Franck called him to Rise out</p>	<p>Mary Orchard, sister of John Orchard, stated that on the night the leather was stolen she and her brother ate supper together. At about 9 o'clock she went to bed, leaving him sitting on a bench behind the stable. About half an hour later she came downstairs again and asked him to go to bed, but he did not. Around midnight he called to her and said that someone had robbed the hen roost, as he had heard the fowl crying and the dogs barking. He said he had gone outside but had seen no one. Mary Orchard stated that she herself heard nothing during the night.</p> <p>James Rider stated that after hearing that John Orchard had lost leather, he went to the house of Orlando Bagley, where John Orchard and his sister lived with Henry Bales. He asked Mary Orchard whether her brother had been at home throughout the night of the loss. She replied that when she went to bed at about 9 o'clock she had left him sitting on the bench behind the stable, and that about half an hour later she came downstairs to tend the fire and again asked him to go to bed, but he did not, and she did not know where he was for the rest of the night.</p> <p>Henry Bales confirmed the same account as James Rider.</p> <p>Bartland Audovert, an armourer, stated that on the same night, when John Orchard claimed his leather was stolen, his father-in-law Sutton Franck woke him because their dogs and neighbouring dogs were barking. They believed something had entered the plantation. He got up at once and, in the moonlight, saw a man walking downwards towards James Draper's house from Haffes pasture. He could not identify the man. He stated that James Draper's dogs barked fiercely at him.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>of his bed, being Disturbed by y<sup>e</sup> barking of his own doggs and his neighbours, and thought that some evell had gott in his Plantation, who Immediately got up and going moone Shine saw a man coming downwards toward James Drapers, from out [...] Haffes Pasture, but could not Discover who it was, And James Drapers doggs barked very fiercely at y<sup>e</sup> man he said, and aboute halfe an houre after saith the same man go from towards the said Drapers Hill House, his doggs still barking after him, who went up towards the Hills on y<sup>e</sup> other Side the Hill</p>	<p>About half an hour later he saw the same man again moving away from the direction of Draper's house, while the dogs continued barking, and the man then went up towards the hills on the opposite side.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The testimony of Mary Orchard introduced uncertainty about John Orchard's movements during the night. Her account showed that his whereabouts were not continuous or confirmed, which weakened the reliability of his position as a complainant and witness. The visit by James Rider and Henry Bales to question Mary Orchard demonstrated an informal but structured method of gathering evidence outside formal examination. This showed how community members and officials actively investigated claims by verifying domestic accounts. The statement from Bartland Audovert provided independent observational evidence based on movement and sound at night. The use of dogs' reactions as indicators of disturbance reflected common practical methods of detecting intrusion within plantation environments. The reference to Haffes pasture and Draper's house placed the suspected movement within a known landscape of fields and dwellings. This spatial detail helped establish a possible route taken by the unidentified individual.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The fact that John Orchard was not accounted for during the later part of the night suggests that his own movements may have been uncertain or concealed. This gap in his timeline may have contributed to doubt about his account or raised the possibility of other explanations for the missing leather. The sighting of an unidentified man moving towards and then away from James Draper's house suggests that a third party may have been involved. The timing and direction of movement, combined with the barking of dogs, indicate that the goods may have been placed or removed without Draper's direct involvement.</p>
203	197	<p>After Serious Consideration on this matter It is ordered That both the said James Draper and John Orchard be Immediately put into the Ma=gazine for security shall Custody or Else give good Security for their personall appearance at the next Generall Sessions/ Island St Helena A Consultation held on Saturday the 18 Day of February 1698/9 at Fort James/ Prs<sup>t</sup> Steph: Poirier Governour Thomas Goodwin assistant Marg: Beale widdow late wife of Jona: Beale Deceased, brought to Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councell the last will and Testament of her said Deceased Husband, which was Read and approved according by the oaths of John Goodwin Robert [...] and John Bowmans, It is ordered That the said Last will and Testament of the said Jona: Beale Decd be reed and a Coppy Given when Desired/ Noe folio 203</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Draper and Orchard to be Imprisoned to the Imprisonment give good Security shall Custody or Else give good Security Beale Jona: wife approved Accor[...] of the will</p>	<p>Both James Draper and John Orchard were ordered into the magazine at once. They were held there for safe custody. If they refused, they had to give security to appear at the next General Sessions. A consultation was held on Saturday 18 February 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Goodwin served as assistant. Margaret Beale, widow of Jonathan Beale, brought forward her husband's will. The document was read before the Governor and Council. It was accepted on the sworn statements of John Goodwin, Robert [...] and John Bowman. The will of Jonathan Beale was ordered to be recorded. A copy was to be issued whenever it was requested.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The order to place both men in the magazine showed that confinement was used to secure attendance, not to punish. The magazine served as a holding place because no separate prison system existed. The option to give security showed a recognisance system. A person could avoid custody by offering a guarantee to appear in court. This linked personal liberty to financial or social backing. The General Sessions functioned as the main court. The Governor and Council prepared cases but did not complete the trial at this stage. The will was accepted through sworn testimony. This showed that witnesses were required to confirm legal documents before they took effect. The order to record the will showed that written records were kept and could be copied. This allowed property rights to be enforced later.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>beale given when Desired</p>	<p>Both Draper and Orchard were confined because the evidence conflicted. Holding both men prevented either from leaving or shaping the case before trial. The reliance on witnesses to approve the will suggests that written proof alone was not trusted. Testimony may have been needed to guard against dispute or forgery.</p>
<p><a href="#">204</a></p>	<p>198</p>	<p>Island St Helena.  Att a Consultation Held on Fryday y<sup>e</sup> 24 day of february 1698 at Fort James/  Prs<sup>t</sup> Steph: Poirier Governo:  Thomas Goodwin assistant  George Hoskinson Chirurgon came this morning to the Governo<sup>r</sup> &amp; Councell in order of making Complaint  against Edward C[ro][s][b][e]ly, Saying that he had abused him  very grosly the night before both by words and blowes, upon wch Complaint the Gov<sup>r</sup> issued forth a warrant to Henry Bales marshall In order of bringing the said C[ro][s][b][e]ly to Fort James, who being accordingly brought  was Examined why he did use such sc[an]d[al]ous of Calling y<sup>e</sup> said Hoskinson severall Names and striking him, who owned his Error, who notwithstanding was Immediately ordered to Prison, or Else Give sufficient Security to be of the good behaviour untill next Sessions/  But aboute an houre after the said Hoskinson came to the Gov<sup>r</sup> &amp; Councell begging that the said C[ro][s][b][e]ly might be Released and Indulged this time  he being willing to Discharge him, being he was but a very poore man, which was accordingly Granted/  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  C[ro][s][b][e]ly Imprisoned  C[ro][s][b][e]ly Released</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Friday 24 February 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Goodwin served as assistant.  George Hoskinson, a surgeon, came before the Governor and Council that morning. He complained that Edward Crosbey had abused him the previous night. The abuse involved both insulting language and physical assault.  A warrant was issued to Henry Bales, the marshal, to bring Edward Crosbey to Fort James. He was brought in and examined. He was asked why he had used offensive language and struck George Hoskinson. He admitted his fault.  He was then ordered into prison at once. If he refused, he had to give sufficient security for good behaviour until the next Sessions.  About an hour later, George Hoskinson returned. He asked that Edward Crosbey be released and shown leniency. He stated that Crosbey was a very poor man and that he was willing to forgive him. This request was granted, and Edward Crosbey was released.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The charge of abusive language and assault showed that both verbal insult and physical violence were treated as offences under local authority. Personal conduct between inhabitants fell within the jurisdiction of the Governor and Council.  The warrant issued to the marshal showed a clear enforcement structure. The marshal acted as the officer responsible for arrest and delivery of the accused.  The requirement to give security for good behaviour showed a preventive system. It aimed to stop further disorder rather than punish past actions alone.  The rapid reversal of the order, after the complainant's request, showed that proceedings depended heavily on the injured party. Forgiveness by the victim could end the case, especially where the offence was personal rather than against public order.  <b>Speculations</b>  The decision to release Edward Crosbey soon after his arrest suggests that the authorities allowed flexibility in minor cases. When the complainant withdrew pressure, the need for formal punishment was reduced.  The reference to Crosbey's poverty suggests that his ability to provide security or pay penalties was limited. This may have influenced the decision to release him rather than enforce a bond he could not meet.</p>
<p><a href="#">205</a></p>	<p>199</p>	<p>Island St Helena.  Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday y<sup>e</sup> 7th Day of March 1698 at Fort James/  Prs<sup>t</sup> Stepn: Poirier Governo:  Thomas Goodwin assistant  Whe[re]as when the Ship Fame Capt John Conaway Commander, was In the Road Richard Alexander  Came to the Governo<sup>r</sup> Desiring him to Give him and his wife  Liberty to goe on board the said Ship, which was Denied  him, yet notwithstanding they both Did put away to and on  go on board y<sup>e</sup> said Ship, for which offence  It was ordered  That the said Richard Alexander pay as a fine for his Contempt of the Governo<sup>r</sup> order the sume of five</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Tuesday 7 March 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Goodwin served as assistant.  When the ship <i>Fame</i>, commanded by Captain John Conaway, lay in the road, Richard Alexander asked the Governor for permission for himself and his wife to go on board. This request was refused. Despite this, both went out and boarded the ship.  For this offence, Richard Alexander was fined £0 5s 0d. The money was ordered to be paid for the use of the Church.  Thomas Gargen, a gentleman, complained to the Governor that Thomas Dixon, a servant, had set his dog on one of his goats. The goat could not be found after the dog attacked it.  Thomas Dixon admitted that his dog had attacked the goat. He stated that the animal had entered his plantation several times. He also said that slaves</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Shillings to y<sup>e</sup> use of the Church Thomas Gargen, Gent<sup>r</sup> makes made Complaint to the Gov<sup>r</sup> that Thomas Dixon Serv<sup>t</sup> had Lett his Dogg at a Son of his, which Cannot be found since the dogg Seized her, The said Dixon doth owne his dogg did worry y<sup>e</sup> said Gargens Son, being she was in his Plantation &amp; had gotten In severall times, but however he hath bin told by madm Johnsons blacks that they saw y<sup>e</sup> said Son alive and well on y<sup>e</sup> house pasture, It is ordered that both the said Gargen and Dixon go on Saturday next to Looke for y<sup>e</sup> said Son with madam Johnsons blacks, and if they found her not, to Come again yt their Controversie might be Decided/ <b>Margin Notes:</b> Alexander Rich<sup>t</sup> fined five shillings for his wife going on board the Ship without Gov<sup>r</sup> leave Gargen and Dixon to go and Looke for the Son</p>	<p>belonging to Madam Johnson had reported seeing the goat alive and well on the house pasture. It was ordered that Thomas Gargen and Thomas Dixon go together on the following Saturday to search for the goat. They were to take Madam Johnson's slaves with them. If the goat was not found, they were to return so that the dispute could be decided. <b>Interpretations</b> The fine of £0 5s 0d for boarding the ship without permission showed that movement between shore and ships was controlled. The Governor's authority extended to regulating contact with visiting vessels. The payment of the fine to the Church showed that penalties could be directed to institutional uses. This linked discipline to both governance and religious support. The complaint about the dog showed that damage to livestock was treated as a civil matter requiring official resolution. Responsibility for animals rested with their owner. The reference to Madam Johnson's slaves showed that slaves were used as witnesses and search labour. Their observations were accepted as part of the evidence in disputes. The order for both parties to search together showed a practical method of resolving uncertainty. The Council required direct verification before issuing a final judgement. <b>Speculations</b> The refusal to allow Richard Alexander to board the ship suggests concern over control of movement. This may have been intended to prevent desertion, unauthorised trade, or disorder among inhabitants. The decision to delay judgement in the dispute over the goat suggests that the Council lacked clear evidence. By ordering a joint search, they created a way to confirm the facts before assigning liability.</p>
206	200	<p>Island St Helena. Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 21 Day of March 1698 at Fort James/ Prs<sup>t</sup> Stepn: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup>: Tho: Goodwin assistant Whereas Mr Thomas Goodwin, &amp; Mr Edw<sup>d</sup> Dunsdon Church wardens for this p[re][s][e]nt year, Informed the Gov<sup>r</sup>: that Simon Whaley Sold his wife and family were in a very Low and poore Condition, having scarce any victuals to eate, and In a manner almost starved, being through his neglect of Planting and Improving his Plan= tation, upon which he and his wife was Examined about this Complaint, who saith that he cannot help his being Reduced thus Low in y<sup>e</sup> world Mrs Manning the said Whaleys wife mother in Law Declares that she doth know that the said Whaley his wife hath severall times had little or no victuals to eate, and is now Reduced to such a Low and poore state that they have not a yam fitt to Dig, Wherefore Considering Seriously the Miserable poore Condition, It is ordered That the said Church wardens shall buy for y<sup>e</sup> said Whaley and his family 3 bus of yams &amp; succors, And that he be Admonished to take more Carefull means In planting and Improving his Plantation then Ever he hath done heitherto, and not be so Extravagant as he hath bin <b>Margin Notes:</b> The Church wardens for the present yeare to buy 3 bus for the Simon Whaley family</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Tuesday 21 March 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Goodwin served as assistant. Thomas Goodwin and Edward Dunsdon, churchwardens for that year, informed the Governor that Simon Whaley, his wife and his family were in severe poverty. They had very little food and were close to starvation. This condition was said to result from his failure to plant crops and improve his plantation. Simon Whaley and his wife were examined. He stated that he could not prevent his decline into poverty. Mrs Manning, mother-in-law to Simon Whaley's wife, stated that she knew the family had often had little or no food. She said they were now in such poor condition that they did not have a single yam ready to dig. The situation was considered. The churchwardens were ordered to buy 3 bushels of yams and other provisions for Simon Whaley and his family. Simon Whaley was warned to take better care in planting and managing his plantation. He was also told to stop his past wasteful behaviour. <b>Interpretations</b> The role of churchwardens included oversight of welfare. They acted as local officers who reported poverty and arranged relief, showing that support for the poor was organised through parish authority. The order to supply 3 bushels of yams showed that aid was given in food rather than money. This ensured immediate survival and prevented misuse of funds. The warning to improve planting showed that relief was conditional. Assistance came with an expectation of labour and self-sufficiency, linking welfare to productivity. The reference to Whaley's neglect and extravagance showed that poverty could be judged as a result of</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>personal conduct. This judgement shaped both the response and the conditions attached to aid.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to provide a fixed amount of food suggests that the authorities aimed to give short-term relief without creating long-term dependence. The measure likely addressed immediate hunger while pushing Whaley to restore his own production.</p> <p>The formal warning about planting and spending suggests concern that his behaviour could burden the community again. The intervention may have been designed to prevent repeated claims for support by enforcing discipline in economic activity.</p>
<a href="#">207</a>	201	<p>Island St Helena.  Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 27 day of March 1698 for orphans, att Fort James/  Prs' Stepn: Poirier Governo:  Thomas Goodwin assistant  Charles Stewart who brought and Delivered the acc<sup>t</sup> of the stock and Estate of mary Orchard wherein it did appeare  that the said Charles Stewart stood Indebted unto the Orphan  Orchard the sume of £16:3:4  It is Ordered  That the said Charles Stewart Entertaine the said mary Orchard this yeare on the same Conditions as he did the yeare last past  Orlando Bagley Jun<sup>r</sup> brought and Delivered the acc<sup>t</sup> of the Estate of mary Orchard, which was Examined  and approved, It is Ordered  That the said mary orchard Live w<sup>th</sup> the said Orlando Bagley the yeare Ensueing, he finding her with sufficient food and apparell, he being allowed for payment thereof the sume of three pounds, and that he have the Milke of her Cattle for Looking after them,  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  Steward Charles  Entertaine the Orphan  as before  Mem<sup>o</sup> that y<sup>e</sup>  Or: Bagley to have  for keeping her the  3£ p ann  Bagleys man agreed  Intended to Live  w<sup>th</sup> Mrs Procter  Orchard Mary to live with  Orlando Bagley y<sup>e</sup> yeare  he have the Milk of her Cattle</p>	<p>A consultation for orphans was held on Monday 27 March 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Goodwin served as assistant.</p> <p>Charles Stewart brought in the account of the stock and estate of Mary Orchard. The account showed that he owed the orphan Mary Orchard £16 3s 4d.</p> <p>It was ordered that Charles Stewart should maintain Mary Orchard for that year on the same terms as in the previous year.</p> <p>Orlando Bagley Junior also brought in an account of the estate of Mary Orchard. This account was examined and approved.</p> <p>It was then ordered that Mary Orchard should live with Orlando Bagley for the following year. He was required to provide her with sufficient food and clothing. In return, he was to receive £3 0s 0d for her maintenance. He was also granted the milk from her cattle as payment for caring for them.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The review of accounts showed that the estate of an orphan was formally managed under supervision. Debts owed to the orphan were recorded and enforced by the Governor and Council.</p> <p>The order that Charles Stewart continue to maintain Mary Orchard on earlier terms showed continuity in guardianship arrangements. Care of an orphan could be assigned to a specific individual under agreed conditions.</p> <p>The involvement of Orlando Bagley Junior, with a separate approved account, showed that responsibility for the orphan and her estate could be reassigned or shared under official oversight.</p> <p>The payment of £3 0s 0d for maintenance showed that guardianship involved a fixed financial allowance. This formalised the cost of food and clothing within the estate's management.</p> <p>The grant of milk from the orphan's cattle as part of payment showed that estate assets were used directly to support their upkeep. This reflected a system where property and care were closely linked.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The shift from Charles Stewart to Orlando Bagley Junior suggests that the Council adjusted guardianship to ensure proper care or better management. This change may have responded to concerns over Stewart's debt to the orphan's estate.</p> <p>The use of both cash and produce as payment indicates a mixed economy. The arrangement likely balanced limited cash resources with practical benefits, ensuring that the guardian had a clear incentive to care for both the orphan and her property.</p>
<a href="#">208</a>	202	<p>Margarett manning Brought and Delivered the acc<sup>t</sup> of the stock and Estate of martha Hunt, which was accordingly Rece<sup>d</sup> and Examined, Mr Manning Desired the sd martha Hunt might Dwell with her the yeare Ensueing, wherefore It is ordered  That the said martha Hunt Live and Dwell with said Mrs Manning the yeare Ensueing, She finding her selfe with Cloaths, and that the sd Mrs Manning have the</p>	<p>Margaret Manning brought in the account of the stock and estate of Martha Hunt. The account was received and examined.</p> <p>Mr Manning asked that Martha Hunt should live with Margaret Manning for the following year. It was ordered that Martha Hunt should remain with her for that year. Margaret Manning was required to provide clothing. In return, she was to receive the milk from</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>milke of the said martha Hunts cattle, for her Looking after them, and for her Dyett also Island St Helena.</p> <p>Att a Consultation Held on Fryday the 28 Day of March 1698 att fort James/ Prs' Stepn: Poirier Gov':</p> <p>Tho: Goodwin assistant Thomas Swallow &amp; James Rider both of the said Island Planters and overseers of the stock and Estate of John Peirce decd make their Complaint to the Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councill that they thought and feared that John Hacknald, who married the said Peirce his widdow would Im= bezell, and wast the said Peirce his widdows Estate, and that they had Desired y<sup>e</sup> said Hacknald to Give them an acco<sup>t</sup> In writing of the said widdows Estate, which he would not, and Denied them an acco<sup>t</sup> thereof, wherefore the said Hacknald being brought before us was Deman= ded of why he would not give y<sup>e</sup> said Swallow and Rider an acco<sup>t</sup> of the said Peirce his widdows Estate, he made Reply that he thought they had</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Mr Tho: Goodwin &amp; the Church wardens to take care of the Estate of Eliz Surtling as was Rece<sup>d</sup> and approved by Councill this year Ensueing Ordered That E Surtling Continue w<sup>th</sup> Mrs Goodwin this year Ensueing upon the same Terms as she did last year (as appeares) Hunt Martha to Live with Mrs Manning one year she to have the milk of her cattle</p>	<p>Martha Hunt's cattle as payment for both their care and her food.</p> <p>A consultation was then held on Friday 28 March 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Goodwin served as assistant.</p> <p>Thomas Swallow and James Rider, planters and overseers of the estate of John Peirce, deceased, brought a complaint. They stated that they feared John Hacknald, who had married Peirce's widow, would waste or remove the estate. They had asked him to provide a written account of the widow's estate, but he refused and denied them access.</p> <p>John Hacknald was brought before the Governor and Council. He was asked why he had refused to provide an account to Thomas Swallow and James Rider. He replied that he believed they had no authority to demand it.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The examination of Martha Hunt's estate showed that orphan property was closely supervised. Accounts were checked before any decision on guardianship was made.</p> <p>The arrangement with Margaret Manning showed that care was exchanged for use of the orphan's assets. The milk from the cattle served as direct payment, linking maintenance to productive property.</p> <p>The complaint by Thomas Swallow and James Rider showed that overseers held responsibility to protect an estate after death. Their role included demanding accounts and preventing loss or misuse.</p> <p>The refusal by John Hacknald to give an account showed a conflict between private control through marriage and formal oversight by appointed estate managers. Marriage to a widow did not remove the need to answer to those responsible for the estate.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The decision to keep Martha Hunt with Margaret Manning suggests that continuity of care was preferred. Stability may have been seen as more important than changing guardians, especially where the arrangement already worked.</p> <p>The dispute over John Peirce's estate suggests concern that remarriage could lead to loss of assets. The demand for a written account may have been intended to secure control and prevent property from being absorbed into the new husband's hands.</p>
