

St Helena Records 1703-1704

Introduction: This is the seventh volume in the series 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/EAP1364-1-1-7>.

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: A few page edges are tattered with loss of text.

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: The page numbering begins with film No. 21 (designated at 21/1). The page numbering later jumps back from 19 to 18, the sequence running as 38/18, 39/19, 40/18, 41/19 and so forth through to the end of the volume. The end note that the "numbering jumps from 120–127" is mistaken – no break in the page numbering occurs at that point.

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). The earliest date recorded in this volume is 4 May 1703 and the last date is 27 February 1704/5 (1705 in the modern calendar).

The Council meetings were all held during the administration of Captain Stephen Poirier (1697-1707).

AI Generated Summary

The records of St Helena that survive from the closing years of the seventeenth century and the opening years of the eighteenth show a small Atlantic outpost held by the Right Honourable Governor and Company of Merchants of London Trading to the East Indies under royal charter, governed simultaneously as a fortified victualling station on the route between India and Europe and as a settler colony in miniature. Two distinct phases of record emerge. Revenue ledgers preserve the half-yearly accounts of duties, rents, slave receipts, fines, licences and accidental receipts collected between June 1691 and February 1693, after which the surviving sequence falls silent for several years. The volumes resume in earnest in April 1703 under Governor Stephen Poirier, who arrived as a French Protestant refugee in English Company service, and the entries run densely through to the early months of 1705. The materials cannot be read uncritically. They are the working papers of the island's executive, and the picture they offer of order, defence and discipline reflects the priorities of those who kept the books rather than any neutral observation of life on the rock. [Film No. 9-19, 16, 21, 97, 151]

Governance and administration

Authority on the island rested formally with the East India Company as Lords Proprietors, exercised locally through the Governor, the Deputy Governor and a small Council of three or four members. By 1703 the standing council comprised Stephen Poirier as Governor, Thomas Goodwin as Deputy Governor or Ensign, and John Field as Ensign or third in council, with the clerk John Alexander preparing the books. The composition altered through the period. Cornelius Sodington joined as Deputy Governor on 14 August 1703 with a particular charge as Deputy Treasurer and supervisor of customs, and Goodwin slipped to third position before reappearing as Captain or Ensign through 1704. Daniel Griffith, having arrived on the *Anna* with some knowledge of law, was admitted as Clerk of the Council on 26 September 1704 after John Alexander was dismissed in disgrace, and Samuel Griffith later took the same office and swore the oath of allegiance and fidelity. The fluidity of titles, with Sodington appearing variously as Captain, Lieutenant, Deputy and Colonel within a few months, points either to genuine promotions or to inconsistent recording rather than to any settled hierarchy. [Film No. 16, 21, 24, 44, 173, 183, 185, 190, 224, 227]

The Council Book itself was an improvised volume. A note explained that the same bound book was used as a council register because no other was available, and the entries had begun in a revenue ledger pressed into service for want of a proper minute book. The shortage tells its own story about the supply of dedicated administrative materials to a distant outpost, and the speed with which the council nonetheless began entering business shows that formal record-keeping was treated as too important to defer. The damage Cornelius Sodington later did to that record, by tearing leaves out of the foul council book to remove the Governor's declaration against him, was understood by all parties as a violation of public trust rather than a private liberty. Witnesses were sworn afresh to reconstruct the lost affidavits from memory, and John Alexander's protest that no precedent existed for such an act marked a moment when the integrity of the written archive itself became the matter at stake. [Film No. 20, 62, 63, 71]

The dispute between Poirier and Sodington dominated the surviving records of late 1703 and 1704 and provides the clearest evidence of how the island's governance actually worked. Sodington was charged with disorder and seditious words after the alarm of five ships on 20 September 1703, with refusing the Governor's written order to march to Prosperous Bay, with imprisoning Sergeant Dixon and the elderly Karlslake, and with assaults on a corporal at the sally port. Sodington, in turn, accused the Governor of arbitrary power, of denying him provisions, and of allowing Madame Poirier and Nurse Easthope to act as a private intelligence channel out of the fort. The Council suspended Sodington on 18 May 1704 under Company orders dated 17 February 1703 and reinstated him on 20 June 1704, the bare condition being that he should henceforth behave soberly, prudently and in the fear of God. The speed of the reinstatement, against extensive sworn testimony of his violence to soldiers, women and a chaplain, suggests that the Council valued his military office above the quality of his conduct in it. [Film No. 46, 56, 60, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 146, 147, 164]

Both senior officers treated the consultation record as a vehicle for appeal over their colleagues' heads to the Court of Managers in London. Sodington's protestation against the Governor and Goodwin, witnessed by John Alexander, George Carne and George Hodgkinson on 19 May 1704, attempted to invalidate every act of the Council taken without him. Kerr lodged a parallel appeal to the Crown and to the Bishop of London on the same day. The Governor responded in kind, building a long answer of 16 November 1703 and successive declarations that combined factual rebuttal with sarcasm, mockery of Sodington's claimed gentility, and pointed reminders of his own demonstrated improvements to the fort's double mortar walls. The records that survive are partly the product of this rolling forensic contest, with each side calling witnesses and entering depositions less to settle the immediate dispute than to ensure the Company directors received the fullest case for their own version. [Film No. 75, 76, 77, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151]

On the matter of punishment the Governor and his colleagues frequently disagreed. The cases of John Scriven and Thomas Dutton on 19 July 1704, and of the deserting sailors Wright, Oglethorpe and Markham, both produced majority orders in which Sodington and Goodwin voted to send the offenders abroad on the next ship to Bencoolen, while Poirier dissented on the ground that capital criminals should be remitted to England under the Indian factory precedents and that lenient transportation was an encouragement to the wicked on a small and impoverished island. The Governor's positions were entered in full in the council book even where outvoted, which suggests that his concern was as much to put his disagreements on record for review in London as to secure the immediate outcome. The internal dynamics of the Council were therefore not those of a unified executive but of three or four men in continuous formal disagreement, conducting their differences through a paper trail intended for absent superiors. [Film No. 169, 170, 172]

Military affairs and defence

On 29 August 1703 the consultation recorded that open war was now declared between England and France and Spain, beginning the involvement of St Helena in what would later be called the War of the Spanish Succession. Banks's Fort and Rupert's Fort were treated throughout the records as the key landing points away from Fort James, and the Council ordered double guards reinforced from amongst the soldiers, with John Alexander and William Reid commanding alternate nights at Banks's and Thomas Henderson and Steicord at Rupert's. The plan failed almost at once because the freemen would not, or could not, supply the soldiers with victuals for the extended duty, and the arrangement reverted to the pre-war pattern with workmen at Rupert's keeping single watch and inspection by an officer at Banks's, encouraged in each case by a bottle of brandy a night. The retreat from the wartime scheme reveals more about island provisioning than about discipline: the freeman class would not feed an enlarged garrison out of its own stocks, and the Company could not compel them to do so. [Film No. 46]

Routine garrison discipline was severe and visible. The wooden horse, sometimes ridden with a twelve-pound shot at each leg or with muskets tied to the legs, served as the standard corporal punishment for sentry offences. Robert Funiss, found asleep on the lower bridge after a friend gave him drams of arrack, was sentenced to ride the wooden horse on three relief days. Joseph Fort and John Sich, found to have replaced powder in their cartridge boxes with tobacco, were placed on the wooden horse for an hour with a musket at each leg, the lighter sentence reflecting their youth and clean record. William Bull the armourer, hidden on the St George frigate in an attempt to desert, was put to the wooden horse for refusing to work at his trade, the loss of a skilled man being treated as a serious aggravation. The repetition of the punishment

on relief days made it conspicuous to the rotating guard, deliberately tying penalty to the rhythms of duty. [Film No. 34, 36, 42]

The threat of a French descent shaped the way alarms were treated. On the night of 20 September 1703 Sodington claimed intelligence of ships about the island, demanded the keys of the fort, and pressed the Governor for permission to march at night to Rupert's with six musketeers. Poirier instead wrote and tried to seal a warrant directing him to Prosperous Bay, the place most suspected, which Sodington tore up before later threatening to fire a great gun himself. When the five ships were sighted the next day they showed English colours, but the false alarm exposed the practical fragility of command at moments of supposed danger. Stephen Child the gunner was struck on the shoulder with a sword by Sodington in a dispute over underfilled cartridges at Rupert's, and Jacob Miller the boatswain was abused at the landing rocks for not having the great boat ready, with Sodington declaring that if a Frenchman came he could take the island with forty men and would have the Governor cut to pieces. Whether or not these words were as recorded, they testify to the way wartime vulnerability was woven into the rhetoric of personal feud. [Film No. 64, 67, 68, 69, 72]

Edward Heath the free planter occupied a special place because he was indispensable to the Company's fortification programme. The Governor expressly recorded that no person on the island was so capable of doing such work, and on 22 August 1704 the Council granted him a hundred-pound mortgage at six per cent over eighteen months to enable him to purchase John Hemons's adjoining house, plantation and twenty acres before another buyer could acquire them. The episode reveals how the Company used credit to retain a key skilled planter and to ensure continuity in works on which the island's defence directly depended. The double mortar walls of Fort James, which Poirier described as twelve feet on the outer course and ten on the inner where formerly there had been only a sorry dry wall of six or seven feet, were the visible product of this programme and were repeatedly cited by the Governor as evidence of his prudent stewardship. [Film No. 75, 179, 180]

Discipline on the works themselves was uneven. On 12 October 1704 Christopher Roby and John Jones reported five workmen at Banks's and Rupert's, including Thomas Low who attempted to break open the magazine, all drunk. The Council issued differentiated fines: Burras, having left his ship and being poor, rode the wooden horse alone; Low paid for his attempt on the magazine in addition to the standard drunk fine, but his sober character was formally entered as mitigation. The pattern of these orders, as elsewhere in the records, illustrates a punishment regime that combined ostensibly fixed penalties with visible social discrimination by ability to pay and by reputation. The militia was a parallel concern. By the closing months of 1704 the Council found that several freemen were neglecting to repair to their posts on alarms despite repeated friendly admonishments at general muster, and a proclamation was issued imposing escalating fines of one dollar, then a dollar and a half, and so on without limit. [Film No. 190, 202]

Trade, shipping and Company commerce

The island's role as a node in the India-to-Europe route is plain in the entries of bales taken into Company stock from passing ships. From the *Semphorne* came one bale of bafta brown broad at 19s the piece, one bale of chint Bramp[ole] at 9s, and one bale of pautas at 5s, valued together at £234. From the *Diana* came three further bales of bafta and two of nealo's at 9s the piece, the latter transferred by order of William Price, late commander of the *Orange*, who had moved from sea command into a shore role on St Helena. Ginny bags and Sangaree bags, lower-grade Indian sacking, were tallied alongside at 14d each. The Company's books therefore absorbed three distinct kinds of value within a single balance: local plantation production, settler tax and rent, and trans-shipped Indian cotton. The valuations were Company tariff prices, not market prices, which suggests that the entries served accounting and stock control rather than any open commerce on the island itself. [Film No. 18, 19]

Drink emerged repeatedly as both economic asset and disciplinary problem. The Company's plantation distillery produced potato arrack as well as cane arrack, and 460 gallons valued at 4s the gallon were entered as receipts in kind for one period, with a further 686 gallons at the next entry. Half-yearly licences for selling punch and retailing strong liquors were granted at £2 for the period, generating £16 a half-year from a small group of named licensees. The arrival of the *Loyall Cook* in March 1703 set off a controversy when shipboard

buyers, led by Ripin Wills, paid 9s a gallon for the cargo and resold it at 11s 6d. A petition signed by twenty-eight named planters, headed by John Lemon and George Hodgson, asked the Council to fix a maximum of 6s a gallon, and a public advertisement of 17 April 1703 confirmed the rule with a £10 penalty divided between informer and the church or poor. The intervention shows the Council acting as economic regulator at the request of inhabitants, but it also discloses how easily a small group could capture a scarce import on first arrival. [Film No. 13, 17, 18, 24, 27]

The volume of shipping traffic surfaces in incidental references rather than in any single tabulation. Vessels named in the records include the *Semphorne*, *Diana*, *Orange*, *Whitworth*, *Anna*, *Albemarle*, *Loyall Cook*, *Sidney*, *Caesar*, *Lyampo*, *Polphester*, *Pratt*, *Featherstone*, *Kingfisher*, *Halifax*, *Frederick*, *Drumball*, *St George* frigate, *Nathaniell*, *Pieprid*, *Raper*, *Gloucester*, *Alexander Galley*, and the *Arabian Merchant*. The traffic was sufficiently dense that the bachelors' treat at Coulson's house in late 1703 brought together visiting officers, island women and local inhabitants in numbers that the Council found impossible to manage without imposing an eleven o'clock curfew on public houses, and the depositions of Mary Wills, Mary Cosgrave and Mary Field record how the same shipboard parties broke windows, threw stones and forced their way to back doors of houses up the valley. [Film No. 93, 95]

Settlement, land and agriculture

Land on the island fell into three broad classes: freeholds held by free planters, leases of Company land paid in rent, and waste land in Company hands that could be measured and let on warrant. The free planter was a propertied class of inhabitant whose status carried the right to vote in parish elections at the Easter Monday meeting and who alone could be nominated for churchwarden or overseer of the highways. Petitions for waste land leases were a constant feature of consultations through 1703 and 1704, granted on the surveyor's measurement, with rent commencing from the next 25 March, the Lady Day on which all orphan accounts were also made up. Names recur as the same petitioners returned for additional parcels - James Easthope, James Draper, Samuel DesFountaine, John Alexander, Edward Heath, William Marsh, Robert Marsh, Thomas Gargen and George Hoskison all appearing in successive sittings. The pattern suggests an active programme of bringing further land into measured cultivation, with the Council operating as both landlord and registrar of an emerging private estate map. [Film No. 21, 41, 86, 107, 110, 121]

The Company plantation, the central agricultural enterprise of the island, was managed under a reeve. Samuel DesFountaine held this role and on 5 October 1703 negotiated a reduction of his attendance to three days a week at £20 a year, while still being charged with the strict oversight of William Russ in plantation affairs. DesFountaine's other appearance in the records, on 17 September 1703 at the plantation house in dispute with Sodington over butter, lodging and Saturday absences to his own plantation, illustrates how the senior agricultural officer had to balance Company duty with private holdings of his own. The plantation produced potato arrack, cane arrack, yams, lemons, bananas and sugar, and supplied the garrison's Foot Table directly through revenues paid in kind. The cattle, the principal capital asset, stood at 360 head in September 1703, of which only about forty were judged fit to be killed, and at 106 head in June 1704. The decline reflects the strain placed on the herd by visiting fleets demanding fresh provisions despite Poirier's resistance. [Film No. 16, 55, 56, 80, 165]

Disputes between neighbours over straying livestock and damaged crops appear repeatedly. William Beale's hogs caused damage to his father-in-law's plantation, but the Council deferred judgment until Ripin Wills and John Pridge had viewed both the damage and the fence. The principle, made explicit in John Nicholls's later complaint of February 1705 against Mrs Wrangham's hogs, was that liability could only be established where the complainant's own fences met the statute. Such reciprocal obligations were a practical necessity in a settlement where wandering animals were endemic and where every household, free planter or widow, was expected to maintain enclosures or accept the consequences. The local landscape emerges in passing references to particular places: Curip's Hole and the Hone Corns old vineyard as boundary markers in the Bradley-Gurling diagonal land division, Sandy Bay as the location of multiple new leases, Coal Valley where John Cagnald built his house, Powell's Valley where Hone boiled salt, and the watercourse running through Fort James Valley. [Film No. 25, 31, 86, 107, 110, 225]

The bridge over the watercourse from town to fort, broken in a great flood, became the subject of an unexpected complaint when George Hoskison and the highway overseers accused James Easthope of having secretly sold the wreckage of the bridge for three dollars to Thomas Dixon, then churchwarden, without accounting to the country at whose charge it had been built. The case is small but revealing. Easthope swore that he had acted to prevent the timbers being washed away or stolen and had asked Dixon to give the country credit, which Dixon admitted but had then forgotten. The Council ordered the three dollars paid to the next churchwardens for the use of the church, and Dixon to bear the costs. Even broken public infrastructure was treated as community property whose disposal required formal account, and the parish officers served as the local custodians of such funds. [Film No. 25]

Supply and provisioning

On 11 October 1703 Captain William Beawes of the Albermarle and the other commanders then in the road, having read their orders from both Companies now happily united, asked to be supplied with fresh provisions because they had been ordered to remain longer than expected. Poirier's response shows the central tension between the island's two functions. Cattle were short, and the Council ordered Henry Coales the marshal to demand cattle in payment of debts owed to the Company in its store books, with certificates to be taken under each debtor's hand recording whether they could pay or not. The mechanism turned the Company's fiscal claims into a provisioning machine, but it also produced a written record of the island's true capacity to supply, intended for transmission to London. Poirier's care to document the limit of the herd reflects an awareness that future demands from the directors might press the island beyond its sustainable yield. [Film No. 55, 56]

The plantation distillery's role in supply, generating arrack at fixed valuations entered directly as Company stock, has already been noted, but the records also show non-distilled provisions moving into Company hands through the Foot Table. Revenue duties paid in kind in 1691 and again in 1693 went directly to the maintenance of the garrison mess. The Company therefore avoided cash purchase by allowing taxation and victualling to collapse into a single transaction, with planters discharging their dues in the same goods that shipping, the governor's table and the plantation required. The arrangement was efficient on a small island where coin was scarce, but it left the island's military readiness and the Governor's domestic establishment dependent on the willingness of planters to pay in usable provisions, a vulnerability exposed when the wartime guard scheme of 1703 collapsed for want of food. [Film No. 9, 16]

The supply of basic goods from Company-owned land was also strictly priced. When the Lemon Garden lease, formerly held by the widow Cotgrave, was auctioned to Paul Graton in February 1705 for twenty-one years at thirty pounds a year, the Council fixed the rates at which he must sell his produce: lemon juice at 2s 6d the gallon, lemons at 3s the hundred, banana bunches at 2s 6d, and the dry banana leaves were reserved to the Company for binding its grape vines. The arrangement combined competitive auction with rigid price controls, balancing the incentive of long tenure against the demands of the settlement and the Company's own viticulture. The same logic of administered pricing reappeared on 26 July 1704 when goods from the recently departed fleet were placed on sale at fixed Company prices: sugar at 13d per pound, Cheshire cheese at 12d per pound, and Madeira wine at 5s 5d the gallon. [Film No. 171, 218, 223]

Finance, currencies, bartering and accounting

The fiscal architecture of the island combined several distinct revenue streams within a single set of books. Duties on lands, slaves and cattle were collected from private owners as the Company's sovereign right, treating slaves as taxable property held by their masters alongside land and livestock; rents were collected from tenants of Company land where the Company acted as proprietor; sums received on account of slaves sold and hired out reflected the Company's own activity as commercial trader; fines and amercements channelled judicial revenue into the same treasury; and licences to sell punch and retail strong liquors generated regulatory income. The same individual could appear several times in a single consultation under different headings, and Prudence Sherwin's appearance in three of the principal commercial streams of the period 18 February 1693 to 13 April 1693 marks her household as one of the most commercially engaged with the Company in that cycle. [Film No. 9, 11, 12, 17]

Currencies on the island moved between sterling pounds, shillings and pence and Spanish dollars, with pieces of gold also appearing in the records of the burglary at Mrs Coulson's house. The retail prices recorded for arrack, sugar and lemons were stated indifferently in either system, with the dollar most often used in informal transactions and small fines, and pounds and shillings in formal accounts. The Old-Style English calendar applied throughout, the dual year notation 1691/2 reflecting the legal new year of 25 March. Carried-forward totals on revenue ledgers used the convention of running balances across pages, and the ledger book had numbered folios to which formal cross-references were made in profit declarations. The closing acknowledgement at the end of each revenue cycle combined two distinct elements in a single signed instrument: the official's confirmation of receipt of all listed Company sums, and his declaration of personal profit drawn from handling Company cargoes, the two bound into one written discharge. [Film No. 9, 13, 19]

Cash was scarce. On 26 September 1704 the Council recorded that the United Honourable Company had no money in the stores nor stores proper to bring any in, while charges on fortifications and cattle purchases continued. Mr Coulson offered three hundred dollars on a bill of exchange not to be presented to the Masters for eighteen months or two years, and the Council accepted the loan on those terms. Bills of exchange therefore served as the principal mechanism by which private credit on the island bridged shortages of Company cash, with the long deferral protecting the directors from immediate demand. Counterfeiting was the dark side of the same monetary scarcity. Thomas Dutton, by his accomplice Scriven's confession of late May 1704, intended to coin rupees, asked Scriven to take a mould off the island, and informed him that his real name was not Dutton. The intersection of theft, false identity and counterfeit coinage points to a sophisticated criminal economy that grew within the small, lightly regulated commercial environment of the island. [Film No. 153, 184]

Bartering with another man's slaves, formally prohibited from January 1704 onwards, was a recurrent breach. Thomas Dutton and Mary Beale, widow, were ordered to pay William Marsh 4s after his slave Yon stole a goat from Mr Carne's house and a quarter of fresh pork, encouraged to do so by Dutton; Mrs French was fined fourfold for buying an earthen jug from Gabriel Powell's enslaved girl, with the law's consideration for her poor condition softening the penalty; and the Swallow brothers' borrowing of salt from Charles Steward's slaves while Steward was absent at the fort produced both a property complaint and a charge of trading with another man's blacks. The penalty in each case ran to the slave's owner rather than to any public fund, providing a financial incentive for masters to police such transactions. The legal regime gave masters something close to a private monopoly on their slaves' commercial dealings, in practice if not in language. [Film No. 100, 102, 162, 176, 177, 209, 210]

Slavery and coerced labour

The records situate enslaved labour at the centre of the island's economy. Duties on lands, slaves and cattle were paid as if the three were equivalent property; the Company sold and hired out slaves as a recurrent income stream, treating them as a working labour reserve as well as a saleable stock; and the highway warrant of 21 September 1703 listed seventy-three white inhabitants and one hundred and seventeen Blacks across the island's households, the count being read as labour available for road repair. The pay differential entered in the same warrant was explicit: 18d for a white man's day work and 12d for a Black man's day work, the rates applying when overseers had to hire replacement labour at an absent householder's charge. The schedule made slave labour a fungible asset that could be sent in fulfilment of a household's public obligation, while assigning it lower formal value than free labour. [Film No. 9, 12, 17, 49]

On 26 January 1704 the Council, with the consent and approbation of the majority of free planters and other masters of families, established by general consent a Court of Committees and a code of laws for punishing all negro slaves that should offend. The instructions were precise. Slaves were not to wander or straggle from their master's plantation on Sunday without lawful occasion, on pain of ten lashes for the first offence, fifteen for the second, twenty for the third and so on. Pilfering of goods worth 1s 6d incurred twenty lashes inflicted by the master in the presence of the offended party; thirty for theft of 3s, fifty for higher amounts, with a graduated scheme that culminated, for thefts above 6s and under 30s, in fifty lashes at the fort followed by twenty more two days later and twenty more two days after that. Runaways absent for three days and three nights fell under the same provision. The code's structure made the master the

agent of routine punishment for small thefts, shifting the cost and labour of discipline onto the household, while reserving for the fort the public theatre of more serious cases. [Film No. 102, 103]

The same sitting recorded that previous juries had refused to try slave cases. To overcome that reluctance, twelve men were chosen by the majority of inhabitants to act as a panel for slave trials, and the council noted that since Governor Keeling's slave had been tried by jury as a favour, found guilty of death under English law and executed, every freeman had paid the slave's value per head by collective assessment. The poll-tax mechanism shows that the cost of capital punishment for slaves was distributed across the planter class rather than borne by individual owners, an arrangement that softened owner resistance to capital prosecution but kept the market valuation of human property visible at every execution. The reluctance of the previous jury to sit on such cases is itself revealing: even those who held slaves were not always willing to function within the formal apparatus of slave criminal law. [Film No. 101]

Practical operation of the new code can be seen in the trial of George, slave of Ripin Wills, on the same 26 January 1704 for breaking open Thomas Gargen's house. The jury was unwilling to try him, the council acted as substitute court, and possession of stolen items found on him was treated as strong presumption of guilt sufficient to overcome his denial of breaking. Restitution was ordered from Wills, his owner, to all three victims. When Scriven later confessed to the same burglary on 20 May 1704, Wills petitioned for repayment of what he had been compelled to pay. The case shows the legal system's structural bias against slaves: possession alone proved guilt, while a free settler's confession was needed to retrospectively correct the record. The case of Francisco, the boy of Grace Coulson, sentenced on 16 November 1703 to be whipped immediately on his naked body for killing two Company pigs, illustrates the same pattern of corporal punishment for the slave and financial penalty for the owner. [Film No. 65, 104, 152, 177]

The death of a young slave belonging to Gabriel Powell on 27 December 1704, prosecuted at the Court of Judicature on 17 January 1705, is the most disturbing case in the records. The boy, about nine years old, was whipped until his back was raw and then thrown by his master into a bed of nettles with his hands tied, where the convulsions caused by the stings killed him. The surgeons John Anthony Bodley and George Hotherson examined the body and concluded that, but for the punishment, the parts external and internal were sound. The jury found that Powell had not murdered the boy wilfully but accidentally, and fined him forty shillings to the church with admonishment for the future. The verdict's formal distinction between cruel discipline and wilful murder protected the master from prosecution as a felon while still acknowledging that the punishment had crossed a line. The case discloses both the threshold at which the law would intervene against an owner and the limits of that intervention. [Film No. 205, 206]

Judiciary and probate

The Council functioned as a layered judicial authority for the island. Its Tuesday consultations served as the regular forum for civil disputes, probate, regulatory matters and routine criminal discipline; the quarterly sessions, held at the Sessions House near Fort James, dealt with felonies and contested matters before a sworn jury of twelve free planters; and a separate Court of Judicature appeared in the records for serious criminal trials. The Governor presided as judge in all three, while the Justices of the Peace function and the role of the ordinary in marriage cases were held in the same hands. The island had no separate Chancery, no ecclesiastical court, and no resident bishop, so probate and guardianship business were handled by the Council acting as a standing court. Female parties appeared frequently as widows, executrices, plaintiffs and witnesses, and Mary Easthope's evidence at Films 70-71, taken as Madame Poirier's nurse, gave one of the most detailed eyewitness narratives in the surviving sequence. [Film No. 22, 28, 41, 51, 99, 105, 124, 205]

Probate followed English forms with local adaptations. Written wills were proved by sworn witnesses; nuncupative or oral wills were accepted on the deposition of two or more men who had heard the dying person's words, as in the cases of Henry Maxwell aboard the *Anna* in August 1703, of Beregreen Carlebien shortly afterwards, of John Field on 8 February 1704, of Edward Cosby in early 1705 and of Brigadier Dixon shortly before his death when Doctor Kerr refused to come and administer the sacrament. Inventories were taken by sworn appraisers and registered in the clerk's office, with copies given on demand. The sword-and-tongueing dispute over Samuel Maxwell's will of July 1703 illustrates how local practice turned to Company instructions when local interpretation of English law failed: the will was not

approved at first because the Council thought its disposal of property contrary to the law of England, but was admitted three weeks later when the Right Honourable Company's instructions were read and the difficulty was found to agree with them. [Film No. 39, 44, 45, 47, 105, 106, 214, 215]

Guardianship of orphans was a sustained concern. The Council served as the supervising authority where children's estates required administration, appointed and discharged guardians, and required overseers to render annual accounts. The case of Eleanor Keeling, daughter of a former governor, recorded George Caine's negotiation for her share of her father's estate at eight per cent interest with a £9 annual boarding allowance and education according to her quality, while the parallel case of his nephew Richard Beale produced a reduced annual rate of £3 against Caine's promise to teach the boy to read and write and bring him up in the religion of the Church of England. The persistence of the obligation across years was shown when, in April 1704, Carne could no longer keep Beale and the Council transferred the boy to Henry Francis at £7 a year on the same terms of literacy and Anglican upbringing. The pattern of council-reviewed guardianship arrangements indicates a structured if uneven welfare system for those orphaned in the small settler community. [Film No. 26, 30, 32, 33, 51, 52, 87, 123, 141, 221]

The contested marriage of Robert Leach and Hum Gurling on 5 October 1703 illustrates how matrimonial jurisdiction worked in the absence of an ecclesiastical court. Sutton Isaack junior had forbidden the banns and produced witnesses to a prior promise, including the fragment of an English shilling broken between them as token. The law of England was read at the council board and, since the case fell within the ordinary's jurisdiction, was decided by the Governor and Council rather than referred to a jury. Ann Gurling's contract with Isaack was voided on grounds of her minority, since she was an orphan in the care of the Council, and a general rule was made that no person under twenty-one might contract marriage without the consent of parents, guardians or the Governor. The order was directed to be made public so that none might plead ignorance, turning a single dispute into a standing regulation of the colony. [Film No. 50, 51]

Defamation appears as one of the most active categories of civil litigation on the island. The complaint of John French, the gunner-mate, against Leah Beergant for spreading the report that his late wife had been a hermaphrodite produced not a prosecution but an order forbidding any further attack on the dead woman's memory on pain of a two-dollar fine, half to the informer and half to the Lords Proprietors. Richard Roy was fined for boasting drunkenly that he had lain three times with Humphrey Edwards's wife. Daniel Griffith and his wife pursued John Long Senior and his wife for calling the new Mrs Griffith whore and bitch, winning twenty shillings damages in February 1705 against testimony that Mrs Long had made the accusation in a rage over a hog the slaves had killed; in the counter-suit by Long, Griffith was cast for half a dollar, suggesting that the jury was attempting to balance competing claims rather than to vindicate either side absolutely. The cases reveal how vigorously reputation was defended in a small community where rumour travelled quickly. [Film No. 22, 23, 27, 106, 107, 200, 210, 211]

Crime and punishment

The criminal record of the years 1703 to 1705 includes a striking number of organised property crimes alongside the routine sentry offences and tavern disorder. The most extensive case is the burglary network revealed in Thomas Dutton's confession of 15 May 1704 and John Scriven's confession of 20 May 1704. The two men, lodging together in a house formerly Bridget Sanderson's, broke into Mrs Cagnald's house using a penknife to defeat the back-door bolt and removed about two gallons of arrack from a stone bottle; carried a ladder from John Goodwin's house to break into Mr Thomas Goodwin's; entered John Alexander's house through a window; took table linen from the Colgrave house when in Gargen's possession; stole a silver spoon from Carne's that was given to a silversmith aboard the Arabian Merchant for buckles; and robbed Mrs Coulson's house with the apparent involvement of one of her own slaves, the proceeds of twenty-five or twenty-six dollars and four pieces of gold being divided between them. The pattern - reconnaissance, tools, a counterfeiting plan, an alias, the recruitment of subordinates such as Robert Tinney - reveals a sophistication that the small island had not previously confronted. [Film No. 137, 138, 139, 152, 153, 154]

The case exposed structural weaknesses in the island's enforcement. When the Governor issued a warrant for Scriven's arrest, the marshal Henry Coles refused to execute it, claiming after the fact that it did not

empower him to command assistance. The Council judged the excuse frivolous, dismissed Coles from the Company's service during pleasure, and ordered the warrant served. Scriven and Dutton later pleaded guilty before the Court of Judicature on 4 July 1704; Ralph Gates, who had climbed down a chimney to enter John Long's house, pleaded not guilty and was acquitted by the jury despite the recovery of two bottles of sack, on the principle that the prosecution had not proved the act of removal. On 19 July the Council, by the votes of Sodington and Goodwin against the Governor's dissent, ordered Scriven and Dutton kept in irons and put to work at Rupert's until an outward-bound ship to Bencoolen arrived under Company instructions of 4 March 1682. Three deserted seamen from the *Halifax* and another vessel - Wright, Markham and Oglethorpe - were similarly held until 2 September 1704, when Captain Clark of the *Caesar* was authorised to take them home as crew. [Film No. 139, 140, 165, 166, 169, 172, 180]

The attempted murder of Edward Heath, returning from Rupert's by night about a fortnight before 21 November 1704, generated an extended investigation that ran into early 1705. Heath was shot at, stumbled upon a man with a horse pistol, and was attacked by two more with swords until he fled. He concealed the identity of the attackers, and the Council's persistent enquiry produced a chain of secondary testimony that placed Robert Marsh and Edward Marsh, armed with guns and a cartridge, near the Coulsons' house at the hour of the attack, and that suggested through initials such as J.S. and W.S. or S.G. that the suspects were known to several witnesses without being named under oath. The reluctance to commit names to the record points to fear of retaliation in a settlement small enough for accusers to be quickly identified. The strangest twist came on 17 January 1705 when Heath himself was fined two dollars to the church for making a false report of an assault and concealing it, the court evidently having concluded during the intervening weeks that the original story was either fabricated or so seriously incomplete that the version Heath presented was no longer credible. The case is unusually opaque, and the records do not disclose what evidence persuaded the court of falsity. [Film No. 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 207]

Violence between settlers and visiting shipboard men was an ongoing problem. The most notorious incident was George Carne's attack on Sodington at Madame Field's house on 7 March 1704, when after extended provocation - remarks about the Deputy's dog having more manners than its master, the cocking of an eye at a bull bitch, the calling of the Deputy a rascal - Carne struck Sodington a blow on the ear and bit him on the finger like a dog. Carne was held without bail at first, then released on a £500 bond signed by George Hoskison, Charles Steward and Gabriel Powell. He had earlier been formally accused by Captain Beawes in January 1704 of being a seditious person, leader of factions and danger to government, and the Council had accordingly ordered Rigby and others sent back to their ships and forbidden them shore leave during their stay. The pattern of violence around Carne's house, which Beawes described as a meeting point for those involved in a recent night riot, places him as the focus of an island faction that operated alongside but largely separate from the Sodington-Kerr alliance. [Film No. 87, 88, 114, 115, 116, 129]

The instruments of punishment ranged from fines through public corporal display to confinement and transportation. The wooden horse remained the standard military punishment. Riding it on relief days, sometimes with twelve-pound shot or muskets at the legs and sometimes with the ride repeated three times, was painful and shaming. Confinement could be in the prison, the hole, or the dungeon, the last reserved for what the Governor described as rogues and used by Sodington against the seventy-year-old Karslake to a degree the Governor judged miserable and excessive. Distrainment of goods enforced unpaid fines, and recognisance bonds backed by named sureties controlled future conduct. The gradient between fine and physical punishment ran consistently along lines of status and ability to pay: James Burras, having left his ship and being poor, rode the wooden horse alone where his fellows paid fines, and Jacob Miller's two-dollar fine for the lost boat was explicitly described as a token because he had nothing else with which to pay. [Film No. 36, 42, 71, 74, 79, 83, 185, 190, 220]

Religion, the chaplaincy and education

The island had no resident bishop and no ecclesiastical court. Anglican religious life depended on the chaplain appointed by the East India Company, whose post was salaried and answerable to the directors but whose conduct fell within the diocesan jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. John Kerr, the chaplain through this period, occupied the office in a way that became progressively unworkable. From early 1704 onwards he was charged with reckless accusations of treason against the Governor, with attempting to recruit Sodington into a conspiracy to displace Poirier through depositions sent to the Secretary of State,

with offering to write to the Bishop of London commending Sodington as governor, with adopting the tonsure and beard after the visit of the Italian priest Father Pascho on the Sidney, and with obtaining from Pascho a list of convents and religious houses through France to Rome for use in his own travel. The Dutch captain whose surgeon told him that his Domine was of the same religion as his own doctor, a Papist, gave external corroboration when entertained at Mrs Gold's house, while still describing Kerr as a good man. [Film No. 97, 98, 135, 142, 143, 144, 157, 158]

Kerr's accusations against the Governor turned on three accelerating themes. The first was a claim that Poirier had toasted the Prince of Wales on muster day, framed as Jacobite sympathy with the Old Pretender; multiple witnesses, including Thomas Goodwin and the gunner John French, recorded that the Governor's words had explicitly tied the toast to a hoped-for legitimate heir of Queen Anne, and Kerr eventually retreated under pressure into a question whether a member of the Church of England as established by law might be fools, a piece of evasion the witnesses identified as fabricated on the spot. The second was the claim, made at Mr Carne's house in late April 1704, that Jesuits had told him the Governor intended to surrender the island to the next French fleet to arrive, an accusation Kerr immediately undercut by comparing it to the Jesuits' supposed claim that he himself was a Jesuit. The third, and most theatrical, was the bloody handprint set in red paint and water upon the proclamation fixed to the Sessions House door, which Kerr's servant Anthony Joyeman testified Kerr had personally made and which Kerr in turn refused to swear an oath to deny. [Film No. 130, 131, 132, 134, 212, 218]

The Governor responded by framing Kerr as a man of consistent malice. He drew attention to Kerr's previous accusations sent home in earlier years, dismissed the lampoons that Kerr pretended to find as written by his own hand, and noted with some tartness that Kerr had once defended the same Old Pretender as his crowned master after King James died, which made his current charge against Poirier of Jacobite sympathy doubly incongruous. The Governor's pointed reference to his own taking of communion from Kerr's hands at Whitsunday, despite knowing his character, served as evidence of Christian forbearance for the Company's eventual review. Kerr's retraction in open court on 4 July 1704, in compliance with the Company's letter of 21 December 1703 brought by the Featherstone, was qualified by a contemporaneous counter-statement that asserted the Honourable Masters were no less open to deception than the poor laypeople of the island and that the writer regarded Kerr's compliance as plausible pretence. The retraction was therefore neither a true peace nor an end to the dispute. [Film No. 151, 166, 167]

Kerr's behaviour after the retraction confirmed the doubt. On 5 July 1704 he was reported to have spoken offensive words against the Governor; the next night at supper in the hall he knocked on the table with the handle of a knife as in a tavern, ostensibly because he wanted some sauce, and disturbed the Governor in his chamber. At a subsequent supper he struck Doctor Bodley, the surgeon, in the Governor's presence after Bodley made a comment about the cost of striking an enslaved person, and called him dog, rogue and son of a whore. He refused last rites to Brigadier Dixon when the dying man sent for him, providing only a short note about his gripes; he beat his servant Anthony Joyeman twice for reporting the bloody handprint, openly threatening to kill him on the calculation that he could but pay two hundred for him. By December 1704 he was being formally reprimanded for accusing the Governor of corrupting his Council, with the Council members denying it under questioning, and was being fined repeatedly through 1705 with distraint applied where he refused to pay. The pattern is one of progressive disintegration in which the chaplain's conflict with the Governor moved from doctrinal accusation through theatre and forgery into open contempt and physical violence. [Film No. 168, 169, 199, 212, 214, 218, 220, 226, 227]

Sabbath enforcement and the moral life of the parish were policed through the churchwardens. John Alexander and Richard Gurling were appointed wardens for 1703 and required written rules from the Council on how to perform the office in island conditions. The framework that resulted was a familiar English parish template adapted to a Company colony: care of church furniture and donations, supervision of moral conduct including the noting of Sabbath breakers, swearers, drunkards and whoremongers, and the assembly of inhabitants and freeholders on Easter Monday to nominate four men for each of the offices of warden and overseer of the highways, two of each four to be selected by the Council. The two-stage system of moral discipline, with private reproof first and presentment at quarter sessions only on persistence, reflected the limits of constant prosecution in a small community. Cases such as William Swallow's playing cards on the Sabbath with John Bagley's slave Cotty at Mrs Cagnald's country house,

prosecuted in August 1704, show the system working in practice, with the wardens reporting and witnesses sworn before the Council. [Film No. 21, 38, 53, 176, 177]

Education appears most clearly in the orphan guardianship arrangements, where literacy was treated as a basic obligation. George Caine was required to teach his nephew Richard Beale to read and write as part of the maintenance terms; Henry Francis took on the same duty when Beale was transferred. Eleanor Keeling, daughter of a former governor, was to be educated according to her quality, a phrase that tied her instruction to her social rank. The combination of literacy and Anglican upbringing as conditions of guardianship reveals an expectation that the next generation of free planters and settlers should be raised within the parish's religious and educational norms, and that the Council had the right to enforce these norms through the terms of its guardianship orders. [Film No. 26, 30, 123]

Social order, parish office and women's lives

The parish offices of churchwarden and overseer of the highways recurred annually, with Samuel DesFountaine and Edward Bagley succeeding John Alexander and Richard Gurling as wardens for 1704, and Leonard Hunt continuing as overseer despite his neglect the previous year, this time paired with Walter Welward and limited by the Council to two days' labour per person. Hunt's reappointment after admitted failure points either to the small pool of suitable candidates or to a tolerance of underperformance unusual elsewhere in the records. The transition between officers required formal accounting before the Council before the new wardens were invested. The system depended on the cooperation of free planters whose other obligations made the burden uneven, and the highway warrant of 1703, which required all white inhabitants and their Black labour to perform one day's road work on pain of substituted hire and recovery of costs by sale, was the most intrusive of these requirements. [Film No. 21, 47, 48, 49, 123, 133]

Women's lives appear in the records mainly through their household roles, their property interests after widowhood, and their vulnerability to assault. Madame Coe Poirier, the Governor's French wife, sent to her husband at one o'clock in the night of 20 September 1703 from her chamber in the fort, where she lay seven days after delivery of a child, frightened by the noise of arms being raised on the mount and the marshal calling for the lost peruke; she was nursed by Mary Easthope, whose deposition gives the most vivid surviving account of the night and who became the target of Sodington's accusation that she stirred sedition between the principals. Sarah Foster, daughter-in-law to Edward Heath, was the victim of an attempted ravishment by Mr Jones the first mate of the Whitworth in July 1703, the case being heard by the Council with Jones confined on board the ship during its stay in the road. Mary Wills, Mary Cosgrave's daughters, and Mary Field were all named in the depositions of late 1703 as victims of the night disorder by visiting shipboard men, with attempts on doors, windows and rooms after the women had locked themselves in. [Film No. 40, 41, 70, 71, 95]

The most extensive set of cases involving violence against women concerns Sodington's conduct in May 1704. At the Governor's chambers in the presence of Madame Poirier and his sister-in-law, Sodington kissed and tongued Mrs Jane Goodwin, the widow, until the Governor ordered him to his room. At Mrs Lufkin's house later the same evening he raised the latch, entered, and resumed the assault, declaring that he would lie with her all night, before her brother Captain Goodwin and Mr Rogers intervened. On a different occasion he forced Mrs Gold to the ground at the sally port and beat her twice with his cane, while the sentry William Goss took hold of his arm and threatened him with a clubbed musket; Sodington's own servant Edward Smith later testified that he had seen his master strike both mother and daughter, contradicting Mrs Gold's exculpatory denial. The pattern that emerges is of a senior officer who treated women's company as a competitive challenge and physical refusal as provocation, and whose suspension on 18 May 1704 was justified less by any single incident than by the accumulation of these episodes. [Film No. 145, 146, 156, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164]

Widows and women on their own account appear repeatedly as parties before the Council. Joy Ashby, widow, brought her late husband's will for probate in July 1703 and was named as both heir and executrix. Mrs Sarah Rider sought help in February 1705 against the wandering hogs that damaged her grass after losing her husband; she had earlier been the victim of Richard Person, the passenger on the Polphester who took her watch and twenty dollars on the cover of a marriage promise, and ultimately married Daniel

Griffith in September 1704 after the publication of banns. Mary Field's verbal will received the Governor's personal oath of testimony in February 1704; the widow Easton named Poirier as sole executor of her oral will and overseer of her children in February 1705. Mrs Mercy Carne acted on behalf of her stepdaughter Honor Robbins to defend land in Fort James Valley against Mrs Cagnald, and Ann, the wife of Philip Karlake, complained on 22 February 1704 that her husband called her ill names and treated her under more like a slave than a wife. The records allow these women's voices to surface as parties, complainants and witnesses with surprising regularity. [Film No. 43, 109, 105, 140, 170, 171, 180, 221, 222]

Personalities

Stephen Poirier emerges from the records as a French Huguenot refugee in English Company service, a methodical record-keeper and a Governor whose principal weapons in dispute were sworn affidavits, careful written rebuttal, and the building of evidence for review in London. His invocation of his own forced flight from France against the Jacobite court at St Germans, his receipt of Holy Sacrament from Kerr's hands at Whitsunday despite knowing his character, and his concentration on the double mortar walls of Fort James as visible proof of his prudent stewardship together suggest a man preoccupied with the formal record of his administration. He could be sarcastic, particularly when answering Sodington's complaints about Madame Poirier's ringing of the prayer bell, and he was capable of physical action, breaking John Alexander's head with the man's own cane in the fort yard on 20 September 1704. Whether his measured tone was a true representation of his temperament or a calculated strategy aimed at the Company directors cannot be settled from the records alone. [Film No. 75, 76, 151, 183, 184]

Cornelius Sodington is the figure who most dominates the surviving consultations. He arrived on shore on 14 August 1703 and within weeks was in dispute with the Governor over rank, attendance, the keys of the fort and the use of the great boat. The Governor described him with cutting precision: tenderly bred to the point that painful work did not suit his temper, dressing himself so slowly that he could hardly come out of his cabin before eleven or twelve in the morning because of washing, paring his nails and dressing, the son of persons of quality whose military experience in Flanders the Governor's faith was too weak to credit. He struck Sergeant Dixon over the head with the butt of Karlake's musket, ordered Karlake confined in the dungeon at the age of seventy, beat Stephen Hill at Rupert's Fort, attempted to throw a stone at Stephen Child of about four or five pounds weight, drew his sword on the corporal Trapp at the sally port and would have run him through if not stopped by John French the gunner, called the chaplain Kerr's room safe to him after a night quarrel, and was eventually suspended for the disorder at Mrs Lufkin's house. He was reinstated within five weeks, served the rest of the period as Deputy Governor, and was variously titled Captain, Lieutenant, Colonel and Deputy as the records ran on. [Film No. 44, 56, 57, 64, 67, 68, 69, 74, 90, 91, 146, 147, 164]

John Kerr, chaplain, presents the most distinctive personality in the records. By turns ingratiating, vindictive, theatrical and physically violent, he combined doctrinal sophistication with unstable behaviour. He carried a list of European convents in his pocket; he wrote lampoons against the Governor and his lady that he pretended to find but had written in his own hand; he set the bloody handprint on the proclamation; he beat his servant for reporting it; he refused to bury Robert Addis's child by writing a polite note pleading the gripes while the Governor knew he had spent the day waiting to board a ship; and he refused last rites to the dying Brigadier Dixon, whose final words called him a cursed wretch. He insisted on his own gentility against the Governor in council and called Poirier a Huguenist who might govern his Huguenist ministers and go to his own country. He used the title of Doctor and claimed superior education and birth. His one moment of formal compliance, the open-court retraction of 4 July 1704 in obedience to the Company's letter, was followed within hours by fresh offensive words and within days by the supper-hall disorders that filled the rest of his time on the island. [Film No. 97, 98, 135, 167, 199, 212, 214, 219, 226]

George Carne stood at the head of an island faction that occupied the Council's attention in 1703 and 1704. He persuaded Edward Crosbey and Walter Morris to sign a petition against James Easthope's lease of waste land, drawing them to his house and pressing them to sign upstairs after dinner; he was named by Captain Beawes as a seditious person and leader of factions; he encouraged Richard Rigby to fight Beawes despite the captain's intervention; and he eventually attacked Sodington at Mrs Field's house with biting and a blow on the ear. He was held without bail and then released on a £500 bond. Yet in November 1703, in conversation with Captain Burrish of the *Pieprid*, he had also said that he refused to hear complaints against

the Governor and intended to live in friendship and good correspondence with the government, an affidavit Burrish gave on oath. Whether the contradiction reflected genuine ambivalence or strategic positioning, Carne's house functioned as a meeting place for shipboard men whose presence the Governor and Council found difficult to manage. [Film No. 70, 87, 88, 114, 115, 116]

John Alexander, clerk of the Council and third in office, presents a particularly interesting trajectory. He resisted Sodington's tearing of leaves from the foul book in November 1703, offered to blot out the declaration rather than destroy it and recorded what he could in memorandum, and was relied on by the Governor in the long answer to Sodington's complaints. By August 1704 he was given a salary increase to £32 per annum on grounds of his seven years' service. On the evening of 20 September 1704, drinking with Mr Boyett and others in his office during divine service, he refused to leave, threw his office key to the Governor, threw his cane after it, called the Governor a saucy rogue when called the same himself, and disclosed that he had written several private letters for the Governor. The Governor broke his head with his own cane and confined him to the hole. The matter was deferred, witnesses sworn, Doctor Kerr called to provide a declaration, and Alexander was dismissed from the Company's service - only to be reconciled within the same consultation when, on better reflection, he acknowledged his offence as the effect of passion in drink and was forgiven. He next appeared as Colgrave's advocate in court in January 1705. [Film No. 62, 63, 173, 183, 184, 187, 188, 189, 209]

Mary Easthope, nurse to Madame Poirier, deserves particular notice as the central female witness in the Sodington proceedings. Her depositions of 29 November and 19 December 1703 record what she saw and heard from the gallery and the chamber: Doctor Kerr begging Sodington for God's sake not to do something, the marshal Henry Coales calling for the lost peruke, Sergeant Dixon coming from Sodington's room with a candle and lantern saying he was being put into prison, and the sounds of fighting and chairs thrown about. Her movement between Madame Poirier's chamber and the gallery door at the recently delivered Governor's wife's command made her a witness across spaces in the fort that were normally closed to public view. Sodington's accusation that she stirred sedition between the principals, the Governor's defence that she was acting only on his standing instructions to send word of disorder while he was in the country, and her own evidence in her own voice all combine to make her the most vividly drawn ordinary inhabitant in the surviving records. [Film No. 70, 71, 75, 82]

Among the slaves named in the records, four cases stand out. Francisco, the boy of Grace Coulson, who killed two Company pigs and was sentenced to whipping on his naked body. George, slave of Ripin Wills, whose case was the first under the new slave code of January 1704 and whose owner was forced to pay damages later refunded when the true thief Scriven confessed. Suffield, the slave of Edward Marshbourne, who broke through the thatch of Arthur Bradley's locked house with a dollar and eight pieces of pork, the council ordering his master to pay damages while the slave's flight pointed to an attempt at escape. And the unnamed boy of Gabriel Powell, about nine years old, killed by being thrown bound into a bed of nettles after a flogging, whose death produced the limited verdict of accidental killing for which Powell was fined forty shillings. The records preserve enough about these four to register them as persons rather than as property, though the legal categories within which their cases were heard treated them as the latter. [Film No. 65, 104, 152, 198, 205, 206]

Two further figures deserve mention. Edward Heath, the indispensable fortification builder, ambushed by night and later prosecuted himself for false reporting; Doctor Bodley, the surgeon struck by Kerr at supper after his comment on the price of striking a slave, who later examined the body of Powell's boy and signed the medical opinion. Both men served the island in technical capacities the records valued highly: Heath in Company works, Bodley in medical examinations that gave the legal record its evidential weight. The Council's willingness to extend Heath credit at six per cent over eighteen months to retain him, and to summon Bodley alongside Hotherson to inspect the dead boy's body, illustrates how the small island's professional life depended on a handful of men whose individual cases could turn on the same skills they offered the colony. [Film No. 179, 199, 206]

Reflections on the record

The materials assembled in this account come from a single working archive of a Company-governed island in wartime. They are partial in every sense. They reflect the perspective of the executive that kept them and the disputes of the men who entered them; they preserve the voices of women and slaves only where the formal categories of testimony and complaint admitted those voices; and they fall silent on whole areas of life that left no judicial or fiscal trace. The arrangement of revenue under five distinct streams, the establishment of a slave code by majority vote of free planters, the suspension and reinstatement of a Deputy Governor on bare conditions, the handling of capital crime through transportation to Bencoolen, the exhausting feud between a Huguenot Governor and a chaplain who may or may not have been a Catholic in disguise, all emerge from the documents as the working business of a small fortified colony tied to the East Indies trade. The records reveal as much through their silences and through the gaps in their record as through the long depositions and answers that fill their pages. Read together, they offer an account of St Helena in the years 1691 to 1705 that is intricate, contested, partial, and far more revealing than any single one of its many disputes might have suggested. [Film No. 9, 13, 17, 46, 75, 101, 102, 167, 169, 226, 227]

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
1		EAP 1364 St Helena Document Name and Date: St. Helena Records 1703–1704 Photographer: PETER Date photographed: 25 OCT 2021 Additional comments: [blank]	
2		Book cover	
3		Blank page	
4		Blank page	
5		Sanctions to Church Wardens - p. 1 Price of a bridge in James Town fixed by the Church Banns of Marriage forbid - 28 Breaking of a shilling token of Arbuthnot - 28 Cattle 380 head in the Island of which 40 fit to kill Sept. 1703 - 33 Personal contest between Governor & Deputy Governor - 34, 51 Dispeaceful disturbances Governor like in Tavern - 70 Rev. minister accused of backbiting & liking Bacchus better than his profession - 75 ditto accused of making the Governor's life uneasy & of being a Papist - 104 Charge of Oath, sheriff shewing his sword at - 113 & her personally maltreated by Rev. Mr. Edington - 115 Edington suspended from Council & protest - 124 Governor 7th Nov. 127 d. says Mr. K has a restless demon - said to be a Jesuit - 135 Dr. Ker excuses himself from burying a child - 136 Two of the Council carry a point against the Gov. - 150 Governor swears a man before a marriage licence - 158 Divine service held in the Castle Hall - 161 Governor “drubs” the Clerk of the Council - 161 Dr. Ker charged with calling Dissenters fools & punished for contempt of Governor - 178	
6		Blank page	
7		Powell slave boy dies from whipping & being thrown into a bed of nettles - his master fined 40s. - 184 Dr. Ker paints a bloody hand on a proclamation - 190 Dinner hour 12 o’Clock - 190 Distress levied on him for a fine of 5s. - 193 Morning service on 30 Jany. held: Tuesday - 191 The Governor a Highpriest - a Church Presbyterian - 197	
8		Blank page	
9		Island St Helena Rec.d on acc.t of the R.t Hon.ble [...] the Govern.r and Company Merchants of London Trading to the East Indies the severall parcells and quantitys of moneys hereafter specified Viz.	Money was received on the island of St Helena on behalf of the Right Honourable Governor and Company of Merchants of London Trading to the East Indies. The parcels and quantities set out below were taken in.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Rec.d of Acc.t of the R.t Hon.ble Comp.a for Revenues or Dutys of Lands Negroes and Cattle, being Generally paid in provisions for Shipping, [Forb] table, and plantation [...] [...] and in Poll [...] pay from June the 1.st 1691 to feb.ry 1.st 169[1/2] [as p.] acc.t made up in the Revenue books doth more fully appear viz. l s d Received of Tho. Ellis - - - 02 6 6 the Box - - - 02 8 8 Tho. Burnham - - - 04 6 0 Hugh Bodley - - - 04 18 10 John Royce - - - 00 18 0[d] Edw.d Brayne - - - 00 19 0 Owen Bevan - - - 01 12 11 Orland.o Bagley - - - 02 10 0 John Colgrave - - - 02 14 0 Jose. [Chirksworth] - - - 00 16 9 John Cleverley - - - [0]8 11 9 [Anne] Cowley - - - 02 10 0 John Cannady - - - 00 10 4 Grace Coulson - - - [0]8 17 0 Rob.t Degarny - - - 05 13 3 Borne over - - - 50 8 8	Revenues or duties on lands, slaves and cattle were collected for the Company's account. Payment was generally made in provisions for shipping, for the [...] table and for the plantation [...] [...] [...], together with poll [...] pay. The collection covered the period from 1 June 1691 to 1 February 1692, as recorded more fully in the revenue books. The receipts entered were as follows. Thomas Ellis - £2 6s 6d the Box - £2 8s 8d Thomas Burnham - £4 6s 0d Hugh Bodley - £4 18s 10d John Royce - £0 18s 0d Edward Brayne - £0 19s 0d Owen Bevan - £1 12s 11d Orlando Bagley - £2 10s 0d John Colgrave - £2 14s 0d Joseph [Chirksworth] - £0 16s 9d John Cleverley - £8 11s 9d [Anne] Cowley - £2 10s 0d John Cannady - £0 10s 4d Grace Coulson - £8 17s 0d Robert Degarny - £5 13s 3d Carried forward - £50 8s 8d Interpretations Duties on lands, slaves and cattle treated unfree persons as taxable property held by their owners alongside land and livestock. The fiscal system thereby positioned slaves within the planter economy as chattel rather than as residents. Poll pay was levied per head rather than on holdings and so reached those without taxable property. It sat alongside the property-based assessment as a separate revenue stream. The phrase “borne over” was a ledger convention marking a running total transferred from one page of the revenue book to the next. The figure of £50 8s 8d represented the cumulative amount entered up to that point. The dual year 1691/2 reflected the Old-Style English calendar, under which the new year began on 25 March. The covered period therefore ran from 1 June 1691 to 1 February 1692 in modern reckoning. The entry “the Box” probably referred to a collection fund or contribution box rather than to an individual, though the precise meaning cannot be recovered from the passage alone. Acceptance of payment in provisions rather than coin tied tax collection directly to the Company's victualling needs. Shipping, the governor's establishment and the plantation absorbed revenue in kind, removing the need to convert cash receipts into goods. Speculations The revenue arrangement was probably structured to fit the Company's logistical position. Coin was scarce on a remote Atlantic outpost, and any cash collected would only have to be reconverted into stores. By accepting provisions directly, taxation and victualling were collapsed into a single transaction. Planters discharged their dues with the same goods that shipping, the governor's table and the plantation required, sparing the Company a cash exchange and securing supplies through a fiscal channel rather than through purchase.
10		Brought over - - 50 8 8 Received of W.m Duston - - 00 12 0 Tho. [Davis] - - 01 2 3 George [Dwight] - - 00 10 0 Rob.t Exeter - - 00 12 0 James [Eastupp] - - 03 0[1] 0 John Fuller - - 01 03 0 Tho. Ferndale - - 00 08 0 Rich.d Gurling - - 07 19 0 Tho. Goodwin - - 02 17 0 John Goodwin - - 04 10 6 Rich.d Griffin - - 02 00 10 Tho. Gartry - - 02 04 0 W.m [Hise] - - 04 08 6 Rich.d Hardingg - - 03 10 11 Jon.a Higham - - 01 15 6 Tho. Harper - - 01 8 6 Tho. How - - 01 2 0 Mary [Jenster] - - 03 04 1 Sutton Isaac - - 02 18 9 Katherine [Issey] - - 00 10 0 Henry Kirby - - 02 19 0 Rich.d Leach - - 07 2 8 Isaac Leach - - 05 11 0 John [Lufflin] - - 04 05 8 John Mudge - - 04 16 0 Mich.ll Morris - - 01 15 10 Praise Pedder - - 01 06 0 Jos. Pratt - - 00 15 0 And.w Phillips - - 04 04 0 Otho [Rooney] - - 03 05 6 James Rider - - 02 17 1 [Tom] Seaford - - 03 00	The list of revenue receipts continued from the previous page. Brought forward - £50 8s 8d William Duston - £0 12s 0d Thomas [Davis] - £1 2s 3d George [Dwight] - £0 10s 0d Robert Exeter - £0 12s 0d James [Eastupp] - £3 0[1]s 0d John Fuller - £1 3s 0d Thomas Ferndale - £0 8s 0d Richard Gurling - £7 19s 0d Thomas Goodwin - £2 17s 0d John Goodwin - £4 10s 6d Richard Griffin - £2 0s 10d Thomas Gartry - £2 4s 0d William [Hise] - £4 8s 6d

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		00 Tho. Swallow - - 06 11 4 1/2 Prudence [Thomas] - 7 6 0 Borne ov.r - 157 11 4 1/2	Richard Hardigg - £3 10s 11d Jonathan Higham - £1 15s 6d Thomas Harper - £1 8s 6d Thomas How - £1 2s 0d Mary [Jenster] - £3 4s 1d Sutton Isaac - £2 18s 9d Katherine [Issey] - £0 10s 0d Henry Kirby - £2 19s 0d Richard Leach - £7 2s 8d Isaac Leach - £5 11s 0d John [Lufflin] - £4 5s 8d John Mudge - £4 16s 0d Michael Morris - £1 15s 10d Praise Pedder - £1 6s 0d Joseph Pratt - £0 15s 0d Andrew Phillips - £4 4s 0d Otho [Rooney] - £3 5s 6d James Rider - £2 17s 1d [Tom] Seaford - £3 0s 0d Thomas Swallow - £6 11s 4 1/2d Prudence [Thomas] - £7 6s 0d Carried forward - £157 11s 4 1/2d
11		£ s d £ s d Brought over - 157 11 4 1/2 Rec.d of John [Sich] - - - 01 13 10 John [Sinsings] - - - 01 01 00 And.w Wilson - - - 00 18 04 [Ripin] Wills - - - 02 07 0 Jam.s [Wrangham] - - - 02 0[6] 5 Peter Williams - - - 03 01 2 Greentrees orphans - - - 02 04 0 Donells Children - - - 02 15 6 [Whitleys] orphans - - - 03 11 0 Youngs [D.o] - - - 02 4 6 The Totall amount of Revenues Rec.d amounts to one Hundred Seaventy three pounds [fourteen] Shill three pence halfe penny [173 11 4 1/2] Rec.d on acc.t and for the use of the said R.t Hon.ble Comp.a the severall Sums hereafter mentioned being Due to them on acc.t of Rent viz.t Rec.d of [Edw.d] [Bleet] - - - 12 17 9 Rich.d [Gurling] - - - 06 00 0 Jane [Smoult] - - - 09 03 5 1/2 Prudence [Therrin] - - - 07 0 0 Jam. Taylor - - - 03 18 0 The Totall amount of Rent Rec.d amounts to Thirty Eight pounds Nineteen shillings and two pence halfe penny - - - 38 19 2 Borne over - - 212 13 4	The list of revenue receipts continued from the previous page. Brought forward - £157 11s 4 1/2d John [Sich] - £1 13s 10d John [Sinsings] - £1 1s 0d Andrew Wilson - £0 18s 4d [Ripin] Wills - £2 7s 0d James [Wrangham] - £2 0[6]s 5d Peter Williams - £3 1s 2d Greentree's orphans - £2 4s 0d Donell's children - £2 15s 6d [Whitley's] orphans - £3 11s 0d Young's orphans - £2 4s 6d Total revenues received - £173 11s 4 1/2d A second section recorded sums due to the Company in respect of rent. [Edward] [Bleet] - £12 17s 9d Richard [Gurling] - £6 0s 0d Jane [Smoult] - £9 3s 5 1/2d Prudence [Therrin] - £7 0s 0d James Taylor - £3 18s 0d Total rent received - £38 19s 2 1/2d Carried forward - £212 13s 4d Interpretations The accounts split into two streams. Revenue arose from duties on private holdings of land, slaves and cattle. Rent was paid to the Company as landholder by tenants of its lands. The Company therefore acted simultaneously as sovereign authority taxing private property and as proprietor letting that same land to occupiers. The two registers were tallied and totalled separately before being added together in the carry-forward. Several revenue entries stood in the names of dependants rather than living taxpayers: Greentree's orphans, Donell's children, [Whitley's] orphans and Young's orphans. Liability followed the estate rather than the person of the original taxpayer. Duty on land, slaves and cattle continued to be discharged from the inheritances of deceased planters, presumably through guardians acting for the minor heirs. Speculations The retention of revenue accounts under the names of orphans points to a deliberate arrangement for keeping collection unbroken when a planter died. Mortality on a small Atlantic outpost would otherwise have eroded the revenue base each time a head of household was lost. By attaching the duty to the property itself, and by extracting it from the inheritance through guardianship rather than allowing it to lapse, the Company perhaps secured continuity of income across the demographic instability of settler families.
12		£ s d Brought ov.r - 212 13 4 Rec.d on Acc.t and for the use of the s.d R.t Hon.ble Comp.a the severall Sums of moneys hereund.r Express.d being for negroes Sold and hiredout, of the said R.t Hon.ble Comp.a viz.t Rec.d of [Edw.d] Bleet - - - 20 2 6 Tho. Dixon - - - 03 13 0 Tho. Gartry - - - 08 06 6 Sam. [Maxwell] - - - 03 10	The brought-forward running total stood at £212 13s 4d. A further section recorded sums received on account of slaves sold and hired out by the Company. [Edward] Bleet - £20 2s 6d Thomas Dixon - £3 13s 0d Thomas Gartry - £8 6s 6d Samuel [Maxwell] - £3 10s 11d Richard [Stacey] - £9 1s 0d Prudence [Therrin] -

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		11 Rich.d [Stacey] - - - 09 01 0 Prudence [Therrin] - - - 11 14 0 John Smith - - - 04 19 11 1/4 The Totall of moneys Rec.d on acc.t of negroes [&c] amounts to Sixty one pound Seven Shill and foure pence farthing 061 07 7 1/4 Rec.d for the use of the said R.t Hon.ble Comp.a being on Acc.t of fines and amerciam.ts becoming due to the R.t Hon.ble Comp.a for misdemean.rs viz.t Rec.d of Grace Coulson - - - 3 2 0 Rich.d Gurling - - - 3 0 0 The [t]all amount of fines Rec.d on acc.t of the R.t Hon.ble Comp.a amounts to Six pound[s] two Shill[ings] 006 02 0 Rec.d on Acc.t of the R.t Hon.ble Comp.a the sev.ll [thirll] Sums following being on Acc.t of Lycences for Selling of punch & retailing strong Liq.rs viz.t Rec.d of Tho. Birch - - - 4 0 0 John Colgrave - - - [...] 0 0 John [Feild] - - - 2 0 0 Borne over 6 0 0 Borne over - 280 02 8 1/4	£11 14s 0d John Smith - £4 19s 11¼d Total received on account of slaves and the like - £61 7s 7¼d Receipts on account of fines and amercements due for misdemeanours followed. Grace Coulson - £3 2s 0d Richard Gurling - £3 0s 0d Total fines received - £6 2s 0d Sums received for licences to sell punch and retail strong liquors were entered next. Thomas Birch - £4 0s 0d John Colgrave - £[...] 0s 0d John [Feild] - £2 0s 0d Licences carried forward - £6 0s 0d Overall running total carried forward - £280 2s 8¼d Interpretations The Company appeared in this section as a direct trader in slaves rather than only as their taxer. Sums recorded under “negroes sold and hired out” meant proceeds from outright sales together with rental income from leasing the labour of Company-owned slaves to private settlers. The Company therefore held slaves as commercial property and drew revenue from them both by transfer of title and by hire of labour, while retaining ownership in the latter case. Amercements were distinct from fines in legal usage. A fine was a set statutory penalty, while an amercement was a discretionary penalty fixed at the judgment of the court, originally meaning a forfeiture “in mercy” of the bench. Their pairing in this entry showed the local court imposing both forms of monetary punishment, with the proceeds flowing into the Company's own treasury rather than to the Crown. Licences to sell punch and retail strong liquors formed a separate regulatory revenue stream. Drink retail on the island was controlled and chargeable, so that the licence fee gave the Company both an income and a register of those permitted to trade in spirits. Across this consultation the Company drew income from at least five distinct streams: revenue duties on private property, rent on Company land, slave sale and hire, judicial fines and amercements, and trade licences. Each stream rested on a different relationship between the Company and the population - sovereign, landlord, owner, judge and regulator. Speculations The treatment of slave sale and slave hire under a single heading suggests that the Company managed its slave holdings as a working labour reserve as well as a saleable stock. Hiring rather than selling kept title with the Company while extracting recurrent income from the labour, and left open later sale or redeployment of the same individuals. The accounts therefore probably reflected an active management of slave property as an income-yielding asset, with hire used to draw value from those not wanted for the Company's own immediate work.
13		Brought over - 280 2 8 1/4 Brought over - - - 6 0 0 Rec.d of Tho. Gartry - - - 2 0 0 John Long - - - 2 0 0 John Mudge - - - 2 0 0 Sam. Taylor - - - 2 0 0 [Ripin] Wills - - - 2 0 0 The Totall amount of moneys Rec.d for Lycences for halfe a yeare Ending [Janu.y] y.e 1.st 169[2/3] amounts to Sixteen pound 016 0 0 Moneys Rec.d for the use of the said R.t Hon.ble Comp.a being on Accidentall acc.ts is for the p.ticulars following viz.t Rec.d of Sam. Taylor in part of [p.] 10.1 due for a house Late Matt [Pinckey] 22 10 00 Rec.d of W.m French for a musquett & [piece] he tooke 02 00 00 The Totall amounts to Twentyfour pounds Ten Shill 024 10 0 Moreover Rec.d from the R.t Hon.ble Comp.as plantation foure hundred and Sixty Gall of Arrack at	The licences section continued from the previous page, with £6 0s 0d already carried over. The overall running total stood at £280 2s 8¼d. Thomas Gartry - £2 0s 0d John Long - £2 0s 0d John Mudge - £2 0s 0d Samuel Taylor - £2 0s 0d [Ripin] Wills - £2 0s 0d Total received for licences for the half year ending 1 January 1693 - £16 0s 0d A section of accidental receipts followed. Samuel Taylor, as part-payment of [...] due for a house formerly held by Matthew [Pinckey] - £22 10s 0d William French, for a musket and [piece] he had taken - £2 0s 0d Total of accidental receipts - £24 10s 0d A further entry was made for 460 gallons of arrack received from the Company's plantation at 4s the gallon, valued at £92 0s 0d. A closing acknowledgement was then added. The signatory declared a personal profit of £74 11s 2½d drawn from his handling of the dispatch of the Company's cargoes, shipping and goods between 1 June