209	203	<p>no power to Demand it, But he being made Sensible of his Error, and that they were lawfull overseers with his wife, He offered to give good Security by Bond for the whole Estate which now in his Custody Provided it might Continue So/ It is ordered That the said Hacknalds offers be Accepted on the aforesaid Conditions, and that he give the Children an acc<sup>t</sup> when they come to age, and also to Keep the said overseers, and the Governo<sup>r</sup> and Councill Harmeless/ Whereas after a Second Examination of the Last will and Testament of Jona<sup>t</sup> Beale Decd, finding that there was a mistake made by the Penman about the Disposing and settling of his Estate to his wife wherefore the witnesses to the said will, were ordered to appeare before us this day, being the fittest persons to sett it in its True forme, which are Robert Addis John Goodwin and John Bowman, who being Examined, do both unanimously say that the said Decd Jona<sup>t</sup> Beale did in all their hearings say that his wife should have her thirds both of his personall Estate and Reale Estate also which was in the Will mentioned she should have her thirds out of his personal Estate It is further ordered That the said Decd Jona<sup>t</sup> Beales widdow shall have 1/3 of his Estate both personall and Reale</p>	<p>John Hacknald stated that Thomas Swallow and James Rider had no authority to demand an account. He was then made to understand that they were lawful overseers together with his wife. He admitted his error. He offered to give security by bond for the whole estate in his custody, on the condition that he might continue to manage it.</p> <p>This offer was accepted. He was required to give a bond for the estate. He was also required to provide a full account to the children when they came of age. He was to keep the overseers, the Governor and the Council free from any loss arising from his management.</p> <p>The will of Jonathan Beale was examined again. A mistake was found in the wording about how his estate was to be settled on his wife. The witnesses to the will, Robert Addis, John Goodwin and John Bowman, were called to appear. They were examined and all agreed on the same point. They stated that Jonathan Beale had said that his wife should receive one third of both his personal and real estate.</p> <p>It was then ordered that the widow of Jonathan Beale should receive one third of the whole estate, both personal and real.</p> <p>A dispute was then raised between George Hoskinson, surgeon, and the widow Beale. The matter concerned a lease of land. George Hoskinson claimed that he held land from Jonathan Beale for a term of</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>And whereas George Hoskinson Chirurgion and the said wid<sup>a</sup> Beale having some Controversie about Lease or acres of Land which by agreement the Hoskinson had of the said Jona<sup>a</sup> Beale for the terme of eleven years, but he now being not willing should have the said Land so long, and the said Hoskinson having no writeing under her Decd Husband hand, for the</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b>  Beale Mary allowed a third part of her Husbands Estate  Hacknald offers to be accepted upon the conditions, he to give Security for the Estate &amp; to give the Children an acc<sup>t</sup> when of age, and to keep the overseers harmeless</p>	<p>eleven years. The widow was not willing for him to hold the land for that full term. George Hoskinson had no written agreement from her late husband to prove the lease.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The bond offered by John Hacknald functioned as a legal guarantee. It secured the value of the estate while allowing him to keep control. This showed how risk was managed through financial obligation rather than removal of possession.</p> <p>The requirement to account to the children when they came of age showed that inheritance rights were protected over time. Control during minority did not remove the duty to restore full value later.</p> <p>The instruction to keep the overseers and the authorities free from loss showed that liability was placed on the estate holder. This protected officials from responsibility if the estate was reduced.</p> <p>The correction of the will through witness testimony showed that spoken intention could override faulty written wording. Legal effect depended on what the testator was proved to have meant, not only on the text.</p> <p>The division of the estate into one third for the widow reflected a fixed rule of inheritance. It applied to both movable goods and land.</p> <p>The dispute over the lease showed the importance of written proof. Without a written agreement, long-term claims to land were uncertain and open to challenge.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The acceptance of Hacknald's bond suggests that the Council preferred to avoid removing him from control. Securing the estate through obligation allowed continuity while reducing risk.</p> <p>The re-examination of the will suggests that the earlier wording created a real dispute. Calling the witnesses ensured a clear settlement and prevented future claims against the widow's share.</p> <p>The challenge to Hoskinson's lease suggests that the widow sought to recover control of land after her husband's death. The lack of written proof gave her grounds to resist a long-term arrangement that reduced her interest.</p>
210	204	<p>[...] abovesaid life  It is by both parties agreed  That the said Hoskinson have the said Two acres of Land, but for the Terme of time of Two yeares and a halfe, Commencing from the 14<sup>th</sup> day of Sept<sup>r</sup> last past,  John Hacknald &amp; John Goodwin both of the said Island Planters presented to us the Last Will and Testament of one Mr Richard Souter, Late belonging unto the Ship America, Interloper, who being very Sick when he came to this Island, was Desirous to stay here thinking he might Recover his Sickness, which said will was Rece<sup>d</sup> and approved, by the oaths of William French, Edward Crosbey, and Peter Williams, who made  oath that the said will now produced was the said Mr Richards Souter last Will and Testament,  It is ordered  That the said will be Rece<sup>d</sup> and a Coppy Given thereof when Desired/  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  Hoskinson to have the two Acres of Land for two years more belonging to the Estate of John Beale  Mr Rich<sup>d</sup> Souter Capt will and Testament viewd and approved and a Coppy given when desired</p>	<p>The dispute over the land was settled by agreement between both parties.</p> <p>George Hoskinson was allowed to keep the two acres of land. The term was fixed at two and a half years. This period began from 14 September 1698.</p> <p>John Hacknald and John Goodwin, both planters, then presented the last will and testament of Richard Souter, who had belonged to the ship <i>America</i>, described as an interloper. He had arrived at the island in poor health and had chosen to remain there in the hope of recovery.</p> <p>The will was received and approved. William French, Edward Crosbey and Peter Williams gave sworn statements that the document was the true last will and testament of Richard Souter.</p> <p>It was ordered that the will be recorded. A copy was to be provided whenever it was requested.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The agreement over the land showed that disputes could be settled by consent rather than imposed judgement. The Council formalised the terms to make them binding.</p> <p>The fixed term of two and a half years replaced the earlier claim of eleven years. This showed that land use could be renegotiated after death, especially where no written lease existed.</p> <p>The description of the ship <i>America</i> as an interloper indicated that it operated outside the authorised trading system. This marked its crew as outside normal</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>Company regulation, though still subject to local authority while on the island.</p> <p>The approval of the will through sworn witnesses showed that legal recognition depended on testimony. This applied even to individuals connected to ships rather than permanent residents.</p> <p>The order to record and copy the will showed that the administration maintained formal records for property and inheritance, ensuring that claims could be verified later.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The reduced term granted to Hoskinson suggests that the widow sought to regain control of land while still allowing temporary use. The compromise balanced her interest in the estate with his existing occupation.</p> <p>The acceptance of Richard Souter's will suggests that the Council extended legal protection to non-residents. This may have encouraged sailors to remain on the island when ill, knowing their property and intentions would be recognised.</p>
211	205	<p>[...] abovesaid life It is by both parties agreed That the said Hoskinson have the said Two acres of Land, but for the Terme of time of Two yeares and a halfe, Commencing from the 14<sup>th</sup> day of Sept<sup>r</sup> last past, John Hacknald &amp; John Goodwin both of the said Island Planters presented to us the Last Will and Testament of one Mr Richard Souter, Late belonging unto the Ship America, Interloper, who being very Sick when he came to this Island, was Desirous to stay here thinking he might Recover his Sicknes, which said will was Rece<sup>d</sup> and approved, by the oaths of William French, Edward Crosbey, and Peter Williams, who made oath that the said will now produced was the said Mr Richards Souter last Will and Testament, It is ordered That the said will be Rece<sup>d</sup> and a Coppy Given thereof when Desired/ <b>Margin Notes:</b> Hoskinson to have the two Acres of Land for two years more belonging to the Estate of John Beale Mr Rich<sup>d</sup> Souter Capt will and Testament viewd and approved and a Coppy given when desired</p>	<p>The dispute over the land was settled by agreement between both parties.</p> <p>George Hoskinson was allowed to keep the two acres of land. The term was set at two and a half years. It began from 14 September 1698.</p> <p>John Hacknald and John Goodwin, both planters, then presented the last will and testament of Richard Souter, formerly of the ship <i>America</i>, an interloper. He had arrived on the island in poor health and chose to remain there in the hope of recovery.</p> <p>The will was received and examined. William French, Edward Crosbey and Peter Williams gave sworn evidence that the document was the true last will and testament of Richard Souter.</p> <p>It was ordered that the will be recorded. A copy was to be provided whenever requested.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The agreed term of two and a half years showed that land rights could be adjusted after a dispute. The Council confirmed the agreement to give it legal force.</p> <p>The absence of a written lease earlier weakened Hoskinson's claim to a longer term. This showed that proof in writing carried strong weight in disputes over land.</p> <p>The description of the ship <i>America</i> as an interloper marked it as outside the authorised trading system. Even so, its crew remained subject to local authority while on the island.</p> <p>The will was accepted on sworn testimony. This showed that legal validity depended on witnesses who could confirm the testator's intent.</p> <p>The order to record the will showed that the administration maintained written records for estates. Copies could be issued to support future claims.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The agreed reduction from a longer term to two and a half years suggests a compromise. It allowed Hoskinson continued use while protecting the widow's control over the estate.</p> <p>The acceptance of Souter's will suggests that the Council sought to maintain order among transient populations. Recognising such wills may have encouraged compliance with local authority by visiting sailors.</p>
212	206	<p>Then the said John Orchards Declaration against James Draper free Planter, was Read, to which the said James Draper being Examined, Denied the fact, Saying he is wrongfully accused, and Desires prooffe, But doth Con= fess that the said Leather was found on the outside his Hill</p>	<p>John Orchard's declaration against James Draper, a free planter, was read. James Draper was examined. He denied the charge and stated that he was wrongly accused. He asked for proof. He admitted that the leather had been found on the outside of his hill house chimney, but said he did not know who had placed it there.</p> <p>Simon Whaley was called and sworn. He stated that on the night John Orchard claimed to have lost his</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>House Chimney, but Cannot tell who putt it there, Then  Simon Whaley was called and Sworne, who saith that the same night as the said orchard hath Declared he Lost his Leather, the said James Draper came downe to his house, who Complained that he was very Ill, being much troubled with the Gripes, and that he Lay at his house all that night w<sup>th</sup> him In one Bed,  Mercy the said Whaleys wife, being Sworne saith the same as her Husband hath already, and further adds that the said James Draper Called to her severall times in the night, She Lying in the same Room in an other Bed, and asked her what was the matter w<sup>th</sup> her child being it Cryed and was very froward all that night, further saith not, Bartland audovart arme: Sworne saith the very same as he did In the Consultation Held the 7<sup>th</sup> Day of febr  Last past,  Sarah Bledgor wid<sup>a</sup> Sworne saith the same as she hath already In her former Declaration In the Consultation Held the 7<sup>th</sup> Day of ffebruary last past/  Mary orchard Sworne saith the same as in her former Declaration, In the Consultation Held the 7<sup>th</sup> Day of ffebruary last past, for the same purpose,/  </p>	<p>leather, James Draper came to his house. Draper said he was very ill and suffered from severe stomach pain. He stayed there all night and slept in the same bed as Whaley.</p> <p>Mercy Whaley, his wife, was sworn. She confirmed the same account. She added that James Draper called to her several times during the night. She lay in the same room in another bed. He asked her about her child, who cried and was restless throughout the night.</p> <p>Bartland Audovert, an armourer, was sworn. He repeated the same statement he had given in the consultation held on 7 February 1699.</p> <p>Sarah Pledger, a widow, was sworn. She repeated the same statement she had given in the consultation held on 7 February 1699.</p> <p>Mary Orchard was sworn. She repeated the same statement she had given in the consultation held on 7 February 1699.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The repeated swearing of earlier witnesses showed that prior testimony could be formally reaffirmed in later hearings. This reinforced the evidential record without requiring new statements.</p> <p>The admission by James Draper that the leather was found on his property, combined with his denial of knowledge, showed a distinction between possession and responsibility. Physical proximity alone did not establish guilt without proof of intent or action.</p> <p>The use of sworn testimony from multiple witnesses showed a structured process of evidence gathering. Statements were compared to test consistency and credibility.</p> <p>The detailed account of illness and shared sleeping arrangements functioned as an alibi. It placed James Draper at a specific location during the relevant time.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The reliance on repeated testimony suggests that the case had become contested and prolonged. Reaffirming earlier statements may have been intended to strengthen their weight against conflicting claims.</p> <p>The emphasis on Draper's illness and presence in another household suggests a deliberate effort to establish that he could not have placed the leather himself. This detail may have been used to counter the physical evidence found near his house.</p>
213	207	<p>Martha Oliver saith that the same night as y<sup>e</sup> said John orchard lost his Leather, he came home to the House of orlando Bagley Jun<sup>r</sup> being gone out the day before, and when he came home he and his Sister mary orchard went to Sup, and after they had all supt she and mary orchard went up Staires to Bed, being then aboute Nine a Clock and left the said orchard Lying downe upon a Bench behinde the table, and doth not know whether he went to Bed that night or not, and that she heard no Noise all that night aboute the House/  Serj<sup>t</sup> Surtling Sworne saith that he had Stolen from his Tann fatt one Hide of Sole Leather, which happened to be found with the said John orchards Leather on the outside of James Drapers still house Chimney, and did all along think that the said orchard stole it, having more Cause to suspect him, then any one Else being he Stole once a Raw Hide from him and Carryed it to Benj<sup>t</sup> Beales Tann fatt to Dress, and kept him to Dress his hide till it was Stolen,  Then the Jury withdrew and stayed aboute three Quarters of an houre, then Returned and gave in a verdict</p>	<p>Martha Oliver stated that on the night John Orchard lost his leather, he returned to the house of Orlando Bagley Junior after being away the previous day. He and his sister, Mary Orchard, ate supper together. After the meal, Martha Oliver and Mary Orchard went upstairs to bed at about 9 o'clock. John Orchard remained lying on a bench behind the table. She did not know whether he went to bed that night. She heard no noise around the house.</p> <p>Sergeant Surtling stated that a hide of sole leather had been stolen from his tanning pit. This hide was later found together with John Orchard's leather on the outside of James Draper's still house chimney. He said that he had long suspected John Orchard. He had more reason to suspect him than anyone else because John Orchard had previously stolen a raw hide from him and taken it to Benjamin Beale's tanning pit to be dressed. He had kept it there until it was stolen.</p> <p>The jury withdrew and remained out for about three quarters of an hour. They then returned with their verdict. John Orchard's case against James Draper failed. He was dismissed from the suit and ordered to pay all court charges.</p> <p>Thomas Davis then brought a complaint against John Hacknald in an action of debt. He stated that John Hacknald owed him £6 10s 0d, as shown by a bond. This debt was to be paid in corn and money of the island. John Hacknald had refused to pay and had delayed him repeatedly without giving any satisfaction.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>That the said John orchard was G[...] by the said James Draper [...] and non Suited, and to Pay all the Court Charges/  Thomas Davis complains against John Hacknald of the said Island, In an action of Debt saying that the said John Hacknald stands Indebted unto him the sume of Six pound Ten Shillings, as by a bond doth make appeare, to be paid In Corne and money of the Island, the which debt the said Hacknald hath Refused to pay, and did put him the said Davis off from time to time, without making any manner of satisfac= tion/  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  Indictm<sup>t</sup> by James Draper the which is to pay all Charges</p>	<p><b>Interpretations</b>  The testimony of Martha Oliver showed that John Orchard's movements during the night remained uncertain. His presence at home was not confirmed for the full period, which weakened his position as a reliable complainant.  The statement by Sergeant Surtling introduced evidence of prior misconduct. Past theft was used to support suspicion, showing that character and previous behaviour influenced judgement.  The reference to a tanning pit showed the local process of leather production. Such sites were important points in the handling and identification of goods.  The jury's role showed that final judgement in disputed cases rested with a group of local men. Their decision determined liability and costs.  The order that John Orchard pay all court charges showed that unsuccessful claims carried financial penalties. This discouraged unfounded accusations.  The bond in the debt case showed a formal financial obligation. It provided written proof of the amount owed and the agreed form of payment.  The mention of payment in corn and money showed a mixed system of exchange. Debts could be settled partly in produce and partly in currency.  <b>Speculations</b>  The verdict against John Orchard suggests that the combined testimony created doubt about his claim. His uncertain movements and past suspicion may have outweighed the evidence against James Draper.  The inclusion of prior theft in the evidence suggests that reputation played a strong role in the outcome. This may have influenced the jury more than the physical discovery of the leather.  The repeated delay in payment by John Hacknald suggests financial strain or unwillingness to meet obligations. The use of a bond indicates that Thomas Davis relied on formal proof to enforce the debt after informal attempts failed.</p>
214	208	<p>The said John Hacknald doth not Deny the Debt, only alledges that the said Davis having a bond from John Peirce Dec<sup>d</sup> whose wid<sup>a</sup> he hath Married for the sume of Thirteen pounds Ten shillings, Specified to be paid In good and Lawfull Money of y<sup>e</sup> said Island, being accounted halfe Silver and halfe Copper barrs, which Moiety of silver he hath already paid, and he having then no Cop<sup>p</sup> barrs, gave the said Davis a Bill under Mr Thomas Goodwin and [...] for the other Moiety in copper barrs, which he Refused/  The said Thomas Davis Confesseth what y<sup>e</sup> said John Hacknald hath said, and that uppon as he had Rece<sup>d</sup> the said Six pounds Ten shill<sup>g</sup> of y<sup>e</sup> said Hacknald, he did  Endorse it on the back side the said Peirce bond as part of payment, but y<sup>e</sup> said Bill which y<sup>e</sup> said Hacknald would have given him, he Refused being but paper, without offence to Mr Goodwin, and being not Reale payment according to the sd bond.  George Hoskinson Chirurgion Sworne saith that he was with the said Hacknald, at the House of John Peirce when he paid the said Davis the said sume of Six pound Ten shillings In silver, and that y<sup>e</sup> said Hacknald offered the said Davis a Bill signed by Mr Goodwin for payment of the other halfe in Cop<sup>p</sup> barrs, which the said Davis Refused,  Then the Jury withdrew and stayed aboute halfe an houre, then Returned and brought in a verdict that the said John Hacknald was to pay the Remainder to y<sup>e</sup> said Thomas Davis, and pay the Court Charges/  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  The Remainder to</p>	<p>John Hacknald did not deny the debt. He stated that Thomas Davis already held a bond from John Peirce, deceased, whose widow he had married. This bond was for £13 10s 0d. It was to be paid in lawful money of the island, defined as half silver and half copper bars.  He stated that he had already paid the silver half. He had no copper bars at that time. Instead, he offered Thomas Davis a bill drawn under Thomas Goodwin and [...], to cover the remaining half in copper bars. Thomas Davis refused to accept it.  Thomas Davis confirmed this account. He stated that after receiving £6 10s 0d in silver, he had endorsed that sum on the back of the Peirce bond as part payment. He refused the bill because it was only paper and not real payment as required by the bond.  George Hoskinson, surgeon, was sworn. He stated that he had been present at the house of John Peirce when John Hacknald paid Thomas Davis the £6 10s 0d in silver. He also confirmed that Hacknald offered a bill signed by Thomas Goodwin for the remaining half in copper bars, and that Davis refused it.  The jury withdrew and remained out for about half an hour. They returned with their verdict. John Hacknald was ordered to pay the remaining balance to Thomas Davis and to pay the court charges.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The bond for £13 10s 0d set out a formal debt with fixed terms of payment. It required settlement in a mixed currency of silver and copper bars, showing a regulated monetary system.  The division into half silver and half copper bars showed that different forms of money were treated as</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>be paid in silver and halfe in copper according to the bond (viz<sup>d</sup>) Hacknald to pay Tho<sup>m</sup> Davis</p>	<p>distinct and not interchangeable unless specified. The bond fixed both the type and proportion of payment.</p> <p>The endorsement of £6 10s 0d on the bond showed a formal method of recording part payment. This created a written record that reduced the remaining obligation.</p> <p>The refusal of the bill showed that paper instruments were not accepted as equivalent to specified forms of payment. The creditor insisted on the exact medium stated in the bond.</p> <p>The jury's decision enforced the original terms of the bond. This showed that written agreements governed the outcome, even where partial payment had been made.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The offer of a bill instead of copper bars suggests that Hacknald lacked the required form of currency. The bill may have been intended as a practical substitute in a setting where coin and metal supply was limited.</p> <p>The refusal by Thomas Davis suggests concern over reliability. Paper promises may have been seen as less secure than physical payment, especially where enforcement depended on local authority rather than wider financial systems.</p>
215	209	<p>Martha Oliver a Black free woman was called and Examined how she gott such fine Cloaths as she had worne, being the Governo<sup>r</sup> Desire to have her Discover the Lewdness of Mary the wife of orlando Bagley sen<sup>r</sup> with Thomas Swallow Planter, of which the Gov<sup>r</sup> hath bin somewhat Informed of by the Church wardens/ Who being Examined saith that some time agoe she Lived at the House of the said mary Bagley, and one day she and Mrs Bagley had some words aboute what Mrs Bagley had heard, that she had told severalls that the sd Swallow used to Come to her house very often, Upon which she went to Live at orlando Bagley Jun<sup>r</sup> house, and some time since Mary orchard went to Mrs Bagleys House, &amp; after she had bin there ab<sup>t</sup> an houere, she Desired her to goe Home, for she was as she told her Intended to go to Mr Bowmans house, So the said mary orchard went home, and aboute an houere after this Deponent and the said Mary orchard having some busines to goe up towards the maine Ridge, they saw a woman in Mrs Bagleys Plantation, but did not know who it was, but when they came Nigher they perceived it was the said Mrs Bagley, and they forethinking that she stayed there waiting for the said Swallow, they was Resolved to watch her, and shortly after saw the said Swallow Come over the maine Ridge, who as soone as she perceived him went towards him, upon which the said Deponent seeing sat downe between two Trees, and beckoned to her to Come to him, who accordingly did, and they talking a little while together, she saw the said Swallow go one way, and the said Mrs Bagley another, however they still were minded to Discover their Designs if possible, and when they the said Bagley and Swallow was gone out of their sight, they went up further, and thinking they were Intended to meet</p>	<p>Martha Oliver, a free black woman, was called and examined. The Governor required her to explain how she came by the fine clothes she had worn. He also sought to have her reveal alleged misconduct by Mary, the wife of Orlando Bagley Senior, with Thomas Swallow, a planter. This suspicion had already been reported by the churchwardens.</p> <p>Martha Oliver stated that she had previously lived at the house of Mary Bagley. At that time, a dispute arose between them. Mary Bagley had heard that Martha Oliver had told others that Thomas Swallow often visited her house. After this quarrel, Martha Oliver left and went to live at the house of Orlando Bagley Junior.</p> <p>She stated that some time later Mary Orchard went to Mary Bagley's house. After about an hour, Mary Bagley told her to leave, saying she intended to go to Mr Bowman's house. Mary Orchard returned home.</p> <p>About an hour later, Martha Oliver and Mary Orchard went out together towards the main ridge on other business. They saw a woman in Mary Bagley's plantation but did not recognise her at first. As they came closer, they saw that it was Mary Bagley. They believed she was waiting for Thomas Swallow and decided to watch her.</p> <p>Shortly after, they saw Thomas Swallow come over the main ridge. When Mary Bagley saw him, she went towards him. Martha Oliver then sat down between two trees and signalled to Mary Orchard to join her. They watched as Mary Bagley and Thomas Swallow spoke together for a short time. They then separated, each going a different way.</p> <p>Martha Oliver stated that they continued to follow them in order to discover their intentions. When they lost sight of them, they went further up. Believing that they intended to meet again, they tried to find them. When they reached the main ridge, they called to Thomas Earle, who was working in his plantation below them, to come up. He came, and Martha Oliver told him that they had spent nearly half the day watching Mary Bagley and Thomas Swallow.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>again, did their Endeavour to find them out, and when they came to the maine Ridge they Called Tho: Earle, who was at worke in his Plantation a little below them, to Come up to them, who did, and when he came, this Deponent told him that they had bin almost halfe the day a watching Mrs Bagley and Thomas Swallow, and told him they were</p>	
216	210	<p>together downe In the gutt amongst the wood and ferne, and asked him wheather he would go downe the said Deponent only, mary orchard being not willing to go downe, he told them he would not go and so went downe to watch againe, But this Deponent tooke a Stone in her hand and went to the place where she Imagined they were, and saw the sd Mrs Bagley Lying downe upon the Ground, and the said Swallow upon her In a most wicked Action: to whome she said ah have I catcht you, Come out for I see you, which did somewhat affright them, and the said Mrs Bagley run one way downe towards the said John Bowman, and the sd Swallow Leind further up the Gutt amongst the ferne, further saith that sometime since the said Tho: swallow Gave her four pounds to Conceale what she had seene between him and Mrs Bagley, which was paid her in Cloaths and that the said Swallow gave the said Mary orchard to y<sup>e</sup> value of Six Dollars In two pr of surratt Lin[n]y</p>	<p>Martha Oliver continued her statement. She said that Mary Bagley and Thomas Swallow went down together into a gully among the wood and fern. She asked Thomas Earle if he would go down with her to watch them, as Mary Orchard refused to go. He declined.</p> <p>Martha Oliver then went alone. She took a stone in her hand and went to the place where she believed they were. There she saw Mary Bagley lying on the ground and Thomas Swallow on top of her in a sexual act. She called out to them that she had seen them. This alarmed them. Mary Bagley ran down towards John Bowman's house. Thomas Swallow went further up the gully among the fern.</p> <p>Martha Oliver also stated that some time later Thomas Swallow gave her £4 0s 0d to keep silent about what she had seen. This payment was made in clothing. She added that Thomas Swallow also gave Mary Orchard goods worth six dollars, in the form of two pairs of Surat linen.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The examination of Martha Oliver showed that the Governor and Council investigated moral conduct as part of their authority. Allegations of sexual misconduct were treated as matters of public concern, especially when reported by churchwardens.</p> <p>The reference to payment in clothing and goods showed that bribes or inducements could be given in kind rather than money. Material goods served as a form of exchange where currency was limited.</p> <p>The mention of Surat linen showed the presence of imported textiles in local circulation. Such goods formed part of everyday exchange and could be used to settle obligations or secure silence.</p> <p>The involvement of multiple witnesses, including Mary Orchard and Thomas Earle, showed that testimony was built through observation and corroboration. Even indirect witnesses were drawn into the inquiry.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The payment of £4 0s 0d in clothing suggests a deliberate attempt by Thomas Swallow to suppress evidence. The use of goods instead of cash may have made the transaction less visible or easier to deny.</p> <p>The effort by Martha Oliver and Mary Orchard to watch and follow Mary Bagley suggests that suspicion was already strong before the event. Their actions indicate that the discovery was not accidental but driven by prior belief and intent to expose the relationship.</p>
217	211	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held att Fort James on Tuesday the 26 Day of Aprill 1699 Prs<sup>t</sup> Stepn: Poirier Governo: Thomas Goodwin assistant Whereas Mr Thomas Goodwin &amp; Mr Edw<sup>d</sup> Dunsdon Church wardens for the yeare last past, Informed the Gov<sup>r</sup> that Mary the wife of orlando Bagley Sen<sup>r</sup> did Commit Lewdness with Thomas Swallow, and had bin knowne to keep one anothers Comp<sup>d</sup> very often, to whome being Deman= ded by the Governo<sup>r</sup> wheather their Consciencs did</p>	<p>A consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday 26 April 1699. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Goodwin served as assistant.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin and Edward Dunsdon, churchwardens for the previous year, reported that Mary, wife of Orlando Bagley Senior, had committed sexual misconduct with Thomas Swallow. They stated that the two had often kept company together.</p> <p>Both were questioned by the Governor. They were asked whether they would admit the truth. They denied any misconduct and asked for proof.</p> <p>Martha Oliver, a free black woman, was sworn. She repeated the same statement she had already given in the Court of Justice held on 4 April 1699.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>not convince them of Confessing the truth of it/ They Denied to have Committed any thing tending to Lewdness, and Desired prooffe against them/ Martha Oliver a Black free woman being Sworne saith positively the very same as she hath already Sworne In the foregoing Court of Justice Held the 4 Day of Aprill last past/ Mary orchard Sworne saith that on the 2 Day of feb' Last past she being agoing up towards the maine Ridge with the above said Martha Oliver, they saw Mrs Bagley In her own Plantation, and the said Swallow Coming over the Ridge she mett him, and had some short Discourse together, and a little time after they parted one from the other, which she and the said Oliver seeing went up to the sd maine ridge</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Mr Goodwin &amp; Mr Dunsdon Church wardens for present Inform the Governo<sup>r</sup> Mary Bagley lewd with Tho: Swallow</p>	<p>Mary Orchard was sworn. She stated that on 2 February 1699 she went towards the main ridge with Martha Oliver. They saw Mary Bagley in her plantation. Thomas Swallow came over the ridge and met her. They spoke briefly and then parted. Martha Oliver and Mary Orchard went up towards the ridge after seeing this.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The involvement of churchwardens showed that moral conduct fell under formal supervision. They acted as informants and brought cases of sexual misconduct before the Governor and Council. The questioning of the accused showed that confession was sought directly. Admission could resolve the case without further proof, but denial required evidence. The repeated testimony of Martha Oliver showed that earlier sworn statements could be reused. This strengthened continuity in the case and avoided repetition of full examination. The testimony of Mary Orchard added partial corroboration. While she did not describe the act itself, she confirmed meetings between the two, which supported suspicion of misconduct.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The reliance on witness testimony suggests that the authorities lacked direct proof at this stage. The case depended on building a consistent pattern of behaviour rather than a single decisive act. The repeated denial by both parties suggests that admission would have carried serious consequences. Their refusal to confess indicates an attempt to force the authorities to rely entirely on witness evidence.</p>
218	212	<p>and when they came there, they Imagined that the said Thomas Swallow, and Mrs Bagley would meet againe, and in what place, and they being above the place where they thought the said Swallow, &amp; Mrs Bagley were, the sd mar= tha Oliver said she would fling a stone downe to him, but did not through the Deponents perswasions however the said Oliver went downe herselfe, after that Thomas Carle came to them, and In her hearing heard y<sup>e</sup> said martha Oliver say Come out for now I have catcht you, whereupon Mrs Bagley run downe towards John Bowman and the said Swallow Run up the Gutt amongst the ferne, and when the said Martha Oliver Came to the Deponents againe, she told her that she had seen Mrs Bagley and said Thomas Swallow a lying together In a very wicked action, Thomas Carle saith that he being at worke In his Plantation, he heard some body Call him two or three times, who happened to be Mary orchard and martha Oliver, and when he Came up to them, they told him that they had bin a watching of Mrs Bagley and Thomas Swallow almost halfe the day, and told him they were downe In y<sup>e</sup> Gutt amongst the wood, and asked him wheather he would go downe with her to them, he replied no, he would not But the said Martha Oliver tooke up a stone in her hand and went downe towards the place where the Swallow and Mrs Bagley was, So he stayed a little while with the said mary orchard, and while the said Mart: Oliver was gone he went In his Plantation againe, further he saith that aboute a weeke after the said Mart: Oliver came to his house, and he having some discourse about</p>	<p>Mary Orchard continued her statement. She said that when she and Martha Oliver reached the main ridge, they believed that Thomas Swallow and Mary Bagley would meet again. They positioned themselves above the place where they thought the meeting would occur. Martha Oliver said she would throw a stone down, but Mary Orchard persuaded her not to. Martha Oliver then went down alone. Thomas Carle came to them while this was happening. In Mary Orchard's hearing, he heard Martha Oliver call out, "Come out, for now I have caught you." Mary Orchard stated that Mary Bagley then ran down towards John Bowman's house, and Thomas Swallow ran up the gully among the fern. When Martha Oliver returned, she told Mary Orchard that she had seen them lying together in a sexual act. Thomas Carle was sworn. He stated that while working in his plantation, he heard someone call him several times. He went up and found Mary Orchard and Martha Oliver. They told him they had been watching Mary Bagley and Thomas Swallow for nearly half the day. They said the two were down in the gully among the wood. They asked him to go down with them, but he refused. Martha Oliver then took a stone and went down alone. Thomas Carle remained briefly with Mary Orchard, then returned to his plantation. He stated that about a week later Martha Oliver came to his house. During a conversation about the matter, she told him that she had seen no misconduct between Thomas Swallow and Mary Bagley. Martha Oliver replied that she was not required to tell Thomas Carle what she had seen. She added that she had been instructed by others not to reveal anything about the matter.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The repeated accounts from Mary Orchard and Martha Oliver showed how testimony was built through layered observation. Direct sight, reported statements and later conversations were all treated as evidence. The contradiction between Martha Oliver's sworn statement and her later remark to Thomas Carle showed</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>the aforesaid busines, she told him that she did not see any harme between y<sup>e</sup> said Swallow &amp; Mrs Bagley, The said Martha Oliver saith she was not obliged to tell him the said Carle what she saw and further because she said persons had obliged her not to Declare any thing of y<sup>e</sup> matter,</p>	<p>that witness reliability was contested. The Council had to weigh conflicting versions and consider possible pressure on witnesses.</p> <p>The calling of Thomas Carle as a supporting witness showed that even partial observers were used to confirm sequence and behaviour. His evidence did not prove the act but supported the timeline and actions.</p> <p>The statement that Martha Oliver had been told not to reveal the matter suggested outside influence. This showed that witnesses could be subject to pressure, which affected the integrity of testimony.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The inconsistency in Martha Oliver's statements suggests that she may have faced pressure after her initial testimony. Her reluctance to repeat the claim outside formal examination may indicate fear of consequences.</p> <p>The effort by Mary Orchard and Martha Oliver to observe and expose the meeting suggests that suspicion of misconduct was already strong. Their actions indicate that the case developed from active surveillance rather than a chance discovery.</p>
219	213	<p>John orchard Sworne saith that the said Martha Oliver told him that she had Catcht Thomas Swallow and Mrs Bagley Lying together amongst some ferne In a wood, and offered him a Dollar not to speake of it againe he promised her he would not, and Desired her to go along to Mrs Bagley, who shewed him, and that she told him that when she saw both the aforesaid Swallow and Mrs Bagley Lying together, she said Come out for now I have Catcht you, and said no bad may young people doe such wicked things amongst one anothers wives/ Anne the wife of orlando Bagley Jun<sup>r</sup> saith that her Sister mary orchard told her one day that her mother in law Mrs Bagley was Ruined, for that her Deponent She, Mary her Sister, Martha Oliver had told her that her mother and Thomas Swallow was a lying together Committing lewd=ness, she saith she Deponent yet saw her sister deceive her selfe, and when the said Martha Oliver came home, and her Depo<sup>t</sup> asked her what she had seen between her mother and Thomas Swallow, she sayed she had seen them In a Lewd action together, Elizabeth the wife of John Long Sworne saith that about four or five night agone, she went into Bagleys house, being she the night time, to fetch her Husband from thence, at which time she saw the said Mrs Bagley Drunk and a sleep upon the floore, her petty Coate above her knees quite naked, and that she put her hand to her belly on purpose to see if she was with child, but did not, what she saith she saw, and then her husband and she went home, and left the said Swallow who stood behind the doore when she went out, so saith/ John Feild sen<sup>r</sup> Sworne saith he hath very often seen the said Swallow Come out of the said Mrs Bagleys house very Early In the morning/</p>	<p>John Orchard was sworn. He stated that Martha Oliver told him she had caught Thomas Swallow and Mary Bagley lying together among fern in a wood. She offered him a dollar to keep silent. He agreed. He asked her to go with him to Mary Bagley, which she did. He said she repeated the same account there and said she had called out to them when she saw them.</p> <p>Anne, wife of Orlando Bagley Junior, was sworn. She said her sister Mary Orchard told her that their mother-in-law Mary Bagley was ruined. This was based on what Martha Oliver had said, that she had seen Mary Bagley and Thomas Swallow lying together in a sexual act. Anne stated that she later asked Martha Oliver directly what she had seen. Martha Oliver replied that she had seen them in a sexual act.</p> <p>Elizabeth, wife of John Long, was sworn. She said that four or five nights earlier she went into the Bagley house at night to fetch her husband. She saw Mary Bagley drunk and asleep on the floor. Her petticoat was raised above her knees. Elizabeth said she touched her body to check if she was pregnant but could not determine it. She then left with her husband. Thomas Swallow remained in the house, standing behind the door.</p> <p>John Feild Senior was sworn. He stated that he had often seen Thomas Swallow leaving Mary Bagley's house very early in the morning.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The evidence included both direct statements and repeated reports of what others had said. This showed that hearsay was accepted alongside direct observation, though its weight depended on consistency.</p> <p>The offer of a dollar to keep silent showed an attempt to suppress evidence. Payments could be used to influence witnesses and affect the outcome of a case.</p> <p>The repeated references to sexual conduct showed that moral behaviour was subject to formal scrutiny. The Governor and Council treated such matters as offences that required investigation.</p> <p>The testimony about Mary Bagley's condition in her house added context about behaviour and reputation. Visible conduct, such as drunkenness and state of dress, was used to support wider claims of misconduct.</p> <p>The observation that Thomas Swallow was often seen leaving early in the morning suggested a pattern of visits. Repeated presence at unusual hours was treated as circumstantial evidence.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The number of witnesses repeating similar claims suggests that the case had become widely known. This</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>may have increased pressure on the authorities to act and to reach a clear decision.</p> <p>The use of both direct claims and supporting observations suggests that no single piece of evidence was decisive. The case appears to have relied on building a pattern of behaviour rather than proving one isolated act.</p>
<a href="#">220</a>	214	<p>Island St Helena [...] It is Concluded &amp; ordered That the [...] of this matter be Referred untill [...] Sessions to be Decided by the Jury And that the said Thomas Swallow and [...] Bagley be Immediately Committed In the Marshalls Custody, or Else find Security for their Good behaviour and personall appearance at the said Quarterly Sessions, Also and That they do not Keep Company one with th other, neither Send any message neither by word not writeing, Upon the forfeiture of five pound Each, besides Corporall Punishment and that they Pay the Charges of this Councell who accordingly did. Not to Convers[e] wth Each other. <b>Margin Notes:</b> Tho: Swallow &amp; Mary Bagleys business referred [...] [...] hill next the next Sessions [...] [...] to give Security or be Imprisoned</p>	<p>The matter was considered but not decided at that time.</p> <p>It was ordered that the case be postponed until the next Quarterly Sessions. It was to be decided there by a jury.</p> <p>Thomas Swallow and Mary Bagley were ordered into the marshal's custody at once. If they refused, they had to give security for good behaviour and for their appearance at the next Sessions.</p> <p>They were forbidden to meet or communicate with each other. They were not to send messages, either by word or in writing.</p> <p>If they broke this order, each would forfeit £5 0s 0d. They would also face corporal punishment.</p> <p>They were required to pay the charges of the Council, which they did.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The decision to defer the case showed that the Council did not give final judgement in serious disputes. The matter was passed to a jury at the Quarterly Sessions, where formal trial took place.</p> <p>The order to commit both parties to custody showed that restraint was used to secure order before trial. It prevented further contact and preserved the integrity of the case.</p> <p>The option to give security showed the use of recognisance. Freedom before trial depended on a guarantee of future conduct and appearance.</p> <p>The strict ban on contact showed concern over collusion. Preventing communication aimed to stop coordination of testimony or concealment of evidence.</p> <p>The penalty of £5 0s 0d and corporal punishment showed that breach of orders was treated as a serious offence. Financial and physical penalties reinforced compliance.</p> <p>The requirement to pay Council charges showed that legal process carried costs. These were imposed on the parties involved in the dispute.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The order to separate the two suggests that the Council believed continued contact could affect the outcome. This may have been intended to prevent agreement between them or influence over witnesses.</p> <p>The decision to defer judgement suggests that the evidence was complex or contested. A jury was needed to weigh the conflicting testimony and reach a final decision.</p>
<a href="#">221</a>	215	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Saturday the 6th Day of May 1699 Att Fort James Prs, Steph: Poirier Governo [...] Bright Dep[...] Gover[...] Tho: Goodwin Assistant [...] Whereas Captn John [...] Commander of the Good Ship Armenian Merchant now riding in the Road before Fort James Presented to Governor and Councell William Lynd Esq[...] somewhat after their arrival, being sent hither by [...] and other friends, who in Great danger of their lives (by ill usage and behaviour of some of his Seamen, who have conspired to run away with the said Ship and Cargo, as also both made use of his said</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Saturday 6 May 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Goodwin served as assistant. [...] Bright served as deputy governor.</p> <p>Captain John [...], commander of the ship <i>Armenian Merchant</i>, then lying in the road before Fort James, presented William Lynd, described as an esquire, to the Governor and Council. He had been sent to the island by [...] and other friends because his life was in danger. This danger arose from the conduct of some of the ship's seamen, who had conspired to seize the ship and its cargo. The complaint focused on Thomas Hannan, the quartermaster, and John [...], who were both examined and denied the accusation.</p> <p>John Worrall was sworn. He stated that while on board the <i>Armenian Merchant</i> before arrival at the island, he heard Thomas Hannan say that if he was not treated better, he would not remain on the ship. He said that</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>[...] and chiefly against Thomas Hannan Quarter Master and one John [...] who were Examined and De[...] this fact</p> <p>John Worrall Sworne saith that he being on board the Armenian Merchant before they arrived at this Island heard Thomas Hannan say that the said Thomas Hannan told him that if he was not better used on board the said Ship, he would never stay longer in the same, but the Ship as night the winds at East and so set her adrift</p> <p>Edward Heath being sworne saith that he heard the aforesaid Thomas Hannan say on board the Armenian Merchant that if he was not better used by his said Commander after this, he would leave the Ship as night the winds at East, and so would drive her on shore, but did not know anything of the said John [...]</p> <p>And whereas no Evidence appeared against the aforesaid John [...] only the said Petition delivered by the said Captn [...] and subscribed by the Officers of the said Ship, It is Ordered that the said Commander do give his oath that the said John [...] was not guilty of such villanous Design, as is mentioned in the said Petition, which willingly he did take, We thereupon considering [...] in what Danger would be the said Ship and the Lives [...]</p>	<p>Hannan threatened to take the ship at night when the wind was easterly and set her adrift.</p> <p>Edward Heath was sworn. He confirmed that he had heard Thomas Hannan make a similar statement. He said that Hannan declared that if he was not treated better by the captain, he would leave the ship at night when the wind was easterly and let her drive ashore. He said he knew nothing about the involvement of John [...].</p> <p>No evidence appeared against John [...], apart from a petition presented by the captain and signed by the ship's officers. It was ordered that the captain swear an oath that John [...] was not guilty of the design described in the petition. The captain took this oath willingly.</p> <p>The Council then considered the danger to the ship and to the lives of those on board.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The presentation of William Lynd showed that individuals could be brought before the Governor and Council for protection. Authority extended to safeguarding persons from threats at sea.</p> <p>The allegation of conspiracy among seamen showed the risk of mutiny. Control of a ship depended on discipline, and threats to seize it were treated as serious offences.</p> <p>The role of the quartermaster, Thomas Hannan, placed him in a position of responsibility on board. His statements carried weight because of his rank within the crew.</p> <p>The reliance on sworn testimony showed that verbal threats could be used as evidence. Witnesses reported statements as proof of intent.</p> <p>The use of a petition signed by officers showed a formal method of complaint within the ship's hierarchy. However, without supporting testimony, it was not treated as sufficient proof.</p> <p>The requirement that the captain take an oath cleared John [...] of suspicion. This showed that the commander's word could resolve uncertainty where evidence was lacking.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The threats described by witnesses suggest that discontent among the crew had reached a serious level. The mention of setting the ship adrift indicates a plan that could destroy both vessel and cargo, which may have been intended as leverage against the captain.</p> <p>The lack of evidence against John [...] suggests that he may have been accused by association rather than action. The captain's oath may have been used to prevent escalation of conflict within the crew by removing suspicion from one member.</p>
222	216	<p>[...]</p> <p>It is ordered That both the said Thomas Harmon and John [...] be Immediately Committed to Prison, and there Continued untill an homeward bound Ship Arrive here, and then to be sent home to England and hapily the Good Ship the Travellock arriving here so suddenly we have Imbarked with the Commanders thereof to receive them on board the said Ship, which was accordingly done</p> <p>Whereas the Governor and Councill being Informed that John Worrall, who went of this Island some [...] of War about three yeares ago, and being sent back again by the Right Honorable Company, had brought a Woman living with him as his wife, and two Daughters and hath Declared this family and belonging to him said Master,</p>	<p>It was ordered that Thomas Harmon and John [...] be committed to prison at once. They were to remain there until a ship bound for England arrived. They were then to be sent to England.</p> <p>The ship <i>Travellock</i> arrived soon after. The two men were placed on board under the care of its commander. This was carried out.</p> <p>The Governor and Council then received information about John Worrall. He had left the island about three years earlier on a ship of war and had since been sent back by the Honourable Company. He returned with a woman whom he claimed as his wife, along with two daughters, and declared them to be his family.</p> <p>On inspection, the woman was identified as the wife of Thomas Usher, a soldier on the island. She had come to the island earlier on the ship <i>Amity</i>. An inquiry was ordered.</p> <p>Thomas Usher was sworn. He stated that the woman brought by Worrall was his lawful wife. He said they were married in England by a minister at a place called Stokes Place. His father gave her in marriage. This took place</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>In seeing them aboard the said his wife [...] proved to be the wife of Thomas Usher, a Souldier on this Island, who came hither in the amity, when she brought a passage to this Island Upon which it was ordered that the truth of this business should be Examined Thomas Usher being Sworne saith that, the woman whome came over to this Island with Worrall as his wife, he was Confident was his own wife, and that he was married to her In England by a minister, at a place called Stokes Place, and the Cerk of it as his Father to give him his wife, about two years before he came to this Island, further saith that when the said Worrall went off this Island he Desired him to Remember his Love to his said wife John Worrall being ordered to speak for himself said that he married the woman in the Leeward Islands, that her Husband Thomas Usher was Dead, and moreover saw a Letter which came from this Island to England, which was said to be sent from Benjamin [...] in whose house the said wife lived when the said Worrall went off this Island being read and Examined about the Information he hath had of such any wife to the said worral wife or any one Else himself was sure, and what the said worral hath said is false further saith that he is sure the woman that came with the said worral was the said ushers wife, he seeing her one board the said ship amity with the said usher, when he came to this Island</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Harmon and [...] to be Imprisoned and sent home in the first Ship</p>	<p>about two years before he came to the island. He added that when Worrall left the island, he had asked him to convey his greetings to his wife.</p> <p>John Worrall was then examined. He stated that he had married the woman in the Leeward Islands. He claimed that Thomas Usher was dead. He said he had seen a letter sent from this island to England, which reported Usher's death. He stated that this letter came from Benjamin [...], in whose house the woman had lived when Worrall left the island.</p> <p>This claim was examined. It was stated with certainty that no such information had been received. It was declared that Worrall's statement was false. It was also confirmed that the woman brought by Worrall was indeed the wife of Thomas Usher, as she had been seen on board the <i>Amity</i> with him when he arrived on the island.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The order to imprison and transport Thomas Harmon and John [...] showed that serious offences at sea were handled by removal to England. The island acted as a holding point rather than a place of final judgement in such cases.</p> <p>The rapid transfer to the ship <i>Travellock</i> showed coordination between local authority and passing vessels. Ships were used as a means of enforcing long-distance justice.</p> <p>The inquiry into John Worrall showed that the Governor and Council also regulated personal and marital status. Marriage was treated as a legal condition that could be investigated and enforced.</p> <p>The sworn testimony of Thomas Usher established marriage through formal ceremony. Reference to a minister and named place showed that lawful marriage required recognised procedure.</p> <p>The rejection of Worrall's claim showed that written reports and personal statements were tested against local knowledge. False claims could be exposed through witness evidence.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The decision to send Harmon and his associate to England suggests that their offence was seen as beyond local capacity to punish. Removal ensured they faced higher authority and prevented further risk on the island.</p> <p>The claim that Usher was dead suggests that Worrall may have relied on uncertain or false information to justify the marriage. This may have been an attempt to legitimise his actions after the fact.</p> <p>The swift rejection of Worrall's statement suggests that the community had strong shared knowledge of its members. This made it difficult to conceal identity or marital status on a small island.</p>