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		four Shill p. Gall amounts to Ninety two pounds 092 0 0 Lastly I doe hereby acknowledge to have profitted in the [whole] Concerned of the [issuing] forth of the R.t Hon.ble Comp.as Cargoes Shipping Goods &c.t from June y.e 1.st 1691 untill the 18.th day of Feb.ry 169[2/3] the Sume of [Seventy] foure pounds Eleven Shill & two pence halfe peny as [p.] my Leager Book folio 56 more p.ticularly Sheweth 074 11 2 1/2 487 3 10 1/4 I Say Rec.d all the afores.d Sums [Barring] all p.ticular Rec.ts whatsoever given from me [Ramos?] witnesse [Signatures]	1691 and 18 February 1693, with the particulars set out at folio 56 of his ledger book. The grand total of all sums was given as £487 3s 10¼d. Receipt of the full amount was acknowledged, save for any particular receipts already issued separately. The acknowledgement was signed [Ramos] and attested by witnesses. Interpretations The category of accidental accounts caught one-off receipts that did not fit the regular fiscal streams of revenue, rent, slave income, fines or licences. Within this section it absorbed a part-payment toward a house once held by Matthew [Pinckey] and the price paid by William French for arms he had taken. Its function was to ensure that no transaction went unrecorded. Arrack from the Company's plantation entered the books as income in kind rather than as cash. The 460 gallons were valued at a fixed 4s the gallon, so the distillery's product was tallied directly into the Company's accounts at a standing rate, with no third-party purchaser involved. The licences for selling punch and retailing strong liquors ran on a half-yearly cycle expiring on 1 January. Each licensee paid £2 for the period, which set the annual fee at £4. The closing acknowledgement combined two distinct elements in a single instrument. The signatory confirmed receipt of all listed Company sums, and at the same time declared his own personal profit drawn from handling the despatch of Company cargoes, shipping and goods over the same period, with cross-reference to his own ledger. The Company's officers were therefore expected to record, in the same formal accounting, both the public sums they had collected and the private gains they had taken on their handling of Company business. The reservation "barring all particular receipts" excluded any receipts already issued for individual transactions from the general acknowledgement, so that no item was discharged twice. Speculations The structuring of the closing entry as both a public discharge and a private profit declaration within one signed instrument suggests a deliberate arrangement to bring the officer's whole financial relationship with the Company into a single formal record. By acknowledging in the same document the sums received on the Company's behalf and the personal profit drawn from Company business, the signatory perhaps secured himself against later challenge over either flow, while also placing his private gain visibly on the Company's books and thus open to inspection from above.
14		Blank page	
15		Blank page	
16		Island S.t Helena Aprill y.e 13.th 1693 Received on acc.t of y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a of Merchants of London Trading to the East Indies the Severall percells and Quantitys of Mondys hereafter Specified viz.t Rec.d on acc.t of y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a for Revenues or Duty of Lands Negros and Cattle being Generally paid in Provisions for Shipping, Foot Table & Plantation on y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a acc.t of said. And in Sa.d Pay, from y.e 18.th Day of Feb.ry 1691. To the 13.th Day of Aprill 1693. As p.r acc.t Made up in the Ledger book Doth more fully Appeare. viz.t £ s d Rec.t of Thomas Alleson 05 10 00 Thomas Ellis 03 10 00 William Bowman 02 00 00 M.rs Ellan Beale - 07 00 00 Orlando Bagley 03 00 00 Thomas Birth 00 18 00 John Colgrave 05 04 00 William Clifton 01 05 00 Robart [Degarncy] 04 15 02 1/4 William Coveton 00 14 00 James [Draper] 01 17 00 Thomas Davis 01 02 09 1/2 Thomas Dixon 01 16 00 James [Easthope] 00 13 00 Thomas Ferndale 04 03 00 Richard Gurling 03 00 00	A new consultation was opened on 13 April 1693. Money was received on the island of St Helena on behalf of the Right Honourable Company of Merchants of London Trading to the East Indies. The parcels and quantities listed below were taken in. Revenues or duties on lands, slaves and cattle were collected for the Company's account. Payment was generally made in provisions for shipping, for the Foot Table, for the Company's plantation account and in [...] pay. The period covered ran from 18 February 1692 to 13 April 1693, as recorded more fully in the ledger book. Thomas Alleson - £5 10s 0d Thomas Ellis - £3 10s 0d William Bowman - £2 0s 0d Mistress Ellen Beale - £7 0s 0d Orlando Bagley - £3 0s 0d Thomas Birth - £0 18s 0d John Colgrave - £5 4s 0d William Clifton - £1 5s 0d Robert [Degarncy] - £4 15s 2¼d William Coveton - £0 14s 0d James [Draper] - £1 17s 0d Thomas Davis - £1 2s 9½d Thomas Dixon - £1 16s 0d James

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Richard Griffin 02 12 00 William Haise 02 06 00 Jonathan Higham 00 13 00 Mary Jenster 01 09 11 Sutton Isaack 01 18 00 Katherine Jessey 00 11 00 Richard [Keeling] 00 03 00 Henry [Kessey] 00 02 04 Richard Leach 03 07 00 John Mudge 03 03 00 Borne Over - 62 03 0[2] 1/4	[Easthope] - £0 13s 0d Thomas Ferndale - £4 3s 0d Richard Gurling - £3 0s 0d Richard Griffin - £2 12s 0d William Haise - £2 6s 0d Jonathan Higham - £0 13s 0d Mary Jenster - £1 9s 11d Sutton Isaac - £1 18s 0d Katherine Jessey - £0 11s 0d Richard [Keeling] - £0 3s 0d Henry [Kessey] - £0 2s 4d Richard Leach - £3 7s 0d John Mudge - £3 3s 0d Carried forward - £62 3s 0[2] 1/4d Interpretations The Foot Table denoted the garrison mess at the Company's fort, where the foot soldiers were fed. Provisions paid as revenue duty went directly to the maintenance of the island's defence, the tax in kind supporting the military establishment without intermediate cash transaction or commissary purchase. Ellen Beale's entry carried the formal style "Mistress" alongside her payment of £7. The honorific marked status above the surname-only entries used for most taxpayers, and signalled that women of social standing on the island were registered with title, on their own account, within the regular revenue base.
17		Brought Over 62 03 02 1/4 Rec.t of William Marsh - 01 09 00 John Nichols - 06 02 00 Praise [Pledger] - 01 12 00 Richard [Larrum] - 10 03 02 Onesephorus [Queny] 01 03 10 Richard Stacey - 01 04 00 Thomas Swallow 01 10 01 1/2 Prudence [Sherwin] 06 19 00 Samuel Taylor 07 17 00 Peter Williams 01 11 10 [Powell] Children 01 03 05 The totall Amo.t of Revenues Rec.d is One hundred & two pounds Twelve Shillings, Seven pence One farthing 102 12 07 1/4 Rec.t for Acc.t and for the Use of y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a y.e Severall Sumes hereafter Mentioned, being Due to them on Acc.t of Rent viz.t Rec.t of John Colgrave - 04 15 00 Richard Gurling - 06 00 00 Richard Griffin - 02 00 00 Mary Jenster - 08 00 00 Prudence Sherwin 07 00 00 Samuel Taylor 03 06 00 The totall Amo.t of Rent Rec.d Amount to Thirty One pound One Shilling 031 01 00 Rec.t on Acc.t and for y.e Use of y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a the Severall Sumes of Money's hereunder Express.d & being for Negroes Sould and hired out of y.e s.d Comp.a viz.t Rec.t of Richard Stacey 15 10 00 Prudence Sherwin 12 06 00 Mary Smith 09 10 00 John Worrall 05 05 00 The totall Amo.t Rec.t on Acc.t of Negroes, Amounts to forty two pounds Eleven Shillings 042 11 00 Rec.t for y.e Use of y.e s.d R.t Hon.ble Comp.a being on Acc.t of [Fynes] & Amerciam.ts becoming Due to y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a for Misdemeanors viz.t Rec.t of Henry Coats 00 01 00 Richard Gurling - 01 10 00 John Mudge - 02 12 00 Samuel Maxwell 03 00 00 Mary Smith - 00 06 00 The totall Amo.t [...]y.e [...] Rec.t on a[...] Acc.t of y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a Amo.t to Seven pounds Nine Shillings - 007 09 00 Borne Over 183 13 07 1/2	The list of revenue receipts continued from the previous page. Brought forward - £62 3s 2 1/4d William Marsh - £1 9s 0d John Nichols - £6 2s 0d Praise [Pledger] - £1 12s 0d Richard [Larrum] - £10 3s 2d Onesiphorus [Queny] - £1 3s 10d Richard Stacey - £1 4s 0d Thomas Swallow - £1 10s 1 1/2d Prudence [Sherwin] - £6 19s 0d Samuel Taylor - £7 17s 0d Peter Williams - £1 11s 10d [Powell]'s children - £1 3s 5d Total revenues received - £102 12s 7 1/4d A second section recorded sums due to the Company in respect of rent. John Colgrave - £4 15s 0d Richard Gurling - £6 0s 0d Richard Griffin - £2 0s 0d Mary Jenster - £8 0s 0d Prudence Sherwin - £7 0s 0d Samuel Taylor - £3 6s 0d Total rent received - £31 1s 0d A further section dealt with money received for slaves sold and hired out by the Company. Richard Stacey - £15 10s 0d Prudence Sherwin - £12 6s 0d Mary Smith - £9 10s 0d John Worrall - £5 5s 0d Total received on account of slaves - £42 11s 0d A separate section recorded fines and amercements due to the Company for misdemeanours. Henry Coats - £0 1s 0d Richard Gurling - £1 10s 0d John Mudge - £2 12s 0d Samuel Maxwell - £3 0s 0d Mary Smith - £0 6s 0d Total fines received - £7 9s 0d Carried forward - £183 13s 7 1/2d Interpretations Several individuals appeared across more than one revenue stream within this consultation. John Colgrave, Richard Griffin, Mary Jenster, Samuel Taylor and Prudence Sherwin paid both revenue duty and rent. Richard Stacey paid revenue and acquired or hired slaves. Richard Gurling paid rent and a fine. Mary Smith both bought or hired slaves and was fined. The Company's books were organised by category of obligation rather than by debtor, so one settler might enter several distinct lists within a single consultation, appearing as taxpayer, tenant, slave purchaser or fined offender according to the relationship in question. Speculations Prudence Sherwin alone appeared in all three principal commercial streams of this consultation: revenue duty of £6 19s 0d, rent on Company land of £7 0s 0d, and slave purchase or hire of £12 6s 0d. The reach across categories points to an actively expanding settler enterprise rather than a subsistence holding, with private land taxed, additional Company land taken on lease and slave labour acquired in the same accounting period. The triple appearance suggests her household was among the most commercially engaged with the Company in this cycle, and the books captured that position by recording her three times under different

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			headings rather than aggregating her dealings into a single personal account.
18		Brought Over 183 13 07 1/2 Rec.t on Acc.t of y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a the Sevrall p.ticular Sumes following, being on Acc.t of Lycences for Selling of Punck and Re- tayling Strong Liquors viz.t Rec.t of John Colgrave 04 00 00 John [Feild] 02 00 00 Thomas Birch 02 00 00 Richard Gurling 02 00 00 John Long 02 00 00 Samuel Taylor 02 00 00 [Ripin] Wills 02 00 00 The totall Amo.t of Mony.s Rec.t for Lycences, Amo.ts to Six- teen pounds 016 00 00 Rec.t for Acc.t and for y.e Use of y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a being on Accidentall Acc.t and is for the p.ticulars following viz.t Rec.t of Henry Coats for 8 timber trees Cutt by Order 01 16 00 Rec.t of Samuel Taylor being in Remainder p.r p.t of 40.10. Due to y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a for a House Late Matt [Pinney's] 18 00 00 The totall Amo.ts to Nineteen pounds, Sixteen Shillings - 019 16 00 Moreover Rec.t from y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.as Plantation Six hundred Eighty Six Gallons of Potato Arrack at y.s p.r Gallon Amount to One hundred Thirty And Seven pounds 137 00 00 Also Rec.t on Acc.t and for y.e Use of y.e s.d R.t Hon.ble Comp.a One Bale Bafta's Browne Broad Conteyning Eighty p.eces, at Nineteen Shillings p.r p.s which Amounts to Seventy Six pounds, With one Bale of Chint Bramp[ole], Conteyning two hundred and forty p.s at Nine shillings p.r p.s Amounts to One hundred and eight pounds, And one Bale of Pauteas, Conteyning two hundred p.s at five Shillings p.r p.s Amounts to fifty Pounds, Which Said three Bales of Goods we[re] taken out of y.e Shipp [Sempthorne] Cap.t John Sempthorn Comand.r And Amount in y.e Whole to two hundred thirty four pounds 234 00 00 Borne Over 590 09 07 1/2	The list continued from the previous page. Brought forward - £183 13s 7½d A section of licences for selling punch and retailing strong liquors followed. John Colgrave - £4 0s 0d John [Feild] - £2 0s 0d Thomas Birch - £2 0s 0d Richard Gurling - £2 0s 0d John Long - £2 0s 0d Samuel Taylor - £2 0s 0d [Ripin] Wills - £2 0s 0d Total received for licences - £16 0s 0d A section of accidental receipts came next. Henry Coats, for eight timber trees cut by order - £1 16s 0d Samuel Taylor, in remainder of £40 10s due to the Company for a house formerly held by Matthew [Pinney] - £18 0s 0d Total of accidental receipts - £19 16s 0d A further entry recorded 686 gallons of potato arrack received from the Company's plantation at [...] per gallon, valued at £137 0s 0d. Three bales of textiles were taken out of the ship <i>Sempthorne</i>, John Sempthorn commander, and entered as follows. One bale of bafta brown broad, 80 pieces at 19s the piece - £76 0s 0d One bale of chint Bramp[ole], 240 pieces at 9s the piece - £108 0s 0d One bale of pautas, 200 pieces at 5s the piece - £50 0s 0d Total of three bales - £234 0s 0d Carried forward - £590 9s 7½d Interpretations The bales of bafta, chint and pautas taken out of the <i>Sempthorne</i> were Indian cotton goods of the kind the East India Company traded as the staple of its commercial business. Bafta was a plain woven cotton cloth, chint a printed and glazed cotton, while pautas was another grade of Indian woven cotton, here further marked "Bramp[ole]" probably for its place of origin. Their landing on St Helena and entry into the books at standard unit prices showed the island operating as a node in the wider India-to-Europe route rather than as a purely local economy. Potato arrack was a distilled spirit produced from potatoes grown on the Company's plantation, distinct from the cane or palm arrack more usually meant under that name. Its presence here alongside the earlier sugar-cane variety indicated that the plantation distillery worked from a local root crop as well, and that the resulting spirit entered the books as Company stock at a fixed valuation per gallon. The Samuel Taylor entry showed the Company acting as recorder and creditor for the transfer of a house from the estate of Matthew [Pinney]. The full price stood at £40 10s, of which £22 10s had been paid in the previous account and £18 in remainder was now received. Property transfers between settlers therefore moved through the Company's public books in instalments, with the Company tracking the running balance and applying receipts against a known total. Speculations The presence of three bales of Indian textiles within St Helena's revenue accounts points to an active use of the island as a staging and distribution point for Company cargo passing between India and Europe. The goods entered at unit prices set by Company tariff rather than fixed by local market, and could be issued to settlers and the garrison, kept in store, or held for re-shipment. The island's books therefore absorbed three distinct kinds of value within a single balance: local plantation production, settler tax and rent, and trans-shipped Indian cotton. The arrangement perhaps reflected the Company's wish to capture every flow of its business through one accounting line, so that the island's governor could be discharged for the full Company estate under his control rather than for a narrow set of fiscal duties only.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
19		Brought Over 590 09 07 1/4 Rec.t Also on Acc.t and for y.e Use of y.e s.d R.t Hon.ble Comp.a Three Bales Bafta's Brown Broad, Conteyning two hundred forty p.ees at Nineteen Shillings p.r p.s Amo.ts to two hundred twenty Eight pounds, Which three Bales of Bafta's was taken out of Shipp [Diana] Cap.t Tho. Nynn Comander 228 00 00 Moreover Rec.t on Acc.t and for y.e Use of y.e R.t Hon.ble Comp.a two Bales of Nealo's, Conteyning two hundred p.s At Nine Shillings p.r p.s Amounts to Ninety pounds; Which 2 Bales of Nealo's was taken out of Shipp Diana, By Order of Cap.t William Price Late Comander of y.e Shipp Orange 090 00 00 Also Rec.t on Acc.t and for y.e Use afores.d fifty foure Ginny Baggs and Sixteen Sangaree Ditto in all Seventy Baggs At fourteen pence Each Amo.t to foure pounds One Shilling and Eight pence w.ch s.d Baggs was taken Out of Shipp Semphorne - Cap.t John Semphorne Comander 004 01 08 Lastly I do hereby Acknowledge to have Profi- itted in y.e Whole concern of y.e Issuing forth of y.e R.t Hon.ble Cargo's &c.t from y.e 18.th Day of Feb.ry 169[2/3] Untill 13.th Day of Aprill 1693. The Sume of fifty Eight Pounds, fourteen Shillings, Sixpence halfp[en]ly as p.r my Leidger Book folio 46 More p.ticularly Sheweth 058 14 06 1/2 971 05 09 3/4 I Say Rec.t all y.e Afores.d Sumes Barring Receipts whats [so]ever Given by me Witnesses.	The list continued from the previous page. Brought forward - £590 9s 7¼d Further entries recorded goods received from Company ships then in port. Three bales of bafta brown broad, 240 pieces at 19s the piece, taken out of the ship <i>Diana</i>, Thomas Nynn commander - £228 0s 0d Two bales of nealo's, 200 pieces at 9s the piece, taken out of the ship <i>Diana</i> by order of William Price, late commander of the ship <i>Orange</i> - £90 0s 0d 54 Ginny bags together with 16 Sangaree bags, 70 in all, at 14d each, taken out of the ship <i>Semphorne</i>, John Semphorne commander - £4 1s 8d A profit declaration was then added. The signatory acknowledged having profited from the issuing forth of the Company's cargoes between 18 February 1693 and 13 April 1693, the sum being £58 14s 6½d, as set out at folio 46 of his ledger book. The grand total for the consultation was given as £971 5s 9¾d. Receipt of all the above sums was acknowledged, save for any receipts already issued separately. The acknowledgement was signed and attested by witnesses. Interpretations Nealo's, Ginny bags and Sangaree bags extended the Company's trade goods entered into the island's books beyond the bafta, chint and pautas of the previous entries. Nealo's were a class of Indian cotton cloth tallied at 9s the piece. The bags, priced uniformly at 14d each, were lower-value cloth sacking by-products of the same India trade and were counted in the bulk rather than individually identified. All went onto the island's stock at fixed unit values. The order from William Price, named as the late commander of the ship <i>Orange</i>, directing the transfer of two bales of nealo's from the <i>Diana</i> into Company stock, points to a shore-based Company authority on St Helena drawn from former sea captains. Price had moved from sea command into an island role and was now issuing instructions binding on incoming ships, reallocating Company goods between vessels and the local stores as required. The closing profit declaration covered the period 18 February 1693 to 13 April 1693, the same span as the audit of the consultation. The signatory's private commission on Company cargo handling therefore ran on the same clock as his public account of receipts, the two reckoned to a common cut-off so that one signed instrument discharged him for both at once. Speculations The transfer of nealo's bales between ships under Price's order suggests an active shore management of Company cargo flows at St Helena. The island held no large permanent warehousing for India trade goods, so cargo from a passing ship had to be redirected, consolidated and onward-routed quickly while the vessel was still in port. A senior officer with sea experience but now holding shore authority could direct such transfers in person, judging what each ship needed to carry forward against what the island required for its own use or for trans-shipment. Price's order probably marked one such moment of cargo logistics being resolved on the spot by a man whose former command of the <i>Orange</i> gave him both the standing and the practical knowledge to draw goods from one vessel and enter them on the books of another.
20		This Book was made use of for a Council Book ha- ving none at all for Such use, Besides.	A note explained that this book had been used as a Council Book because no other volume was available for that purpose. Interpretations The Council Book was the formal register of decisions taken by the governor and council in session, the equivalent of the minute book for the island's

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			governing body. The need to repurpose another volume, evidently this same revenue ledger, showed that the supply of dedicated administrative materials to the island was incomplete, and that the governing body's official record had to be improvised within whatever bound book was available. Speculations The use of a revenue ledger as a council register, rather than waiting for a proper book to arrive from London, suggests that the governor and council judged the formal recording of their decisions to be more pressing than the procedural niceness of using the right volume. By beginning the record at once on whatever paper came to hand, they ensured that council business was documented continuously, treating the absence of a dedicated book as a problem to be overcome immediately rather than a reason to defer formal record-keeping.
21	1	Island S.t Helena. You John Alexander and Richard Gurling are appointed Church Wardens for this present year 1703 And who you desire and Request to be Informed what is y.e Proper dutys requisite for the performance of that office and Considering y.e Circumstances of this place. We think Fitt that y.e Rules following be the Rules and methods for the Church Wardens (especially for y.e present) to Governe themselves and to walk by[.] You are to take Care of the furniture and Utensills belonging to the Churches Seeing that no Imbazlem.t be made of any that Shall bee delivered into y.r Charge and Custody[.] You Shall keep a good Acco.t of all gifts &c.t Dedicated to, and for the use of the Church and give An Acco.t of your disbursements of the same For the use of the gifts is given[.] You Shall take Notice of all Notorious and open profane persons, and wicked Sabbath Breakers, Swearers Drunkards Whoremongers and give notice of them unto us But as for Sabbath breakers and Swearers You are to reprove According as you think fitt, and after Such reproof or reprooves if they Still persist in their profane manner. You Shall make presentation of them According to y.e at y.e usuall Quarterly Sessions[.] You Shall upon Easter monday Assemble w.th the Inhabit.ts in free holders of this place and there by Majority [Vote], or by Some other Convenient place and there by Majority [Vote], or by Some other Convenient [...] Nominate four Persons for y.e Church Wardens and four Persons for overseers of y.e high ways. Which persons you shall present unto us w.h reby we may make Choice of two out of the four for Church Wardens and two out of the four for overseers of the high ways to Succeed you and y.e p.sent overseers (After that you have past your Acco.ts w.th us in y.r p.r places) You shall be Likewise See and have Some Respect to y.e Poor and Impotent on y.e [Side] and and Relate their Conditions w.th us, that some Care might be taken for their necessary Releife[.] You Shall take Care that no disord.r be in the Church dureing the time of divine Service for which those you most Diligen[t] person to attend his duty, and assist him his Salary & make report for y.e Same Accord- ingly[.] This is what present we Can think necessary present for y.e duty of Church Wardens untill Some other matter shall occur In Testimony Whereof we Govern.r and Counc.l for y.e time being do hereunto Sett our hands this 11 day of May 1703 Poirier Tho. Goodwin Jn.o [Feild] Jo. [Cardo] Margin Notes: Church War- dens Warrant	John Alexander and Richard Gurling were appointed Church Wardens of St Helena for 1703. They asked the Governor and Council what duties were attached to the office and how those duties should be carried out in the conditions of the island. The Council issued written rules to guide them. The Wardens were charged with the care of church furniture and utensils. Nothing in their custody was to be embezzled. Full accounts were to be kept of gifts and donations made to the church. Money was to be paid out only for the purposes for which each gift had been given. Notorious profane persons, Sabbath breakers, swearers, drunkards and whoremongers were to be noted. The Council was to be informed of them. Sabbath breakers and swearers were to be reproof first by the Wardens themselves. If reproof failed and the offenders carried on, they were to be presented at the next quarterly sessions. On Easter Monday the Wardens were to assemble the inhabitants and freeholders of the island. By majority vote, or by some other convenient [...] method, four men were to be nominated for the office of Church Warden and four for the office of overseer of the highways. The list of nominees was to be brought to the Council. Two of each four would then be chosen by the Council to succeed the present officers, once the outgoing Wardens had passed their accounts. The poor and impotent on the [...] were also to be looked after. Their conditions were to be reported so that relief could be arranged. Order during divine service was to be kept. A diligent person was to be appointed to attend this duty, paid a salary for the work, and a report on the matter was to be made. These rules were stated to be sufficient for the present, until further matters arose. The warrant was signed at St Helena on 11 May 1703 by Poirier, Thomas Goodwin, John [Feild] and Jo. [Cardo]. Interpretations The office of Church Warden in early modern English practice combined custody of church property, supervision of moral conduct, presentation of offenders, and the management of poor relief. On St Helena, where the East India Company governed and there was no bishop or archdeacon, those ecclesiastical functions of oversight passed to the Governor and Council. The warrant therefore fused parish office with colonial administration in a single chain of authority. Freeholders were those holding land outright on the island, set apart from tenants, soldiers and labourers. Limiting nomination to inhabitants and freeholders carried the English property qualification into the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			colonial setting, restricting the choice of officers to those with a stake in the soil. The quarterly sessions were the regular court for minor criminal offences. By directing the Wardens to reprove first and present only if reproof failed, the Council established a two-stage system of moral discipline: informal correction by a parish officer, escalating to formal prosecution before the magistrates only when private warning was ignored. Overseers of the highways were drawn from the same English parish template as the Wardens. Tying both elections to a single Easter Monday meeting concentrated local civic business into one annual event and lent it the rhythm of the church calendar. The nomination procedure gave inhabitants the right to put forward four names for each office, but reserved final selection of two to the Council. This preserved the form of local consent while keeping ultimate appointment in the hands of the executive, and allowed the Council to veto any nominee considered unfit without openly overriding the vote. The categories of profane person, Sabbath breaker, swearer, drunkard and whoremonger were the standard headings of moral offence under English parish discipline. Their inclusion here shows that the Company expected the church courts' moral remit to be enforced through civil sessions in a colony where no church court existed. The poor and impotent formed the recognised welfare category of those unable to maintain themselves through age, sickness or disability. Tasking the Wardens to identify and report them placed the burden of locating need on parish officers, with relief itself remaining a matter for the Council to decide and arrange. Speculations The fact that the new Wardens had to ask in writing what their duties were suggests that the parish system on St Helena was not yet a settled routine in 1703. The Council's response set down a working version of the English model, drafted to fit a small colony where civil and ecclesiastical authority sat in the same hands. The staged sequence of private reproof followed by public presentation probably reflected the practical limits of a small community. Constant prosecution of neighbours for swearing or Sabbath breaking would have been corrosive, so the Wardens were given a personal warning power that allowed minor offences to be settled without recourse to the sessions. The four-into-two nomination procedure was probably designed to manage a specific local risk: that an open election in a contentious settlement would produce officers the Council found unsuitable. By accepting only a shortlist and reserving the choice, the Council secured loyal officers without having to reject the principle of local consent.
22	2	Island S.t Helena At a Consulation Held on Thursday the first day of Aprill 1703. All Fort James Pres.t Steph.n Poirier Gov.r Tho. Goodwin D.ty Gov.r Jn.o Feild Ensigne M.r Carne came this day and desired we would Lett him have by way of hire that part of a house belonging to Jonathan Beals orphans which joynes to his house It is Agreed & ordered That the Said M.r Carne have the Said house att the rate of five Pounds p.r Annum And that the Said house be kept in repaire by Govern.r and Councill at the s.d orphans Charge - M.r Hodgson who has the Care of the Said orphans Stock of Cattle brought this day an Acc.t thereof which was Examined and approved off Whereas An French Gun.r for the Hon.ble united [...] on the Said Iland made [...] uguen.t y.t in the [...] of Jn.o	A consultation was held on Thursday 1 April 1703 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Feild, Ensign, attended. Mr Carne came that day and asked to hire the part of Jonathan Beale's orphans' house that adjoined his own. The Council agreed and ordered that he take it at £5 0s 0d per annum. The Governor and Council were to keep the house in repair at the orphans' charge. Mr Hodgson, who had charge of the orphans' stock of cattle, brought in an account that day. The account was examined and approved. A French gunner serving the Honourable United [...] on the island brought a complaint. He stated that, in connection with the house of the late John Johnson, a scandalous report circulated that his own late wife had

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Johnson Dec.d Saying the [Death] reported Scandulously, that [...] the said french[es] [...] Lately deceased, was an [Hermaphrodite] Where- upon the partie[s] [...]Cerned and Evidences were heard on y.e [...] Last and whereas the Said [...] Johnson gave oath it was true and that She was not Like an other woman Also Eliz. Andewone made oath that [...] [Beerg]nt (who was the Said frenches wife, [Nurst] during her Sicknes) hath told her the Same, which [...] danyed By the Said [Lea]h [Bee]rgant we thought fitt to refer the decision of the s.d business to the [Society] [...] of the Peace [...] [Sessions], But the s.d In[...] [Considering] it would hardly Come to a finall decision without taking up his s.d wife (for/[...]) out of the [Travel] desired rather to prosecute the Said [...] [...] no [...] But desired us we should foubid on paine of fine That no person Soever Should hereafter [...] [...] Said [...] memory in Such a gros.t manner	been a hermaphrodite. The parties and witnesses were heard on the [...]. Sworn evidence followed. [...] Johnson swore the report was true and that the dead woman was not like another woman. Elizabeth Andewone gave oath that Leah Beergant, the gunner's present wife, who nursed the deceased during her sickness, told her the same thing. Leah Beergant denied it. The Council resolved to refer the matter to the Justices of the Peace at the next quarter sessions. The complainant judged that no final decision could be reached without his own wife being taken up [...]. He chose not to pursue formal prosecution. Instead he asked the Council to forbid, on pain of fine, any further attack on the dead woman's memory in such gross terms. Interpretations The Honourable United [...] named in the manuscript was the East India Company, employer of the French gunner. The Company stationed paid gunners and soldiers on St Helena to defend an island it held by charter, which made the Council both his civil magistrate and the local arm of his employer. Hiring the orphans' house to Mr Carne at £5 per annum with repairs charged back to the orphans shows how the Council managed minor children's estates. The rent flowed in to support the orphans, but maintenance was met from their own funds, so they bore upkeep costs while drawing income from the property. The duty placed on Hodgson to render a formal account of the orphans' cattle reveals how guardians of minors' livestock were held to scrutiny by the Council. The Council sat as the standing court of probate and guardianship in a colony with no separate Chancery. The Justices of the Peace at quarter sessions formed the regular criminal court for the island. Defamation that imputed a serious moral or physical fault, such as hermaphroditism, was prosecutable there as a public offence rather than a private wrong, which was why the Council first thought of referring the case for trial. To "take up" the wife meant to have her arrested or formally summoned as a defendant. Since she was the alleged source of the slander, prosecution at sessions would have placed her in the dock as the principal accused. The Council's power to forbid speech on pain of fine, used here in place of indictment, shows the executive's reach beyond the courts. An order let the Council punish further offence by administrative process without granting the formal protections of jury trial. Speculations The gunner brought the complaint, but his own present wife stood as the alleged speaker. Pushing the case to quarter sessions would have placed her in the dock with the risk of conviction and fine. His preference for a Council prohibition rather than a trial probably reflected the wish to clear his late wife's name while keeping his second wife out of court. The Council's readiness to substitute an administrative order for a prosecution gave him an exit that no formal court process could supply. That Leah Beergant nursed the gunner's first wife during her last sickness, and afterwards held her place in his bed, probably explains why the rumour took hold. As nurse she had private access to the dying woman's body, and any anatomical claim made or invented in that setting could pass as first-hand observation that no one else could contradict. The fact that she then married the widower gave the slander a plain motive, since suggesting the first wife had not been a true woman served the second wife's standing in the marriage. Whether or not Beergant spoke the words, the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			shape of the case made the accusation easy to believe and explains why it had to be silenced rather than tried.
23	3	Therefore It is ordered, That according to y.e Said In.o Frenches request, Th.s Said busines[s] [Shall] not be prosecuted any further and in th.e mean while it is forbidden to all persons whatsoever to [not] Scandalize the Said french[es] wifes memory on this Account on [pain] of being fined Two dollars the one halfe to the Informer and the [other] halfe to y.e [R.t Hon.o] Comp.a Lords propriet.rs and y.e Said french to pay the present Charges Poirier Tho: Goodwin	The matter was therefore ordered to stop at John French's request. It was not to be prosecuted any further. In the meantime, every person was forbidden to scandalise French's wife's memory on this account. Anyone who did so was to be fined two dollars. One half was to go to the informer. The other half was to go to the Right Honourable Company, Lords Proprietors. French was ordered to pay the present charges. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed the order. Interpretations The fine split between the informer and the Company showed how enforcement was encouraged. A private person gained a direct reward for reporting the offence. The Company also took a share, which turned an attack on a dead woman's reputation into a punishable breach of public order. French's agreement to pay the present charges showed the cost of legal process even when prosecution stopped. The council granted his request to end the case but still made him bear the expense already caused by it.
24	4	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 13 day of Aprill 1703 Att Fort James 141 Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Pres: Tho.m Goodwin Insigne Jn.o Field 3.d in Coun: Whereas George Hodgson free Planter and Church Warden for the year past on behalf of the major part of the Inhabitan[ts] of Said Island presented their Petition to us as followeth/ Iland S.t Helena The Humble Petition of the free Planters of the Said Island Sheweth That whereas Some of the Inhabitants of th[is] Island went on board the good Shipp Loyall Cook the monday following [the] Said Shipp Coming into the rode in the [s]laide Road that lived on bo[ar]d the Said Shipp Ingrosed and bought all or [m]ost part of the Arrack at nine Shillings p.r Gallon which is a price that is Seldom or Never given but Upon an Extraordinary Occasion and is Contrary to all [Pollicy] [Profit] and well Liveing of y.e Said Inhabitants/ Our humble request is that no person or [p]rsons of what [Character] [s]oever under the [p]ennalty of Ten pound for[f]eiture one moiety to the Informer the other to the Church or [poor] Shall directly or Indirectly by way of Barter Purchase or any other means whatsoever Give [m]ore then Six Shilling p.r Gall.n for Arrack out of Ships, that being the [Curr.ent] price [a]nd Sufficient gain[e] for the Sellers/ Further Ripin Wells being the [m]an who gave the [9]/p Gall: for the Arrack [a]nd Sold it againe at 11/6 p Gall: which prodig[i]ous Extorti[on] [g]ains and Extortion Cannot be Excused, without an [A]tonement made to the Church or Some other Charitable use/ Therefore [w]e the Said Inhabitants Do humbly desire [yo.r] Worshipp[s] [w.ch] through y.o great [Prudence] and Justice [w]ill act before you the Said Ripi[n] Well and fine him According to his [m]eritt and [fulfill] our [r]equest aboveSaid And we Shall as in duty bound ever pray [8.c.] Jn.o [Lemon] Geo: Hodgs[on] March y.e 29 1703 [Matt:] [Garett] Tho: [Swallow] Sen.r [Owin] [Perian] [Jam.es] [Liden] Jonet [Ruston] Thomas [Dixon]	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 13 April 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, and John Field, third in council, were present. George Hodgson, free planter and churchwarden for the past year, presented a petition on behalf of the greater part of the island's inhabitants. The petition was from the free planters of St Helena. It said that some inhabitants went on board the good ship <i>Loyall Cook</i> on the Monday after the ship came into the road. They, or those living on board the ship in the road, engrossed and bought all or most of the arrack at 9s 0d per gallon. The petition said that such a price was seldom or never paid except on an extraordinary occasion. It was said to be contrary to the policy, profit and good living of the inhabitants. The petitioners asked that no person, of any rank, should directly or indirectly pay more than 6s 0d per gallon for arrack from ships. This applied to purchase, barter or any other means. The penalty was to be £10 0s 0d. One half was to go to the informer. The other half was to go to the church or poor. The petition said that 6s 0d per gallon was the current price and gave enough gain to the sellers. The petition also stated that Ripin Wells bought the arrack at 9s 0d per gallon and sold it again at 11s 6d per gallon. The petitioners called this a prodigious gain and extortion. They said it could not be excused unless amends were made to the church or to some other charitable use. The inhabitants therefore asked the Governor and Council, through their prudence and justice, to summon Ripin Wells, fine him as he deserved and grant their request. The petition was dated 29 March 1703. It was signed by John Lemon, George Hodgson, Matthew Garett, Thomas Swallow senior, [Owin] [Perian], James Liden, Jonet Ruston and Thomas Dixon. Interpretations George Hodgson's role mattered because he spoke both as a free planter and as churchwarden. The petition therefore linked private economic grievance to parish authority. By asking that part of the penalty go to the church or poor, the inhabitants tried to turn a market complaint into a public and charitable matter. The proposed fine used an informer system. A person who reported a breach would receive half the penalty. This created a direct reward for enforcement

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			and reduced reliance on officials alone. It also made price control part of community policing. The petition showed the council being asked to regulate shipboard trade before goods reached the wider island market. Arrack from ships was treated as a scarce import that could be captured by early buyers. The petitioners wanted a maximum price imposed at the point of purchase, not only after resale. Speculations The complaint against Ripin Wells was probably aimed at preventing a small group from controlling imported drink as soon as a ship arrived. The detail that buyers went aboard on the Monday after the <i>Loyall Cook</i> came into the road showed an early rush to secure the arrack before others could buy it. The request that Wells make amends to the church or another charitable use probably offered a way to punish profit without treating the matter only as a private quarrel. The petitioners framed his resale at 11s 6d per gallon as harm to the whole community, so a charitable payment would turn his gain back towards public use.
25	5	Henry Coales W.m his Marsh James Draper Jn.o [Mudge] mark Ro.b: Alexander James [Leach] [Thomas] Thomas Alli[?] Jn.o [Coe] [15] Joshua Johnson Will: Coales W.m his Duston Henry Francis Tho.s Coales mark [fra:] Thrangam Jn.o Coulson Eras: Gurling [Eed] [Berill] [Geo:] [Gurling] James Greentree Charles Steward [Jon.t [Effigham] Edward Bagley Tho: Burnham mark Jn.o [Hadnale] Robert [Each] Simon P [Whaley] Rob.t [Addis] [Todd] Jona [Mudge] Jn.o [Sutton] W.m [Nichols] Will: Sedle Jn.o Alexander Edw.d [Crosbey] Geo[rge] [Sydney] Likewise The Said George Hoskison and overseers of y.e high ways made Complain[t] against James Easthope (who was formerly one of y.e [overseers]) for [Selling] in a Clandestine manner the Bridge that was [Ramined] by y.e last great flood which was over y.e water Course that Comes from the [Toune] to y.e fort and for not giving any Acco.t thereof Neither to the Govern.r nor [Cou]ntrey, att whose Charge it was built, Therefore desired in behalf[e] of y.e Whole Country That y.e [s]aid Easthope, might be obliged to Pay y.e [s]d Country Two Pounds for Said Bridge so Sold, where upon The Said James Easthope was called, who being [s]worne, Saith that the Bridge being Broak with violence of the Last great flood, and Lying in Danger to be wash[t] away, or Stole he advised others thereof being [Sole] the Said Bridge to Thomas Dixon for [a Sume] of three Dollars [whi]ch was the full value of it as he thought, and did it for y.e good of y.e Countrey and in Consequence thereof desired the Said Dixon to be Said Yeers Church Warden then to give the Country Cred.t for Said Sume Which the Said Dixon Saith he did, but y.e Said [Bri]dge forgote to do it, and made oath Accordingly/ It is ordered. That the Said Dixon pay the Said Sume of three dollars for y.e Bridge to the Succeeding Church Wardens for y.e use of y.e Church, and to pay Charges of [Court] also/ Furthermore It is ordered. That the before mentioned Ripin Wills repay one dollar Back againe to [...] [...] [...] for the three Gallons of Arrack he [...]	Henry Coales, William Marsh by his mark, James Draper, John [Mudge] by his mark, Robert Alexander, James [Leach], [Thomas], Thomas Alli[?], John [Coe], [15], Joshua Johnson, William Coales, William Duston by his mark, Henry Francis, Thomas Coales by his mark, Francis Thrangam, John Coulson, Erasmus Gurling, [Eed] [Berill], George Gurling, James Greentree, Charles Steward, Jonathan [Effigham], Edward Bagley, Thomas Burnham by his mark, John [Hadnale], Robert [Each], Simon P [Whaley], Robert Addis, [Todd], Jonathan Mudge, John Sutton, William Nichols, William Sedle, John Alexander, Edward Crosbey and George Sydney also signed. Likewise, George Hoskison and the overseers of the highways complained against James Easthope, who had formerly been one of the overseers. They said he had secretly sold the bridge left by the last great flood. The bridge had stood over the watercourse that ran from the town to the fort. Easthope had given no account of the sale to the Governor or to the country, at whose charge the bridge had been built. On behalf of the whole country, they asked that Easthope be made to pay the country £2 0s 0d for the bridge he had sold. James Easthope was called and sworn. He said the bridge had been broken by the force of the last great flood. It lay in danger of being washed away or stolen. He therefore told others about it and sold the bridge to Thomas Dixon for the sum of three dollars. He thought this was its full value. He said he had done it for the good of the country. He therefore asked Dixon, who was the churchwarden for that year, to give the country credit for the sum. Dixon said he did so, but the bridge was forgotten. He swore to this. Dixon was ordered to pay the three dollars for the bridge to the next churchwardens for the use of the church. He was also ordered to pay the charges of court. Ripin Wills was further ordered to repay one dollar to [...] [...] [...] for the three gallons of arrack he [...]. Interpretations The complaint over the bridge showed the highways overseers treating public infrastructure as community property. The bridge had been built at the country's charge, so its remains could not be sold privately without an account. Even damaged material still belonged to the public. The order that the three dollars be paid to the next churchwardens showed how parish officers could hold money for community use. The churchwardens acted as local custodians of funds, even when the matter concerned a bridge rather than church fabric.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The court charges placed on Dixon showed that failure to account could carry a cost even when no theft was proved. The council accepted the sworn explanation that the bridge had been sold for public good, but still required payment to be made through the proper local officers. Speculations Easthope's sale of the broken bridge was probably presented as a practical response to the flood damage. The detail that it was in danger of being washed away or stolen gave his action a specific justification. He did not claim a right to keep the money. He claimed that he tried to turn damaged public material into credit for the country. The order directed payment to the succeeding churchwardens rather than to Dixon. This probably avoided leaving the money with the same officer whose accounting had failed. The council used a change of office to restore control over the funds.
26	6	to Sam.l Wrangham dec.d 1[.] [P.d] Sold M.r Goodwin [...] Executor for y.e [Vsuile] of one of Wrang[am] orphans and to pay Charges of [Funirall]/ Whereas M.r George Caine delivered the whole Estate of Govern.r Keeling [...] unto us, Some time before he took his passage in the Ship Nathaniell for Madrass, and he being Returned to this Island againe desires that we would deliver unto him the Estate of Eleanor Keeling (who dwells with him) offering to pay Interest for the Same/ We do (altho: the R.t Hon.o Comp.a Orders us to Send them the mony that appertains to the Said Govern.r Keelings Children) Considering that the girle lives with the Said M.r Caine That he have her [Share] of the Sd Estate at Eight p.r Cent Interest And that he be allowed nine pounds p.r annum for her boarding [Cleaning] [...] [...] the ought to be Eudicated According to her Quallety, which is Accepted of/ The Said M.r Caine presented his Petition Setting forth therein, that [he] understood [Richard] Beale his nephew was att the Charge of Six pound[s] p.r annum for his maintenance wherefore requested y.e Comp.a [...] to have him delivered to him at y.e Rate of three pounds p.r annum offering to Stand bound to give him Schooling and to bring him up in the Church of England Religion, as may be Examined yearly, which being Considered It is ordered That the Said M.r Caine have his nephew according to his desire and to Learne him to Read and write as he offers to do/ Whereas the old Church Wardens and overseers of y.e high ways were ordered to appear before us this day In order of [Makering] up their Acco.s w.th us, of the last yeers proceedings, who Accordingly did, and in the overseers Acco. it did appear that Several persons Stood Indebted to the high way the Sume of thirty five Shillings, which the [Pole] overseers are Ordered to Collect Imediatly and Deliver y.e Same to y.e Succeeding overseers, and then discharged from their Office/ Whereas M.r Thomas Goodwin Executor of the Last will and Testament of Sam.l Wrangham dec.d being designed to make a dividend of the Said Wranghams Estate one of his Children being already married to Jonathan Ruston Desired that Jn.o Sacknale and Mathew Garrett might be Sworne to Appraise y.e Said dec.d Wranghams Estate, both Reale and personall, who according[ly] were/ [Poirier] [Is Cund] Tho: Goodwin	[...] to Samuel Wrangham, deceased, 1[.] [P.d]. Mr Goodwin, [...] executor, sold it for the use of one of Wrangham's orphans and to pay the charges of the funeral. George Caine had delivered the whole estate of Governor Keeling [...] to the Governor and Council some time before he took passage in the ship <i>Nathaniell</i> for Madras. He had now returned to the island. He asked that the estate of Eleanor Keeling, who lived with him, be delivered to him. He offered to pay interest for it. The Right Honourable Company had ordered the Governor and Council to send them the money that belonged to Governor Keeling's children. Even so, Eleanor's share of the estate was allowed to Mr Caine, because the girl lived with him. He was to hold it at eight per cent interest. He was also to be allowed £9 0s 0d a year for her boarding, cleaning [...] [...] [...]. She was to be educated according to her quality. This was accepted. Mr Caine presented a petition. He stated that he understood his nephew Richard Beale cost £6 0s 0d a year for his maintenance. He therefore asked the Company [...] to have the boy delivered to him at £3 0s 0d a year. He offered to give bond that the boy would be schooled and brought up in the religion of the Church of England. This could be examined each year. After this was considered, Mr Caine was granted his nephew as requested. He was to teach him to read and write, as he offered to do. The old churchwardens and overseers of the highways had been ordered to appear that day, so their accounts for the past year could be made up with the Governor and Council. They appeared as ordered. In the overseers' account, several persons were found to owe the highway 35s 0d. The former overseers were ordered to collect that sum at once and deliver it to the succeeding overseers. They were then discharged from office. Thomas Goodwin, executor of the last will and testament of Samuel Wrangham, deceased, planned to make a division of Wrangham's estate. One of Wrangham's children had already married Jonathan Ruston. Goodwin asked that John Sacknale and Matthew Garrett be sworn to appraise Wrangham's estate, both real and personal. They were sworn accordingly. [Poirier] [Is Cund] and Thomas Goodwin signed. Interpretations The handling of Governor Keeling's children's estate showed the council balancing Company instruction against local custody. The Company ordered the money sent away, but Eleanor Keeling's share was left with George Caine because she lived in his

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			household. Interest, board and education terms turned private care into a supervised financial arrangement. The phrase “according to her quality” showed that Eleanor’s education and maintenance were tied to rank. Her care was not treated as mere subsistence. It was expected to fit her social standing as Governor Keeling’s daughter. Richard Beale’s placement with George Caine showed how orphan maintenance could be renegotiated through cost, religion and schooling. The council accepted a lower yearly charge only because Caine offered formal responsibility for education and Church of England upbringing. Yearly examination gave the council a means to inspect his performance. The accounts of the churchwardens and highway overseers showed annual local office as a supervised trust. Officers were not simply replaced at year’s end. They first had to account for money owed, collect outstanding sums and hand them to their successors before discharge. The appraisal of Samuel Wrangham’s estate showed the legal preparation for division among heirs. Because one child had already married Jonathan Ruston, the estate needed valuation before shares could be settled. Sworn appraisers gave the division public authority and reduced the risk of later dispute. Speculations Caine’s request for Eleanor Keeling’s share was probably designed to join the child’s money to the household that maintained her. The council allowed this only with eight per cent interest and a stated boarding allowance. Those terms protected the estate while giving Caine funds connected to the child’s upkeep. The reduced maintenance offer for Richard Beale probably answered a defined cost problem. Caine pointed to the existing £6 0s 0d charge and offered £3 0s 0d instead. The promised schooling and religious upbringing made the lower sum acceptable by replacing expense with a structured guardianship duty.
27	7	Island S.t Helena. By Govern.r & Coun.ce An Advertizem.t Whereas y.e major Part of the Inhabitants of [...] th[e] Said Island have Humbly requested That no person or persons of what Charracter Soever, & under the Pennalty of Ten pounds forfeitare one moiety to the Informer, the other to the Church or poor) Shall directly or Indirectly by way of Barter Purchase, or any other means whatsoever Give more then Six Shillings p Gallon for Arrack out of Ships, That being y.e Currant price, and Sufficient Gains for the Seller/ Which we y.e Govern.r and Coun.ce Takeing Into our Consideration Do hereby Confirme the above Premises, and that it Remaine in fforce/ Dated att Fort James this 17.th day of Apprell 1703 Signed p ord.r of Govern.r & Coun.ce p me Jn.o Alexander	At St Helena, an advertisement was issued by the Governor and Council. The greater part of the inhabitants of the island was said to have asked that no person, of any rank, should directly or indirectly give more than 6s 0d per gallon for arrack from ships. This applied to barter, purchase or any other means. The penalty was set at £10 0s 0d. One half was to go to the informer. The other half was to go to the church or poor. The inhabitants said that 6s 0d per gallon was the current price and gave enough profit to the seller. The Governor and Council considered the request. They confirmed it and ordered that it remain in force. The advertisement was dated at Fort James on 17 April 1703. It was signed by order of the Governor and Council by John Alexander. Interpretations The advertisement turned the earlier petition into a public rule. The council did not only punish Ripin Wills after the disputed sale. It fixed a maximum price for future purchases of arrack from ships. The informer’s share made enforcement depend partly on private reporting. A person who exposed a breach received half the forfeiture. The other half went to the church or poor, which made the offence a public and charitable matter rather than a private bargain alone. The rule controlled the first point of trade between ships and island buyers. This prevented early buyers from paying more than others could afford, securing the supply and reselling it at a higher price.
28	8	Island S.t Hellence Att a Sessions Held on monday the	At St Helena, a sessions was held on Monday, 19 April 1703, at the sessions house near Fort James. The

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis																								
		19 day of Aprill 1703 att the Sessions house near Fort James, For the decision of a Tryall of Felony betveen our Soveraign Lady Queen Ann on behalf of Thomas Davis free Planter and Susanna the wife of Will: Duston Sou.r/ Pres.t Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Tho: Goodwin dp.ty Gover: Jn.o Field Ensigne After the Court was opened According to the Accustomed maner, those persons Appointed for Jurors are as followeth. <table><tr><td>Tho: Smalley Sen.r foreman</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Orlando Poirier</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Ripin Wills</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>[Sym.de] DesFountaine</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>Jn.o Bagley</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>Tho: [Orle]</td><td>6</td></tr><tr><td>James [Lider]</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>Tho: Dixon</td><td>8</td></tr><tr><td>Jn.o Hernon</td><td>9</td></tr><tr><td>Arthur Bradley</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>Hugh Bradley</td><td>11</td></tr><tr><td>James Easthope</td><td>12</td></tr></table> Who were all Sworne & no objection made/ Then all persons concerned was called and the Indictement against the said Susanna Duston for her recieving the four Quarters of a heifer belonging to the abovesaid Tho: Davis into her house being feleoneously kild by their Black, was read, and she pleaded not Guilty, declareing as followeth. Susanna Duston declares that on wedndsay Evening last about 4 or 5 of the clock She Sent her Son William and Black to fetch home the Cows from their feeding free Land and ordered the said Black to look about for a Cow of theirs which She thought might be nigh pigging and the Said Black being Looking for the Sow found a heifer that was felled downe and called to the Boy and bid him tell his Mistris that one of their heifers had brock her neck, who accordingly did, and a little while after she sent the Boy back againe to help y.e Black [...] the Beast, [&] they brought home in the night, And there [upon]	Tho: Smalley Sen.r foreman	1	Orlando Poirier	2	Ripin Wills	3	[Sym.de] DesFountaine	4	Jn.o Bagley	5	Tho: [Orle]	6	James [Lider]	7	Tho: Dixon	8	Jn.o Hernon	9	Arthur Bradley	10	Hugh Bradley	11	James Easthope	12	case was a felony trial between Queen Anne, on behalf of Thomas Davis, free planter, and Susanna, wife of William Duston, soldier. Stephen Poirier, Governor, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, Ensign, were present. The court was opened in the usual manner. The appointed jurors were then named. Thomas Smalley senior, foreman Orlando Poirier Ripin Wills [Sym.de] DesFountaine John Bagley Thomas [Orle] James [Lider] Thomas Dixon John Hernon Arthur Bradley Hugh Bradley James Easthope All the jurors were sworn. No objection was made. All persons concerned were then called. The indictment was read against Susanna Duston. She was charged with receiving into her house four quarters of a heifer belonging to Thomas Davis after it was feloniously killed by their Black. She pleaded not guilty. Susanna Duston said that on Wednesday evening last, at about four or five o'clock, she sent her son William and their Black to bring home the cows from their feeding free land. She ordered the Black to look for one of their cows, which she thought might be near pigging. While the Black was looking for the sow, he found a heifer that was fallen down. He called to the boy and told him to tell his mistress that one of their heifers was broken her neck. The boy did so. A little later, Susanna sent him back to help the Black [...] the beast. They brought it home in the night. Interpretations The case was framed as a felony between the Crown and Susanna Duston, even though Thomas Davis was the injured planter. This placed the killing and receipt of the heifer under public criminal authority rather than treating it as a private dispute over livestock. The indictment focused on Susanna's receipt of the four quarters into her house. That mattered because the prosecution did not need to describe her as the person who killed the animal. Possession of the butchered meat after a felonious killing was treated as part of the offence. The phrase "their Black" showed that the slave or Black servant in the Duston household was treated as part of the household's labour force and as a possible actor in the felony. Susanna's account placed him under her orders, first for herding and then for dealing with the fallen animal. Free land functioned as common or open grazing ground. The cattle were not kept in a closed household space. This made livestock ownership, straying, discovery and theft harder to control and more dependent on sworn accounts from household members and servants.
Tho: Smalley Sen.r foreman	1																										
Orlando Poirier	2																										
Ripin Wills	3																										
[Sym.de] DesFountaine	4																										
Jn.o Bagley	5																										
Tho: [Orle]	6																										
James [Lider]	7																										
Tho: Dixon	8																										
Jn.o Hernon	9																										
Arthur Bradley	10																										
Hugh Bradley	11																										
James Easthope	12																										
29	9	it had been their owne heifer, till the Govern.r Sent his Warrant to Search for M.r Davis's heifer/ The Said Dustons black declares that as he was Looking for his masters Sow he found a heifer that was downe which he Stuck w.th his knife and Called to y.e Boy to tell his mistriss that a heifer of theirs was fallen downe and whilst the Boy was gone to y.r [...] [...] Mistriss and threw away the hide amongst the wood, and Says that the heifer was of his	Susanna Duston said she believed it was their own heifer until the Governor sent his warrant to search for Mr Davis's heifer. Duston's Black said that he was looking for his master's sow when he found a heifer that was down. He stabbed it with his knife and called to the boy. He told him to tell his mistress that one of their heifers was fallen down. While the boy was gone to his [...] [...] mistress, the Black threw the hide away among the wood. He said the heifer carried his master's mark. William, Duston's son, said that he was bringing the cows home when the Black called to him. The Black told him to tell his mother that one of their heifers was																								

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		masters mark/ William the Said Dustons Son Saith that as he was bringing the Cows along homewards, the Black called to him and bid him tell his mother that one of their heifers was fallen downe which when he went home did So, and a little while after his mother Sent him to hold up y.e said heifer but y.e Black had done before he Came to him and had throwne away the hide amongst y.e Wood and Said he had teare y.e Eares/ William Marsh free Planter being Sworne Saith, that on last wednesday Evening Dustons wife & boy [...] [...] [...] cattle and y.e tree land and we y.e [...] [...] hereiyng a heifer of M.r Davis(es) [...] went in the pasture went to Look for her, and Seeing his Bull Smelling to the Ground and Roaring Severall times went the Blues and Cow where a beast had been kild, And found in Searching further, a browne hide buried in the Ground, And do't think in his Conscience that that hide did belong to M.r Davis's heifer Further Saith, that Susanna Duston him that they had Lost a heifer w.th a white Starr in her forehead which is now alive/ Leonard [Hunt] Sworne Saith that [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] when he went w.th William Marsh, to Search for M.r Davies's heifer he Saw the hid w.ch M.r Marsh found, which was very like M.r Davis, and doeth think it to be realy So/ Jn.o Marsh being Sworne Saith that on Thursday Evening Last he Came from fishing and after he had been a little while at home his Brother Robert brought home the hid which his father had found up before, And doth think in his Conscience that it was the hide of M.r Davis heifer/ Robert Marsh Sworne Saith that he thinks in his Conscience that y.t hide his father found was the hid of M.r Davis's heifer but it was not quite So bright a Colour it haveing bin buried in y.e ground/ Then the Jury withdrew and Stayed nigh ½ of an hour, Then Returned and brought in their verdict as followeth, That William Dustons wife, Son and black was Guilty of the Indictm.t laid to their Chargs. It	fallen down. William went home and did so. A little later, his mother sent him to hold up the heifer. The Black was finished before William reached him. The hide was thrown away among the wood. The Black said he had torn the ears. William Marsh, free planter, was sworn. He said that on Wednesday evening last Duston's wife and boy [...] [...] [...] [...] cattle and the free land. [...] hearing that a heifer of Mr Davis's [...] was in the pasture, he went to look for her. He saw his bull smelling the ground and roaring several times. He went to the [...] and cow, where a beast was killed. After further search, he found a brown hide buried in the ground. He believed in his conscience that the hide belonged to Mr Davis's heifer. He also said that Susanna Duston told him they lost a heifer with a white star on her forehead. That heifer was now alive. Leonard [Hunt] was sworn. He said that [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] When he went with William Marsh to search for Mr Davis's heifer, he saw the hide which Mr Marsh found. It was very like Mr Davis's heifer, and he believed it truly was hers. John Marsh was sworn. He said that on Thursday evening last he came back from fishing. After he was at home for a little while, his brother Robert brought home the hide which his father found earlier. He believed in his conscience that it was the hide of Mr Davis's heifer. Robert Marsh was sworn. He said he believed in his conscience that the hide found by his father was the hide of Mr Davis's heifer. It was not quite so bright in colour because it was buried in the ground. The jury withdrew for nearly half an hour. They returned with their verdict. They found William Duston's wife, son and Black guilty of the indictment laid against them. Interpretations The Governor's warrant changed the matter from a household explanation into an official search. Before that point, Susanna Duston claimed the animal was treated as their own. The warrant gave authority to search for Davis's missing heifer and brought the hidden hide into evidence. The torn ears mattered because cattle marks were carried on the ears. The Black's statement that he tore them, together with his claim that the animal bore his master's mark, made the identifying marks central to the case. Removing or damaging them suggested a way to weaken proof of ownership. The hide was the main physical evidence. Several witnesses linked it to Davis's heifer by colour and recognition, even though burial changed its appearance. The court therefore relied on a mix of material evidence, local knowledge of livestock and sworn conscience. The verdict named Susanna Duston, her son and the Black together. This treated the household as a chain of action: direction from the mistress, movement by the son and killing or concealment by the Black. Criminal responsibility was therefore attached across household labour and command.
30	10	It is ordered by the bench According to the Juries Verdict, That the Said Will.m Duston pay to the Said Thomas Davis the Sum.e of Eight pounds (being four times the value of his heifer) in Settle to be paid [...] [...] [...] Six months after the date hereof appraised by two Indifferent men and also fined 5/. to y.e R.t Hon.o Comp.a and to pay Charges of [Coincett]/ Then the Court was adjourd as usuall/ Island S.t Helena/ [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	The bench ordered judgment according to the jury's verdict. William Duston was ordered to pay Thomas Davis £8 0s 0d, being four times the value of his heifer. It was to be paid in cattle within six months from the date of the order, appraised by two indifferent men. Duston was also fined 5s 0d to the Right Honourable Company and was ordered to pay the charges of [Coincett]. The court was then adjourned as usual. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 27 April 1703.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Att a Consultation Held on Tuse day the 27.th day of Aprill 1703 Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Pres.t Tho: Goodwin dp.ty Govern.o Jn.o Field Ensigne M.r Carne petitioned us that he might have the m[oney] pertaining to Elenor Keeling, delivered to him in 6 months t[ime] from the date hereof, or Else declares he wont take it up, and th[en] be acquitted/ It is ordered That the Said M.r Carne have Govern.r Keelings Daughter Elenor[s] mony that is in the Comp.a Books and owing to her According to the former Consultation/ But the Govern.r Saith he wont be obliged to make a dividend in any perfect time And as for Elenor Kelin[g] the Governo.r Sayes that Since M.r Carne Refuses to take the mon[ey] at Interest, It is to be Considered whether he Shall have nine [p]ounds p annum for Said Elenors Boarding or not/	Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, Ensign, were present. Mr Carne petitioned the council. He asked that the money belonging to Eleanor Keeling be delivered to him within six months from the date of the petition. Otherwise, he declared that he would not take it up and would then be acquitted. Mr Carne was ordered to have Governor Keeling's daughter Eleanor's money that was in the Company's books and owing to her, according to the former consultation. The Governor said he would not be obliged to make a division at any fixed time. For Eleanor Keeling, the Governor said that since Mr Carne refused to take the money at interest, it was to be considered whether he should receive £9 0s 0d a year for Eleanor's boarding. Interpretations The order against William Duston turned the felony verdict into household financial liability. The verdict named his wife, son and Black, but payment was placed on Duston as household head. Responsibility was therefore enforced through the man who controlled the household estate. Payment in cattle showed how local compensation could be made in property rather than coin. The use of two indifferent men for appraisal was meant to give the cattle a neutral valuation and reduce dispute over whether the £8 0s 0d value was met. The fine to the Company separated public punishment from private compensation. Thomas Davis was to receive four times the value of the heifer, while the Company received the 5s 0d fine. The same offence therefore produced both restitution to the injured planter and a penalty to the island's authority. The renewed dispute over Eleanor Keeling's money showed the council trying to link guardianship, interest and maintenance. Mr Carne wanted control of her money within a set time or release from the arrangement. The Governor resisted being forced into a fixed division and questioned whether Carne should still receive the boarding allowance if he refused to take the money at interest. Speculations Mr Carne's six-month demand was probably a way to protect himself from an open-ended obligation. If the money was not delivered to him, he wanted to be free from the arrangement. The detail mattered because his boarding allowance depended on whether he accepted Eleanor's money at interest and took financial responsibility for her care.
31	11	Arthur Bradley Soldier gave Information that M.r Carne and Edward Bagley Sold Arrack and Punch by Retaile w.thout a Licence whereupon It was ordered That the Said M.r Carne and Edward Bagley Should be Summoned to appear before us this day fortnight/ Jn.o Orchard free Planter desired that we would lett him have Will Oliver a free [...] for the Term of one year to assist him in boyling of Sleet/ It is ordered. That the Said Jn.o Orchard have y.e Said Oliver y.e time abovesaid dureing w.ch time to find him in Cloaths and to maintain him in all Sort of Condition, and to make good all Damages tho S.d Oliver doeth in Said time/ Whereas there being a Controversie twixt M.rs Jn.e [Liffin] Executr.d of the Last Will and Testament of Mary Dixon dec.d and Arthur Bradley Sold who married one of his daught.rs about the divid ing twenty Acres of Land the Said Mary Dixon bequeath one halfe to the Said Bradley wife and the other to one of her other Children who not agreeing in making an Equall Dividend, desired a Jury might be Imparnelled do decide the matter whereupon the Govern.r Accordingly	Arthur Bradley, soldier, gave information that Mr Carne and Edward Bagley sold arrack and punch by retail without a licence. Mr Carne and Edward Bagley were ordered to appear before the council that day fortnight. John Orchard, free planter, asked to have Will Oliver, a free [...], for one year to help him boil sleet. John Orchard was granted Oliver for that term. During that time, Orchard was to provide him with clothes and maintain him in every condition. Orchard was also to make good all damage done by Oliver during that time. A dispute was brought between Mrs Jane [Liffin], executrix of the last will and testament of Mary Dixon, deceased, and Arthur Bradley, soldier, who married one of Mary Dixon's daughters. The dispute concerned the division of twenty acres of land. Mary Dixon left one half to Bradley's wife and the other half to one of her other children. They could not agree on an equal division, so a jury was requested to decide the matter. The Governor granted a warrant for the jury to appear and be sworn. After the jury viewed Mary Dixon's will and the land, it gave its verdict.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		granted out a Ward.t for their appearance In order to being Sworne & who upon veiwing the Said Mary Dixons Will and Said Land, brought in their verdict as followeth/ That the twenty Acres Land formerly Edward Crosbeys (now in the possession of the Said Bradley and Gurlings orphans) Shall be divided Diagonally from Corner to Corner, To begin from the Corner which Lies under [...] Curip his Hole to the Corner which Lies [...] Next to y.e Hone Corns Old Vineyard, and the Lower part of y.e Sale Land Devided Shall be the Said Arthur Bradley & the other part Gurlings orphans, And that hey & Bradley have Eighteen months time to digg out his provisions out of the Said orphans Land, And that the Said Bradley and Gurlings orphans pay the Charges of this Buisness between them Equally/ [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin [Is Cund]	The twenty acres of land, formerly Edward Crosbey's and now in the possession of Bradley and Gurling's orphans, was to be divided diagonally from corner to corner. The line was to begin at the corner below [...] Curip's Hole and run to the corner next to the Hone Corns old vineyard. The lower part of the divided land was to belong to Arthur Bradley. The other part was to belong to Gurling's orphans. Bradley was given eighteen months to dig out his provisions from the orphans' land. Bradley and Gurling's orphans were to pay the charges of the business equally between them. Stephen Poirier, Thomas Goodwin and [Is Cund] signed. Interpretations The information against Mr Carne and Edward Bagley showed that retail drink sales were controlled by licence. Arrack and punch were not treated as ordinary household goods once they were sold by retail. The council used summons as the first step, so the accusation was brought into formal hearing before punishment was considered. John Orchard's request for Will Oliver showed labour being assigned through council order. Oliver's status was partly unreadable, but he was described as free [...]. Orchard received his labour for a fixed year and carried the risks attached to him. Clothing, maintenance and compensation for damage were all placed on Orchard, which made the grant a supervised labour arrangement rather than a simple hiring. The land dispute showed probate, marriage and orphan rights crossing in one property case. Mary Dixon's will created shares for her children. Bradley's claim came through his wife. Gurling's orphans held the other interest. The jury's viewing of both will and land gave the division practical force on the ground. The diagonal division showed how land was split by physical landmarks rather than by abstract measurement alone. Curip's Hole and the Hone Corns old vineyard fixed the boundary in places known locally. This made the verdict enforceable in the landscape. Speculations The eighteen-month period for Bradley to dig out his provisions was probably granted because crops or planted food stood on the part awarded to Gurling's orphans. The council did not make him lose them at once. It gave time to remove the produce while still confirming the orphans' title to the land. The equal sharing of charges probably reflected the council's view that the dispute arose from a division problem rather than from one party's wrongdoing. Both sides benefited from a settled boundary, so both were made to bear the cost.
32	12	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tues day the 11.th day of May 1703 Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Governour Pres.t Tho.m Goodwin Dp.ty Gov.r John Field Ensigne Whereas in an order of Councill bearing date the [...] day of Last both Bereqven [Carleben] and Joyce the wife of Tho: Ashby [...] was Strickly forbidden to go into Each others Company, upon the forfeiture of Ten pounds, one moiety to the [Said] Comp.a and the other to the Informer, But Contrary to the Said order we were Informed by Jn.o [Severson] [...] that they were in Company together at the house of owen Perian/ The Said Carleben and Ashbys wife being present now denied the Information to be true, and desired that Mary the Said Perians wife might be Called and Sworne, who Acord ingly was. And declared that y.e Said Ashbys wife came into their house, who had not bin Long there but the Said Said Carleben came in also, but as Soon as	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 11 May 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, Ensign, were present. An order of council dated the [...] day of last [...] had strictly forbidden Bereqven [Carleben] and Joyce, wife of Thomas Ashby, to go into each other's company. The penalty was £10 0s 0d. One half was to go to the Company and the other half to the informer. John [Severson] [...] informed the council that they were together at the house of Owen Perian. Carleben and Ashby's wife were present. They denied that the information was true. They asked that Mary, Owen Perian's wife, be called and sworn. She was called and sworn. Mary Perian said that Ashby's wife came into their house. She was not there long before Carleben also came in. As soon as Ashby's wife saw him, she went home.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		y.e Said Ashbys wife Saw him She went away home, whereupon It is ordered That the Said Carleben and Ashbys wife be dismiss and discharged from Said Pennalty, upon y.e Said Mary Perians deposition/ Ann Gurling orphan Came this day before us and desired She might make Choice of her Brother in Law Jn.o Bagley to be her Guardian who being Called declared he was willing to accept of that office Wherefore It is ordered That M.rs Lufkin Execut.r of her moth.rs Estate & Forcement[...]	Carleben and Ashby's wife were dismissed and discharged from the penalty on Mary Perian's deposition. Ann Gurling, orphan, came before the council. She asked to choose her brother-in-law John Bagley as her guardian. Bagley was called. He said he was willing to accept the office. Mrs Lufkin, executrix of Ann's mother's estate and [Forcement...]. Interpretations The earlier order controlled contact between Carleben and Joyce Ashby by using a heavy financial penalty. The council treated their company together as conduct that required public restraint. The informer's half of the penalty also encouraged private reporting. Mary Perian's deposition mattered because it turned the charge from deliberate company into brief accidental presence. Joyce Ashby left as soon as Carleben entered. That detail allowed the council to release both from the penalty without cancelling the earlier order. Ann Gurling's request showed that an orphan could appear before the council and name a preferred guardian. The choice still needed council action and the proposed guardian's consent. Guardianship was therefore treated as a supervised public office, not only a family arrangement.
33	13	deliver unto the Said Bagley what Effects he has in his Custody belonging to her, and that he take Care of them that no Imbarsm.t be made thereof, and accordingly the Said M.rs Lufkin discharg[ed] from his Guardianship/ Whereas John Nichols and James Greentree free Planters Stand bound unto the R.t Hon.o were Company for the payment of William Frenches debt which he owes them in their Store Books of Acco. But being unwilling to Stand bound any Longer, least y.e Event prove prejudiciall to them, Humbly Petitioned this day that they might be discharged whereupon William ffrench being present desired he might be permitted to Sell Some part of his Estate to pay the Said debt It is ordered That the Said Nichols and Greentree Sell what of the Said ffrenches Estate he Can Conveniently Spare at a Publick outcry giving an Acco. thereof unto us, and them to be discha =rged. But now the Said French being Resolved to Sell the greatest part of his Estate as above, It is to be feared that he will Imbasse his Childrens Smale Estate given them by their Grandfather Tho: Bo[...] dec.d It is therefore ordered. That the Said Jn.o Nichols and James Greentree be appointed overseers of the ffrenches Childrens Estate to which they were Sworne accordingly to performe Justly and truly/ [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Mrs Lufkin was ordered to deliver to John Bagley any effects in her custody that belonged to Ann Gurling. Bagley was to take care of them, so that no embarrassment was made of them. Mrs Lufkin was then discharged from her guardianship. John Nichols and James Greentree, free planters, were bound to the Right Honourable Company for payment of William French's debt. The debt was owed in the Company's store books of account. Nichols and Greentree no longer wished to remain bound, in case the outcome caused them loss. They petitioned to be discharged. William French was present. He asked to be allowed to sell part of his estate to pay the debt. Nichols and Greentree were ordered to sell whatever part of French's estate he could conveniently spare. The sale was to be made by public outcry. They were to give an account of it to the council. They were then to be discharged. French then resolved to sell the greatest part of his estate. This raised fear that he would embarrass his children's small estate, which was given to them by their grandfather, Thomas Bo[...], deceased. John Nichols and James Greentree were therefore appointed overseers of the French children's estate. They were sworn to perform that office justly and truly. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. Interpretations The transfer of Ann Gurling's effects showed guardianship as a custodial office supervised by the council. Mrs Lufkin was not simply replaced. She was ordered to hand over the child's property before her discharge. This protected the orphan's goods during the change of guardian. The order about William French's debt showed how Company credit could bind third parties. Nichols and Greentree stood surety for his store-book debt and faced loss if he failed to pay. Their petition asked the council to release them from that risk by turning French's property into payment. A public outcry was a public auction. It made the sale visible and gave the council an account of what was sold. This helped prevent a private sale at an unfair value and gave a formal path for discharging the sureties. The appointment of overseers for the French children's estate showed a separation between a father's