223	217	<p>Gabriell Corvell who Came over to this Island as a Sold[...] In the said Ship Amity being Examined Saith that he saw the woman yt Came wth the said Worrall on board the said Ship when she Lay In the Road here, and that he went on Shore to buy some Necessaries for her Husband The worral voyage to St Helena and she Lay on board the said Ship severall nights Considering therefore the oath of the said Usher and the falshood of the said John worral, In saying he had found a Letter sent by his Benjamin Sales, with the woman Married Misbehaviour of the said worral when he was one of the Inha[...] Britains of this Island, And also that the said Ushers wife Could not Deny but that she was the wife of her husband Usher It was ordered</p>	<p>Gabriel Corvell, who came to the island as a soldier on the ship <i>Amity</i>, was examined. He stated that he saw the woman who arrived with John Worrall on board that ship when it lay in the road at St Helena. He went ashore to buy necessities for her husband during the voyage. He said that she stayed on board the ship for several nights.</p> <p>The Governor and Council then considered the evidence. Thomas Usher had sworn that the woman was his lawful wife. John Worrall's claim about a letter reporting Usher's death was found to be false. Worrall's past conduct on the island was also taken into account. The woman herself did not deny that she was Usher's wife.</p> <p>It was ordered that John Worrall return the woman to Thomas Usher. He was also required to return all her clothes and goods that he had brought with her.</p> <p>He was forbidden to have any further contact with her. If he did, he would face severe punishment.</p> <p>It was further ordered that John Worrall be sent to England on the first ship bound home, or elsewhere, in accordance with his contract with the Company.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>That the said Worrall Deliver unto the said Usher his wife and also all her Cloaths and other goods which he brought with her and also that he do not keep the said Ushers wife Company any longer at any time, upon paine of severe punish[...] And that the said Worrall be Sent home to England by the first Homeward bound Ship that shall arrive at this Island, or else where, according to his Contract with our said masters</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Worrall to Deliver to Usher his wife and all that belonging to her and not to Come neare her any More and to be Sent off</p>	<p>The testimony of Gabriel Corvell confirmed the woman's earlier presence with Thomas Usher. This supported Usher's claim and showed how witnesses from the same voyage could establish identity and relationship.</p> <p>The order to return both the woman and her goods treated marriage as a legal right over both person and property. The husband's claim extended to her possessions brought with her.</p> <p>The prohibition on contact showed that the authorities enforced separation after judgement. This prevented further dispute or scandal and maintained social order.</p> <p>The decision to send Worrall to England showed that removal was used as a disciplinary measure. It enforced Company authority and removed a disruptive individual from the island community.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The emphasis on Worrall's earlier behaviour suggests that his reputation influenced the outcome. Past conduct may have made the Council less willing to accept his claims.</p> <p>The strict order to avoid all contact suggests concern that the relationship might continue. The authorities likely aimed to prevent further conflict or public disorder by enforcing clear separation.</p>
224	218	<p>Hugh Bodley who is attorney of M[r] John Vernon who is attorney Likewise of M[r] Isaac Seafant wid[ow] hath been before us this Day Deposed with Oath Demand Execution of the Last Will and Testament of John Canady Deceased In order making his Complaint against the said Robert Demonde saying that he having the said Lett[er] of attorney for the Demand of some Considerable Sume of mony It is Pretended to be Due unto the said Grace Worsant, of the wife of the said John Canady when she was In England He hath not been left her Daughter which hath been Sufficiently by the oath of severall persons In England But however the said Grace Seafant hath for the same Demand not brought in person the said Demonde should not get any mony untill the said bond was produced notwithstanding the Depositions sworne and declared before the Lord Mayor of London were being testified by his hand and seale Wherefore It is Ordered That before we can proceed any further in Examination of the said Bodley and Demonde that the said Bond be produced before us Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Wednesday the 10 Day of May 1699 att Fort James Prs: Steph: Poirier Governo Capt: Tho: Bright Deputy Governo [...] Goodwin Councill Whereas Hugh Bodley attorney of one Mary Nicholson of London widow by the Country of Kent Esqr did according to his said Letter of attorney bearing Date the foure Day of Sept[em] Last past Demand of M[r] Thomas Goodwin and William Facknald Executors of the Last Will and Testament of Thomas</p>	<p>Hugh Bodley appeared as attorney for John Vernon, who also acted as attorney for Isaac Seafant, a widow. He came before the Governor and Council and demanded execution of the last will of John Canady, deceased.</p> <p>He made a complaint against Robert Demonde. He stated that he held a letter of attorney to recover a considerable sum of money said to be owed to Grace Worsant, the wife of John Canady, from the time when she was in England. He said that this claim had been supported by sworn depositions taken before the Lord Mayor of London and confirmed under his hand and seal.</p> <p>Robert Demonde refused payment. He insisted that no money should be paid unless the original bond was produced. He did not accept the depositions alone as proof.</p> <p>It was ordered that no further examination of Hugh Bodley and Robert Demonde would proceed until the bond was produced before the Council.</p> <p>A consultation was then held on Wednesday 10 May 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as councillor.</p> <p>Hugh Bodley also appeared as attorney for Mary Nicholson of London, a widow from Kent. Under a letter of attorney dated 4 September 1698, he demanded from Thomas Goodwin and William Facknald, executors of the will of Thomas Philips, deceased, the remaining part of the estate left to Ann Holmes and to Mary Nicholson.</p> <p>His authority was examined and approved. He then requested that Thomas Goodwin and William Facknald swear that the account they had produced, listing funeral expenses and other debts of the deceased, was true. Both men took the oath and confirmed the account.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The use of a letter of attorney showed that legal claims could be pursued through appointed representatives. This allowed individuals in England to act in island courts without being present.</p> <p>The insistence on producing the bond showed that original written instruments carried decisive authority. Depositions, even when formally certified in London, were not sufficient without the primary document.</p> <p>The reference to sworn depositions before the Lord Mayor of London showed that evidence from</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Philips Deceased of the Remaining part of his Estate bequeathed in his Will unto his Niece Ann Holmes the said Mary Nicholson and after perusal of the said Bodleys authority which was approved of he Desired that both the said M[r] Goodwin and Facknald might take their oath that the Account now produced by them of Funerall Charges and other Charges Indebted by the Testator was a True acc[oun]t who both accordingly did</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> The bond to be produced before us</p>	<p>England could be introduced, but still had to meet local standards of proof.</p> <p>The role of executors showed that estates were settled under formal supervision. They were required to present accounts and confirm them under oath.</p> <p>The requirement for an oath on the account showed that financial records were validated through personal responsibility. This created liability if the account proved false.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The refusal to accept depositions without the bond suggests concern over fraud or error. The Council may have required strict proof to prevent false claims from being enforced at a distance.</p> <p>The demand for sworn confirmation of expenses suggests that disputes over estate charges were common. The oath likely served to deter inflated or improper claims before distribution of the estate.</p>
225	219	<p>It was ordered That the said M[r] Thomas Goodwin and M[r] Facknald doe Pay unto the said Hugh Bodley for the use of the said Mary Nicholson, all the Remaining part of the said Tho: Phillips Estate, as is mentioned in his said Last will &amp; Testament bequeathed to the neares[t] of his Kin also</p> <p>The said Hugh Bodley having Likewise a Letter of attorney from one mary Bird widow, being late the wife of Thomas Bird now Deceased, living in Lambeth neare Hors head, to whom the aforesaid Thomas Phillips Deceased left as a Legacy Eighty pounds which said sume the said Bodley Demands according to his said Letter of attorney</p> <p>It is ordered That the said M[r] Thomas Goodwin and M[r] Facknald Execut[or]s Pay unto the said Hugh Bodley for the use of the said Mary Bird the said sume of 80 pounds, and that he give the said M[r] Thomas Goodwin and M[r] Facknald a full Discharge for the same</p> <p>John Goodwin of this said Island free Planter represents to Governour and Councill the Petition Setting forth in his said Petition that when he came to this Island from England with his mother the R[t] Hono[r]able a Le[...r] G[...] of this Island Promised him Tenn Acres of Land and one Cow, which he hath not never enjoyed, therefore doth humbly Desire us that we would grant him his Request in Granting him the said Tenn acres of Land and one Cow the truth of which we Examined by Calling the said R[ob]t [...] as and he Informing and [...] no such thing was promised to him, we being willing to satisfy him propose to him whether he would be Content to have his said Petition sent to the said R[ob]t Hono[r]able at London for their Determining of the Question, who was not willing, only Desired us that he might have Three acres of Land in the mean time untill further Advice from the</p>	<p>It was ordered that Thomas Goodwin and William Facknald, as executors, pay Hugh Bodley the remaining part of the estate of Thomas Philips. This payment was for the use of Mary Nicholson, in accordance with the will, which left the estate to the nearest kin.</p> <p>Hugh Bodley also presented a letter of attorney from Mary Bird, widow of Thomas Bird, formerly of Lambeth near Horse Head. Thomas Philips had left her a legacy of £80 0s 0d. Hugh Bodley demanded this sum on her behalf.</p> <p>It was ordered that Thomas Goodwin and William Facknald pay Hugh Bodley £80 0s 0d for the use of Mary Bird. He was required to give them a full discharge for this payment.</p> <p>John Goodwin, a free planter of the island, then presented a petition. He stated that when he came to the island from England with his mother, the Honourable [...] had promised him ten acres of land and one cow. He said he had never received them and asked that the grant now be made.</p> <p>The claim was examined. [...] was called and stated that no such promise had been made.</p> <p>John Goodwin was asked whether he would allow the petition to be sent to the Honourable Company in London for decision. He refused. He asked instead to have three acres of land in the meantime, until further instruction came from the Company, provided that no one else should receive it.</p> <p>This request was granted on condition that he did not sell or use the land until the Company's decision was known.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The payment to Hugh Bodley showed that executors were required to distribute estates strictly according to the will. They acted under oversight and could be compelled to make payment.</p> <p>The requirement for a full discharge showed that once payment was made, the executors were formally released from further liability. This protected them from later claims.</p> <p>The use of letters of attorney allowed individuals in England to claim legacies through an agent. This linked the island's legal system to wider networks of property and inheritance.</p> <p>The petition by John Goodwin showed that land grants could be requested from authority but depended on proof. Claims based on alleged promises were tested through examination of witnesses.</p> <p>The decision to refer the matter to the Company showed that final authority over land lay in London. Local officials could only make temporary arrangements.</p> <p>The condition that the land could not be used or sold showed that possession could be granted without full ownership. This prevented permanent transfer before final approval.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>said Company being that no other person should have it, which we Granted upon Condition that he neither sell nor make any use of it untill the said R[ob]t Hono[r]able Pleasure be known  Tho Bright  Tho Goodwin  [...] Goodwin pr[...] for to have Land below may deliver to be referred to y[e] Comp[any]</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b>  M<sup>r</sup> Goodwin and M<sup>r</sup> Faulknad Executors to pay to Bodley the remainder of the Estate as by will is specified  y<sup>e</sup> said Executors to pay Bodley 80 pounds legacy given to y<sup>e</sup> said Mary Bird to be paid to Hugh Bodley and he to give a full Discharge for the same  Goodwin J<sup>n</sup> requests for 10 acres land below to be referred to y<sup>e</sup> Company</p>	<p><b>Speculations</b>  The grant of three acres despite rejection of the main claim suggests an attempt to maintain goodwill. The Council may have sought to ease dissatisfaction while avoiding a binding decision.  The refusal to send the petition to London suggests that John Goodwin preferred immediate partial gain over uncertain delay. This choice indicates awareness that a full claim might fail if formally reviewed.</p>
226	220	<p>Island St Helena  Att a Consultation Held on Fryday the 12th Day of May 1699 Att Fort James  Prst;  Step: Poirier Governo[r]  Cap<sup>t</sup> Tho: Bright Dep<sup>t</sup> Governo:  Tho: Goodwin Ensign &amp; In Councill  Whereas Hugh Bodley by a Petition made Complaint to us, that John Facknald Contrary to our Order Refused to pay him his part of the Money ordered to be paid him, pretending him off without any reference from him, and knowing now an opportunity to Abscond for England againe thought best now in [...] Desired us to have the said Facknald Secured and that he might find a means to satisfie him  The said Facknald being warned was asked why he did not satisfy the said Hugh Bodley, who said he could not at present but Desired a little time to make sale of some Goods, or else give him Security if he could find any persons who would stand bound for payment thereof, however this being no Reale Payment he was, Ordered To be kept In Prison untill such time as he the said Facknald Satisfy the said Bodley the said sume of money that he is Charged with or else find two Responsible men to be bound for payment thereof who afterwards gave the said Bodley Bond and Security for payment of his Debt which the said Bodley accepted</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b>  Facknald Imprisoned till he hath made payment</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Friday 12 May 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as ensign and councillor.  Hugh Bodley submitted a petition. He complained that John Facknald had refused to pay the money previously ordered. Facknald had delayed payment and gave no clear answer. Bodley feared that Facknald might leave for England and avoid payment. He asked that Facknald be secured and compelled to satisfy the debt.  John Facknald was brought in and questioned. He said he could not pay at that time. He asked for more time to sell goods. He offered to give security if he could find persons willing to stand bound for him. This was not accepted as payment.  He was ordered into prison. He was to remain there until he paid the full sum or found two responsible men to act as sureties for the debt.  He later provided a bond with security for payment. Hugh Bodley accepted this.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The imprisonment of Facknald showed that debt could be enforced through custody. Confinement was used to compel payment or secure compliance.  The refusal to accept delay without security showed that time alone was not sufficient. The debtor had to provide a guarantee to protect the creditor.  The requirement for two responsible men showed a system of surety. Payment could be secured through others who accepted legal responsibility if the debtor failed.  The acceptance of a bond showed that formal written obligation could replace immediate payment. This allowed the debt to be secured while avoiding continued imprisonment.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The concern that Facknald might leave the island suggests that mobility created risk in debt enforcement. The request to secure him indicates that departure could prevent recovery.  The eventual acceptance of a bond suggests that Facknald lacked ready money but had enough standing to find guarantors. This allowed a practical resolution without prolonged confinement.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		To be kept in Prison untill he hath made payment or become bound and found Security	
227	221	<p>John Hemmon doth make his Complaint of Elizabeth the wife of John Johnson doth saying that she had Reported that he would have bin nough[t] with her, and that she had abused his wife in Calling her whore, Strumpit, and more ill language, in the hearing of Several p[er]sons, who are hereafter mentioned Richard Ray for[t]h Saith that he being Sitting at the said Hemmons Doore the said Elizabeth Johnfon thrust a stick at one of his Dogs which the said Hemmons wife telling asked her why she threw stones at her Dogs, to whome she the said Eliz'h Replied God d[am]n your Slutt</p> <p>Marg' Chargrave wid<sup>o</sup> Saith she heard the said John Hemmons wife call the said Elizabeth Johnson Slut and Impudence for report- -ing a false Report of her Husband, to whome the said Eliz'h Johnson said dont Call me such names you Strumpett Margery Hayles Sworne saith that she being sitting at her Doore yesterday night, heard John Hemmon tell the said Eliz'h Johnson Impudent Slut, then she Replied not such an Impudent Slut as to tell such a Rogue as you ride me, which Mr Hemmon hearing said something to her but Cannot Justly tell what, to which Replied the said Eliz'h Johnson dont Call me any names you whore and Strumpit, and some other names, further saith she heard the said Eliz'h Johnson sweare Several oath[s] at the same time, Margaret Manning saith she being in the said Hemmons House some dayes in Sickness of his wife lying in, the said Eliz'h being there then also, she hath heard her severall times use very foul language to her said Hemmons wife and to her selfe also</p> <p>Brig't the wife of Henry Ca[...] Saith she heard the said Hemmons wife Call the said Eliz'h Johnson whore, to whome she answered againe the greatest whore (lives where first Brig't the wife of Matt' Garnett saith that this day Sonne[t] she went to see the said Hemmons wife, who told her that she had Desired her Husband to stay at home that day (who Intended to goe up in the Country) &amp; p[er]suaded him to see some fruit tree[s] or else the said Eliz'h would steale halfe of it, which caused her the said Eliz'h Johnson to fall out with Mr Hemmons, &amp; with she thought and Mr Hemmon called her the wife whore, to whome she replied I never played whore for silver buttons &amp; brooches, and</p>	<p>John Hemmon brought a complaint against Elizabeth, wife of John Johnson. He stated that she had spread a report that he had tried to have sexual relations with her. He also said that she had insulted his wife in public, calling her a whore, a strumpet and using other abusive language, in the hearing of several people.</p> <p>Richard Rayforth stated that he was sitting at Hemmon's door when Elizabeth Johnson struck at one of his dogs with a stick. Hemmon's wife asked her why she had done so. Elizabeth Johnson replied with abusive language, calling her a slut.</p> <p>Margaret Chargrave, a widow, stated that she heard Hemmon's wife call Elizabeth Johnson a slut and accuse her of spreading a false report about her husband. Elizabeth Johnson replied by calling her a strumpet.</p> <p>Margery Hayles, sworn, stated that she was sitting at her door the previous night when she heard John Hemmon call Elizabeth Johnson an impudent slut. Elizabeth Johnson replied that she was not so impudent as to claim that a rogue like him had ridden her. Hemmon said something in return, but she could not recall his words. Elizabeth Johnson then told him not to call her names and called him a whore and a strumpet, using other insults and swearing several oaths.</p> <p>Margaret Manning stated that she had been in Hemmon's house while his wife was ill after childbirth. Elizabeth Johnson had also been present. She said she had heard Elizabeth Johnson use foul language many times towards Hemmon's wife and towards herself.</p> <p>Bridget, wife of Henry Ca[...], stated that she heard Hemmon's wife call Elizabeth Johnson a whore. Elizabeth Johnson replied that the greatest whore lived where [...], but did not complete the statement.</p> <p>Bridget, wife of Matthew Garnett, stated that she visited Hemmon's wife that day. Hemmon's wife said she had asked her husband to remain at home instead of going into the country, so that Elizabeth Johnson would not steal half of their fruit. This led to a quarrel. Hemmon called Elizabeth Johnson a whore. She replied that she had never acted as a whore for silver buttons and brooches, and again said that the greatest whore lived where [...], without finishing the statement.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The complaint showed that accusations of sexual misconduct and insults were treated as actionable offences. Damage to reputation, especially involving claims of sexual behaviour, fell under the authority of the Governor and Council.</p> <p>The repeated exchange of insults showed that both parties engaged in verbal abuse. Testimony recorded exact words to establish who initiated and escalated the dispute.</p> <p>The presence of multiple witnesses showed that public speech carried legal consequences. Statements made openly could be proved through those who heard them.</p> <p>The reference to childbirth showed that women in domestic settings were central to these disputes. Illness and household gatherings created settings where conflict and testimony arose.</p> <p>The mention of goods such as silver buttons and brooches showed that accusations of sexual behaviour could be linked to material exchange. This reflected concern over reputation and moral conduct tied to property.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The repeated references to alleged sexual conduct suggest that the dispute centred on reputation rather than physical harm. The accusation made by Elizabeth</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>said she greatest whore lives where first <b>Margin Notes:</b> [...]</p>	<p>Johnson may have triggered a broader conflict involving both households. The number of witnesses and the spread of statements suggest that the quarrel had become widely known. This may have increased pressure on authorities to intervene and restore order between the parties.</p>
<a href="#">228</a>	223	<p>The said Eliz: Johnson saith that the said M.r Hammonds called her whore and other names, which caused her to call the said M.r Hammond the like names againe at the [...] It is ORDERED That the said Eliz.th Johnson be fined the sume of five shillings for swearing (to the poore of the Parish) which she Immediately paid. And be dismiss with only a Reprimand for calling the said Hammonds wife names, being she called her so first before as ye Evidence hath Declared Tho Bright Tho Goodwin Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 30.th Day of May 1699 Att Fort James Prst Step: Poirier Governor Thomas Bright Dep.ty Gover: Thomas Goodwin Ensign John Lish Planter made Complaint to us, that he had lost a goat, and had heard that one of Madam Johnsons Blacks, and one of John [...]s Black, had killed the said goat which two Blacks were ordered to Fort James In order of being this day Examined The said John Lishins Black saith that as he and Simon the said Mad.m Johnsons Black was agoing a fishing, and that Mad.m Johnsons Dogg was with them, and by the way runn after some Goats, and catcht one, so being ye goat was almost Dead, he cut the throat of it, and they Devided it Equally between them The said Mad.m Johnsons black saith the same, and further adds he could not hinder ye dog from Running after ye goats Margin Note: Johnson Elizabeth fined five shillings for swearing</p>	<p>Elizabeth Johnson said that John Hemmon had first called her a whore and used other insults. She said this made her answer him with the same language. She paid a fine of £0 5s 0d for swearing. The money went to the poor of the parish. She was then warned for insulting Hemmon's wife. No further punishment was given, because the evidence showed that Hemmon's wife had used such language first. A consultation was held on Tuesday 30 May 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as ensign. John Lish, a planter, reported that he had lost a goat. He said he had heard that one of Madam Johnson's slaves and one belonging to John [...] had killed it. Both were brought in for questioning. The slave belonging to John Lish said that he and Simon, a slave of Madam Johnson, were going to fish. Madam Johnson's dog followed them. The dog chased some goats and caught one. The goat was almost dead, so he cut its throat. They then divided the meat between them. Simon gave the same account. He added that he could not stop the dog from chasing the goats. <b>Interpretations</b> The fine for swearing showed that abusive language was punished even when both sides took part. Direct payment to the poor linked discipline to parish welfare. The warning without further punishment showed that provocation reduced liability. The Council weighed sequence and context, not just the words used. The complaint about the goat showed that loss of livestock triggered formal inquiry. Property damage involving animals and slaves fell under official control. The slaves were examined directly. Their statements were accepted as evidence in deciding the case. The dog's role showed that animal action could create liability. Human agents were still responsible for the outcome. <b>Speculations</b> The limited penalty suggests the aim was to end the dispute rather than escalate it. A fine and warning restored order without prolonging conflict. The explanation given by the slaves suggests they acted after the animal was already dying. This may have been used to justify taking the meat rather than treating it as deliberate theft.</p>