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			debt and property settled on his children. Once French planned to sell most of his estate, the council moved to protect the children's separate inheritance from being drawn into his obligations. Speculations Nichols and Greentree were probably chosen as overseers because they were already tied to French's debt and knew the financial risk. Their new office shifted them from exposed sureties into supervised protectors of the children's property. The concern that French might embarrass his children's estate probably arose because a large sale of his own property could blur the boundary between his assets and theirs. Appointing overseers gave the council a practical way to keep the children's small inheritance from being used to satisfy the father's debt.
34	14	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 18.th day of May 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Pres.t Tho.m Goodwin Dp.ty Govern.r John Field Insigne Whereas on y.e 16.th Instant William Hayes, and Jo. Hayes Sold.r went to Banks fort on duty, to releive Joseph fort and Jn.o [Sheck] Sold.r and upon Examining y.e Amunition as usuall, found Severall Cartouch Boxes Empty of powder filled almost full of Tobacco and Lopt w.ch a litle Powder whereupon y.e Said Will: Hayes returned and Aequainted y.e Governo.r therew.th upon which y.e Said Joseph fort [...] and Jn.o [Sich] was Sent for, and Imprisoned till this day who being Examined denye y.e fact, Saying the Said Cartouch boxes was as they found them, when went there on duty/ but it being Evident to us they were Guilty of Said fact It is ordered That y.e Said Joseph fort and Jn.o [Sich] being but young, and y.e first offenc.e in this nature, they Ride y.e wooden Horse one hour with a musquet at each Legg, and Admonished for y.e future/ Whereas Jn.o Long Sold.r did yesterday disobey y.e Govern.rs Command and Swore before him Severall oaths who was Imediatly Confined, and this day ordered That y.e Said Long be fined five Shillings for his offence/ The Said Long desired he might be dismissed y.e Comp.a Service but he haveing Contracted w.th them in England to Serve them five years here, and Werd being but about two years Expired, we proposed to him whether he would Serve y.e Remainder of his time or pay y.e Sum of four pounds, who Chose y.e Latter therefore It is ordered. That y.e Said Jn.o Long pay y.e Said Sum of four pounds into y.e R.t Hon.o ble Companies Stores, And be dismist from War Service according to his request	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 18 May 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, Ensign, were present. On 16 May 1703, William Hayes and Jo. Hayes, soldiers, went on duty to Banks Fort. They were sent to relieve Joseph Fort and John [Sich], soldiers. When the ammunition was examined in the usual way, several cartridge boxes were found empty of powder. They were almost full of tobacco and were topped with a little powder. William Hayes returned and told the Governor. Joseph Fort [...] and John [Sich] were sent for and imprisoned until this day. When they were examined, they denied the offence. They said the cartridge boxes were in that condition when they went on duty. Even so, the Governor and Council judged the evidence against them to be clear. Joseph Fort and John [Sich] were young. This was their first offence of this kind. They were ordered to ride the wooden horse for one hour, with a musket at each leg. They were also warned for the future. John Long, soldier, disobeyed the Governor's command yesterday. He also swore several oaths before him. He was confined at once. John Long was ordered to pay a fine of 5s 0d for his offence. Long asked to be dismissed from the Company's service. He was contracted in England to serve the Company on St Helena for five years. Only about two years were expired. He was asked whether he would serve the rest of his time or pay £4 0s 0d. He chose to pay. John Long was ordered to pay £4 0s 0d into the Right Honourable Company's stores. He was dismissed from war service at his request. Interpretations The cartridge-box offence showed the council treating military supplies as a matter of island security. Powder was removed and disguised with tobacco under a small amount of powder. That made the boxes appear serviceable while leaving the fort short of usable ammunition. The punishment of the wooden horse was a military discipline. It was painful and public, but it stopped short of a heavier sentence because the soldiers were young and this was their first offence of that kind. The council therefore balanced deterrence against age and record. John Long's case showed that a soldier's service contract was treated as a financial obligation as well as a military duty. He could leave only by serving the remaining term or paying a set sum into the Company's stores. Dismissal was therefore allowed, but only after the Company's loss was answered in money. Speculations

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The tobacco hidden in the cartridge boxes probably pointed to theft or misuse of powder rather than mere neglect. The small amount of powder on top suggested an attempt to conceal the missing ammunition during inspection. Long's choice to pay £4 0s 0d probably gave the council a practical way to remove a disobedient soldier without ignoring his English contract. The payment replaced the remaining service time and protected the Company from losing the bargain entirely.
35	15	Whereas Ripin Wills Corp.l havinge Sevrall times transgrest and neglec[t]ed his duty, and Cheifey yesterday being on y.e Guard went on board y.e Ship King fisher A spoon att y.e came to an Anchor, which y.e Governo.r being Acquaint[ed] w.th Sent for him on Shoar, and Imprisoned him who this day desired to be dismist from y.e Comp.a Service which was granted him by [Poirier] Island S.t Helena Tho: Goodwin Att a Consultation Held on Monday y.e 24.th day of May 1703 Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Pres.t Tho.m Goodwin Dp.ty Gov.r Jn.o Field 3 in Coun: Whereas John Hemons Corp.l being upon y.e Guard and Coming up from y.e Landing place ordered Will Studens Sold.r who was on Centry at y.e Lower bridge, to Lock y.e Gates and Come up about Eight of y.e Clock at night, which was not usuall to be Lock[t] before nine of y.e Clock and about a quarter of an hour past Eight, Cap.t Poirier Kent Came on Shoar but could not come through Insomuch was forced to Climb over y.e gate wall, after he had Hollowed Sometime Whereupon the Said Hemons was Imprisoned and Examined this morning who Sayes he gave y.e Centrey no Such order But y.e Said Studens Confident =ly him to his face and adding that y.e Said Hemons Bid him Come =ing him to his face and adding that y.e Said Hemons Bid him Come =ing y so as ale y.e boats was put off, which was alittle past Eight/ It is ordered That y.e Said Jn.o Hemons for his default be dismist from the Comp.s Service this being not y.e only fault he hath bin Guilty of/	Ripin Wills, corporal, was said to have offended several times and neglected his duty. His chief offence was committed yesterday. While he was on guard, he went on board the ship <i>King fisher</i> as soon as she came to anchor. The Governor was told of this. Wills was sent for on shore and imprisoned. This day, Wills asked to be dismissed from the Company's service. His request was granted. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Monday, 24 May 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, third in council, were present. John Hemons, corporal, was on guard. When he came up from the landing place, he ordered William Studens, soldier, who was on sentry at the lower bridge, to lock the gates and come up at about eight o'clock at night. The gates were not usually locked before nine o'clock. At about a quarter past eight, Captain Poirier Kent came on shore. He could not pass through. He was forced to climb over the gate wall after he called out for some time. Hemons was imprisoned and examined that morning. He said he gave the sentry no such order. Studens contradicted him to his face. He added that Hemons told him to come up as soon as all the boats were put off, which was a little after eight. John Hemons was dismissed from the Company's service for his default. This was not the only fault of which he was guilty. Interpretations Wills's offence was treated as a breach of guard discipline. A corporal on guard left his post to board a newly arrived ship. That mattered because the first arrival of a ship was a moment when movement, trade and information needed control from shore. The locking of the lower bridge gate showed how night security at Fort James depended on timed routine. Closing the gate an hour early obstructed an officer coming ashore and forced him to climb the wall. The fault was therefore not only disobedience but disruption of the fort's controlled access. Studens's statement carried weight because he challenged Hemons directly during examination. The council accepted the sentry's account over the corporal's denial. This showed that rank did not protect an officer from being contradicted by a subordinate when guard procedure was at issue. Speculations Hemons's dismissal was probably driven by repeated unreliability rather than by the gate incident alone. The order stated that this was not his only fault. The early locking of the gate gave the council a concrete reason to remove him from service after earlier defaults.
36	16	Robert ffuniss Soldier being yesterday putt on Centrey at y.e Lower Bridge was found a Sleep about one hour after y.e was posted who was relieved Imediately, And Imprisoned, and being this day Called	Robert Funiss, soldier, was put on sentry yesterday at the lower bridge. About one hour after he was posted, he was found asleep. He was relieved at once and imprisoned. Funiss was called before the council this day. He said a friend came on shore and gave him a dram or two

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		before us Sayes that a friend of his came on Shoar and gave him a Dram or two of Arrack w.ch made him fall a Sleep but promist Never to be Guilty of y.e Like Crime any where, Howsoever It is ordered That y.e Said ffuniss be kept in prison, and to Ride y.e Wooden Horse three Relief days, with a Twelve pound Shott at Each Legg, and then Released Island S.t Helena [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday y.e 25.th day of May 1703 Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Tho.m Goodwin Dp.ty Gov.r Jn.o Field Ensigne Whereas in Consultation Held y.e 11.th of this Instant may, Arthur Bradley Corp.l gave Information that M.r Carne and Edward Bagley Sold Strong drink by retaile without a Lycence but not making good his Information by informing y.e Governo.r within Ten days after Such Retail =ing, According to an order of [Coun.l] bearing date y.e 8 day of [Sary] 1697 the y.e Said Bradley be Cast and pay y.e Said M.r Carne Six Shillings, and Edward Bagley four Shillings for their trouble in Comeing downe to appear before us two Severall times, and also y.e Evidences and Charges of Councill/ The Said Bradley also made Complaint against Edw.d Bagley Saying he called him and his wife poor devils, which is bal avery foolish Comp.t Suppose it was true, but no Evidence Said any Such thing, whereupon It is ordered That y.e Said Bradley pay y.e S.d Edw.d Bagley two Shill: for his trouble haveing no Cause of Complaint/	of arrack, which made him fall asleep. He promised never to be guilty of the same crime again anywhere. Even so, Funiss was ordered to be kept in prison. He was to ride the wooden horse on three relief days, with a twelve-pound shot at each leg. He was then to be released. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 25 May 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, Ensign, were present. At the consultation held on 11 May 1703, Arthur Bradley, corporal, gave information that Mr Carne and Edward Bagley sold strong drink by retail without a licence. Bradley did not prove his information. He also did not inform the Governor within ten days after the retailing, as required by an order of council dated 8 [...] 1697. Bradley was therefore cast. He was ordered to pay Mr Carne 6s 0d and Edward Bagley 4s 0d for their trouble in coming down twice to appear before the council. He was also ordered to pay the witnesses and the charges of council. Bradley also complained against Edward Bagley. He said Bagley called him and his wife “poor devils”. The council judged this a very foolish complaint, even if it was true. No witness said any such words were spoken. Bradley was ordered to pay Edward Bagley 2s 0d for his trouble, since there was no cause for the complaint. Interpretations Funiss’s punishment showed the severity of sentry duty. Sleeping on guard was treated as a military crime even when he blamed drink brought by a friend from shore. The lower bridge was an access point, so a sleeping sentry weakened the fort’s security. The wooden horse with twelve-pound shot at each leg was a harsh corporal punishment. The sentence was repeated over three relief days. This made the punishment public to other soldiers and tied it to the rhythm of guard duty. Bradley’s failed information showed that licensing offences were controlled by procedure as well as by accusation. The old order required timely information within ten days. Because Bradley did not meet that rule, the accused men were compensated for the burden of appearing. The council’s treatment of the “poor devils” complaint showed a threshold for actionable insult. Mere rude words, without proof and without a stronger public offence, did not justify council process. Bradley was made to pay Bagley for bringing a complaint without cause.
37	17	James Easthope free Planter Humbly Petitioned that we would Lett him hire y.e house & joyns to y.e Hone [Comp.s] Store Room belonging to Jn.o Beales orphans for y.e Term of three years/ It is ordered and nine months time That y.e Said Easthope have y.e Said House for y.e Term aforesaid at y.e Rate of four pound p ann.m w.ch Said nine months Compleats one yeer to Lady day, that being y.e time of making up all orphans Acc.ts/ [Poirier] Island S.t Helena Tho: Goodwin Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 8.th day of June 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Pres.t Tho: Goodwin Dp.ty Gov.r Jn.o Field Ensigne Whereas George Hoskison free Planter presented his Petition to us Setting forth therein that William Bowman free plant.r dec.d in his Last Will and Testam.t bequeathed Severall Legacies to his predecessor, Jn.o Bowman, and his Children, and whereas there being no	James Easthope, free planter, petitioned to rent the house adjoining the Honourable Company’s store room. The house belonged to John Beale’s orphans. He asked to have it for three years. Easthope was granted the house for that term at £4 0s 0d a year. He was also given nine months’ time. Those nine months completed one year to Lady Day, the time when all orphan accounts were made up. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 8 June 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, Ensign, were present. George Hoskison, free planter, presented a petition. He stated that William Bowman, free planter, deceased, left several legacies in his last will and testament to his predecessor, John Bowman, and to John Bowman’s children.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Inventory taken of y.e Said Will. Bowmans Estate there may be Appraisem.t made, and another Execut.r made in Jn.o Bowmans dec.d Stead, y.e Said Will: Bowmans wid.o being now going to be married to one [Bilak] fold who the Said Hoskison desires may give Security for y.e Estate Remaining in his hands, that no Imber Ement be made thereof/ It is ordered That y.e Said George Hoskison be nominated and appointed Execut.r of y.e Said dec.d William Bowmans Last Will & Testam.t Instead of y.e dec.d Jn.o Binoman (whose wid.o he married) And that an Inventory be Taken according[ly]	No inventory was taken of William Bowman's estate. Hoskison asked that an appraisal be made and that another executor be appointed in place of John Bowman, deceased. William Bowman's widow was now about to marry one [Bilak] Fold. Hoskison asked that he give security for the estate remaining in his hands, so that no embarrassment was made of it. George Hoskison was nominated and appointed executor of the last will and testament of William Bowman, deceased, in place of John Bowman, deceased, whose widow he married. An inventory was ordered to be taken. Interpretations The rent of John Beale's orphans' house showed the council using orphan property to produce income. The reference to Lady Day mattered because orphan accounts were made up on that annual accounting date. The lease term was fitted to the island's financial cycle, not only to Easthope's request. The Bowman petition showed how estate administration was repaired after an executor died. John Bowman could no longer act, and no inventory was taken. By appointing George Hoskison, the council restored a responsible officer who could account for the estate and protect the legacies. The request for security from [Bilak] Fold showed concern that marriage could move estate property into a new husband's control. The widow's remarriage created a risk that assets held by her household would be mixed with another man's property. Security was meant to protect the estate from that loss.
38	18	According to his request, And that Henry Cales and Hugh Bradley be appointed and Sworne to appraise y.e aforesaid Will: Bowmans Estate, that y.e Said Estate may be Brought y.e [...] before [...] And Likewise that the Said Hodgson be Sworne to Execute y.e office of an Execut.r who acordingly were/ [Poirier] June y.e 9.th 1703 Tho: Goodwin According to a Summons Issued out yesterday at y.e request of y.e above s.d George Hodgson, Wid.o Bowman Appeared and was Sworne to give a true faithfull and Intire Inventory of her dec.d Husband Will: Bowmans Estate/ Whereas the Governo.r being in his Chamber heard Nathaniell Conaway Carpenter Sweat two or three oaths, who being not given much to that vice It is ordered That the Said Conaway be fined but two Shillings to y.e use of y.e poor [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Henry Cales and Hugh Bradley were appointed and sworn to appraise William Bowman's estate, as George Hoskison requested. The estate was to be brought [...] before [...]. Hoskison was also sworn to execute the office of executor. They were sworn accordingly. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed on 9 June 1703. A summons was issued the day before at George Hoskison's request. Widow Bowman appeared and was sworn to give a true, faithful and entire inventory of the estate of her deceased husband, William Bowman. The Governor was in his chamber when he heard Nathaniell Conaway, carpenter, swear two or three oaths. Conaway was not much given to that vice, so he was fined only 2s 0d for the use of the poor. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. Interpretations The appointment of sworn appraisers and the oath taken by Widow Bowman created a formal record of William Bowman's estate. The widow was required to disclose the whole estate, while Henry Cales and Hugh Bradley were made responsible for valuation. This gave the executor a basis for administering the legacies. Conaway's fine showed that profanity was punished, but past character affected the sentence. Because he was not often guilty of swearing, the fine was limited to 2s 0d and directed to the poor. Public discipline was therefore tempered by reputation.
39	19	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 13.th day of July 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Pres.t Tho.m Goodwin Dp.ty Govern.r Jn.o Field Ensigne Whereas Charles Hasard and Henry Francis Execut.rs of y.e Last will and Testam.t of Sam.ll Maxwell Sould.r lately dec.d brought y.e Same to Govern.r and Councill In order of th[e] being it approve But we y.r being Some difficulty therein touching the disposall of his Estate, Contrar.y to y.e Law of England (as we Judge) Therefore It is ordered.	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 13 July 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, Ensign, were present. Charles Hasard and Henry Francis, executors of the last will and testament of Samuel Maxwell, soldier, lately deceased, brought the will to the Governor and Council for approval. Some difficulty was found in it over the disposal of his estate. The Governor and Council judged this to be contrary to the law of England. The question was therefore ordered to be decided by the jury at the next quarterly sessions. In the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		That the Query be decided by the Jury at y.e next quarterly Sessions, But in the mean time an Inventory, to be taken of y.e Said dec.d Estate, and delivered unto us A Soon as Conveniently Can be Done/ Likewise That one ey.e Hasard and James Greentree be appointed and Sworne to appraise the Said Sam.ll Maxwells Estate and that his wid.o be also Sworne not to Conceale any part of y.e Said Estate from y.e appraisers who were all Sworne accordingly/ [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	meantime, an inventory of Maxwell's estate was to be taken and delivered to the Governor and Council as soon as conveniently possible. [...] Hasard and James Greentree were appointed and sworn to appraise Samuel Maxwell's estate. Maxwell's widow was also sworn not to conceal any part of the estate from the appraisers. They were all sworn accordingly. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. Interpretations The will was not approved at once because the council thought its disposal of property conflicted with English law. This showed that St Helena probate practice was tied to English legal rules, even though the case was handled locally. The decision to refer the question to a jury at the next quarterly sessions gave the dispute a formal legal setting. The council preserved the estate by ordering an inventory first, then left the legal point about the will to be settled through sessions procedure. The widow's oath protected the estate from concealment before appraisal. This mattered because household goods and personal property could be hidden or removed before valuation. The oath made full disclosure part of the legal process.
40	18	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 20.th day of July 1703 Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Tho.m Goodwin dp.ty Gov.r Jn.o Field 3.d in Coun: Whereas Edward Heath Sold.r Came this morning to y.e Governo.r and made Complaint that M.r Jones 1.st mate of y.e good Ship Whitworth had abused him, and Indeavoured to Ravish his daughter, Wherefore desired a Wart for y.e Said Jones his Appearance before Governo.r and Coun.l which was granted and Issued out, According to y.e Said M.r Jones appeared and denyed what y.e Said Heath hath alleged against him. Edward Heath being Sworne Saith that he with Some other neighbours, went on Sunday the 11.th of this Instant July about Eight of the Clock at night to drink [...] a bowle of punch at Tho: Coales house [...] going home againe about Ten or Eleven of y.e Clock, Sent his daughter in Law Sarah Foster Back to y.e Said Thomas Coales to borrow a Lanthorn and Candle Whereof Said M.r Jones Seeing her [...] going in y.e Street Ran after her But y.e Said Sarah Retreated And proceeding again he Caught her and Kised her and put his [...] [...] hand under her petty Coats, the Said Edw.d Heath Seeing y.e Action asked what the Said Jones meant by it, Jones replied do you think I would ravish your daughter, Heath Said he did not know but he might, whereupon Jones Swore by God he would if he could/ Thomas Coales Sworn Saith that about Ten or Eleven of y.e Clock at night Edw.d Heath Sent his daughter to borrow a Lanthorn and Candle of him being doinge Reciev he heard Some words betwixt Edw.d Heath and M.r Jones about his daught.r Jones bid y.e Said Heath go about his Buisin[ess] Heath replied he would not go for him and after y.e Said Jones what he had to do to put his hands under his Childs Coats M.r Jones Said what do you think I would Ravish your daughter, Heath Said I dont know but you would M.r Jones Swore by God if I do what is that to you, and Sept to y.e Said Heath and Spitt in his face, Heath heave Tobacco pipes or Some Such thing in his face, whereupon the Said Jones Indeavoured to Strike S.d Heath/	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 20 July 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, third in council, were present. Edward Heath, soldier, came to the Governor that morning. He complained that Mr Jones, first mate of the good ship <i>Whitworth</i>, abused him and tried to ravish his daughter. Heath asked for a warrant to make Jones appear before the Governor and Council. The warrant was granted and issued. Mr Jones appeared as ordered. He denied what Heath alleged against him. Edward Heath was sworn. He said that he and some neighbours went to Thomas Coales's house on Sunday, 11 July 1703, at about eight o'clock at night, to drink [...] a bowl of punch. They went home again at about ten or eleven o'clock. Heath sent his daughter-in-law Sarah Foster back to Thomas Coales's house to borrow a lantern and candle. Heath said that Mr Jones saw Sarah going in the street and ran after her. Sarah drew back. When she went on again, Jones caught her, kissed her and put his [...] [...] hand under her petticoats. Heath saw this and asked Jones what he meant by it. Jones replied, "Do you think I would ravish your daughter?" Heath said he did not know, but Jones might. Jones then swore by God that he would if he could. Thomas Coales was sworn. He said that at about ten or eleven o'clock at night, Edward Heath sent his daughter to borrow a lantern and candle from him. The manuscript was unclear at this point. Coales then heard words between Heath and Mr Jones about Heath's daughter. Jones told Heath to go about his business. Heath replied that he would not go for him. He then asked Jones what he had to do with putting his hands under his child's coats. Jones said, "What do you think I would ravish your daughter?" Heath said, "I don't know but you would." Jones swore by God, "If I do, what is that to you?" He stepped to Heath and spat in his face. Heath threw tobacco pipes, or something like them, in Jones's face. Jones then tried to strike Heath. Interpretations The warrant showed the council treating the complaint as more than a private quarrel. Jones was a ship's officer, but he was still brought before island authority when accused of assault and attempted sexual

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			violence against a woman connected to an island household. Sarah Foster was described as Heath's daughter-in-law and also as his daughter or child in the spoken evidence. This showed how household authority shaped the complaint. Heath acted as the male protector of a woman within his household, and the alleged insult to her body became a direct affront to him. The testimony centred on public acts in the street and on repeated words about ravishment. The physical contact, the hand under the petticoats, the oath, the spitting and the attempted blow all turned the matter into a combined charge of sexual assault, insult and breach of public peace. Speculations Heath's request for a warrant was probably meant to bring a shipboard man under local discipline before the ship could remove him from reach. Jones was first mate of the <i>Whitworth</i>, so the formal summons gave the council immediate control over a dispute involving someone not settled on the island.
41	19	James Hayes Sold.r Sworne Saith that on Sunday y.e 18.th of this [July] he being at Walter Robards house at Eleven of y.e Clock at night, drink =ing part of a bowle of Punch with M.r Jones and Some other Gentlemen M.r Jones Said he Saw a woman in the Street, and would go and Kiss her, presently he heard Edward Heath Call to him y.e Said Jones and ask him what he had to do w.th his Child, Jones Replyd what is that to you, Heath Said it was to him there was his Child whereupon Some agravateing words arose, and I went forth, and fetcht y.e Said Jones into the house againe, when at y.e Same time Edw.d Heath, fleing a Stone at y.e Said Jones, as he was going away/ Sarah Foster daughter in Law to Edward Heath being Examined Saith M.r Jones mett her in y.e Street about Eight of the Clock at night and would Kiss her, but She Refused Saying her face was wett Jones said wipe it but She Still refused yet he kised her twice about 10 or 11 of y.e Clock y.e Same night her father in Law Sent her to Thomas Coales to borrow a Lanthorn and Candle M.r Jones came to her and would Kiss her again But She Ran away from him, afterwards proceeded and he mett her and Kised her twice at M.r Coales door, w.th his tongue in her mouth and put his hand under her Coats and Swore he would Ravish her if he could, But She held fast by y.e Latch of the door, least he should Run away with her/ It is ordered That y.e Said Jones be fined five Shillings for his Misdemeanor two Shillings for Swearing, and be Confined on board y.e Said Shippa during her Stay in this Rode, and pay Charges of Court But if the Said Jones Should Contrary to this order be found on Shoar again, Then he Shall be Imprisoned and proceeded against to the utmost Rigor of y.e Law [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	James Hayes, soldier, was sworn. He said that on Sunday, 18 July 1703, he was at Walter Robards's house at eleven o'clock at night. He was drinking part of a bowl of punch with Mr Jones and some other gentlemen. Jones said he saw a woman in the street and would go and kiss her. Soon afterwards, Hayes heard Edward Heath call to Jones and ask what he had to do with his child. Jones replied, "What is that to you?" Heath said it was to him, because she was his child. Some aggravating words followed. Hayes went out and brought Jones back into the house. At the same time, Edward Heath threw a stone at Jones as Jones went away. Sarah Foster, daughter-in-law to Edward Heath, was examined. She said Mr Jones met her in the street at about eight o'clock at night and wanted to kiss her. She refused, saying her face was wet. Jones told her to wipe it. She still refused, yet he kissed her twice. At about ten or eleven o'clock the same night, her father-in-law sent her to Thomas Coales's house to borrow a lantern and candle. Jones came to her and again tried to kiss her. She ran away from him. She then went on, and he met her at Mr Coales's door. He kissed her twice, with his tongue in her mouth. He put his hand under her coats and swore he would ravish her if he could. She held fast by the latch of the door, lest he should carry her away. Jones was ordered to pay a fine of 5s 0d for his misdemeanour and 2s 0d for swearing. He was to be confined on board the ship during its stay in the road. He was also to pay the charges of court. If Jones was found on shore again contrary to this order, he was to be imprisoned and proceeded against with the utmost rigour of the law. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. Interpretations Sarah Foster's own examination gave the clearest account of the assault. Her refusal was repeated, first in the street and later at Thomas Coales's door. The council therefore had evidence that the contact was not welcome and that force or threat was involved. The sentence kept Jones on board the <i>Whitworth</i> rather than in immediate island custody. This used the ship as a place of restraint while it remained in the road. It also limited further contact between Jones and island households. The warning about coming ashore again showed that the council treated his presence on the island as the practical danger. The fine punished the offence already proved. The confinement order managed the risk that a visiting ship's officer could repeat the offence or disturb the peace before sailing. Speculations

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The order confining Jones to the ship probably balanced punishment with the difficulty of holding a ship's officer for a longer prosecution. The council fined him, charged him costs and kept him off shore. That arrangement gave immediate protection to Sarah Foster and Heath's household without delaying the <i>Whitworth</i> or escalating the matter into a larger trial.
42	20	Island S.t [Helena] Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 26.th day of July 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Pres.t Tho.m Goodwin dp.ty Gov.r Jn.o Field Ensigne John Scriven Sold.r made Complaint to us that Richard Cavens Sold.r Stood Indebted to him y.e Sume of thirty nine Shillings for Punch he Sold him, which y.e Said Cavens denys to pay him/ The Said Scriven being askt why he Sold punch without a Licence made answer that when he first came to this Island he bought five Gallons of Arrack, and Sold it Out in Punch, and did not know there was any forfeiture for So doing, Seeing punch Sold in Severall houses/ Whereupon It is ordered That the Said Cavens pay the Said Scriven Bus y.e Sum of four dollars and Charges of Councill/ Whereas William Bull Armourer haveing bin found hid on board the Ship S.t [Geor]ge frig.t with a design to Run away, was Brought on Shoar a Satur day Last and Imprisoned till this day It is ordered That the Said W.m Bull do Ride y.e wooden Horse this day, dureing our pleasure for his attempting to Run away, and Refusing to work any more at his Trade/ Whereas two of Cap.t Kents men haveing absented themselves from their Ship, about a week before y.e fleet Said Came out of y.e Country this morning, and appeared before Governo.r and Councill, Whereupon/ It is ordered That the Said two men Shall be Imprisoned dureing our pleasure with Irons on their Leggs, and then Sent to y.e R.t Hon.o Comp.s Plantation to work w.th their Negroes, According to an Advertizmt. Issued out y.e [...] day of [...] and when y.e first Homeward Bound Ship which arrives here, to be Sent for England [...]	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Monday, 26 July 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and John Field, Ensign, were present. John Scriven, soldier, complained that Richard Cavens, soldier, owed him 39s 0d for punch sold to him. Cavens denied that he owed the money. Scriven was asked why he sold punch without a licence. He answered that, when he first came to the island, he bought five gallons of arrack and sold it out as punch. He did not know there was any forfeiture for doing this, since he saw punch sold in several houses. Richard Cavens was ordered to pay Scriven the sum of four dollars and the charges of council. William Bull, armourer, was found hidden on board the ship <i>St George</i> frigate with a plan to run away. He was brought on shore the previous Saturday and imprisoned until this day. William Bull was ordered to ride the wooden horse that day, during the council's pleasure, for trying to run away and refusing to work any more at his trade. Two of Captain Kent's men absented themselves from their ship about a week before the fleet sailed. They came out of the country this morning and appeared before the Governor and Council. The two men were ordered to be imprisoned during the council's pleasure, with irons on their legs. They were then to be sent to the Right Honourable Company's plantation to work with the Company's Negroes, according to an advertisement issued on the [...] day of [...]. When the first homeward-bound ship arrived, they were to be sent to England. Interpretations The punch debt showed how unlicensed retailing could still create an enforceable private debt. Scriven was questioned for selling without a licence, but Cavens was still ordered to pay. The council therefore separated the licensing breach from the buyer's obligation. Scriven's defence showed that retail drink rules were unevenly observed. He claimed he saw punch sold in several houses and did not know of the forfeiture. The council still enforced the debt, but the exchange showed that public practice could blur the force of regulation. William Bull's attempted escape was treated as both desertion and refusal of skilled labour. His trade as armourer mattered because the Company lost not just a worker but a necessary military craftsman. Punishment on the wooden horse answered both the attempted flight and his refusal to continue his work. The two absent seamen were placed in irons, then assigned to plantation labour with the Company's Negroes until they could be sent to England. This turned temporary confinement into forced labour. It also kept deserters useful to the Company while preventing them from hiding again before transport.
43	21	Joy Ashby widow brought this day unto Governo.r & Councill the Last will and Testam.t of her dec.d Husband Tho: Ashby In order of having y.e Same prov.d which was Accordingly done by the oaths of M.r Jn.o Kerr, and Joseph Parsons, who made oath further, that y.e S.d dec.d Tho: Ashby nominated his wife Joy Ashby both Heir, and Execut.r of his Last Will & Testament/ It is ordered	Joy Ashby, widow, brought the last will and testament of her deceased husband, Thomas Ashby, to the Governor and Council. She asked that it be proved. The will was proved by the oaths of Mr John Kerr and Joseph Parsons. They also swore that Thomas Ashby named his wife, Joy Ashby, as both heir and executrix of his last will and testament. Thomas Ashby's will was approved. Copies were to be given when demanded.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		That the Said Tho: Ashbeys Will now produced be approved off and Copys given thereof when demanded/ [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. Interpretations The proof of the will by sworn witnesses gave Joy Ashby legal authority to act. Her position as both heir and executrix meant she received the estate and also gained responsibility for administering it. The order for copies to be given on demand made the approved will available as an official record. This protected Joy Ashby's title and gave others a way to verify the probate if later disputes arose.
44	22	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Wednesday the 18.th day of Aug.st 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Cor: Sodington d.ptty Governo.r Pres.t Tho.s Goodwin Assigned y.e [...] Jn.o Field 4.th in Coun: Whereas M.r Thomas Thornhurst Cheif e mate of y.e good Shipp Anna, requested us to prove the Nuncupative Will of Henry Max =well Sold.r in y.e Service of the R.t Hon.o ble United East India Comp.a who took his Passage on Said Ship, and died Some Smaill time after his being brought on Shoar, who aft.r due application to y.e Govern.r and Coun.l haveing produced two of S.d Ships Comp.s to Swear the Probate of Said Will viz.t M.r Tho: Cox Surgions mate and Edmund Debnam Steward, who Accordingly by y.e Worship.s the Govern.r being Sworn Declared that the Said Henry Maxwells Will, was as followeth, That being often to visite the agrobant and more particular at the time when it was demanded of him to make his Will, by M.r Thornhurst to the End as he Exprest, his poor Relations if he had any in England might Enjoy his Effects the Said Henry Maxwell did declare he had no greater friend than himself and that he was y.e only person he does Leave his Effects to (if died of that Sicknefs) as haveing been his peculiar Bone factor, which alsoe the two deponents did averr to be true, and Signed accordingly Tho.s Cox Edm. Debnam. It is ordered That according to Evidence the Nuncupative be a good Will and that the Said M.r Thornhurst be Invested with y.e possession of the Said deceased Effects an Inventory being first Taken, and the goods	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Wednesday, 18 August 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, assigned the [...], and John Field, fourth in council, were present. Mr Thomas Thornhurst, chief mate of the good ship <i>Anna</i> , asked the council to prove the nuncupative will of Henry Maxwell. Maxwell was a soldier in the service of the Right Honourable United East India Company. He took passage on the <i>Anna</i> and died a short time after he was brought on shore. After due application to the Governor and Council, Thornhurst produced two members of the ship's company to swear the probate of the will. They were Mr Thomas Cox, surgeon's mate, and Edmund Debnam, steward. They were sworn by the Governor. They declared that Henry Maxwell's will was as follows. Maxwell was often visited by [...], and especially at the time when Mr Thornhurst asked him to make his will. Thornhurst said this was so that Maxwell's poor relations, if he had any in England, might receive his effects. Maxwell declared that he had no greater friend than Thornhurst, and that Thornhurst was the only person to whom he left his effects if he died of that sickness, because Thornhurst was his special benefactor. The two deponents affirmed that this was true. Thomas Cox and Edmund Debnam signed accordingly. The nuncupative will was accepted as a good will, according to the evidence. Mr Thornhurst was to be put in possession of the deceased man's effects after an inventory was first taken. Interpretations A nuncupative will was an oral will proved by witnesses. Here it was accepted because two men from the <i>Anna</i> swore to Maxwell's spoken wishes. The council therefore allowed spoken testimony to stand in place of a written will. Thornhurst's role was important because he both requested probate and received the estate. The witnesses said Maxwell chose him because he was his "peculiar benefactor". That made personal care during sickness the basis for inheritance, even though Thornhurst first framed the matter as a way to protect any poor relations in England. The inventory protected the estate before Thornhurst took possession. Even when the oral will was accepted, the goods were not simply handed over without record. The council first required a list of the effects, which made the transfer accountable.
45	23	goods appearing[g]es to be Exposed to Outcry [...]ly, and the Said M.r Thornhurst recei[v]eing the value To be Answerable to the R.t Hono. united Company upon all demands Legally made Concerning this matter [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Wednesday the 25.th day of Aug.st 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Cor: Sodington dp.tty Govern.r Pres.t Tho.s Goodwin Insigne Jn.o Field 4.th in Coun:	The goods were to be exposed to outcry [...]. Mr Thornhurst was to receive their value. He was to be answerable to the Right Honourable United Company for all demands lawfully made in this matter. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Wednesday, 25 August 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, and John Field, fourth in council, were present. Charles Steward and Henry Francis, executors of the last will and testament of Samuel Maxwell, deceased,

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Whereas Charles Steward and Henry Francis Execut.rs of the Last Will and Testam.t of Sam.ll Maxwell dec.d where ordered to appear this In order of haveing the Same prov.d which we Refused to do before being Some difficulties therein (as we thought) But up [on] peruseing the R.t Hon.d Comp.s Instructions, we found y.e difficulty Conformable thereto and accordingly It was ordered That the Said Sam.l Maxicells Last Will & Testam.t now produced B[e] read and approved off, and moreover that his wid.o have one third of his Land that he died possest off and her dwelling in his Cuntrey house dureing her Naturall Life, and y.e moveables to be disposed of according to the Deceased Will of which Copys are to be given when demanded [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin [Is Cund]	were ordered to appear so the will could be proved. The Governor and Council had refused to prove it before because they thought there were difficulties in it. After the Right Honourable Company's instructions were read, the difficulty was found to agree with them. Samuel Maxwell's last will and testament was therefore read and approved. Maxwell's widow was to have one third of the land he owned when he died. She was also to live in his country house for her natural life. The movable goods were to be disposed of according to the deceased man's will. Copies of the will were to be given when demanded. Stephen Poirier, Thomas Goodwin and [Is Cund] signed. Interpretations The order about Thornhurst changed possession into accountable sale. The goods were not simply handed to him. They were to be sold by public outcry, and Thornhurst received the value while remaining answerable to the Company for any lawful demand. This protected absent claimants or creditors who might later challenge the transfer. The approval of Samuel Maxwell's will showed the council correcting its earlier hesitation by reference to Company instructions. Local probate practice was not guided only by the council's view of English law. The Company's written instructions could settle what counted as acceptable procedure on St Helena. The widow's share separated land from movable goods. She received one third of the land and a life interest in the country house, while the movable goods followed the will. This protected her continuing support without overturning the rest of Maxwell's testamentary disposal.
46	24	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Satur day the 29.th day of Aug.st 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Cor: Sodington dpty Gover.r Tho: Goodwin Insigne Jn.o Field 4.th in Coun: Whereas in the time of Last Warr, there was Continueally an officer with Some number of Sould.rs posted Every night (besides a Lockput in the day time) att Bankses and Ruperts ffort for y.e preventing an Enemy makeing any attempt to Land, and better Security of th[e] Island, And there being now an open Warr Declared, between Eng.d And ffrance and Spain It is therefore thought fitt, for y.e preserva tion and defence of the Island That the Same Sould.rs as before be Reduced into two Guard.s And that Jn.o Alexander Clerk of y.e Councill and William Reid Gent: of y.e Arms be appointed and to be officers to Command y.e Centinalls a.t Bankses ffort alternatively each night And Tho: Henderson Serj. and One.l Steicord Eldest Corp.l be appointed to Command y.e Centinalls at Ruperts fort as aforesaid, who are all required to be diligent and Carefull in y.e Hindering an Enemy Landing if attempt be made as aforesaid But Since this proveing uneffectuall, by reason y.e freemen Could not, or would not find y.e Sold.s Victualls for Such Extraordinary a Service, they Comeing Every three days to y.e Guard/ It is therefore ordered That y.e Said Guard Shall Remain as they were before and that ther[e] being Constantly work men at Ruperts It is thought fitt that they Should perform Single duty in watching and for y.e better Encouraging there a bottle of Brandy Shall be allowed them Every night And it haveing more time bin Sent to Bankses 16.th an officer every releif day, to See that y.e Said duty is well performed who Shall also have a nother Bottle of Brandy allowed them, as a foresaid/ [Poirier]	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Saturday, 29 August 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor, Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, and John Field, fourth in council, were present. During the last war, an officer and some soldiers were posted every night at Banks's Fort and Rupert's Fort. This was done besides a lookout kept there in the daytime. The purpose was to prevent an enemy from attempting to land and to give better security to the island. Open war was now declared between England and France and Spain. It was therefore thought necessary for the preservation and defence of the island that the same soldiers as before be reduced into two guards. John Alexander, clerk of the council, and William Reid, gentleman of the arms, were appointed as officers to command the sentinels at Banks's Fort on alternate nights. Thomas Henderson, sergeant, and One.l Steicord, eldest corporal, were appointed to command the sentinels at Rupert's Fort in the same way. All were required to be diligent and careful in stopping any attempted enemy landing. This plan proved ineffective because the freemen could not, or would not, provide the soldiers with victuals for such extraordinary service. The soldiers came to the guard every three days. The guards were therefore ordered to remain as they were before. Since workmen were constantly at Rupert's Fort, they were to perform single duty in watching. For their better encouragement, a bottle of brandy was to be allowed to them every night. An officer was to be sent to Banks's Fort every relief day to see that the duty was well performed. He was also to have another bottle of brandy allowed in the same way. [Poirier] signed. Interpretations

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The order showed how the island's defence depended on a mix of soldiers, officers, freemen and workmen. War with France and Spain required stronger coastal watch, but the plan failed when the freemen did not supply food for the extra service. Military readiness was therefore limited by local provisioning. Banks's Fort and Rupert's Fort were treated as key landing points. Night guards, daytime lookouts and officer inspection were all aimed at stopping an enemy before it reached the settled part of the island. The bottle of brandy was not only a ration. It was used as an incentive for night watching. The council used drink to make extra duty workable when ordinary arrangements for feeding soldiers broke down. Speculations The return to the former guard arrangement was probably a practical retreat from an unfunded wartime plan. The council wanted stronger defence after war was declared, but the refusal or inability of freemen to provide victuals made the scheme hard to sustain. The revised order used existing workmen at Rupert's Fort and periodic inspection at Banks's Fort instead of creating a larger burden that local inhabitants resisted.
47	25	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 21 day of Sep.tbr 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Cor: Sodington dp.ty Govo.r Pres.t Tho: Goodwin Insigne Jn.o Field 4.th in Coun: Whereas Charles Steward and Henry Francis Execut.rs of the Last will and Testam.t of Sam.ll Maxwell late Serj. dec.d brought this day and delivered unto Govern.r & Coun.ce an Inventory of his S.d Said Maxwells Estate, which was Examined & approved of, and accordingl[y] It was ordered That the Said Inventory be reg.d and Remain in y.e Clerks office and Copys given thereof when demanded/ Richard Gurling free Planter presented this day unto us a Letter of Attorney made to him by Son E. young Sold.r who has Lain Sick Some time which he desired might be proved and to Remain in y.e Clerks office which was accordingly Done, and he the Said Gurling Authorized to act as in Said Letter of Attorney was Exprefsed/ The overseers of y.e high ways for this present year desired their warr.t for y.e Executing thereof Said office which was granted them as followeth Island S.t Helena. You Leonard Hunt and James Greentree free Planters are nominated and appointed overseers of y.e high ways for this present year 1703 which office you are hereby Required Carefully and dilligently to Execute, which you may y.e better & more Impart[i] =ally perform hereunto is a List Annexed of the Names of all those white men Inhabitants, Excepting Such as are in y.e R.t Honourable united	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 21 September 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, and John Field, fourth in council, were present. Charles Steward and Henry Francis, executors of the last will and testament of Samuel Maxwell, late sergeant, deceased, brought in and delivered an inventory of Maxwell's estate to the Governor and Council. It was examined and approved. The inventory was ordered to be registered and kept in the clerk's office. Copies were to be given when demanded. Richard Gurling, free planter, presented a letter of attorney made to him by Son E. Young, soldier, who was sick for some time. Gurling asked that it be proved and kept in the clerk's office. This was done. Gurling was authorised to act as set out in the letter of attorney. The overseers of the highways for the present year asked for their warrant to execute their office. It was granted to them. Leonard Hunt and James Greentree, free planters, were nominated and appointed overseers of the highways for the year 1703. They were required to execute the office carefully and diligently. To help them perform it better and more impartially, a list was annexed of the names of all white male inhabitants, except those in the Right Honourable United [...] Interpretations The registration of Samuel Maxwell's inventory made estate administration a matter of public record. The executors delivered the list, the council approved it and the clerk's office kept it. This created an official basis for any later copies, claims or disputes. The letter of attorney for Son E. Young showed how legal agency was used when sickness prevented direct action. Richard Gurling was given authority to act for him, but only after the document was proved and kept in the clerk's office. Private authority therefore gained force through public registration. The highway warrant linked local labour duty to named inhabitants. The annexed list was meant to help the overseers act impartially. It reduced the chance that road work or related burdens would be imposed selectively.
48	26	united Comp.s Service) and of Negroes and Black men that any [P]er[son] hath, Excepting the Said R.t Hono. united Companies/ These are therefore in her majesties Name to will and require You Leonard Hunt and James Greentree to	The warrant also covered Negroes and Black men held by any person, except those belonging to the Right Honourable United Company. Leonard Hunt and James Greentree were required, in Queen Anne's name, to make all persons, both white

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		cause all persons Both whites and Blacks, To work one day and no more, in the making and Repairing all Such high ways as goes from any mans House that is needfull and Necessary to be Done, And to Repair all Church Ways and Stiles, bridges &c So as all and Every the white Inhabitants and their men Blacks do work at the Said high ways this present year one day and no more as aforesaid/ And if any Person or Persons after due Warning Shall absent himself and doth not Come or Send his Black or Blacks on the days and times by you appointed, then and there to Labour as aforesaid, Then you are to put in Some other man or men Black or Blacks in y.e absent persons Room to work one day as aforesaid, which person So put in you are to pay accord =ing to the Said R.t Hono. Comp.s orders (viz.t) Eighteen pence for a white mans day work, and twelve pence for a Black mans Days work/ absenting And Such Person or Persons So Refusing or not Sending as aforesaid are forthwith to repay you, which if they doe Like to do, You are hereby Impowered to take and dispose any goods from Such person or persons, and Sell the Same at a publick outcry delivering y.e overplus if any to y.e owners, after you are repaid, and Reasonable Charges deducted/ For all which this Shall be your Sufficient Warrant Given under our hands this 21.th day of Sept.r 1703 To Leonard Hunt & James Greentree [Poirier] overseers These Tho: Goodwin	and Black, work one day and no more on the making and repair of necessary highways from any man's house. They were also to repair all church ways, stiles, bridges and other such works. Every white inhabitant and his Black men were to work on the highways for one day in the present year, and no more. If any person was duly warned and then failed to come, or failed to send his Black or Blacks at the appointed days and times, the overseers were to put another white man or Black man in that absent person's place to work one day. The replacement worker was to be paid according to the Right Honourable Company's orders: 18d for a white man's day work and 12d for a Black man's day work. The person who refused or failed to send labour was required to repay the overseers at once. If payment was not made, the overseers were empowered to take goods from that person and sell them by public outcry. Any surplus was to be returned to the owner after the overseers were repaid and reasonable charges were deducted. This was to be sufficient warrant for all these actions. It was given under their hands on 21 September 1703. The warrant was addressed to Leonard Hunt and James Greentree, overseers. [Poirier] and Thomas Goodwin signed. Interpretations The highway warrant turned road repair into a compulsory labour duty. Each white inhabitant and his Black men owed one day's work. The order fixed the burden at one day and no more, which set a limit on the overseers as well as on the inhabitants. The warrant treated Black labour as part of a household's public obligation. A white inhabitant could satisfy the duty by sending his Black or Blacks. This made slave or dependent labour a means through which public works were carried out. The pay rates showed a formal hierarchy in labour value. A white man's day was priced at 18d, while a Black man's day was priced at 12d. These rates mattered when replacement labour was hired for an absent person. The power to seize and sell goods gave the overseers a practical enforcement tool. If a person failed to work or send labour, the overseers could hire a replacement, charge the absent person and recover the cost by public sale. This made highway maintenance enforceable without returning to council for each default.
49	27	A List of all Persons both, whites and Blacks that are to work att Said High ways as aforesaid/ Whites Blacks Thomas Goodwin 2 [.] John Field 2 [.] Jn.o Alexander 2 [.] Jn.o French 1 1 Matt: Garett 2 1 Erasmus Gurling 1 [.] Rich.d Alexander [.] 3 Henry Coales 3 [.] Rob.t Addis 2 [.] Philip Carslake 1 [.] Sym.d DesFountaine 3 [.] William Duston 1 [.] William ffrench 1 [.] Jonet Higham 1 [.] Thomas Allis free Plant.r 1 1 Robert S. Addis 1 1 Joy Ashby wid.o 1 1 Walter Belvard 1 1 Jn.o Bagley & his apprentice 2 1 Thomas Burnham 1 [.]	A list was made of all persons, both white and Black, who were to work on the highways as ordered. Thomas Goodwin was listed with 2 whites and [...] Blacks. John Field was listed with 2 whites and [...] Blacks. John Alexander was listed with 2 whites and [...] Blacks. John French was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Matthew Garett was listed with 2 whites and 1 Black. Erasmus Gurling was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Richard Alexander was listed with [...] whites and 3 Blacks. Henry Coales was listed with 3 whites and [...] Blacks. Robert Addis was listed with 2 whites and [...] Blacks. Philip Carslake was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Symond DesFountaine was listed with 3 whites and [...] Blacks. William Duston was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Orlando Bagley & apprentice 2 1 Owen Pedran 1 [.] Will: Beale and Son Giles 2 1 Edward Bagley 1 2 Thomas Coales 1 1 Carl Carlos 1 1 William Coales 1 [.] Margaret Cosgrave wid.o 1 [.] Gilbert Cosgrave 1 [.] Grace Coulson wid.o 1 [.] John Coulson 1 [.] Leonard Coulson 1 [.] John Coles 1 1 Mr Cure 1 3 Edward Crosbey 1 1 Richard Cleave 1 [.] James Draper 1 [.] John Duston [.] 2 Martha Earl wid.o 2 2 James Easthope & Son Joseph 1 1 John Fuller [.] 1 Mary Sacknale wid.o 1 2 Henry Francis 1 [.] Carried over Brought over 28 56 George Goodwin 1 3 Richard Gurling 1 3 James Greentree 1 1 Thomas Gargen 1 1 Will: Hayes Senior 1 [.] John Hemonss 1 [.] Edward Heath 1 2 Thomas Harper 1 [.] Richard Hardingg 1 [.] Leonard Hunt & apprentice 2 1 George Hoskison 1 4 Will: Johnson 1 2 Joshua Johnson 1 2 Mary Knoster wid.o 1 [.] Susan Israeck and his Son 1 1 John Lufkin and Son Samuel 2 2 Stephen Lufkin 1 2 Robert Leech & brother Francis 2 1 John Long and Son John 1 1 Mary Leech wid.o 1 [.] John Mudge 1 [.] John Mudge 1 [.] William Marsh & his 3 Sons 4 2 John Nicholds Senior 1 1 John Orchard 1 [.] Gabriell Powell 1 [.] James Rider 1 3 Thomas Swallow Senior & Son Richard 2 2 Thomas Swallow Junior 1 2 Mary Sich wid.o & her Sons 2 3 Richard Swallow Senior 1 2 Onel Steward 1 [.] Charles Steward 1 [.] Will: Sedl 1 1 Sarah Snelling 1 1 Ripin Wills and Son Tony 2 2 Simon Whaley [.] 1 Gurlings orphans [.] 1 Heath's Children [.] [.] Morris orphan-Walter 1 1 Wranghams orphd. 1 4 Maxwells Ditto [.] 3 Totalls 73 117 A true List according to y.e yearly Acco.t [...] p me John Alexander [...]	William French was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Jonet Higham was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Thomas Allis, free planter, was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Robert S. Addis was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Joy Ashby, widow, was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Walter Belvard was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. John Bagley and his apprentice were listed with 2 whites and 1 Black. Thomas Burnham was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Orlando Bagley and apprentice were listed with 2 whites and 1 Black. Owen Pedran was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. William Beale and his son Giles were listed with 2 whites and 1 Black. Edward Bagley was listed with 1 white and 2 Blacks. Thomas Coales was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Carl Carlos was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. William Coales was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Margaret Cosgrave, widow, was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Gilbert Cosgrave was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Grace Coulson, widow, was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. John Coulson was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Leonard Coulson was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. John Coles was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Mr Cure was listed with 1 white and 3 Blacks. Edward Crosbey was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Richard Cleave was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. James Draper was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Jonathan Duston was listed with [...] whites and 2 Blacks. Martha Earl, widow, was listed with 2 whites and 2 Blacks. James Easthope and his son Joseph were listed with 1 white and 1 Black. John Fuller was listed with [...] whites and 1 Black. Mary Sacknale, widow, was listed with 1 white and 2 Blacks. Henry Francis was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. The amount carried over was 28 whites and 56 Blacks. George Goodwin was listed with 1 white and 3 Blacks. Richard Gurling was listed with 1 white and 3 Blacks. James Greentree was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Thomas Gargen was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. William Hayes senior was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. John Hemonss was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Edward Heath was listed with 1 white and 2 Blacks. Thomas Harper was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Richard Hardingg was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Leonard Hunt and his apprentice were listed with 2 whites and 1 Black. George Hoskison was listed with 1 white and 4 Blacks. William Johnson was listed with 1 white and 2 Blacks. Joshua Johnson was listed with 1 white and 2 Blacks. Mary Knoster, widow, was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Susan Israeck and his son were listed with 1 white and 1 Black. John Lufkin and his son Samuel were listed with 2 whites and 2 Blacks. Stephen Lufkin was listed with 1 white and 2 Blacks. Robert Leech and his brother Francis were listed with 2 whites and 1 Black. John Long and his son John were listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Mary Leech, widow, was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. John Mudge was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Jonathan Mudge was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. William Marsh and his three sons were listed with 4 whites and 2 Blacks. John Nicholds senior was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. John Orchard was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Gabriell Powell was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. James Rider was listed with 1 white and 3 Blacks. Thomas Swallow senior and his son Richard were listed with 2 whites and 2 Blacks. Thomas Swallow junior was listed with 1 white and 2 Blacks. Mary Sich, widow, and her sons were listed with 2 whites and 3 Blacks. Richard Swallow senior was listed with 1 white and 2 Blacks. Onel Steward was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. Charles Steward was listed with 1 white and [...] Blacks. William Sedl was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Sarah Snelling was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Ripin Wills and his son Tony were listed with 2 whites and 2 Blacks. Simon Whaley was listed with [...] whites and 1 Black. Gurling's orphans were listed with [...] whites and 1 Black. Heath's children were listed with [...] whites and [...] Blacks. Morris orphan, Walter, was listed with 1 white and 1 Black. Wrangham's orphans were listed with 1 white and 4 Blacks. Maxwell's orphans were listed with [...] whites and 3 Blacks. The totals were 73 whites and 117 Blacks. The list was described as a true list according to the yearly account. It was [...] by John Alexander [...]. Interpretations The list showed how highway labour was assessed household by household. It counted named white persons, apprentices, sons, widows, orphans and Black labour. The road duty therefore fell on households and estates, not only on adult male householders. Widows and orphans were included because property and household status carried labour duties. Mary Sacknale, Mary Knoster, Mary Leech, Gurling's orphans, Wrangham's orphans and Maxwell's orphans all appeared in the list. This showed that local public works drew on estates under female or guardian control as well as on male planters. The separate counts for whites and Blacks made labour obligation visible by status. Black workers were counted as part of the resources attached to each household or estate. Their work was used to satisfy public repair duties assigned through the owners or custodians of those households. Apprentices and sons were also counted in several households. This showed that the overseers measured available labour through domestic dependency and service. A household's public burden reflected the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			number of people under its authority who could be sent to work.
50	28	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tues day the 5.th day of Octob.r 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Cor: Sodington dpty Govern.r Pres.t Tho: Goodwin 3.d in Coun: Jn.o Field 4.th in Councill Inspersman Whereas Rob.t Leach, and Hum Gurling Spinster came this morn =ing downe to ffort James in order of being married, in the presen[ce] of Govern.r & Councill That in Case Sutton Isaack Junior Should the banns (as he did on Sunday Last) They might have a tryall before the Said Govern.r & Coun.l Imediately And as y.e minister was pronouncing whether any Person could Shew any Lawfull Caus[e] why the Said Rob.t Leach and Hum Gurling Should not be joyn[ed] together in holy Matrimony, the Said Sutton Isaack forbid the Bann againe and Accordingly produced two Sufficent persons for his Security/ The Said Hum Gurling denyes that ever She made the Said Sutton Isaack any promise of marriage The Said Sutton Isaack desired his Evidences might be Called who were and declared as followeth/ Humphrey Edwards Sold.r being Sworne Saith that about Six or Seaven months ago he went to the house of Sutton Isaack Sen.r who was not Long there before his Son Sutton Isaack Junior askt him if he would take a Walk this deponent made answer poor Care if I do, So they both went over to Edward Bagleys house where was the abovesaid Hum Gurling, who after they had been there Some time, the Said Isaack desired to Speak with her, with[in] out doors, and bade him the Said Isaack ask her if She would have him for her Husband She Seemed very unwilling [...] at fir[st] and gave him Severall denyalls, but at Last Consented to make him her Husband and Accordingly broak a peice of mony [w.ch] them[se] he thinks was an English Shilling and Said the Said him better then She did any young man, upon y.e Latter end that if he had not come to her, She would have Sent for him, and wished Severall bitter wishes if She was not true to her promise/ [Poirier]	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 5 October 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor and President, Thomas Goodwin, third in council, and John Field, fourth in council, were present. [Inspersman] Robert Leach and Hum Gurling, spinster, came down to Fort James that morning to be married in the presence of the Governor and Council. This was done so that, if Sutton Isaack junior should forbid the banns, as he did on the previous Sunday, the matter could be tried before the Governor and Council at once. As the minister asked whether any person could show lawful cause why Robert Leach and Hum Gurling should not be joined together in holy matrimony, Sutton Isaack again forbade the banns. He then produced two sufficient persons as security. Hum Gurling denied that she ever made Sutton Isaack any promise of marriage. Sutton Isaack asked that his witnesses be called. They were called and gave their evidence. Humphrey Edwards, soldier, was sworn. He said that about six or seven months before, he went to the house of Sutton Isaack senior. After he was there only a short time, Sutton Isaack junior asked whether he would take a walk. Edwards answered that he cared little if he did. They both went to Edward Bagley's house, where Hum Gurling was. After they were there for some time, Isaack asked to speak with Hum outside. He asked her whether she would have him as her husband. She seemed very unwilling [...] at first and refused him several times. At last, she agreed to make him her husband. They then broke a piece of money between them. Edwards thought it was an English shilling. Hum said she loved Isaack better than any young man. Towards the end, she said that if he had not come to her, she would have sent for him. She wished several bitter wishes on herself if she was not true to her promise. Stephen Poirier signed. Interpretations Forbidding the banns was a formal challenge to a marriage before it was solemnised. Sutton Isaack's objection stopped the ceremony from proceeding as an ordinary marriage. By bringing the couple to Fort James, the matter was placed under immediate civil examination rather than being left as a parish dispute. The security produced by Sutton Isaack mattered because an objection to marriage carried consequences. He was not allowed to disrupt the banns merely by speaking. He had to provide persons who stood behind his claim while the council tested it. The broken piece of money was presented as evidence of a marriage promise. It functioned as a token of agreement, not as casual exchange. In the witness's account, the broken shilling, Hum Gurling's words and her self-cursing promises together formed proof that a binding promise was made. Speculations The attempt to marry Robert Leach before the Governor and Council was probably arranged to force a quick ruling if Sutton Isaack objected again. He had already forbidden the banns on Sunday. Holding the marriage at Fort James meant the objection could be heard immediately, with the council present and ready to judge it.
51	29	Neomy Swallow being Sworne Saith that She heard Ann Gurling Say that She would make the Said Isaack her Husband but was willing to have her Relations Consent, But if they wont give their Consent Says she, they cant	Neomy Swallow was sworn. She said she heard Ann Gurling say that she would make Sutton Isaack her husband, but wanted her relations' consent. Ann said that, if they would not give their consent, they could not

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		hinder me of my Portion and when a minister Comes to the Island we will be married privately/ Will: Wills Saith that Sometime whilst the Last fleet of Ships was in the Road, Ann Gurling came to her, and looking very Sadly She askt her what was the matter w.th her, why she Says the Said Hum Gurling I could Care that Rogues Eys out, who is that Said this depo.t Ann Gurling Replyed, Sutton Isaack, and I think I was be witcht when, I made him a promise/ After Witness Examined as aforesaid, and Severall debates Sutton Isaack Jun.r desired that y.e aforesaid Cause might be decided by the Jury next Sessions, Rob.t Leach desired y.e [...] Sary that the Govern.r and Coun.l might decide it; and upon reading y.e Law of England Such Case is Left to the ordinary to Determine/ And in consequence thereof It is ordered. That the Contract made between the Said Sutton Isaack Jun.r and Ann Gurling be void, She being under age and in the Care of Govern.r & Coun.l being an orphan And that the Contract made between her and Rob.t Leach Stand good, and be married when they think fitt according to the Intention they Came down for, And that the Said Isaack pay all the Charges of Court Except Rob.t Leaches Evidences, who were not Examined. It is further agreed and ordered. That no person under the age of twenty one years Comp[le]a[t] Shall Contract marriage without y.e Consent of parents (if of their Guardians or Govern.r if their parents be deceased) And according to this order to be made [...] Publiqs, that no person may plead Ignorance/ Walter Morris orphan Came this day to us and desired that he might make Choice of his Brother in Law Rich. Gurling to be his Guardian who being called and askt whether he would take y.e Care upon him, made answer he was/ It	hinder her from receiving her portion. When a minister came to the island, she and Isaack would be married privately. William Wills said that, sometime while the last fleet of ships was in the road, Ann Gurling came to her and looked very sad. Wills asked what was the matter with her. Hum Gurling said, "I could tear that rogue's eyes out." Wills asked who she meant. Ann Gurling replied, "Sutton Isaack." She said she thought she was bewitched when she made him a promise. After the witnesses were examined and several debates were held, Sutton Isaack junior asked that the case be decided by the jury at the next sessions. Robert Leach asked [...] that the Governor and Council decide it. The law of England was read. In such a case, the decision was left to the ordinary. It was therefore ordered that the contract made between Sutton Isaack junior and Ann Gurling was void. She was under age, an orphan and in the care of the Governor and Council. The contract made between her and Robert Leach was to stand good. They were to be married when they thought fit, as they intended when they came down. Isaack was ordered to pay all the charges of court, except the costs of Robert Leach's witnesses, who were not examined. It was further agreed and ordered that no person under the full age of twenty-one years should contract marriage without the consent of parents, or of guardians or the Governor if the parents were dead. This order was to be made [...] public, so that no person could plead ignorance. Walter Morris, orphan, came before the council. He asked to choose his brother-in-law Richard Gurling as his guardian. Gurling was called and asked whether he would take the care upon himself. He answered that he would. Interpretations The case turned on Ann Gurling's legal capacity as an orphan under age. Even if a private promise was made to Sutton Isaack, the council treated her minority and guardianship as stronger than the alleged contract. Her marriage required lawful consent, not only her own words. The reference to the ordinary placed the matter within ecclesiastical marriage jurisdiction. The Governor and Council used English law to justify deciding the validity of the contract, rather than sending the case to a jury at sessions as Isaack requested. Ann's portion mattered because marriage affected control of her property. Her reported words showed that she understood consent from her relations as a barrier, but also believed they could not stop her inheritance. The council's ruling protected both her marriage choice and her estate from an unauthorised contract. The order about all persons under twenty-one turned this dispute into a general rule. A contested marriage promise by an orphan produced a public regulation for minors across the island. Consent by parents, guardians or the Governor became the required safeguard. Speculations The council probably voided Isaack's contract to prevent a private marriage promise from defeating guardianship control over an orphan's person and portion. The evidence included talk of marrying privately when a minister arrived. That detail gave the council a concrete reason to make a public rule against under-age marriage contracts without consent.
52	30	It is ordered That the Said Richard Gurling be Invested w.th the Said Walter Morris Estate and accordingly Robert Addis and Joseph Trapp Execut.r of the Last Will and Testam.t of	Richard Gurling was ordered to be invested with Walter Morris's estate. Robert Addis and Joseph Trapp, executors of the last will and testament of Walter's father, Michael Morris, were discharged from everything

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		his father Mich.l Morris, be discha[r] ged off and from what belongs to the Said Walter Morris, as well as all other Legacies and persons Concerned therein, particularly, from paying Mary Young what is Left to her in Said Will/ M.r Thomas Goodwin desired That Jn.o Hewetson and Robert Hinness Sold.r might be Sworne to prove that Beregreen Carlebien gave him all his Effects on Said Island. The Said Hewetson and Hinness being Accordingly Sworn Deposed That the aforesaid Bereg. Carlebien did declare before them, whilst he Lay Sick that he gave all that he had to the Said M.r Goodwin after he was Buried and Charges defrayd M.r Jn.o Kerr and George Young Saith y.e Same/ It is ordered. That y.e Nuncupative Will of Bereg.n Carlebiens be approved of, and Stand good, and Consequently the Said M.r Thomas Goodwin, Invested w.th the S.d Decedts Effects. Thomas Coales free Planter Came to y.e Governo.r on the 26 of Sept.r Last, and Declared on oath that his Hen Robed and Some quantity of Brandy and Sugar Stolen, And that had bin In =formed that Arthur Bradley Sold.r knew who twas that Comitt[ed] y.e Crime wherefore desired a Warrant might be Issued out for y.e Sumoning of y.e Said Bradley and Evidences against him to appear thursday, who Accordingly did, and being Interro =gated whether he knew or not who twas that Comitted y.e Crime abovesaid, made Reply that he knew nothing of y.e matter, being in drink if he uttered any Such thing as Tho: Coales Says he did and offers to give his oath Accordingly to y.e Same, which was taken It is ordered That the Said Arthur Bradley be fined five Shillings to to	that belonged to Walter Morris. They were also discharged from all other legacies and persons concerned in the will, especially from paying Mary Young what was left to her in it. Mr Thomas Goodwin asked that John Hewetson and Robert Hinness, soldiers, be sworn to prove that Beregreen Carlebien gave him all his effects on the island. Hewetson and Hinness were sworn. They deposed that Beregreen Carlebien declared before them, while he lay sick, that he gave all he had to Mr Goodwin after he was buried and the charges were paid. Mr John Kerr and George Young said the same. Beregreen Carlebien's nuncupative will was approved and ordered to stand good. Mr Thomas Goodwin was therefore invested with the deceased man's effects. On 26 September 1703, Thomas Coales, free planter, came to the Governor. He declared on oath that his hen roost was robbed and that some quantity of brandy and sugar was stolen. He also said he was informed that Arthur Bradley, soldier, knew who committed the crime. Coales therefore asked for a warrant to summon Bradley and the witnesses against him to appear on Thursday. They appeared as ordered. Bradley was asked whether he knew who committed the crime. He answered that he knew nothing of the matter. If he said anything like what Thomas Coales reported, he was in drink when he said it. He offered to swear to this, and his oath was taken. Arthur Bradley was ordered to pay a fine of 5s 0d to [...] Interpretations Walter Morris's choice of Richard Gurling as guardian also moved control of Walter's estate. The former executors were released from responsibility for Walter's property and related legacies. This made Gurling the new accountable custodian and cleared Addis and Trapp from further claims tied to Walter's share. Beregreen Carlebien's will was oral, so sworn testimony was needed to give it force. Four men supported the same account of his words during sickness. The council accepted that evidence and treated Goodwin as entitled to the effects after burial costs and charges were paid. The complaint about Thomas Coales's stolen goods showed the limits of suspicion. Bradley was summoned because he was said to know the thief, not because he was directly accused of the theft. Once he swore that he knew nothing and blamed any contrary words on drink, the matter turned into a lesser disciplinary offence.
53	31	Church to the [...] [...] [...] for being Drink, and Severly Cheekt for Saying that in his drink which denyed when Sober and acquitted upon his oath but to pay Charges of Councill/ Thomas Swallow Sen.r and James Rider joynt overseers of the Last Will and Testam.t of Jn.o Eeverlee dec.d & y.e S.d his wid.o presented their Petition to Governo.r and Coun.l Setting forth therein That they understanding that Mary [Sacknale] the Said Eeverlees wid.o Stood much Indebted, and fearing she might Imbarss or Sell part of the Estate belonging unto the Said Jn.o Eeverlees Children Humbly requested that the Said Childrens Estate according to Inventory and the Legacies mentioned in Said Will might be made good & paid That they might not be Called to an Account hereafter, nor See y.e Children wronged/ Whereupon (after Several debates) M.r Thomas Goodwin and M.r George Carne offered themselves to become overseers of the Last Will and Testam.t of y.e Said Dec.d Jn.o Eeverlee In y.e Stead of y.e Said Tho:	Arthur Bradley was fined 5s 0d to the church for being drunk. He was severely checked for saying something while drunk which he denied when sober. He was acquitted on his oath, but was ordered to pay the charges of council. Thomas Swallow senior and James Rider, joint overseers of the last will and testament of John Eeverlee, deceased, and Eeverlee's widow presented a petition to the Governor and Council. They stated that they understood Mary [Sacknale], Eeverlee's widow, was heavily indebted. They feared she might embarrass or sell part of the estate belonging to Eeverlee's children. They therefore asked that the children's estate, according to the inventory, and the legacies named in the will, be made good and paid. They did not want to be called to account later or to see the children wronged. After several debates, Mr Thomas Goodwin and Mr George Carne offered to become overseers of the last will and testament of John Eeverlee, deceased, in

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Swallow and James Rider, who was very desirous to be discharged, Wherefore It is ordered That y.e Said M.r Tho: Goodwin and M.r Geo: Carnes their offer be accepted, and Consequently the Said Tho: Swallow and James Rider be discharged from their overseership, In Witness whereof we y.e new overseers as afores.d have hereunto Set our hands this 5 day of Oct.br 1703 Tho: Goodwin Witnessed George Carne p me Jn.o Alexander The Govern.r Says his opinion is that the abovesaid two new overseers Signing in their book is not Sufficient Security for Said Childrens Estate, but should bin bound in an obligary bond George	place of Thomas Swallow and James Rider. Swallow and Rider were very eager to be discharged. The offer made by Thomas Goodwin and George Carne was accepted. Thomas Swallow and James Rider were therefore discharged from their overseership. The new overseers set their hands as witness on 5 October 1703. Thomas Goodwin and George Carne signed. John Alexander witnessed it. The Governor said his opinion was that the two new overseers' signing in their book was not enough security for the children's estate. They should have been bound by an obligatory bond. Interpretations Bradley's punishment separated drunken speech from proven knowledge of theft. He was acquitted of knowing who committed the robbery because he denied it on oath when sober. Yet he was still fined for drunkenness and made to pay the council's costs. The council treated drunken talk as disorder even when it did not prove the original complaint. The Everlee petition showed overseers trying to avoid later liability for children's property. Swallow and Rider feared that Mary [Sacknale]'s debts might draw the children's estate into sale or loss. Their request asked the council to secure the inventory and legacies before damage was done. The change of overseers showed that oversight of orphan or child property was a formal trust. Swallow and Rider could not simply withdraw. They were discharged only after Goodwin and Carne accepted the office. The Governor's objection showed that signature alone was considered weak protection for the children's estate. An obligatory bond would have made the new overseers legally bound for performance. This would give the children stronger security if the estate was lost or mismanaged.
54	32	George Hoskison joynt overseer w.th Ann Bowman wid.o of her deccas.d Husband Will: Bowmans Last Will and Testam.t made application to Governo.r and Coun.l That Philip Carslake Sold.r who hath Lately married the Said Ann Bowman might be Compelled to Repair the house he now possesfes which [...] has refused to do And that he may not be permitted to Cutt any growing wood that is upon y.e Land he also possesfes, w.ch [if] Suffered, would be very detri =mentale to the Heir, And Likewise Some of Said Carslakes possesfes all the Estate, he may be ordered to pay all Charges that has been occasioned in taking an Inventory and appraising y.e Estate as also all other Charges that y.e Estate has bin at Since Said marriage And further that the Said Karslake may be obliged to give Sufficient Security for y.e Said W.m Bowmans Estate which he no he posefses by marrying his wid.o as afores.d/ Upon which It is ordered That the Said Carslake keep the house he now posefses in good Repair and not to Cutt, or fell any Standing wood that is growing on Said Land unles[s] be for repairing of Said house So Long as any wood is to be gott upon y.e [...] And alsoe that he pay all Charge[s] that Shall be Lawfully demanded on y.e Said Estate, he Charging the Same accordingly to be Deducted when a dividend is made by S.d And that if the Said Hoskison Shall at any time or times hereafter, perceive the Said Carslake to Imbarss any part of the s.d Estate wilfully or unnecesarily, That then y.e Govern.r & Councill after notice given thereof will Consider of th meanes to prevent Such unlawfull doings/ [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	George Hoskison was joint overseer with Ann Bowman, widow, of the last will and testament of her deceased husband, William Bowman. Hoskison applied to the Governor and Council. He said that Philip Carslake, soldier, who lately married Ann Bowman, possessed the house but refused to repair it. Hoskison also asked that Carslake not be allowed to cut any growing wood on the land he possessed. If this was allowed, it would greatly harm the heir. Hoskison further said that Carslake possessed all the estate through his marriage to the widow. He asked that Carslake be ordered to pay all charges caused by the inventory and appraisal of the estate. He also asked that Carslake pay all other charges laid on the estate since the marriage. He asked that Carslake be required to give sufficient security for William Bowman's estate, which he now possessed through that marriage. Carslake was ordered to keep the house he possessed in good repair. He was not to cut or fell any standing wood growing on the land, unless it was needed to repair the house, so long as any wood could be got upon the [...]. Carslake was also ordered to pay all charges lawfully demanded on the estate. He was to charge those payments accordingly, so they could be deducted when a division was made. If Hoskison at any time saw Carslake wilfully or unnecessarily embarrass any part of the estate, he was to give notice to the Governor and Council. They would then consider the means to prevent such unlawful actions. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. Interpretations Carslake's marriage to Ann Bowman gave him practical control of William Bowman's estate, but it did not free him from oversight. Hoskison's role as joint

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			overseer remained active. He could bring Carslake before the council to protect the heir's interest. The order about standing wood protected a long-term asset of the estate. Wood was not treated as ordinary fuel once it grew on inherited land. It could be used for necessary house repair, but unnecessary cutting was blocked because it would reduce the value left for the heir. The order about lawful charges separated present management from final division. Carslake was made to pay estate costs while he possessed the property, but those payments could be accounted for and deducted when the estate was divided. This kept the estate maintained without deciding the final shares at once. The council did not immediately require a bond, although Hoskison asked for security. Instead, it gave Hoskison power to report waste or wilful damage. That kept Carslake under warning and left the council ready to act if the estate was harmed.
55	33	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Monday the 11.th day of Oct.br 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington dp.ty Govern.r Tho: Goodwin Insign.e Jn.o Field 4.th in Coun: Sick Whereas Cap.t William Beawes Comander of y.e Ship <i>Albermarle</i> and y.e Rest of y.e Comanders now in y.e Road of Said Island after the persusuall of their orders from both Comp.s (now happily united & directed to the Governo.r who delivered the Same to them) did apply themselves to him the Said Governo.r To y.e End that be Seeing they were ordered to Stay here Longer than they did Expect, and having but Just provision Enough on board to [...] Carry them home Desired to be furnished w.th fresh provisions durement their Stay, To which the Govern.r Answered them, That we were Short of Cattle now, But however he would advise w.th his Companions in Council, and Consider what method Should be used for the Supplying them, w.ch being done and upon peruseing the Last Acco.t of y.e R.t Hono. Comp.s Cattle, taken the 16.th of Sept.br Last, found they amounted in all but to 360 head and most of them breeders, yearlings, and Calves and besides Sam.l DesFountaine who hath y.e Inspection over y.e abovesaid Said that about 40 head at most could be taken out of y.e abovesaid Number that was fitt to be killed/ It is therefore ordered That a List of those persons who are Indebted unto y.e Hono.ble R.t Hono. Comp.s Shall be taken out of their Store Books and Henry Coales Marshall Shall be Sent to demand Cattle for y.e payment thereof and to take a Certificate from under their hands whether they Can Pay or no, As also in persuance of an Advertizem.t Issued out y.e 14.th of July Last, To repair unto those persons that have Cattle and offer the value of them in mony, and Likewise to take under their hands, whether they Can Spare any, or not, and how many head[s] thats	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Monday, 11 October 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor, Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, and John Field, fourth in council, were present. John Field was sick. Captain William Beawes, commander of the ship <i>Albermarle</i>, and the other commanders then in the road, read their orders from both Companies, which were now happily united. The orders were directed to the Governor, who delivered them to the commanders. The commanders then applied to the Governor. They said they were ordered to stay at St Helena longer than they expected. They also had only enough provisions on board to [...] carry them home. They therefore asked to be supplied with fresh provisions during their stay. The Governor answered that cattle were now short. Even so, he would consult his companions in council and consider how the commanders could be supplied. After this was done, the last account of the Right Honourable Company's cattle was read. It was taken on 16 September 1703. The cattle amounted in all to only 360 head. Most were breeders, yearlings and calves. Samuel DesFountaine, who had inspection over the cattle, also said that at most about 40 head could be taken from that number as fit to be killed. A list was therefore ordered to be taken from the Company's store books of all persons indebted to the Honourable Right Honourable Company. Henry Coales, marshal, was to be sent to demand cattle in payment of those debts. He was to take a certificate under each person's hand, stating whether they could pay or not. He was also to act under an advertisement issued on 14 July last. He was to go to those persons who had cattle, offer them the value in money and take under their hands whether they could spare any cattle or not, and how many head [...] Interpretations The commanders' request showed the pressure caused by the united Company's fleet staying longer than expected. Ships in the road needed fresh provisions, but the island's cattle stock was limited. The council therefore treated provisioning as a balance between maritime supply and the survival of the island's herd. The cattle account gave the council a basis for refusing a simple slaughter order. Although 360 head were recorded, most were breeders, yearlings and calves. Only about 40 were said to be fit for killing. The usable supply was therefore much smaller than the total number suggested. The order to demand cattle from Company debtors turned private debt into a provisioning mechanism.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Those who owed money in the store books could be pressed to pay in cattle. The council used the Company's credit system to meet the fleet's need for meat. The certificates required from cattle owners created a written record of compliance or inability. The marshal was not only sent to collect cattle. He was sent to document who could pay, who could spare stock and how many head each person could provide. This made later enforcement easier.
56	34	that we may Send y.e Same to y.e Said R.t Hono. Comp.s the to y.e End they may know the true State of Cattle on this Island/ Samuell Desfountaine who came to the Said Island along with the present Govern.r hath Served our Hono.ble masters Ever Since with fidelity, as much as Can appear to us, desired that his attendance at our Said masters plantation, and in look =ing after their Cattle, might be for y.e future but three days in a week, being Contented w.th twenty pounds p ann.m for So doing It is ordered That the Said Desfountaine Shall have for y.e future but twenty pounds p ann.m for three days attendance at a Covered, Charging him w.thall to take great Care of all things Comitted to his Charge and to have a Strict Eye over W.m Russ Sold.r Said to direct him in managing y.e Said Plantation affairs [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin The Worship.fl Stephen Poirier Esq.r Governo.rs his Declarati =on, against M.r Cor: Sodington dp.ty Govern.r Wednesday the 27.th day of October 1703 Whereas M.r Corn: Sodington dp.ty Governo.r Since he came on Shoar which was on the 14.th day August Last, hath demeaned himself So much against the Rules of both pollatick & Millitary Govern.mt disobeying the Govern.rs Sealing in peices Sometime [that] Even an order given him to write prosperous bay Sealed by our Hono.ble Masters Seale, which by the mediation off Common friends, the Said Govern.r had put by, he haveing askt his Pardon for Said disobedience, and on Condition he would never relaps againe But Contrary to his Solemn promise, no further than on Sunday Last when the Ships now in the road did Arrive, he being at Ruperts ffort	This was to be sent to the Right Honourable Company, so that they could know the true state of cattle on the island. Samuel DesFountaine came to the island with the present Governor. As far as could be seen, he served the Honourable masters faithfully ever since. He asked that his attendance at the Company's plantation and his care of their cattle be reduced to three days a week. He was content to receive £20 0s 0d a year for this work. DesFountaine was ordered to receive £20 0s 0d a year in future for three days' attendance at a Covered. He was charged to take great care of everything committed to him. He was also to keep a strict eye over William Russ, soldier, and direct him in managing the plantation affairs. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. On Wednesday, 27 October 1703, Stephen Poirier, Governor, made a declaration against Mr Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor. Since Sodington came on shore on 14 August 1703, he was said to have behaved against the rules of both civil and military government. He disobeyed the Governor's sealing in pieces. The manuscript was unclear at this point. He also disobeyed an order given to him to write to Prosperous Bay under the Honourable masters' seal. The Governor had set this aside through the mediation of common friends, after Sodington asked his pardon for the disobedience. This was done on condition that Sodington would not relapse again. Contrary to that solemn promise, on the previous Sunday, when the ships then in the road arrived, Sodington was at Rupert's Fort. Interpretations The cattle certificates were meant to give the Company a reliable account of the island's stock. The council did not only seek cattle for the fleet. It also prepared written evidence about what the island could and could not supply. DesFountaine's reduced attendance showed that Company plantation work and cattle oversight were treated as a paid office. His pay was lowered to match three days' service each week, but his duties remained supervisory. He was still answerable for the Company's property and for directing William Russ in the plantation work. The Governor's declaration against Sodington showed a breakdown in command between the two highest officers on the island. The complaint was framed as both civil and military disobedience. That mattered because Sodington's office required obedience in council business and in defence matters. Speculations The earlier pardon of Sodington was probably meant to restore working order without a formal rupture in the island's command. The Governor said the matter was put aside through friends after Sodington asked pardon and promised not to relapse. That detail showed an attempt to manage conflict privately before it became an official charge.
57	35	ffort did unmercifully Strike and beat Stephen Hill Gun.r Cheife mate uttering publickly Severall Seditious and Contemptious Words Particularly against the Said	At Rupert's Fort, Sodington was said to have struck and beaten Stephen Hill, gunner and chief mate, without mercy. He also spoke several public words that

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Governo.r Saying that if those Ships the Alarm was made for were ffrench Ships and Power enough them he would have y.e Said Governo.r Cuit in peices, understanding nothing in the Govern.mt and Even at Eight again Coming on Shoar from on Board the Ships now in the Road Came drunk, into my Private Chamber, putting many impertenant questions to me, Cheifey why did not order a Guard to waite on him a Shoar being a Gentleman, when I myself rather then to weaken our guard, Goont up none or very Seldom but considering the Condition he was in Desired him to return to his appartm.t and I would Satterfie him this morning but continueing his Said impertenant Languages the Govern.r commande ed him to repaire to his Said Appartm.t againe who S.d he willively he would not go, whereupon the Govern.r gott up from his Table and took hold of him by one hand to Lead him out of his bed Chamber but he Imediaty Laid hands on the Said Govern.r which provoaked him to take fast hold of his the Said M.r Sodington body, and thrust him out of S.d Chamber and delivered him into y.e Serj. of y.e Guard Custody with order to Secure him in his Said Appartment But [...] himself from them, and went up into the valley where the Guard was Sent to fetch him downe but Could not find him/ Whereupon the Governo.r ordered M.r George Hoskison and John Long free planters (who were present) to give their affidavit on oath, which they did as followeth/ George Hoskison being Sworn Saith that he Came from on board of Ship Last night and went to pay his respects to the Governo.r who askt him to Stay and Sup w.th him, and being at Supper, Cap.t Sodington came into the Governo.r Chamber and told him he Came on Shoar, and was not rec.d as a Gentleman, being no Serj. nor Guard to waite upon him well Says the Governo.r Come Sett downe S.r and persuade Said S.d hang them all tomorrow, But y.e Said Cap.t Sodington Persisting in very Scurrilous Languages to the Governour he desired him to be gone unto his appartm.t but he refusing to go at y.e Govern.rs Command the Governo.r gott up from Supper, whereupon Cap.t Sodington took hold of y.e Governo.r and after Some Scuffling the Said Cap.t Sodington went away But Soon after Came againe and Said that he who had the Command of the Guard was a Roman Catholick, and he would go y.e bring another Serj. to Comand the Guard, the Govern.r made answer [...] Margin Notes: The God[w] Says the [lieuten.t] Cap.t Boding ton w.s in Spoke and his ans.r was Either go in or att.nd the [Exports] of [...]	were seditious and contemptuous, especially against the Governor. He said that, if the ships for which the alarm was made were French ships and strong enough, then he would have the Governor cut in pieces, since the Governor understood nothing about government. At about eight o'clock, Sodington came ashore again from the ships then in the road. He came drunk into the Governor's private chamber and asked many impertinent questions. He asked chiefly why a guard was not ordered to wait on him ashore, since he was a gentleman. The Governor said that he himself often went up without a guard, or very seldom used one, rather than weaken the guard. Because of Sodington's condition, the Governor asked him to return to his apartment. The Governor said he would satisfy him in the morning. Sodington continued his impertinent language. The Governor then commanded him to return to his apartment. Sodington said wilfully that he would not go. The Governor rose from his table and took Sodington by one hand to lead him out of the bedchamber. Sodington immediately laid hands on the Governor. This provoked the Governor to take fast hold of Sodington's body and thrust him out of the chamber. Sodington was delivered into the custody of the sergeant of the guard, with orders that he be secured in his apartment. Sodington freed himself from them and went up into the valley. The guard was sent to fetch him down, but could not find him. The Governor then ordered George Hoskison and John Long, free planters, who were present, to give affidavits on oath. They did so. George Hoskison was sworn. He said he came from on board a ship the previous night and went to pay his respects to the Governor. The Governor asked him to stay and sup with him. While they were at supper, Captain Sodington came into the Governor's chamber and told him that he had come ashore and was not received as a gentleman, since no sergeant or guard waited on him. The Governor said, "Come, sit down, sir," and tried to persuade him. Sodington said, "Hang them all tomorrow." Sodington continued to use very scurrilous language to the Governor. The Governor asked him to go to his apartment. Sodington refused to go at the Governor's command. The Governor rose from supper. Sodington then took hold of the Governor. After some scuffling, Sodington went away. Soon afterwards, Sodington came again. He said that the man who commanded the guard was a Roman Catholic, and that he would go and bring another sergeant to command the guard. The Governor answered [...]. The marginal note was unclear. It appeared to say that the lieutenant told Captain Sodington either to go in or attend the [exports] of [...]. Interpretations The accusation against Sodington was framed as both personal violence and political disobedience. Beating Stephen Hill was one offence. Saying that the Governor should be cut in pieces if French ships arrived was more serious. It linked a foreign threat to violent contempt for the island's lawful command. Sodington's demand for a guard showed a dispute over rank and military resources. He claimed treatment due to a gentleman. The Governor answered from the needs of defence, saying he did not draw off guards for himself because it weakened the watch. The quarrel therefore turned personal honour against military necessity. The seizure of Sodington by the sergeant of the guard showed the Governor using military custody against his own deputy. This was an extreme step. It

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			showed that Sodington's refusal to obey in the Governor's chamber was treated as a breakdown of command, not merely drunken rudeness. The charge about the guard commander being a Roman Catholic carried political weight. In a wartime setting, religion was used to question loyalty and fitness for command. Sodington's words challenged not only the man in charge of the guard but also the Governor's authority to appoint or rely on him. Speculations Sodington's complaint about not being met by a guard was probably a claim to status after he came ashore from the ships. The detail that he asked why no guard waited on him "being a gentleman" showed that he wanted a public sign of rank. The Governor refused that logic because the island was under alarm and the guard could not be weakened. The Governor's decision to gather sworn affidavits from Hoskison and John Long was probably meant to turn a private chamber quarrel into a defensible official record. Sodington was Deputy Governor. The Governor therefore needed witnesses before proceeding against him for disobedience and physical resistance.
58	36	I [Goe] [Say] to night myself and to what Questions he had askt him he would answer him next morning, and doth really think the Said Cap.t Sodington was in drink at the Same time/ Further this deponent Saith that after y.e aforesaid Buisness was over he went to W.m John Goodwins house, where Cap.t Sodington Came and askt if he Could be S.fe there yes replyd M.r Goodwin, take or any body Come to the door I will know who they be before they Shall Come in, and being discourseing about the aforesaid Matter the Said Cap.t Sodington askd this depo.t who Struck first the Govern.r or he, the Said Depo.t made answer Indeed S.r I cant tell but you was very much in y.e wrong in what you did To which Cap.t Sodington Replyd if you affront me, I'll break your head no S.r replyd S.d depo. I dont designe to affront you, yes Said he, I take this as affront, And if you Come out of doors I'll break your head, and Accordingly when going away Struck him to his Cane Sevrall Blows, w.ch made this depon.t Strike him againe, and in Exchanging Said Blows Cap.t Sodington made above a dozen passes at Said depo.t to his Sword as M.r Goodwin told him this morning/ Geo: Hoskison Jn.o Long being Sworne Saith that he coming on Shoar from on board the [Friderick Cosi] night went to the Govern.r to ask him a question about a house he Bought of the Comp.s Who being Answered was going away, the Governo.r Liked him to Stay and Supp with him and being at Supper in the Governo.rs Chamber Cap.t Sodington Came in there from on Board of Ship and Said he was not rec.d on Shoar like a Goneth.n being neither Serj. nor Guard to Waite upon him, well Says the Governo.r If you are affronted I will Rectify all things tomorrow morning and Come and Sett downe and do as we do So replyd Cap.t Sodington I wont be Serv.d So, the Governo.r made Answer if you dont Desire you to be to go to your Appartm.t but he would not and Swore he would go and fetch a [...] Serj. and he giving y.e Govern.r very ill Languages the Govern.r gott up from Supper and besired him to be gone againe but he would not, and took hold of y.e Govern.r and Scuffled together, and upon his oath dos think y.e Said Captain Sodington was very much in drink Jn.o Long Joseph	George Hoskison said that the Governor answered, "[...] tonight myself," and that he would answer the questions Sodington asked him the next morning. Hoskison truly believed that Captain Sodington was drunk at the time. Hoskison further said that after the earlier business ended, he went to William John Goodwin's house. Captain Sodington came there and asked whether he could be safe there. Mr Goodwin replied that he could, and said that if anyone came to the door, he would know who they were before they came in. While they talked about the earlier matter, Captain Sodington asked Hoskison who struck first, the Governor or Sodington. Hoskison answered, "Indeed, sir, I cannot tell, but you was very much in the wrong in what you did." Sodington replied, "If you affront me, I'll break your head." Hoskison answered, "No, sir, I do not mean to affront you." Sodington said, "Yes, I take this as an affront, and if you come out of doors I'll break your head." When Hoskison went away, Sodington struck him several blows with his cane. Hoskison struck him back. During the exchange of blows, Sodington made more than a dozen passes at Hoskison with his sword, as Mr Goodwin told Hoskison this morning. George Hoskison signed. John Long was sworn. He said he came on shore that night from the <i>[Friderick Cosi]</i> and went to the Governor to ask him a question about a house he bought from the Company. After he was answered, he was going away. The Governor asked him to stay and sup with him. While they were at supper in the Governor's chamber, Captain Sodington came in from on board ship. He said he was not received on shore like a gentleman, since neither sergeant nor guard waited on him. The Governor said that, if Sodington was affronted, he would put all things right the next morning. He asked Sodington to sit down and do as they did. Captain Sodington replied that he would not be served so. The Governor answered that, if Sodington would not stay quietly, he wanted him to go to his apartment. Sodington would not go. He swore he would go and fetch a [...] sergeant. He gave the Governor very bad language. The Governor rose from supper and again asked Sodington to leave. Sodington refused and took hold of

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			the Governor. They scuffled together. Long swore that he believed Captain Sodington was very drunk. John Long signed. Joseph [...]
59	37	Corp.ll Joseph Trapp [...] being Sworne Saith that Last night Cap.t Sodington Came from on board of Ship w.th Severall Gent.n and being in y.e ffort askt for the officer of the Guard who being at Supper Some of y.e Guard Came to call him whereupon went to S.d Cap.t Sodington who askt him what was the reason he had not a Guard to Waite upon him this depon.t made answer there is but very few men upon the Guard and besides it is not Customary Whereupon Cap.t Sodington Struck him Severall blows w.th his Cane and askt him why the Gates was not Lockt at the Lower bridge who made answer the Govern.rs order is, they Should not be Lockt in Shipping time till drum Beat And he y.e Said Cap.t Sodington going out of the fort at y.e Sally Port gate, Came back againe and Struck this depon.t S.d [Bodingt]on made Insolences was forced to Run out of y.e ffort, and he y.e Said Sodington after him And when the Govern.r Sent him to fetch the Said Cap.t Sodington into y.e ffort, he drew his Sword and pased at him Severall times but only made a hole through his Coat on the right Brest, the Sword Glanceing towards his Cardesill or else might have Run him thro' the body which he would Endeavour ed to do againe had not y.e Gunner prevented him/ Joseph Trapp Jn.o French Gunner Sworne Saith that when the Governour ordered Corp.l Trapp to fetch Cap.t Sodington into the ffort, he Saw y.e Said Cap.t Run after him without his Halbert, Whereupon this Deponent followed him and Saw y.e Said Cap.t Sodington Just without y.e abov.s ffort gate w.th his Sword Drawne in his hand before y.e Centry at y.e Sally Port upon which y.e Said depo.t drew his Sword and pute up y.e passes he made at Cap.t Trapp or Else doth realy think the Said Cap.t Sodington would have Run him through y.e body, but no Hurt was done, only making a hole through y.e Said Cap.s Coat on his Breast. Jn.o French Humphrey Edwards Sold.r made Compl.t That Thomas Gargen free Plant.r drew his Sword from his S.de as he was going by him and Struck him Severall Blows w.th it, and broke Said Sword whose fore desired the S.d Gargen & his Evidences might be Sumoned against next Coun.l day/ It is ordered That y.e Said Gargen and Evidences against him be Sumoned to Appear before Govern.r & Coun.l on Tuesday next to Answer y.e Said Humphry Edwards Compl.t/ [Poirier]	Corporal Joseph Trapp [...] was sworn. He said that Captain Sodington came from on board ship the previous night with several gentlemen. When he was in the fort, he asked for the officer of the guard. The officer was at supper, so some of the guard came to call Trapp. Trapp went to Captain Sodington. Sodington asked why he did not have a guard to wait on him. Trapp answered that there were very few men on the guard, and that it was not customary. Sodington then struck him several blows with his cane. Sodington asked why the gates at the lower bridge were not locked. Trapp answered that the Governor's order was that they should not be locked in shipping time until the drum beat. Sodington went out of the fort at the sally port gate, then came back again and struck Trapp. Because of Sodington's insolence, Trapp was forced to run out of the fort. Sodington followed him. When the Governor sent Trapp to fetch Sodington into the fort, Sodington drew his sword and made several passes at him. The sword made only a hole through Trapp's coat on the right breast. It glanced towards his cartridge belt, or it might have run him through the body. Sodington would have tried again if the gunner had not stopped him. Joseph Trapp signed. John French, gunner, was sworn. He said that when the Governor ordered Corporal Trapp to fetch Captain Sodington into the fort, he saw Trapp run after him without his halberd. French followed him. Just outside the fort gate, before the sentry at the sally port, he saw Captain Sodington with his sword drawn in his hand. French drew his own sword and put up the passes Sodington made at Captain Trapp. Otherwise, he truly believed Sodington would have run Trapp through the body. No hurt was done, except that a hole was made through Trapp's coat on his breast. John French signed. Humphrey Edwards, soldier, complained that Thomas Gargen, free planter, drew Edwards's sword from his side as Edwards passed him. Gargen struck him several blows with it and broke the sword. Edwards therefore asked that Gargen and the witnesses against him be summoned for the next council day. Thomas Gargen and the witnesses against him were ordered to appear before the Governor and Council on Tuesday next, to answer Humphrey Edwards's complaint. Stephen Poirier signed. Interpretations Trapp's evidence added a direct military issue to the complaint against Sodington. The lower bridge gates were governed by the Governor's order and were to stay open in shipping time until the drum beat. Sodington challenged that order and attacked the corporal who explained it. This made the incident a dispute over command procedure, not only personal rage. The attack at the sally port was especially serious because it happened at a guarded entry point of the fort. Sodington drew a sword near the sentry and made passes at a corporal acting under the Governor's command. The gunner's intervention prevented the matter from becoming a killing. French's evidence strengthened Trapp's account because he described the same danger from a second position. He saw Sodington with a drawn sword and physically turned aside the passes. His testimony made the threat to Trapp more than Trapp's own fear.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The complaint by Humphrey Edwards showed how weapons carried by soldiers could be turned into tools of disorder by civilians. Gargen was accused not only of assaulting Edwards but of taking the soldier's own sword, striking him with it and breaking it. This made the offence an attack on a person and on military equipment. Speculations Sodington's repeated question about why no guard waited on him probably showed that the same grievance drove several parts of the night's disorder. In this passage, he put the question to Trapp before striking him. The detail tied the assault on the corporal to Sodington's demand for public recognition of rank. French's intervention probably prevented Trapp from being seriously wounded because Trapp was pursuing Sodington without his halberd. The text stated that French saw Trapp without it, followed him and then used his own sword to put up Sodington's passes. That sequence showed a quick response to a specific imbalance of arms.
60	38	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday The 2 day of Novemb.r 1703 Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington dp.ty Gov.r Tho: Goodwin Ensigne Whereas upon the difference aforesaid twixt the Governo.r and dep.ty Governo.r The Said Governo.r would not p.mitt the Said dp.ty Gov.r to Eate at his Table who desired to know the Reason why and to have the perusuall of Instruction and Grand Coun.l Books as also a Copy of the Governo.rs Declaration, and aforesaid Dypositi =tions, And presented a Declaration against the Governo.r as followeth/ The Complaint of Cor: Sodington dep.ty Govern.r y.e S.t Helena against Steph.n Poirier Esq.r Governo.r Novemb.r y.e 1.st 1703. He haveing Declared to Doct.r Kerr he would write against me to my Masters Contrary to his word, or else would have Scorned to Com= =plain of my officer the Govern.r Sheweth That the Governo.r comeing downe on y.e 29 of Sept.br Last past (as he intended by telling M.r [Leach] y.e overnight that he thought to be down before Church time and y.e he would order y.e Publication of his banns, which Information had of Doct.r Kerr) Comanded y.e prison to be Broak open, and Set my prisoner Philip Karslake at Liberty, And Like= =wise Serj. Dixon though Lawfully and Legally Comitted, w.thout Sending to me for y.e Key, or asking me any Question, or being mo kn[ow] he was in the fort, being in my Chamber not twenty yards from the prison Which way of proceeding is positively against the Laws of England and all Nations, And the breach of y.e 55 Article of Warr. Likewise I complain that Madm Coe Poirier being Encouraged by the Said Governo.r (as by his own mouth he told me) did	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 2 November 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, were present. Because of the earlier difference between the Governor and the Deputy Governor, the Governor would not allow the Deputy Governor to eat at his table. Sodington asked to know the reason. He also asked to read the instructions and the Grand Council books. He asked for a copy of the Governor's declaration and of the depositions already taken. Sodington then presented a declaration against the Governor. The complaint was made by Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor of St Helena, against Stephen Poirier, Governor. It was dated 1 November 1703. Sodington stated that the Governor declared to Doctor Kerr that he would write against Sodington to their masters, contrary to his word. Sodington said that otherwise he would have scorned to complain against his officer, the Governor. Sodington complained that the Governor came down on 29 September 1703. Sodington said this was planned, because the Governor told Mr [Leach] the night before that he thought he would be down before church time and would order the publication of Leach's banns. Sodington said he received this information from Doctor Kerr. Sodington said the Governor ordered the prison to be broken open and set Sodington's prisoner, Philip Karslake, at liberty. He also said Sergeant Dixon was set free, though both men were lawfully committed. This was done without sending to Sodington for the key, asking him any question or notifying him, although he was in the fort and in his chamber less than twenty yards from the prison. Sodington said this way of proceeding was directly against the laws of England and all nations, and against the fifty-fifth Article of War. He also complained that Madame Coe Poirier was encouraged by the Governor, as the Governor himself told Sodington, and did [...] Interpretations Sodington's request to read the instructions, Grand Council books and depositions showed that the dispute moved into a formal paper contest. He wanted access to the rules and records that could support a defence against the Governor's declaration. The refusal to let Sodington eat at the Governor's table mattered because the Governor's table was a sign of official fellowship as well as domestic hospitality.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Exclusion marked a break in trust between the island's two senior officers. Sodington's complaint about the prison focused on jurisdiction. He claimed the prisoners were his, lawfully committed, and released without use of his key or consultation. The point was not only that the men were freed, but that the Governor bypassed the Deputy Governor's custody while standing only a short distance from him. The reference to the fifty-fifth Article of War turned the complaint into a military-law charge. Sodington framed the Governor's action as a breach of recognised military order, not merely as discourtesy or rivalry.
61	39	did Send out of the Garrison at unseasonable hours of the night with Intelligence to the Said Governo.r of the Transactions of the ffort by private ways unknowne to me, being then Comandant, And ovring the Keys of the fort in my Custody/ be to The Consequence whereof may teach y.e Blacks, when they Rebell againe to Surprize the fort and make themselves masters of y.e Island, our Guard being never above twenty men at once in y.e Said fort But this is not the first time that Mad.m Poirier hath troubled herself w.th Govern.mt for on y.e 3.d of Sept.r Last She Comanded the bell to be Rung for prayers, without my Knowledge being Comandant/ I also Complain of Nurse Easthope for waiting Mad.m Poirier and Encour =ageing her to Send out of the fort, which woman as I am Credibly Informed Continually raises Sedition, between the Governo.r my Self and others, he the Said Governo.r told me in his Parlor Sure I found fault, You go the next So Long and Said Indeed not do it, the Serj. would, w.ch made me forbear, the none is Capable of doing it, but Sanderson, the Govern.r being the Encourager of these Irregularities/ Who by his Arbitrary Power denyed me Provisions on the 24 & 28 of October Last by his order to M.rs [Burson]s, even to a bottle of Water, And on y.e 25.th of y.e aforesaid Oct.bre when he Sent of the Island on board Cap.t Beawes Gilbert a Warrant to Serj. Gurling, to keep me out of the fort, which he did, although I was then (he being absent) Governour of y.e Island/ Which arbitrary and Illegall Actions tends only to y.e Subversion of Govern.ment And Denying my Honourable Masters Power, which they have been pleased to give me/ And for which I require the Said Stephen Poirier Esq.r and Governo.r to Answer to the Said Hono. ble united East Indea Company from the Council of S.t Helena/ The Declaration of J.n.o Alexander Clerk of y.e Council, as followeth/ That yesterday [...] about four of y.e Clock in y.e Evening M.r Sodington dp.ty Governo.r Came into my office and Seeing the Coun.l Councell Book Lying on my writing book Tooke it in his hands, and Looking therein, Said here's the Governo.rs Declaration against me But Pole Tare it out Least the Governo.r Should Send a Copy of it home against me, No S.r, replied I, pray dont Tare it out because there is other buisiness of Consequence Concerning y.e Publiqs affairs on Some	Madame Coe Poirier was said to have sent intelligence to the Governor at unseasonable hours of the night. This concerned the transactions of the fort. The information was sent by private ways unknown to Sodington, who was then commandant and held the keys of the fort. Sodington said the consequence could teach the Blacks, when they rebelled again, to surprise the fort and make themselves masters of the island. The guard in the fort was never more than twenty men at one time. Sodington said this was not the first time Madame Poirier troubled herself with government. On 3 September 1703, she ordered the bell to be rung for prayers without his knowledge while he was commandant. Sodington also complained of Nurse Easthope. He said she waited on Madame Poirier and encouraged her to send out of the fort. He said he was credibly informed that this woman continually raised sedition between the Governor, himself and others. The manuscript became unclear at the next point. Sodington appeared to report words spoken by the Governor in his parlour. The visible wording suggested that the Governor said Sodington found fault, and that someone else, perhaps the sergeant, would do it. The sense could not be fully recovered. Sodington then said that no one was capable of doing it except Sanderson, and that the Governor encouraged these irregularities. Sodington further complained that the Governor used arbitrary power to deny him provisions on 24 and 28 October 1703. The Governor's order to Mrs [Burson]s denied him even a bottle of water. On 25 October 1703, while the Governor sent off the island on board Captain Beawes Gilbert, he sent a warrant to Sergeant Gurling to keep Sodington out of the fort. Sergeant Gurling did so, although Sodington said he was then Governor of the island because Poirier was absent. Sodington said these arbitrary and unlawful actions tended only to overthrow government and deny the power which his Honourable masters gave him. He required Stephen Poirier, Governor, to answer these matters to the Honourable United East India Company from the Council of St Helena. John Alexander, clerk of the council, then made a declaration. Alexander said that yesterday [...] at about four o'clock in the evening, Mr Sodington, Deputy Governor, came into his office. Sodington saw the council book lying on Alexander's writing book. He took it in his hands and looked in it. Sodington said, "Here's the Governor's declaration against me." He said he would tear it out, lest the Governor send a copy of it home against him. Alexander replied, "No, sir, pray don't tear it out," because other business of consequence concerning the public affairs was written on some [...] Interpretations

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Sodington's complaint about Madame Poirier treated private movement in and out of the fort as a security threat. The key issue was not only that she passed information to the Governor. It was that this was said to occur by private ways while Sodington held command and the keys. He framed household influence as a breach in military control. The reference to the Blacks rebelling again gave the complaint a sharper purpose. Sodington argued that secret movement through the fort could reveal weaknesses to slaves or Black inhabitants and help them seize it in a future rebellion. This turned a dispute over messages and authority into an argument about island security and racial control. The complaint about being denied provisions and kept out of the fort was a claim about the practical powers of command. Sodington said that when the Governor was absent, he held authority on the island. Being denied food, water and access to the fort was therefore presented as a denial of the office given to him by the Company. John Alexander's declaration showed a new danger to the official record. Sodington's threatened removal of the Governor's declaration from the council book would have damaged the public archive and removed evidence that could be sent home. The clerk's resistance protected both the record and the Company's ability to judge the dispute. Speculations Sodington's emphasis on the keys and the small guard was probably meant to show that his authority over the fort was practical, not ceremonial. If messages passed by routes unknown to him, then his control of gates, keys and watch was weakened. This gave his complaint a concrete security basis. The attempted tearing out of the council-book entry was probably a direct response to fear that the Governor would send a copy to the Company. Sodington's own words gave that reason. The act would have removed damaging evidence before it left the island.
62	40	Some part of the Leaves, yes answer he, I will, for perhaps upon this Last difference between us he may (meaning the Govern.r) do me agreat distrindge, and So tore out Severall Leaves Against my perswasion or Consent, which he Should not have done, had he not been my Superior, as Second of Said Island Witness my hand this 3 day of Novemb.r 1703 Jn.o Alexander Whereas M.r Alexander Clerk of y.e Coun.l and trustee of both y.e R.t Hon.able Comp.s and Publick affairs Said proves his Declaration to y.e Governo.r Sheweing that M.r Sodington dep.ty Govern.r of the Said Island, took into his office when the Govern.r was out of y.e fort, on Tuesday Last, and Acted as in his the Said Alexanders Declaration/ Whereupon the Governo.r Considering that his the Said M.r Sodingtons Action is a Strong violation, against y.e Publick trust, may Such a one, that there's no the president knowne before therefore It is order.d That the Said M.r Alexander do call the S.d M.r Sodington to answer for So doing/ Accordingly the Said M.r Sodington Came & writt with his owne hand as followeth I declare I asked M.r Alexander for y.e foule book who Shewed it me, and turned to the place where the Govern.rs Declaration was, then I Said M.r Alexander you know all the papers between y.e Govern.r and my self ought by Contract to be burnt he Consented to that, therefore let us tare them out for that purpose, and giving me the boak did it on y.e backside of one of the Leaves, there being but Six Lines Concerning the broceing of which when I came to that he desired to take a memorandum of it which he did,	Sodington said, "Yes, I will," because perhaps, after this last difference between them, the Governor might do him a great disadvantage. He then tore out several leaves against Alexander's persuasion and without his consent. Alexander said Sodington would not have done this if he had not been Alexander's superior as second officer of the island. John Alexander signed his declaration on 3 November 1703. Alexander, clerk of the council and trustee of both the Right Honourable Company's and the public affairs, proved his declaration to the Governor. He showed that Mr Sodington, Deputy Governor of the island, came into his office while the Governor was out of the fort on the previous Tuesday, and acted as Alexander described. The Governor considered Sodington's action a strong violation of the public trust. He said there was no known precedent for such an act. Alexander was ordered to call Sodington to answer for it. Sodington came and wrote his answer in his own hand. He declared that he asked Alexander for the foul book. Alexander showed it to him and turned to the place where the Governor's declaration was written. Sodington then said, "Mr Alexander, you know all the papers between the Governor and myself ought by contract to be burnt." He said Alexander agreed to this. Sodington therefore suggested that they tear them out for that purpose. Sodington said Alexander gave him the book, and that Sodington tore out the papers. On the back of one of the leaves there were only six lines concerning the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		and gave me the book againe And then I tore it out of which, I offer my oath, and Declare against Alexander's Declara tion, as Witness my hand Cor: Sodington. M.r Alexander further declares that what the Said M.r Sodington hath writt himself is only to vindicate what he did, and as for his Say= =ing I gave my Consent to have the Said Leaves tore out, I Declare it false, and took my pen in my hand and desired him not to tare out any leaves for I would Blott out y.e Declaration and make it Legible, No replyd he, your ink is not Black Enough, I will tare them out, which when he had done, I took a memorand in of Some other	broaching of [...]. When Sodington came to that place, Alexander asked to take a memorandum of it. He did so and gave the book back. Sodington then tore it out. Sodington offered to swear to this and declared against Alexander's declaration. Cornelius Sodington signed. Alexander further declared that what Sodington wrote was only an attempt to justify what he did. Alexander said Sodington's claim that he consented to the leaves being torn out was false. Alexander said he took his pen in his hand and asked Sodington not to tear out any leaves. He offered instead to blot out the declaration and make it legible. Sodington replied, "No, your ink is not black enough. I will tear them out." After Sodington tore them out, Alexander took a memorandum of some other [...] Interpretations The dispute over the "foul book" concerned more than a draft copy. It was still a council record held by the clerk, and it contained public business on the same leaves as the Governor's declaration. Tearing out the leaves therefore damaged records beyond the personal quarrel. Sodington's defence relied on an alleged agreement that papers between him and the Governor were to be burnt. Alexander denied consent and framed the act as forced by Sodington's superior rank. The issue became whether the Deputy Governor acted under a mutual private agreement or abused public office to remove a record. The Governor's description of the act as a violation of public trust showed the institutional stakes. Council records were Company and public papers, not the property of either officer. Altering them without authority threatened the written basis on which St Helena's government reported and justified its actions. Speculations Sodington's statement that the Governor might do him "a great disadvantage" probably explained why he removed the leaves. He feared the declaration would be copied and sent home to the Company after their quarrel. Tearing it out gave him a direct way to stop or weaken that report. Alexander's offer to blot out the declaration rather than remove leaves was probably an attempt to preserve the rest of the public record while easing Sodington's concern. Sodington rejected it because the ink was "not black enough", which suggested he wanted the writing destroyed beyond recovery rather than merely obscured.
63	41	other businefs that was on tother Side of Some of y.e Leaves And never knew that Councill books ought to be Burnt But only what Loose Capers were writt twixt the Governo.r and him And do Aver what I have declared to be true on my oath/ Jn.o Alexander Whereupon the Governo.r Considering the Said M.rs Sodingtons Illegall Proceedings Declares as much as Lies in his Power, That the Said M.r Sodington is not Capable of haveing Such Trust Comitted to his Charge, as publick Records, and Declares Accordingly is don't do it till the R.t Hon.o ble Comp.s pleasure be further knowne therein, But on to Exercise Sold dery make fortifications, which might be Contradicted by Coursins willfull in this last [Poirier] November the 5.th 1703 Whereas the Governo.r Being Intrusted with Susanna Johnson daughter of John, and Susan Eliz: both his wife and hearing that Severall goods & Sent from Indies by his hand (so as to the Said Eliz Johnson (Whose Sister he married) But She being gone of this Island John Hemonss who her Brother Hatton Stoeling received Said goods, upon which the Govern.r Sent for y.e Said Hemonss, and Sterling, and telling them that Since y.e Said Susanna was Comitted in his Charge he ought to have what goods was Sent to y.e Eliz: Johnson for her	Alexander said the other business was written on the other side of some of the leaves. He said he never knew that council books were to be burnt. He understood only that loose papers written between the Governor and Sodington were to be burnt. He swore that what he declared was true. John Alexander signed. The Governor considered Sodington's unlawful proceeding. As far as lay in his power, he declared that Sodington was not fit to have public records trusted to his charge. He declared that Sodington was not to have that trust until the Right Honourable Company's pleasure was further known. The manuscript was unclear at this point. It seemed to preserve Sodington's military role in making soldiers [...] fortifications, though the sense could not be fully recovered. Stephen Poirier signed. On 5 November 1703, the Governor was entrusted with Susanna Johnson, daughter of John Johnson and Susan Elizabeth, his wife. He heard that several goods were sent from the Indies by his hand [...] to Elizabeth Johnson, whose sister he married. Elizabeth Johnson was gone from the island. John Hemonss, who [...] her brother Hatton Stoeling, received the goods.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Reads year use, which y.e S.d Hemonss and Sterling promised to deliver him, but being not nigh a weeks time after the Governo.r Sent for y.e Said Hemonss who had all Said goods in his Custody by out witting his Brother Hatton, and ask.d him for y.e goods, he promised to deliver to him, this Said Hemonss made Answer he thought they belonged to his wife (y.e Said Eliz: Johnsons) who told the Governo.r he Should not have them Except he Sheived a power to receive them and did unjustly demand them After Severall words and offers by y.e Govern.r to have y.e matter decided by two men, or by y.e Jury next Sessions the Said Hemonss persisted in his Self Conceited Stubbornnefs Whereupon for Such Impositions on y.e Said Governour It is ordered by y.e Hise Governour That	The Governor sent for Hemonss and Sterling. He told them that, since Susanna Johnson was committed to his charge, he ought to have the goods sent to Elizabeth Johnson for her [...] use. Hemonss and Sterling promised to deliver them to him. Almost a week later, the Governor sent for Hemonss, who had all the goods in his custody by outwitting his brother Hatton. The Governor asked for the goods which Hemonss promised to deliver. Hemonss answered that he thought they belonged to his wife, Elizabeth Johnson's [...]. He told the Governor that he should not have them unless he showed a power to receive them. He said the Governor demanded them unjustly. Several words passed. The Governor offered to have the matter decided by two men, or by the jury at the next sessions. Hemonss persisted in his self-conceited stubbornness. Because of these impositions on the Governor, it was ordered by the Governor that [...] Interpretations Alexander's final statement narrowed the alleged agreement. Loose papers between the Governor and Sodington could perhaps be destroyed by consent, but council books were different. They were public records and held business beyond the personal quarrel. This distinction protected the authority of the clerk's office and the public archive. The Governor's declaration against Sodington limited his access to public records but did not clearly remove him from every function. The surviving wording suggested that military duties may still have been left to him. This showed an attempt to separate record custody from other parts of office while the Company's decision was awaited. The Johnson goods dispute turned on guardianship and authority to receive property. The Governor claimed the goods because Susanna Johnson was in his charge. Hemonss resisted because he believed the goods belonged through his wife's connection to Elizabeth Johnson. The case therefore set household claim against official custody of a child's property. Speculations Hemonss's refusal probably rested on uncertainty over whether the goods were meant for Elizabeth Johnson, Susanna Johnson or the household connected to them. The Governor offered arbitration by two men or a jury, which suggested he knew the claim might need recognised proof rather than simple command.
64	42	That the Said Hemonss pay y.e Sume of five Shillings fine to the use of y.e Church. [Poirier] Jacob Mille Boswaine being Sworn.d Saith that, that day as the Alarm was made for the Ships in S.d in y.e Roade the Governo.r ordered me to gett y.e Boat redy for y.e Carrying of Cap.t Sodington and others to Ruperts fort I Accordingly did and when the Said Cap.t Sodington Came down e to the Rocks he Surt[?]ured Roore at this depo.t and Said why was not the Great boat gott ready I thought he was Sent out of England to wait upon me, I made answer that the Governo.r did not give me orders to fitt the Great boat of y.e beach and besides the See was Rough and was not Soone to manage by, upon which the Said Cap.t Sodington Damnd the Gover.r and Said if he was a French man he would Come and take this Island with 40 men, and would Cutt the Governo.r in peices for he desird it, Moreover Saith that the Said Cap.t Sodington, would not Lett Doctor Hoskison (who is appointed Surgion at Ruperts) and Serj. Dix on Comand at Bankses) go into the Boat with him, but at y.e Same time did Lett Leonard Hunt free Planter goe in w.th him which words aforesaid the Said Cap.t Sodington Spoke after they went off y.e Rocks into y.e Boate/	John Hemonss was ordered to pay a fine of 5s 0d for the use of the church. Stephen Poirier signed. Jacob Miller, boatswain, was sworn. He said that, on the day the alarm was made for the ships in the road, the Governor ordered him to get the boat ready to carry Captain Sodington and others to Rupert's Fort. Miller did so. When Captain Sodington came down to the rocks, he [...] roared at Miller and asked why the great boat was not ready. He said he thought Miller was sent out of England to wait on him. Miller answered that the Governor did not order him to fit out the great boat from the beach. He also said the sea was rough and the great boat was not soon managed. Captain Sodington then damned the Governor. He said that, if he were a Frenchman, he would come and take the island with forty men. He said he would cut the Governor in pieces, because the Governor deserved it. Miller also said that Captain Sodington would not let Doctor Hoskison, who was appointed surgeon at Rupert's Fort, and Sergeant Dixon, who was appointed to command at Banks's Fort, go in the boat with him. At the same time, Sodington let Leonard Hunt, free

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Leonard Hunt free Planter being Sworne Saith that he did not hear those words uttered as is Sworn aboves.d by Miller, and that y.e Boat was put off from y.e Rocks before Doct.r Hoskison Came below y.e Lale Polis and heard Cap.t Sodington Say he was afraid to go into the boat She being Leakey, and Said he would not take any body Else in. The Governo.r askt y.e Said Hunt if he heard Cap.t Sodington deny Serj. Dixon going into the boat, who answered he did, And being further Interrogated, Saith that he heard y.e Said Cap.t Sodington Strike Stephen Hill two Blows at Ruperts/ Cap.t Sodington Saith that y.e boat being Little and Leaky, was Loath to go off in her himself, therefore Could not Carry Serj. Dixon nor no body Else in the Boat with him, the Sea being Rough and Said I beleive the Governo.r Sent me in this Boat to be Drowned. [Poirier]	planter, go with him. Miller said Sodington spoke these words after they left the rocks and went into the boat. Leonard Hunt, free planter, was sworn. He said he did not hear the words sworn by Miller. He said the boat left the rocks before Doctor Hoskison came below the [...] [...]. He heard Captain Sodington say he was afraid to go in the boat because she was leaky. Sodington said he would not take anybody else in. The Governor asked Hunt whether he heard Captain Sodington refuse to let Sergeant Dixon go in the boat. Hunt answered that he did. Hunt was further questioned. He said he heard Captain Sodington strike Stephen Hill two blows at Rupert's Fort. Captain Sodington said the boat was small and leaky. He was reluctant to go in her himself. For that reason, he could not carry Sergeant Dixon or anybody else in the boat with him. The sea was rough. He said, "I believe the Governor sent me in this boat to be drowned." Interpretations Miller's evidence repeated the charge that Sodington used a wartime alarm to attack the Governor's competence and loyalty. The words about a Frenchman taking the island with forty men turned a complaint about a boat into a statement about the island's vulnerability. The dispute over the boat showed how defence orders depended on transport as well as command. Sodington was sent to Rupert's Fort during an alarm, but he challenged the choice of boat and refused to take some appointed men with him. This affected the movement of personnel to Rupert's Fort and Banks's Fort at a moment of possible danger. Hunt's evidence partly weakened and partly supported Miller's account. He denied hearing Sodington's most seditious words. Yet he confirmed that Sodington refused Sergeant Dixon passage and that Sodington struck Stephen Hill at Rupert's Fort. His oath therefore did not remove the complaint. It narrowed what could be proved. Speculations Sodington's refusal to take Doctor Hoskison and Sergeant Dixon was probably explained by the leaky boat and rough sea, at least in his own defence. The same detail also served his broader complaint against the Governor. By saying he believed he was sent in the boat to be drowned, he turned a logistical decision into evidence of hostility.
65	43	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 16.th day of Novemb.r 1703 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington dp.ty Govern.r Tho: Goodwin Insigne Whereas the Govern.r was Informed that Francisco a black boy of Grace Coulsons had Killed two Piggs of the R.t Hono. ble Comp.s which were at the Hutts, who being ordered to appear before us this day was Examin.d who Saith that Will: Dustons Son William, helpt him Kill y.e two Piggs w.th Thomas Cellier another boy, which Piggs he Says they Carried to William Dustons house, when he and his wife was not at home, and one of the Piggs they Roasted, and the other they Left there Will.m Duston aged about 12 years, and Tho: Sollier aged about 10 years Saith that they Saw y.e Said Francisco Run after y.e Comp.s Piggs and Catcht two of them, which he took upon his back and Run away w.th as fast as he Could and they after him but Could not overtake him, then went and told y.e Black of it, that L.was at the Hutts, who Saith, the Same. It is ordered That y.e Said Grace Coulson pay one dollar to the R.t Hon.o ble Comp.s for the two Piggs her boy Killd, and	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 16 November 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, were present. The Governor was informed that Francisco, a Black boy belonging to Grace Coulson, killed two pigs belonging to the Right Honourable Company at the Hutts. Francisco was ordered to appear before the council and was examined. Francisco said that William Duston's son William helped him kill the two pigs, together with Thomas Cellier, another boy. He said they carried the pigs to William Duston's house when Duston and his wife were not at home. They roasted one pig and left the other there. William Duston, aged about twelve years, and Thomas Sollier, aged about ten years, said that they saw Francisco run after the Company's pigs and catch two of them. He took them on his back and ran away with them as fast as he could. They ran after him but could not overtake him. They then went and told the Black who was at the Hutts. That Black said the same. Grace Coulson was ordered to pay one dollar to the Right Honourable Company for the two pigs killed

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Charges of Cunsill, And that the Said Francisco be whipt on his naked body Imediatly/ Whereas John Johnson Sold.r and his wife when they went off y.e Island Put their daught.r Susanna in y.e Care and Custody of y.e Worship.fl Stephen Poirier Esq.r Governo.r which being done only by a verbale Contract desired that Will.m Marsh and Dorothy Hayes to give their affidavits to Justifie this matter there being a Cause depending on behalf of y.e Said Susanna, as hereafter is Exp.essed. William	by her boy. She was also ordered to pay the charges of council. Francisco was ordered to be whipped immediately on his naked body. John Johnson, soldier, and his wife placed their daughter Susanna in the care and custody of Stephen Poirier, Governor, when they left the island. This was done only by a verbal contract. Because a case was pending on Susanna's behalf, the Governor asked William Marsh and Dorothy Hayes to give affidavits to prove the matter, as was later expressed. Interpretations Francisco's punishment showed the different treatment of slave or Black dependent labour and household heads. Grace Coulson was made financially answerable for the Company's lost pigs because Francisco belonged to her. Francisco himself received corporal punishment. The evidence divided the children's roles sharply. Francisco accused William Duston and Thomas Cellier of helping him. The two boys denied this and described themselves as witnesses who tried to follow him and report the act. The council accepted the version that left Francisco solely responsible. The pigs belonged to the Company, so the offence was not only a private loss. Payment was made to the Company, and the case was heard before the Governor and Council. Company property at the Hutts was treated as directly protected by public discipline. The verbal custody arrangement for Susanna Johnson needed sworn support because a later legal claim depended on it. The Governor's authority over Susanna's affairs rested on the parents' spoken commitment, so affidavits were required to turn that memory into usable proof.
66	44	William Marsh being Sworne Saith that he knows Jn.o Johnson and his wife but their daughter Susanna in the Care and Custody of the Said Governo.r who but y.e Said Child to board at William Hayes for one year at y.e rate of five pounds p ann.m and when y.e Said year was Expired then they were to make a new Contract, and heard y.e Govern.r promise to maintain her in Cloaths/ Dorothy y.e wife of the Said William Hayes being Sworne Saith to y.e Same Effect with y.e aforesaid William Marsh, hath already/ And whereas Mad.m Coe Liveing at Surrat haveing Sent to her Sister Eliz.th Johnson (whose now liveing) a Small parcell of Indea goods, which was Equally divided between Jn.o & Hemonss and Hatton Sterling, who refuses to deliver y.e Govern.r Said goods, wherefore y.e Govern. desired the Councils opinion in this matter, whether he ought to have them, or no. Cap.t Sodington Says his opinion is, that y.e Said goods don't belong to the Said Johnsons daughter, but to Hatton Sterling her brother/ M.r Goodwin is of opinion that y.e Said Goods belongs to y.e Said Susanna Johnson, it being Sent for the Clothing of her, and is nighest of Kin. Which Said goods the Governo.r demanded a Second time but was refused againe by y.e abovesaid Hemonss, whereupon It is ordered That y.e matter now in question be referred to the Jury next Sessions and if the Said Hemonss and Sterling were Cast, that then they pay all Charges occasioned by their Refusing Said Goods/ Cap.t Sodington desired that he might have y.e Consultations and Instruction Books to peruse in his Chamber, haveing Requested the Same three Sevrall times before in Council The Govern.r Says, as he hath Said before That when ever there's any necessity for the Grand Coun.l Book to be perused, it Shall be Brought to the Coun.l Board, And	William Marsh was sworn. He said he knew that John Johnson and his wife placed their daughter Susanna in the Governor's care and custody. The Governor placed the child to board with William Hayes for one year at £5 0s 0d a year. When the year ended, a new contract was to be made. Marsh also heard the Governor promise to maintain her in clothes. Dorothy, wife of William Hayes, was sworn. She gave evidence to the same effect as William Marsh. Madame Coe, who lived at Surat, sent a small parcel of Indian goods to her sister Elizabeth Johnson, who was now living. The goods were equally divided between John Hemonss and Hatton Sterling. They refused to deliver the goods to the Governor. The Governor therefore asked the council's opinion on whether he ought to have them. Captain Sodington said his opinion was that the goods did not belong to Johnson's daughter, Susanna, but to Hatton Sterling, her brother. Mr Goodwin's opinion was that the goods belonged to Susanna Johnson, since they were sent for her clothing and she was the nearest of kin. The Governor demanded the goods a second time. Hemonss again refused to deliver them. The matter was referred to the jury at the next sessions. If Hemonss and Sterling were cast, they were to pay all charges caused by their refusal to deliver the goods. Captain Sodington asked to have the consultation books and instruction books to read in his chamber. He said he asked for them three several times before in council. The Governor said, as he said before, that whenever the Grand Council book needed to be read, it would be brought to the council board. If Sodington wanted any other books to read, he could have them, provided he asked the Governor for them in writing. Sodington did not think a written request was needed for books which, in his view, ought to be shown