<a href="#">229</a>	224	<p>Henry the said Lufkins son saith that their black Robin being gone a fishing, came home with a side of Goat, who told him that he and mad.m Johnsons Black Simon had killed it upon the fishing Rocks upon which It is ordered That there being an ord.r forbidding any Blacks to carry any dogs with them out of their masters ground, except George one of Capt Horne Company Blacks, and that the Goate was killed about John Nichols Plantation, as it did appeare by all circumstances and that the said two Blacks went rel[...] a hunting other goats taking that Liberty being their masters and mistress were from</p>	<p>Henry, son of John Lufkin, stated that their slave Robin went out to fish and returned with part of a goat. Robin told him that he and Simon, a slave of Madam Johnson, had killed it on the fishing rocks. It was found that an order already banned slaves from taking dogs off their master's land, except for George, who belonged to Captain Horne's company. The goat was killed near John Nicholls's plantation. The evidence showed that the two slaves had gone out to hunt goats while their master and mistress were away at the fort. Both slaves were whipped on their bare bodies. Madam Johnson and John Lufkin were each required to pay £0 5s 0d to John Lish, making £0 10s 0d in total for the goat. They were also required to pay the Council charges. Under a proclamation for appointing parish officers for the year 1699, the process had been delayed. The day for making the return had passed, but the</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>at the Fort, whereupon the said Blacks were Immediately whipt on their naked bodys, and that mad.m Johnson and said John Lufkin pay unto the said John Lish the sume of ten shill: that is to say 5 shill: for the said goate and bring pig with young, [...] pay Charge of Councell According to a Proclamation issued out for the quieting and nominating of Parish officers for this present yeare 1699, the day for that purpose being past, and the day to make returne accordingly which should have bin sooner, but being not Ready It was referred untill now, and att which time appeared those persons that were chosen both for Church wardens and overseers of the high wayes, which are as followeth Churchwardens Henry Coales } East Division John Midge Edw Sewlin } west Division John Nichols overseers of the High wayes Matthew Bazett } for ye East Division John Coale Robert Addis } for ye West Division Thomas Earles It is ordered That Henry Coales and John Nichols be appointed Church wardens for this present yeare 1699 Church wardens Mr Thomas Goodwin and Edw Edmonds be discharged from that office, having brought an account of the Church money remaining for yeare last past, which being made up in writing, wherein it appeares they have Received and expended the sume of [...] which they had in their hands, to [...]</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> The Blacks whipped and their Masters to pay 5s each to Mr Lish Non Churchwardens sworn and the old Discharged</p>	<p>matter was taken up at this time. The persons chosen for churchwardens and for overseers of the highways appeared before the Council.</p> <p>Henry Coales and John Midge were chosen for the east division. Edward Sewlin and John Nicholls were chosen for the west division.</p> <p>For the highways, Matthew Bazett and John Coale were chosen for the east division. Robert Addis and Thomas Earle were chosen for the west division.</p> <p>Henry Coales and John Nicholls were appointed as churchwardens for the year 1699.</p> <p>Thomas Goodwin and Edward Edmunds were released from the office. They had submitted a written account of the church money for the previous year, showing what they had received and spent from the funds in their hands.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The whipping of the slaves showed direct corporal punishment for breaches of order. Enforcement focused on discipline and control over movement and use of animals.</p> <p>The rule against taking dogs off the plantation showed regulation of hunting. This protected livestock and limited unauthorised use of resources.</p> <p>The requirement that the masters pay compensation showed that owners were held financially responsible for the actions of their slaves.</p> <p>The division into east and west sections showed structured local administration. Offices were distributed across defined areas of the island.</p> <p>The appointment of churchwardens showed the link between parish organisation and governance. These officers managed both welfare and local order.</p> <p>The account submitted by the outgoing wardens showed that office holders were required to report on funds. Written accounts ensured oversight and accountability.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The whipping combined with fines suggests a dual system of punishment. Physical discipline controlled the slaves directly, while financial penalties ensured that owners enforced order.</p> <p>The delay in appointing parish officers suggests administrative difficulty or lack of readiness. The formal appearance of the appointed persons may have been used to confirm acceptance and authority.</p> <p>The requirement to account for church funds suggests concern over proper management. This may reflect the importance of parish resources in supporting both religious and social functions.</p>
230	225	<p>Henry Coales &amp; John Nichols, which said acc.t was approved and is hereafter written Also It is ordered That Matthew Bazett and Robert Addis be appointed overseers of the High wayes for this present yeare 1699 who was accordingly sworne to execute the office, and likewise That the overseers of the high wayes for the yeare last past vizt Thomas Deacon and William [...] be now discharged from that office The acc.t of the Churchwardens viz.t Mr Thomas Goodwin and Edward Edmonds, given in this 30.th day of May 1699 Church and Poore Dr To the sume paid Edward Crusey Sexton in full of one yeares wages 0:06:9 To a French man paid or given 0:06:9 To Cash paid John Long for bread 0:15:6</p>	<p>Henry Coales and John Nicholls accepted the account. It was approved and entered on record.</p> <p>Matthew Bazett and Robert Addis were appointed as overseers of the highways for the year 1699. They took the oath for the office. Thomas Deacon and William [...] were released from the same office for the previous year.</p> <p>The account of the churchwardens, Thomas Goodwin and Edward Edmunds, was presented on 30 May 1699.</p> <p>They paid Edward Crosbey, the sexton, £0 6s 9d for one year's wages. They paid a Frenchman £0 6s 9d. They paid John Long £0 15s 6d for bread. They spent £1 5s 10d on extra expenses. They paid £2 5s 0d for medicine for the poor. These payments totalled £5 6s 1d. They held £0 12s 0d in hand. This made £5 18s 1d. They paid Harrison £12 0s 0d for the care and full recovery of Ralph Gates after he was wounded.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>To Ditto laid out extraordinar[y] for 1:05:10  To the poore laid out for one Doctor physick 2:05:0  5:06:1  To the Remaining in their hands 0:12:0  5:18:1  To Debtor Harrison paid for maintenance of Ralph Gates, when he was wounded and making a perfect Cure of him } 12:00:0  To one Cow Heifer and Calfe bought for John Hammons servant having lost a hand } 7:12:0  To Sam.ll Broomhall for James for Employed 2:05:0  To Nayle, Cotton out of store 4:15:9  4:18:9  To John Bowman for building a wall of stone 12:18:0  To John Bagley Carpenter for his worke 26:00:0  To Plantation worke for negroes labour 6:10:0  To Thomas Harper for severall services 1:00:0  73:03:9  Borne over  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  Bazett and Addis sworne overseers of the High wayes</p>	<p>They spent £7 12s 0d to buy a cow, a heifer and a calf for John Hemmon's servant, who had lost a hand.  They paid Samuel Broomhall £2 5s 0d for work done by James.  They spent £4 15s 9d on nails and cotton from the store.  They paid £0 3s 0d for a fishing line.  These payments totalled £4 18s 9d.  They paid John Bowman £12 18s 0d for building a stone wall.  They paid John Bagley, a carpenter, £26 0s 0d for his work.  They spent £6 10s 0d on plantation work done by slave labour.  They paid Thomas Harper £1 0s 0d for various services.  These payments totalled £73 3s 9d.  The account continued.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The swearing of highway overseers showed that local infrastructure was managed through appointed officers. Roads were treated as a public responsibility under formal supervision.</p> <p>The discharge of former officers after accounting showed a clear cycle of office. Responsibility ended only after financial review.</p> <p>The payments to the sexton and for bread and medicine showed that church funds supported both religious duties and poor relief.</p> <p>The payment for medical care for Ralph Gates showed that parish funds could cover treatment and recovery after injury. This reflected organised support for labourers or inhabitants in need.</p> <p>The purchase of livestock for an injured servant showed compensation in kind. Loss of bodily capacity could be offset by providing means of livelihood.</p> <p>The spending on building, tools and labour showed that church funds also supported wider community works, including construction and plantation activity.</p> <p>The use of slave labour in recorded expenses showed that such labour formed part of organised economic activity and was accounted for in official records.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The range of payments suggests that church funds served as a general welfare and works budget. The same account covered relief, wages, building and supplies, which indicates a broad local role.</p> <p>The provision of animals to an injured servant suggests an effort to maintain productivity after injury. This may have been intended to prevent long-term dependence on parish support.</p>
231	226	<p>Church and Poore Dr  Brought over . . . . . 73:03:9  To John Long for bread . . . . . 3:15:0  To Cash to Sam.ll Henson for 18:00:0  To Ralph Gurney paid . . . . . 0:14:0  To John Bowman more for Bannisters . . . 0:18:6  To James Bagley for worke . . . . . 10:05:0  To Account paid for thatching ye Church . . . 0:10:0  To Edward Crusey as Sexton two years . . . 5:10:0  To Acco.t of Ballance due in the Rt Hon.o  Companyes Account of acco.t . . . . . 13:18:9  127:11:0  Contra  By Cash paid to Mr Edmonds Recr. 3:04:3  Received of Mr Lish for a weeke 0:01:0  Received more at a Commutation p[...][...] 2:19:10  of May 1699  By a Collection of the Poore amounting to 20:09:0  By a Collection of Spare for 2218 Acres 55:09:0  By a Collection of two years head money 12:03:0  By the Rt Hon.ble Comp.a allowed by Gov.r &amp; Council  20:00:0  towards the Rebuilding of the new Church</p>	<p>The account continued.  They carried forward £73 3s 9d.  They paid John Long £3 15s 0d for bread.  They paid Samuel Henson £18 0s 0d.  They paid Ralph Gurney £0 14s 0d.  They paid John Bowman a further £0 18s 6d for bannisters.  They paid James Bagley £10 5s 0d for work.  They paid £0 10s 0d for thatching the church.  They paid Edward Crosbey £5 10s 0d for two years' service as sexton.  They recorded £13 18s 9d as a balance due in the Honourable Company's accounts.  The total reached £127 11s 0d.  On the credit side:  They paid Thomas Goodwin £3 4s 3d.  They received £0 1s 0d from John Lish for one week.  They received £2 19s 10d from a commutation.  They collected £20 9s 0d for the poor.  They collected £55 9s 0d assessed on 2,218 acres.  They collected £12 3s 0d from two years' head money.  They received £20 0s 0d from the Honourable Company, allowed by the Governor and Council,</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>By Mr Carne the gift of Cap.t Thomas Pitt 05:00:0  By Gov.r Poirier the gift of Cap.t Bare 03:00:0  By the Gift of Hugh Bodley 4:00:0  By Fines Viz.t  Mr Heller 1:00:0  Benj Leades 0:05:0  Tho: Grensdale 0:05:0  Mr Heller 0:12:0  Simon L[...][...] 0:09:0  Tho: Burnham 0:05:0  John [...][...] 0:10:0  3:00:0  Borne over . . . . . 128:01:0</p>	<p>towards rebuilding the church.  They received £5 0s 0d from Mr Carne, given by Captain Thomas Pitt.  They received £3 0s 0d from Governor Poirier, given by Captain Bare.  They received £4 0s 0d as a gift from Hugh Bodley.  They received fines as follows:  Mr Heller £1 0s 0d.  Benjamin Leades £0 5s 0d.  Thomas Grensdale £0 5s 0d.  Mr Heller £0 12s 0d.  Simon [...] £0 9s 0d.  Thomas Burnham £0 5s 0d.  John [...] £0 10s 0d.  These fines totalled £3 0s 0d.  The account was then carried forward at £128 1s 0d.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The continued account showed a structured system of parish finance. Income and expenditure were recorded in detail and balanced across categories.  The payments for bread, wages and building work showed that church funds supported daily needs, labour and construction.  The entry for thatching the church showed ongoing maintenance of public buildings. Parish funds were used for repair as well as rebuilding.  The reference to a balance due in the Company's accounts showed that parish finance was linked to the Company's central system. Funds could move between local and Company control.  The collections based on acreage and head money showed organised taxation. Land and population were both used as bases for raising funds.  The contributions from named individuals and captains showed reliance on gifts. External support supplemented local revenue.  The recording of fines as income showed that penalties formed part of the parish's financial system.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The large collection based on acreage suggests that landholding was a key measure of wealth. Taxing land may have been seen as a fair way to distribute the burden.  The mixture of local collections, Company support and private gifts suggests that funding was unstable. Multiple sources may have been needed to meet ongoing expenses.  The detailed accounting of fines suggests that enforcement of rules contributed directly to parish income. This may have encouraged consistent application of penalties.</p>
232	227	<p>Contra  Brought over 3:00:0 120:01:0  John orchard 0:06:0  Leiv Morris 0:09:0  John Butler 0:06:0  Will Seales 0:06:0  Henry Coales 0:06:0  Grace Pa[...][...] 0:12:0  John Goodwin 0:05:0  Richard Alexander 0:09:0  05:11:0  By the Ball.ce of former acco.t Given in by Rich.d Griffin and Samuel Taylor in y.e stead of M.r Banks 125:12:0  05:09:6  Totall 127:01:6  Tho Bright  Tho Goodwin  Grace Pa[...]on Wid.o made Request That whereas her son  John Paddock and she had made an agreement between them about</p>	<p>On the credit side, the account continued.  They carried forward £3 0s 0d and £120 1s 0d.  They received £0 6s 0d from John Orchard.  They received £0 9s 0d from Leiv Morris.  They received £0 6s 0d from John Butler.  They received £0 6s 0d from William Seales.  They received £0 6s 0d from Henry Coales.  They received £0 12s 0d from Grace Pa[...].  They received £0 5s 0d from John Goodwin.  They received £0 9s 0d from Richard Alexander.  These payments totalled £5 11s 0d.  They then added £125 12s 0d as the balance from a previous account submitted by Richard Griffin and Samuel Taylor in place of Mr Banks.  A further balance of £5 9s 6d was included.  The total came to £127 1s 6d.  Grace Pa[...]on, a widow, then made a request. She stated that she and her son John Paddock had made an agreement between them concerning land, houses, slaves and cattle, as set out in a written document. She asked for permission to have this agreement copied and</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>about Lands Houses Slaves Cattle etc as by the hereafter mentioned writinge doth appeare which writinge she Desired we would  Grant her y.e Liberty of havinge them Copied out and Entred  In the Court Bookes of the said Island by Reason of preventing future Damage they might receive by moth, fire water Etc Considering it to be no Detorment to her  masters affaires we have Granted her Request and which writeings are as followeth</p>	<p>entered into the court records. She said this was to prevent loss or damage from moth, fire or water.  This request was granted. The writings were to be copied and entered into the court books.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The continued account showed that parish finance included small payments from many individuals. This reflected regular contributions from inhabitants.  The inclusion of a previous balance showed continuity in accounting. Funds were carried forward and integrated into new accounts.  The formal total confirmed that accounts were balanced and verified before closure.  The request by Grace Pa[...]on showed that private agreements could be recorded in official books. This gave them legal weight and protection.  The concern over damage from moth, fire and water showed the vulnerability of documents. Recording copies in court ensured preservation of property rights.  The inclusion of land, houses, slaves and cattle in the agreement showed the range of property formally recognised and transferable.  <b>Speculations</b>  The request to copy the agreement suggests concern over future disputes. A court record would provide proof if the original document was lost or challenged.  The use of official records for private agreements suggests that individuals relied on the Council to secure long-term claims. This may have been especially important where property involved multiple forms and shared interests.</p>
233	228	<p>Island St Helena  Know all men by these presents that I Hugh Bod[...] of the said Island free Planter of the one part and M[...] Grace Pa[...] of the said Island Widdow of the other part  Wittnesseth that the said Hugh Bod[...] for and in consid-  eration of the sume of thirty eight pounds in Store Rec[...] by me already Rec[...] of the aforesaid Grace Pa[...]  the Receipt whereof I doe acknowledge and of every part thereof  doe clearly acquit and Inlarge her the said Grace Pa[...] her heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assignes and for divers  good causes and considerations me thereunto moving have bargained  and sold and by these presents doe fully and absolutely grant bargain sell and deliver unto the said Grace Pa[...] her heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assignes all that piece or  parcel of Land containing by estimation Tenn acres with  a Plantation and Houses thereon standing and growing and  being situate and being in Copped valley on the said Island bounded to the land of Henry [...] Dec[...] with all  other the appurtenances thereunto belonging with a Black woman  slave called by the name of Agu[...] together the hoggs growing  and all utensils with the said Hugh Bod[...] other goods containing by estimation two upwords then twenty two or three  beeves also one Iron Pott being in the Dwelling house situate  in the said Tenn acres of Land To have and to hold the said  Tenn acres of Land with the said appurtenances together</p>	<p>An agreement was recorded between Hugh Bod[...] of St Helena, a free planter, and Grace Pa [...], a widow of the same island.  Hugh Bod[...] confirmed that he had received £38 0s 0d in store payment from Grace Pa [...]. He acknowledged full receipt and released her from any further claim for that sum.  In return, he transferred full ownership to her. This included ten acres of land in Copped Valley. The land contained a plantation and houses. It bordered land formerly belonging to Henry [...], now deceased.  He also transferred a slave woman named Agu [...]. He included hogs, all tools and utensils, and other goods. These goods included more than twenty-two or twenty-three cattle. He also transferred one iron pot located in the dwelling house on the land.  Grace Pa[...] received full and permanent ownership of the land and all property attached to it. She was given the right to use and dispose of the land, the slave, and all other goods without interference from Hugh Bod[...] or any other person acting on his behalf.  The agreement was signed and sealed on 24 May 1698.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The payment of £38 0s 0d in store goods showed that large transactions could be settled without cash. Goods held in store functioned as a recognised medium of exchange.  The transfer of land, buildings, livestock, tools and a slave in one transaction showed that property was treated as a combined estate. Ownership extended across land, labour and equipment.  The inclusion of the slave by name showed that individuals were treated as transferable property within legal contracts.  The clause granting full and uninterrupted possession showed a standard form of legal protection. It barred future claims by the seller or others connected to him.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>with the said Black woman and the other particulars herein specified to her the said Grace Pa[...] her heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] and assigns from the Day of the Date hereof for ever to use and Dispose of the said Land Black woman slave and all other the premises without any let suit trouble evic[...] or interruption of him the said Hugh Bod[...] his heires Execu[...] Administrat[...] or assigns or any other person or persons whatsoever by him or them or any of their means or procurement And the said Hugh Bod[...] hath set to his hand and seale this 24th day of May one thousand six hundred ninety and eight and in the tenth year of the Reigne</p>	<p>The recording of boundaries and neighbouring land showed the importance of location in defining property rights.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The wide range of property included suggests that the sale transferred a working plantation rather than isolated land. This may have allowed the buyer to take over production without delay.</p> <p>The formal release of claims suggests concern over future disputes. The detailed wording may have been intended to prevent any later challenge to ownership.</p>
234	229	<p>Sealed Signed Deli[...] In the Presence of us James Draper Simon Whal[...] marke Matthew Bazett This Indenture made the Twenty fourth day of May in the yeare of our Lord one thousand six hundred ninety eight And in the tenth yeare of the Reigne of our Sovereigne Lord King William the Third by the Grace of God of England Scotland France and Ireland King Defender of the Faith &amp;c Between Grace Pa[...] of the Island of St Helena Widdow and John Coulson of the said Island Planter Witnesseth that the said Grace Pa[...] hath this day of the date hereof putt the said John Coulson her eldest son being now of the age of one and twenty yeares and upwards into the full and just possession of one moiety or halfe part of a House Plantation and two slaves being her two children namely Bess the property of the said Coulson left to his late father John Coulson Deceased together with his free share and part of the stock cattle and all other the appurtenances of said Plantation with which he the said John Coulson doth hereby Declare himselfe fully contented and satisfied for his moiety or right belonging unto him the said John Coulson by the lawes and Customes of this Island as being there to his late father John Coulson Deceased the other moiety or halfe according to the said lawes and Customes belonging unto Grace Pa[...] during her naturall life Now the said Grace Pa[...] doth by these presents promise and Covenant for her selfe her heires Executors Administrators to leave and in God and Devotion to her son John Coulson the other moiety of the said House Plantation and two slaves at her Decease and she doth likewise promise as [...]</p>	<p>The agreement was signed, sealed and delivered in the presence of James Draper, Simon Whal[...] (by mark) and Matthew Bazett.</p> <p>A further indenture was made on 24 May 1698. It was between Grace Pa[...], a widow of St Helena, and John Coulson, a planter of the same island.</p> <p>Grace Pa[...] placed her eldest son, John Coulson, who was over twenty-one years of age, into full possession of half of a house and plantation. She also gave him two slaves, described as his children, including one named Bess. These had belonged to his late father, John Coulson, deceased.</p> <p>He also received his share of the stock, cattle and all other property connected to the plantation. John Coulson declared himself satisfied with this share as his rightful portion under the laws and customs of the island.</p> <p>The remaining half of the estate was held by Grace Pa[...] for the duration of her life. She promised that after her death this remaining half of the house, plantation and the two slaves would pass to her son.</p> <p>A later declaration, dated 5 March 1702, confirmed this arrangement. Grace Pa[...] formally gave up any claim she or her heirs might have had to the earlier agreement. She granted her son John Coulson full title to the entire property at Fort James after her death. She marked this document with her sign.</p> <p>The declaration was witnessed by James Rider, Henry Coales, Matthew Bazett and [...] Alexander.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The indenture showed a formal division of inheritance. Property was split into two equal parts, with one half transferred immediately and the other reserved for the widow's lifetime.</p> <p>The reference to local laws and customs showed that inheritance followed established rules. Sons received defined shares, while widows retained life interest.</p> <p>The inclusion of slaves as part of the inheritance showed that they were treated as heritable property alongside land and livestock.</p> <p>The later declaration showed that earlier agreements could be revised. A written confirmation strengthened the son's claim and removed any future dispute.</p> <p>The use of marks instead of signatures showed that some parties could not write. Witnesses ensured the document remained valid.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The immediate transfer of half the estate suggests a desire to secure the son's position while the mother was still alive. This may have reduced conflict or uncertainty over inheritance.</p> <p>The later confirmation suggests concern about future challenge. By removing her own claim, the</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Island St Helena  I Grace Pa[...] of the said  Island wid:o Do relinquish from me my heires  Executors Administrat[...] and assigns  what Titles that I had to a Covenant made between my  son John Coulson and I, as  it may appeare on the other side, and do by these  presents grant unto my said son John Coulson  ye whole lot Fort James unto him after my Death. In  witness whereof I have  hereunto set my hand this 5th day of March 1701  her  Grace G Coulson  mark  James Rider  Henry Coles  Matt: Bazett  [...] Alexan[...]</p>	<p>widow ensured that the property would pass without dispute after her death.</p>