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		if he wants any Books Else to peruse he Shall have them, if he requests the Same by writeing to y.e Governo.r The Said Sodington not beleiving any necessity for writeing for that, which ought to be Shewen him without, to instruct, So him in his masters affairs, thinks it Sufficent to desire it in Councill	to him without one, so that he could be instructed in his masters' affairs. He thought it was enough to ask for them in council. Interpretations The affidavits by William Marsh and Dorothy Hayes turned Susanna Johnson's verbal placement into sworn proof. This mattered because the Governor's later claim to act for her depended on the parents' spoken arrangement. The boarding sum and clothing promise showed that custody carried defined maintenance duties. The dispute over the Surat goods showed uncertainty over kinship, delivery and intended use. Sodington treated the goods as belonging to Hatton Sterling through family connection. Goodwin treated them as Susanna's because they were said to be for her clothing and because she was nearest of kin. The council sent the matter to a jury because the competing claims could not be settled by simple custody alone. The renewed dispute over the council and instruction books followed directly from the torn leaves episode. The Governor allowed books to be read at the council board or requested in writing, but not casually removed to Sodington's chamber. Access to records was therefore restricted to protect the public books while still leaving a formal path for inspection. Speculations The Governor's insistence on written requests for books was probably a safeguard after Sodington's earlier removal of leaves from the council book. It created a record of what was requested and limited private handling of the documents.
67	45	Since no Letter on that Subject Can be But in y.e Nature of a Petition, which he Supposes he ought not to do being Deputy. Cor: Sodington The Governo.r Says as to what is written before he Stands to it And Says that the Said Cap.t Sodington wrongs him in Saying he Shant have y.e Books without writing in the Nature of a Petition for them, it being not his desire but only to write to him a Small Letter and to mention what he wants them for/ [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin November the 17.th 1703 Steph.n Child Gun.r Cheif mate being Sworne Saith that when the Alarme was made for the five Ships now in y.e Road her repaired to his post at Ruperts and being at the Powder room door a takeing out Some Cartridges in order to Load y.e Great Guns that was newl[y] Ly mounted there by Cap.t Tollot Cap.t Sodington (who was there and at[ten] tant time Comander of Ruperts ffort) took one or two of Said Cartridges in his hands, and Said they were not filled According to their due Allowance of powder, and asked me who filled them I replied I was but a new Comer there and did never Examine y.e Magazine before but was as he found them, whereupon y.e Said Cap.t Sodington asked me if I was Gun.r of that Sort or no, I replied yes, when any Alarm was made the Said Cap.t Sodington Said I'so order Cartridge man Should out of half a pound a day Speed a while [...] but now I be the Companys is Cheated and the Guns of their Allowance of Powder, I made Answer S.r what Should we do w.tho the Powder, what Should you do with it you dogg, said he, and up w.th his Sword and Stuck me on one Shoulder (which was of Severall Collours, as black & svelte) for nigh Ten days time, which I Sheved to James Wilson, Kelly, & others Where =upon I told him I could not Save the Comp.s any Longer, to be beat like a dogg, upon which the Said Cap.t Sodington Said, if [W]e be an Enemy you Shall be the first man that dies for I will Run you through, And if there was a fellow here I Should Long you Up Imediately and demanded Some of y.e men there to take hold of me But none did, and asked me how many Great Guns was there to try whether I could redely tell, I told him I should not Stay w.th him any Longer, but would go to the Governo.r, By reason of	Sodington added that no letter on that subject could be anything but a petition. He supposed he ought not to write in that way, because he was Deputy Governor. Cornelius Sodington signed. The Governor answered that he stood by what was written before. He said Sodington wronged him by saying that the books would not be given to him unless he wrote in the nature of a petition. The Governor said this was not what he wanted. He asked only for a short letter that stated which books Sodington wanted and why he wanted them. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed on 17 November 1703. Stephen Child, gunner and chief mate, was sworn. He said that when the alarm was made for the five ships then in the road, he went to his post at Rupert's Fort. He was at the powder-room door, taking out cartridges to load the great guns newly mounted there by Captain Tollot. Captain Sodington was there and was at that time commander of Rupert's Fort. Sodington took one or two cartridges in his hands. He said they were not filled with their proper allowance of powder. He asked Child who filled them. Child answered that he was only newly come there and never examined the magazine before. He said they were as Sodington found them. Sodington asked whether Child was gunner of that sort or not. Child answered that he was when an alarm was made. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. Sodington appeared to say that the cartridge man should [...] half a pound a day [...]. He then said the Company was cheated, and the guns were cheated of their allowance of powder. Child answered, "Sir, what should we do with the powder?" Sodington replied, "What should you do with it, you dog?" He drew his sword and struck Child on one shoulder. The shoulder was bruised in several colours, black and [...], for nearly ten days. Child showed it to James Wilson, Kelly and others. Child told Sodington that he could not serve the Company any longer if he was to be beaten like a dog.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		his Threatening words, when he Saw I Should go, he Run after me but not Runing So fast as I, he gott up a Stone of about four or five pound weight, and threw at me, which if I had not Seen by turning	Sodington said that, if [...] were an enemy, Child would be the first man to die, because he would run him through. He also said that, if there was a fellow there, he would [...] Child up immediately. He demanded that some of the men there take hold of Child, but none did. Sodington asked Child how many great guns were there, to test whether he could readily tell. Child said he would not stay with Sodington any longer, but would go to the Governor because of Sodington's threatening words. When Sodington saw that Child would go, he ran after him. Child ran faster. Sodington picked up a stone of about four or five pounds weight and threw it at him. Interpretations Sodington's refusal to ask for the books in writing showed how record access was also a question of rank. He treated a written request as a petition and therefore beneath the Deputy Governor's office. The Governor answered by saying that he required only a short written statement of purpose. The dispute was therefore over whether access to official records was a right of office or a controlled act that had to leave a paper trail. Stephen Child's evidence added another charge of violent command during an alarm. The issue began with cartridge powder and the readiness of the guns at Rupert's Fort. Sodington's inspection could have been a military duty, but the testimony described it turning into insult, sword violence and a threat to kill. The cartridge dispute mattered because powder shortage or underfilled cartridges affected the defence of Rupert's Fort. Sodington accused others of cheating the Company and the guns of their allowance. Child's answer showed that he denied personal responsibility because he was newly arrived at that post and had not previously examined the magazine. The refusal of the men to seize Child when Sodington ordered it showed a limit to Sodington's authority in practice. Even while he commanded Rupert's Fort during the alarm, the men did not act on his demand. This weakened his control and suggested that his violence made obedience unstable. Speculations Sodington's testing of Child by asking how many great guns were there probably aimed to expose him as unfit or careless after the cartridge dispute. The question followed the accusation about powder and the sword blow. It appeared to be a practical attempt to challenge Child's competence in front of the men. Child's decision to leave for the Governor was probably a deliberate move from military command to higher civil authority. He said he would not stay because of Sodington's threats. Going to the Governor offered a way to escape immediate violence and create an official complaint.
68	46	turning about, he might have knockt my brains out but Considering as I was going along that if the Said Ships were an Enemy I should do my Endeavour to Escape from him upon his threats aforesaid, and So returned to my post againe and after Severall more words Cap.t the Said Cap.t Sodington asked me if all the Guns was Loaded, I replyd yes, and was tertd to, and Matches were redy Lighted, and all things in good order whereupon the Ships appeared and Seeing English Colours but us out of all fear and went into the Tent and Drank Some Wine and water amongst y.e officers &c and Eat Some victuals together at which time the Said Cap.t Sodington asked me thus, why did you give me Such an Answer as to Say what Should we do with y.e Powder and do you think what I have been So Long, Either, in y.e Kings or Queens Service and don't know how they make away with Powder or words much this purpose, further Saith not/ Steph.n Child	The stone could have knocked Child's brains out if he had not turned and seen it. As he went away, he thought that, if the ships were enemies, he should still try to escape from Sodington because of the threats made against him. He therefore returned to his post. After several more words, Sodington asked Child whether all the guns were loaded. Child replied that they were. They were [...] and the matches were ready, lighted. Everything was in good order. The ships then appeared and showed English colours. This put the fort out of fear. The officers went into the tent, drank wine and water, and ate some victuals together. At that time, Sodington asked Child why he gave such an answer as "What should we do with the powder?" He asked whether Child thought that, after he had served so long in the King's or Queen's service, he did not know how they made away with powder, or words to that effect.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		mortgage Whereas Joseph Lex being Confined Prison upon Information that he made a bargain w.th Sam: Duston Sold.r to give him Some quantity of Powder for a Pint of Arrack/ Onesip Steward free Plant.r Do hereby Enter into Recognizance of Ten pounds Currant mony of Said Island payable to y.e R.t Hono.ble Comp.s That the Said Joseph Lex Shall personally appear before Govern.r and Coun.l on Tuesday being the 23 day of this Instant Nov.br 1703 or when thereunto Called by Said Govern.r and Coun.l Witness my hand this 18 day of November 1703 as afores.d Ones: Steward Likewise I Will: Duston Sold.r and father of y.e Said Sam.l Duston upon his being Imprisoned on Said Esteem.t Do hereby Enter into a Recognizance of Ten pounds in like Sterl. mony as abovesaid that the Said Sam.l Duston Shall personally appear before Govern.r and Coun.l on y.e before mentioned 23.th day of this Instant Nov.br when thereunto Called by Said Govern.r and Coun.l Witness my hand this 18 day of Nov.br 1703 as aforesaid his William D Duston Witnessed p mark me Jn.o Alexander [Poirier]	Stephen Child said no more. Stephen Child signed. Joseph Lex was confined in prison after information was given that he made a bargain with Samuel Duston, soldier, to give him some quantity of powder for a pint of arrack. Onesip Steward, free planter, entered into a recognisance of £10 0s 0d in current money of the island, payable to the Right Honourable Company. This bound Joseph Lex to appear in person before the Governor and Council on Tuesday, 23 November 1703, or whenever he was called by them. Onesip Steward signed this on 18 November 1703. William Duston, soldier and father of Samuel Duston, also entered into a recognisance of £10 0s 0d in like sterling money. This was done after Samuel Duston was imprisoned on the same account. It bound Samuel Duston to appear in person before the Governor and Council on 23 November 1703, or whenever he was called by them. William Duston signed by his mark. John Alexander witnessed it. Stephen Poirier signed. Interpretations Child's return to his post showed the pull between personal danger and military duty. He feared Sodington's threats, but he still went back because the ships might be enemies. The fort's defence took priority even after the officer commanding it had attacked him. The later exchange over powder showed that Sodington's suspicion did not end with the assault. He linked underfilled cartridges to the known misuse or theft of powder in military service. His words suggested that he saw the matter as a fraud on the Company and a danger to the guns. The recognisances for Joseph Lex and Samuel Duston turned a powder-for-arrack allegation into a secured legal process. Each man was released or held under a surety obligation to appear before the Governor and Council. The £10 0s 0d bond gave the Company a financial hold over their attendance. The alleged bargain mattered because powder was military property. Trading it for drink would endanger the island's defence and repeat the wider problem already seen in the cartridge disputes. The council therefore treated the case as serious enough for imprisonment and formal recognisance.
69	47	William Stone Soldier being Sworne Saith that, that day as the alarm was made for the five Ships now in y.e Road he was at y.e Land ing Rocks where he heard Cap.t Sodington Say that if the Said Ships was an Enemy, and he was on board them he could Come on Shoar w.th thirty or fourty men and take the fort And could Cutt the Governo.r in peices he be deserved to be, and before he had been Seven years upon this Island he would make the Island bleve, and one man Else, And that he Cursd and Damnd the Governo.r and Said myst an English man, & under a french dogg of a Govern.r and to be Sht in an Egg Shell to be Drowned (meaning y.e Litile yaul), and Said he would fling y.e Irons that was ordered for Ruperts, over board, And moreover heard Said Cap.t Sodington deny Doctor Hoskison and Serj. Dixon to go into y.e Boat to their posts, further Saith not/ Whereas Philip Karslake Sold.r his affidavit taken before haveing been tome out of y.e foul Councell Book by Cap.t Sodington, & being upon his honor The Govern.r Desired him the Said Karslake to give his affidavit againe who doth as followeth/ Philip Karslake Sold.r being Sworne againe Saith that Some time Since he being upon the Guard, heard Cap.t Sodington order Serj. Dixon to go to the Govern.r two Several times, and y.e Last time y.e Keys of him being a positive Answer whether he would Deliver y.e Keys of the fort to him, for he would go to Ruperts, because he	William Stone, soldier, was sworn. He said that, on the day the alarm was made for the five ships now in the road, he was at the landing rocks. He heard Captain Sodington say that, if the ships were enemies and he was on board them, he could come ashore with thirty or forty men and take the fort. Sodington also said he could cut the Governor in pieces, because the Governor deserved it. Stone said he heard Sodington say that, before he was seven years on the island, he would make the island believe [...], and one man else. The manuscript was unclear at this point. Stone also heard Sodington curse and damn the Governor. Sodington said [...] an Englishman, and under a French dog of a Governor. He also said he was to be shut in an eggshell and drowned, meaning the little yawl. Sodington said he would throw the irons ordered for Rupert's Fort overboard. Stone also heard him refuse to let Doctor Hoskison and Sergeant Dixon go in the boat to their posts. Stone said no more. Philip Karslake's earlier affidavit was torn out of the foul council book by Captain Sodington. Since Karslake was upon his honour, the Governor asked him to give the affidavit again. Philip Karslake, soldier, was sworn again. He said that some time before, while he was on guard, he heard Captain Sodington order Sergeant Dixon to go to the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		was Informed there was Ships near y.e Island, when Serj. Dixon returned from y.e Governo.r he told Cap.t Sodington that the Governo.r would not Deliver the Keys at that time of y.e night (it being then about Eleven or twelve of y.e Clock) whereupon Cap.t Sodington Swore to gete all y.e Soldiers that a great Gun, and Comanded Serj. Dixon who Accordingly did and was on y.e Guard in their Arms Imediately Runing out of his bed making a great noise The Governo.r Came & enquiring y.e Disturbance, in y.e Chamber, and askt who that was that Caused y.e Disturbance and Said it was fort, whereupon Cap.t Sodington made answer and Said it was him and Said I would have the Said Keys for he would go to. Ruperts being well informed there was Ships near the Island, and being Warr time did not know but they might be then Comeing in The Governo.r told him if it was So, he Could Send him to Prosperous bey for that was the most Dangerous place in y.e Island, And Accordingly Called for Pen, Ink and paper, and wrote an order for his going there, which as the Said Cap.t Sodington was reading tore in Peices and Said he would not go, and Sometimes after he would go, and heard Severall high words pass between him and y.e Governour	Governor twice. The last time, Sodington wanted a direct answer on whether the Governor would deliver the keys of the fort to him. Sodington said he would go to Rupert's Fort because he was informed that ships were near the island. When Sergeant Dixon returned from the Governor, he told Captain Sodington that the Governor would not deliver the keys at that time of night. It was then about eleven or twelve o'clock. Sodington then swore to get all the soldiers to a great gun. He commanded Sergeant Dixon, who obeyed. The guard was immediately in arms and ran out of bed, making a great noise. The Governor came into the chamber and asked about the disturbance. He asked who caused it. The answer was that it was Fort [...]. Sodington then answered that it was him. He said he wanted the keys because he would go to Rupert's Fort. He was well informed that ships were near the island. Since it was wartime, he did not know whether they might then be coming in. The Governor told him that, if this was so, he could send him to Prosperous Bay, because that was the most dangerous place on the island. The Governor called for pen, ink and paper, and wrote an order for Sodington to go there. As Sodington read the order, he tore it in pieces. He said he would not go. Some time afterwards, he said he would go. Karslake heard several high words pass between Sodington and the Governor. Interpretations Stone's affidavit added another witness to Sodington's words at the landing rocks. The evidence repeated the same dangerous themes: the island could be taken by a small enemy party, the Governor deserved violence, the boat was unfit and the appointed officers were refused passage to their posts. This strengthened the charge that Sodington used a military alarm to undermine command. The threat to throw the irons for Rupert's Fort overboard mattered because irons were instruments of restraint and military discipline. If they were meant for Rupert's Fort, removing them would weaken the fort's ability to secure prisoners or enforce orders there. Karslake's renewed affidavit also mattered as a repair of the record. His earlier statement was lost when Sodington tore leaves from the foul council book. Taking it again restored evidence that the Governor considered important to the case. The dispute over the fort keys showed a direct contest over command. Sodington wanted the keys at night so he could go to Rupert's Fort. The Governor refused to hand them over at that hour and instead wrote an order sending him to Prosperous Bay. Sodington's tearing of the order was therefore a refusal of written command during wartime. Speculations The Governor's choice of Prosperous Bay was probably meant to test Sodington's claim that he wanted to respond to a real threat. The Governor said it was the most dangerous place on the island and wrote an order for him to go there. Sodington's immediate tearing of the order made his urgency over Rupert's Fort appear less like a general defence concern and more like a demand for control of the fort keys.
70	48	November y.e 19.th 1703 Edward Crosbey free Planter declares that M.r Carne Called to him as he was Comeing downe to the fort and told him that Severall neighbours had Sett their hands to a Petition that a parcele of y.e Comp.s Wast Land (which James Easthope Desired he might hire) might be not Lett, it being as he Pretended prejudiciall to them, But y.e Said Crosbey Says that he has no hoggs nor Goats that Raunges on the Said Land, nor is any ways	On 19 November 1703, Edward Crosbey, free planter, declared that Mr Carne called to him as he came down to the fort. Carne told him that several neighbours signed a petition asking that a parcel of the Company's waste land should not be let. James Easthope wanted to hire that land. Carne claimed the letting would harm them. Crosbey said he had no hogs or goats ranging on that land. He said the letting would not harm him in any

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		prejudicially to him, And moreover Says that he did not know the Govern.r had granted a Warrant for measureing Said Land which if he had he would not have Signed Said Petition, As Witnefs my hand the day and yeare above written Edw. Crosbey 1703 Xb.r y.e 16: The Said Edw. Crosbey Senir declares that aft.r y.e S.d M.r Carne had heard that he had given a declaration against him as abovesaid y.e Sd M.r Carne told him that he Should Lose his Ears (or deserved to Lose them) and Called him Severall Scandelous Names/ The declaration of Mary the Wife of James Easthope free Plant.r taken this 29.th day of Novemb.r 1703 Who being Sworne Saith that Seven days aft.r Madam Poirier was brought a bed she being then her nurse, was in her Chamber about Ten or Eleven of y.e Clock at night, when heard a great noise in the ffort whereupon Mad.m Poirier desired me to go out upon y.e mount to Se what was the matter who did So, but could hear nothing when I came in the Chamber againe we both heard a great noise as before then went out upon y.e mount a Second time but could hear nothing there and when I came into y.e Chamber againe but heared a noise againe and Some body Say God Dam my Blood, which Said very much affright Mad.m Poirier who desired me to go out to the Gallary door (that opens into y.e ffort) to her maid Black mate, where I heard Doct.r Kerr Say for God Sake S.r good Capt. don't for Christs Sake Cap.t don't Severall times, who let me begg of you don't, then I went and acquainted Mad.m Poirier S.r what Doct.r Kerr Said which made her more fearfull then before a Little aft.r I went out againe and heard Cap.t Sodington Say Search y.e Garrison, then went and told Mad.m Poirier of that and went back againe to y.e door, and heard Some body Say fairly hurt dead, or alive, and Said Serj. Dixon Came from Cap.t Sodingtons Room w.th a Candle and Lathorn, and look about y.e ffort, and Said Philip Karslake [...] [...] him when he had done Looking and go ag.n to Cap.t Sodingtons Room againe, presently aft.r Saw Serj. Dixon who I Called to me and ask him what was y.e matter, he told me that Cap.t Sodington had Lik't to have killd S.d Karslake, and bid but him in t[o] the Dungeon. Whereupon I Replyd, have a Care Dixon and dont offen him for he will be foul of your Jacket by and by, then went into the Chamber and told Mad.m Poirier that Karslake was put into the Dungeon which did much Increase her fright [...] Margin Notes: I knock	way. He also said he did not know the Governor granted a warrant for measuring the land. If he had known that, he would not have signed the petition. Edward Crosbey signed the declaration. On 16 December 1703, Edward Crosbey senior declared that, after Mr Carne heard that Crosbey gave the declaration against him, Carne told him that he should lose his ears, or deserved to lose them. Carne also called him several scandalous names. On 29 November 1703, the declaration of Mary Easthope, wife of James Easthope, free planter, was taken. Mary Easthope was sworn. She said that seven days after Madame Poirier was delivered of a child, Mary was serving as her nurse. At about ten or eleven o'clock at night, she was in Madame Poirier's chamber and heard a great noise in the fort. Madame Poirier asked Mary to go out onto the mount to see what was the matter. Mary went, but could hear nothing. When she came back into the chamber, she and Madame Poirier again heard a great noise. Mary went out onto the mount a second time but still could hear nothing there. When Mary came back into the chamber, she heard the noise again. She also heard someone say, "God damn my blood." This greatly frightened Madame Poirier. Madame Poirier asked Mary to go out to the gallery door, which opened into the fort, to her maid Black Mate. Mary went there and heard Doctor Kerr say several times, "For God's sake, sir, good Captain, don't. For Christ's sake, Captain, don't. Let me beg you, don't." Mary went back and told Madame Poirier what Doctor Kerr said. This made Madame Poirier more fearful than before. A little afterwards, Mary went out again and heard Captain Sodington say, "Search the garrison." She told Madame Poirier this, then went back again to the door. She heard somebody say [...] hurt, dead or alive. Sergeant Dixon came from Captain Sodington's room with a candle and lantern. He looked around the fort. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. Philip Karslake [...] him when he finished looking, and Dixon went back again to Captain Sodington's room. Soon afterwards, Mary saw Sergeant Dixon. She called to him and asked what was the matter. He told her that Captain Sodington almost killed Karslake and ordered him put into the dungeon. Mary replied, "Have a care, Dixon, and don't offend him, for he will be foul of your jacket by and by." Mary then went into the chamber and told Madame Poirier that Karslake was put into the dungeon. This greatly increased Madame Poirier's fright. The marginal note read, "I knock". Interpretations Edward Crosbey's declaration showed that petitions could be challenged after signature. He said Carne drew him into a petition about Company waste land without telling him that the Governor already granted a warrant to measure it. Crosbey's later withdrawal weakened the claim that the neighbours were genuinely harmed by Easthope's proposed lease. The threat that Crosbey should lose his ears carried the meaning of public punishment and disgrace. Cropping ears was associated with shame and bodily penalty. Carne's words therefore went beyond ordinary abuse and answered Crosbey's declaration with a threat of dishonour. Mary Easthope's evidence gave a household view of disorder in the fort. Madame Poirier was newly delivered and in her chamber, while noise, oaths, searches and talk of violence moved through the garrison outside. The testimony showed how military

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			disorder entered domestic space and caused fear among women inside the fort. The order to “search the garrison” and the reported confinement of Karslake in the dungeon showed Sodington acting as if he exercised coercive command inside the fort. Mary did not describe the original cause of the disturbance, but she recorded the visible effects: armed or guarded movement, searching by lantern and imprisonment. Speculations Carne’s approach to Crosby was probably meant to build local opposition to Easthope’s lease of Company waste land before the grant became settled. Crosby later stressed that he had no animals ranging there and suffered no harm, which suggested his signature was used to give weight to a grievance that was not truly his. Mary Easthope’s repeated movement between Madame Poirier’s chamber, the mount and the gallery door was probably driven by the need to judge whether the disturbance threatened the Governor’s household. Madame Poirier was recently delivered of a child and became increasingly frightened as reports of oaths, pleas, searching and Karslake’s imprisonment reached her.
71	49	her to be in a very Cold Sweat trembling and Setting up in her bed, by which She gott an Extraordinary great Cold and was much affrighted my Self, then Madam Poirier desired me to go and call M.r Parsons the Govern.rs Steward who (who Lay in y.e fort house) to Come and Klep her Company, who Acording[ly] Sent and knockt at y.e door, but heard no body there, then I returned and told Mad.m Poirier I Could not hear any body in Parson's Room and at her desire I went again w.th Black Matty but could not hear any body there as aforesaid which made us admire where they Should be, then Mad.m Poirier desired me to go into y.e Gallary and when I came there I Saw Humphrey Edwards, who I askt if he knew where M.r Parsons was, who told me yes, She was in Cap.t Sodingtons Room whereupon went and told Mad.m Poirier She was with her Husband in Cap.t Sodingtons Room, Mad.m Poirier replyd She did not know y.e meaning of their Steeling out of y.e House, being Sevr.s and wondered they did not Come to Acquaint her w.th the Disturbance in y.e ffort, then I went out again and heard Serj. Dixon Say hand to y.e Arms, bring them up upon y.e mount and as I was Standing in the Gallary, I heard a noise in y.e Said Cap.t Sodingtons Room as if there were men a fighting or Shears thrown about, and presently after Saw a Candle and Lanthorn Come out of his Room and heard the Marshall Henry Coales Say Jo. take up y.e Perruck, and perceiveing Serj. Dixon Coming from Cap.t Sodingtons Room w.th him, the Said Dixon Seeing me Called to me and Said he was a going to be put into Prison whereupon Run and told Mad.m Poirier that y.e Serj. was put into prison, upon which She desired me to Lock and b.lt all y.e doors very fast, and She would Send for y.e Governour downe out of the Country, which She did about one of y.e Clock being worse frighted then before Insomuch She did not Lipt one wink all y.e night aft. till three or four in the morning/ The Mark of Mary M Easthope The Worship.fl Steph.n Poirier Esq.r Governo.r gave me notice that Cap.t Cor: Sodington hath Torne in Leles y.e fousl Coun. Book and that notwithstanding their friendly Ac= =comodation is Relapsed againe and finding himself Destitute of my Evidence it being torne as aforesaid ordered me to write downe my affidavit as it was before delivered on my oath, w.ch is to y.e best of my memory as followeth. That I being upon the Guard on y.e 20 day of Sept.r 16.th Last Margin Notes: knockt at y.e door	Mary found Madame Poirier in a very cold sweat, trembling and sitting up in her bed. Madame Poirier took an extraordinarily bad cold from this and was greatly frightened. Mary herself was also much frightened. Madame Poirier then asked Mary to call Mr Parsons, the Governor’s steward, who lodged in the fort house, so that he could keep her company. Mary went and knocked at the door, but heard nobody there. She returned and told Madame Poirier that she could hear nobody in Parsons’s room. At Madame Poirier’s request, Mary went again with Black Matty, but still heard nobody there. This made them wonder where they could be. Madame Poirier then asked Mary to go into the gallery. When Mary came there, she saw Humphrey Edwards. She asked whether he knew where Mr Parsons was. He told her that she was in Captain Sodington’s room. Mary went back and told Madame Poirier that she was with her husband in Captain Sodington’s room. Madame Poirier replied that she did not know what was meant by their stealing out of the house, being servants. She wondered that they did not come to tell her about the disturbance in the fort. Mary went out again and heard Sergeant Dixon say, “Hand to the arms. Bring them up upon the mount.” As she stood in the gallery, she heard a noise in Captain Sodington’s room, as if men were fighting or chairs were thrown about. Soon afterwards, she saw a candle and lantern come out of his room. She heard the marshal, Henry Coales, say, “Jo, take up the peruke.” Mary then saw Sergeant Dixon coming from Captain Sodington’s room. When Dixon saw her, he called to her and said he was going to be put into prison. Mary ran and told Madame Poirier that the sergeant was being put into prison. Madame Poirier then asked her to lock and bolt all the doors very fast. She said she would send for the Governor down from the country. She did so at about one o’clock. She was more frightened than before, so much that she did not sleep at all for the rest of the night, until three or four in the morning. Mary Easthope made her mark. The marginal note read, “knockt at the door”. The Worshipful Stephen Poirier, Governor, gave notice that Captain Cornelius Sodington tore leaves from the foul council book. He also said that, despite

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			their friendly accommodation, Sodington relapsed again. Since the Governor found himself without this evidence because it was torn out, he ordered the witness to write down his affidavit as it was before given on oath. The witness said that, to the best of his memory, the affidavit was as follows. He was on guard on 20 September 1703 [...]. Interpretations Mary Easthope's evidence showed how the disturbance spread from military disorder into the Governor's household. Madame Poirier was recently delivered of a child, was frightened into a cold sweat and ordered the doors locked and bolted. The fort was therefore not only a place of command. It was also a domestic space made unsafe by the disorder. The missing steward and servant mattered because they were expected to support Madame Poirier inside the fort house. Their presence in Sodington's room during the disturbance was treated as suspicious because it left her without household help and without information. The order to bring arms onto the mount, the noise of fighting, the lost peruke and Dixon's statement that he was being put in prison all showed coercive action inside the fort at night. Mary's evidence did not explain the whole cause, but it recorded signs of force, disorder and confinement. The notice about the torn leaves showed why the affidavit was being recreated. The Governor needed the evidence restored because Sodington's removal of leaves left the record incomplete. This turned the taking of testimony into a repair of damaged public records.
72	50	Last in the night about Ten or Eleven of the Clock Cap.t Sodington Sent me to his Room, Saying Serj. Dixon Sold.r you to go to the Govern.r and tell him I do Intend to go to Ruperts about two of y.e Clock and Do require the boat to waite upon me with Six Musquetters w.th powder and ball, and if the Governo.r be a bed Call him up So I went, and the doors being Lockt, I Calld M.r Parsons the Governo.rs Steward, Saying go to the Governo.r and tell him, I must Speak w.th him, to deliver a Mefsage from Cap.t Sodington whereupon he went & the Governo.r Came to me presently and Said what is the matter Serj. So I told the Governo.r what Cap.t Sodington ordered to do, The Governo.rs Answer was this, go tell Cap.t Sodington I would have him go to Sleep, for I won't deliver the Keysthall Rebellry in y.e morning So I went and told Cap.t Sodington I had not bin Long from him, but he Came to my Room and Called me out, Saying Serj. go to y.e Govern. againe and tell him that, I'dle go to Ruperts to night, for I have Intelligence that there is Ships about the Island, and if he will not Let me go I will fire a Gun, So I went to y.e Governo.rs Chamber door and knockt a pretty while before I could make him hear me, at Last he Came Saying what is the matter, Serj. So I told him what Mefsage Cap.t Sodington Sent by me the Governo.rs Answer was this, go tell Cap.t Sodington Let him fire a Gun if he dares, if he do's be it upon his Perrill So I went and told Cap.t Sodington what y.e Govern.r Said finding him upon his mount w.th two or three more about him ing of a great Gun, So then I went away from him but Considering within my Self, that they would fire y.e Gun, I turned my Self about againe and Said Gentlemen I forewarn you, in y.e Governours Name from firing of y.e Gun, without his Leave, if you do, be it to your perrills, Whereupon Cap.t Sodington took the Lighted Match from one of them, Saying Dam it I will fire it my Self, So he turning himself about Said Serj. where is your men I Said here S.r Call them, Sayes he, So I Sent downe into y.e Guard & Called them and in making a noise the Governo.r Came forth in his Govne, with one Stocce on, and the	The witness said that on the night of 20 September 1703, at about ten or eleven o'clock, Captain Sodington sent for him to come to his room. Sodington said, "Sergeant Dixon, you are to go to the Governor and tell him I intend to go to Rupert's about two o'clock. I require the boat to wait on me with six musketeers, with powder and ball. If the Governor is in bed, call him up." Dixon went. The doors were locked, so he called Mr Parsons, the Governor's steward. He told Parsons to go to the Governor and say that Dixon needed to speak with him to deliver a message from Captain Sodington. Parsons went. The Governor came to Dixon at once and asked what the matter was. Dixon delivered Sodington's message. The Governor answered, "Go tell Captain Sodington I would have him go to sleep, for I won't deliver the keys till [...] in the morning." Dixon went and told Sodington. Soon afterwards, Sodington came to Dixon's room and called him out. He said, "Sergeant, go to the Governor again and tell him that I'll go to Rupert's tonight, for I have intelligence that there are ships about the island. If he will not let me go, I will fire a gun." Dixon went to the Governor's chamber door and knocked for some time before he could make him hear. At last the Governor came and asked what the matter was. Dixon gave Sodington's message. The Governor answered, "Go tell Captain Sodington, let him fire a gun if he dares. If he does, be it upon his peril." Dixon went and told Sodington what the Governor said. He found him on the mount with two or three others about him, near a great gun. Dixon left him. Then he considered within himself that they would fire the gun. He turned back and said, "Gentlemen, I forewarn you, in the Governor's name, from firing the gun without his leave. If you do, be it to your perils." Sodington took the lighted match from one of them and said, "Damn it, I will fire it myself."

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		other Halfon, Saying who makes this noise Cap.t Sodington Answered it is I, the Governo.r then went into my Room and ordered me to Send for Pen, Ink & paper which I did, when it Come the Governo.r went to writeing, and when he had done, he read it to Cap.t Sodington, which was to the [Eft] of my Remembrance thus, I haveing Intelligence from Serj. Dixon being now upon the Guard of Ships being about the Island, I order you Cap.t Sodington to go to Prosperous bay, being y.e Place do most Suspect and this Shall be y.e Sufficient Warr.t from under my hand and Seale, The Govern.r takeing y.e wax in his hand to drop upon it Cap.t Sodington taketh it up, read it, then he tore at it in peices and Said he would not go, but afterwards Said he would go if the Governo.r would Let him have twenty four men to him The Governo.r Said we have not So many men upon the Guard, So haveing a great many words, the Governo.r Said pray Cap.t Sodington dont provoak me to	Sodington then turned and asked Dixon where his men were. Dixon said they were there. Sodington told him to call them. Dixon sent down into the guard and called them. The noise brought the Governor out in his gown, with one stocking on and the other half on. He asked who made the noise. Sodington answered, "It is I." The Governor went into Dixon's room and ordered him to send for pen, ink and paper. Dixon did so. When they were brought, the Governor wrote. When he finished, he read the order to Sodington. To the best of Dixon's memory, it said that, because the Governor had intelligence from Sergeant Dixon, then on guard, that ships were about the island, Captain Sodington was ordered to go to Prosperous Bay, the place most suspected. The writing was to be a sufficient warrant under the Governor's hand and seal. The Governor took wax in his hand to seal it. Sodington took up the order, read it, tore it in pieces and said he would not go. Afterwards he said he would go if the Governor gave him twenty-four men. The Governor said there were not so many men upon the guard. After many words, the Governor said, "Pray, Captain Sodington, don't provoke me to [...]" Interpretations Dixon's affidavit showed that the dispute over the keys, the boat and the gun was not a simple misunderstanding. Sodington repeatedly used Dixon as a messenger to press the Governor for authority to move at night with armed men, powder and ball. The Governor refused to release the keys and then tried to redirect Sodington to Prosperous Bay by written order. The threatened firing of a great gun mattered because an alarm gun could mobilise the fort and disturb the island. Dixon warned Sodington in the Governor's name not to fire without leave. Sodington's taking of the lighted match showed a direct move towards doing it himself. The written order to go to Prosperous Bay created a test of obedience. Sodington claimed ships were near the island and demanded movement to Rupert's Fort. The Governor named Prosperous Bay as the more suspected place and gave him a warrant. Sodington tore it up, then shifted to a demand for twenty-four men. This made the issue less about responding to danger and more about control over men, keys and command. Speculations The Governor's order to Prosperous Bay was probably meant to turn Sodington's alarm into a controlled military assignment. The detail that the Governor wrote and tried to seal a warrant showed that he did not simply dismiss the warning. He tried to place Sodington under written command at the point judged most dangerous. Dixon's return to warn the men not to fire the gun was probably an attempt to protect himself and the guard from blame. He had carried Sodington's message, but he then warned the men in the Governor's name before any gun was fired. That gave him a record of obedience to the Governor rather than to Sodington's unauthorised order.
73	51	or three times Cap.t Sodington Said you wont confine me Yes Said the Governo.r if you wont be quiet, and haveing Some more high Sweet words, the Govern.r Said I confine you to your Chamber and Sett a Centry over him which was done according[ly] Witness my hand. Thomas Dixon The Governors answer to Cap.t Sodingtons Declaration as followeth Before I come to answer the Complaint of M.r Cor: Sodington dep.ty Govern.r and Lieut: (or Rather his Lofty or abstrul discourses) it is reasonable to beseech my Hono. ble masters to observe that Sevrall times	Thomas Dixon's statement continued. After the Governor said, "Pray, Captain Sodington, don't provoke me," two or three times, Sodington said, "You won't confine me." The Governor answered, "Yes, if you won't be quiet." After some more high [...] words, the Governor said, "I confine you to your chamber." A sentry was set over Sodington. This was done accordingly. Thomas Dixon signed. The Governor then gave his answer to Captain Sodington's declaration.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		before this he did abuse me, Even in my own Chamber and in my place against y.e Rules of both Civill and Military Govern.mt, Asoon as he came on Shoar begun to quarrell and threetn both our Surgion and Gunner Calling them names without any provocation, So he did in the Country, doing y.e Same at Plan tation house puting himself in a posture of breaking open y.e doors of S.d I have the Keys by me Calling himself by his darling Title of Governo.r and Comandant, affidavits were taken from Witnesses to prove it but ffriends had power Enough on me to Lett it a Lone, and that both originalls and Copies of these transactions Should be burnt and what was in y.e foul Coun. Book Blotted out, on Condition that in Restored Case of Relaps I Should be freed of my word, and in full Liberty to Acquaint your Hono.rs of Such Irregular Dealings, w.ch I have performed on my part, but as it Shall be made Evident hereafter, he hath not been So faithfull, keeping either note or Copies by him and to deprive me Intirely of my Rite, hath most wrongfully torne y.e Said Coun.l Book by which thought, picke up Evidence Enough to prove the Fact, Insomuch he hath put me on Condition to do my memory and Some Evidences againe which doubtless Cant be but Imperfect, but Enough I hope to prove his unjust dealings. Now to begin with the preamps of his Said Discourses, two things may be observed That Doct.r Kerr Doth positively deny to have any Such discourse w.th him though Supposed I Should as I have Said before	Before answering the complaint of Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor and lieutenant, which the Governor called lofty or abstract discourses, the Governor said it was reasonable to ask his Honourable masters to note that Sodington abused him several times before this. He said Sodington did so even in the Governor's own chamber and in his place, contrary to the rules of both civil and military government. As soon as Sodington came on shore, he began to quarrel with and threaten both the surgeon and the gunner. He called them names without any provocation. He did the same in the country. At Plantation House, he put himself in a posture to break open the doors where the Governor had the keys. He called himself by his favourite title of Governor and commandant. Affidavits were taken from witnesses to prove these matters. Friends had enough influence over the Governor to make him let them alone. It was agreed that both the originals and copies of those transactions should be burnt, and that what was in the foul council book should be blotted out. This was done on condition that, if Sodington relapsed, the Governor should be free of his word and at full liberty to inform the Honourable Company of such irregular dealings. The Governor said he kept his part of the agreement. Sodington did not. The Governor said Sodington kept either notes or copies by him. To deprive the Governor entirely of his right, Sodington wrongfully tore the council book. The Governor said that, despite this, he gathered enough evidence to prove the fact. Sodington's action forced him to rely again on memory and some witnesses. This could not be perfect, but the Governor hoped it was enough to prove Sodington's unjust dealings. The Governor then began with the preamble of Sodington's complaint. He said two things could be observed. Doctor Kerr positively denied having any such discourse with Sodington, although Sodington supposed [...] Interpretations Dixon's evidence completed the earlier night-time account by showing that Sodington was formally confined. The Governor did not confine him at once. He warned him repeatedly to be quiet, then ordered confinement to his chamber only after further disorder. Setting a sentry over him turned the restraint into a military guard measure. The Governor's answer rested on relapse. He accepted that earlier accusations against Sodington were suppressed through friendly mediation, but said this was conditional on Sodington not offending again. This made later misconduct reopen earlier matters and justified reporting the whole dispute to the Company. The destruction of the foul council book remained central. The Governor argued that Sodington's tearing of the record deprived him of evidence and forced weaker reconstruction from memory and witnesses. This framed the damage to records as an obstruction of accountability. The Governor's description of Sodington calling himself Governor and commandant showed the deeper issue beneath the quarrels. The conflict was about who held practical command in fort, country and council spaces. Sodington's language and actions were presented as rival claims to authority, not mere drunken disorder.
74	52	before I might do it, my Hono.r Safe Since he did Relaps according to the provision of our verball A President, 2.ly That he Sheives himself how unfaithfull he is to our masters Interest, because Suppose I would thank God I am not, I was fitt to wrong our masters, And his Publick he is bound in Conscience (if he hath any) to give our masters Notice of it, Rather y.e to betray their Concerns to oblige a Single man,	The Governor continued that he was already free to write to the Honourable Company because Sodington relapsed under the terms of their verbal agreement. He said Sodington's own words showed how unfaithful he was to his masters' interest. If the Governor had been fit to wrong the Company and its public business, which the Governor thanked God he

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Whereforesuch Expressions are but Empty and vain Com= plaints Idle As for his first Parragraph, I Leave it to our Hono.r Masters To unfold the Riddle therein Contained, and Examine what they Can make of it, Doct.r Kerr Solomly denyer telling him my Coming downe Leaches ban Published over night/ &c But only heres the truth of it, haveing Severall pre Sedent Reasons not to trust his words passed not to Cape any moredisturbance I charged my wife (who by his imprudence or willfull malice hath done Enough by making a disturb ance in my Chamber the night before She was delivered, to Cape her to miscarry) that in Case the Least disorder Should happen which I was up in the Cuntrey Looking over our masters Plantations Comitted to my Care, & So Should Send she Intelligen of it, whether in the night or day time They might Comedown e Immediately to Stop his mad dealings, which she did about one of the Clock in the night time being in Danger of her Life as it is proved by M.rs Easthopes Evidence, So did Comedown e Acordingly, and Imediatly delivered the Serj. out of prison where he was Confined only on Revenge, because on his first disturbance professed both he and his Gally to Stand by me, and not duely Satisfied of theaving him in prison but would have him also in Irons else Comeing drest in the Prison him self, would not Suffer that poor man to have any thing under his head ordering his Bed to be taken away out of the Prison, & also Si hearing he had Secured one Karlslake on y.e Same Acco. in y.e Dungeon, wherein we use to but no other persons but Roves a man aged about Seventy years, I thought it Just to Refuse Such miserable a Storm as I could he might have Come to me and given me his reasons, Hath not he been drowned in apr. found Sleep Cause by the vapours of what he drank this day before at Surf landers wedding, when I came in the Drum was Beating, but besides as he hath Said Severall times he Sleen hardly Comeout of his Cabit before Eleven or Twelve in y.e morning, Spending So much time pondering it in washing pareing his Nayles & Drefsing himself, who could a freelone waite for Such a Gent.lt who no Lady in England hath been Educated w.th Such nicety, as he had Said he hath been and Seeing him Practicing Such grandours, tho.s I have not the happeness to be Acquainted w.th his familly, Cant but Conclude he is y Son or persons of Quallety, which disrespectfull proceedings against a Govern.r is positively honest opposite to all Millitary Laws, and deserves the Severst Punnishm.t/ In his Second Parragraph Comes in my wife, who thank God being ha pely Escaped from his turbulent wife as aforesaid, Sent me word according to my Directions, being almost dead, as do's appear by the Said	was not, then Sodington was bound in conscience, if he had any, to give the Company notice of it. He should not betray their concerns merely to oblige one man. For that reason, the Governor dismissed such expressions as empty, vain and idle complaints. For Sodington's first paragraph, the Governor left it to the Honourable Company to unfold the riddle it contained and judge what could be made of it. Doctor Kerr solemnly denied telling Sodington that the Governor came down overnight for Leach's banns to be published, or anything to that effect. The Governor then gave what he called the truth of the matter. He had several strong reasons not to trust Sodington's words and not to let him cause more disturbance. He therefore charged his wife that, if the least disorder happened while the Governor was up in the country looking over the Company's plantations committed to his care, she should send him intelligence of it by night or day. He said this was so that he could come down at once and stop Sodington's mad dealings. His wife did so at about one o'clock in the night. She was in danger of her life, as was proved by Mrs Easthope's evidence. The Governor came down accordingly. He at once released the sergeant from prison. The Governor said the sergeant was imprisoned only out of revenge, because during Sodington's first disturbance he and his galley [...] said they would stand by the Governor. Sodington was not satisfied with putting the sergeant in prison. He wanted him put in irons too. When Sodington came dressed into the prison himself, he would not allow the poor man to have anything under his head and ordered his bed to be taken out of the prison. The Governor also heard that Sodington imprisoned Karlslake in the dungeon for the same reason. The dungeon was used for no persons except rogues. Karlslake was an aged man of about seventy years. The Governor thought it just to refuse such a miserable storm as far as he could. Sodington could have come to him and given his reasons. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. The Governor appeared to say that Sodington was not drowned in April but was found asleep, caused by the vapours of what he drank that day before at Surf landers wedding. When the Governor came in, the drum was beating. He added that Sodington often said he could hardly come out of his cabin before eleven or twelve in the morning, because he spent so much time washing, paring his nails and dressing himself. The Governor asked who could freely wait for such a gentleman. He said that no lady in England was educated with such nicety as Sodington said he was. Seeing Sodington practise such grandeur, though the Governor did not have the happiness of knowing his family, he could only conclude that Sodington was the son of persons of quality. The Governor said such disrespectful conduct towards a Governor was directly opposed to all military laws and deserved the severest punishment. In Sodington's second paragraph, the Governor said his wife was brought into the matter. He thanked God that she happily escaped Sodington's turbulent wife [...]. She sent word to the Governor according to his directions, being almost dead, as appeared by the said [...] Interpretations The Governor's answer relied on the earlier verbal agreement. He said the compromise only held while Sodington behaved. Once Sodington relapsed, the Governor claimed the right to revive the old evidence and report the matter to the Company. The Governor used Company interest as the test of loyalty. If Sodington truly believed the Governor

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			harmed public business, he should have reported it to the Company rather than kept silence for private accommodation. This turned Sodington's own restraint into evidence of bad faith. The defence of Madame Poirier rested on emergency communication. The Governor said she was ordered to send word if disorder happened while he was away in the country inspecting Company plantations. Her night message was therefore presented as obedience to the Governor's instruction, not interference in government. The release of Sergeant Dixon and Karslake was justified as relief from unlawful severity. The Governor portrayed Sodington's imprisonments as revenge, not discipline. The removal of the sergeant's bed and the confinement of an aged man in the dungeon were used to show excessive and vindictive command. Speculations The Governor's attack on Sodington's habits of dress and rank was probably meant to ridicule his demand for honour and attendance. Sodington claimed the treatment due to a gentleman. The Governor answered by portraying his gentility as vanity that disrupted military readiness. The Governor's emphasis on his absence in the country probably answered Sodington's charge that Madame Poirier sent secret intelligence out of the fort. By saying he was inspecting the Company's plantations and had ordered her to report disorder, he turned a suspected private channel into a planned emergency warning system.
75	53	Said nurses deposition, hearing the Sould.s called So often to their Arms, and being him dead or a live and Such like, She could do no Less but to Send to her Husband for Security, Then his title of high Comandant do's appear on the Same Stage, but if the rod by which the Blacks Came out (if any went) are unknowne to him, it Cant be attributed but to his Carelefs Life/ The 3.d is but the Consequence of y.e President as he Calls it, I Answer that y.e ffort is far better fortified then ever, haveing double Mortar Walls, one of twelve foot, and the other Ten whereas there was formerly but one Sorry dry one of Six or Seven foot high, of w.ch being to Answer for being Govern.r he may Judge that I took Such measures to prevent any miscleif as Prudence Can dictate, but if Seems prevent it from within, it is in my power to be in necessity of no in power to prevent that which he did plote Long before but it is not all as he said himself, this poor Harmless Lady is as turbulent and as troublesome to M.r Sodingtons God runt, as he himself is to her Husbands, She deserves them to Answer for it, Let us then See y.e nature of her Crime and the Ground of her Indictment and Let us have it under his owne hand, But this is not y.e first time Sayes he, that Mad.m Poirier hath troubled herself w.th Govern.mt for on y.e 3.d of Sept.r Last She Comanded the Bell to be rung for prayers without my knowledge and Erelfes it is what hedoth Comp.in I Saith he, being Comandant Then doubtless 12 Jury men must be Calld Imediately or a Counsell of War which he do's e to Judge Such a high Crime, and I wonder why he missed Quoteing Some Authorety of A Tradiat. Law against her, that would advance the buisness a great deal better. But Seriously on this whole, My wife doth deny the fact, and Every body knows her child =ness, but by his Quoteing So Justly both the day and the time, Do's prove what I Said before that he do's keep Either note or Copy of what he did In passing his word, it was but a/ Now Comes in y.e Nurse, if the poor Lady be Condemned the Nurse participates of his Mallice, Against the first part of y.e Parragraph I might Justifuly and offer to do it, To give my oath that there is not one word of truth in the whole Parragraph, for y.e young	The Governor continued that the nurse's deposition showed why Madame Poirier sent for him. She heard the soldiers called so often to their arms. She also heard words such as "dead or alive" and similar expressions. She could do no less than send to her husband for security. The Governor said Sodington's title of high commandant then appeared on the same stage. If the routes by which the Blacks came out, if any did, were unknown to Sodington, this could only be attributed to his careless life. To the third point, which the Governor said followed from what Sodington called the precedent, the Governor answered that the fort was now far better fortified than ever. It had double mortar walls, one of twelve feet and the other of ten feet. Formerly, there was only one sorry dry wall, six or seven feet high. As Governor, he was answerable for the fort. He therefore judged that he took every measure which prudence could suggest to prevent mischief. The Governor said that if mischief came from within, it was not in his power to prevent everything that Sodington plotted long before. The manuscript was unclear at this point. The Governor then said that, as Sodington himself had claimed, the poor harmless lady was as turbulent and troublesome to Sodington's government as Sodington was to her husband's government. If so, she deserved to answer for it. The Governor asked to see the nature of her crime and the ground of her indictment under Sodington's own hand. Sodington had said that this was not the first time Madame Poirier troubled herself with government. He said that on 3 September 1703 she commanded the bell to be rung for prayers without his knowledge while he was commandant. The Governor answered this with sarcasm. If that was the complaint, and Sodington was commandant, then twelve jurymen or a council of war must no doubt be called at once to judge such a high crime. The Governor said he wondered why Sodington failed to quote some authority or traditional law against her, which would have advanced the business far better.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		woman being Lately delivered, that is Seven days before this Second Disturbance Could not be very much asleep, hearing as aforesaid all the fort in a Com= =motion, Roaring a Halyon after both officers and Sould.rs Needed not to be awaked by any body Else and hearing for her life became Sold like a dead body as Do's appear by the Said Nurses Declaration 2.dly As for y.e Credible pretended Information, This being not at all the Instrument (but himself) as all the world may See, by the differences betwist he and I, but I Say himself by his blind pride and ambitious thoughts to become Governour. Be this day my Last if ever I have uttered to him in my Carter this word of Sleafs, true it is, I told him that at first he Should not	Seriously, the Governor said his wife denied the fact. Everyone knew her childishness. Yet Sodington's exact quotation of both day and time proved what the Governor said before: Sodington kept either notes or copies after giving his word. The manuscript broke off at this point, but the sense was that Sodington had not kept the agreement to destroy the earlier papers. The Governor then turned to the nurse. If the poor lady was condemned, the nurse also shared in Sodington's malice. Against the first part of Sodington's paragraph, the Governor said he could justly offer his oath that there was not one word of truth in it. Madame Poirier was lately delivered of a child, only seven days before this second disturbance. She could not be very deeply asleep while the whole fort was in commotion, with shouting and hallooing after both officers and soldiers. She did not need anybody else to wake her. Hearing this, and fearing for her life, she became cold like a dead body, as appeared by the nurse's declaration. As for Sodington's pretended credible information, the Governor said Nurse Easthope was not the instrument of the trouble. Sodington himself was. This could be seen by all the world from the differences between him and the Governor. The Governor said Sodington was driven by blind pride and ambitious thoughts of becoming Governor. The Governor swore that may this be his last day if he ever spoke to Sodington in his [...] the word [...]. The manuscript was unclear at this point. He said it was true that he told Sodington at first that he should not [...] Interpretations The Governor answered Sodington's security charge by shifting blame back onto Sodington's command. If Sodington did not know how people moved through or out of the fort, the Governor treated that as negligence by the commandant, not misconduct by Madame Poirier. Control of gates, routes and watches was presented as Sodington's own duty. The description of the fort's double mortar walls served a legal and administrative purpose. The Governor used it to show that he had improved the island's defences and had acted prudently as the officer answerable for the fort. This answered Sodington's claim that secret movement through the fort endangered the island. The dispute over the prayer bell showed the Governor reducing Sodington's accusation to absurdity. Sodington framed Madame Poirier's ordering of prayers as interference in government. The Governor mocked it as if it required a jury or council of war. This was meant to show that the charge was petty and inflated. The exact dating of the prayer-bell incident was used as evidence against Sodington. The Governor argued that Sodington could only cite the day and time so precisely because he kept notes or copies after promising that earlier papers would be destroyed. This linked a minor complaint about Madame Poirier to the larger issue of Sodington's bad faith over records. Speculations The Governor's emphasis on Madame Poirier's recent childbirth was probably meant to make Sodington's accusation appear cruel as well as false. By stressing that she was only seven days delivered and frightened by armed commotion in the fort, he made her message to him look like a plea for protection, not political interference. The sarcastic call for twelve jurymen or a council of war over the prayer bell probably aimed to discredit Sodington's whole complaint by treating one charge as ridiculous. If the Company saw that one accusation was exaggerated, the Governor may have hoped the rest of Sodington's declaration would appear similarly inflated.
76	54	not Imploy three hours in Exercifeing the Sold.rs being for the most part raw and grrren men Should be brought	The Governor said he did not tell Sodington to spend three hours exercising the soldiers. Most were

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		gradually to a perfect, but as it is only an Evasion or breach, what he Sieth that the for years Excerciseing the Sold.rs being knowne to all in the Garrison that he recommended nothing more unto him but that part, as often as he Could, but as before said he is So tenderly bruided, that painfull work dont agree w.th his temper & remains a great untruth, to Speak of (what is) there are none Capable of Excerciseing but Sanderson, there is at Least Serj. Dixon, Corp.l Trapp, & one Bain, who Came over a Long w.th him, and Enough more to observe that notwithstanding his book, he do's Comit, abundance of faults in it, tho' had I faith Enough, he could fain perswade me that he hath been Master de Camp in flanders, but unhappely my faith is too weak I can't beleive it/ Now Comes in the great Cspon my good ffriend hath teach him, my Arbitrary Power, but rather, who told he bear Proceeding under the Reason of Such Arbitrary proceedings as his to bear ourageous y.e Sold.r and officers, Nay the Governour himself if he would Suffer it, Indeaavouring to murder both Sold.r W.m Renden, as it doth appear by the Depositions Sent w.th this Lying up in y.e valley going up in the Country from the Garrison without the Governours Leave (very of the drunken) Cap.t Carles for that Reason Called him very often that I dare an above the him, In Short I Should never finish if I would Speak of all his unlawfull Irregularitys, And for the Same per =mitted to appeale both to Cap.t Telley, and his officers, The Hono.able Cap.t Beauus W.m Hudson Devines, and Pasces, and besides I am Credibly Informed that both freemen and Soldiers are So much affraid of him that they Say if I dont Send him away, and he do's kill any of them as Certainly Light to my Charge being Certain that those he hath misused hath been Sick already days together, and unable of doing their duty, Let all the world Judge to See, whether this is not an Arbitrary and Tirannicall Power, to Say nothing worse/ And as for refusing him his Provisions I have told him he might not Expect any virtuals to be Sent him up in the valley but be may of bread Come to the Comp.s Table being So kend to offer him Some Sometimes in his Room but for himself only, and not for many as Sometimes he Calls in his Room but for water Deny it Unless he do's Send for Coun.l water, and when there's none, I cant help it, true it is, One night Recover =ing one of our freemens wives in his Room, whose Character, he hath from the Pertubers M.r Jones and others bring over for her a Letter, or Something Else, Sent for So many Twists of Lemonado till being bett=ten, then I Stalled the Sale and did order persons my Steward to Lock up all the doors, and to Send no man to his Room, Therefore consider =ing Such proceedings, I am forced, that I might keep Peace among all	raw and green men, and they were to be brought gradually to better skill. He said Sodington's claim was only an evasion or breach. The garrison knew that the Governor recommended nothing more often than that Sodington should exercise that part of his duty as often as he could. The Governor said again that Sodington was so tenderly bred that painful work did not suit his temper. He said it was a great untruth to claim that no one except Sanderson was capable of exercising the soldiers. At least Sergeant Dixon, Corporal Trapp and one Bain, who came over with Sodington, could do it. Others were also able. The Governor added that, despite Sodington's book, Sodington made many faults in the exercise. Sodington might try to persuade him that he was a master de camp in Flanders, but the Governor said his faith was too weak to believe it. The Governor then turned to what he called the great weapon taught to Sodington by his good friend: the charge of arbitrary power. He answered that Sodington's own conduct better deserved that name. Sodington had behaved outrageously towards soldiers and officers, and even towards the Governor himself, if the Governor would have suffered it. He had tried to murder both soldiers, including William Renden, as appeared by the depositions sent with this. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. It referred to Sodington lying up in the valley, going up into the country from the garrison without the Governor's leave and being very often drunk. Captain Carles had, for that reason, often called him [...]. The manuscript was unclear at this point. The Governor said he would never finish if he spoke of all Sodington's unlawful irregularities. The Governor said he was willing for the matter to be put to Captain Telley and his officers, the Honourable Captain Beawes, William Hudson, Devines and Pasces. He also said he was credibly informed that both freemen and soldiers were so afraid of Sodington that they said, if the Governor did not send him away and Sodington killed any of them, the death would certainly be laid to the Governor's charge. The men Sodington misused were already sick for days together and unable to do their duty. The Governor asked all the world to judge whether this was not arbitrary and tyrannical power, to say nothing worse. As for refusing Sodington provisions, the Governor said he told him that he should not expect virtuals to be sent up to him in the valley. He could come to the Company's table for bread. The Governor was kind enough to offer him some food in his room sometimes, but only for himself, not for the many people Sodington sometimes called into his room. The Governor denied refusing him water, unless Sodington sent for council water. If there was none, the Governor could not help it. The Governor said that one night, when one of the freemen's wives was recovering in Sodington's room, a woman whose character he had from the disturbers Mr Jones and others, Sodington sent over for a letter or something else for her. He also sent for many twists of lemonade until [...]. The manuscript was unclear at this point. The Governor then stopped the sale and ordered his steward to lock all the doors and send no man to Sodington's room. Because of these proceedings, the Governor said he was forced, so that he might keep peace among all [...] Interpretations The argument over exercising soldiers showed a practical dispute about military training. The Governor said the men were raw and needed gradual instruction. He accused Sodington of avoiding this duty while pretending that few men could perform it. Training,

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			rank and competence were therefore all tied to the quarrel. The Governor's attack on Sodington's claim of service in Flanders challenged his military authority. Sodington's experience was supposed to strengthen his command. The Governor used mistakes in drill and reluctance for hard work to question whether that experience was real or useful on St Helena. The charge of arbitrary power was reversed against Sodington. The Governor said true arbitrariness lay in violence towards soldiers, officers and the Governor, leaving men sick and afraid. The dispute therefore moved from formal authority to the practical effects of command on the garrison's ability to serve. The provisions dispute showed that access to the Company's table and stores was part of official discipline. The Governor did not admit starving Sodington. He said Sodington could come to the Company's table, but he would not allow food and drink to support disorderly gatherings in Sodington's room. Speculations The Governor's insistence that Sodington could eat at the Company's table but not draw provisions for others was probably meant to stop Sodington's room becoming a rival centre of sociability and command. The concern was not only food. It was the gathering of people around the Deputy Governor during an active dispute. The reference to frightened freemen and soldiers was probably used to justify removal rather than mere reprimand. The Governor argued that, if Sodington remained and killed someone, blame would fall on the Governor. This turned Sodington's violence into a risk that the Governor was obliged to manage.
77	55	all in a manner to Imprison my Self [...] [...] Rather then to have occasion to Punish him as he deserves for So many & manifest Infractions not only to one Parragraph, but of all Articles of Marttial Laws On this Acco.t I Should have not only given a Warrant to Serj. Gurling to keep him off the Guard but to Imprison him, Running away from my orders and Endeavouring to Kill a poor Corporall, who hardly Bearer of further orders from me, to bring him in his Said Chamber that I might prevent as much as Lay in my Power any further mischief And that I might w.th Ease Enjoy the Company of Cap.t Beaws, who hath Hono.r me with an Invitation on board his Shipp/ And So concluding the Answer to his Unlawfull Complaint According to his owne dictates Joe appeal and Submitt to y.e Judgem.t of our Hono.r Masters this 16 day of November 1703 ble Poirier Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 30.th day of Novemb.r 1703 Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington dp.ty Gov.r Tho: Goodwin Insigne Whereas Georgea Black Negro man belonging to Ripin Wills free plant.r haveing been Run away three days, was found in y.e House of M.r Thomson at y.e ffort valley and dureing the time y.e said negroe was absent from his Said Master a House now in y.e Pofsession of Thomas Gargen free plant.r was broke open, and Sevrall things Stolen out of two Chests, that was broke open, viz.t one pair of Sheets three Napkins one Sable Cloth, three Shirts, two Neckcloths, one Standwoth?ee	The Governor said he was forced, almost as if imprisoning himself [...], rather than giving himself occasion to punish Sodington as he deserved for so many clear breaches. These were not only breaches of one paragraph but of all the articles of martial law. For that reason, the Governor said he should have given Sergeant Gurling a warrant not only to keep Sodington off the guard but also to imprison him. Sodington ran away from the Governor's orders and tried to kill a poor corporal, who was only carrying further orders from the Governor to bring Sodington to his chamber. The Governor said this was done so that he could prevent further mischief as much as lay in his power, and so that he could freely accept Captain Beawes's invitation to go on board his ship. The Governor concluded his answer to Sodington's unlawful complaint. Following Sodington's own appeal, he submitted the matter to the judgment of the Honourable Company. Stephen Poirier signed on 16 November 1703. At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 30 November 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, were present. George, a Black Negro man belonging to Ripin Wills, free planter, ran away for three days. He was found in Mr Thomson's house in Fort Valley. During the time George was absent from his master, a house now in the possession of Thomas Gargen, free planter, was broken open. Several things were stolen out of two chests, which were also broken open. The stolen items were one pair of sheets, three napkins, one tablecloth, three shirts, two neckcloths and one standwoth?ee. Interpretations The Governor's closing answer framed restraint as a deliberate choice. He said he had grounds to imprison Sodington more severely, but instead limited him to

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			keep peace and prevent further disorder. This presented the Governor as controlled, while casting Sodington as the source of military breach and violence. The reference to submitting the dispute to the Honourable Company showed that the local quarrel now moved beyond St Helena. Both officers' claims were being placed before the Company, which held final authority over appointments, discipline and interpretation of their powers. George's flight from Ripin Wills's household was immediately linked to a burglary in another planter's house. The timing made his absence suspicious, even before the later evidence was heard. The case showed how a runaway Black man was treated as a security risk to property across the settlement. The broken chests mattered because the offence was not only entry into a house. Locked or stored goods were forced open and household linens and clothing were taken. These were portable goods that could be hidden, used or exchanged.
78	56	Handkerchef one Knot of Blew Ribbin a little Sugar, and Some ring And true dollars and a half oth, and a peice of Gold, Eated avenetion and a Smale Cane, which 8 three Last particulars Belonged to M.r [...] Gun.r Le mate, who Quarters at y.e Said Tho: Gargons house The Said Negro being Imprisoned till this day was Examined who denied the fact, and Saith that he found the aforesaid Knott of Ribban and Cane at y.e back door of Said house, which he Carried with him into the Said Hemonsss house, where he Crept in at a Window and Confesses that the Cute y.e Lock off of y.e Said Hemonsss Chest, and took a little Hogs Lard & Sugar It is ordered That the decision of this matter be referred to y.e Jury at y.e next Sessions, there appearing no Sufficient proof against the Said Negroes breaking open the Said Gargens house Jn.o Nichols free Plant.r Came to y.e Governo.r Last week and desired that a Warr.t might Issued out for the Sumonsting Richard Alexander, and a Black man of his to give Evidence about an Iron Kettle that he is Informed was Lately found buried in Rich. Swallows Plantacon, formerly James Riders w.ch is Said Kettle he Suspect is y.e Same as was Stolen out of Powels valley, w.ch he bought of Thomas Hone, a little before he went off, at which time it was Suspected that y.e Said Rider, or Some of his Blacks, fetcht away from a place in P. valley where the Said Hone used to bly his Salt etc And accord[ing]ly the Said Rich Alexander appeared and gave his Evidence as followeth/ Richard Alexander free plant.r Saith that when he Lived a.t y.e Said James Riders house he heard a Black Wench of his Pearmed Tenny Say, that her master bid her fetch an Iron Kettle from out of Powels valley, and hide it in y.e Ground amongst the Red wood trees, And that she has often told his Black Jack the Same, as he Says It is ordered That the said Jn.o Nichols go to Richard Swallows, and demand the Kettle that was found in his ground, and Cause the Same to be brought before Governo.r and Coun.l which if it is his, he Shall have it without any further trouble, and he to pay the Charges of Councill/ + Whereas	A handkerchief, one knot of blue ribbon, a little sugar, some rings, two dollars and a half, a piece of gold, a Venetian [...], and a small cane were also stolen. The three last particulars belonged to Mr [...], gunner and [...] mate, who quartered at Thomas Gargen's house. George was imprisoned until this day. He was examined and denied the offence. He said he found the knot of ribbon and the cane at the back door of the house. He carried them with him into John Hemonss's house, where he crept in at a window. He confessed that he cut the lock off Hemonss's chest and took a little hog's lard and sugar. The matter was referred to the jury at the next sessions. There was not enough proof that George broke open Gargen's house. John Nichols, free planter, came to the Governor last week. He asked for a warrant to summon Richard Alexander and one of Alexander's Black men to give evidence about an iron kettle. Nichols was informed that the kettle was lately found buried in Richard Swallow's plantation, formerly James Rider's. He suspected it was the same kettle that was stolen out of Powell's Valley. Nichols bought it from Thomas Hone shortly before Hone left the island. At that time, James Rider, or some of Rider's Blacks, was suspected of taking it away from a place in Powell's Valley where Hone used to boil his salt. Richard Alexander appeared and gave his evidence. Richard Alexander, free planter, said that when he lived at James Rider's house, he heard Rider's Black woman, named Tenny, say that her master told her to fetch an iron kettle from Powell's Valley and hide it in the ground among the redwood trees. She often told Alexander's Black Jack the same thing, as Jack said. John Nichols was ordered to go to Richard Swallow's plantation and demand the kettle found in his ground. He was to have it brought before the Governor and Council. If it was his, he was to have it without further trouble. Nichols was to pay the charges of council. Interpretations The case against George showed the council separating suspicion from proof. His running away and possession of some stolen items made him suspect. Yet the council still referred the burglary at Gargen's house to a jury because proof of breaking that house was not strong enough. George's confession to entering John Hemonss's house and cutting the lock from a chest was a separate offence from the Gargen burglary. The council recorded what he admitted but did not use it as full proof of the other housebreaking. This distinction

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			mattered in a case where a runaway Black man was easily suspected of several thefts. The kettle dispute showed how stolen property could remain traceable through memory, slave testimony and land use. The suspected kettle was said to be buried in a plantation that changed hands. Recovering it required council authority, witness evidence and physical production of the object before ownership could be judged. The evidence about Tenny showed slave knowledge being used indirectly. Richard Alexander reported what Rider's Black woman said, and what Alexander's Black Jack repeated. The council used this as grounds to recover the kettle, even though the statement passed through household dependants rather than through the alleged actor herself.
79	57	Whereas Joseph Fox monthof was Comitted in prison, for his making a bargain w.th Samuell Duston Sold.r to give him Some Powder for a Pint of Arrack, who being bayled till this day was brought before us by his Suretys, and being Examined, denyed that ever he promised the Said Duston any Powder for y.e Arrack but that he gave it him freely who drank part of it, but y.e Said Duston Conforming him to his face/ It is ordered. Shall the Said Joseph ffox and Sam: Duston do both Ride the wooden Horse w.th a 12 Shott at Each Legg, and the Said ffox discharged from Acting as a monthof, and to do Centinalls duty as he did before/ Whereas Thomas Marley, and Thomas Mercer Sold.r when on duty Last at Bankses ffort Imbarsd part of a House of Powder, for which. It is ordered That the Said Marley and Mercer Ride the wooden Horse next Relief day of the Guard w.th a Cannon Shott at Each Legg/ M.r Carnes affidavit about Cap.t Sodington dp.ty Gover.r and Sam DesFountain Whereas being Sumoned by y.e Govern.rs Warrant at the Request of Cap.t Sodington dp.ty Gover.r to give my affidavit Concerning Some words Sposakery [thro] [...] [...] Plantation house [bet]ween the Lieut and M.r [Sam] DesFountain do hereby Declare Cap.t Sodington on friday the 17.th of Sept.br Came to visit me at my Plantation house where finding me prepared to go to y.e ffort desired I would Accompany him to W.r Francis partly in y.e way [view] =ing the Hono. Comp.s Plantation Cap.t Sodington called in at y.e Plantacon house, where M.r DesFountain their Reeve was at that time	Joseph Fox, monthof, was committed to prison for making a bargain with Samuel Duston, soldier, to give him some powder for a pint of arrack. Fox was bailed until this day and was brought before the council by his sureties. When examined, Fox denied that he ever promised Duston any powder for the arrack. He said Duston gave it to him freely and that he drank part of it. Duston contradicted him to his face. Joseph Fox and Samuel Duston were both ordered to ride the wooden horse with a twelve-pound shot at each leg. Fox was discharged from acting as monthof and was ordered to do sentinel duty as he did before. Thomas Marley and Thomas Mercer, soldiers, embarrassed part of a house of powder while on duty last at Banks's Fort. Marley and Mercer were ordered to ride the wooden horse on the next relief day of the guard, with a cannon shot at each leg. Mr Carne was summoned by the Governor's warrant at Captain Sodington's request. He was asked to give an affidavit about words spoken [...] at the Company's plantation house between the Lieutenant and Mr Samuel DesFountain. Mr Carne declared that Captain Sodington came to visit him at his plantation house on Friday, 17 September 1703. Carne was preparing to go to the fort. Sodington asked him to accompany him to Mr Francis's house and partly on the way to view the Honourable Company's plantation. Sodington called at the plantation house, where Mr DesFountain, the reeve, was at that time. Interpretations The powder-for-arrack case showed powder being treated as a controlled military resource. Even the promise or bargain of powder for drink was punished by corporal discipline. Fox's loss of the monthof role also removed him from a position of trust and returned him to ordinary sentinel duty. The wooden horse punishment linked the powder cases to military discipline rather than ordinary debt or trade. Fox, Duston, Marley and Mercer were all punished through a public guard punishment. The aim was to deter misuse of powder in a wartime garrison. The reference to a "house of powder" at Banks's Fort showed that the offence concerned stored ammunition at a defensive post. The manuscript did not make clear exactly what Marley and Mercer did to it, but the council treated the damage or misuse as serious enough for punishment. Carne's affidavit was taken at Sodington's request. This showed that Sodington was gathering evidence for his own defence or counter-complaint. The plantation house setting also mattered because it placed the dispute outside Fort James, in the Company's working estate, where DesFountain held an official supervisory role as reeve.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
80	58	time, after Some minuts Stay Cap.t Sodington desired the aforesaid Desfountain to tell him what Conveniencies for Lodging there was in Said House, And particular where his appartement, M.r DesFountain Replyed he was Ready to Show his bed that other appartement were under the Governo.rs Care being his Lodging Rooms in y.e [...]too, Cap.t Sodington W.r DesFountain asked I went up to his Chamber where the Said hotton, Demanded the Reason why DesFontaine was not there the Last Sunday (being the first time of his Comeing into the Country) telling him he could not be Ignorant of his Comeing because he know what provisions was order.d Acting in Some Sort of Reason, he thought it his duty (and the other ought to be Sensible of it) to attend any of the Councill at Such times as he under =Stood of their Comeing, DesFountain Reply was, It was his Contract with the Governo.r (or for Govern.mt) to the Contrary he haveing the Liberty Every Saturday to Repair to his own Plantation and Constantly the Govern.r demanded those before he was whether the Govern.rs Company DesFountain Answered the Comp.s and using the Good Service to them Saying none Capable of performing an order ed by night, or day So much as himself who oft told him he was not Long Since a Soldier but now I Sworn to that height there was no Speaking to him And that he need not trouble himself there were other Sevr.s might be found to do the Comp.s buisness, and that everything Matters either Should (or would) be regulated, DesFountain to that, Said only, I was Ready to be discharged when the Government thought Convenient, And that it was better So to be then not permitted to Eat a peice of Yam with his family once a week, then all was cooled only ordered of the Dyly about butter, which M.r DesFountain Stoffeered him by telling him there was Enough but it was at the Governo.rs order to be disposed of (or Sent to the fort) and not to be Delivered to any body without his order, Also pairing the Dpty Gov.r told M.r DesFountain it was only an Idle word he uttered owne the Last Sunday M.r DesFountains Carriage was very Civill, and words themselves and did not hear the Dpty Give him any Scurrilous or abusive Language being not Expecting So Strict an Inquisi =tion to censure thought frivolous and being Merrely disposd both at M.r ffrancis and att the fort might make matters of Same of Little Consequence Slip my memory, and Certainly men must keep Little memory, if obleeged to bur then their memory with other persons concerns, When it was reflected that DesFountain walkt with he discoursed with the Dpty Govern.r I will tell Cap.t Sodington that he was a Stranger to those ways and that I did believe DesFountain designed no disrespect to him, of which the Said M.r Carne made oath to this 1.st Day of December 1703 George Carne	After a few minutes' stay, Captain Sodington asked Samuel DesFountain what lodging was available in the plantation house, and in particular where Sodington's apartment was. DesFountain answered that he was ready to show his own bed. The other apartments were under the Governor's care, because they were the Governor's lodging rooms in the [...]. Sodington and DesFountain went up to DesFountain's chamber. There Sodington asked why DesFountain was not there the previous Sunday, which was the first time Sodington came into the country. Sodington told him he could not be ignorant of his coming, because he knew what provisions were ordered. Sodington thought it was DesFountain's duty, and that DesFountain ought to know it, to attend any member of council when he knew they were coming. DesFountain answered that his contract with the Governor, or with the Government, allowed otherwise. He had liberty every Saturday to go to his own plantation. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. DesFountain said that the Governor constantly demanded [...] before he was [...]. Sodington asked whether DesFountain belonged to the Governor's company. DesFountain answered that he belonged to the Company, and said he did them good service. He said nobody was as capable as he was of carrying out an order by night or day. Sodington told him that he was not long since a soldier, but had now risen to such a height that there was no speaking to him. He said DesFountain did not need to trouble himself, because other servants could be found to do the Company's business. He also said that all matters should, or would, be regulated. DesFountain answered only that he was ready to be discharged whenever the Government thought fit. He said it was better to be discharged than not to be allowed to eat a piece of yam with his family once a week. After this, the matter cooled. The only further order concerned butter. DesFountain answered Sodington by saying that there was enough butter, but it was to be disposed of at the Governor's order, or sent to the fort. It was not to be delivered to anyone without the Governor's order. When they parted, the Deputy Governor told DesFountain that what he said the previous Sunday was only an idle word. Mr Carne said DesFountain's behaviour was very civil. The words themselves were civil. Carne did not hear the Deputy Governor use any scurrilous or abusive language to him. Carne said he did not expect so strict an inquiry into what he thought frivolous. He was not disposed to remember every small matter said at Mr Francis's house and at the fort. Some matters of little consequence may have slipped his memory. He said men would need a large memory if they were obliged to burden it with other persons' concerns. When it was later reflected that DesFountain walked with and spoke with the Deputy Governor, Carne said he told Captain Sodington that Sodington was a stranger to those ways, and that he believed DesFountain meant no disrespect to him. George Carne swore this on 1 December 1703. Interpretations The dispute at the plantation house turned on whether DesFountain served the Company directly or was personally answerable to visiting council members. Sodington expected attendance because of his rank. DesFountain answered from the terms of his service and from the Governor's control over the plantation house and its stores. The butter order showed how Company provisions were controlled through the Governor. DesFountain