<p><a href="#">235</a></p>	<p>230</p>	<p>much as in her life to keep and maintaine the said John  Coulson in the quiet possession of the moiety of the  said House  and Plantation he is now in possession off And the said  John  Coulson Doth for himselfe his heires Executors and  Administrat[...]  Relinquish all Right Title Claime and Interest he now  hath  or his heires Executors Administrat[...] may have to any  other  Part Except the aforesaid House and Plantation and the  Estate  Real and personall In the possession of the said Grace  now unto  his mother Grace Coulson And the said John Coulson  Doth for  himselfe his heires Executors and Administrat[...]  promise &amp; Covenant  that he or they shall and will not by any means  whatsoever Lett  hinder or obstruct his said mother Grace Coulson But  doth  by these presents as much as in him or may concerne  his heires  freely and absolutely Give unto the said Grace Coulson  full power to  Give and Dispose of by will or otherwise to any person  whatsoever  all the Estate she now hath or may have at the Day of  her  Death in her owne possession or in possession of any  other person  for her and of all Debts Due to her from any person  whatsoever  And the said John Coulson Doth for himselfe his heires  Executors  and Administrat[...] Quit and Claime he may have to any  part of  the profits of the Estate his late father dyed seized off  Since  the Decease of his said father And the said Grace  Coulson  Doth for her selfe her heires Executors Administrat[...]  freely relinquish  any pretence she may have upon the said John Coulson  for  his Education Board apparell money and whatsoever  else he  hath had from his said mother since the Decease of his  father  And it is Covenanted and Agreed between the said  parties that  the Dwelling house Stile and all necessarys thereunto  belonging doth  Equally belong to both and whatsoever arrears that be</p>	<p>Grace Coulson agreed to maintain her son John  Coulson in quiet possession of the half of the house and  plantation already given to him.</p> <p>John Coulson gave up all claim to any other part of  his late father's estate. He accepted that all remaining  real and personal property stayed with his mother.</p> <p>He promised that he would not interfere with her  control of that property. He granted her full authority to  dispose of it by will or otherwise, including all goods in  her possession and any debts owed to her.</p> <p>He also gave up any claim to profits from the estate  since his father's death.</p> <p>Grace Coulson gave up any claim against her son  for his upbringing. She released any demand for costs of  his education, food, clothing or money provided since  his father's death.</p> <p>Both agreed that the dwelling house, the stile and  all necessary parts belonged equally to them. Any  arrears connected to the property were to be divided  between them in proportion to their shares.</p> <p>They agreed to share equally the cost of repairing  the house and its attached structures whenever needed.</p> <p>The agreement was confirmed on St Helena on 24  May 1698. Grace Coulson marked the document. John  Coulson signed it. It was witnessed by Thomas Bright,  Benj[...] Ridd and Fra[...] W[...].</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The agreement fixed a clear division between  immediate possession and retained control. The son  held one half, while the mother kept full authority over  the rest during her lifetime.</p> <p>The release of all further claims by the son showed  a final settlement of inheritance rights. This prevented  later disputes over additional portions of the estate.</p> <p>The grant of full disposal power to the mother  showed that a widow could control and transfer  property freely. Her authority extended to land, goods  and debts.</p> <p>The waiver of claims for upbringing costs showed  that family obligations could be formally cancelled. This  prevented later financial demands within the household.</p> <p>The shared ownership of the house and  responsibility for repairs showed that joint property  required joint maintenance. Costs were tied directly to  ownership share.</p> <p>The use of seals, marks and witnesses confirmed  the legal force of the agreement. Validation depended  on public acknowledgment rather than private writing  alone.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The detailed mutual release suggests a desire to  avoid future conflict. Both parties secured their  positions by giving up potential claims.</p> <p>The division of control and future inheritance  suggests a staged transfer of property. This allowed the</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>there shall be Divided between the said Grace and John Coulson according to his or her proportion of Estate there  Dissolved And the said Grace and John Coulson doth further  Covenant and agree to pay their Equall proportion towards  Repairing the said Dwelling house Stile and all appurtenances thereunto belonging when there shall be Occasion In  Witnesse  whereof the Parties to these presents have hereunto set their  hands and seales In the Island of St Helena this day and yeare  first above written  The marke of Grace Coulson  John Coulson  Sealed and Deli[...] in the presence of  Tho: Bright  Benj[...] Ridd  Fra[...] W[...]  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  [...]</p>	<p>mother to retain security while ensuring the son's eventual succession.</p>
236	231	<p>[...] [...] Universis [...] Praesentes me Johannem Coulson de Insula sanctae Helenae agricolam teneri et firmiter obligari Gratiae Coulson de eadem Insula Vidua in Mille libras bonae et legalis monetae Angliae [...] solvendum eidem Gratiae Coulson aut suo certo attornato  Executor[...]  Administrator[...] vel assignat[...] suis ad quam quidem solutionem  bene et fideliter faciendam obligo me haered[...]  Executor[...]  Administrator[...] meos firmiter per praesentes Sigillo meo  [...] meo apposito Datum hoc Instrumentum quarto die Maii Anno Domini 1699 Annoq[...] regni Domini nostri Gulielmi Tertii Angliae &amp;c Regis Defensoris Fidei [...]  The Condition of this obligation is such that if the above bound  John Coulson shall well and truly performe the Covenants bearing  equall Date with these presents mentioned on the part of the said John Coulson  and his above mentioned Grace Coulson then this obligation to  be void and of none effect or otherwise to remaine in full force and  vertue  Sealed &amp; Delivered in the  presence of  Tho: Bright  Will[...] Ridd  Fran[...] West  John Coulson  Island St Helena  This Indenture made the nine and twenty day  of September Anno Domini one thousand six hundred ninety two Between  the said Robert Pester on the one part and Mr Grace Coulson of the said Island widdow on the other part  Witnesseth  that the said Robert Pester for and in consideration of the  summe of Eight pound Currant money of this Island to me  in hand paid and legally authorized the said Robert Pester  hath granted bargained and sold and by these presents doth grant</p>	<p>John Coulson entered into a formal bond with his mother, Grace Coulson, a widow of St Helena.  He bound himself to her in the sum of £1,000 0s 0d sterling. He undertook to fulfil all the terms agreed between them in a separate covenant made at the same time. If he carried out those terms fully and faithfully, the bond would become void. If not, it would remain in force.  The bond was sealed and delivered in the presence of Thomas Bright, Will[...] Ridd and Fran[...] West. It was dated 4 May 1699 in the reign of King William III.  A further indenture was then recorded, dated 29 September 1692.  Robert Pester, one party, sold land to Grace Coulson, a widow of the island. In return for £8 0s 0d in current island money, he transferred a parcel of land measuring about five acres. This land lay at the head of Rupert's Valley.  The transfer included all trees, woods, springs, water sources and grazing attached to the land. Grace Coulson received full and permanent ownership for herself and her heirs.  The land bordered property already in her possession on the northern side.  The bond between John Coulson and Grace Coulson was later acknowledged before witnesses, confirming its validity.  <b>Interpretations</b>  The bond for £1,000 0s 0d acted as a penalty security. It ensured that John Coulson carried out the agreed terms. Failure to do so would trigger a heavy financial liability.  The condition that the bond became void on performance showed a standard enforcement method. Compliance cancelled the obligation, while breach activated it.  The indenture for £8 0s 0d showed a formal land sale. Even small parcels were transferred through written agreement with defined boundaries and rights.  The inclusion of natural resources such as water and grazing showed that land ownership extended beyond the surface. These elements were essential to its economic use.  The confirmation of the bond before witnesses showed that validation required public acknowledgment. This strengthened enforceability.  <b>Speculations</b>  The high value of the bond compared to the earlier property division suggests strong concern about</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>alien enfeoffe and sell unto the said Mr Grace Coulson her heires and assignes all that one parcell of Land containing five acres more or lesse lying and being at the head of Ruperts valley on the said Island together with all woods trees springs waters feedings growing or being thereon and to hold unto the said Mr Grace Coulson her heires and assignes for ever All that piece or parcell of Land which abutteth toward the North upon Land now in the possession of the said Mr Grace</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b>  Memd: That this Bond hath been acknowledg[e]d by both parties concerned before us the subscribers.  Jn Coulso[n]  Tho Madd: Bazett</p>	<p>enforcement. It may have been set high to deter any breach by John Coulson.</p> <p>The purchase of additional land in 1692 suggests that Grace Coulson had been building her estate over time. This may explain the detailed arrangements later made to divide and secure it within the family.</p>
<a href="#">237</a>	232	<p>Coulson, towards the South upon the edge South upon the Right shore, East as Common towards the East where the said James Common towards the west upon Land lately in the possession of Edward B[...] Deceased and now in the possession of the said John Coulson and all other the aforesaid premisses have in and by these presents Bargained Sold and every of them doth hereby unto the said Mrs Grace Coulson and her heires and assignes for Ever Further the said Robert Pester doth oblige my selfe heires Execut[...] Admin[...] or assignes by these presents to pay back againe unto the said Mrs Grace Coulson or her heires the full summe of Eight pound in currant money of this Island to be paid in Eight pounds Sterling or any other for them their use on or before from the said Mrs Grace Coulson her heires &amp;c the said some acres of Land have bargained and sold In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seale this day and yeare first above written  The marke of  Robert T Pester  Witness  Sam: Wrangham  John H[...]  Dan: Don[...]  The originall of all the aforesaid writings have bin Delivered unto Grace Coulson of the said Island widow by me  Jo: Alexander</p>	<p>The land at Rupert's Valley was described in detail. It bordered land already held by Grace Coulson to the north. It extended southwards along the edge of the shore. To the east and west it adjoined common land and land formerly held by Edward B[...] and now in the possession of John Coulson.</p> <p>Robert Pester transferred full ownership of this land and all attached rights to Grace Coulson and her heirs forever.</p> <p>He also bound himself to repay the £8 0s 0d if required. This repayment was to be made in current island money or in sterling, for her use, by an agreed date. If repayment was made, the land could revert according to the terms of the agreement.</p> <p>The document was marked by Robert Pester and witnessed by Samuel Wrangham, John H[...] and Daniel Don[...].</p> <p>All the original documents described above were delivered to Grace Coulson, a widow of the island, by John Alexander.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The detailed boundary description fixed the land within a known landscape. Reference to neighbouring holdings and common land ensured that ownership could be recognised and defended.</p> <p>The clause allowing repayment of £8 0s 0d showed that the transaction functioned as a conditional sale. It operated like a mortgage, where the seller could recover the land by repaying the sum.</p> <p>The option to repay in either local currency or sterling showed flexibility in monetary systems. Different forms of money were accepted as equivalent in legal agreements.</p> <p>The delivery of original documents to Grace Coulson showed that possession of written title was essential. Control of the document reinforced control of the property.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The repayment clause suggests that Robert Pester may have needed immediate funds but intended to recover the land later. The agreement allowed him to raise money without permanent loss if he could repay.</p> <p>The careful recording and transfer of documents suggests concern over proof of ownership. This may reflect frequent disputes or the risk of documents being lost or challenged.</p>
<a href="#">238</a>	233	<p>David Edmunds Planter presented to Govern[...] and Councill a Petition setting forth in the said Petition that one Jervell Walker who was a Soldier formerly here went of this Island in the Ship [...] which Ship was cast away before she arrived And the said Jervell</p>	<p>David Edmunds, a planter, presented a petition. He stated that Jervell Walker, a former soldier on the island, had left on board the ship [...]. That ship was later lost before reaching its destination.</p> <p>At the time of his departure, Walker held a bill of exchange for £190 5s 0½d. It was payable by the Honourable East India Company in England and had</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>Walker at the time of his Departure from off the said Island had a Bill of Exchange payable on the Rt Honble English East India Company in England signed by the Govr and Council of the said Island then being for the summe of one Hundred Ninety pound five shill[...] and a halfe penny which said summe was never paid to any person whatsoever Wherefore he the said Edmunds having a Letter of Attorney from the said Jervell Walker and by him signed sealed and delivered for Recovery of the said summe In Case he should miscarry before he came to England which hath proved Certaine Whereupon we considered maturely the whole Circumstances of the said Edmunds Request and of the matter of the said Walker also and the Governour of which said Walker to us as though it was still due here on which said Edmunds grounds his Demands and altho Considering well what was then his Request by reason of the said Bill being so plaine It is ordered That the said Edward Edmunds Petition be Transmitted to the Rt Honble the East India Company in England by the first Homeward bound Ship that they may Consider it themselves and do what Justice they think fitt Jonathan Higham set[...] Petitioned us setting forth therein that for great necessity he stands in for a Black Desiring us to lett him have the four Tunnage negro that we have on the Rt Honble Comp[...] acco: out of a Madagascar ship after Consideration of his great want of a negro servant and wanting one to help him in the Planting and Improving his Plantation we have granted him his Request accordingly</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Mr Edmunds Petition sent home to the Comp[...] Higham Negro granted</p>	<p>been signed by the Governor and Council. The money had never been paid.</p> <p>Edmunds held a letter of attorney from Walker. This authorised him to recover the sum if Walker died before reaching England, which had now happened. The Governor and Council examined the matter. The claim appeared valid, and the bill of exchange was clear. However, the decision was not made locally.</p> <p>The petition was sent to the Honourable East India Company in England by the first ship bound home. The Company was asked to consider the case and decide the outcome.</p> <p>Jonathan Higham also submitted a petition. He stated that he urgently needed a slave to assist him in planting and improving his land. He asked to be given one of the “tonnage slaves” held on the Company’s account from a Madagascar ship.</p> <p>His request was granted. One slave was assigned to him for this purpose.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The bill of exchange showed a formal financial instrument linking the island to England. Payment depended on recognition by the Company rather than local enforcement.</p> <p>The use of a letter of attorney allowed Edmunds to act for Walker after his death. This ensured that claims could continue despite the loss of the original holder.</p> <p>The decision to send the petition to England showed that authority over large financial claims rested with the Company. The island administration could not settle such sums on its own.</p> <p>The reference to “tonnage slaves” showed that enslaved people could form part of Company assets. They were allocated to individuals for labour as needed.</p> <p>The grant of a slave for plantation work showed how labour shortages were addressed. Agricultural production depended on access to enslaved labour.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The decision to refer the claim suggests caution over large payments. The Council may have avoided liability by passing the matter to the Company.</p> <p>The grant of a slave to Higham suggests that labour demand was pressing. The request may have been approved quickly to support production and prevent loss of output.</p>
239	234	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 7th Day of June 1699 Att Fort James Prst Stephn Poirier Governor Capt Tho: Bright Depu[...] Govr Thomas Goodwin Ensignes &amp; Con[...] Thomas Gargen Senr did make Compaint this morning to us Declaring his Condition In being Destitute of a habitation and having a family It was very chargable to live without a Plantation, Wherefore he Intreated us to sell him that House Ten acres of Land with the Provisions therein standing and Growing, which was bought of Richard Griffin when he went off After Consideration on this matter</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Tuesday 7 June 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as ensign and councillor.</p> <p>Thomas Gargen senior appeared and described his situation. He had no settled place to live and supported a family. Living without a plantation had become costly. He asked to buy a house and ten acres of land with the provisions growing on it. This property had previously been purchased from Richard Griffin when Griffin left the island.</p> <p>His request was accepted.</p> <p>He was given the house, ten acres of gumwood land and the fruit trees growing on it for £45 0s 0d. He was allowed one year to pay the full amount, with no interest charged during that time.</p> <p>If any part of the £45 0s 0d remained unpaid after one year, he was allowed a further three years to pay the balance. During those three years, interest would be</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>We have thought fitt to grant the said Thomas Gargen his Request, and have Concluded and agreed as followeth That the said Tho: Gargen have the said Ten Acres of gumwood Land the House standing thereon and the fruitfull trees in the said Plantation, att the Rate and Price of forty five pounds, he having one years time for payment thereof paying no Interest, but if it should so happen that there should Remaine any part of the said sume of 45℥ unpaid att the Expiration of one yeare that then he the said Gargen have Three yeares time longer for ye payment of so much as shall be unpaid, he paying Interest att the Rate of five p C[...] for the sume so Remaining unpaid for 3. Ind of twenty yeares together with the Interest of five p C[...] halfe yearly to Commence from the 24th of this Instant</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Gargen Thomas to have 10 acre land &amp; provisions formerly Richd Griffin at ye rate and price of 45℥</p>	<p>charged at a rate of five per cent on the unpaid sum. Interest was to be paid every six months, beginning on 24 June 1699.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The grant of land showed that the Council could sell property to settlers in need. Access to land was tied to both livelihood and stability. The inclusion of a house and growing provisions showed that the sale transferred a working holding. This allowed immediate use for subsistence and production. The staged payment plan showed a structured credit system. Buyers could acquire land without full payment upfront. The interest-free first year showed an incentive to settle and begin production. It reduced initial financial pressure. The later imposition of interest showed a shift from support to enforcement. Delayed payment carried a financial cost. The half-yearly payment of interest showed formal scheduling of obligations. Debt was managed through fixed intervals.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The terms suggest that the Council aimed to place land into active use. Granting credit may have encouraged cultivation rather than leaving property idle. The extended repayment period suggests that immediate cash was scarce. The arrangement allowed gradual payment from future production rather than existing wealth.</p>
240	235	<p>In pursuance of the Rt Honble Comp[...] our masters Late orders and Instructions for Regulating their Fort Generall Table, we order that the persons hereafter mentioned be admitted to Dyett att the said Fort Generall Table Vizt Stephn: Poirier Governo[...] Capt Tho: Bright Depu[...] Gov[...] Tho: Goodwin Ensignes &amp; his wife, Mr John Humphreys Minister Hugh Yankeel Chirurgon &amp; his wife John Alexander Clark of the Councell Lt Serjt upon the Guard Matthew Bas[...] assistant to Mr Goodwin William [...] as writer Roger [...] as Do Henry Gates Marshall 13 Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 20 Day of June 1699 Att Fort James Prst Stephn: Poirier Governor Capt Tho: Bright Deputy Governor Thomas Goodwin Ensignes Whereas Mr Lemuel Blackmore Son and heire of John Blackmore Esq Late of the said Island Gent (Deed) presented his petition to us, tending that we would be pleased to Transmitt Into his hands the Estate belonging to his said Deceased father John Blackmore Esq who Departed this life on the 1 day of December 1690</p>	<p>In response to recent orders from the Honourable East India Company, arrangements were made for the regulation of the Fort's general table. The following persons were admitted to dine there: Stephen Poirier, Governor. Thomas Bright, deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin, ensign, and his wife. John Humphreys, minister. Hugh Yankeel, surgeon, and his wife. John Alexander, clerk of the Council. The lieutenant and sergeant on guard. Matthew Bas[...] as assistant to Thomas Goodwin. William [...] as writer. Roger [...] in the same role. Henry Gates, marshal. A consultation was then held on Tuesday 20 June 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as ensign. Lemuel Blackmore, son and heir of John Blackmore, formerly of the island and now deceased, submitted a petition. He requested that the estate of his late father, who died on 1 December 1690, be delivered into his hands.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The regulation of the general table showed that food provision at the fort was centrally controlled. Dining at the table reflected rank and official position. The inclusion of officers, clergy and administrative staff showed a defined hierarchy. Access to shared provisions formed part of official status. The petition by Lemuel Blackmore showed that inheritance required formal approval. Estates were not automatically transferred but needed recognition by authority. The identification of Lemuel as heir showed that succession depended on legal status. Claims had to be presented and verified before property could pass.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The formal listing of those admitted to the table suggests an effort to control costs or privilege. The Company may have sought to limit access to reduce expense or enforce hierarchy.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The delay between John Blackmore's death in 1690 and the petition in 1699 suggests that the estate may have been held under administration for some time. The request may indicate a change in circumstances or readiness to transfer control.</p>
241	236	<p>But considering we are uncertaine whether our Masters the Rt Honble Comp[...] might have any pretentions or Controversie with the said Lemuell Blackmore, and he having had the sole the Administration of ye estate since the said Rt Honble Comp[...] our said masters aforesaid, In whose place, and having been re=ported to us severall times, that he did not manage the trust committed to him so faithfully as he ought to have done, we further Considered the matter and accordingly have Ordered That all the remaining part of the said Deced fathers Estate, being now in the present adverse possession shall be Transmitted to the Rt Honble Comp[...] which we have Delivered in the Care and Custody of the Honble Rayner Comander of the good ship Imp[...] which now Riding in the Road, In Hope of delivering the same into the hands of the said Honble Company In England att his arrivall, whome we doubt not but will doe him the said Lemuell Blackmore all the justice as Possible can be Expected Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Thursday the 22 Day of June 1699 Att Fort James Prst Stephn: Poirier Governor Capt Tho: Bright Depu[...] Govr Tho: Goodwin Ensign Worrell John Worrall who came over here In the Armenian merchant, was ordered to Returne back againe to England, In the ship Tavestock Capt Joanes Command: Came to the Governour Complaining that on Monday last he being up in the Country at the Buriall of John Borman free planter where was also Tho: Skelton and his wife, who having some words</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> The Remaining part of the Estate of Lemuell Blackmore to be delivered into the hands of the Honble Company for their further disposall</p>	<p>The Governor and Council considered the petition of Lemuel Blackmore. They were uncertain whether the Honourable East India Company might have claims or disputes over the estate. Lemuel Blackmore had already held sole control of the estate for some time. Reports had reached them that he had not managed this trust faithfully.</p> <p>They decided not to transfer the estate to him. Instead, all remaining parts of his father's estate, then in contested possession, were gathered and sent to the Honourable Company in England. The property was placed in the care of Rayner, commander of the ship <i>Imp[...]</i>, then lying in the road. He was entrusted to deliver it to the Company. The Council expected that the Company would judge the matter and give Lemuel Blackmore whatever justice was due.</p> <p>A consultation was held on Thursday 22 June 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as ensign.</p> <p>John Worrall, who had arrived on the <i>Armenian Merchant</i> and had been ordered to return to England on the ship <i>Tavestock</i> under Captain Joanes, came before the Governor. He made a complaint.</p> <p>He stated that on the previous Monday he had been in the country attending the burial of John Borman, a free planter. Thomas Skelton and his wife were also present. A dispute arose between them.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The refusal to transfer the estate showed that inheritance could be withheld if management was questioned. Authority over estates rested with the Company rather than the individual heir.</p> <p>The decision to send the estate to England showed central control. Local officials deferred to the Company in cases involving uncertainty or dispute.</p> <p>The use of a ship's commander to transport the estate showed reliance on maritime channels for legal and financial matters.</p> <p>The reference to burial gathering showed that disputes could arise in social settings. Such events brought together multiple parties and could lead to conflict.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The reports of poor management suggest that Lemuel Blackmore's conduct had already caused concern. Sending the estate away removed his control and prevented further misuse.</p> <p>The decision to rely on the Company suggests that the Council sought to avoid responsibility for a contested inheritance. This may have protected them from later criticism or challenge.</p>
242	237	<p>[...] between them, about some Concerns, the said Fisher Returned the said Worrall very unreasonable words, as God damn [...] you, whereupon the Governour know=ing him to be a very Malicious fellow, and who for the most part when wife sake will say and swear any thing he was asked if there was any body In Company with them when those words was spoken, he the said Worrall Replied there was no body but the said Fishers wife, who Immediately was summoned to appeare before us who accordingly did and</p>	<p>A dispute arose at the burial of John Borman, a free planter. John Worrall claimed that Fisher spoke abusive words to him, including swearing. When questioned, Worrall admitted that only Fisher's wife had been present.</p> <p>Fisher's wife was brought in. She denied the accusation. She stated that no such words had been spoken. She offered to swear this under oath. She accused Worrall of lying and called him a wicked man.</p> <p>She further stated that Worrall had already caused her to be accused of adultery. She said he had ignored the Governor's order forbidding him from contacting her. He had tried several times to approach and speak with her. She added that he had claimed he would take her off the island disguised in men's clothing when he left.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>before the said Worrall shew and confronted him say that what the said Worrall hath Declared about her Husband was a false thing, offering withall to make oath of the same being very certaine there was no such words spoken neither tending any manner to that purpose, Calling him the said Worrall wicked fellow, and that by his behaviour had brought her to that great Crime of Adultery, and had against the Govrs order forbidding him to come in her Company or goe where she was, who (Entraly threatned had severall times) attempted to Come and speake to her, and had Reported she would steale her off the Island in mans cloathing with she would be [...], when he went off, and for prooffe hereof the Evidences hereafter were Examined John Alexander being asked what he could say about the said Worralls saying he would steale the said Fishers wife away saith he being att the Buriall of Thomas Bower wife, the said Worrall being there also, who having some Discourse together, about Fishers wife, as the said Worrall said if he could come to the speech of her, and if she would be Ruled by him he would carry her of a board of the ship he went of in Mans apparell, and was very Inquisitive to know whether the Govr had wrote any thing concerning him of his misdemeanour by the Tavestock Capt Joanes Commander who was answered by the said Alexander he could not tell for the Governr wrote the Letter that was sent to the Rt Honble Company as himself, which was sensible of the Contrary further saith not Thomas Dixon senr being Examined about what the said Worrall and Fishers Discourse saith yt he was at the buriall of John Borman free planter, and coming going from the said Bormans house to Church yard, the Corps, saw the said Fisher and his wife also coming to meet them but was not in the same Road as they were, who had not bin at the house, whome the said Worrall seeing</p>	<p>Witnesses were then examined. John Alexander stated that he was present at the burial of Thomas Bower's wife. Worrall was also there. During a conversation about Fisher's wife, Worrall said that if he could speak with her and if she followed his advice, he would take her off the island on board ship, dressed as a man. Worrall also asked whether the Governor had written about his misconduct in a letter sent to the Honourable Company by the ship <i>Tavestock</i>. John Alexander replied that he did not know. Thomas Dixon senior stated that he was present at the burial of John Borman. As the group moved from the house to the churchyard, he saw Fisher and his wife approaching. He did not walk with them and did not hear their conversation.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The examination showed that verbal accusations required supporting witnesses. A claim made without independent evidence could be challenged and denied. The presence of only one witness at the alleged exchange weakened Worrall's claim. The Council relied on corroboration rather than single testimony. The accusation of adultery showed that moral offences were closely tied to reputation. Allegations could damage social standing and provoke official inquiry. The repeated attempts by Worrall to contact Fisher's wife showed that disobedience to prior orders was taken seriously. Authority extended to regulating personal contact. The claim that he would remove her from the island in disguise showed concern over control of movement. Leaving the island without permission was treated as a serious breach.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The denial by Fisher's wife and her counter-accusation suggest that the dispute had shifted from a verbal quarrel to a broader conflict over reputation. Each side attempted to discredit the other. The statement about removing her in disguise suggests that Worrall may have been planning or boasting of escape. This may have increased suspicion against him and influenced how his claims were judged.</p>
243	238	<p>[...] coming stayed for them till they came in the same Boat as he was in, but what Discourse they had he cannot tell being some Distance from them the rest of the words that passed Mr [...] further saith not Upon the whole Considering the former Life of the said Worrall, the known Language of the said Fishers wife, and other Circumstances, and that the said Fisher was never heard or known to swears an oath or use any Oaths and besides the ships being ready to saile, prevents us of having a further Tryall of the said, wherefore It is ordered That the said Thomas Fisher be Cleared and acquitted from any of the Complaint made by the said Worrall,</p>	<p>Thomas Dixon stated that Fisher and his wife joined the others and came in the same boat, but he was too far away to hear what they said. The Governor and Council reviewed the whole matter. They considered Worrall's past behaviour, the character of Fisher's wife, and other circumstances. They noted that Thomas Fisher had never been known to swear or use abusive language. The ship was ready to sail, which prevented further examination. Thomas Fisher was cleared of the complaint. John Worrall was sharply reprimanded for his conduct. He was ordered to go on board the ship <i>Anna</i>, commanded by Captain Sam Bridges, in accordance with the order already issued for his departure. A consultation was held on Thursday 29 June 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as ensign.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>and that the said John Worrall be checked and reprov'd severely for his misdemeanour behaviour, and be ordered to repaire on board the good Ship Anna Capt Sam Bridges Commander thereof, who had a Grant of the same given under our hands the Day and yeare before said Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Thursday the 29th Day of June 1699 att Fort James Prst Stephn: Poirier Governor Capt Bright Deputy Governor Thomas Goodwin Ensign Whereas John Henderson sold made Complaint to the Governor and Councill, that on Tuesday night before after the tap too had beaten, he being lying downe on his Bed in the long Gallery being the place where the souldiers usually resort on the guard, came Jonathan Midge and Richard Ray sold and pulled him the said Henderson by the Leggs, and dragged him a long the floore of the said Gallery, In so much he had Received some hurt upon his Back by Nayles and splinters</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Worrall to be checked and sent aboard the Ship Anna Thomas Fisher cleared of the Complaint</p>	<p>John Henderson, a soldier, made a complaint. He stated that on the previous Tuesday night, after the evening signal had been given, he was lying on his bed in the long gallery, where soldiers usually gathered while on guard. Jonathan Midge and Richard Ray, also soldiers, came to him, pulled him by the legs, and dragged him along the floor. He said this caused injury to his back from nails and splinters.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The clearing of Fisher showed that judgement relied on reputation as well as testimony. Known character influenced the outcome where evidence was limited.</p> <p>The reprimand of Worrall showed that false or unproven accusations were treated as misconduct. Authority protected individuals from wrongful claims.</p> <p>The order to send Worrall on board the <i>Anna</i> showed enforcement of earlier decisions. Departure from the island could be compelled.</p> <p>The complaint by Henderson showed that violence among soldiers was subject to formal inquiry. Conduct within military spaces was regulated by the Council.</p> <p>The reference to the evening signal showed structured military routine. Behaviour after this time fell under stricter discipline.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The decision to end the case quickly suggests that the imminent sailing of the ship forced a resolution. Practical limits may have shaped the judgement.</p> <p>The emphasis on Fisher's reputation suggests that character carried weight where direct proof was lacking. This may have favoured established inhabitants over those already under suspicion.</p>
244	239	<p>[...] splinters the floore being very rough, Who being both Examined did depose they meddled with the said Henderson, although he was Drunk and cannot tell who was that hauled him of his bed, moreover saying he stumbled over them as they lay on their beds</p> <p>The said John H[e]nd[er]son saith he will make oath it was Jonath Midge that hauled him by the Leggs, but cannot positively sweare that the said Richard Ray hauled him also, but think[s] it was he,</p> <p>John Sheil[e] Corporall being Examined, saith he was then on the Guard, &amp; their busines was ended, he being going to sleep in a Roome under the said long Gallery, and heard one a little after ten, went up to see what was the matter but before as they who raised said John Henderson by his Legs (as he saith) had perceiving them they lay downe on their matts together, and it being so Darke he could not see who they were but the said John Henderson told him that Jonath Midge and Richard Ray that hauled him by the Leggs, whereupon called to the said Midge and Ray but they made no answere, so went downe againe to the Corporalls Roome</p> <p>It is ordered That the said John Henderson being not quite sober now, the Decision of this matter be Referred untill he is thoroughly sober, and then to have an oath given him, which he refused to take, that the busines may be Decided accordingly</p> <p>William Seales [...] having broken some former [...] [...] belonging to his [...], In and about his own [...], who</p>	<p>Jonathan Midge and Richard Ray were examined. They admitted that they had been near John Henderson, but denied pulling him from his bed. They said Henderson was drunk and had fallen over them where they lay.</p> <p>John Henderson stated that he would swear that Jonathan Midge pulled him by the legs. He said he believed Richard Ray had also done so, but could not swear it with certainty.</p> <p>John Sheile, a corporal, was examined. He said he had been on guard and went to rest in a room beneath the long gallery. Shortly after ten o'clock he heard a disturbance and went up to investigate. By the time he arrived, the men involved had lain down on their mats. It was too dark to identify them. Henderson told him that Midge and Ray had dragged him. The corporal called out to them, but they gave no reply, so he returned to his room.</p> <p>The case was delayed because Henderson was still not sober. A decision was postponed until he was fully sober and able to give sworn evidence. When later offered the oath, he refused to take it.</p> <p>William Seales was fined £0 2s 6d for breaking a previous order concerning conduct on his own premises.</p> <p>John Worrall, who had been ordered to return to England, owed £32 10s 0d to the Honourable Company for the passage of his two daughters and the wife of Thomas Fisher. When questioned about payment, he brought Henry [...] the marshal before the Council. The marshal agreed to take responsibility for the debt and to ensure payment of the full sum.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The postponement of the case showed that testimony required sobriety. Evidence given under oath had to meet a standard of reliability.</p> <p>The refusal by Henderson to swear an oath weakened his claim. Without sworn evidence, the case could not be resolved in his favour.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>is [... ] ordered to pay Two shillings and six pence for so doing Whereas John Worrall was ordered to Returne to England again, as by the Consultation held the 22 Day of this instant June doth appeare, and he the said Worrall standing Indebted unto the Rt Honble Comp[... ] the sume of thirty two pounds Ten shillings being for the passage of his two Daughters, and Tho Fishers wife, who being discoursed with about the payment thereof brought Henry [... ] marshall to us, and said the said [... ] would engage himself to pay the said sume of thirty two pounds <b>Margin Notes:</b> The Matter to be Referred till Henderson be sober</p>	<p>The examination of a corporal showed that military personnel acted as witnesses within guard spaces. Their role included maintaining order and reporting disturbances. The fine imposed on William Seales showed that earlier orders remained enforceable. Breaches of regulation could be punished even outside formal disputes. The debt owed by Worrall showed that passage costs were recoverable by the Company. Travel was treated as a financial obligation. The acceptance of a guarantor for the debt showed the use of surety. Responsibility could be transferred to another person who undertook to pay. <b>Speculations</b> The refusal to swear suggests that Henderson may have doubted his own certainty once sober. This may have led to abandonment of the complaint. The willingness of the marshal to guarantee Worrall's debt suggests a personal or practical arrangement. This may have been intended to ensure Worrall's departure without delay while securing payment later.</p>
245	240	<p>Island St Helena [...] Ten shilling on his acco: which the said [... ] himselfe offered to [... ] to us for the said sume of 32:10:0 on the said Rt Honble Comp[...] behalf, wch the Undertaker stands Indebt [... ] to them It is ordered That the said Henry [... ] offer be accepted, and that he [... ] of the Passage of the said Worralls two Daughters [... ] Ten pounds more to be deducted out of the said Worralls [... ] Two Sons Growing salary And that Thomas Fisher pay for the Passage of his wife the sume of seaven pounds Ten shillings more, which in all makes the whole sume of Thirty two pounds Tenn shillings, as appears by the perticuler acco: as followeth The said Henry [... ] to pay the sume of 15:00:00 The said Worralls two Sons [... ] must be? 5:00:00 Deducted as aforesaid the sume of 5:00:00 Thomas Fisher for his wives Passage the sume of 07:10:00 Sume Total is 32:10:00 Likewise The said Henry [... ] doth further oblige himselfe by an obligation to keep the parish harmeless from any Charge or [... ] whatsoever, on acco: of the maintenance of the said Worralls Two Daughters Tho: Bright Tho: Goodwin <b>Margin Notes:</b> [... ] Henry [... ] for [... ] [... ] passage of Worralls daughters [... ] sons growing salary</p>	<p>Henry [... ] offered to take responsibility for part of John Worrall's debt to the Honourable Company, which amounted to £32 10s 0d for the passage of Worrall's two daughters and Thomas Fisher's wife. His offer was accepted. He agreed to pay £15 0s 0d towards the cost of the daughters' passage. A further £5 0s 0d was to be recovered from the wages due to Worrall's two sons. Thomas Fisher was required to pay £7 10s 0d for the passage of his wife. These amounts together made the full sum of £32 10s 0d. Henry [... ] also bound himself by formal obligation to protect the parish from any future expense for maintaining Worrall's two daughters. <b>Interpretations</b> The division of the debt showed that liability could be shared among several parties. Costs were allocated according to responsibility for each person's passage. The deduction from the sons' wages showed that earnings could be seized to settle debts. The Company could recover money directly from future income. The requirement that Thomas Fisher pay for his wife's passage showed that individuals were responsible for dependants. The obligation taken by Henry [... ] showed that the parish sought protection from future costs. Surety ensured that public funds would not be used for private maintenance. <b>Speculations</b> The use of multiple sources to settle the debt suggests that Worrall could not pay it himself. The arrangement spread the burden to ensure recovery without delay. The requirement to protect the parish from maintenance costs suggests concern that the daughters might become dependent. This measure aimed to prevent future claims on public support.</p>
246	241	<p>Island St Helena Att a Court of Justice Held on Tuesday the 1st Day of July 1699 att the Sessions Howse Night Fort James Prst; Steph: Poirier Govr Cap: Bright Deputy Govr Thomas Goodwin Ensigne After the Court was opened according to the Accustomed Manner those appoynted for Jurors are as followeth</p>	<p>A court of justice was held on Tuesday 1 July 1699 at the Sessions House near Fort James. Stephen Poirier presided as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as ensign. The court opened in the usual manner. A jury was formed and sworn without objection. The jurors were John Mudge, John Long, William Marsh, Samuel Wrangham, John Nicholls, Thomas Davis as foreman, James Haslebury, Richard Leach, James Rider, Erasmus Burling, Robert Addis and John Goodwin. Thomas Swallow, a free planter, and Mary, wife of Orlando Bagley senior, were brought before the court.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>John Mudge . . . 8  John Long . . . 9  Willm Marsh . . . 10  Sam: Wrangham . . . 11  John Nichols . . . 12  Tho: Davis foreman . . . 1  James Haslebury . . . 2  Richard Leach . . . 3  James Rider . . . 4  Erasmus Burling . . . 5  Robert Addis . . . 6  John Goodwin . . . 7</p> <p>Who was all sworn, and no objection made  Then Thomas Swallow free Planter, and Mary the wife of Orlando Bagley senr was caled into Court, and their Indictment Read before them, for that they both being guilty of Leudness, as by the Consultation held the 26 day of Aprill last past for that purpose, who was presented by Mr Thomas Goodwin and Richard Davenant  Church wardens for the yeare last past, doth more largely appeare  The said Swallow and Mary Bagley Denied the fact and accordingly Desired prooffe  Then the Evidences were Caled as followeth  [...]  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  [...]</p>	<p>The charge against them was read. They were accused of lewd conduct, based on earlier proceedings held on 26 April 1699. The accusation had been brought forward by Thomas Goodwin and Richard Davenant, who served as churchwardens for the previous year.  Both denied the accusation and demanded proof. Witnesses were then called.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The formal opening of the court and swearing of the jury showed structured legal procedure. Trials were conducted with defined roles and process.  The selection of jurors from local planters showed that judgement relied on members of the community. Authority was exercised through collective decision.  The reading of the indictment showed that charges were formally stated in court. Accused persons were required to answer directly.  The role of churchwardens in bringing the accusation showed their function in enforcing moral conduct. They acted as agents of social discipline as well as parish administration.  The charge of lewdness showed that sexual conduct was subject to legal control. Moral offences could be prosecuted in a formal court.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b>  The use of a jury suggests that the case was considered serious enough to require broader judgement. This may reflect the public nature of the accusations and their impact on reputation.  The denial by both accused indicates that the outcome depended heavily on witness testimony. The earlier inquiry may not have been sufficient to establish guilt without formal trial.</p>
247	242	<p>Mary Orchard being sworne saith the same as she did in the Consultation Held on Tuesday the 26 day of Aprill last past  Ann the wife of Orlando Bagley senr being also sworne saith the very same as she did in the Consultation  Held on Tuesday the 26 day of Aprill last past  Elizth Long the wife of John Long being sworne saith the same as she hath in the Consultation Held on Tuesday the 26 day of Aprill last past  John Field serj being sworne saith the same as he did in the Consultation Held on Tuesday the 26 day of Aprill last past  Thomas Earles being sworne saith the same as he hath in the Consultation Held on Tuesday the 26 day of Aprill last past  also the Deposition of Martha Oliver was Read in Court to the Jury, who finde her former Deposition was taken, as appeares in the aforesaid Consultation, hath bin  [...]  Then the Jury withdrew and stayed about halfe an houre then Returned and Delivered their Verdict as followeth  That the said Thomas Swallow and Mary Bagley the wife of Orlando Bagley senr was Cleare of the Crimes wherewith they stand Charged, but admonished  to take great care of themselves more Especially then they have done formerly  Then Mercy Oliver a Black free woman was Called into Court, for that she hath bin lately Delivered of a Bastard, and after Examined who was the father of her Child, the said Leavance a black man of Tho: Ellers was, In whose house She Liveth now, and hath for Severall yeares  <b>Margin Notes:</b>  Swallow Tho and Mary Bagley found Cleare of the Crime laid to their Charge</p>	<p>Mary Orchard was sworn and repeated the same evidence she had given on 26 April 1699.  Anne, wife of Orlando Bagley senior, was sworn and repeated her earlier testimony from the same date.  Elizabeth Long, wife of John Long, gave the same account as before.  John Field, a sergeant, confirmed his earlier statement.  Thomas Earle also repeated the evidence he had given at the earlier hearing.  The written deposition of Martha Oliver was read aloud to the jury. It was accepted as properly taken at the earlier consultation.  The jury withdrew for about half an hour. They then returned with their verdict.  Thomas Swallow and Mary Bagley were found not guilty of the charge. They were warned to conduct themselves more carefully in future.  Mercy Oliver, a free Black woman, was then brought before the court. She had recently given birth to a child out of wedlock. When questioned, she named Leavance, a Black man belonging to Thomas Earle, as the father. She stated that she lived in his house and had done so for several years.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b>  The repetition of earlier testimony showed that prior depositions could be reused in court. This allowed continuity between preliminary inquiry and formal trial.  The reading of Martha Oliver's statement showed that written evidence could stand in place of live testimony when already recorded.  The jury's verdict showed that proof was not considered sufficient to convict. Acquittal required more than suspicion or repeated allegation.  The warning given after acquittal showed that behaviour could still be regulated even without conviction. Moral oversight extended beyond strict legal guilt.  The examination of Mercy Oliver showed that childbirth outside marriage triggered official inquiry.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			<p>The court sought to identify the father for purposes of responsibility.</p> <p>The identification of the father showed that liability for a child could be assigned. Responsibility for maintenance could follow from such identification.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The acquittal despite repeated testimony suggests that the evidence may have been seen as indirect or uncertain. The jury may have required clearer proof of the alleged act.</p> <p>The immediate questioning of Mercy Oliver suggests that such cases were handled routinely. The court likely aimed to assign responsibility quickly to prevent the child becoming a burden on the parish.</p>
<a href="#">248</a>	243	<p>It is ordered That the said Mercy Oliver should Immediately Receive on her Naked Body under the Gallows 31 Lashes, which was accordingly Executed Katherine Tuesdale Widdow Presented to us the last will and Testament of her dece'd Husband Tho: Tuesdale late of the said Island free planter, In order of having same approved, which was accordingly done by the oath of Thomas ashby, Thomas Fisher and Robert Addis, who being made oath that the Will now produced was the said Thomas Tuesdales last will and Testament, and that they knew of none other by him made either in word or writing It is ordered That the said dece'd Thomas Tuesdales last Will and Testament be now Examined and approved, and a Copy given thereof when Desired Tho: Bright Tho: Goodwin <b>Margin Notes:</b> Oliver Mary To whipt for having a Bastard Tuesdale Thomas His last will to be approved</p>	<p>Mercy Oliver was punished at once. She was taken to the gallows and received thirty-one lashes on her bare body.</p> <p>Katherine Tuesdale, a widow, then presented the last will of her late husband, Thomas Tuesdale, a free planter of the island. The will was examined.</p> <p>Thomas Ashby, Thomas Fisher and Robert Addis were sworn. They confirmed that the document presented was Thomas Tuesdale's final will and that no other will had been made by him, either spoken or written.</p> <p>The will was accepted as valid. A copy was to be provided when requested.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The punishment of Mercy Oliver showed that childbirth outside marriage could be treated as an offence. Corporal punishment enforced moral discipline.</p> <p>The location of the punishment at the gallows showed its public nature. The act was intended to deter others through visibility.</p> <p>The presentation and confirmation of the will showed a formal process of probate. Witnesses were required to verify authenticity before approval.</p> <p>The statement that no other will existed showed the need to prevent competing claims. Certainty over the final document was essential for distribution of property.</p> <p>The provision of copies showed that legal documents could be reproduced for use. This allowed parties to rely on written proof in future disputes.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The immediate execution of punishment suggests that the offence was treated as clear and undisputed. Delay was not considered necessary where the facts were established.</p> <p>The careful confirmation of the will suggests concern over inheritance disputes. Formal validation may have been intended to prevent later challenges to the estate.</p>
<a href="#">249</a>	244	<p>Island St Helena Att a Consultation Held on Wens day the 5th Day of July 1699 Att Fort James Prs: Steph: Poirier Governor Capt Tho: Bright Deputy Gov: Tho: Goodwin Ensign Whereas on the 27th Day of June last past Mrs Eleanor Beale widow Petitioned us that we would be pleased to Grant her a Letter of Administration, that she might accordingly Administer on her Dece'd Husbands Estate (Capt Anthony Beales Estate) which she would have done before that time, had it not bin for Severall Allegations she hath bin under It is ordered</p>	<p>A consultation was held on Wednesday 5 July 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as ensign.</p> <p>Eleanor Beale, a widow, had earlier petitioned on 27 June 1699 for authority to manage the estate of her late husband, Captain Anthony Beale. She had delayed making this request because of several allegations made against her.</p> <p>Her request was granted. She received formal authority to administer her husband's estate. This authority was issued under the seal of the Honourable East India Company and signed by the Governor and Council. The wording of the document followed.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The grant of administration showed that control of a deceased person's estate required official approval. Widows did not act automatically but needed formal authority.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>That the said Mrs Eleanor Beale widdow have a Letter of Administration Granted her under the Rt Honble Company Seale, signed by Governor and Councill, which Letter of Adm: hereafter followeth in haec verba Island St Helena Wee the Governor and Council of the said Island, on behalf of the Rt Honble English East India Compy: as Absolute Lords &amp; Prop: of the said Island To all Eleanor Beale Greeting Administration <b>Margin Notes:</b> Letter of Administration granted to Mrs Eleanor Beale widdow</p>	<p>The use of a sealed document showed that legal power depended on written instruments. The Company's seal confirmed its validity.</p> <p>The reference to earlier allegations showed that character and conduct could affect access to authority. Approval was given only after consideration of these concerns.</p> <p>The role of the Governor and Council acting for the Company showed that ultimate control of estates rested with Company authority.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The delay caused by allegations suggests that there may have been doubts about Eleanor Beale's suitability. Granting the administration despite this suggests that no sufficient objection remained.</p> <p>The formal wording and sealing of the document suggest concern over proper management of the estate. This may have been intended to prevent disputes or misuse of property.</p>