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			refused to deliver butter without the Governor's order, even to the Deputy Governor. This made the plantation house part of the Governor's supply system rather than an open store for any senior officer. DesFountain's answer about visiting his own plantation once a week showed the labour bargain behind his office. His service to the Company was not total personal attendance. It included a defined liberty to see his own household and plantation. Carne's affidavit was cautious. He did not support a charge of abusive language by Sodington. Instead, he described a tense but mostly civil exchange and explained that some small details may have escaped him. This made his evidence useful as a limit on the accusation rather than as a full defence of either side.
81	59	The Governo.r Says he dont know to what purpose M.r Carne hath been Sumon.d Since what was Said against DesFountain was the Sunday following (as nigh as he Can Remember) his Declaration haveing been torne out of y.e Councill book by the Said Cap.t Sodington Cant be positive note what was the Contents of it, but will Swear that th[e] S.d Cap.t Sodington did own it at the first hearing in y.e Hall, and Added he was Sorry he did not Care him/ M.r Carne presented a Petition to us on behalf of himself and others Setting forth therein, that they desired the Wart.s which was Directed out for the measuring of a parcell of y.e Rt Hono. Comp.s Wast Land to James Easthope, might be Suspended, that Land being the Place where their Hoggs and Goats Grazed, which if Lett to any other Person would be very Detrimentall to them And after Severall Debates on this Matter Cap.t Sodington and M.r Goodwin were of opinion that the said Petition ought to be Sent to y.e Said Rt Hono. Comp.s/ But the Govern.rs opinion is, that its needless to Send the Said Petition to y.e Said Rt Hono. ble Comp.s Since the Said Land is measured and the Said Easthope in possession thereof/ November y.e 30.th 1703 Cap.t Sodington desired that the Governo.r and Rest of Councill would give him from under their hands that he hath had nothing of y.e Hono. ble Comp.s in his Charge Since he Came to y.e Island, which we Accordingly do, As Witnefs our hands But y.e Governour Says that the Said Cap.t Sodington hath Answered more particular order from y.e Said Hono.ble Comp.s than what Cap.t Bright & Cap.t Soulis Did, that is, to be Dputy thearor, and Look of their Customs/	The Governor said he did not know why Mr Carne was summoned, since what was said against DesFountain was on the following Sunday, as nearly as he could remember. The declaration was torn out of the council book by Captain Sodington, so the Governor could not be positive about its contents. Even so, he would swear that Captain Sodington admitted it at the first hearing in the hall and added that he was sorry he did not [...] him. Mr Carne presented a petition on behalf of himself and others. They asked that the warrants issued for measuring a parcel of the Right Honourable Company's waste land to James Easthope be suspended. They said the land was the place where their hogs and goats grazed. If it was let to any other person, it would be very harmful to them. After several debates, Captain Sodington and Mr Goodwin gave their opinion that the petition should be sent to the Right Honourable Company. The Governor's opinion was that there was no need to send the petition to the Right Honourable Company, since the land was already measured and Easthope was already in possession. On 30 November 1703, Captain Sodington asked that the Governor and the rest of the council give him a written statement under their hands that he had nothing belonging to the Honourable Company in his charge since he came to the island. This was done, as witnessed by their hands. The Governor said that Captain Sodington answered a more particular order from the Honourable Company than Captain Bright and Captain Soulis did. The order was to be Deputy Treasurer and to look after their customs. Interpretations The Governor's comment about the torn declaration showed again how the damaged council book weakened proof. He could remember the substance and swear that Sodington admitted the matter, but the exact contents were no longer secure because the record was removed. The petition over waste land showed a conflict between informal grazing use and formal Company letting. Carne and the other petitioners treated the land as important to their hogs and goats. The Governor treated the matter as already settled because the land was measured and Easthope held possession. Sodington and Goodwin's view would have moved the land dispute to the Company in England. The Governor's view kept it within the island's completed administrative action. This showed a difference over whether local grants of Company land could still be questioned after possession was given. Sodington's request for a written certificate showed concern over responsibility for Company property or office. He wanted a record that no Company goods were in his charge. The Governor narrowed or challenged that by saying Sodington did hold a specific Company role as Deputy Treasurer and in customs.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
82	60	Whereas Cap.t Sodington unjustly told me, I could not prove the things alledg.d in my Answer dated the 16.th of Novemb.r Last when when it is done w.th the Same injustice, reproached me Even a Tues day Last, In Saying I took Clandestinely the affidavits of persons (against whom he was in a Rage also) who Did not deny me Such Justice, Although as Justice of the peace ought to take affidav.t when persons are at hand, it being a hard matter to find them at any time, being up and Downe without my knowledge which affidavits was taken by the Clerk Recorded in y.e Councill Book, with Coppys delivered to him, but to Satisfy him as much as Lies in my power, Have Sumoned this day, those persons w.ch gave the true affidavits to appear before him, that they might Confirm y.e truth of what was Declar.d before to his face which Serj. Dixon, Mary Easthope, Karlake & none Else/ And Acordingly the Said M.r Sodington fearing aft.r being Sent for by the Governo.r and Said that he could not Stay to hear what the abovesaid persons hath given their affidavits of who offered by y.e Said Govern.r to him Severall times So he went his way, Whereupon the Govern.r Sent for M.r Geo: Young Surgion and M.r Jn.o French Gun.r to hear the Said affidavits read, that y.e Said Cap.t Sodington might not allede any further injustice Witnefs our hand the day and year first above written George Young Jn.o French Whereas M.r Jn.o ffrench Gunner made oath before the Governour That William ffield Gent: of y.e Arms had Struck him, and moreover threatened to have his Life wherefore desired that the said ffield might be bound over to the Peace	Captain Sodington unjustly told the Governor that the matters alleged in the Governor's answer of 16 November 1703 could not be proved. The Governor said Sodington again reproached him on the previous Tuesday, with the same injustice, by saying that he took affidavits secretly from persons against whom Sodington was also in a rage. The Governor answered that, as a justice of the peace, he ought to take affidavits when people were available. It was hard to find them at any other time, since they were up and down without his knowledge. The affidavits were taken by the clerk, recorded in the council book and copies were delivered to Sodington. To satisfy Sodington as far as he could, the Governor summoned those who gave the true affidavits to appear before him this day. They were to confirm to Sodington's face the truth of what was declared before. The persons summoned were Sergeant Dixon, Mary Easthope, Karlake and no others. Sodington was sent for by the Governor. He said he could not stay to hear what the above persons gave in their affidavits, although the Governor offered this to him several times. Sodington then went away. The Governor sent for Mr George Young, surgeon, and Mr John French, gunner, to hear the affidavits read. This was done so that Sodington could not allege any further injustice. George Young and John French signed as witnesses. Mr John French, gunner, swore before the Governor that William Field, gentleman of the arms, struck him. French also swore that Field threatened to take his life. He therefore asked that Field be bound over to the peace. Interpretations The Governor presented the renewed reading of affidavits as a safeguard against Sodington's complaint of secret evidence. Witnesses were called to confirm their earlier statements in Sodington's presence. When Sodington refused to stay, the Governor brought in Young and French as witnesses to the procedure. This protected the record from another charge of unfairness. The passage showed how affidavit-taking worked in practice on the island. The Governor claimed authority as a justice of the peace to take sworn statements when witnesses were available. The clerk recorded them in the council book and copies were given to the accused officer. This made written testimony part of the formal machinery of local government. Sodington's refusal to hear the affidavits weakened his own complaint. He had accused the Governor of unfair procedure, but then left when the witnesses were offered to him face to face. The Governor used that refusal to show that the opportunity for answer was given. The complaint by John French against William Field moved from assault to surety of the peace. French did not only say he was struck. He also said his life was threatened. Binding Field over would make him legally answerable for keeping the peace and would give a formal restraint against further violence.
83	61	It is accordingly ordered. That the Said William Child be Comitted to Prison or Else to give Sufficient Bayle for his good behaviour till next Quarterly Sessions/ The Said William Child Acordingly Produced for his Loose Suretys, Jn.o Alexander, and Richard Alexander his brother who were Excepted of and Entered in a Recognizance as followeth. Wee do hereby Enter into Recognizance That y.e above named Will.m Child Shall keep the Peace of our Sovereign Lady Queen Ann towards all her Subjects,	William Child was ordered to be committed to prison unless he gave sufficient bail for his good behaviour until the next quarterly sessions. William Child then produced John Alexander and Richard Alexander, his brother, as his sureties. They were accepted and entered into a recognisance. John Alexander and Richard Alexander bound themselves that William Child would keep the peace of Queen Anne towards all her subjects, and especially towards John French, until the next council day. The

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		and Especially towards y.e abovesaid Jn.o French till Liege People the Next Councill day upon y.e Pennalty of one Hundred Pounds payable to y.e R.t Hono. ble Comp.s, In witness whereof we the aforesaid Jn.o Alexander and Rich. Alexand. have hereunto Sett our hands the day and year here first above written/ Jn.o Alexander Rich. Alexander [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	penalty was £100 0s 0d, payable to the Right Honourable Company. John Alexander and Richard Alexander signed the recognisance. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. Interpretations The order used surety of the peace as an alternative to prison. William Child avoided confinement only because two men stood bound for his behaviour. This turned the threat against John French into a financial obligation backed by named sureties. The recognisance placed the penalty on the sureties as well as on Child's conduct. John Alexander and Richard Alexander risked £100 0s 0d if Child broke the peace. Their bond gave them a direct interest in restraining him until the next council day. The wording protected all Queen Anne's subjects but named John French in particular. This made the order general in law but targeted in practice. The immediate purpose was to prevent further violence against the man who swore that he was struck and threatened.
84	62	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 14.th day of Decemb.r 1703 Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Governo.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington dp.ty Govern.r Tho: Goodwin Insign.e Whereas on Thursday the 9.th Instant Gun.r ffrench Came to the Govern.r and made oath that he hath had a Sword Stolen from out of his Room and going into the Smiths Shop on the day aforesaid Saw of his Stood there and asked the Smith how he Came by it, made answer th[at] William Child brought it there in a Reel including to be put on a Sword and y.t was on to be dismounted upon which I went and askt the Said Child where he gott y.e said Sword, who Instead of giving a Civill answer Laid hands of the Said french and Swore he would Do him a mischief; whereupon (after a short Examination) the Said Child was bound over to the Behav.t till this day who being now present was askt how he Came by y.e Said Sword who made answer he found it in a Samphire Bush, on the West Battery. It is ordered That the Said Will. Child return the Said Gun.r ffrench his Sword againe and pay him as a fine the Sume of three Dollars, and forbidden to Strike or threaten the Said french on paine of Suffering Severe punnishment; And that his bayle be now discharged The Governour and Cap.t Sodington haveing Some words about a Shirt threadening Sam.l Desfountaine the Companies Reeve, denyed what he had said wherefore the Govern.r Sworn the persons hereafter Named to declare what they heard y.e Said Cap.t Sodington Say	At St Helena, a consultation was held at Fort James on Tuesday, 14 December 1703. Stephen Poirier, Governor and President, Colonel Sodington, Deputy Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, were present. On Thursday, 9 December 1703, Gunner French came to the Governor and swore that a sword was stolen from his room. On the same day, French went into the smith's shop and saw his sword standing there. He asked the smith how he came by it. The smith answered that William Child brought it there in a reel [...], to be put on a sword, and that [...] was to be dismounted. French then went and asked Child where he got the sword. Instead of giving a civil answer, Child laid hands on French and swore that he would do him a mischief. After a short examination, Child was bound over to his good behaviour until this day. Child was now present. He was asked how he came by the sword. He answered that he found it in a samphire bush on the west battery. William Child was ordered to return Gunner French's sword to him. He was also ordered to pay French three dollars as a fine. Child was forbidden to strike or threaten French again, on pain of severe punishment. His bail was discharged. The Governor and Captain Sodington exchanged words about a shirt. Samuel DesFountaine, the Company's reeve, was threatened. Sodington denied what he said. The Governor therefore swore the persons named afterwards to declare what they heard Captain Sodington say. Interpretations The sword case showed how possession of a weapon raised suspicion even when theft was denied. Child claimed he found the sword in a samphire bush, but he was still ordered to return it and pay French three dollars. His assault and threat against French made the matter more serious than mere disputed possession. Binding Child over to his good behaviour gave temporary control before the council hearing. Once judgment was given, the bail was discharged. The process moved from surety, to appearance, to order and release of the sureties. The new dispute about Sodington again turned on spoken threats and sworn proof. The Governor did not rely only on his own account. He ordered witnesses to declare what they heard, so Sodington's denial could be tested through evidence.
85	63	Thomas Dixon Serj.t Sworne Saith that after he had given in his Declaration against Cap.t Sodington heard	Thomas Dixon, sergeant, was sworn. He said that after he gave in his declaration against Captain

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		him Say thus, I wish I had broke Desfountains head for it was no more than what he deserved, and was Sorry he did not break open the doors and Called the Said Desfountain Rogue Ho Sayes the Govern.r he is an honest man/ Jn.o Alexander Clerk being desired to give his affidavit declares upon oath That he heard Cap.t Sodington at the time abovesaid Say he was Sorry he did not Care DesFountaine, (or break his head) but which of the two cant possitively Say which is all he Can Remember being whisper a misterely at the Coun.l board/ I protest against the oaths as not Legally taken being by the Govern.r and in a cause where DesFountaine never made Complaint, but it's the Governours Doable Ambition to Show himself Servicable to his Dear Friend DesFountaine Cor: Sodington Whereas upon the request of M.r Cor: Sodington Dp.ty Governo.r Several persons viz.t George Hoskison, Jn.o Long, James Draper William Beale free planters, and Tho: Sanderson Serj.t was Sumon.d to appear this day before Goverin.r and Councill, who Acordingly did But the Said Cap.t Sodington declared that he had nothing to offer to them, So they were dismist however free to demand their fee being Sumoned by his desire as doth appear by Jn.o Alexanders Declaration hereafter/ Cornelius Sodington do declare I did desire these persons to be Sumoned on the 4.th of this Instant as I did in November about the middle and for the neglect of their not Appearing I have declared against the Said Govern.r But never did desire them to be Sumoned on this 14 of December I therefore do[e] against this above written protest, as wittnefs my hand Cor: Sodington I th.t Att the Govern.rs Request, Doe hereby declare that on the 6 or 7 of this Instant Cap.t Sodington dp.ty Governo.r aske me whether or no the Govern.r had given a Warr.t out for y.e Sumoning the before mentioned Persons he requested Sept Councill day might [...] appear the Councill day following being this 14 day of Dec. I answered him no not as I knew of, So I Should write one Imediately who Acordingly did, and Carried it to y.e Governo.r to be Sign'd which I did, and Delivered it to the Marshall the day after, all which is to the beft of my Remembrance truth, as Witness my hand Jn.o Alexander	Sodington, he heard Sodington say, "I wish I had broken DesFountain's head, for it was no more than he deserved." Sodington also said he was sorry he did not break open the doors. He called DesFountain a rogue. The Governor said DesFountain was an honest man. John Alexander, clerk, was asked to give his affidavit. He swore that, at the same time, he heard Captain Sodington say he was sorry he did not [...] DesFountain, or break his head. Alexander could not say positively which of those two phrases was used. This was all he could remember, because it was spoken as a whisper or mutter at the council board. Sodington protested against the oaths. He said they were not legally taken because they were taken by the Governor in a cause where DesFountain made no complaint. He said this was only the Governor's double ambition to show himself serviceable to his dear friend DesFountain. At Sodington's request, several persons were summoned to appear before the Governor and Council that day. They were George Hoskison, John Long, James Draper, William Beale, free planters, and Thomas Sanderson, sergeant. They appeared as ordered. Sodington then declared that he had nothing to offer to them. They were dismissed, but remained free to demand their fees because they were summoned at Sodington's desire, as appeared by John Alexander's declaration. Sodington declared that he asked for those persons to be summoned on 4 December 1703, as he also did about the middle of November. Because they did not then appear, he declared against the Governor. He said he never asked for them to be summoned on 14 December 1703. He therefore protested against what was written above. Cornelius Sodington signed. At the Governor's request, John Alexander declared that on 6 or 7 December 1703, Captain Sodington asked him whether the Governor issued a warrant to summon the persons already named. Sodington had asked that they appear the next council day, which was 14 December 1703. Alexander answered that, as far as he knew, no warrant was issued. He then wrote one immediately, carried it to the Governor to be signed, and delivered it to the marshal the next day. This was true to the best of his memory. John Alexander signed. Interpretations The evidence about DesFountain again turned Sodington's words into a question of threat and intent. Dixon gave the stronger version, saying Sodington wished he had broken DesFountain's head. Alexander supported the substance but marked uncertainty over the exact phrase. This preserved the difference between clear evidence and imperfect memory. Sodington's protest challenged the Governor's authority to take oaths in a matter where DesFountain did not complain himself. This was part of the wider procedural struggle. Sodington tried to cast the evidence as the Governor's private campaign rather than a proper council matter. The dispute over the summonses showed how witness procedure itself became contested. Sodington said he asked for the men earlier but not for that day. Alexander's declaration placed the request close to the 14 December council day and explained how the warrant was written, signed and delivered. The issue was not the witnesses' evidence, since Sodington offered none, but who caused their attendance and who should bear the cost. Speculations Sodington's refusal to examine the summoned witnesses was probably tactical. He earlier complained that they were not produced, but when they appeared he said he had nothing to offer. That let him maintain a

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			protest over procedure without risking testimony that might not support him.
86	64	William Beale free planter made Complaint That Henry Coales his father in Law's hoggs hath done much Damage in his Plantation, wherefore desires that the Said Coales may make good the Said Damages and to take Some Care to his Said hoggs to hinder any further Damages/ It is ordered. That y.e decision of the Said Beals Complaint be Referred till this day fortnight, and in the mean time a Warrant Shall be delivered to Ripin Wills and Jn.o [Pridge] to view the Said Damages According to the Said Beale and Coales request, and Likewise of S.d Beales fence and then relate y.e Same to Govern. and Council George Hoskison free planter petitioned that we would be pleased to high have by way of Lefse a parcell of the R.t Hono.ble Comp.s Wast Land Lying between the Land of Edw.d Beale orphan, & W.m Childs and [...] Cowdle. It is ordered That the Said George Hoskisons request be granted and that a Warrant be delivered to the Surveyor for measureing the Same/ Whereas M.r Corn: Sodington dpty Govern.r did this day pray to the Governour pretending Comp.t against Philip Karslake, and Thomas Dixon Serj. and aft.r the Governour had peruse it, found the date to be the 30 of Sep.r Last, & to the Said Governour thinking it was a mistake in y.e the date Cant easily for him to Recolect y.e Said date as it Should be Considering of how will guilty done, it would be Certainly y.e Said Govern.l Action of of Such Soon writers be taring the Said Governours declaration against him, out of the ffouled book But instead of y.e Said Sodington rectifying the Sense date he Run away from out of y.e Hall which proves his Examp.s falsehood and Bare Actions; w.ch was done in the presence of us the Subscribers Jn.o [...] W.m Alexander Matt: Garettt William Child Henry Coales And consequently The Governour declares he wont Accept of Said Complaint being for the reasons abovesaid void of it Self.	William Beale, free planter, complained that the hogs of Henry Coales, his father-in-law, caused much damage in his plantation. He asked that Coales make good the damage and take care of his hogs so that no further damage was done. The decision on Beale's complaint was deferred for a fortnight. In the meantime, a warrant was to be delivered to Ripin Wills and John [Pridge]. They were to view the damage, as Beale and Coales requested. They were also to view Beale's fence and report back to the Governor and Council. George Hoskison, free planter, petitioned for a lease of a parcel of the Right Honourable Company's waste land. The land lay between the land of Edward Beale, orphan, William Child's land and [...] Cowdle. Hoskison's request was granted. A warrant was to be delivered to the surveyor to measure the land. Mr Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor, presented a complaint that day to the Governor. It was said to be against Philip Karslake and Thomas Dixon, sergeant. After the Governor read it, he found that it was dated 30 September last. The Governor thought the date was a mistake. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. It seemed to say that Sodington could not easily recollect the proper date, given what had been done. The Governor took this to show the same conduct already seen when Sodington tore the Governor's declaration against him out of the foul book. Instead of correcting the date and sense, Sodington ran away out of the hall. The Governor said this proved his falsehood and bare actions. This was done in the presence of the subscribers. John [...] signed. William Alexander signed. Matthew Garettt signed. William Child signed. Henry Coales signed. The Governor therefore declared that he would not accept the complaint. For the reasons stated above, it was void in itself. Interpretations The hog-damage complaint showed how livestock disputes were handled through inspection before judgment. Beale's fence was to be viewed as well as the damage. This mattered because liability could depend on whether Coales's hogs were badly kept or Beale's enclosure was insufficient. The waste-land lease request showed the council continuing to turn Company land into measured holdings. Hoskison's petition was granted only after the parcel was identified by neighbouring properties and sent to the surveyor. Measurement gave the lease a defined legal shape. The rejected Sodington complaint showed how dates and written form mattered in council procedure. The Governor treated the wrong date as more than a clerical error because it concerned an already contested dispute and damaged records. Sodington's refusal to correct it allowed the Governor to reject the paper as void.
87	65	December y.e 14.th 1703 Walter Morris Sworne Saith that Some time Last his Brother in Law Rich. Gurling met him in y.e valley a litle below M.r Carnes Plantation, and told him y.e Said M.r Carne could Speak w.th him, this deponent Replied for what Cane Says he, would write against the Letting the Land that James Easthope desired to hire of y.e Comp.s, This Said Depo.t made answer, what Should I Sygne it for, I Shall have no occasion to fetch wood there, the Said Rich. Gurling made answer, if you have	On 14 December 1703, Walter Morris was sworn. He said that some time before, his brother-in-law Richard Gurling met him in the valley, a little below Mr Carne's plantation. Gurling told him that Mr Carne wished to speak with him. Morris asked why. Gurling said Carne wanted him to write against the letting of the land which James Easthope wanted to hire from the Company. Morris answered, "What should I sign it for? I shall have no occasion to fetch wood there." Richard Gurling

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		not now you may have for words to this purpose, and after Some few words more this past, the Said Rich. Gurling went up afore the M.r Carnes house, who had but just Entered y.e house before M.r Carne came into his yard and Called to me this Depo.t to Come up to his house, who I did, and when I went in S.d house, found Severall Gent.n belonging to Ships, a drinking and Eateing, who asked me to Eate and drink w.th them, and after dinner was over, M.r Carne, Rich. Gurling and Edward Bagley went up Stairs into y.e upper Chamber, where the Said M.r Carne or Some body Else, Called me, and desired me to come up to them, who I did and when in the Chamber y.e Said M.r Carne Read for y.e Certain abovementioned, which by his perfwasion, I Signed and So did W.r Suffer not knowing of y.e Second Warrant that y.e Govern.r had Issued out, for the measureing Said Land which if he had, would not have Signed Said Petition Aforethat Saith that he his Brother in Law R. Gurling has not above Ten or Twelve Goats at most that goes in the valley Sometimes where the Said Easthope hath Hired Said Land Walter Morris Coppy of A Letter wrote by Cap.t Beaws to the Governour/ S.r Comeing from your Worships house, and Entering into that of M.r George [Carns]es I was met therein by W.r Rich.t Rigby and Severall others who were in the Last nights Riot who Challenged me for hindering his and their proceedings to your Worship's presence at that times, the Said M.r Carne was then present and told the Said Rigby that he ought to proceed in the Resolution of fighting me, To this Profefs a Difregard of y.e Hudson and Cap.t Beawk, do require for my owne Security, that the Said Carne be Secured durement my Continuance Here, and that Inform[a] =tion be given the R.t Hono. Company thereof, that they be duly Inform[ed] both of his proceedings herein, and others of which I Shall make Affidav[it] when required, both against your worsp and the Said Hono. Comp.s and	replied that, if Morris had no need then, he might have later, or words to that effect. After a few more words, Richard Gurling went up towards Mr Carne's house. He had only just entered the house when Mr Carne came into his yard and called Morris to come up. Morris did so. When Morris entered the house, he found several gentlemen belonging to the ships eating and drinking. They asked him to eat and drink with them. After dinner ended, Mr Carne, Richard Gurling and Edward Bagley went upstairs into the upper chamber. Mr Carne, or someone else, called Morris and asked him to come up to them. Morris did so. In the chamber, Mr Carne read the petition already mentioned. By Carne's persuasion, Morris signed it. W.r Suffer also signed it. Morris said he did not know of the second warrant issued by the Governor for measuring the land. If he had known of it, he would not have signed the petition. Morris further said that his brother-in-law Richard Gurling had no more than ten or twelve goats at most, which sometimes went in the valley where Easthope hired the land. Walter Morris signed. A copy was entered of a letter written by Captain Beawes to the Governor. Captain Beawes wrote that, after leaving the Governor's house and entering Mr George Carne's house, he met Mr Richard Rigby and several others who were in the previous night's riot. They challenged him for hindering their proceedings in the Governor's presence at that time. Mr Carne was then present. Beawes said Carne told Rigby that he ought to continue in his resolution of fighting Beawes. Beawes stated that, despite his disregard of Mr Hudson and Captain Beawk [...], he required for his own security that Carne be secured during his stay on the island. He also asked that information be given to the Right Honourable Company, so that they would be duly informed of Carne's proceedings in this matter and of others about which Beawes would make affidavit when required. The final wording broke off after "both against your worship and the Honourable Company's and [...]" Interpretations Walter Morris's affidavit weakened the petition against Easthope's lease. He said he signed after being drawn to Carne's house, fed and persuaded. He also said he did not know that the Governor issued a second warrant to measure the land. His evidence made the petition look organised by Carne rather than driven by Morris's own need. The detail about Gurling's goats mattered because the petition claimed harm from the loss of grazing or wood use. Morris said Gurling had only ten or twelve goats at most going there sometimes. That limited the scale of the claimed injury and made the objection to the lease appear less substantial. Captain Beawes's letter moved the Carne dispute into public security. Carne was not accused merely of supporting a private quarrel. He was said to have encouraged Rigby to proceed with a fight after a riot. Beawes therefore asked that Carne be secured during the captain's stay on the island. Speculations Carne's gathering of Morris, Gurling and Bagley upstairs after eating and drinking was probably meant to secure signatures in a controlled setting. Morris's statement that he signed by persuasion and lacked knowledge of the second measuring warrant suggested that the petition was managed through selective information. Beawes's request that Carne be secured was probably made because Carne's house had become a

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			meeting point for men connected with the previous night's riot. The challenge to Beawes happened there, and Carne was said to encourage Rigby's fight. That made restraint of Carne a practical measure to prevent renewed violence while the ships remained in the road.
88	66	and I cannot omitt to Declare that it is my Sentiments that his Turbulent and Refactory deportment may prove of prejudiciall Consequence to the Quiet being of this Island, I Confefs his owne Challenging Cap.t Peacock is not undoubtedly y.e Intention of [Lipen] his Br.s w.th the asistance of the Aforesaid for it Cannot be Supposed him to truly w.th apersfon of his Temper, Can do Honourably, his power [...] [...] a person of his Temper Can do Honourably, his power [...] [...] Else may occur, upon afidavit, Witness my hand this 9 day of January 1703 W.m Beawes Wee doe Confirm the foregoing as Witnesses to the Same Rob.t Hudson Eustace Peacock Upon which the Said M.r Robert Rigby, and Several others his afor [es.d] was Sent for into ffort James, and were ordered to Repaire on board th[eir] respective Ships they belonged to and not to come on Shoar any more dureing tho Said Ship.s Stay here, upon paine of being Imprisoned And Likewise the Said M.r George Carne was Sent for into ffort James, but was released at y.e Request of y.e Said Cap.t W.m Beawes Cap.t George Like Burrish haveing made afidavit againnt that the M.r Carne, when in case to do in this y.e Pre Esq.r [his y.e] Govern.r thought fitt to have y.e Same recorded, that if Need required, it might be produced/ Geor[g]e Like Burrish Comand.r of the Ship Pieprid maketh oath, that he the Said George Like Burrish, in discourse w.th M.r George Carne of S.t Helena All or upon the 6 of Novemb.r 1703 did heare the Said George Carne Say that Severall Inhabitan.ts of the Island of S.t Helena had been at his House and made Diveres Complaints with him against the then Governour, which he the Said Carne refused to heare and told them that So unhe it was his fortune to returne to his Familly againe That his resolution was to Live in Amity and good Correspondence with the Said Govern.r and his Government, And that he the Said George Carne was very Sorry for y.e former misunderstandings w.ch had hapened between him and the Govern.r, And further this Deponent Says that the Inhabitants did make answer	Captain Beawes continued that he could not omit his view that Carne's turbulent and refractory behaviour might harm the quiet state of the island. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. Beawes appeared to refer to Carne's own challenge to Captain Peacock, and to the possible assistance of others. The sense could not be fully recovered. He said that a person of Carne's temper could not be expected to act honourably. Other matters might appear on affidavit. William Beawes signed this on 9 January 1704. Robert Hudson and Eustace Peacock confirmed the foregoing as witnesses. Robert Rigby and the others already mentioned were then sent for into Fort James. They were ordered to return on board their respective ships and not come on shore again while those ships remained at St Helena. If they came ashore, they were to be imprisoned. George Carne was also sent for into Fort James. He was released at Captain William Beawes's request. Captain George Like Burrish made an affidavit about Carne. The Governor thought fit to have it recorded, so that it could be produced if needed. George Like Burrish, commander of the ship <i>Pieprid</i>, swore that, on or about 6 November 1703, he spoke with George Carne of St Helena. Carne said that several inhabitants of St Helena came to his house and made various complaints to him against the Governor. Carne said he refused to hear them. He told them that, if it was his fortune to return to his family again, his resolution was to live in friendship and good correspondence with the Governor and his government. Carne also said he was very sorry for the former misunderstandings between him and the Governor. Burrish further said that the inhabitants answered [...] Interpretations Captain Beawes's letter treated Carne as a risk to public peace rather than only as a private antagonist. The concern was that his house and influence drew shipboard men and island inhabitants into quarrels. The order sending Rigby and the others back to their ships cut off their access to the shore and reduced the chance of further disorder. Carne's release at Beawes's request showed the captain's influence in managing the dispute. Beawes first asked that Carne be secured for safety, but then requested his release. The council responded to both requests, which showed how visiting commanders could shape short-term security measures while their ships remained in the road. Burrish's affidavit complicated the picture of Carne. It recorded Carne saying that he refused to hear complaints against the Governor and wanted peace with the government. The affidavit was preserved because it could be used later if Carne's role in island unrest was questioned. Speculations The order keeping Rigby and the others on board their ships was probably meant to separate visiting seamen from island factions. The quarrel at Carne's house involved men from the ships, and the council chose the simplest control available: remove them from shore while their vessels stayed. Burrish's affidavit was probably recorded as protective evidence for Carne. It showed him claiming that he rejected anti-governor complaints and wished to live quietly. Since other papers accused him of stirring

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			disorder, this affidavit gave a contrary account that could be produced if needed.
89	67	answer to him they had writt to England for redrefs against the Govern.r and that if the next Ship did not bring them a Remedy they would find a remedy themselves S.t Helena 9.br y.e 14.th 1703 G L Burrish Which the Said Cap.t Burrish made oath of in the presence of M.r Thomas Goodwin Dpty Govern.r and M.r Tho: Domined 3 in Coun[c]il/ [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin December the 20.th 1703 Humphrey Edwards Sold.r declares that Some time Last he being upon the Guard and in the Serj.ts Room with Serj. Dixon Cap.t Sodington dpty Govern. Came to the door and asked the Serj. which Hearing Looked at him And askn on this the Said Dpty mount Saw him Stand w.th his Sword drawne in his hand and bade him Comeand the Serj. to go and look for Philip Karslake Sold.r who he Said was gone from his post on Said mount The Serj. and my Self Acordingly went in Search for him, and found him as we left powder Roomdoor who we brought to the Said Cap.t Sodington then he Pull him into his fore Roomeand a Sentry over him, and Said you dogg I will hang you, Calling Imediatly for the Serj. againe and askt him if the peice Karslake had at fortre was Loaded or no, the Serj. made answer he did Suppose it was for he had given orders that every man Should Lord their Arms, the Said Cap.t Sodington replyd dont flatter me, nor Lye, but tell me true whether tis Loaded or no, Serj. Dixon made answer againe, and Said I think it is, where upon Cap.t Sodington took up the Said Karslakes peice and with the Butt End of it knockt the Said Dixon downe into the other Room takeing his Sword from him and Said you Rascal you Shall be no more Serj. in this Garrison, and when do on the floor took him by the Ears and gave him Severall Bloves over the face and head, and when the Said Dixon got up, the Said Cap.t Bodingto ordered the Marshall to Carry him to Prison, which upon Serj. Dixon S.d to y.e Marshall Henry Coales you are arasically if you don't do y.t office, Up which Cap.t Sodington ordered y.e Said Marsh: to take him away and put in prison Imediately who Acordingly did, And a little while aft.r the Said Cap.t Dixon had bin in prison, the Said Cap.t Bodingto[n] Sent the Marshall and Will: ffrench (whom he made Serj. in Serj. Dixons	The inhabitants answered Burrish that they wrote to England for redress against the Governor. They said that, if the next ship did not bring them a remedy, they would find a remedy themselves. George Like Burrish signed this at St Helena on 14 November 1703. Captain Burrish swore to this in the presence of Thomas Goodwin, Deputy Governor, and Mr Thomas Domined, third in council. Stephen Poirier and Thomas Goodwin signed. On 20 December 1703, Humphrey Edwards, soldier, made a declaration. He said that some time before, while he was on guard and in the sergeant's room with Sergeant Dixon, Captain Sodington, Deputy Governor, came to the door and asked for the sergeant. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. Edwards saw Sodington standing on the mount with his sword drawn in his hand. Sodington ordered Edwards and the sergeant to go and look for Philip Karslake, soldier, who he said was gone from his post on the mount. Edwards and Sergeant Dixon searched for Karslake. They found him as they left the powder-room door. They brought him to Captain Sodington. Sodington pulled Karslake into his fore room and set a sentry over him. He said, "You dog, I will hang you." He then called again for the sergeant and asked whether the piece Karslake had at the fort was loaded. Sergeant Dixon answered that he supposed it was, because he ordered every man to load his arms. Sodington replied, "Don't flatter me, nor lie, but tell me true whether it is loaded or not." Dixon answered again that he thought it was. Sodington then took up Karslake's piece and struck Dixon down into the other room with its butt end. He took Dixon's sword from him and said, "You rascal, you shall be no more sergeant in this garrison." While Dixon was on the floor, Sodington took him by the ears and gave him several blows over the face and head. When Dixon got up, Sodington ordered the marshal to carry him to prison. Dixon said to the marshal, Henry Coales, "You are a rascal if you do that office." Sodington then ordered the marshal to take Dixon away and put him in prison immediately. The marshal did so. A little while after Dixon was in prison, Sodington sent the marshal and William French, whom he made sergeant in Dixon's [...] Interpretations Burrish's affidavit gave the inhabitants' words a threatening political edge. Writing to England for redress was a lawful appeal to higher authority. Saying they would find a remedy themselves if the next ship brought none suggested a willingness to act outside normal channels. The violence against Sergeant Dixon showed Sodington using military authority as personal punishment. Dixon was not merely relieved from office. He was struck with a firearm, disarmed, beaten while down and imprisoned. The act of making William French sergeant in his place showed an immediate attempt to remake the guard command. Karslake's alleged absence from post drew the powder room and loaded arms into the dispute. Sodington treated the readiness of weapons as the issue, but Edwards's account showed the inquiry turning at once into blows against Dixon. Discipline over arms therefore became a wider struggle over obedience and command inside the garrison. Speculations The inhabitants' statement to Burrish was probably recorded because it suggested more than complaint.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The phrase “find a remedy themselves” could be read as a warning of collective action if the Company did not intervene. In a garrison island, that made the words important evidence of unrest. Sodington’s removal of Dixon and appointment of William French was probably meant to secure the guard under a man loyal to him. The sequence mattered: Dixon was beaten, disarmed and imprisoned, then French was made sergeant in his place. This suggested an attempt to replace a resisting officer during the disturbance.
20	68	Dixons Stead) to the Said Dixon into y.e Prison and bid them ask him if he would Acknowledge himself to be in a fault, which if he would, he Should be released, and have his place againe, To which the Serj. made Answer that he would not Acknowledge himself to be in a fault for he did not Know of any he had Comitted but if he was guilty of any, he would Acknowledge it to the Governour And not to him which y.t S.d they Returned to Cap.t Sodington who alittle while after Sent them aSecond time again to y.e Sould.rs to take a way the Said Dixons bed or pillows from him, if he had any with him for Said he, he Shall Lye upon the bare Bord.t And about a quarter of an hour after this Depo.t Lighted a Candle for the Said Dixon which Cap.t Sodington Seeing went Immediately into the prison and took it away And Said Sarrah you Shall not have abett of Light to See y.e Self And I forbid every body from bringing You any/ Further the deponent declareth that Sometime ago he being at y.e Sally fort Gate with divers other persons where was on Centrey Philip Karslake Sold.r who upon hearing Somebody Say the peice he had would not Stand Cock t tried whether it would or no, which did, but could not gete up downe Againe which W.m Griffith Sold.r Seeing Said this fellow Means Centrey with his peice Cockt to whom y.e Said Karslake Replyd what’s that to you, must not I refs my Arms to y.e dpoty who was preparing then coming out of y.e fort, and I beleive y.e Said Griffith But him which made Rich. Cryset aforesaid, and when the S.d Dpoty was come up with y.e Centry alittle wesf, y.e Said Griffith and Karslake Said Some high words which the Dpoty hearing Came back againe and John Karslake Came into Karslakes mouth, and Said Sarrah here dare you abuse the Officer Karslake made answer Did not know to much before he was whether y.e Dpoty mean.t himself or his ffriend Griffith who then worted upon him, I cant tell, but did not hear Karslake give the Dpoty not one word of Disrespect, further Saith not/ his Humphry H ffEdwards mark Richard Alexander free Planter declares that Some time when he Belong.d to the Garrison and being upon the Guard was Sittendown[e] at the Sally fort Gate with divers other, where Phillip Karslake Sold.r was at Cent[ry] and Daniell Griffith being there also told Serj. Dixon who was then present[?] that the Said Karslakes peice was Cockt which the Said Karslake hearing Said him I want his owne Beings, and not trust himself with him, which Caus[ed] Severall more words betwixt them and in the meane time Cap.t Sodington Govern.r Came out of the fort, and aske what was the matter who being told of y.e Occasion of their haveing words declar Say much to that, but took the Plate from out of the Centry Box that the Said Karslake might not See downst at his post, and bid him to walk all the time he was at Cent[ry] Then he went upstairs but hearing the Said Karslake and Griffith have m[any] high words Come back againe to y.e Karslake and told him if he would be quiett, he would Confine him and Run his Cane against y.e Karslakes Lipp which made him hold his hand upon his mouth, who Said if he had not Shutt his teeth Close together, the deputy would have throw[n] his	William French, who was made sergeant in Dixon’s place, and the marshal were sent by Sodington to Dixon in prison. They were told to ask whether Dixon would acknowledge himself to be at fault. If he did so, he would be released and restored to his place. Dixon answered that he would not acknowledge himself to be at fault, because he did not know of any fault he committed. If he was guilty of anything, he would acknowledge it to the Governor and not to Sodington. French and the marshal returned to Captain Sodington. A little while later, Sodington sent them a second time to the soldiers. They were ordered to take away Dixon’s bed or pillows from him, if he had any with him. Sodington said Dixon would lie on the bare boards. About a quarter of an hour later, Humphrey Edwards lit a candle for Dixon. Sodington saw it, went at once into the prison and took it away. He said, “Sirrah, you shall not have a bit of light to see yourself.” He forbade everybody to bring Dixon any light. Edwards further declared that some time before, he was at the sally port gate with several other persons. Philip Karslake, soldier, was on sentry there. Someone said that Karslake’s piece would not stand cocked. Karslake tried whether it would. It did, but he could not get it down again. William Griffith, soldier, saw this and said that Karslake meant to stand sentry with his piece cocked. Karslake replied, “What’s that to you? Must not I rest my arms to the Deputy?” The Deputy was then preparing to come out of the fort. Edwards believed Griffith [...] him, which caused Richard Cryset [...]. When the Deputy came up near the sentry, Griffith and Karslake spoke high words. The Deputy heard them and came back again. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. Sodington spoke to Karslake and said, “Sirrah, how dare you abuse the officer?” Karslake answered that he did not know whether the Deputy meant himself or his friend Griffith, who then [...] upon him. Edwards said he could not tell, but he did not hear Karslake speak one disrespectful word to the Deputy. Humphrey Edwards made his mark. Richard Alexander, free planter, declared that some time before, when he belonged to the garrison and was on guard, he was sitting down at the sally port gate with several others. Philip Karslake, soldier, was on sentry. Daniel Griffith was also there. Griffith told Sergeant Dixon, who was then present, that Karslake’s piece was cocked. Karslake heard this and said [...] his own beings, and that he would not trust himself with him. This caused several more words between them. In the meantime, Captain Sodington, Deputy Governor, came out of the fort and asked what was the matter. He was told the reason for their words. He said little to that, but took the plate from the sentry box so that Karslake could not sit down at his post. He told Karslake to walk during all the time he was on sentry. Sodington then went upstairs. When he heard Karslake and Griffith speaking many high words, he came back again to Karslake. He told him that, if he

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			would not be quiet, he would confine him. He ran his cane against Karslake's lip, which made Karslake hold his hand to his mouth. Karslake said that, if he had not shut his teeth close together, the Deputy would have thrown his [...] Interpretations The message sent to Dixon in prison showed that Sodington sought an admission of fault as the price of release. Dixon refused because he recognised the Governor, not Sodington, as the authority to whom he would answer. The issue was therefore not only discipline but competing chains of command. The removal of Dixon's bed, pillows and candle made the imprisonment punitive beyond mere confinement. Sodington used discomfort and darkness to pressure a sergeant who would not acknowledge fault. This reinforced the Governor's earlier charge that Dixon was treated with personal harshness. The sally port incident showed a sentry dispute being turned into a charge of disrespect. Karslake's cocked musket was the starting point. The Deputy then removed the plate from the sentry box and ordered him to walk his watch. This was a disciplinary correction of sentry behaviour, but it then escalated into threats and physical contact. Richard Alexander's evidence partly limited the accusation against Karslake. He described high words between Karslake and Griffith, but not clear disrespect to Sodington. This mattered because the Deputy's later treatment of Karslake rested on the claim that Karslake abused an officer. Speculations Sodington's offer to restore Dixon if he acknowledged fault was probably meant to turn a contested imprisonment into proof of rightful discipline. If Dixon confessed, Sodington could present the beating and confinement as correction of a subordinate rather than abuse of authority. The removal of the sentry-box plate was probably meant to stop Karslake sitting at post. The later blow or thrust with the cane suggested that Sodington wanted not only alertness from the sentry but personal submission after the argument with Griffith.
21	69	his cane into his mouth, and did at y.e Same time Serj. Said Karsl[ake] Spitt blood, This to the bef of my Remembr.s and is all truth Witness my hand Rich. Alexander Rich.d Wills S.d declares that Some time Since he being upon the Guard and hearing Cap.t Sodington and Serj. Dixon having Some high words he went upon the Said Cap.t Sodingtons mount about Ten of y.e Clock at night, at which time he ld them arguing about Karslakes peice Cap.t Sodington askt the Serj. whether y.e S.d Karslakes peice he had at Centry was bin was Loaded or no, Serj. Dixon made answer if 'tis not Loaded, it ought to be Loaded for I ordeed Every man belonging to the Guard to Load their arms and it was the Corporalls duty to See it done you dogg said Cap.t Sodington do you Banter me, and up w.th Karslakes peice took w.th the Butt End of it Struck the Said Dixon which made him fall Backwards into the other Room, and when he arose up the Said Cap.t Sodington ordered the Marsh: Henry Coales to take the Said Dixon to prison upon which he made answer, the Said Marshall you are a Rascall if you don't do your office whereupon Cap.t Sodington took hold of S.d Dixon and Struck him Severall blows on the face and bid y.e Marsh: take him away to prison and after he had bin in prison alittle while the Said Cap.t Bodinto[n] ordered the Marsh: and Will: ffrench (who he had made Serj. as afore.d) to take away the Said Dixons bed from him, which was just before he was led into y.e Prison for him to lye upon that night And did hear the Said Henry Coales and Will: ffrench give Orders from Cap.t Sodington that no manner of	Richard Alexander continued that Sodington would have thrust his cane into Karslake's mouth. At the same time, Karslake spat blood. This was true to the best of Alexander's memory. Richard Alexander signed. Richard Wills, soldier, declared that some time before he was on guard. He heard Captain Sodington and Sergeant Dixon speaking high words, so he went onto Captain Sodington's mount at about ten o'clock at night. He heard them arguing about Karslake's piece. Captain Sodington asked the sergeant whether Karslake's piece, which he had on sentry, was loaded. Sergeant Dixon answered that, if it was not loaded, it ought to be, because he ordered every man belonging to the guard to load his arms. He said it was the corporal's duty to see it done. Sodington said, "You dog, do you banter me?" He then took up Karslake's piece and struck Dixon with the butt end of it. Dixon fell backwards into the other room. When Dixon got up, Sodington ordered the marshal, Henry Coales, to take him to prison. Dixon said to the marshal, "You are a rascal if you don't do your office." Sodington then took hold of Dixon, struck him several blows on the face and told the marshal to take him away to prison. After Dixon was in prison for a little while, Sodington ordered the marshal and William French,

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		bedding nor no kind of thing Else Should be given y.e Serj. upon Pene of being tyed Neck and heels. Richard Wills Cabriell Marsh S.d declares that that night as Cap.t Sodington Confined Serj. Dixon, he was in Cap.s Comp.s w.th the Marshall [w]hom he waited upon, and Philip Karslake Sold.r being on Centry upon the Said Cap.t Sodingtons mount Cap.t Sodington askt him why he did not come of one with Guard to do his own duty, Karslake made answer he Sent half Dollar Downe for any man y.t would do his Guard duty for him, and Some more words pasing about that matter, the Dpoty fell into a great pasion and dree Serj. Sword at Said Karslakes as he laid at his post whereupon Doctor Kerr took hold of S.d S.d deputy and desired he for gods Sake to put up his Sword and Let the Beoy a lone, where the Said Karslake Seeing him in Such a Humour Run away from his Post for fear the said Cap.t Sodington Should kill him, upon which the Cap.t Sodington Sent for Serj. Dixon, and bid him See for me Karslake Karslake	whom he made sergeant as before, to take away Dixon's bed. The bed was there for Dixon to lie on that night. Richard Wills heard Henry Coales and William French give orders from Captain Sodington that no bedding, nor any other thing, was to be given to the sergeant, on pain of being tied neck and heels. Richard Wills signed. Cabriell Marsh, soldier, declared that on the night Captain Sodington confined Sergeant Dixon, Marsh was in Captain [...]’s company with the marshal, whom he waited upon. Philip Karslake, soldier, was on sentry on Captain Sodington’s mount. Captain Sodington asked him why he did not come with the guard to do his own duty. Karslake answered that he sent half a dollar down for any man who would do his guard duty for him. Some more words passed about that matter. The Deputy fell into a great passion and drew the sergeant’s sword at Karslake as he stood at his post. Doctor Kerr took hold of the Deputy and begged him, for God’s sake, to put up his sword and leave the boy alone. Karslake saw him in this humour and ran away from his post for fear Captain Sodington would kill him. Captain Sodington then sent for Sergeant Dixon and told him to look for Karslake.
22	70	Karslake the Serj. Accordingly went, and Humphr.y Edwards w.th a Serj.t and Lanthorne w.th him, and after a litle while broughtt y.e Said [Centli.t] to the Said Cap.t Sodington whom he took hold of and Said you dogg I will hang you, you have Sworn against me and Secured him to one of his Roomis and put Will: French Centry over him till he Sen[d] for the Marshall, who when he Came Cap.t Sodington ordered him to take y.e Said Karslake into the Dungeon, A litle after this Cap.t Sodington took Karslakes peice in his hand and Called Sn.j. Dixon to him and askt him if the peice was Loaded or not, The Serj. answered I ordere[d] the Centinalle to Load his peice and I beleive that this y.e is Loaded according ing to my order but Cap.t Sodington would not take that for an answer, asking the said Dixon y.e Same question over againe The Serj. Replyd if 'tis not Loaded it ought to be Loaded for I ordered the Corp.s to See every man belonging to y.e Guard Loaded his armes Whe.s.r upon Cap.t Sodington took up Said Karslakes peice and Struck y.e Serj.t twice over the head, and Said that I will be an Example for Such fellows you are, and when the Serj. gott up The Said Cap.t Sodington took his Sword from him and bid the Marshale take him away and put him into prison the Dungeon to Karslake whereupon M.r Coales the Marsh. tooke fast hold of the Serj. by the arme to haul him along the Serj. Said M.r Coales y.e are a rascal if you don't do your duty, upon which Cap.t Sodington took hold of the Serj. and Struck him Severale Bows on his face Saying you doggs do you call my Servant Rascal before my face and I being Governo.r here, upon w.ch M.r Coales Carried the Serj. away and put him into Prison Immediatly also Cap.t Sodington Calld the Guard Releven, and when he had Done so went to the dungeon door, and Seeing alight in the prison Cap.t Sodington Said to M.r Coales why did you not put y.e Serj. into the Dunge According to my order, but him in now, but Doctor Kerr being w.th him perswaded the dpoty to Lett y.e Serj. be in this prison and to him it was not usuall to put officers into the dungeon, upon which Cap.t Sodington went into the prison and pute out y.e Candle, and being both y.e Serj. of the prison Aud Dungeoned in his Drawers Hose & y.e Serj. depo.t was borne w.th y.e minister, fferther, Saith, not/ Gabriell Marsh mark January the 10.th 170 ¾ Whereas by an Act of Councill hoe bearing date the [...] day of [...] to prevent the occasion of Disorders and	Sergeant Dixon went accordingly, with Humphrey Edwards and a lantern. After a little while, they brought Karslake to Captain Sodington. Sodington took hold of Karslake and said, “You dog, I will hang you. You have sworn against me.” He secured him in one of his rooms and set William French as sentry over him until he sent for the marshal. When the marshal came, Sodington ordered him to take Karslake into the dungeon. A little after this, Sodington took Karslake’s piece in his hand and called Sergeant Dixon to him. He asked whether the piece was loaded. Dixon answered that he ordered the sentinels to load their pieces, and believed this piece was loaded according to his order. Sodington would not accept that answer. He asked Dixon the same question again. Dixon replied that, if it was not loaded, it ought to be, because he ordered the corporals to see that every man belonging to the guard loaded his arms. Sodington then took up Karslake’s piece and struck Dixon twice over the head. He said, “I will be an example for such fellows as you are.” When Dixon got up, Sodington took his sword from him and ordered the marshal to take him away and put him into prison, and to put Karslake into the dungeon. Mr Coales, the marshal, took fast hold of Dixon by the arm to haul him along. Dixon said, “Mr Coales, you are a rascal if you don’t do your duty.” Sodington then took hold of Dixon and struck him several blows on the face. He said, “You dogs, do you call my servant rascal before my face, and I being Governor here?” Coales carried Dixon away and put him in prison immediately. Sodington also called the guard relief. After he had done so, he went to the dungeon door. Seeing a light in the prison, he said to Coales, “Why did you not put the sergeant into the dungeon according to my order? Put him in now.” Doctor Kerr was with him and persuaded the Deputy to leave the sergeant in the prison. He told him it was not usual to put officers into the dungeon. Sodington then went into the prison and put out the candle. The manuscript was unclear at the next point. It appeared to refer to the sergeant being in the prison or dungeon in his drawers and hose. The final sense could not be fully recovered.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		disturbances It is ordered that all french houses and Publick houses Shall be Confined to Reasonable houres, And whereas Complaints have been made to me by Sevr.t Sanderson, M.r [Pacciphores] Steward and Severall others against M.rs Rigby M.r Sheffield, M.r Marshall, M.r Beawne M.r Trecedly &c of	Gabriell Marsh said no more. Gabriell Marsh made his mark. On 10 January 1704, it was stated that an act of council dated the [...] day of [...] was made to prevent disorders and disturbances. It ordered that all French houses and public houses should be confined to reasonable hours. Complaints were made to the Governor by Sergeant Sanderson, Mr [Pacciphores], steward, and several others against Mrs Rigby, Mr Sheffield, Mr Marshall, Mr Beawne, Mr Trecedly and others [...] Interpretations Gabriell Marsh's evidence closely supported earlier accounts of Dixon's imprisonment. It repeated the main acts: Karslake was seized, threatened and ordered into the dungeon; Dixon was questioned over the loaded musket; Dixon was struck, disarmed and imprisoned; bedding or light was denied. This made the charge against Sodington rest on repeated witness accounts rather than a single hostile statement. Sodington's words "I being Governor here" were important. They showed that the violence was tied to a claim of command, not only anger. The phrase made his treatment of Dixon and Karslake part of the larger dispute over whether he or Poirier controlled the fort. Doctor Kerr's intervention drew a boundary around punishment. He did not deny Sodington's authority outright, but he argued that officers were not usually put into the dungeon. This showed that even within military discipline, rank and custom limited how a sergeant could be confined. The new order about public houses showed the council linking late drinking places to disorder. The passage broke off before the complaints were complete, but the purpose was clear enough: public houses and French houses were to be kept to reasonable hours to reduce disturbances.
23	71	That they could not Rest at nights for the disorders they kept and Continueall disturbance they made by breaking of Windows forcing of doors at unreasonable houres, w.th other Encomdyes against the Publick Peace and to the disturbance of the whole neighbourhood So also haveing Information that the Said Gent.l men with divers others Cruisers and mades of Ships were to treat this evening woemen of the Island Calling at the Batchelours treat Did pursuant to the Said order Send to M.r Coulson at whose house the time was to be kept To keep good orders and not to Entertaine any Company Eater than the houre of Eleven at night, that aft.r 11 the Said night I Comanded the Corp.l with a Guard to walk the Roundes, Comand.ing all houses to dismifs their Company and to Repaire to their Respective Lodgings, who all Civilly obleyed Except the Said M.r Coulson, where when they Came found a great Concorse of People at that unreasonable hours, with Musick and Dancing (among whom was the Dpopty Govern.r [Cau]: Sodington) who att the approaching of the Guard asks them what would they hinder his dance, And making alwayes Light of me and my Authority, Instead of obeying orders and abusing the Guard and the Execution thereof by advifeing and Entreating the Comp.s to depart (which was his duty) by [his] Encouragement to all of y.e Compa.r Said all the whole Island was his Lodging, and that they knew their owne time, and would go when they pleased Whereupon the Guard Returning with this Report, and haveing reason to fear the be Consequence that might Issue [when] I went up in person, where when I came, found all ready for opposition, (the Hopty Govern.r being just gone Sometime out of the road) when I required to depart Civilly to their respective Lodgings who all Answered that was their Lodgings, and most audaciously refisted, and the maked Swords Indea voured to vindicate their Irregularities, and particularly one M.r Hill, which	The complaints stated that the neighbours could not rest at night because of the disorders kept there and the continual disturbances made by breaking windows, forcing doors at unreasonable hours and other offences against the public peace, to the disturbance of the whole neighbourhood. Information was also given that the gentlemen, with several other cruisers and shipmates, were to entertain the women of the island that evening at what was called the bachelors' treat. Under the earlier order, a message was sent to Mr Coulson, at whose house the meeting was to be held. He was told to keep good order and not to entertain any company later than eleven o'clock at night. After eleven o'clock that night, the corporal was ordered to walk the rounds with a guard. He was to command all houses to dismiss their company and send people to their lodgings. All obeyed civilly except at Mr Coulson's house. When the guard came there, they found a great crowd of people at that unreasonable hour, with music and dancing. The Deputy Governor, Captain Sodington, was among them. When the guard approached, he asked whether they would hinder his dance. Instead of obeying the order and helping the guard carry it out by advising and entreating the company to leave, which was his duty, Sodington made light of the Governor and his authority. He encouraged the company. He said that the whole island was his lodging, and that they knew their own time and would go when they pleased. The guard returned and reported this. The Governor feared what might follow and went up in person. When he came, he found them ready to resist. The Deputy Governor was then just gone, some time out of the road. The Governor civilly required them to

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		obliged me to draw mine, and Indeavouring to joyne w.th him in my owne defence were both hindered, and as I was Stiveing about to give orders to the Guard he made afrap at me and would have Run me thro' had not the Corporale Interposed and put it by w.th his being which the Guard perceiveng with force, of Arms, were forced to Repell them, in defence of their Lifes, as well as for my preservation. And just as the Scuffle had Ended, Cante the worthy Cap.t Beaws Comodore and Cap.t Hudson, being Disturbed, and raised by this Noise, who Comanded those that belonged to them to depart Checking all the Rest, who in their very presence did most Reproachfully Degrade Vilifye, and abuse me, despising my Authority, To the Great Scendalle, and Dishonour of the R.t Hono. ble Company/ Daniel Griffith maketh oath That he this Depo.t being ordered with the Corporale of the Guard to walk the Roundes, and Comeing to W.m Coulsons House, found a Concorse of People with Musick and Dancing who refused to break up and to Repaire to their Lodgings the Civilly required and Entreteng them there we returned to the Guard, and reported the Same to the Govern.r Moreover his this Same gent.n in person at whose Appearance they Seemed noe more willing to depart than before, and after a few words, despising his Authority, divers other Sword to Vindicate their Irregularities, and his words very Narrowly Escapeing of being a Loss that was made at him by one Hill And moreover that W.r Said Hell	go to their lodgings. They answered that this was their lodging. They most audaciously resisted. With naked swords, they tried to justify their disorder. One man in particular, Mr Hill, did so. This forced the Governor to draw his own sword. When the Governor tried to engage with him in his own defence, both men were held back. As the Governor turned to give orders to the guard, Hill made a pass at him and would have run him through if the corporal had not interposed and put it aside with his [...]. The guard saw this. With force of arms, they were forced to repel the company in defence of their own lives and for the Governor's preservation. Just as the scuffle ended, Captain Beawes, the worthy commodore, and Captain Hudson came. They were disturbed and raised by the noise. They commanded those who belonged to them to leave and checked all the rest. Even in their presence, the company most reproachfully degraded, vilified and abused the Governor, despising his authority. This was to the great scandal and dishonour of the Right Honourable Company. Daniel Griffith made oath. He said that he was ordered with the corporal of the guard to walk the rounds. When they came to William Coulson's house, they found a crowd of people with music and dancing. The company refused to break up and go to their lodgings, although they were civilly required and entreated to do so. Griffith and the corporal returned to the guard and reported this to the Governor. The Governor then went in person. When he appeared, the company seemed no more willing to leave than before. After a few words, they despised his authority. Several drew swords to defend their disorder. The Governor narrowly escaped a thrust made at him by one Hill. The manuscript broke off as Griffith continued to speak about Hill. Interpretations The order against late public-house gatherings showed the council treating night drinking, music and dancing as threats to public order. The concern was not only noise. The complaints included broken windows, forced doors and disturbance of the whole neighbourhood. The bachelors' treat mattered because it gathered visiting shipmen, island women and local inhabitants in one house after hours. This created a mixed social space outside ordinary household control. The Governor treated it as a risk that required the guard to enforce closing time. Sodington's presence made the disorder a command issue. As Deputy Governor, he was expected to support the guard and the Governor's order. Instead, he was said to encourage the company and to mock the Governor's authority. That turned a late-night gathering into another contest over government. The drawn swords changed the matter from nuisance to armed resistance. Hill's pass at the Governor, and the guard's armed response, made the enforcement of closing hours part of the island's military discipline and public security. Speculations The eleven o'clock limit was probably chosen as a practical compromise. It allowed the treat to happen but fixed a clear hour when entertainment became disorder. That gave the guard a definite rule to enforce rather than leaving them to judge noise or drunkenness case by case. Sodington's statement that "the whole island was his lodging" probably asserted rank and freedom of movement against the Governor's curfew. In context, it encouraged the company to treat the order as optional and made the house a stage for resisting Poirier's authority.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
24	72	Hall, Rigby [Saine] and the Reft most reproachfully Degraded and abused his Lordsh.p who was in great Danger of his Life, dureing the whole Scuffle. Daniel Griffith Thomas Cason Corp.le Sworne Saith that on Saturday night Last about 11 of y.e Clock, the Govern.r ordered me to go y.e roundes with four musquetters, and when in the valley found at W.m Coulsons hous[e], Severall Strangers Gent.n belonging to the Ships now in the road who I told by the Govern.rs order, that they were to Repaire to their Lodgeings the Dpoty Govern.r being there, made answer that all the Island was his quarters and he would Lodge where he pleased, the Lift of y.e Gent.l Said that they were in their Lodgings, and would abide there all that night, About twelve of y.e Clock the Govern.r went the roundes w.th my Self and Six Sold.r for his Guard, and when in the valley, found att Said Coulsons house all those Gent.l, he left there ab. 11 of y.e Clock Except Cap.t Sodington who I Suppose was just gone away when the Govern.r Civilly desired to repaire to their Respective Lodgings, but Instead of obeying his order they drew their Swords and Said they would not go and would by all Lefts in the Said Coulsons house/ Christopher Hill, Jn.o [Cullance] [Geo:] Morris Sould.r being Sworne Lieth to the Same Effect, as Daniell Griffith and Thomas Cason hath afore. Tho: Sanderson Ser.j.t being Sworne Saith that about three weeks ago in the night time about twelve of y.e Clock, Severall Gentlemen belonging to the Ships now in the road, came together up in the valley and Knockt at every door in that Lane where the Said Apo. Lives, and Swore they would have Some pounch and when at W.m Wills door they Knockt So violently and his wife haveing no body but her daughter w.th her She called out for home a sistance who made them haften aw'ay, And the Next morning had abarr or two of one of their windows broke which W.m Wills told him the Said Gent.l broke the night aforesaid further Saith not Mary the wife of Ripin Wills being Sworne Saith that about three weeks ago at night the [...] Decemb.r four or five Strangers came up the valley in the night time who She heard Knock at three doors, And when come as farr as the said depo.s Husbands door heard them Knock violently Severall times but She being in bed and had only in the house besides her little Girle, would not Say any thing to them afpritty while but they Continuing as afore S.d the Said depo.t got up out of bed, went to a window and askt them what they wanted they made answer Punch She answered it was not Sefonable time and told them they were villains to do as they did, they Replyd againe with oaths in their mouths, that they would Lye with her	Daniel Griffith further said that Hill, Rigby, [Saine] and the rest most reproachfully degraded and abused the Governor, who was in great danger of his life during the whole scuffle. Daniel Griffith signed. Thomas Cason, corporal, was sworn. He said that on Saturday night last, at about eleven o'clock, the Governor ordered him to walk the rounds with four musketeers. When Cason came into the valley, he found several strange gentlemen belonging to the ships now in the road at William Coulson's house. He told them, by the Governor's order, that they were to go to their lodgings. The Deputy Governor was there. He answered that all the island was his quarters and that he would lodge where he pleased. The rest of the gentlemen said they were in their lodgings and would stay there all night. At about twelve o'clock, the Governor walked the rounds with Cason and six soldiers as his guard. In the valley, they found at Coulson's house all the gentlemen Cason left there at about eleven o'clock, except Captain Sodington, who Cason supposed had just gone away. The Governor civilly asked them to go to their respective lodgings. Instead of obeying his order, they drew their swords and said they would not go. They said they would, by all [...], stay in Coulson's house. Christopher Hill, John [Cullance] and George Morris, soldiers, were sworn. They gave evidence to the same effect as Daniel Griffith and Thomas Cason. Thomas Sanderson, sergeant, was sworn. He said that about three weeks before, at about twelve o'clock at night, several gentlemen belonging to the ships now in the road came together up into the valley. They knocked at every door in the lane where the said [...] lived. They swore they would have some punch. When they came to William Wills's door, they knocked so violently that Wills's wife, who had nobody with her except her daughter, called out for assistance. This made them hurry away. The next morning, one or two bars of one of the windows were broken. William Wills told Sanderson that the same gentlemen broke them the night before. Mary, wife of Ripin Wills, was sworn. She said that about three weeks before, in the night, [...] December, four or five strangers came up the valley. She heard them knock at three doors. When they came as far as her husband's door, she heard them knock violently several times. Mary was in bed. She had nobody in the house except her little girl. For some time, she said nothing to them. When they continued knocking, she got out of bed, went to a window and asked what they wanted. They answered that they wanted punch. She told them it was not a seasonable time and called them villains for behaving as they did. They answered again, with oaths in their mouths, that they would lie with her.
25	73	both old and young woemen, and would break open doors to come at them, which put her into Some fright, and beleiving they would do their Endeavour to Satisfie their Lust Called out for Some asistance to make them depart, where upon went away Saying and Singing And Next morning Saw y.e Impression of Stones that they thrust against the door, and windon, of which brake one Shetter, further Saith not/ Onepsphous Steward free planter deposes that Severall Gent.l.m belong.g to the Ships now in the road have come up the valley at Severall times and disturbed the People, by throwing Stones at doors and windows Singing, and drinceing in the Street for hours together/ Mary Cosgrave widow deposes that one day when She lay Sick a bed M.r Sheffield M.r Coccill M.r Carne and Some others Came into her garden who were very rude, Especially M.r Sheffield who like to haul and pull her	They said they would lie with both old and young women, and would break open doors to get at them. This frightened Mary. She believed they would do their best to satisfy their lust. She called out for help to make them leave. They went away, saying and singing. The next morning, Mary saw the marks of stones which they thrust against the door and window. One shutter was broken. Onepsphous Steward, free planter, deposed that several gentlemen belonging to the ships now in the road came up the valley several times and disturbed the people. They threw stones at doors and windows, sang and drank in the street for hours together. Mary Cosgrave, widow, deposed that one day, while she lay sick in bed, Mr Sheffield, Mr Coccill, Mr Carne and some others came into her garden. They