<a href="#">250</a>	245	<p>Administration of all and singular the Goods and Chattels Rights and Debts which were the said Cap<sup>t</sup> Anthony Beale dec<sup>d</sup> who died Intestate, as is affirmed att the time of his death, and since within the Jurisdictions of the said Rt Honble Lords Prop<sup>rs</sup> of the said Island To you we do Committ, and you we doe make ordaine and appoynt by these presents Administratrix of the said goods and chattels primises (charging you by the oath taken in this behalfe, that a true full and perfect Inventory you make of all and singular the goods and chattels of the said Deced Cap<sup>t</sup> Anthony Beale late Husband, that is or may be found on the said Island on or before the 30th day of this Instant July 1699 and all debts of the said Island in which he was any wayes obliged at the time of his Death, you well and truly pay, and receive all such debts as were owing him as aforesaid, as the law will charge you, And that you Deliver a just Accompt of your Administration here unto us when you shall be thereunto called, and that we you save harmless for ever against all persons by Reason of yo<sup>r</sup> Administration, In Testimony whereof we have caused the said Rt Honble Company Seale of the said Island of St Helena to be hereunto these presents affixed this 27th Day of June 1699 John Long and James Rider both of the said Island free planters were chosen and appointed to be the Two sworn that should appraise and value the abovesaid Deced Cap<sup>t</sup> Anthony Beales Estate, and was accordingly sworn to make a true faithfull and Intire Inventory of the said Anthony Beales Estate, to the best of their knowledge. <b>Margin Notes:</b> Mem<sup>o</sup> Beales Law of Administr<sup>o</sup></p>	<p>Full authority was given to Eleanor Beale over all goods, chattels, rights and debts that belonged to her late husband, Captain Anthony Beale, who died without a will.</p> <p>She was formally appointed as administratrix of the estate. She was required to take an oath and produce a complete inventory of all property belonging to the estate on the island by 30 July 1699.</p> <p>She was required to pay all debts owed by her husband at the time of his death. She was also required to collect all debts owed to him.</p> <p>She was bound to present a full account of her management when called upon. She was also required to indemnify the authorities against any claims arising from her administration.</p> <p>The document was sealed with the Company's seal on 27 June 1699.</p> <p>John Long and James Rider, both free planters, were appointed to value the estate. They were sworn to produce a true and complete inventory based on their knowledge.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> The appointment of an administratrix showed that estates without a will were managed under official supervision. Authority was granted through formal legal process.</p> <p>The requirement to produce an inventory showed that all property had to be recorded before distribution. This ensured transparency and control.</p> <p>The duty to pay debts and collect dues showed that the estate was treated as a financial unit. Obligations and assets were settled through administration.</p> <p>The requirement to indemnify the authorities showed that the administratrix bore responsibility for her actions. The Company was protected from liability.</p> <p>The appointment of sworn appraisers showed that valuation was carried out by trusted members of the community. This ensured that the estate was assessed fairly.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The strict requirements suggest concern over mismanagement of estates. The authorities may have aimed to prevent loss or concealment of assets.</p> <p>The use of local planters as appraisers suggests reliance on community knowledge. This may have been necessary where formal valuation systems were limited.</p>
<a href="#">251</a>	246	<p>Whereas In the Consultation Held the 29<sup>th</sup> day of June last past John Hevetson made Complaint to us of Jonathan Midge and Richard Ray sod<sup>d</sup> abusing him, as by the said Consultation doth more largely appeare</p>	<p>The earlier complaint made on 29 June 1699 was taken up again.</p> <p>John Hevetson, a soldier, was sworn. He stated clearly that Jonathan Midge pulled him by the legs from his bed while he slept in the long gallery. He said he was</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>The said John Hevetson sod<sup>d</sup> being Sworne saith positively that it was Jon<sup>a</sup> Midge that pulled him by his legs from off his bed, when he Lay in the Long Gallary asleepe, at which time he Rec<sup>d</sup> severall stripes by Frazer and Splinkers on his back, but cannot sweare the sd Rich<sup>d</sup></p> <p>Ray pulled him also, but doth think twas he; Wherefore It is ordered</p> <p>That the said Jon<sup>a</sup> Midge Ride the wooden horse one houre att the Discretion of the Guard, with admonition not to molest the sd Hevetson any more, and that the said Hevetson being uncertaine whether Richard Ray that was the other yt pulled him also, that he be Dismiss<sup>d</sup> accordingly</p> <p>Sam: Wrangham made Complaint to the Gov<sup>r</sup> and Councill That Charles Steward sod<sup>d</sup> have stabled him with a knife, the night before had he bin not prevented by some men that stood by them, and was only soe because he would have prevented the sd Charles Steward from fighting, being then</p> <p>In a very quarrellsom humour, whereupon the said Charles Steward was Immediately sent for and Examined about this matter, who saith he was somewhat in drink or else would not have done what he did, in abusing the sd Wrangham, and he not offered any such thing, but that the sd Wrangham and two or three more was upon him, which caused him to be [...] in such a desperate humour</p> <p>Wherefore</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Midge Jon<sup>a</sup> Punished and Ray quitt<sup>d</sup></p>	<p>injured on his back by nails and splinters during the incident. He said he believed Richard Ray was also involved, but could not swear this with certainty.</p> <p>Jonathan Midge was punished. He was made to sit on the wooden horse for one hour, under the control of the guard. He was warned not to trouble Hevetson again.</p> <p>Richard Ray was released, as no certain evidence was given against him.</p> <p>Samuel Wrangham then brought a complaint. He stated that Charles Steward, a soldier, had tried to stab him with a knife the previous night. This had been prevented by others present. He said the attack occurred because he tried to stop Steward from fighting while he was in a quarrelsome state.</p> <p>Charles Steward was brought in and examined. He admitted that he had been drinking and said he would not have acted as he did if sober. He denied attempting to stab Wrangham. He claimed that Wrangham and others had come against him, which caused him to lose control.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The punishment of Midge showed use of military discipline. The wooden horse was a standard physical penalty used to enforce order among soldiers.</p> <p>The release of Ray showed that judgement depended on certainty of proof. Suspicion alone did not lead to punishment.</p> <p>The warning given to Midge showed that discipline combined punishment with instruction. Future conduct was explicitly regulated.</p> <p>The complaint by Wrangham showed that threats of violence, even if not carried out, were treated seriously.</p> <p>The admission of drunkenness showed that intoxication was recognised as a factor in misconduct. It did not excuse behaviour but explained it.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The use of the wooden horse suggests an intention to punish publicly without causing lasting injury. This may have been aimed at maintaining discipline while avoiding severe harm.</p> <p>The conflicting accounts in Steward's case suggest that group conflict may have escalated quickly. Alcohol may have played a key role in turning a dispute into a near act of violence.</p>
252	247	<p>Wherefore It was ordered</p> <p>That the said Charles Steward should be Immediately committed to prison, or Else give sufficient security to be of the good behaviour untill the next Quarter Sessions, who Immediately gave bond to be of the good behaviour, which was accepted of</p> <p>Island St Helena</p> <p>Att a Consultation Held on Thursday the 6th Day of July 1699 att Fort James</p> <p>Prs:</p> <p>Steph: Poirier Gov<sup>r</sup></p> <p>Capt: Bright Deputy Gov<sup>r</sup></p> <p>Thomas Goodwin Ensign</p> <p>Whereas Peter a Slave of Mary Bowman wid<sup>o</sup> was sent downe to the fort by his Mistris the said Mary Bowman for that the said servant had absented himself from her said Mistris about three or four dayes, when by her he sent to the fort to fetch some things from her fort house, and had at the same time broke open a Chest and stole from thence one peice of silk, wch was in her house belonging unto John Harris sod<sup>d</sup>,</p>	<p>Charles Steward was required to secure his conduct. He avoided imprisonment by giving a bond for good behaviour until the next Quarter Sessions. This was accepted.</p> <p>A consultation was held on Thursday 6 July 1699 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier served as Governor. Thomas Bright served as deputy governor. Thomas Goodwin served as ensign.</p> <p>Peter, a slave belonging to Mary Bowman, was brought to the fort. His mistress reported that he had been absent for three or four days. During that time, he had broken open a chest in her house and taken a piece of silk belonging to John Harris, a soldier.</p> <p>Peter was examined. He said his mistress had sent him from the country to the fort to fetch salt. On his way back, he met Thomas [...], a soldier, at a place called Birtch, the upper house in the fort. Thomas asked what he carried. Peter said he had salt and a bottle of arrack.</p> <p>They spoke further. Thomas asked him to get sugar so they could make punch. Peter agreed. They made a bottle of punch and drank it together.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The requirement for a bond in Steward's case showed that behaviour could be controlled through financial obligation rather than imprisonment. Surety acted as a guarantee of future conduct.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>whose Examination is as followeth The said Peter being Examined saith that his Mistris sent him out of the Country to the fort for to fetch some salt for her, who being going up into the Country againe by the way met one Birch which is the upper house in the fort called there was Thomas [...] sod<sup>d</sup> who asked him what he had in his bag, to whom answered some salt, and a bottle of Arrack, and having some further discourse, asked the said Peter if he would finde sugar to make a bowl of punch, who did so they made a bottle of punch of it, and Drank it up between them, after the punch was all drank the said</p> <p><b>Margin Notes:</b> Steward he [...] gave security for his good behaviour</p>	<p>The complaint against Peter showed that absence without permission and theft were treated as serious offences for slaves.</p> <p>The breaking open of a chest showed that property within a household was protected under law. Theft of goods belonging to another person, even within the same house, was actionable.</p> <p>The examination of Peter showed that slaves were questioned directly. Their statements were used to establish events and assign responsibility.</p> <p>The involvement of a soldier in the incident showed interaction between slaves and soldiers. Such contact could lead to disorder, especially where drink was involved.</p> <p>The reference to arrack and punch showed the presence of alcohol in daily life. Drinking was linked to loss of discipline and misconduct.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b> The sharing of drink suggests that the theft may not have been planned but followed opportunity. Alcohol may have lowered restraint and led to further wrongdoing.</p> <p>The presence of a soldier in the incident suggests that authority figures were not always separate from disorder. This may have complicated enforcement of discipline.</p>
253	248	<p>When he went out of the house, and left him In the house, and bid him stay there while he came back againe, who did so, and when the said Fisher came back againe, he brought with him Jona<sup>d</sup> Mudge and Stephen Kidd, so a little after he and Thomas Fisher playd att Cards for halfe a Dollar in money, and that Peter had one Dollar of him to goe purchase a Bottle of Punch, w<sup>ch</sup> they had, and after it was out, he was very Drunk, In so much that the said Fisher tooke out of his Pocket one Dollar more, whereupon Peter and asked the sd Fisher for his money, but would not give him againe, so would have come and complained to the Gov<sup>t</sup> but Jona<sup>d</sup> Mudge hindred him, and through his perswasion did not, and about an houre after he fell asleep behinde the House, who George Hoskison seeing awaked him and bid him go and give him his Hammock which was in his Mistris house, who accordingly did, and the said Hoskison gave him Two p<sup>c</sup> of blew Cloth to carry up in the Country for him, and after he had the same he went to his Mistris house againe, and broke open a Chest which was in the house and tooke from thence one peice of Silke which he carryed with him, Intending then to goe up in the Country, but Jona- than Higham sod<sup>d</sup> and Jacob Miller being In the said widd<sup>o</sup> Rogers house, where he had bin a little before, with the said Fisher and someothers, The said Higham asked him whose peice of Silke that was he had, he told him his, and asked the said Higham if he would buy it, who said yes, and said what will you have for it, he Replyed Two Dollars,</p>	<p>Peter continued his account.</p> <p>After leaving the house, Thomas Fisher told him to stay there and went out. When Fisher returned, he brought Jonathan Mudge and Stephen Kidd. Soon after, Peter and Thomas Fisher played cards for half a dollar. Peter then had one dollar and used it to buy a bottle of punch, which they drank together.</p> <p>After the drink was gone, Peter became very drunk. Thomas Fisher then took another dollar from Peter's pocket. Peter asked for the money back, but Fisher refused. Peter said he wanted to complain to the Governor, but Jonathan Mudge persuaded him not to.</p> <p>About an hour later, Peter fell asleep behind the house. George Hoskinson found him and woke him, asking him to fetch his hammock from his mistress's house. Peter did so. Hoskinson then gave him two pieces of blue cloth to carry back to the country.</p> <p>Peter returned again to his mistress's house. He broke open a chest and took a piece of silk belonging to John Harris. He then left with the intention of going back to the country.</p> <p>At the house of Sarah Rogers, a widow, he met Jonathan Higham and Jacob Miller. Higham asked him whose silk it was. Peter said it was his own and offered to sell it. They agreed on a price of two dollars. Peter received part payment in the form of punch and was to receive the remaining nine shillings later.</p> <p>Peter added that when he was drunk, Higham took back a pair of stockings that Peter had bought from him. Higham then gave him half a dollar in money.</p> <p>Jacob Miller was sworn. He said that he had come down from the country and passed by Sarah Rogers's house. Jonathan Higham called him in. He saw Thomas Fisher there. Shortly after, Peter arrived. Miller saw Peter take a dollar from his own pocket and place it on the table. He then saw Peter and Thomas Fisher play cards.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b> Peter's account showed a sequence of drinking, gambling and theft. Alcohol played a central role in weakening control and leading to further offences.</p> <p>The use of cards and money showed informal gambling among soldiers and slaves. This activity contributed to disorder and dispute.</p> <p>The breaking open of the chest showed clear intent to steal. Property within the household was legally protected, even from those living or working there.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>so they agreed upon the price, and Rec<sup>d</sup> one halfe Dollar bottle of Punch in part of payment, which the said Higham Receiv<sup>d</sup> of him Just before for a paire of stockings, and was to have the Remainder which was Nine shillings on the Sunday after further saith that when he was Drunk the said Higham tooke from him the paire of stockings, which he had bought of him, so paid him halfe a Dollar of his owne money Jacob Miller being Sworne saith that he being come downe into the fort valley out of the Country, and as he was a coming by the house of Sarah Rogers widd<sup>o</sup> Jona<sup>l</sup> Higham being there called him into the house, and when he came in, saw Thomas Fisher being somewhere there, and a little after he saw Mrs Bowman Peter coming also there and a little after he had bin in the house the sd Peter tooke out of his owne pocket one Dollar, and laid it upon the table, and Thomas Fisher [...] sd Peter playd att Cards</p>	<p>The attempted sale of the silk showed that stolen goods could be quickly exchanged within the local community. Transactions took place informally and without verification of ownership.</p> <p>The part payment in drink showed that goods and money could be mixed in exchange. Value was not always settled in coin.</p> <p>The involvement of several individuals showed how misconduct spread through groups. Responsibility extended beyond the initial act.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The sequence suggests that intoxication created the conditions for theft. Peter's actions appear to have followed loss of money and judgement rather than a planned act.</p> <p>The willingness of Higham to buy the silk suggests that he may have suspected its origin. The informal nature of the transaction indicates a tolerance of doubtful goods within such settings.</p>
254	249	<p>for money and in playing the said Fisher cheated the said Peter out of his Dollar, and halfe a Dollar thereof, the said Fisher sent for a bowle of Punch by him, who went and fetched the said punch for Margery Hayes who hath no Lycence for Retailing of such Liquors and when he carried the said Punch into the house to the said Hayes and the said Peter so they all drank together, then in the drinking of the said Punch in James Wilson, Stephen Kidd, and Jon<sup>a</sup> Mudge, who all drank of the said Punch, and a little after the said Peter Running downe towards the fort, which said Mudge seeing runn after him and brought him back againe, further saith that John Higham gave him a peice of new Stocking, to sell and get a bowle of punch for them, or otherwise to his said Master but could not get any, and the said Peter being then the said Higham said hee give you halfe a Dollar money for the stocking and presently thereupon a Dollar given to him on the table, which said Higham Receiv<sup>d</sup> and Delivered him the said Peter stocking, and immediately after the said Higham gave this Depon<sup>t</sup> the same Dollar to fetch a bottle of Punch, who did so from the said Margery Hayes, and in the meane time he was gone for the Punch the said Peter sold the said Higham a peice of silk for two Dollars, and paid him halfe a Dollar in punch in part of payment, and was to have on Sunday after to his house for the Remainder of the payment Margery Hayes being Examined saith she cant deny but that she she sold Jacob Miller two bowles of Punch, and further saith that she had done making a bottle of punch for the said Midge</p>	<p>Jacob Miller stated under oath that Thomas Fisher cheated Peter of one dollar and half a dollar while they played cards.</p> <p>Fisher then sent Peter to fetch a bowl of punch. Peter obtained it from Margery Hayes, who did not hold a licence to sell drink. Peter returned with the punch, and Fisher, James Wilson, Stephen Kidd and Jonathan Mudge all drank from it.</p> <p>Peter then ran down towards the fort. Jonathan Mudge followed him and brought him back.</p> <p>Miller added that Jonathan Higham gave him a piece of new stocking to sell in order to obtain punch. When no buyer was found, Higham gave him half a dollar for it. A dollar was then placed on the table, which Higham received before returning the stocking to Peter. Higham then gave Miller the same dollar to fetch more punch from Margery Hayes.</p> <p>While Miller was away, Peter sold the piece of silk to Higham for two dollars. He received part payment in punch, with the remainder to be paid on the following Sunday.</p> <p>Margery Hayes was examined. She admitted that she sold Jacob Miller two bowls of punch. She also confirmed that she had prepared a bottle of punch for Jonathan Mudge. She said that Peter came into her house and tried to take the punch, claiming it was his because he had been cheated of one and a half dollars, though he did not name who had cheated him. He then left again with Miller.</p> <p>James Wilson was sworn. He said he was on guard duty with Stephen Kidd and Jonathan Mudge and went to Sarah Rogers's house, where Thomas Fisher was present. He saw Peter playing cards for money and saw a dollar on the table. He clearly saw Fisher cheat Peter out of that money.</p> <p>Wilson said Fisher later gave Peter a piece of silk, and Miller took it to obtain a bottle of punch. While Miller was gone, Peter followed him to Hayes's house. Wilson later went to look for them and heard Peter complain that he had lost one and a half dollars at cards.</p> <p>When they returned with the punch, Peter protested that they had taken his money and were drinking his punch. He was already drunk and could not be calmed.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>the said Peter came into her house and would have that punch from the said Jacob Miller, saying tis mine for they have cheated me of 1½ Dollars, but named nobody, but went away againe with the said Miller James Wilson being Sworne saith he being upon the Guard guarding work up the valley with Stephen Kidd and Jon<sup>a</sup> Mudge to the house of Sarah Rogers, where was Thomas Fisher, and he saw Peter staying att Cards for money, and saw a Dollar lye on the Table, but before they had bin long in the house, the said Fisher got the Dollar from the said Peter by cheating him at Cards, which he saw very plainly and afterwards after the said Fisher gave to the said Peter a piece of silke which Jacob Miller fetched a bottle of punch for it, and while the punch was gone for, the said Peter went after the said Miller to Margery Hayes, and they staying some time long before they came this Depon<sup>t</sup> went to seek them, and heard the said Peter complaine to the said Margery Hayes that he had on cards lost 1½ Dollars to her and Jacob Miller for him long time but now when they came with the said bowle of Punch, and the said Peter in the said Hayes house, but when the Punch was almost out the said Peter came to them, and said what do you cheat me of my money and drink my Punch too, and there being a little Punch remaining in the bottle, the said Peter drank to the said Peter, but he would not keepe him being in the humour of drinke, so Fisher bid him</p>	<p>The evidence showed that cheating at cards was recognised as misconduct. Gambling disputes could lead to wider disorder.</p> <p>The sale of drink without licence showed breach of regulation. Control of alcohol was formally enforced, even if widely ignored in practice.</p> <p>The repeated exchange of goods for drink showed a mixed economy. Money, goods and alcohol were used together as payment.</p> <p>The sale of stolen silk showed that illicit goods could enter local trade quickly. Buyers did not always verify ownership.</p> <p>The involvement of soldiers in gambling and drinking showed weak discipline within the garrison. Authority figures participated in the same disorder they were meant to control.</p> <p>The statements taken under oath showed reliance on witness testimony. Multiple accounts were used to establish a consistent narrative.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The repeated cheating and drinking suggest that the group exploited Peter's condition once he became intoxicated. His loss of control may have made him an easy target.</p> <p>The acceptance of stolen silk as payment suggests that some participants prioritised immediate gain over risk. This may indicate a tolerance of minor theft within informal exchanges.</p>
255	250	<p>[...] who said he would now see the accompt in the [...] and after some words passed between him and the said Fisher [...]</p> <p>[...] the said Fisher Dogg, and gave the said Fisher [...] and a halfe, upon which the said Fisher struck him [...] severall blowes, Immediately after the said Peter went downe towards the fort saying he would complaine to the Governour that the said Fisher had Cheated and Robbed him of his money, but which the said Fisher being runn after him and brought him Back againe Upon Mature Consideration It is ORDERED Viz<sup>t</sup> That the said Thomas Fisher be fined for Dealing with a slave the summe of foure Dollars to the said Slave Mistress viz<sup>t</sup> Mary Bowmans, and pay ½ of the Charges That the aforesaid Jon<sup>a</sup> Higham be fined the summe of Two Dollars to the Hon<sup>bl</sup> Company for Bartering with the said Peter, mary Bowmans Slave, and pay ½ of the Charges That Stephen Kidd, and Jon<sup>a</sup> Mudge be fined to pay to the Church the summe of one Dollar each for Drinking in Company with the said Kidd and Peter</p>	<p>After further argument, Peter struck Thomas Fisher's dog and paid him one and a half dollars. Fisher then struck Peter several times. Peter tried to go to the fort to complain that Fisher had cheated and robbed him, but Fisher ran after him and forced him back.</p> <p>The matter was then decided.</p> <p>Thomas Fisher was fined four dollars for dealing with a slave. The money was to be paid to Mary Bowman, the slave's mistress. He was also required to pay one third of the costs.</p> <p>Jonathan Higham was fined two dollars for trading with Peter. This sum was paid to the Honourable Company. He was also required to pay one third of the costs.</p> <p>Stephen Kidd and Jonathan Mudge were each fined one dollar, to be paid to the church, for drinking in company with the slave.</p> <p>Peter was taken to the flagstaff and whipped on his bare body. The punishment was carried out at once.</p> <p>Margery Hayes was fined forty shillings for selling punch without a licence. This fine was paid to the Honourable Company.</p> <p>The record of these proceedings was copied and sent to the Honourable Company, covering the period from 1 June to 6 July 1699.</p> <p><b>Interpretations</b></p> <p>The fines imposed on Fisher and Higham showed that interaction with slaves was regulated. Trading or dealing with a slave without proper authority was punishable.</p>

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		<p>That the said Peter be Immediately whipt on his Naked body  at the flag Staffe, which was accordingly Executed  And lastly that the beforementioned Margery Hayes be  fined to the Hon<sup>bl</sup> Company for Retailing Punch  without  a Lycence the summe of forty shillings  Tho: Corwin  Tho: Goodwin  This Booke hath also been Copied over  and sent to the Rt Hon<sup>bl</sup> Company  from the 1<sup>st</sup> day of June to this 6<sup>th</sup> day of July 1699  (Councell met and sent to the Hon<sup>bl</sup> Company  for the good this Thomas Cook and by Command of  who then sailed from St Helena in y<sup>e</sup> [...]  Isaac ff Alexander</p>	<p>The payment of Fisher's fine to Mary Bowman showed that compensation was directed to the slave's owner. The offence was treated as damage to property and authority.</p> <p>The fines to the Company and the church showed that penalties were distributed between institutional bodies. Revenue from offences supported both governance and parish functions.</p> <p>The punishment of Peter showed that slaves were subject to immediate corporal discipline. His theft and disorder were punished despite the role of others in the events.</p> <p>The fine on Margery Hayes showed enforcement of licensing rules. The sale of alcohol was controlled as part of maintaining order.</p> <p>The division of costs among offenders showed that legal expenses were shared according to involvement. This reinforced accountability.</p> <p>The copying and transmission of records to the Company showed oversight from England. Local governance was subject to review by central authority.</p> <p><b>Speculations</b></p> <p>The unequal treatment of Peter and the others suggests that status shaped punishment. As a slave, he received physical punishment, while others paid fines.</p> <p>The focus on punishing unlicensed drinking and interaction with slaves suggests concern over disorder at the fort. The authorities may have aimed to limit situations where discipline broke down.</p>
<a href="#">256</a>	251	Blank apart from letter scrolls	
<a href="#">257</a>	252	Blank page	
<a href="#">258</a>	253	Book cover	
<a href="#">259</a>	254	<p>Document Name and Date: St Helena Records 1990-1699  Dimensions (height x width x depth) (cm): 38cm(H) x 25cm(W) x 35cm(D)  No. written pages: 251  No. blank pages: 1  Spine and cover: Good Conditional  Inside pages: Tattered pages, frayed inside edges, Insect boring and occasional foxing  Additional comments: [blank section]  Time taken to photograph (hours): 4.5</p>	