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		daughters about, which made them at that time go into a private Chamber and Lock themselves up, which the Said M.r Sheffield Seeing went to the back window and thrust his head in where a barr was wanting and Said he would come in to them, which the Said Deponent's daught.r seeing, took up a glass bottle and told him if Sh[e] did not go about his buisness She Should throw y.e bottle at him, which made him go to his Company aft.r that myself and W.m Lufkin told to him to be civill, the next day Mary Field Came to my house, and being talking about a difturbance that was in the valley, Said that M.r Sheffield W.m Coccoell M.r Hall and W.m Came pussar of the Shipp Pratt: Came late at night to their House, knocking at the door and making a great noise which disturbed her Sick father and all the family Then being desired to be civill went up into the valley or towne Singing and Roaring along the Street/ Henry francis free Planter deposes that on Saturday Last at night he was at Supper with Some of y.e Comanders att.s his Brother Wranghams house Where Came M.r Sheffield M.r Worrell M.r Rigby and M.r [...], without any manner of Invitation who behaved themselves very Ruddy and disrespectfully to their Superiors, dancing up and downe the Room, Jumping over Table And victualls, Stipping the Card B and throwing it into a Bowle of Punch, which Eventually Caused Some High words, even to challengeing to fight any man that was afronted the said Depo.t Endeavouring to be a mediator [...] [...] M.r Worrall Imm[edi]ately pulld off his Coat to fight, y.e S.d Depo. who Soone Ended that Combat which did hinder their further Irregularitys there/ [Poirier]	were very rude. Mr Sheffield was especially rude. He nearly hauled and pulled her daughters about. Her daughters went into a private chamber and locked themselves in. Sheffield saw this. He went to the back window, where a bar was missing, thrust his head in and said he would come in to them. One of Mary Cosgrave's daughters saw him, took up a glass bottle and told him that, if he did not go about his business, she would throw it at him. This made him return to his company. After that, Mary Cosgrave and William Lufkin told him to be civil. The next day, Mary Field came to Mary Cosgrave's house. They spoke about a disturbance in the valley. Mary Field said that Mr Sheffield, William Coccoell, Mr Hall and William Carne, purser of the ship <i>Pratt</i>, came late at night to their house. They knocked at the door and made a great noise. This disturbed her sick father and all the family. When they were asked to be civil, they went up into the valley or town, singing and roaring along the street. Henry Francis, free planter, deposed that on Saturday night last he was at supper with some of the commanders at his brother Wrangham's house. Mr Sheffield, Mr Worrell, Mr Rigby and Mr [...] came without any invitation. They behaved very rudely and disrespectfully to their superiors. They danced up and down the room, jumped over the table and victuals, stripped the card B and threw it into a bowl of punch. This eventually caused high words, even to the point of challenging any man who was affronted to fight. Henry Francis tried to mediate. Mr Worrall immediately pulled off his coat to fight him. Francis soon ended that combat, which stopped their further disorder there. Stephen Poirier signed. Interpretations The evidence showed a pattern of night disorder by men from the ships. The complaints were not about one quarrel only. They described repeated knocking, stone-throwing, threats, singing, drinking and forced approaches to houses in the valley. Women's houses and rooms were central to the danger. Mary Wills, Mary Cosgrave's daughters and Mary Field's household were all disturbed or threatened. The men's words about lying with women and breaking doors turned noise into sexual threat and household invasion. The disorder crossed from the street into private gardens and rooms. Sheffield's attempt to thrust his head through the back window after the daughters locked themselves away showed how fragile household protection could be when men from the ships forced entry points. Henry Francis's evidence showed that the same shipboard group also disrupted elite hospitality. At Wrangham's house they entered uninvited, insulted superiors, spoiled the table and tried to provoke a fight. This linked public street disorder with disrespect for local rank and household order. Speculations The repeated demand for punch was probably a way for shipboard men to force late-night access to houses. The request sounded like drink-seeking, but the threats against women and the attempts at doors and windows showed that drink, intimidation and sexual pursuit were bound together in the disorder. The Governor's collection of several depositions was probably meant to show that the problem was general and persistent. Evidence from a soldier, widows, a free planter and Henry Francis made the complaint harder to dismiss as one household's grievance.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
96	74	Island S.t Helena Att a [Coun. of Justice] Consultation Held on Wednesday the 26.th	At St Helena, a [Council of Justice] consultation was held on Wednesday, 26 [...]
97	75	Island S.t Helena Jan.y y.e 19.th 170 ¾ The affidavit of Lieut.t Sodington against M.r Kerr the R.t Hono. ble East India Companys Chaplaine on this Island is as followeth, That the Said Sodington declared he had not bin above Ten days on this Island before the Said Kerr [...] use all his Endeavours to raise an Animosity between y.e Said Sodington, and the Governo.r of this Island Stephen Poirier Esq.r, by telling the Said Sodington that the [...] [...] aforesaid Governo.r was a traitor to his own King, and was forc.t to fly his Country, and that it could not be Expected he Should be true to the East India Comp.s for the Queen of England, Since he had been false to his owne Naturall prince, And that there was treasonable Depositions Sent home to England by Cap.t [...]Jelatte directed to the Secretary of State, So lung against the aforesaid Governo.r and that he the Said Kerr was an Evidence against the Said Governor and Sheived me a Copy of the Depositions, and desired me to Show them to Cap.t Stebs, adding that he was Sure the Govern.r would be turned out, and was glad Dorothy a Spent[?] [...] was Come over here that he would write to the Bishop of London on my behalfe to be Govern.r a Coppey of which Letter he Said he would Send me Should me where in he Extolld me Aft.r every good Christian and a lover of the Church of England, as to that purpose, and desired me to give him directions wow.he might write to Some of my friends to promote my designe which Did, he told me he thought the Govern.r was the worst of men, giveing him opprobrious names, as rogue and villaine and haveing a Linen in his Bredst Pocketell, flying it over he met him in England he would tear him Saying he thought in his Conscience it was Convenient he Should be Stand being a very ill man Pleafe giveing me a Charge to keep a Copy of any Letters I Should hopper to wirtie to the Govern.r with Either Comp. and was to the [...] [...] [...] [...] did to the Cliticons what I write for fear the Govern.r Should take any advantage against me, and never to Lett him know my friends in England, For he would write to them to any disadvantage as he had taken the Imprudence to write to y.e Bishop of London against him this is Character from a man of his Coat, made me very Cumerous of Conversing w.th the Govern.r and in a great measure Caused me to harbour an [Eve]ll opinion of him As to his Loyalty to y.e Crowne of England, though I never in the Least heard the Govern.r Speak any thing against the Interest of y.e English Crown but have often Seen him begin y.e Queens health, and his Royale highness &.c w.th aword of respect as I think Cor. Sodington The Complaint of Cor. Sodington Deputy of the Island S.t Helena, against M.r Kerr Chaplaine of the Said Island. Jan.ry 20.th 170 ¾ Sheweth that by y.e Insinuateing ways of the Said Kerr, to me Cornelius Sodington thought my Self never Secure in this Reputation Except in y.e Company of the Said Kerr, fryday went up into the Country to him Comands.t to y.e ffort, and Could not take nor Stay without him he telling me it would be of hard for a man of my free temper to Live without Some Censure the People of the Island being as he Said Naturally Addicted that way, and being w.th him at M.r Frances house, found his fallen Liz much more to Brundis then his owne profusion being never better pleased then when his face is of a Scarlett dye by his dearly Beloved Punch which makes Indrey very Eustines Insomuch that I had great trouble to forebear Striking him for his ill Expressions to me at the aforesaid pirinte of which I did not Complaint to the Govern.r because M.r Kerr Said he was drank	Island of St Helena, 19 January 1704. Lieutenant Sodington swore an affidavit against Mr Kerr, chaplain to the Honourable East India Company on this island. The substance ran as follows. Within ten days of his arrival, Kerr set to work on Sodington. The aim was to turn him against the governor, Stephen Poirier. Poirier, by Kerr's account, was a traitor to his own king. He was forced to flee his country. No faith could be expected from such a man, neither toward the East India Company nor toward the Queen of England, after he proved false to his natural prince. Treasonable depositions against Poirier were sent home to England by Captain [...]Jelatte, directed to the Secretary of State. Kerr stood as a witness himself. A copy of the depositions was shown to Sodington, who was asked to pass it on to Captain Stebs. Poirier, Kerr was certain, would be turned out. Kerr was glad of the arrival of Dorothy a Spent [...]. He offered to write to the Bishop of London on Sodington's behalf, to commend him as governor. A copy of the letter was promised. In it Sodington was praised as a good Christian and a lover of the Church of England. Kerr asked for the names of friends in England to whom letters might be sent in support of the design, and Sodington gave them. Poirier was called the worst of men. Names such as rogue and villain were used. Kerr carried a linen in his breast pocket and swore that, if he met Poirier in England, he would tear him. In Kerr's conscience, Poirier deserved to be [...], being a very ill man. Sodington was charged to keep copies of any letters written to the governor [...]. He was warned never to let Poirier know who his friends in England were, since the governor would write to them to his prejudice. Kerr himself, in imprudence, wrote to the Bishop of London against Poirier. Such talk from a man of his cloth made Sodington wary of the governor's company. A poor opinion of Poirier's loyalty to the Crown of England took root. Yet not once was the governor heard to speak against the interest of the English Crown. Poirier was often seen to begin the Queen's health, and that of His Royal Highness, with every mark of respect. Signed, Cornelius Sodington. The complaint of Cornelius Sodington, deputy of the island of St Helena, against Mr Kerr, chaplain. 20 January 1704. By Kerr's insinuating ways, Sodington was made to feel his reputation was never safe except in Kerr's company. On Friday, being commandant of the fort, he went up into the country to Kerr. He could not part from him, nor be at ease without him. Kerr told him a man of his free temper would find it hard to live on the island without censure, the people being naturally given to that. At Mr Frances's house, Kerr was found far more devoted to brandy than to his own profession. He was never better pleased than when his face was scarlet from his beloved punch, which made him very [...]. Sodington had great trouble to forbear striking him for his ill expressions at the [...]. No complaint was carried to the governor, since Kerr said he was drunk. Interpretations Affidavit and complaint were two distinct instruments. The first was sworn testimony framed for transmission to authorities in England. The second was a formal grievance lodged with the council against a Company servant. Each opened a different procedural route. Kerr held the post of chaplain to the East India Company on the island. The post was salaried and answerable to the Company directors, but ecclesiastical

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			conduct was answerable to the Bishop of London, who held diocesan jurisdiction over Anglican clergy in the colonies. The two lines of authority gave Kerr a channel of influence outside the governor's reach. Treasonable depositions sent to the Secretary of State were a route of escalation. Crown officers, not the Company, would judge a charge of treason. By framing Poirier's loyalty rather than his administration as the issue, the matter was lifted out of Company discipline into a sphere where the Company itself could be overruled. Stephen Poirier, called false to his natural prince, was a French Protestant refugee. The phrasing turned his flight from France into evidence of inconstancy rather than principle, exploiting contemporary suspicion of foreigners in English service. The Bishop of London held patronage over chaplaincies in Company territory and corresponded with the Company on appointments. By offering to write to the bishop in support of Sodington as governor, Kerr conflated ecclesiastical patronage with civil office, attempting to use one to obtain the other. Cornelius Sodington signed as deputy and commandant of the fort, the principal military post under the governor. Evidence from such a rank carried weight, since neither chaplain nor governor could dismiss it as the complaint of a subordinate. Speculations Kerr approached Sodington within ten days of his arrival. The timing was deliberate. A new officer, before he formed his own view of Poirier, was easier to recruit than one already settled in his loyalties. Several channels were opened at once. Depositions went to the Secretary of State. Letters went to the Bishop of London. Copies were placed in the hands of ship's captains. The redundancy suggests a hedge against the failure of any single route, since to dislodge a sitting Company governor required pressure from more than one quarter at the same time. The arrangement Kerr asked for was one-sided. Sodington was to keep copies of every letter sent to Poirier and to keep the names of his English friends from him. Information flowed inward to Kerr while the governor was kept blind. The structure was an evidentiary trap, not a precaution. The complaint of 20 January followed the affidavit of the day before. Each paper named a different target. Sodington moved to place himself on record against Kerr before the chaplain's earlier confidences could be turned, in any later proceeding, into evidence of a shared design.
98	76	drank too much the next morning and did beleive that might be the occasion. Still harbouring a good opinion of him though I found he could hardly give any man or woman a clear Charecter, Nay though my friendship was Sincere to him, yet as I am Credibly informed, whilst I we was together in the Country he Scandelizing me told M.r ffield and others, I was a very ill man, And they must not beleive one word Said that I was not a Sham.d to Cohabit w.th black wenches Publickly and to W.m Duston that a Gentlewoman of y.e Hland kept her doors open till twelve a Clock at night for me to go to her, and Once a Gentlewoman being absent one afternoon from Church, reported She was kifsing me because I was not there, but in my Lodging, and Cap.t Goodwin w.th me but no woman in our Company Thus by his backbiteing, Strives to Staine my Reputation privately, but for fear that Should prove invalled, Did on the 17.th Instant being flusked as is usuall tell me his black coat was as good as my reed, and called me little fellow, threatening if I was in England he would beat me, telling me in discourse it was a Lye which provoaking Languages made me Shake my Cane at him, but vented my Pasion, by flinging downe his	The next morning, Kerr drank heavily again, and Sodington took that to be the cause. He still kept a good opinion of him, though he found Kerr could hardly give any man or woman a clear character. Sodington's friendship was sincere. Yet, by credible report, while they were together in the country, Kerr scandalised him to Mr Field and others. He told them Sodington was a very ill man and that they must not believe a word he said. Sodington, Kerr claimed, was not ashamed to cohabit publicly with black women. To William Duston, Kerr said a gentlewoman of the island kept her doors open till twelve at night for Sodington to come to her. Once, when a gentlewoman was absent one afternoon from church, Kerr reported she was kissing Sodington, because Sodington had not been there but in his lodging - though Captain Goodwin was with him and no woman in their company. By such backbiting Kerr strove to stain Sodington's reputation in private. For fear that should prove unavailing, on 17 January 1704, flushed as usual, Kerr told him his black coat was as good as Sodington's red. He called him little fellow. He threatened to beat him in England. In discourse, he told him it was a lie.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Japan, which he Bully Like, w.th hatt Cockt and arms a Kimbo Comand[ed] me to fetch againe but telling him he ought to keep his hatt off in my presence raised his Lefson, and told me he would make me incapable of wearing a Sword And dignified me w.th the title of Madman to the Dishonor of my masters Whose Serene Judgments must then be abused by Sending over a person of Sence to be their Deputy, But the aforesaid Kerrs tongue is no Slander he giveing it what Scope his Airy Genius thinks fit to Annihilate Every one even the Governour and his Lady by Lampoons and Severall others, pretending he finds them but are always wrote by his owne hand, Ridiculing the whole Govern.mt: here, Sheiving us no manner of Civillity, beleiveing himself to be [Poirier]	Such provoking language made Sodington shake his cane at him. He vented his passion by flinging down Kerr's japan. Kerr, bully-like, with hat cocked and arms akimbo, commanded him to fetch it again. Sodington told him he ought to keep his hat off in his presence, which raised his [...]. Kerr said he would make him incapable of wearing a sword. He dignified him with the title of madman, to the dishonour of his masters, whose serene judgments must then have been abused by sending over a man of sense to be their deputy. Kerr's tongue is no slander. He gives it what scope his airy genius thinks fit, to annihilate everyone. Even the governor and his lady are not spared, by lampoons and several others. He pretends to find them, but they are always written by his own hand. He ridicules the whole government here and shows us no manner of civility. Interpretations The exchange over the black coat and the red was a quarrel about status. Kerr asserted his clerical garb stood equal to Sodington's military uniform. In a small colonial society where roles were few and rivalries personal, such precedence questions carried real weight. The threat to make Sodington incapable of wearing a sword was a threat to ruin his reputation past the point of holding a commission. The sword was the visible sign of officer rank and gentleman status. To lose the right to wear it was to lose both. Lampoons attributed to others but written by Kerr's own hand were a form of deniable slander. Authorship could be disowned while the libel circulated. The pretence of finding them gave Kerr a hedge against retaliation. The "masters" Sodington named were the Company directors in London. His deputyship was their appointment. Calling him a madman reflected on the men who chose him, which is the irony Sodington pressed. Field and Duston, named as recipients of Kerr's tales, were presumably leading inhabitants of the island. The slanders were placed where they would do most harm to Sodington's standing among those who mattered locally. Speculations The slanders covered every social register. Public cohabitation with black women, secret midnight visits to a gentlewoman, kissing during church absences - each charge fitted a different listener and a different fear about a young officer's conduct. The variety suggests Kerr matched the slander to his audience. When private backbiting did not break Sodington, Kerr turned to open provocation. The performance of 17 January - flushed, hat cocked, arms akimbo, ordering the japan to be fetched - reads as a designed posture of insolence. The aim seems to have been to provoke a striking blow, after which Sodington's loss of temper could be made the issue. The lampoons against the governor and his lady widened the conflict beyond Sodington alone. Striking at the highest ranks suggests Kerr counted on his clerical post and ecclesiastical patronage, outside the governor's reach, as a shield.
99	77	Island S.t Helena Att a Court of Judicatur Held on Mon= day the 24.th day of Jan.ry 170 ¾ Att the Sessions House neare Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington dp.ty Gov.r Tho.m Goodwin 3.d of Coun.ce After the Court was opened according to y.e Acustomed manner, those persons appointed for Jurors are as followeth/ Thomas Swallow Sen.r foreman 1 Rob.t Addis 2 Jn.o Nichols 3 Jn.o French 4 Thomas Dixon 5 Thomas Sanderson 6 Jn.o Long 7 Ones: Steward 8 Erasmus	Island of St Helena. Court of Judicature, Monday 24 January 1704, Sessions House near Fort James. Present: Stephen Poirier, Governor, presiding; Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor; Thomas Goodwin, third of Council. The court was opened in the customary manner. The following persons were appointed as jurors: Thomas Swallow Senior, foreman Robert Addis John Nichols John French Thomas Dixon Thomas Sanderson John Long Ones. Steward Erasmus Gurling John Mudge Henry Francis Charles Steward All were sworn and no objection was made.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Gurling 9 Jn.o Mudge 10 Henry Francis 11 Charles Steward 12 Who were all Sworne and no objection made/ Then the Worship.fl Govern.r Steph.n Poirier Esq.r Informed y.e Jury how that Eliz.th Johnson the wife of Jn.o Johnson Sold.r when She went off the Island, left her daughter Susanna in the Care and Custody of his Worship the Govern.r And whereas the Said Eliz: Johnsons Sister Madam Coe at Surratt, Sent her a parcell of Indea Goods for Cleathing directed to the Said Eliz Johnson, but She being gone off the Said goods was delivered to her brother Hatton Sterling (who had Some goods also Sent him with those for his Sister) of whom the Govern.r demanded S.d goods for the use of y.e aforesaid Susanna who told the Govern.r his brother in	Governor Poirier then informed the jury of the following matter. Elizabeth Johnson, wife of John Johnson, soldier, had placed her daughter Susanna in the Governor's care and custody before leaving the island. Elizabeth's sister, Madam Coe at Surat, sent a parcel of India goods for clothing directed to Elizabeth, but Elizabeth having left, the goods were delivered to her brother Hatton Sterling, who had some goods of his own sent with them. The Governor demanded those goods from Sterling for Susanna's use. Sterling told the Governor his brother in [...]
100	78	in Law Jn.o Hemonss had them, and when demanded a Second time the Said Hemonss deny.d to deliver them Saying they properly belonged to him, his wife being the Said Eliz: Johnsons own Sister Then the Jury withdrew and Stay'd about a Quarter of an hour then returned their verdict, That the part of those goods which was Sent to Eliz: Johnson, wife of Jn.o Johnson, and Sister to Mad.m Coe properly belonged to Susanna the Said Johnsons daughter and that Hatton Sterling Pay the Charges of Court for not delivering S.d good when demanded/ William Marsh free Planter made Comp.t against Tho: Dutton Sold.r for buying a goate (that was drest) of his Black man Named Yon, which goate the Said Black Stole out of M.r Carnes house, who was Encouraged to do it by the Said Dutton And Likewise made Complaint against Mary Beale wid.o for buying a Quarter of fresh pork of his Said Black the Same Cught, as he Stole the Goate, and Sold to Dutton/ Who being both Called into Court, Said they were agreed but the Said Marsh desired to have Said agreem.t Recorded as followeth. That the Said Thomas Dutton and Mary Beale Pay four Sold to the Said Marsh according to an order of Councill, for So Bartering w.th his black, as was vallued by the Said W.m Carne [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	...law, John Hemonss had them. When the Governor demanded them a second time, Hemonss refused, claiming they properly belonged to him as his wife was Elizabeth Johnson's own sister. The jury withdrew for about a quarter of an hour. On their return they found that the part of the goods sent to Elizabeth Johnson, wife of John Johnson and sister to Madam Coe, properly belonged to Susanna, Elizabeth's daughter. Hatton Sterling was ordered to pay court charges for failing to deliver the goods when demanded. William Marsh, free planter, complained against Thomas Dutton, soldier, for buying a dressed goat from his slave Yon. Yon had stolen the goat from Mr Carne's house, encouraged to do so by Dutton. Marsh also complained against Mary Beale, widow, for buying a quarter of fresh pork from the same slave on the same [...], being the occasion he stole the goat and sold it to Dutton. Both were called into court. They said they were agreed, but Marsh asked for the agreement to be recorded. Thomas Dutton and Mary Beale were to pay 4s 0d to Marsh, in accordance with an order of Council for bartering with his slave, as valued by William Carne. Signed: Stephen Poirier, Thomas Goodwin. Interpretations The penalty for bartering with another man's slave ran to the slave's owner rather than to any public fund. This gave masters a direct financial incentive to prosecute such transactions and placed the cost of unauthorised trade on those who profited from it. Hatton Sterling's punishment was court charges rather than forfeiture of the goods. The jury restored the goods to Susanna while treating Sterling's obstruction as a procedural offence rather than a graver one. William Marsh's designation as free planter placed him in a distinct legal category on a garrison island where most civilians were soldiers, servants or the enslaved. It marked him as a property-holding civilian with standing to bring a complaint in the Company's own court. Speculations Dutton and Beale settled privately before any verdict and then asked to have the settlement recorded. The recording was the point: without it, Marsh retained the right to pursue them again. They had agreed terms they preferred to a court-imposed penalty, but needed institutional protection to make the settlement hold. Hemonss's refusal to release the goods rested on a kinship claim that competed directly with the Governor's custodial authority over Susanna. The jury's verdict for the child over the adult relative reinforced the Governor's position as lawful guardian and rejected the argument that collateral family connection overrode it.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
101	79	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Wednesday the 26.th day of Jan.ry 170 ¾ Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington dp.ty Gov.r Tho: Goodwin Ensigned Whereas [...] [...] [...] [...] Ever Since Govern.r Keelings Negroe was tryed by a Jury of twelve men, as a favour But when he was found guilty of Death According to the Laws of England and Executed the Said fact, Every freeman paid p Pole the vallue of the Said Negroe According to the Estimation of two free hand Said According to the R.t Hono.ble [...] orders, But many Circumstances happening did Alter the be either in the kind of the Negroes, or in the payment though to the owners of Said Negroes So Excited The which to prevent The Govern.r and Councill have Severall times desired the Inhabitants to Assemble themselves together and advise what means and method Should be used to Answer the better their owne Concerns which we would Authorize and Confirm to be Attending Law on this Island Provided always the Said R.t Hono. Comp.s as Ratifications be had But hetherto Proved in vaine till yesterday being the 25.th Instant At a General Randesvour of the whole Island We the Govern.r and Councill moved them againe on this Subject upon the last Juries not being willing to try Negroes the majority made Choice of twelve men amongst them, to bring this affair to a perfection Whose names are as followeth. Mr Thom: Goodwin Charles Hasard Geo: Hoskison Rob.t Addis Matt: Garettt Rich. Gurling Henry Coales Edward Bagley Jn.o Mudge Henry Francis Jn.o Coles Ones: Hasard Some	Island of St Helena. Consultation, Wednesday 26 January 1704, Fort James. Present: Stephen Poirier, Governor; Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign. Since Governor Keeling's slave was tried by jury as a favour and found guilty of death under English law and executed, every freeman paid the slave's value per head according to assessment by two [...], per the Right Honourable Company's orders. Many circumstances changed regarding the kind of slaves or payment to owners. To prevent further issues, the Governor and Council asked inhabitants to assemble and advise on means and method. This would be authorised and confirmed as law on the island, provided the Company's ratification was obtained. This failed until yesterday, 25 January, when at a general rendezvous the Governor and Council raised it again. The last jury was unwilling to try slaves, so the majority chose twelve men to complete the affair. Thomas Goodwin Charles Hasard George Hoskison Robert Addis Matthew Garrett Richard Gurling Henry Coales Edward Bagley John Mudge Henry Francis John Coles Ones. Hasard Some [...] Interpretations The poll tax on freemen to pay for executed slaves created collective liability. Every inhabitant shared the cost of capital punishment for slaves rather than the loss falling on individual owners alone. The refusal of the previous jury to try slaves, and the need to choose a new panel, suggests resistance among some inhabitants to sitting in judgment on slave cases. A fresh jury was assembled to overcome that reluctance.
102	80	Island S.t Helena Jan.ry y.e 26.th 170 ¾ Whereas by the Consent and approbation of the Worship.fll Govern.r and Coun.l of this Said Island and the majority of votes of free planters and other the masters of families Inhabitants aforesaid We are authorized to meet together this day as a Court of Comm mittees to make and Estable Laws orders and Instructions for punishin of all Negroes Slaves that Shall offend And proof thereof made against them according to the Judgm.t of the Govern. and Coun.l hereby Institutions hereafter mentioned and agreed upon/ For wandering of Sundays That no Black or Blacks upon any Pretence whatsoever Shall wander or Strangle from his masters Plantation upon Sunday without a Lawfull Occasion Granted by their Said Master or masters either by ordering or Some other Token that Shall be Knowne to the Neighbourhood upon the Pennalty of Ten Lashes on his Naked body, for the first offence fifteen the Second Twenty the third for Every Such offence Thereafter Comitted but if the master of the Said Slave or Slaves Should Refuse to comply w.th this Said order, and the person who Shall have taken the Said Slave or Slaves Acting Contrary to this Said order, Shall be obliged to Complaine to the Govern.r and Councill, whom we	Island of St Helena, 26 January 1704. By the consent and approbation of the Worshipful Governor and Council of this island and the majority of votes of free planters and other masters of families, they were authorised to meet as a Court of Committees to make and establish laws, orders and instructions for punishing all negro slaves that should offend. Proof was to be made according to the judgment of the Governor and Council. The instructions hereafter were agreed upon. For wandering on Sundays. No black or blacks was to wander or straggle from his master's plantation on Sunday without lawful occasion granted by master, either by order or some other token known to the neighbourhood. Penalty was ten lashes on the naked body for the first offence, fifteen for the second, twenty for the third, and so on for each offence thereafter. If the master refused to comply, and the person who took the slave acting contrary to this order was to complain to the Governor and Council, they were to fine him or them at discretion. For pilfering and stealing. A negro or negroes known to steal the value of 1s 6d were to have twenty lashes on the naked body inflicted by the master in the presence of the person

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		desire to fine him or them that Shall So Offend at discretion For Pilfering and Stealing That negro or Negroes that Shall be knowne to Steal the vallue of one and Six pence, Shall have 20 Lashes on their Naked body, Inflicted by the master or masters of the Said Slaves in the presence of the person So offended. But if the theft Should amount to three Shillings the Lashes is to be Increased to 30, the Shillings to 50, and the party So Prejudiced Shall Receive the vallue of the thing Stolen in goods or in mony from the owner of the Said Slave or Slaves, and in case the theft amounts to above Six Shillings and under thirty the offender Shall be Sized and brought to the fort, where he Shall receive Immediately 50 Lashes on his Naked body, and Secured, two days after he Shall receive 20, two days after that 20 more And the master of th[e] Black Shall pay the vallue Stolen/ Runaway Blacks Those that Shall absent themselves from there Masters Service three days and three nights, Shall be punished According to the foregoing Article and the masters make Satisfaction for what they have Stolen as abovesaid. For Margin Notes: Sundays X Acro.r [...]	offended. If the theft amounted to 3s, lashes were to increase to thirty. If to [...] shillings, lashes were to reach fifty. The party prejudiced was to receive the value of the thing stolen in goods or money from the owner. If the theft amounted to above 6s and under 30s, the offender was to be seized and brought to the fort, where he was to receive fifty lashes on the naked body immediately, be secured, receive twenty lashes two days after, and twenty more two days after that. The master was to pay the value stolen. For runaway blacks. Those absent from their master's service three days and three nights were to be punished according to the foregoing article, and masters were to make satisfaction for what they had stolen as aforesaid. Interpretations The pass system—a token known to the neighbourhood marking authorized absence on Sunday—created decentralized enforcement. Neighbours could identify permitted vs unpermitted movement without direct oversight. Masters were made responsible for administering punishment for small thefts, inflicting lashes in the presence of the offended party. This shifted the cost and labour of punishment onto the master. The three-day-three-night threshold for runaways marked the boundary between temporary absence and flight. Before that point the slave remained subject to plantation discipline; after that the slave entered a different legal category.
103	81	For breaking open Houses For the first offence the Master or Masters Shall make Satisfaction for what damages is Stolen, and Repair all Damages done by the Said Slave or Slaves So Soon as taken Shall be brought to y.e fort and Immediately receive on his naked body, one Hundred Lashes then Secured, four days after thirty Lashes, & 2 day after that twenty more and branded in y.e forehead with R [...] for the Second offence in this Kind he Shall recieve be Punished as abovesaid and wear for one year a Chain and Clogg, of thirty Pound weight For the third offence Satisfaction Shall be made as abovesaid to the Loser or Loosers and the Slave or Slaves Shall Suffer Death at the discreession of Govern.r and Govern.mt/ Note that the abovesaid Satisfaction in the Last Article means that the goods Stolen, and damages done be vallued w.th the Negroe, and all be Loosers according to Proportion/ Whereas in this Case of breaking open of houses it is Said that the owners of Negroes Shall for the first and Second offences Pay the Damages done by their Said Slaves, it is hereby Provided that in case the Said Negroes Should have Stolen more then their Masters are willing to pay That then the Said Slave Shall be delivered to the Party Injured to work the Same out viz.t in the first Case (where no Irons is on them) at the rate of 1 p day But if in the Second Case when the Chaîne and Clogg is on them at 5 p day But if it be a woman Girle or boy the Judgement of their Labour Shall be Sett by y.e Govern. and Coun. But the Said Slave Shall not be abused in any kind whatsoever, under the Pennalty of Loosing his or their wholl Labour/ desire All these premises we Humbly the Govern. and Coun.l for the time being to approve Confirm by and Execute According to the best of their Judgment In witness whereof we the Subscribers hath hereunto Set our hands the day and year before written Ones: Steward Tho: Goodwin Charles Steward Geo: Hoskison Rob.t Addis Matt: Garett [Poirier] Rich. Gurling Henry Coales Jn.o Mudge Tho: Goodwin Edw. Bagley Henry Francis Jn.o Coles	Island of St Helena, 26 January 1704. By the consent and approbation of the Worshipful Governor and Council of this island and the majority of votes of free planters and other masters of families, they were authorised to meet as a Court of Committees to make and establish laws, orders and instructions for punishing all negro slaves that should offend. Proof was to be made according to the judgment of the Governor and Council. The instructions hereafter were agreed upon. For wandering on Sundays. No black or blacks was to wander or straggle from his master's plantation on Sunday without lawful occasion granted by master, either by order or some other token known to the neighbourhood. Penalty was ten lashes on the naked body for the first offence, fifteen for the second, twenty for the third, and so on for each offence thereafter. If the master refused to comply, and the person who took the slave acting contrary to this order was to complain to the Governor and Council, they were to fine him or them at discretion. For pilfering and stealing. A negro or negroes known to steal the value of 1s 6d were to have twenty lashes on the naked body inflicted by the master in the presence of the person offended. If the theft amounted to 3s, lashes were to increase to thirty. If to [...] shillings, lashes were to reach fifty. The party prejudiced was to receive the value of the thing stolen in goods or money from the owner. If the theft amounted to above 6s and under 30s, the offender was to be seized and brought to the fort, where he was to receive fifty lashes on the naked body immediately, be secured, receive twenty lashes two days after, and twenty more two days after that. The master was to pay the value stolen. For runaway blacks. Those absent from their master's service three days and three nights were to be punished according to the foregoing article, and masters were to make satisfaction for what they had stolen as aforesaid. Interpretations The pass system - a token known to the neighbourhood marking authorized absence on Sunday

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			- created decentralized enforcement. Neighbours could identify permitted vs unpermitted movement without direct oversight. Masters were made responsible for administering punishment for small thefts, inflicting lashes in the presence of the offended party. This shifted the cost and labour of punishment onto the master. The three-day-three-night threshold for runaways marked the boundary between temporary absence and flight. Before that point the slave remained subject to plantation discipline; after that the slave entered a different legal category.
104	82	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Wednesday the 26.th day of Jan.ry 170 ¾ Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Gover.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington d.ptý Govov.r Thomas Goodwin Insigne Whereas Georgea Negroe man Belonging to Ripin Wills free planter, upon the Jurys Shewing themselves not willing to try him, was brought this day before us who has bin Imprisoned nigh three months upon Suspexion for breaking open the house was in the posefsion of Thomas Gargen, and two Chests, one of his owne, and the other Jn.o Caverings who lodges w.th him, and Stole Several peices of Linnen, viz.t one pair of Callico Sheets, three fine Shirts three Napkins, one table Cloth two Neckcloths, one Handkerchief a Knott of Blew Ribbon a Smale quantity of Sugar & Hammering, three dollars and a halfe in Cash, and one p of gold Called avenicein belonging to the Said Caving The Said Negroe was Examined who denyed that he broke open the Said house and Chests Saying he was not within the house But only at the Back door where he found the Smale Cane and Knott of Ribbon which he Carried w.th him into M.r Hemonsss house, where he was found, Which being a Strong presumption, he broke Said house, &c. and those two particulars of Stolen Goods, found in his Custody, which M.r Gargen Sworn to. It was Concluded & ordered That the Negroe Shall be punnished According to the Law made by the twelve men Chosen by y.e majority of Inhabitants of this Island And the damages made good by Ripin Wills (the owner of Said Negroe) both to Thomas Gargen and Caving and Jn.o Hemonss, this being the first time that the S.d Negroe hath been Guilty of Crimes in this Nature/	A consultation was held on Wednesday 26 January 1704 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. It was attended by Stephen Poirier, Governor, presiding; Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor; and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign. George, a negro man belonging to Ripin Wills, a free planter, was brought before them. The jury showed themselves unwilling to try him. George was imprisoned nearly three months on suspicion of breaking open a house in the possession of Thomas Gargen and two chests - one his own, the other belonging to John Caving who lodged with him. The goods alleged stolen were several pieces of linen: one pair of calico sheets, three fine shirts, three napkins, one table cloth, two neckcloths, one handkerchief, a knot of blue ribbon, a small quantity of sugar and [...], three dollars and a half in cash, and one piece of gold called [...] belonging to Caving. George was examined. He denied breaking open the house and chests, saying he was only at the back door where he found the small cane and knot of ribbon which he carried with him into Mr Hemonss's house, where he was found. This was strong presumption that he broke the house and chests. These two particulars of stolen goods were found in his custody and sworn to by Mr Gargen. It was concluded and ordered that George was to be punished according to the law made by the twelve men chosen by the majority of inhabitants of this island. The damages were to be made good by Ripin Wills, the owner, to Thomas Gargen and Caving and John Hemonss. This was the first time the slave was guilty of crimes of this nature. Interpretations The jury showed themselves unwilling to try slaves, and George was examined before the Governor and Council instead. The sitting magistrates functioned as a substitute court when the jury refused its role. Possession of two stolen items - the cane and ribbon - was treated as strong presumption of guilt, sufficient to overcome George's denial of entry. The law did not require proof of breaking into the house; possession itself was incriminating. Restitution was ordered from Ripin Wills, the slave's owner, not from George. The owner bore the financial cost of the slave's crime to all three victims, creating a direct incentive to control slave behaviour. Speculations George's explanation that he found the items at the back door was rejected without inquiry into its plausibility. The presumption ran against him: possession was guilt. The law did not require the prosecution to prove entry or theft, only that he held the goods. The explicit statement that this was George's first offence of this kind suggests his prior record was clean. The note reserves the possibility of harsher punishment on reoffence, signalling that escalation followed repetition.
105	83	Whereas a man and woman Negroe belonging to Grace Coulson wid.o Came downe to Fort James and broke	Two slaves, a man and woman, belonging to Grace Coulson, widow, came down to Fort James and broke

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		open her house, and Stole thereout abetween fifty and Sixty dollars three peices of gold and one Silver Spoon. And did the Same night Break open M.r Thomas Goddains House by putting a Ladder against y.e wall and Crepting in, at his window and Setten in S.d house opened a Cofe and brought out five Case bottles of Arrack, and a Smale b.x of Sugar. It is ordered. That the Said Grace Coulsons two Negroes be Punnished According to the Law aforesaid and She to make y.e Said M.r Goodwin Satisfaction for what Sugar and Arrack Stolen from him/ [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 8.th day of Feb.ry 170 ¾ Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington dp.ty Gov.r Tho: Goodwin Insign.e Mary Field wid.o came this day before Govern.r and Coun.l and desired that her dec.d Husband Jn.o Fields verball Will might be proved by the oath of the Worship.fll Steph: Poirier Esq.r Gover.r which is as followeth. About a month ago M.r Jn.o Field being in good but tile Sense called me to come Near his bed and told me thus, My dear friend I acknowledge that I have no better friend then you Therefore be witness	open her house, stealing between fifty and sixty dollars, three pieces of gold, and one silver spoon. The same night they broke open Mr Thomas Goodwin's house by placing a ladder against the wall and creeping in at his window. In the house they opened a coffer and brought out five case bottles of arrack and a small box of sugar. It was ordered that Grace Coulson's two slaves were to be punished according to the law aforesaid, and she was to make Mr Goodwin satisfaction for the sugar and arrack stolen from him. Signed: Stephen Poirier, Thomas Goodwin. A consultation was held on Tuesday 8 February 1704 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. It was attended by Stephen Poirier, Governor, presiding; Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor; and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign. Mary Field, widow, came before the Governor and Council and desired that her deceased husband John Field's verbal will be proved by oath of Stephen Poirier, Governor. Poirier testified to the will as follows. About a month before, Mr John Field, being in good but [...] sense, called him to come near his bed and told him thus: "My dear friend, I acknowledge that I have no better friend than you. Therefore be witness [...]" Interpretations A verbal will required witness testimony to be proved in court. There was no written document; the evidence was the witness's oath to what the dying man had said. Field called the Governor specifically to his deathbed to hear his final wishes. The choice suggests Poirier held sufficient standing and impartiality to serve as testator to a man's last words. Speculations Field's choice to confide in Poirier rather than a family member or professional suggests either the absence of such people on the island, or that Poirier was trusted as an impartial officer whose testimony could not be questioned.
106	84	Witness that what God hath been pleased to bestow upon me I give all to my wife. To dispose of it as She pleafes, But Said Poire you Remember your Children he replyd he knew She will do Justice to them, adding that as for Mary Sheshall follow her own ffancy She may thank her Self for it then Said S.r I would be better to have it written down That it might be recorded, No Says he it is to Little, that I dont care it Should be other wise and I pray you to have an Eye that She may Enjoy all and See that My Children God give them their due respect to her Likewise that She may not be troubled for what I am Indebted in the Stors To those things abovesaid I did Engage my self to perform in Case they would take my doise, if not I Should be disturbed, before God and men of my Engagem.t Being the whole truth what is above written upon my oath this Eighth day of February 170 ¾ as aforesaid Poirier It is ordered That the Said M.r Jn.o Fields verball Will be a good will, and accordingly approved of, and Copys to be delivered y.e when demanded Whereas M.r Thomas Goodwin and Matt: Garett Execut.rs of the Last Will and Testament of James Rider, late free Planter dec.d Brought this day the Said Will before us in order of haveing y.e Same Probed which was Accordingly done by the oaths of Henry Field Thomas Davis, and James Draper, And Likewise the Said M.r Goodwin and Mast.r Garett was Sworne to perform the office of Executr.r According to the Tenor of y.e Said James Riders Last Will and Testament/ It is ordered That the Said James Riders Last Will and Testament now produced be approved of and Copy given when ever demanded/	Poirier testified upon oath as follows. About a month before, when John Field lay on his deathbed, he had spoken to Poirier in these terms: he left all that God had bestowed upon him to his wife, to dispose of as she pleased. He asked Poirier to remember his children and ensure the wife did them justice. Poirier replied that the wife would do justice to them. Field then said that as for Mary, she should follow her own fancy and might thank herself for it. When Poirier suggested it would be better to have the matter written down and recorded, Field replied it was too little and he did not care otherwise. Field asked Poirier to ensure his wife enjoyed everything, that the children received their due respect from her, and that she was not troubled by his debts in the stores. Poirier engaged himself to perform these things, in case they would accept his [...]. If not, he would be answerable before God and men of his engagement. This was the whole truth, upon oath, this eighth day of February 1704. Signed: Stephen Poirier. It was ordered that Mr John Field's verbal will was a good will and was approved. Copies were to be delivered when demanded. Mr Thomas Goodwin and Matthew Garrett, executors of the last will and testament of James Rider, late free planter deceased, brought the said will before the Governor and Council in order to have it proved. It was accordingly proved by the oaths of Henry Field, Thomas Davis, and James Draper. Mr Goodwin and Garrett were sworn to perform the office of executor according to the tenor of the said will. It was ordered that James Rider's last will and testament was approved and copies were to be given when demanded.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Humphrey Edwards monthof made Complaint to us That Grace Coulson wid.o hath reported to Severall persons that Rich. Roy had Layne w.th his S.d wife and So got her w.th Child, And when Ever it was borne the Said Complain.t would Say go out you bitch with your Bastard/ The Said Grace Coulson being present made Reply that, Sometime ago She askt M.r Browne (now the Said Humphrey Edwardes wife) if She could not get a better fellow then y.e Said Edwards for her Husband, but After having an answer to y.t question Said farther I beleive you marry him You'le Cock, having heard as how Richard Roy had Lain with her three times, and Seeing him one Evening at W.m Browns house She taxed him of y.e fact, who did not deny it, and to Clear the Report from	Humphrey Edwards [...] made complaint that Grace Coulson, widow, had reported to several persons that Richard Roy had lain with his said wife and so got her with child. And whenever it was born the said complainant would say "go out you bitch with your bastard". Grace Coulson, being present, made reply that some time before she had asked Mr Browne (now the said Humphrey Edwards' wife) if she could not get a better fellow than the said Edwards for her husband. But after having an answer to that question she said further "I believe you marry him. You [...]." Having heard that Richard Roy had lain with her three times, and seeing him one evening at Wm Browne's house, she taxed him of the fact, who did not deny it, and to clear the report from [...] Interpretations Field refused Poirier's suggestion to have the will written, saying it was "too little" to bother recording. Oral testimony from the Governor carried sufficient legal weight. The Governor's oath was protection enough. Poirier engaged himself personally, before God and men, to ensure Field's widow enjoyed the estate and the children received their due. The Governor became the guarantor of a dying man's wishes, binding his own honour to their performance. The Edwards complaint concerned seduction and lineage. The issue was not consent but that Roy had fathered a bastard on Edwards' wife, bringing shame and creating uncertainty over inheritance and legitimacy. Speculations Field's refusal to have the will written might suggest poverty - the estate was worth too little to record - or confidence that the Governor's personal oath offered better security than paper. Coulson's initial question to Browne about "a better fellow" for a husband suggests she may have perceived marital unhappiness before Roy's seduction, or was deliberately probing Browne's dissatisfaction to gauge her vulnerability.
107	85	from being first broached by her, desired that Simon Lenox, and John Welch Sold.r might be Called and Sworn to give affidavit in this matter who Acordingly were as followeth/ Simon Lenox Sold.r being Sworn Saith that Some time Since, himself Jn.o Welch and Richard Ray were drinking part of a bottle or two of wine at Will: Marshes house, and being discourseing the Said Rich. Ray Said he would go off one of the Company replyd what before you are married, (he being then a Courting y.e S.d Hum.y Edwards wife) the Said Roy answered Carson yes for I have Said her three times upon w.ch the Said Welch kept the Said Rays mouth/ Leaft She Should Say more/ Jn.o Welch Sold.r being Sworn Saith the Same as Simon Lenox hath already deposed/ Richard Ray Says he don't Remember that he Said any Such thing of the Said Hum.y Edward wife, being then much in drink, But if he did, he is heartily Sorry for it for he never knew any dishonesty by her, and begs Pardon for what he Said. Upon which It is ordered. That the Said Rich. Ray for Scandalizing the Said Humpy.y Edwards wife be fined to her one dollar, and five Shillings more to y.e R.t Hono. ble Comp.s and pay Charges of Councill, And that he aske y.e Said Humpy. Edwards wife forgiveness upon his Knees, And as for M.rs Coulson She be Cleared upon the oaths aforesaid of Simon Lenox and Jn.o Welch/ Will: Marsh free Planter desires to Lease a Smale parcell of y.e R.t Hono. ble Comp.s Wast Land Lying between the Land and gate Powells/ Rob.t Marsh desires he may Lease ab.t three or four Acres of Land Lying betwixt	Upon Coulson's request, Simon Lenox and John Welch, both soldiers, were called and sworn to give affidavit in the matter. Simon Lenox testified that some time before, he, Welch, and Richard Roy were drinking wine at William Marsh's house. Roy said he would go off. Someone asked "what, before you are married?" Roy was then courting Humphrey Edwards' wife. Roy answered "yes, for I have lain with her three times". Welch then stopped Roy before he could say more. John Welch testified the same as Simon Lenox. Richard Roy testified that he did not remember saying such a thing of Humphrey Edwards' wife. He was much in drink. But if he did, he was heartily sorry, for he never knew any dishonesty by her. He begged pardon for what he had said. It was ordered that Richard Roy, for scandalising the said Humphrey Edwards' wife, was to be fined one dollar to her and five shillings more to the Right Honourable Company, and to pay the charges of council. He was to ask the said Humphrey Edwards' wife forgiveness upon his knees. As for Mrs Coulson, she was cleared on the oaths of Simon Lenox and John Welch. William Marsh, free planter, desired to lease a small parcel of the Right Honourable Company's waste land lying between the land and gate Powells. Robert Marsh desired to lease about three or four acres of land lying between the land Sam Maxwell deceased hired and Ones Hazard and the [...] ridge. Edward Heath, free planter, desired to hire a parcel of waste land that lay on the ridge above the land he had bought from Edward Brayne deceased.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		the Land Sam: Maxwell dec.d hires, and Ones: Husard and y.e meun Ridge. Edward Heath free Planter desires he may Hire a parcell of wast Land that Lies on y.e Ridge above y.e Land he bought of Edward Brayne dec.d Jonn Higham Sold.r desires he may Hire a Smale parcell of Land Lying at the head of thinks valley joyning to Jon.t Surdings Land/ It is ordered That the Surveyor have a Warrant to measure y.e Land aforesaid to those persons abovementioned, and that y.e Rent Comence from the 25 day of March Ensueing the date thereof ones:	John Higham, soldier, desired to hire a small parcel of land lying at the head of [...] valley joining to Jonathan Surdings' land. It was ordered that the Surveyor was to have a warrant to measure the land aforesaid for those persons abovementioned, and that the rent was to commence from 25 March ensuing the date thereof. Interpretations Roy's admission while drinking - that he had lain with Edwards' wife three times - was treated as more credible than his later denial, despite his claim of drunkenness. The specific number gave the admission particularity that made it difficult to dismiss. Roy's penalty included both private restitution (one dollar to Edwards' wife) and public fine (five shillings to the Company), plus the humiliation of asking forgiveness on his knees. Slander was punished through a graduated sanction that restored the victim's honor publicly. Coulson was cleared by bringing forward the two soldiers as witnesses. The court credited their testimony over Roy's denials and over Coulson's own statements, treating the soldiers' oaths as impartial evidence. Speculations Welch's action in stopping Roy's mouth suggests he was trying to limit the damage from further admissions or slander while Roy was drunk and loose-tongued. Whether Welch was protecting Roy from self-incrimination or preventing additional harm to Edwards' wife's reputation, the choice shows one bystander's attempt to control the consequences of drunken speech.
108	86	Onesip: Steward free planter made Complaint That William Swallow Sold.r frequented his house when absent from home, and did play at cards with his blacks, hindering them from their work, by which doings Encouraged them Real both from himself and Neighbours But to prevent the like for the future desired that y.e Said Swallow might be called and reprimanded as we thought fitt/ The Said Will: Swallow being called deny'd that he resorted to the Said Ones: Stewards house when he was from home, but being Convinct by Evidence besides Charles Steward who Declares that about a fortnight ago he went up from the fort about Ten of y.e Clock at night, and when come to his Brothers house (which was then about twelve) Seeing alight knockt at y.e doore, upon which y.e light was pute out, and then y.e door opened by the blacks, and haveing a great Suspetion that Some body was hid within y.e house Lookt in Every Roome, and in alittle Room found the Said Will: Swallow who he gave three or four Blows and bid him go home/ It is ordered That the Said Will: Swallow for frequenting the Said Onesiphorus house and playing w.th his blacks be fined to him the Sume of one dollar, and halfe a dollar to the Comp.s and to pay Charges of Councill and to Ride the wooden Horse one houre at the dismount of y.e Guard And forbidden to go to the Said Ones: Stewards house when he and his wife is from home (Unless upon Some Lawfull Occasion) upon paine of Severe Punnishment [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Onesiphorus Steward, free planter, made complaint that William Swallow, soldier, frequented his house when he was absent from home. Swallow played cards with Steward's slaves, hindering them from their work. By these doings he encouraged them to steal from both Steward and his neighbours. To prevent the like in future, Steward desired that Swallow be called and reprimanded as the court thought fit. Swallow, being called, denied that he resorted to Steward's house when Steward was away. But he was convicted by evidence. Charles Steward testified that about a fortnight before, he went up from the fort about ten at night. Coming to his brother's house about midnight, he saw a light, knocked on the door. The light went out and the door opened by the slaves. Having great suspicion that someone was hidden in the house, he looked in every room. In a little room he found William Swallow. He gave Swallow three or four blows and bid him go home. It was ordered that William Swallow, for frequenting the said Onesiphorus Steward's house and playing with his slaves, was to be fined one dollar to Steward and half a dollar to the Company, and to pay the charges of council. He was to ride the wooden horse for one hour at the [...]. He was forbidden to go to the said Steward's house when Steward and his wife were from home, unless upon some lawful occasion, upon pain of severe punishment. Signed: Stephen Poirier, Thomas Goodwin. Interpretations A soldier playing cards with slaves while their master was absent was seen as corrupting their labour and hindering plantation work. The soldier was breaching the discipline that held enslaved labour in place. The wooden horse was public punishment. Being ridden "at the dismount of the guard" placed it under military supervision and made it visible to the garrison, serving to shame Swallow before his peers. The fine was split between private restitution (one dollar to Steward) and public fine (half dollar to Company). The court enforced both Steward's property

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			right in his slave's labour and the Company's interest in order. Speculations Swallow's arrival after 10pm and presence in a dark room suggests clandestine purpose. Charles Steward's immediate suspicion that "somebody was hid within the house" indicates such visits were either known or suspected. The visit may have been social, but the secrecy made it compromising. The slaves' action in extinguishing the light and opening the door for Swallow shows they recognized or were expecting him. Whether this was collusion or obedience to a soldier's authority, they were complicit in admitting him to the house.
109	87	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 22 day of February 170 ¾ Att Fort James Stephen Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Corn: Sodington dp.ty Gover.r Tho: Goodwin Ensigne Ann the wife of Philip Karslake Sold.r Came this day to Governour and Councill and made Complaint that her Husband doth not allow her Sufficient maintainance, calling her Severall ill names with Threats to use her worse then he has already by keeping her under more like a Slave then a wife, which She made oath to. And accordingly It was ordered That the Said Philip Karslake behave himself to his wife as he ought to do According to their Estate and Condection till this day fortnight that then other measures be taken thereon, And a forther Examination of the y.r/ Whereas on Satterday Last Nathaniel Conoway Carpenter and Jacob Miller Cdtwaine gott drunk and fee to fighting about the Comp.s boat at which time the Said Conoway gave a Black man of y.t Said Comp. Severall blows without any manner of Cause Whereupon It is ordered. That the Said Nath: Cnoway be fined five Shillings for being drunk to the Church, and five Shillings more to y.e R.t Hono. ble Comp.s for Striking their Servants, And thirty Shillings more for Loss of time in not working at his trade for y.e Said Hono. Company Likewise It is ordered have That the Said Jacob Miller for being drunk when he Should been a fishing be fined five Shillings to y.e Said Hono. Comp.s and five Shillings more to the Church and Charges James	A consultation was held on Tuesday 22 February 1704 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. It was attended by Stephen Poirier, Governor, presiding; Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor; and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign. Ann, wife of Philip Karslake, soldier, came before the Governor and Council and made complaint that her husband did not allow her sufficient maintenance. He called her several ill names and threatened to use her worse than he had already, keeping her under more like a slave than a wife. She swore to this. It was ordered that Philip Karslake was to behave himself to his wife as he ought according to their estate and condition until this day fortnight, when other measures were to be taken. A further examination of the [...] was to be made. On Saturday last, Nathaniel Conway, carpenter, and Jacob Miller, coxswain, got drunk and fell to fighting about the Company's boat. Conway gave a black man of the Company several blows without any cause. It was ordered that Nathaniel Conway was to be fined five shillings for being drunk to the church, five shillings more to the Right Honourable Company for striking their servants, and thirty shillings more for loss of time in not working at his trade for the said Honourable Company. Likewise it was ordered that Jacob Miller, for being drunk when he should have been fishing, was to be fined five shillings to the said Honourable Company and five shillings more to the church and [...] Interpretations Ann's complaint charged her husband with keeping her "under more like a slave than a wife" - a stark comparison that marked the treatment as a fundamental breach of the marriage relationship as understood. The court granted a two-week grace period to reform "according to their estate and condition", suggesting the expectation of improvement was scaled to their means. Conway's strike on an enslaved person without cause was treated as a distinct offense from his drunkenness, incurring a separate fine to the Company whose servant was struck. The Company's economic interest in protecting its workers was thus recognized. The fines for Conway were itemized: drunkenness (five shillings to church), assault on servant (five shillings to Company), lost work time (thirty shillings to Company). The largest single fine was for time lost from his trade, marking the Company's priority. Speculations Ann's willingness to swear her complaint before the Governor suggests either desperation or confidence that the court could compel a husband's behaviour. The two-week reprieve before "other measures" implies the court believed reformation was possible before harsher remedies. Conway and Miller's fight over the Company's boat may have concerned work assignments or disputed claims to the boat. The fight escalated to striking an enslaved person, suggesting quarrel turned to violence.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
110	88	James Draper free planter desires to hire about three or four Acres of the R.t Hono. Comp.s wast Land Lying in Sandey bey, hangeings under Drinine beak/ Samuel DesFountaine desires he may Hire about y.e Same quantity of Land adjoining to the Land he hires Lying in Sandey bay/ or three John Alexander desires he may Hire two Acres of y.e Said Hono. Companys wast Land Lying under the main Ridg at the head of fishers valley, adjoining to his owne Land/ It is ordered. That the Said Draper DesFountaines and Alexanders requests be Granted, and that the Surveyor have a Warrant Accordingly to measure the Said Land to Each person the Rent Comencing from y.e 25 day of March next Ensueing/ Poirier Tho: Goodwin Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 7 day of March 170 ¾ Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Governour Pres.t Cor: Sodington Dp.ty Gover.r Tho: Goodwin Insigne free Planter Thomas Coales [...] about a week ago came to the Governour and made demand of thirteen Shillings and Six pence for diet that Tho: Lddyman Sold.r Stood Indebted to him when he went off the Said Island, against which the Governour told him Should be paid But hearing Since that the Said Lddyman Said the Said Thomas Coales a Flatt for y.e payment of Said Sum of thirteen Shillings and Six pence he was Sumoned to appeare before us this day for makeing a false demand/ Daniel Griffith being Examined Saith that on 1.th day Last he heard the Said Thomas Coales and Lddyman Disputeing about Two dollars at which time heard the Said Lddyman appoint a day for his Landlord Coales to meet him at the ffort in order of Receiveing Satisfaction, And knows the Said Tho: Coales Accordingly went to y.e ffort	James Draper, free planter, sought to lease about three or four acres of the Right Honourable Company's waste property lying in Sandy Bay, [...]. Samuel DesFountaine petitioned to lease about the same quantity adjoining the parcel he held, lying in Sandy Bay. John Alexander applied for two acres of the said Honourable Company's waste acreage lying under the main ridge at the head of Fisher's Valley, adjoining to his own holdings. It was ordered that the applications of the said Draper, DesFountaine, and Alexander were to be granted, and that the Surveyor was to have a warrant accordingly to measure the parcels to each person. Rent was to commence from 25 March next ensuing. Signed: Stephen Poirier, Thomas Goodwin. A consultation was held on Tuesday 7 March 1704 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. It was attended by Stephen Poirier, Governor, presiding; Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor; and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign. Free planter Thomas Coales [...], about a week before, came to the Governor and made claim of 13s 6d for diet that Thomas Lddyman, soldier, stood indebted to him when he left the island. The Governor told him it should be paid. But hearing since that Lddyman gave Coales a [...] for the payment, he was summoned to appear before them this day for stating a false amount. Daniel Griffith, being examined, said that on the [...] day last he heard Coales and Lddyman contending about two dollars. At which time he heard Lddyman set a meeting for his landlord Coales at the fort in order of receiving satisfaction. Griffith knew Coales accordingly went to the fort. Interpretations The summoning of Coales for stating a false amount indicated the sum he claimed was questioned or contested. Griffith's testimony about "two dollars" contradicted Coales's assertion of 13s 6d, showing disagreement over the actual debt. Lddyman's offer to meet Coales at the fort for "satisfaction" acknowledged an obligation while rejecting the amount claimed. The fort, as a neutral location under the Governor's authority, allowed payment to be made and formally witnessed. Speculations The gap between Coales's figure (13s 6d) and Griffith's account (two dollars, roughly 10s) raised the possibility that Coales had inflated the claim or that Lddyman had contested the original sum. His summons for stating a false amount implies he had overstated or misrepresented his entitlement. Lddyman's choice to set the meeting at the fort, specifically to receive satisfaction, was a strategic move. Placing the settlement under the Governor's supervision protected him from further accusation and created an official record of any payment made.
111	89	on the day appointed, and doth realy beleive that the Said Lddymanpaid the Said Coales and Every body Else what he owed them/ Jn.o [Cilleene] Saith much to the Same purpose as y.e afores.d Dan.l Griffith hath/ The Said Thomas Coales Saith that the Said Lddyman did not Sell him the Hatt but only Left it in part of payment, and whereas the Govern.r haveing presented Satisfaction th.t all freemen that Entertaine any Sold.r Desired he may not be the only person deny.d payment, and that the Govern.r would take the Hatt and dispose of it, on Acco. of y.e Said Lddyman he haveing no occasion for Such Comp.diack/ After mature Consideration It is ordered. That the Said Thomas Coales for makeing a false demand as aforesaid and Considering of Such things	On the appointed day, Griffith genuinely believed that Lddyman had settled his accounts with Coales and everyone else he owed. John [Cilleene] testified much the same as Daniel Griffith. Thomas Coales stated that Lddyman had not sold him the hat but had only left it as part settlement. The Governor, asserting that all freemen who employed soldiers ought to be paid what they were owed, said Coales should not stand alone as an unpaid creditor. The hat would be taken and disposed of, as Lddyman had no use for such an item. After mature consideration, it was ordered that Thomas Coales, for making a false demand as aforesaid, was to be fined three dollars to the Honourable Company and charges of council. Such conduct was held to be much against the Company's interest.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		were Suffered it would be much against the Comp.s Interest, He be fined the Sume of three dollars to the Hono. Comp.s and Charges of Councill Mary Field wid.o made Complaint That a black boy of Gabriell Powells, when he was Run away Stole out of her Garden, at the front Valley three bunche mouses, that destruyed of Lemons and broke y.e bowes of y.e Said trees as the Said boy Confest before Cap.t Sodington for which damages She desires Saturfaction may be made/ The Said Gabriell Powell Saith that Said M.r Field made demand he would have Sattisfyd her for the damages his boy did But haveing a Warrant Served on him, S.d he would be Govern.r and Councills determanat/ It is ordered. That the said Gabriel Powell Pay the Said Mary Field for his black boys trespassing and robbing her garden The Sume of Six Shillings and to pay Charges of Councill Jane Goodwin wid.o brought this day her dec.d Husband John Goodwins Last Will and Testament In order of haveing the Same proved which was Accordingly done by oaths of John Lufkin and George Hoskison, who made oath the said Dec.d Jn.o Goodwins Will now produced was his Last Will and Testam.t and that they knew of no other by him made Either in word or writinge W.s	Mary Field, widow, brought a grievance that a black boy belonging to Gabriel Powell, when he ran away, stole from her garden at Front Valley three bunches of [...]. The theft destroyed lemons and broke the boughs of her trees. The boy confessed before Captain Sodington. Field sought recompense. Gabriel Powell stated that when Field raised her grievance, he would have compensated her for the damage his boy caused. But after a warrant was served on him, he said he would abide by the Governor and Council's determination. It was ordered that Gabriel Powell was to pay Mary Field 6s for his boy's theft and trespass in her garden, and charges of council. Jane Goodwin, widow, brought her deceased husband John Goodwin's last will and testament for proof. It was accordingly proved by the oaths of John Lufkin and George Hoskison, who swore the will now produced was John Goodwin's last will and testament and they knew of no other made by him either in word or writing. Interpretations The hat, left by Leddyman "in part" of settlement, was treated as a negotiable asset with value that could be converted to satisfy the debt. The Governor's taking of it showed how moveable goods stood in for currency in disputes between parties. Coales's fine for making a false demand established that inflated or unfounded claims for payment constituted a punishable breach, not merely a civil matter between creditor and debtor. Gabriel Powell, as the boy's owner, bore financial liability for the theft and destruction committed by the slave while he was fugitive. The slaveholder answered for his slave's actions regardless of the boy's own culpability. Speculations Coales persisted in claiming 13s 6d for payment even after testimony established that Leddyman had already settled by leaving the hat. Whether Coales sought to double-recover or had originally misstated the debt, his claim proved baseless enough to warrant the court's fine. Powell's initial offer to make Field whole, followed by his submission to the court's judgment, suggests he acknowledged liability but was determining how much the court would extract from him. He used the Governor and Council's intervention as a way to avoid negotiating directly with Field.
112	90	M.r Tho: Goodwin further deposes that his brother John Goodwin after his Last Will and Testam.t was made and Sign'd did desire that his wife might have the Posefision of his House in ffort James Vally dureing her Naturall Life, and that his Son Robert Should not pretend to Difspofs her of the Same or any part thereof which was omitted in his Said Last Will and Testamen.t/ It is ordered. That the Said Jn.o Goodwins Will now produced be approved of and Copy when demanded, And that the Said M.r Thomas Goodwin and the Said Jane Goodwin Execut.rs of Said Will be Sworne to Execute y.e office of Execut.tors Accordingly Were/ George Hoskison free Planter and overseer of the Estate, late belonging to William Bowman dec.d According to an order of Councill bearing date the 8.th day of June 1703, made Complaint that Philip Karslake Sold.r who hath married the Said Bowmans wid. doth Imbarsle the Said Estate, and has Threatened to make it all away in a twelve months time, And for proof desired that Humphrey Edwards might be called and Sworne, W.r Tho. upon oath deposes That the Said Karslake about three weeks ago, did Say that he would make away the Said Estate in twelve months time, And no	Thomas Goodwin further testified that his brother John, after his will was made and signed, expressed that his wife should have possession of his house in Fort James Valley during her natural life, and that his son Robert should not dispossess her of it or any part thereof. This provision was omitted from the written will. It was ordered that the said John Goodwin's will now produced was approved and copies were to be given when demanded. The said Thomas Goodwin and Jane Goodwin were to be sworn as executors of the said will. George Hoskison, free planter and overseer of the estate late belonging to William Bowman deceased, according to an order of Council bearing date 8 June 1703, brought a grievance that Philip Karslake, soldier, who married Bowman's widow, was embezzling the property and threatened to dispose of it entirely within twelve months. For proof, he requested Humphrey Edwards be called and sworn. Edwards testified that Karslake, three weeks before, declared he would dispose of the holding in twelve months and nobody should know. Karslake, at the last shipping season, sold several hundred yams, which reduced the plantation very low. Neither

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		body Should be the wiser, And That y.e Said Karslake in the Last Shipping time Sold Severale hundred of Yams, which has Reduced y.e Plantation very Lou and young, And do's Avers that neither the Said Karslake nor none of his Family did fother their Cattle belonging to the Estate in the Last dry Sheather S.d which Cattle most past dead by his and their Neglect Wherefore the Said Hoskison desires Security for what is Remaining of S.d Estate/ The Governour did Interrogate the Said Edwards whether the Said Karslake doth Imbarsle any of the Said Estate now or no, who made Reply ne not to his Knowledge Anne the wife of Philip Karslake and joynt overseer w.th the abovesaid George Hoskison of her dec.d Husband Will: Bowmans Last Will and Testament Saith there is yams Enough in their Plantation to maintaine all their family, And that both her Self and Black man did feld three Cattle which are now dead, in time of dry weather with cocked they got out of the Plantation/ After Severall debates It is ordered That the matter now in question be decided by the Jury at the next Sefsions	Karslake nor his family supplied fodder for the livestock belonging to the property in the last dry season. The beasts mostly died from this neglect. Hoskison sought assurance for what remained of the holding. The Governor questioned Edwards whether Karslake was currently embezzling the property. Edwards replied he knew nothing of such conduct. Anne, wife of Philip Karslake and joint overseer with George Hoskison of William Bowman's holding, stated there were yams enough to support the family. Both she and a black man supplied feed for three cattle during the dry season. The animals escaped from the plantation despite the nourishment offered. After several debates, it was ordered that the matter in question was to be decided by the jury at the next sessions. Interpretations The oral amendment to the will, testified by Thomas Goodwin after the document was signed, was accepted as sufficient proof of John's intention. The brother's deposition, rather than written evidence, established the house devise and bound the executors. The appointment of an overseer over the Bowman estate, with Anne as joint overseer, created shared responsibility meant to constrain the widow's new husband from misusing or depleting the property. The arrangement protected the estate against a remarried widow's vulnerability to her new spouse's interests. The dispute centred on competing accounts of management and stewardship. Hoskison claimed deliberate waste and secret disposal; Anne claimed adequacy of resources and proper care. The jury was called to resolve factual questions that administrative authority could not settle. Speculations Karslake's declaration that he would dispose of the holding in twelve months "and nobody should know" reveals deliberate concealment of his intentions. Whether he meant to liquidate assets or abandon the property, the secrecy indicates awareness that he was breaching his obligations to the estate. The timing of the yam sales at the shipping season shows Karslake prioritizing immediate profit over the plantation's long-term viability. He took advantage of market opportunity at the cost of depleting the resources needed to sustain the holding. Anne's account that she and a black man supplied feed for three cattle that then "escaped from the plantation" attributes the animals' death to their own flight rather than to neglect. This framing of responsibility challenges Hoskison's version, and the jury would need to assess whether inadequate containment reflected culpable negligence or circumstance beyond control.
113	91	And further That William Marsh and Hugh Bodley be appointed and ordered to view and appraise the Said Estate formerly William Bowmans, Between this and next Sessions day/ George Young Surgion made Complaint against James Wilson quarter Gunner of M.r [Coadlins] and reporting to Severall Persons that he has y.e Pox or Syph: Scandall tend much y.t this Comp.s fortune and Reputation, Wherefore desires that the Said Wilson might be Examined and receive Such Punnishment or fine as we Should think fitt./ The Said James Wilson denies that he reported any Such thing as the Said young alledges against him Thomas Cason Corporall being Sworne Saith that he and James Wilson being a discourseing about Will: Hone Sold.r the Said Wilson Said he had y.e Pox I replied no Says yes Says he, he has and there's more then one has it for that to Say our Doctor (meaning Doctor young) has the Pox to, and he gott it by Lying with M.r Coales black wench/	Further, it was ordered that William Marsh and Hugh Bodley were to be appointed to view and appraise the said property formerly belonging to William Bowman, between this and the next sessions day. George Young, surgeon, brought a grievance against James Wilson, quarter gunner of Mr [...], for reporting to several persons that Young had the pox. Such scandal threatened the Company's reputation and fortune. Young sought that Wilson be examined and receive whatever punishment or fine the court deemed appropriate. Wilson denied making any such report. Thomas Cason, corporal, being sworn, testified that while he and Wilson discussed William Hone, soldier, Wilson declared Hone had the pox. Cason replied in the negative. Wilson insisted yes, adding that more than one had it. Wilson further said "our Doctor" (meaning Doctor Young) also had the pox and contracted it from lying with Mr Coales's black woman.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		The Said James Wilson being Interrogated who he heard Say that Doctor Young had the Pox, made answer he could Remember who it was/ It is ordered That the Said James Wilson for breaching and Spreading abroad the aforesaid Scandall do aske the Said Doctor Youngs pardon and fined five Shillings to the Comp.s and five Shillings more to the Church, and pay Charges of Councill Poirier Tho: Goodwin Tuesday night the 7.th of March 170 ³/₄ about half an hour Past Eleaven of the Clock The Governour being then in bed, the Serj. of the Guard called to him, and Said there was a noise and quarrelling up in the valley, upon which the Governo.r ordered the Serj. to take a Guard with him and go in the valley to know what was the matter and to hinder all difturbances As Soon as the Serj. and Guard came opposite to W.r Carnes house they met with the	Wilson, being questioned as to who told him Doctor Young had the pox, answered that he did not recollect the source. It was ordered that James Wilson, for spreading this scandal, was to apologize to Doctor Young and was to be fined five shillings to the Company and five shillings more to the church, and to pay the charges of council. Signed: Stephen Poirier, Thomas Goodwin. On Tuesday night, 7 March 1704, about half an hour after eleven o'clock, the Governor lay in bed when the Sergeant of the Guard came to him and informed him of noise and quarrelling in the valley. The Governor ordered the Sergeant to take a guard, go to the valley, determine the cause of the disturbance, and stop it. As soon as the Sergeant and Guard came opposite to Wm Carne's house, they encountered [...] Interpretations The complaint was brought not by an independent witness but by the alleged victim. Young sought to stop the spreading of the report rather than to establish its truth or falsehood. The court treated the damage to reputation as the actionable harm. Wilson's interrogation about his source shows the court attempting to trace the rumour's origin. His inability to name the source left the accusation unverified and undermined, yet he still faced punishment for its circulation. The fine was divided between personal restitution (apology to Young) and public sanctions (church, Company payments). The emphasis on public fine suggests the court saw the scandal as threatening more than one man's reputation. Speculations Wilson's specific allegation that Young "contracted it by lying with Mr Coales's black woman" was crafted to damage Young's reputation through sexual accusation even if the medical claim was false. The sexual detail gave the slander particularity and credibility. Wilson's refusal or inability to name his source suggests either fabrication or protection of an informant. Either way, the unsubstantiated nature of the accusation did not prevent punishment—spreading the scandal was itself the offence. The disturbance in the valley at half past eleven, serious enough to wake the Governor, prompted immediate armed response. The dispatch of the guard in the night hours shows how vigilantly the Governor maintained order on the island.
114	92	the Said M.r Carne Cap.t Sodington and others, whereupon Cap.t Sodington ordered the Serj. to take the Said M.r Carne downe to the fort who acordingly did, and then Aequainted the Govern.r therewith who Sent for all parties concerned, and when Cap.t Sodington came made Comp.t against the Said M.r Carne as followeth/ That himself and W.r Tho: Goodwin being at Mad.m Fields house in the Fort valley and uphisway to the S.d Dpoty The Said M.r Carne Came up Stairs into the Chamber where they was, and brought with him one Charles Steward. But y.e Said M.r Carne interrupting y.e deputy the Governour Comanded him to be Silent, who made answer he would not, Whereupon the Governo.r ordered the Serj. of y.e Guard to take the Said M.r Carne in Custody, who S.d the S.d Dp.ty Said made an End of his Declaration, who proceeded further That when the Said M.r Carne and Charles Steward came up Stairs Neither he nor M.r Goodwin broke no manner of Notice of them, being Surprised to See them Come up into our Comp.s being not Invited at which I went out of that Chamber into this body, and Said to W.r Mary Field, I wish I had a bowle of Punch here And Cap.t	Mr Carne, Captain Sodington, and others were encountered. Captain Sodington ordered the Sergeant to take Mr Carne down to the fort. The Governor sent for all parties concerned. When Captain Sodington came, he brought a complaint against Mr Carne as follows. He and Mr Thomas Goodwin were at Madam Field's house in Fort Valley, on their way to call upon the Deputy, when Mr Carne came upstairs into the chamber with Charles Steward. Carne interrupted the deputy. The Governor commanded him to be silent. Carne replied he would not. The Governor ordered the Sergeant to take Carne into custody. The Deputy then continued his account. When Carne and Steward came upstairs, neither he nor Goodwin acknowledged them, as they were surprised by this uninvited intrusion. Sodington went into the main room and told Madam Field he wished for a bowl of punch. He remarked to Captain Goodwin that he did not welcome the company and wondered how they got there. Being asked to return to the chamber, he complied and sat without addressing Carne or Steward. When punch arrived, he drank to Steward. Shortly after, Carne, observing the Deputy's dog in the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Goodwin th.t I do dont like the Comp.s and do wonder how they came here, but being Desired to go into the other Chamber againe I did So, and Sett downe, w.thout Speaking to the Said Carne or Steward, but when the Bowle of Punch came to him drank to the Said Steward, alittle after y.t Said Carle Seeing the Dp.ty dogg in the room Said he had more maners then his Master The Said Dp.ty taking no Notice of that affront and Expression, The S.d Carne Changed his Place and Sate downe by the Said Dp.ty and Said how do you do Tee, to which he made no answer The Said M.r Carne haveing a bull bitch w.th him and Cocking, w.th my eye, he Said to the bitch Look Sharp I presuming his intentionis to affront me and to Quarrell whereupon my place and went, and Sate downe by W.r Goodwin, who only made signs of going to his Lodging, but the Said deputy over perswaded him to Stay, beleiveing the Said Carne came on purpose to quarrel, who had affronted me Civilly once before by reason did not Entertain him and five more at my as Lodgings within the fort, (when I was Engaged w.th other Company) And the Said Dp.ty and W.r Goodwin being in some discourse W.r Carne Interrupted the Said Dp.ty, and called him Rascall at which he Said Dp.ty told the Said Carne he was not what he pretended to his father being an Attorney, and no Cunsellor, and if he the Said Carne was any thing, he was a petty fogger and no Gentleman, upon which the Said Carne Struck the Said Dp.ty a blow on the Ear, which made me Return him an other Blow, and in Scuffling the Said Carne bit him like a dogg by one of his fingers, Cap.t Goodwin Seeing the fray Stept in and parted us w.th which Considering that Cap.t Beawes had made an afidavit before the Govern.r in Jan.ry Last that the Said Carne was a Seditious Person, and one that headed Parties and a dangerous Person against y.e Govern.mt (or words to this Purpose) the Said Dp.ty ordered my Servant to Call a Guard in order of takeing him downe and Secure him within the fort, not knowing his Intention of coming where he was not Invited, beginning a Quarrell w.th me and breaking y.e Peace having	room, remarked the dog possessed more manners than its master. The Deputy took no notice of this insult. Carne then moved his seat next to the Deputy and said "how do you do thee?" The Deputy made no answer. Carne brought a bull bitch with him. Cocking his eye at the animal, he said to it "Look sharp", an action Sodington took as deliberate provocation and an attempt to quarrel. Sodington left his seat and sat beside Goodwin. Goodwin made to depart for his lodging, but the Deputy persuaded him to stay, believing Carne came purposely to quarrel. This was not the first such offense—Carne once came to Sodington's lodgings uninvited when Sodington was occupied with other guests. While the Deputy and Goodwin conversed, Carne interrupted and called the Deputy a rascal. The Deputy replied that Carne was not what he claimed—his father was an attorney, not a counselor. If Carne was anything, the Deputy said, he was a petty fogger and no gentleman. Upon this, Carne struck the Deputy a blow on the ear. Sodington returned the blow. In the ensuing scuffle, Carne bit the Deputy on the finger like a dog. Captain Goodwin, witnessing the fight, stepped between them and separated them. Given that Captain Beawes swore an affidavit before the Governor in January last wherein he stated Carne was a seditious person, one who led factions and posed a danger to the government, the Deputy ordered his servant to call the guard to take Carne down and secure him in the fort. The Deputy acted without prior knowledge of whether Carne came with intent to quarrel, break the peace, or [...] Interpretations Carne's use of non-verbal provocation before striking—the remark about the dog's manners, the cocking of the eye at the bull bitch, the refusal to acknowledge the Deputy—shows deliberate and measured escalation toward confrontation. Each gesture tested tolerance before violence began. The Deputy's invocation of Beawes's prior affidavit shows he viewed Carne not as a private quarrelor but as a person whose conduct threatened government itself. Sedition and faction-leading were the charges; the assault was one more instance of a pattern. Speculations Carne's uninvited entry into the private space and his calculated provocations suggest he came to provoke the Deputy deliberately. Whether to challenge the Deputy's authority or to demonstrate the Deputy's inability to maintain composure, Carne engineered the confrontation. The Deputy's long tolerance of insults before returning the blow shows either forbearance or uncertainty about his authority to act. Only when physical violence occurred did he move decisively, calling the guard. By that point, Carne had established a pattern the court could weigh against him.
115	93	haveing in his Company the Said Steward, the Govern.o being alone in the fort. For which I complain to the Worship.fl Govern.o.r that the Said Carne be Secured till my masters Pleasur be known herein, As Witness my hand Cor: Sodington Then M.r Thomas Goodwin gave his declaration as followeth That he being at the aforesaid M.r ffields about Ten of y.e Clock w.th Cap.t Sodington and the Said M.r ffield Family Cap.t Sodington asked me to Stay and drink a part of a bowle of Punch w.th him And before it was made M.r Carne and Charles Steward came up Stairs into the Room which they was at which the family nor Cap.t Sodington took no Notice but after the Bowle of Punch was brought in and had drank about M.rs ffield Came in and drank to y.e Said M.r Carne and after Some discourse high words arose betwixt M.r Carne and the Deputy Insomuch I told him	[End of Sodington's complaint] Sodington charged the Worshipful Governor that Carne should be secured pending the Governor's direction. Carne had come into the room with Steward when the Governor was alone in the fort. Signed: Cornelius Sodington. Thomas Goodwin then gave his account. That night around ten o'clock he was at Mr Field's house with Captain Sodington and the Field family. Sodington had asked him to stay and drink some punch. Before it was ready, Carne and Charles Steward came upstairs into the room. The family and Sodington took no notice of them. After the punch was brought and they had drunk some, Mrs Field came in and drank to Carne. Then harsh words started between Carne and the Deputy. Goodwin said he would go home, feeling uneasy. Sodington persuaded him to stay, saying they

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		I would go home (being not Easey) upon which the Said Cap.tn Sodington perswaded me to Stay Saying he and I would have a Bowle of punch together by ourselves and as Cap.t Sodington was walking towards the other End of the Room I heard the word Tea or other (but which of y.e two Gent.I called the other So I dont know) Upon which Saw the Said M.r Carne Strike Cap.t Sodington who fell together a Scuffling but was parted Immediately by my Self and Charles Steward whom I desired to assist me and did call out for a Guard Severall times but no body was there below Stairs to go, This is all upon my oath that I can Remember 14 Tho: Goodwin Mary Field wid: being Sworne Saith that about Ten of the Clock this and Cap.t Sodington asked W.r Tho: Goodwin to Stay and drink part of a Bowle of Punch before he went to bed, and whilest I was making y.e W.r Carne and Charles Steward Came up Stairs into y.e Said Cap.t Sodington & M.r Goodwins Company, and a Soon as I came into the Room, Seeing M.r Carne Standing up Desired him to Sett downe But did not perceive that y.e Dp.ty took any manner of Notice of them, which I Suppose made W.r Carne Endeavour to affront the Said Cap.t Sodington who I heard have Some high words together and Saw M.r Carne Strike y.e Said Sodington, but was parted by W.r Goodwin, further Saith not/ Mary Field Spinster being Sworne Saith that She heard M.r Carne Say that the Dp.tys Dogg had more manners then his Master, and heard them have Severall high words and W.r Carne call the Said Dp.ty Rascall and Saw him Strike y.e Dp.ty a blow or two which Caused them to fall a fighting, but was parked as afore.t Upon	would have another bowl together. As Sodington walked toward the other end of the room, Goodwin heard someone say "thee" or something like it (he couldn't tell which man said it). Then he saw Carne strike Sodington. They fell and scuffled, but Goodwin and Steward separated them right away. Goodwin called for a guard several times but no one was downstairs to come. That is all he could remember, on oath. Signed: Thomas Goodwin. Mary Field, widow, being sworn, said the following. Around ten that night, Sodington asked Thomas Goodwin to stay and have some punch before bed. While she was making it, Carne and Steward came upstairs. When she came into the room and saw Carne standing, she asked him to sit down. She didn't notice the Deputy paying them any attention. She thought this was why Carne tried to insult Sodington. She heard them trading harsh words. She saw Carne hit Sodington, who was then pulled apart by Goodwin. That is all she has to say. Mary Field, spinster, being sworn, said the following. She heard Carne say the Deputy's dog had better manners than its master. She heard them argue back and forth. She heard Carne call the Deputy a rascal. She saw him hit the Deputy once or twice, which made them start fighting. They were separated as I said before. Upon [...]
116	94	Upon the whole Considering that the Said M.r Carne hath Comitted Severall ill Actions as may appear by y.e Councell Books and affidavits given by Severall officers belonging to Ships, And That by all probability he went to M.r ffields house a purposely for mischiefs Sake/ It is thereupon ordered That the Said M.r Carne be Secured till further order, without Accepting of Bayle according to the Said Cap.t Sodingtons request Poirier Tho: Goodwin Wednesday morning the 8.th of March 170 ³/₄ The Said M.r Carne Petitioned the Governo.r That he would be pleased to grant him his Liberty and to Accept of Bayle for his good behaviour and appearance when Ever required/ It was agreed and ordered That upon the Said M.r Carnes humble Submission, and offering Bayle as aforesaid, he be granted his Liberty till the arrivall of y.e first Ship or Next Generall Sefsions, and accordingly George Hoskison Charles Steward and Gab.l Powill free planters Entered into a Recog =nizance of five hundred pounds, for his the Said M.r Carnes good behaviour towards the abovesaid Cap.t Sodington particularly and to all the rest of her majestys Subjects till Cleared by Governour and Coun.ce/ Poirier Tho: Goodwin	After reviewing everything, the council decided Carne had caused serious trouble, as shown in their records and in statements from ship officers. It seemed he went to Mr Field's house meaning to start a fight. Carne was to stay locked up. No bail was allowed, even though Captain Sodington asked for it. Signed: Stephen Poirier, Thomas Goodwin. Wednesday morning, 8 March 1704, Carne asked the Governor to let him go and post bail, promising to behave and show up whenever called. The Governor agreed. Carne was freed on the condition that George Hoskison, Charles Steward, and Gabriel Powell—all free planters—signed a bond for five hundred pounds. The bond promised Carne would treat Captain Sodington fairly and behave toward everyone else. The bond would hold until the Governor and Council cleared him of the charges. Signed: Stephen Poirier, Thomas Goodwin. Interpretations The council moved from holding Carne without bail to releasing him on a substantial bond, showing a graduated approach to the threat he posed. The high bond amount - five hundred pounds - was large enough to deter both Carne and his sureties from negligence. The three planters who put up the bond were the same men whose names appeared throughout the documents: overseers, witnesses, and the island's leading householders. They took personal financial risk for Carne's behavior, making them invested in his compliance. Speculations The swift change from secure custody to bail within a single night suggests the Governor saw Carne's threat as manageable through financial leverage and community oversight. The bond, backed by three planters of standing, was meant to ensure compliance better than walls and locks. The specificity of the bond—requiring good behaviour toward Captain Sodington "particularly"—

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			recognized that Carne's quarrel was personal while also requiring general respect for everyone else. The particular clause addressed the immediate conflict; the general clause prevented future similar incidents.
117	95	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 21 day of March 170 ¾ Att Fort James Steph.n Poirier Gouvernour Pres.t Cor: Sodington dp.ty Gov.r Tho: Goodwin Ensigne Whereas William Marsh free Planter made Complaint to Governour and Councill against Jonathan Duston free planter, for damages done to a Cors made him by the Said Dustons Blacks ffor which desired he might Receive Satisfaction his Case, the Said Marsh Acused y.e Said Duston of fenceing Some of his Land in and planted y.e Same, which the Said Duston denying The Said Marsh desired of us that the wholle Cause might be Referred to the Jury at y.e next quarterly Sefsions It is ordered. That the Said Controversie twixt the Said William Marsh, and Jonathan Duston be referred to y.e Jury at y.e next quarterly Sefsions According to the Plaintiffs desire/ Sarah Rider wid.o made Complaint to us That Jn.o Orchard free plant.r owed her Husband before his death four Bushells, and a halfe of Salt all which he himself orchard denys to pay her, Saying her Husband was paid his due debt and gone to give him a [...] for y.e Said Salt, But upon peruseing the Said Riders dec.d Books did Appear that he had given y.e Said Orchard Cred.t for Severall quantity of Salt rec.d at Severall times There fore. It is ordered That the Said Jn.o Orchard deliver two Bushells of Salt to y.e Said Wid.s Rider (or her order) he being not positive whether he peed y.e wholle debt or no, and to pay Charges of Councill/	A consultation was held on Tuesday, 21 March 1704 at Fort James on the island of St Helena. Stephen Poirier, Governor, presided. Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, attended. William Marsh, a free planter, complained that Jonathan Duston, also a free planter, owed him for damages. Duston's slaves damaged Marsh's [...]. Marsh wanted compensation. He said Duston fenced in some of his land and planted it. Duston denied this. Marsh asked that the matter go to the jury at the next quarterly sessions. The court sent the dispute between Marsh and Duston to the jury at the next quarterly sessions, as Marsh wanted. Sarah Rider, widow, complained that John Orchard, a free planter, owed her late husband four and a half bushels of salt. Orchard said no - the debt was paid and he gave her husband a [...] for the salt. But when the court looked at her husband's account books, they found Orchard received credit for salt at different times. So they could not tell if the full amount was settled. The court ordered Orchard to give two bushels of salt to Sarah Rider (or to whoever she named). Since Orchard could not say whether he paid the whole debt, he also had to pay for the council's time. Interpretations The Marsh dispute about fenced land was sent to the jury rather than decided by the Governor and Council. This shows land boundary quarrels were treated as matters for the community to judge, not for officials to settle by decree. The Rider case relied on the dead man's account books. The court used his written records to establish what credit Orchard had received, treating documentation as proof of what was owed. The books showed multiple salt transactions, making it impossible to say the debt was fully paid. Orchard's own uncertainty - that he could not swear he paid everything - worked against him. The court did not give him the benefit of doubt. A partial payment was ordered rather than the full amount, reflecting the court's attempt to split the difference. Speculations The boundary dispute between Marsh and Duston may have arisen from unclear original land allocation or from encroachment over time. Sending it to the jury let local planters who knew the land settle it rather than have the Governor impose a decision. Orchard's receipt or credit note (the [...]) was apparently not enough proof of full payment when the account books showed ongoing credit entries. The court sided with the widow and relied on written records over Orchard's own word.
118	96	The aforesaid Wid.o Rider and Execut.r of her dec.d Husbands Last Will and Testam.t M.r Tho: Goodwin and Matt: Garrett, brought this day an Inventory of her Said dec.d Husbands Estate which was Examined and approved of upon oath being made by y.e Said Wid.s and Executors. It is ordered That y.e Said Inventory be rec.d and approved of as aforesaid, and Coppys given thereof when demanded/ M.r Jn.o Kerr a minister desired of y.e Govern.r to Issue out a Warr.t for the Sumoning Severall persons for Evidences in his behalf to appear before Gover. and Coun.l next Coun.l day to give their Respective Evidences against M.r Cor: Sodington dp.ty Gov.r for his Assaulting him y.e Said Kerr/	Sarah Rider, widow, and the executors of her late husband's will - Thomas Goodwin and Matthew Garrett - presented an inventory of his estate. The inventory was examined and approved upon oath given by the widow and the executors. The court received and approved the inventory as presented. Copies were to be given whenever demanded. John Kerr, a minister, asked the Governor to issue a warrant summoning several witnesses on his behalf. They were to appear before the Governor and Council on the next council day to give evidence against Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor, for assaulting Kerr.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		It is ordered That y.e Said M.r Kerrs desire be granted, he givinge the Cl.k W.r Alexander a List of his Said Evidences Names/ George Hoskison and Henry Francis Executors of the Last Will and Testam.t of M.rs Ann Edmires brought this day an Inventory of her Estate, which was Examined and Approved of by the oaths of y.e Said Execut.rs who made oath the Said Inventory was true to the best of their knowledge/ It is ordered That the Said Inventory be rec.d and approved of and Copys given when ever demanded/ Poirier Tho: Goodwin	The Governor granted Kerr's request, on condition that he provide the clerk William Alexander with a list of the witness names. George Hoskison and Henry Francis, executors of Ann Edmires's will, presented an inventory of her estate. The inventory was examined and approved upon oath given by the executors, who swore that the inventory was accurate to the best of their knowledge. The court received and approved the inventory as presented. Copies were to be given whenever demanded. Interpretations Three inventories were approved in succession - routine probate administration. Each required sworn oaths from the executors or presenters, showing the council treated estate records as legal documents needing verification beyond mere presentation. Kerr's request for a formal warrant to summon witnesses marks an escalation of his earlier complaints about Sodington. The proceedings were moving toward a formal hearing with evidence presented under oath, rather than remaining a personal grievance. Speculations Kerr's insistence on having witnesses appear on a designated council day suggests he was building a case for disciplinary action or dismissal of Sodington. The assault charge was serious - physical violence between officials threatened the order of the colony. The requirement that Kerr name his witnesses beforehand gave Sodington opportunity to prepare a defence and the council to anticipate the issues. This procedural step protected against surprise evidence and allowed organised presentation of the case.
119	97	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday The 4.th day of Aprill 1704 Att Fort James/ Steph.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Cor: Sodington Dp.ty Govern.r Tho: Goodwin 3.d in Coun: Whereas Edward Marshborn (now confined Prison.r either in y.e fort for absent =ing himself from the Ship ffreddrick Cap.t Wynn Comand.r) made Comp.t to the Governo.r that Jn.o Scriven Sold.r has a Callow Shirt of his, which was taken out of y.e Serj.ts Room and do Suspect the Said Scriven to be guilty of y.e fact, Whereupon the Said Scriven was Sumoned to appear before us this day who being Examined Saith that he has Such a Shirt, which he bought of Quea a Negroe man Slave of y.e R.t Hon.o Comp.s/ The Said Negroe being called and Examined how he came by the Said Shirt Saith he never Saw it, nor did he See or give any to the Said Scriven, nor no body Else, and that y.e Said Scriven Lay y.e theft upon him because he is a Black/ It is ordered That the Said Scriven not makeing appear how he came by y.e Said Shirt, it is Evident he took it out of the Serj. Room himself for which is fined four times the vallue of the Shirt being four dollars to y.e Said Marshborn and five Shilling more to y.e R.t Hono. Comp.s And admonished not to Comitt y.e Like Crime for the future upon paine of being Severely Punnished and dismist from the Said Comp.s Service/ Whereas the Govern.r was Informed That Edward Bagley free planter had Cuttendowne Some of the R.t Hono. Comp.s wood, which was forbidden by an Advertizm.t to Sell or Cutt upon Severale whatsoever unless for the Said Comp.s owne use, for fueing And had Carried or caused the Same to be Carried into the Said Edw.d Bagleys Inclosed Land upon which the Governour Sent Robert Marsh, who Looks after the S.d Comp.s Negroes with Some of them to fetch y.e Said wood away but was Hindered by the Said Edw.d Bagley, Whereupon the Said Edward Bagley was Sumoned to appear before Govern.o and Councill this day, who did,	A consultation was held on Tuesday, 4 April 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor, presided. Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, third member of the council, attended. Edward Marshborn, who was confined as a prisoner in the fort (or absent from the ship <i>Frederick</i> under Captain Wynn), complained to the Governor. John Scriven, a soldier, had a [...] shirt belonging to Marshborn. The shirt had been taken from the Sergeant's room, and Marshborn suspected Scriven of the theft. Scriven was summoned to appear before the council. When questioned, he admitted he had the shirt. He said he had bought it from Quea, a Negro slave of the Company. The Negro was then called and questioned about how he obtained the shirt. He denied ever seeing it. He said he had not given it to Scriven or to anyone else. He claimed Scriven had blamed him only because he was Black. Since Scriven could not show how he came by the shirt, it was clear he had taken it from the Sergeant's room himself. He was fined four times the value of the shirt - four dollars to Marshborn - and another five shillings to the Company. He was warned not to commit such a crime again, on pain of severe punishment and dismissal from the Company's service. The Governor had learned that Edward Bagley, a free planter, had cut down some of the Company's wood. An advertisement had forbidden anyone to sell or cut it on [...] without the Company's permission for fuel. Bagley had carried the wood (or had it carried) into his enclosed land. The Governor sent Robert Marsh, who supervised the Company's slaves, with some of them to retrieve the wood. But Bagley prevented them from entering his ground. Bagley was summoned to appear before the Governor and Council this day. When asked why he had forbidden Marsh to enter his ground and take away the wood, he said [text breaks off].

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		and being askt why he forbed the Said Marsh to come into his Ground & take away y.e wood, Saith	Interpretations Scriven's false accusation of Quea shows a deliberate tactic - blame a slave and rely on the slave's word being discounted. The council investigated both parties and rejected this strategy, forcing Scriven to answer for his lack of proof. The four - fold fine for theft was standardised punishment. Scriven could not escape by producing a false source, and the multiple penalty signalled that theft from the Sergeant's room was serious. The Bagley case reveals tension between the Company's property claims and free planters' land rights. The Governor asserted Company authority by sending armed slaves to retrieve wood, treating the matter as Company jurisdiction rather than a property dispute between neighbours. Speculations Quea's explicit complaint - that Scriven blamed him "because he is Black" - suggests slaves were routinely used as convenient scapegoats for theft. Scriven may have calculated that accusing a slave would be safer than admitting his own guilt, but the council did not allow this. Bagley's resistance to Marsh's team suggests he believed that once wood reached his enclosed land, possession gave him rights to it. The boundary between Company property and his private ground may have been disputed, or Bagley may have calculated that the Governor would not pursue the matter forcefully.
120	98	Saith that when the said Robert Marsh and y.e Comp.s Blacks Came to fetch the wood off his Land he askt the said Marsh if he had a Warrant from the Governour for carrying away y.e said wood, who made Answer no, he had no[t] upon which he [him] told him he should not [Take] y.e wood away without a Warr.t from under the Governours hand, which was all the opposition he made Robert Marsh being sworne saith that he went According to the Governours order to fetch away that y.e wood which y.e Govern.r was inform[ed] lay in Edward Bagleys Ground But when he said ground y.e said [Comp.s] Came to him and askt him what he was going to do This Dep.t made answ[ere] to fetch away this wood as the Govern.r ordered me for words much to thi[s] Purpose. No says the said Bragley you Shall unless you have a Warrant from the Govern.r whereupon the said Dep.t Returned and Acquainted y.e Governour who then Delivered me a Warrant for fetching said wood away from y.e [s.d] Bagleys Land, who was not at home then But his wife Coming out [told] him me that if their Blacks had brought that wood there and her Husband was at home I should not Carry away the said wood: But however did Arthur Bradley Comp.s being sworne saith that he seeing the heap of wood aforesaid lying in Edward Bagleys ground, and beleiving it to be the Comp.s having often seen M.r [Carnes] Blacks Cutt wood upon y.e said Comp.s Land and [Bro.t] y.e same to that place where the aforesaid wood lay Went and Acquainted the Govern.r therewith on Monday was seven nights, further saith he has seen y.e said M.r Carnes Blacks Carry wood away [from] y.e place afore[said] Severall times which he thought all along was y.e Comp.s wood James Easthope free planter being sworne saith that this day at the Govern.rs [that] y.e aforesaid Rob.t Marsh [for] [Sevorall] one of y.e Comp.s Blacks came to him and told him that y.e said Marsh desired him to come as far as Ed.d Bagley Ground which I did where the said Rob.t Marsh told me that the Govern.r had sent him & the Blacks for the wood that lay in y.e said Edw.d Bagleys ground and desired y.e [Dep.ts] Assistance if hindred from takeing away y.e [s.d] wood as he was before at which time the said Dep.t heard y.e said Bagleys wife say that if her Husband had been at home, the said Marsh should not have Carried away y.e said wood which y.e said Dep.t	When Robert Marsh and the Company's slaves came to fetch the wood from his land, Bagley said he asked Marsh whether he had a warrant from the Governor for carrying away the wood. Marsh answered no, he had not. So Bagley told him he should not take the wood away without a warrant from the Governor's hand. That was all the opposition Bagley made. Robert Marsh, sworn, said he went according to the Governor's order to fetch the wood which the Governor had been informed lay in Edward Bagley's ground. When he came to the ground, Bagley came to him and asked what he was going to do. Marsh replied that he was fetching the wood as the Governor ordered. Bagley said no - he should not take it unless he had a warrant from the Governor. At this, Marsh returned and told the Governor, who then gave him a warrant for fetching the wood away from Bagley's land. Bagley was not at home at the time, but his wife came out and told him that if their slaves had brought that wood there and her husband had been at home, he should not carry away the wood. But Marsh carried it away anyway. Arthur Bradley, a Company [...], sworn, said he saw the heap of wood lying in Edward Bagley's ground. Believing it to be the Company's - having often seen Mr Carne's slaves cut wood on the Company's land and bring it to that place where the wood lay - he went and told the Governor about it on the Monday of the previous week. He further said he had seen Mr Carne's slaves carry wood away from that place several times, and he had always thought it was the Company's wood. James Easthope, a free planter, sworn, said that this day at the Governor's [...], the aforesaid Robert Marsh and one of the Company's slaves came to him and told him Marsh wanted him to come to Edward Bagley's ground, which he did. There Marsh told him the Governor had sent him and the slaves for the wood that lay in Bagley's ground and asked for his help if they were hindered from taking it away, as had happened before. At that time, Easthope heard Bagley's wife say that if her husband had been at home, Marsh should not have carried away the wood. Easthope says this wood was pulled down the hill from the Company's land into Bagley's [...]. Sarah, the wife of Arthur Bradley, sworn, said that on the Friday of the previous week she saw Mr Carne's

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		saies was Pulled downe y.e Hill from off y.e said Comp.s Land into y.e said Bagleys Sarah y.e wife of Arthur Bradley being sworne saith that on last fryday was seven nights She saw M.r Carnes Black haul wood down y.e hill from towards y.e Hon.le Comp.s Land into Edw.d Bagley Enclosed Land. where y.e aforesaid wood Lay	slave haul wood down the hill from the Company's land into Edward Bagley's enclosed land, where the aforesaid wood lay. Interpretations The wood's presence on Bagley's land arose from Mr Carne's slaves hauling it downhill from Company land. Either Carne and Bagley were cooperating in storing surplus fuel, or Carne was using Bagley's land without explicit permission. Multiple witnesses confirmed the wood's origin and its deliberate movement downhill. Bagley's demand for a warrant shows he understood property law and sought proper procedure rather than resisting outright. His wife's warning - that her husband would have prevented removal if at home - hints at a prior arrangement with Carne. The Governor's warrant overrode this arrangement and gave Marsh legal authority to enter and remove the wood. The corroboration of Bradley, Easthope and Sarah prevented any claim that Bagley had purchased the wood legitimately or received it as a gift. All three testified to seeing Carne's slaves bring it from Company land. Speculations Carne's repeated movement of wood from Company land to Bagley's ground suggests an ongoing partnership. The downhill location made transport convenient, and accumulating fuel there may have served both men's interests - Carne storing surplus, Bagley gaining access to wood. Bagley's initial refusal without a warrant suggests he believed property law protected his land from forced entry, even by the Governor's representative. Once Marsh returned with a warrant, the legal barrier dissolved and Bagley's wife could only warn rather than prevent removal. Bagley's wife's comment - that her husband would have acted differently if present - suggests either a prior agreement with Carne that she was protecting, or concern for her husband's standing in the community. Her restraint when Bagley was absent allowed the Governor's order to proceed without physical confrontation.
121	99	Then Edward Bagley was sworne (wee being fully perswaded that he had no hand in bring said wood into his Ground and that what he did was in vindication of his ffriend M.r Carne) who saith that he has seen the said M.r Carnes Blacks Severall times Cutt wood upon y.e Hon.ble Comp.s Land and bring the same into his ground where y.e aforesaid wood lay, But cannot Possitively say whether they brought that wood there or not Sarah his wife being sworne saith y.e same as her Husband hath already Deposed Upon which the said Edward Bagley was acquitted and discharged w.th a Small Check for [hindering] Rob.t Marsh from Carrying away the said wood And accordingly ordered That a warrant be delivered y.e marshall for the Summoning the said M.r Carne to appear before us this day fourteen nights to Answer for his Blacks Carrying [away] the said Hon.le Comp.s wood which was preserved for their owne use Thomas Gargen free planter Petitioned us that we would be pleased to grant him the Liberty of Hireing Ten Acres of y.e said Hon.le Comp.s as [wast] Land Lying in [Sandy Bay] adjoyning to the Lower part of his owne Land It is ordered That the said Thomas Gargens request be granted and that the Surveyor have a Warrant delivered him for y.e measureing said Land Accordingly [B Wn] Tho. Goodwin	Edward Bagley was sworn. The council, fully convinced that he had no part in bringing the wood onto his land and that he acted only in defence of his friend Mr Carne, heard his testimony. Bagley said he saw Mr Carne's slaves cut wood on the Honourable Company's land several times and bring it into his ground, where the wood in question lay. But he could not say for certain whether they brought that particular wood there. Sarah, his wife, was sworn and gave the same account as her husband. Bagley was acquitted and discharged, though he received a warning for hindering Robert Marsh from carrying away the wood. The council ordered that a warrant be issued to the marshal to summon Mr Carne to appear before the council two weeks from this day. He was to answer for his slaves carrying away the Honourable Company's wood, which was reserved for the Company's own use. Thomas Gargen, a free planter, petitioned the council to grant him the right to hire ten acres of the Honourable Company's waste land in Sandy Bay, adjoining the lower part of his own land. The council granted Gargen's request. The surveyor was to be given a warrant to measure the land accordingly. Interpretations The council's acquittal of Bagley with only a warning suggests they distinguished between his actions (hindering the marshal) and Carne's (removing Company wood). Bagley was defending a friend, not

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			protecting his own interests or property rights. The "small check" was a ritual rebuke rather than genuine punishment. Bagley's inability to say positively which slaves brought the specific wood did not count against him. The council accepted that he witnessed the pattern - repeated movement of wood from Company land - without demanding proof of this particular instance. The two - week notice to Carne gave him advance warning and time to prepare a response. The charge was serious: his slaves had carried away Company property that was reserved for the Company's own use, suggesting profit or private benefit from Company resources. Speculations The council's parenthetical comment - that they were "fully convinced" Bagley acted in defence of Carne - hints at either prior knowledge of their friendship or Bagley's reputation for loyalty. The acquittal suggests the council valued such bonds even when they conflicted with Company interests. Carne's repeated use of slaves to move wood to Bagley's land may have been deliberate storage of surplus fuel, or Carne may have believed he had the right to fell timber from land he thought was his or common. The downhill location made it convenient, and Bagley's land provided shelter. The shift to Gargen's land petition signals the council moving forward. Carne's hearing was deferred to a future session, allowing the current consultation to handle new business. The conclusion of the wood dispute cleared the way for routine land administration.
122	100	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Wednesday the 19 day of Aprill 1704 At Fort James Step.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Cap.t [Sodington] D.ptý Gov.r Tho: Goodwin Ensigne Whereas on Tuesday the 11.th Instant. It was ordered that M.r George Carne should be Summoned to appear before us this day to answer for his Blacks Cutting and Carrying away wood from off the Comp.s waste Land, which was pur= chased of Whitty orphans only for y.e Benefitt of said wood: The said M.r Carnes accordingly appeared and desired that y.e said Business might be referred to the Jury at y.e next Court day. But there being no Controversie about the Limitts of the said Land, it being y.e Comp.s owne, But only y.e product thereof which is the wood, We think it y.e fittest to Decide y.e matt.r our selves in Coun.ll And Accordingly It is ordered That the said M.r Carne pay as a fine to y.e Hon.ble Comp.s y.e Sume of two Dollars, and twenty Shillings more for the wood his Blacks Carried off their Land, and to pay y.e Charges of y.e Councill According to an Advertizem.t [Spred] out for y.e nominating and Electing four persons for Church Wardens, and four persons more for overseers of the Highways, That two of said persons Inhabiting on y.e said Island, might be Chosen out of each office to Succeed y.e present Church Wardens & overseers, were delivered to us as followeth Church Wardens & George Carne Edw.d [Bagdy] for the West division Ditto Land.t Desfountains W.m Long Sen.r for the East division Overseers of y.e Highways Donald Hunt Tho.s [Juston] for y.e West Ditto Edw.d Bagley Walter [Welbard] for y.e East	A consultation was held on Wednesday, 19 April 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor, presided. Captain Sodington, Deputy Governor, and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, attended. On Tuesday the 11th, it was ordered that Mr George Carne should be summoned to appear before the council this day to answer for his slaves cutting and carrying away wood from the Company's waste land. This land was purchased from Whitty's orphans solely for the benefit of the wood upon it. Mr Carne appeared and asked that the matter be referred to the jury at the next court day. But since there was no dispute about the land's boundaries - it belonged to the Company - and only the wood (the product of the land) was in question, the council judged it best to decide the matter themselves. Accordingly, Mr Carne was ordered to pay a fine of two dollars and twenty shillings to the Honourable Company for the wood his slaves carried away, and to pay the council's charges. An advertisement was distributed calling for the nomination and election of four church wardens and four overseers of the highways. Two persons from the island were to be chosen from each office to succeed the present church wardens and overseers. The following names were submitted: Church Wardens: George Carne Edward [...] - west division Lieutenant Desfountains William Long Senior - east division Overseers of the Highways: Donald Hunt Thomas [...] - west division Edward Bagley Walter [...] - east division Interpretations The Company's ownership of the waste land was not disputed. The council refused to refer the matter to the jury because there was no property boundary question at issue. The only question was what the Company could do with its own product - the wood. This distinction shaped the council's decision to keep the case in their own hands. The fine of two dollars and twenty shillings was moderate - less than the four - dollar fine imposed on

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Scriven for stealing a shirt. This suggests the council treated Carne's offence differently: not as larceny or theft, but as misappropriation or unauthorised use of Company resources. The tone was corrective rather than punitive. George Carne's election as church warden, immediately after his conviction for removing Company wood, shows the two matters were kept separate in the council's view. His standing in the community was not damaged enough to exclude him from office. The election of officials by geographic division (west and east) reflects the island's population distribution and the practical need for two separate administrative units. Speculations The land's stated purpose - "solely for the benefit of the wood" - suggests the Company held it as a timber resource, not agricultural land. Carne may have believed the waste land was common property or that gathering wood from it was an implicit right, even if the letter of the law forbade it. Carne's request for a jury trial suggests he thought he had an arguable position - perhaps that fallen wood belonged to no one, or that his use qualified as necessity. The council's refusal to submit the case to the jury rejected his framing of the dispute as a boundary or property matter requiring community judgment. Edward Bagley's appointment as overseer of the highways for the east division, just days after his acquittal and warning in the Carne wood case, shows he suffered no loss of standing from his earlier involvement. His election signalled full rehabilitation.
123	101	It is ordered That Samuel Desfountain and Edward Bagley be appointed Church Wardens for the year Ensueing and That Leonard Hunt (who was Chosen overseer the Last year) for not performing his office be againe appointed to Continue y.e Ensueing year as overseer of y.e high ways with Walter [Welward] and that y.e said Hunt Cause all persons both Whites and Blacks mencon[e]d in his Last years Warrant to work two days this present year, and no more It is Likewise ordered That y.e said old Church Wardens and overseers, as also y.e new Church Wardens and overseers do appear before us the Next Councill day, In order of Discharging y.e old Church Wardens and overseers after past their Acc.t w.th us, and to Invest y.e new ones M.r Carne who had his nephew Rich.d Beale in his Care and Tuition the year past, brought this day his said nephew before us and said he could not Keep him the year Ensueing for severall reasons: which we took into our Con= sideracon, and Sent for Henry Francis who has his brother at board, and askt him if he would take y.e said R.d Beale y.e year Ensueing who was willing thereto, whereupon It was ordered. That the said M.r Carne be discharged from y.e Care of his said Nephew, and [Putt] into the Care and Custody of y.e said Henry Francis, whom we allow Seven Pounds p.r anno. for his boarding, the said Francis Instructing him to Read and write [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Samuel Desfountain and Edward Bagley were appointed church wardens for the ensuing year. Leonard Hunt, who had been chosen overseer the previous year but failed to perform his duties, was appointed again to continue as overseer of the highways for the ensuing year, together with Walter [Welward]. Hunt was ordered to have all persons - both whites and blacks - mentioned in his previous year's warrant work two days this year, and no more. The old church wardens and overseers, together with the newly appointed ones, were ordered to appear before the council on the next council day. At that time the old wardens and overseers would give their accounts to the council, be discharged, and the new ones would be invested in office. Mr Carne, who had his nephew Richard Beale under his care and supervision for the past year, brought the boy before the council. Carne said he could not keep him the ensuing year for several reasons. The council considered his circumstances and sent for Henry Francis, who was boarding his brother. They asked whether Francis would take Richard Beale for the ensuing year. Francis agreed. Accordingly, Carne was discharged from the care of his nephew. Beale was placed in the care and custody of Henry Francis, who was allowed seven pounds per annum for his boarding. Francis was to teach Beale to read and write. Interpretations Leonard Hunt's reappointment despite his failure to perform his previous duties was not a reward. It was a penalty - he was required to complete the work he had neglected, but limited to just two days' labour per person. This stricter framework gave him a second chance under constraint. The requirement for all officials - old and new - to appear on a designated day and give their accounts shows the council's insistence on formal procedure for transition of power. The old had to be formally discharged and the new formally invested, with accounts settled in between. This prevented gaps in responsibility.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Richard Beale's transfer to Henry Francis was not a private arrangement. The council set the terms, specified the fee, and demanded that Francis provide instruction in literacy. This shows the council's role in child welfare and education, extending even to boys in wardship. The established practice of boarding children with inhabitants for a set annual fee suggests a common arrangement for orphans, poor children, or those whose guardians could not maintain them. The fee covered both sustenance and education. Speculations Carne's sudden inability to keep his nephew for "several reasons" (not detailed) suggests either a change in his circumstances - perhaps financial hardship - or a prior agreement with Francis to take the boy. The council's swift substitution of Francis hints the transfer may have been discussed or planned beforehand rather than decided on this day. Hunt's failure to perform his duties the previous year may have resulted from inability to enforce labour obligations, resistance from the named workers, or personal difficulty in managing the role. The explicit two - day limit suggests the council was controlling the demands on him rather than excusing him entirely. The emphasis on teaching Beale to read and write reflects the colony's expectation that even children in wardship should gain literacy. The fee of seven pounds per annum suggests this was a valued service requiring educated instruction, not mere child - minding.
124	102	Island S.t Helena Att a Sessions Held on Thursday the 20.th day of Aprill 1704 att y.e Sessions house near Fort James Step.n Poirier Govern.r Pres.t Cap.r [Sodington] D.pt y Gov.r Tho: Goodwin Sm Coun.ll After the Court was opened according to y.e Accustomed manner, those persons appointed for Jurors are as followeth Thomas Swallow Sen.r foreman 1 Robert Addis 2 John Mudge 3 Thomas Dixon 4 [Cresip] [Steyord] 5 Erasmus Gurling 6 [Jn.o] Nichols 7 [Jn.o] Long 8 Henry Francis 9 Robert Wills 10 Orlando Bagley 11 Tho.s Gargen 12 George Hodgkinson free planter and overseer of the Estate Late belonging to William Bowman Dec.d Declares Against Phillip [Karlick] Soldier who hath Married The said Bowmans widdow That he Imbazles The said Estate, and Has threatned To make It All away in a twelvemonths time. Humphrey Edwards being sworn saith That The said [Karlick] About 3 weekes ago said That he would make away the said Estate in a twelvemonths time and That no body should be the wiser. And That the said [Karlick] In the Last shipping. Sold Severall Hundreds of Yams which has Reduced The Plantacon Very Low and young And Doss [Know] Know y.t neither the said [Karlick] nor his family Did fodder The Cattle belonging To The Estate In The Last Dry weather	A court session was held on Thursday, 20 April 1704 at the sessions house near Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor, presided. Captain Sodington, Deputy Governor, and Thomas Goodwin attended. After the court was opened in the accustomed manner, the following persons were appointed as jurors: Thomas Swallow Senior - foreman Robert Addis John Mudge Thomas Dixon [...] [...] Erasmus Gurling John Nichols John Long Henry Francis Robert Wills Orlando Bagley Thomas Gargen George Hodgkinson, a free planter and overseer of the estate formerly belonging to William Bowman deceased, brought a complaint against Phillip [...], a soldier who had married Bowman's widow. Hodgkinson charged that [...] was embezzling the estate and had threatened to dispose of it entirely within twelve months. Humphrey Edwards, sworn, said that [...] had stated about three weeks earlier that he would dispose of the estate within twelve months and that nobody would know about it. Edwards further said that [...] had sold several hundreds of yams in the last shipping season, which had severely depleted the plantation. Edwards also said that neither [...] nor his family had fed the cattle belonging to the estate during the last dry season. Interpretations The complaint against Karlick centre on two forms of misconduct - active embezzlement through the sale of produce, and neglect of the estate's resources. The yams sold represented current production; the cattle unfed represented capital assets being allowed to deteriorate. Edwards' testimony provided specific detail to support Hodgkinson's charges. His account of Karlick's own words - that he would "make away" the estate within twelve months and nobody would know - showed premeditation and secrecy, not mere mismanagement. The appointment of twelve jurors suggests this was a significant case requiring the full panel. The presence of Henry Francis (who had just taken Richard Beale into his care) and others from the planter community

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			meant judgment would come from those who understood estate management. Speculations Hodgkinson's appointment as overseer of Bowman's estate, and his willingness to prosecute Karlick, suggests he had authority to enforce the dead man's wishes and protect the widow's interests. His complaint indicates the estate was being stripped of value - whether Karlick intended to conceal his sales or simply to take what he could before the estate was settled is unclear. The sale of "several hundreds of yams" in the shipping season suggests either legitimate commerce (selling surplus produce for income) or deliberate liquidation of assets. Karlick's statement that nobody would "know" of his actions implies he believed this was improper or against the widow's interests. The cattle's condition during dry season (when fodder would be scarce and expensive) reflects the broader pattern: Karlick was reducing expenditure on the estate while extracting value from it, leaving the widow with depleted resources.
125	103	Most part whereof Dyed through meer Neglect. Grace the wife of Humphrey Edwards being Sworn Saith. That She asked her Mother whether the said [Karlick] Said He would make away with the said Estate who Answered yes, he Did, And further Saith The Same with her husband Upon The Whole. The Jury Delivered The Verdict following That The said [Karlick] Give The Comp.te George Hodgkinson Sufficient Security for what Estate Is now remaining In his Custody and to pay Court Charges It Is further Ordered. That 2 men be appointed to Apprase The whole Estate of The said W.m Bowman Dec.d and bring an Inventory thereof Unto Govern.r and Councill In a fortnight, And the said [Karlick] to produce Sufficient Security According To The Jury's Verdict. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Most of the cattle died through mere neglect. Grace, the wife of Humphrey Edwards, was sworn. She said she had asked her mother whether Karlick had said he would dispose of the estate. Her mother answered yes, he had. Grace also confirmed that she agreed with her husband's account of these matters. The jury delivered the following verdict: Karlick was to give the complainant George Hodgkinson sufficient security for whatever estate remained in his custody, and was to pay the court's charges. It was further ordered that two men be appointed to appraise the whole estate of the said William Bowman deceased and bring an inventory to the Governor and Council within a fortnight. Karlick was to produce sufficient security according to the jury's verdict. Interpretations The jury's requirement for "sufficient security" was a standard legal mechanism. Karlick had to post a bond guaranteeing he would not further diminish the estate while it was being appraised. If he breached the condition, the estate could claim against the bond to recover losses. Grace's testimony added corroboration through a third party - her mother - who had heard Karlick's own words directly. This second-hand evidence was admitted and valued, suggesting the court accepted it as reliable evidence of his intentions. The appraisal order, with a two - week deadline, was designed to create an official record of the estate's condition before Karlick could further reduce it. The two appraisers would establish a baseline inventory for the court's records and the widow's protection. Karlick remained in active custody and management of the estate pending the appraisal, but his freedom was constrained by the security requirement. This balanced his practical need to manage the property against the widow's need for protection against further waste. Speculations Karlick's stated intention that nobody would "know" of his disposals suggests he believed he could liquidate assets without accountability. The posting of security made his actions financially consequential - any further loss would be traceable to him and recoverable from the bond. The sale of hundreds of yams during the shipping season may have been deliberately timed to exploit merchant arrival and favorable prices. The reduction of the plantation to "very low and young" growth suggests a major harvest that would take years to recover, potentially stranding the widow with a depleted holding.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The fortnight deadline for appraisal suggests the court's sense of urgency. If left longer, Karlick might sell more produce or allow more cattle to die. The widow needed an official inventory quickly to know what remained of her late husband's property and what security the court had actually protected.
126	104	Aprill y.e 29.th 1704 Whereas M.r Jn.o [Ken] Minister Studies every moment ag.t The Govern.r to make his Life uneasy. Even this afternoon Having good Ground to Suspect him to be more a papist than a protestant, and being not willing to Let Loop the Least Reed of Superstition In the Church And on that occasion being this Evening alsoe made this Evening on a wooden Stool In the Hall as well as in [Sevor.l] other places, and Eve[n] In his bed Chamber, and on all the Chests In the Church and after prayers this Evening the Govern.r asked the said [Ken] why he did [it] he made answ.r he did not doe It neither did he know who did [it] what the Govern.r seemingly took for a truth, ([Who] was perhaps He Did It) then the Govern.r Called for one of the Companys [Servants] to put the said Stool out of the said Stool, who going to Do It The Minister went to him and took the said Stool away from the said Servant which the Govern.r hindred by Coming Suddently to y.e whom the said [Ken] opposed also and said In passion The Bowles [Pottes] [&c. mind and [open] In The Hall Accused the Govern.r of Drinking the Prince of Wales Health, which he said over Again before M.r Thomas Goodwin and the Gunner. Upon Which The Sevrall Witnesses following were Sworn Edward Heath Sworn Saith That as he was Comin[g] Through the Entry heard a Noise In the old Kitchin and Going Int[o] the Door Saw the Govern.r and Doctor [Ken] together with a Stool between them and seeing the Govern.r Cane Swinging about, went bac[k] 2 or 3 Steps, and when the Gov.r and Minister were Going In y.e Hall Doctor [Ken] said took the Drink pottels [&c]. Mind or no, an goeing Walking in the Hall The Govern.r told the Minister he provoked him to wrath, and If he was of Cap.t [Sodingtons] Humour he wo.d be [Knockt] Down for he Deserved It. Doctor [Ken] asked The Govern.r what he had to do with any thing y.t Belong'd to the Church; The Gov.r made answ.r You doe not Deserve to belong to the Church, for you are Drunk every day, and was Soe then.	29 April 1704 The Governor reported that Mr John Kerr, the minister, relentlessly worked against his interests and sought to trouble him constantly. This evening, the Governor had grounds to suspect Kerr held Catholic convictions rather than Protestant ones, and that he permitted religious practices of a superstitious nature to persist within the church building. During the evening, marks had been inscribed on a wooden bench in the main hall, and similarly on various other items throughout the church - in Kerr's bedchamber and upon storage chests. After the evening prayers, the Governor questioned Kerr about who had made these marks. Kerr rejected the charge, stating he was not responsible and possessed no knowledge of the person who had done it. The Governor appeared to accept this account [though the narrator implies suspicion]. The Governor then instructed one of the Company's staff members to carry the bench away. When the staff member moved to comply, Kerr intervened, seizing the bench from him. The Governor prevented this by approaching suddenly to confront him. Kerr resisted and [...text unclear...]. He then charged the Governor with toasting the Prince of Wales' health, and made this accusation again before Mr Thomas Goodwin and the gunner. Several witnesses were subsequently sworn. Edward Heath, sworn, reported that whilst passing through the entry he detected noise coming from the old kitchen. Upon entering that room, he observed the Governor and Doctor Kerr standing with a bench between them. The Governor's walking stick moved through the air, prompting Heath to retreat several steps. As the Governor and Minister moved toward the main hall, Doctor Kerr made [...text unclear...]. The Governor told Kerr he had angered him greatly, and stated that had Kerr possessed Captain Sodington's disposition he would have been struck to the ground, which he merited. Kerr asked what claim the Governor held over church property. The Governor responded that Kerr was unfit to serve the church, as he remained intoxicated every day - and was intoxicated at that very moment. You're right - I should have included them. Here are the Interpretations and Speculations: Interpretations The crosses inscribed on the stool and other church items represented a theological dispute between Kerr and the Governor. Kerr's alleged sympathies toward Catholic practice - specifically his toleration of what the Governor viewed as superstitious marks - directly challenged the Governor's authority to maintain Protestant discipline within the church. Kerr's intervention to seize the bench from the servant suggests he regarded the object as significant evidence of his position or practice. His refusal to allow the Governor to remove it was not mere obstruction but an assertion of ecclesiastical authority against secular command. The Governor's accusation that Kerr drank daily was designed to undermine his credibility as a witness and moral authority. By characterizing Kerr as habitually intoxicated, the Governor reframed the entire incident as the actions of an unreliable man rather than a principled theological disagreement. The calling of multiple witnesses to testify about the confrontation shows the incident was treated as a

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			serious matter requiring formal evidence, not a private quarrel to be resolved between the two men. Speculations The crosses may have represented Catholic devotional practice - a visible sign of the superstition the Governor feared Kerr was introducing into the colony's church. Kerr's insistence on preserving the marked stool suggests he wished to defend his theological position or protect evidence that the marks had religious significance. Kerr's accusation that the Governor toasted the Prince of Wales may have been a retaliatory charge intended to damage the Governor's standing by implying disloyalty or sedition. Such a toast could be interpreted as challenging the current sovereign in favour of a Catholic heir. The Governor's claim that Kerr was drunk "every day" may reflect genuine concern about Kerr's fitness for office, or may be a rhetorical tactic to discredit him. If true, it suggests Kerr's behaviour had become a chronic problem the Governor had tolerated until this evening's confrontation.
127	105	M.r Thomas Goodwin. Saith. That upon Muster day Last being the 27.th Instant after Drinking the Queens Health upon the parade Discourse fell In of The Queens being with Child which pleased every body Then Sayes The Govern.r It will be the Prince of Wales and Heres to his Health with all my heart And so Drank about. And further being In the Hall do Certyfye That the Minister Did Accuse the Govern.r with Drinking the Prince of Wales Health. Cap.t Sodington. Saith. That he never Heard the Govern.r neither Directly, or Indirectly Drink to the Prince of Wales Health. But Ever Since He Came Into the Island found That the Govern.r was a true Subject To The Crown of England. John French Gunner Sworn Saith That upon Musterday Last. The Govern.r Drinking The Queens Health At the parade Discourse arose about The Queens being with Child, I wish She is Sayes The Govern.r of a Prince then It will be a Prince of Wales and heres his Health with all my heart and Drank about which Every body was well pleased with and Drank the said Health. Further Saith y.t being In the Hall heard M.r Goodwin ask Doctor [Ken] whether he Did, or Could Accuse the Govern.r of Drinking The Prince of Wales Health who Replied He Did not Accuse him, but Could not say but that he would. Presently The said M.r [Ken] Did Accuse the Govern.r with Drinking The said Health. The said M.r [Ken]. Saith. That He did not, nor Does not Accuse the Govern.r of Drinking The Prince of Wales Health. But In Answ.r to the Question proposed Either by the Govern.r or Cap.t Goodwin whether the Govern.r had Drunk a Health, To The Prince of Wales on Last Muster- Day, He Replied when The Govern.r Delivered The Bowle Into his hands. The Gov.r said It Is a Health To The Prince	Mr Thomas Goodwin testified: On muster day (the 27th), after the Queen's health had been raised on the parade, conversation turned to the Queen's pregnancy. Everyone welcomed this news. The Governor then remarked "If it is a son, he will be Prince of Wales, and I drink to his health with genuine pleasure" and drank. Later, in the hall, Goodwin confirmed that the Minister accused the Governor of toasting the Prince of Wales. Captain Sodington testified: He had never heard the Governor raise a glass to the Prince of Wales, neither explicitly nor by implication. Since arriving on the island, he had found the Governor to be a loyal subject of the English crown. John French, the gunner, sworn, testified: On muster day, when the Governor drank the Queen's health at the parade, the conversation shifted to the Queen's pregnancy. The Governor said "I hope it will be a boy - then we shall have a Prince of Wales, and I drink to him with all sincerity" and drank. Everyone present approved and drank the same health. Later in the hall, French heard Mr Goodwin ask Doctor Kerr whether he could accuse the Governor of toasting the Prince of Wales. Kerr responded that he had not made such an accusation, though he could not rule out the possibility. Moments later, Kerr did accuse the Governor of raising that particular health. Mr Kerr testified: He had neither accused nor was accusing the Governor of toasting the Prince of Wales. However, when asked by either the Governor or Captain Goodwin whether the Governor had drunk to the Prince of Wales on muster day, he replied that when the Governor handed him the bowl, the Governor said "This is a health to the Prince..." [text breaks off] Interpretations The Governor's toast to a potential Prince of Wales was conventional patriotic sentiment in 1704, not seditious. Toasting the Crown's succession and the hoped - for heir was expected behaviour at official gatherings like muster day. Multiple witnesses described the same remarks in substantially similar terms, making Kerr's framing of them as suspicious or disloyal implausible. Kerr's evasive response - saying he had not accused the Governor but "could not say but that he would" - shows uncertainty or deliberate hedging. His immediate contradiction, accusing the Governor moments later, suggests the accusation was retaliatory rather than principled. Kerr's final retreat - claiming he was merely answering a question about what the Governor said, rather than making a judgment - represents an attempt to reframe the accusation as factual reporting. His

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			incomplete statement breaks off precisely where this distinction becomes crucial. Speculations Kerr's accusation may have been retaliation for the earlier evening's confrontation over the crosses and the stool. Unable to win that argument, he seized on the Prince of Wales toast as a way to damage the Governor's standing. The Governor's patriotic intent is evident from the context - the muster day ceremony, the formal toasting ritual, and the universal approval from those present. The hope for a legitimate heir was loyalist sentiment, not sedition. Kerr's backpedalling in his testimony suggests he knew the accusation was weak. By attempting to reframe it as merely describing what was said, rather than judging it, he acknowledged the accusation could not withstand scrutiny.
128	106	Prince of Wales with all my heart Said I, If He Come of the Queens body, our Gracious Sovereign Queen Ann.s And Referrs himselfe To the Queen, and his Masters for Justice and will Give a Larger Answear, after he has got a Coppy of The Abovewriten Charg.s from The Clerk Under his hands [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Kerr's statement concluded: The Governor said "...Prince of Wales, and I speak with complete sincerity. If such a child were to be born to our gracious Queen Anne, if the child were genuinely hers..." Kerr then referred himself to the Queen and to his religious superiors for judgment of the matter. He stated he would furnish a complete response once he had obtained a copy of the written charges from the clerk. Interpretations Kerr's completion of the Governor's remarks reveals the toast was conditional on legitimacy. By repeating the phrase "if he come of the Queen's body," Kerr was acknowledging the Governor's patriotic intent - the toast was to a rightful heir, not to a Catholic pretender or rival to the throne. Kerr's appeal to the Queen and his masters (his ecclesiastical superiors) was a formal act of appeal against the Governor's authority. Rather than answer to the Governor and Council, Kerr was taking the dispute to higher authority - the Crown and presumably the Bishop of London. Kerr's request for a copy of the written charges before giving his full answer shows he was adopting a defensive legal posture. By demanding to see the formal accusations in writing, he was claiming the right to prepare a proper defence rather than respond extemporaneously. The entire trajectory of Kerr's testimony - from accusation, to qualification, to retreat, to appeal to higher authority - reveals he had no sustainable case against the Governor. Once the Governor's own words were quoted back to him and corroborated by multiple witnesses, Kerr's position collapsed. Speculations Kerr's insistence on the legitimacy condition - "if he come of the Queen's body" - suggests that what truly troubled Kerr was the theological possibility of a Catholic heir to the throne. If the child had been illegitimate or born of a Catholic union, a toast to such a prince would have been seditious. But the Governor's toast was to a legitimate Protestant heir, which was unquestionably loyal. Kerr's appeal to the Queen and his superiors may have been a tactical retreat - acknowledging he could not win the case before the Governor and Council, and hoping that distance (and his ecclesiastical status) would protect him from consequences. By involving higher authorities, Kerr was attempting to frame the dispute as a matter of principle rather than personal quarrel. Kerr's demand for written copies of the charges suggests he intended to build a defence based on technical or procedural objections, or to appeal the decision elsewhere. His willingness to defer his answer indefinitely shows he was buying time rather than answering the substance of the accusation.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
129	107	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultation Held on Tuesday the 2.d of May 1704 Stephen Poirier Govern.r Present. Corn: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin 3.d in Councill. Whereas. M.r George Carne was sometime since Complained of by Cap.t Sodington as by his Declaracon of y.e 7.th of March Last may Appear, whereupon the said M.r Carne was bound over To the Good behaviour for the future till The Last Court At which time he was Cleared, as Customary, But there being n.t [Got] an Occasion. To Know whether The said M.r Carne broke The Peace He was Summoned to Appear before us this Day which he Accordingly did and Delivers a Coppy of the said Cap.t Sodingtons Declaracon And That The Matter be Left to The Jury at next Cor.t Day. It Is ordered. That the said M.r Carnes Request be Granted According to his Petion M.r Tho: Goodwins opinion Is That M.r Carne Having been Imprisoned and bound over to The Peace till Last Court Day at which time was Cleared as Usual, ought to be tryed then. And not now The Govern.r Replies That The Talent	A consultation was held on Tuesday, 2 May 1704. Stephen Poirier, Governor, attended. Cornelius Sodington, Deputy, and Thomas Goodwin, third member of the council, attended. Mr George Carne had been the subject of a complaint from Captain Sodington previously, as shown in Sodington's declaration of 7 March last. Following that complaint, Carne was bound over to keep the peace, pending the next court session. At that court, he was cleared in the usual manner. However, a question had arisen as to whether Carne had violated the terms of his bond. He was therefore summoned to appear before the council this day, which he did. Carne presented a copy of Captain Sodington's declaration and requested that the matter be submitted to the jury at the next court day. The council ordered that Carne's request be granted in accordance with his petition. Mr Thomas Goodwin offered the following opinion: Carne, having been imprisoned and bound to keep the peace until the last court session at which he was cleared in the usual way, should have been tried for any breach at that time, not now. The Governor responded that [...text breaks off] Interpretations The bond was a restraining mechanism - Carne was held responsible for his conduct during the interim period. Once he was "cleared" at the next court session, the bond was formally satisfied, but the question of whether he had violated it during that interim period remained potentially actionable. Goodwin's objection shows tension over timing and jurisdiction. He argued that any breach of the bond should have been determined at the court where Carne was cleared. To reopen the matter weeks later, after he had been formally cleared, seemed to Goodwin like revisiting a settled case. Carne's request for jury trial demonstrates confidence in community judgment and avoidance of what might appear to be Governor or Sodington bias. A jury drawn from the planter population would decide based on evidence rather than official preference. The gap between the March incident and this May hearing (eight weeks) suggests either that evidence of a breach only recently surfaced, or that Sodington was pursuing the matter further after the initial proceeding concluded. Speculations The "occasion to know whether Carne broke the peace" may refer to new evidence or testimony - perhaps witness accounts of Carne behaving aggressively or threateningly during the bond period. If such evidence emerged only after the last court session, it would justify the delayed hearing. Goodwin's position may reflect concern that the Governor was permitting Sodington to relitigate a case that had been resolved. Reopening the proceeding after formal clearance could be seen as harassment or as giving Sodington a second opportunity to discredit Carne. The Governor's response (text breaks off) may have addressed whether the breach of bond (if proven) had occurred before or after the clearance, and whether a court could retrospectively try a defendant for violating a bond that was no longer technically in effect.
130	108	of The Law of being bound to the Peace Is for The future But his offence being before, ought to be fined, And Accordingly It Is ordered. That the said M.r Carne be fined 6.d for Breach of Peace Whereas. Last Night about 12 of y.e Clock, George Hodgkinson and Charles Howard free planters Came and Cal[ed] to the Centry on the West Mount To Call The Serj.t Thomas Dixon whom when he Came they Desired to Goe to The Govern.r who was then In bed) and to tell him they	The Governor continued: The law binding someone to keep the peace applies to future conduct. If his offence occurred before the bond was imposed, he ought to be fined for it. Accordingly, it is ordered that Mr Carne be fined six shillings for breach of the peace. Last night about midnight, George Hodgkinson and Charles Howard, free planters, arrived at the west mount and called to the sentry to summon Sergeant Thomas Dixon. When Dixon appeared, they asked him

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Desired to Some To Spe[ak] with him The Serj.t Accordingly did Then The Govern.r ord.r him to open the Sallyport Gate and bring them To him who when Come Said they had Something to Declare to his worship, but would not doe It till one of the Councill was p.rsent with him whereupon the Govern.r sent for M.r Goodw.n when He Came they Declare, that M.r Jn.o [Ken] Minister had Declared at M.r Carnes house, that 2 Jesuits told him that the Govern.r would, or Designed to Deliver up the Island. To The next French ffleet that Came to the said Island, for the Govern.r told them Soe. Upon which It was ordered. That the Said M.r [Ken] and Evidences ag.t him Should appear here this Morning, who Declare as followeth. The said M.r [Ken]. Saith. That no Jesuites nor noe other persons Ever told him That the Govern.r would Deliver up this Island. To the french ffleet, Neither did he ever think soe, for he never Saw, nor heard any thing, but that the Govern.r was a true. Loyall Subject To The Crown of England. And to be more plainly und.rstood. Declares	to go to the Governor (who was then asleep) and request that they be allowed to speak with him. The sergeant complied. The Governor then instructed Dixon to open the sallyport and bring the planters to him. When they arrived, they said they had something to report to the Governor, but would not proceed until a council member was present. The Governor sent for Mr Goodwin. Once Goodwin arrived, Hodgkinson and Howard reported the following: Mr John Kerr, the minister, had stated at Mr Carne's house that two Jesuits had told him the Governor intended to surrender the island to the next French fleet to arrive here, claiming that the Governor himself had made this statement to them. Consequently, it was ordered that Mr Kerr and any witnesses against him appear before the council this morning. Mr Kerr testified: No Jesuits or any other persons ever told him the Governor intended to surrender the island to the French fleet. He had never believed such a thing, for he had neither seen nor heard anything suggesting the Governor was anything other than a faithful subject of the English Crown. To make his position clearer, he declared [text breaks off] Interpretations The planters' insistence on a council member being present before they spoke shows they understood they were making an extremely serious accusation. Official witnessing protected them against charges of slander or malice. Kerr's blanket denial - that no Jesuits or anyone else had made such a statement to him - stands in direct contradiction to what Hodgkinson and Howard claimed he had said. One party was committing perjury, and the council had to determine which. The alleged statement was made at Carne's house, a private venue, suggesting Kerr was spreading seditious rumours through informal planter gatherings rather than in public. This made the accusation more insidious - it reached influential men in private settings where it could fester. Kerr's extraordinary assertion that he had "never seen nor heard anything but that the Governor was a true, loyal subject" directly contradicts his entire documented history of conflicts, accusations, and opposition to the Governor. This statement is either profound dishonesty or denial so complete as to be remarkable. Speculations Kerr's alleged claim about Jesuits was designed to invoke the deepest Protestant anxieties about Catholic powers. By suggesting the Governor was in league with (or had been corrupted by) Jesuit priests, Kerr was making the most damaging accusation possible in a colonial context - that of treason and foreign conspiracy. The timing of this accusation - after Kerr's failed attempt to frame the Governor for sedition over the Prince of Wales toast - suggests Kerr was escalating and diversifying his attacks. Unable to make the Prince of Wales charge stick, he shifted to an even more serious one. Hodgkinson and Howard may have acted on the Governor's initiative or suggestion, coming at midnight with formal insistence on witnessing to create an irrefutable record of Kerr's statement. This strategy trapped Kerr into either admitting what he said or denying it under oath. Kerr's denial about the Jesuits may be technically precise - perhaps no actual Jesuit told him anything - while remaining evasive about whether he had claimed or believed the Governor intended to surrender the island. His incomplete statement breaks off precisely where he would have to clarify what he actually had said or meant.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
131	109	time till the Afternoon, To Explain him selfe better, by writing his Answ.r or Declaracon Charles Heward Free planter being Sworn Saith. That He being Last Night about 10 a Clock at M.r Carnes house, Amongst Some Discourse heard M.r [Ken] say That The Jesuites told him That the Govern.r told them he would Deliver the Island up to the next French ffleet That Came to the said Island, but Some short time after Replyed, I beleive this Is as true, as the Jesuit told the Govern.r I was a Jesuitt Charles Heward. George Hodgkinson being Sworn Saith That being Last Night at M.r Carnes house about 10 a Clock Doctor [Ken] being there also told the Company told the Company what had past betwixt him and the Govern.r on Saturday Evening Last among other Discourse The said Doctor [Ken] said, That the Jesuits told him That the Gov.r told them that he would Deliver the Island up to the next French fleet y.t Came to the said Island, To which Charles Howard Said how, will the Govern.r doe Soe? then the said Doctor Replyed, But I beleive this is as true, as the Jesuits told the Govern.r as He sayes I am a Jesuit, After Some few words this Depon.t asked the said M.r [Ken] If he would Say that what he had Said was false, they would not persist In the matter any further, The Said Doctor [Ken] Replyed If this will Redound To the Good of the Island I am no [more] as you think fitt, But Desire I am not to Disturb the publick Peace. The said Depon.t further saith, He Heard Doctor [Ken] [say] If t'was not Reasalon To Drink the Prince of Wales Health To which Answ.r was made yes, t'was. said by his Discourse Und.r= Stood the Govern.r had Drunk the Prince of Wales Health. But a Little after said, That Capt.t Goodwin Had Cleared that Matter. Edward Bagley Free planter being Sworn Saith. That being Last Night at [the] M.r Carnes house about 10 a Clock Doctor [Ken] being there a talking with M.r Carne Heard Him say That the Govern.r Designed To Deliver up The Island. To The next French ffleet That Came To The Said Island. As He was told by 2 Jesuitts. Which Charles Howard Hearing Said, Will The Govern.r Do So? But But	Kerr requested time until the afternoon to prepare a written response clarifying his position. Charles Howard, free planter, sworn, testified: The previous night about 10 o'clock at Mr Carne's house, during general conversation, he heard Mr Kerr claim that Jesuits had told him the Governor intended to hand the island over to the next French fleet to arrive. However, shortly after making this statement, Kerr amended it, saying "I believe that claim is as credible as the Jesuit's assertion to the Governor that I myself am a Jesuit, Charles Howard" - meaning he did not believe it. George Hodgkinson, sworn, testified: The previous night at Mr Carne's house about 10 o'clock, Doctor Kerr recounted what had occurred between him and the Governor on Saturday evening. Among other matters, Kerr stated that Jesuits had informed him the Governor intended to surrender the island to the next French fleet. Charles Howard responded "How could the Governor possibly do that?" Kerr then said "But I believe that claim has as much truth as when the Jesuits told the Governor, as he claims, that I am a Jesuit." After some conversation, Hodgkinson asked Kerr whether he would retract his statement as false, and if so, they would not pursue the matter further. Kerr replied "If this serves the island's welfare, I am willing to comply, but I ask that we do not create public discord over it." Hodgkinson also testified: He heard Kerr ask whether it was reasonable to drink a health to the Prince of Wales. When told it was perfectly reasonable, Kerr seemed to understand the Governor had indeed raised such a toast. But shortly afterward, Kerr mentioned that Captain Goodwin had already resolved that particular issue. Edward Bagley, free planter, sworn, testified: The previous night at Mr Carne's house about 10 o'clock, whilst Doctor Kerr was speaking with Carne, Bagley heard him state the Governor intended to surrender the island to the next French fleet to arrive, as Jesuits had told him. When Charles Howard heard this, he asked "Would the Governor actually do such a thing?" But [text breaks off] Interpretations Kerr's immediate self-correction - comparing his claim to a false assertion - reveals he was not presenting the statement as established fact. Either he was repeating rumour without belief, or making an ironic point. The immediate qualification undermines any claim that he was seriously advancing seditious accusations. The three witnesses corroborate each other's accounts with striking consistency. Each independently reports Kerr making the claim and then immediately undercutting it with the same comparison about being called a Jesuit. This pattern of corroborating testimony is credible and damaging to Kerr's character. Kerr's willingness to drop the matter if it served the island's welfare, and his plea not to disturb public peace, suggests he recognised the statement was inflammatory and indefensible. His retreat signals awareness that the accusation was unfounded. The gathering at Carne's house was informal and social, not an official proceeding. Kerr's statement, though made in private, reached multiple witnesses and could spread through the planter community, making it a form of private sedition potentially more damaging than public utterance. Speculations Kerr may have been testing how the planter community would react to such a rumour, or floating it ironically to see if anyone would defend the Governor or challenge the claim. His immediate self-correction protected him from being accused of straightforward sedition while allowing the damaging rumour to circulate. Kerr's interwoven references to both the Jesuits rumour and the Prince of Wales toast issue suggest he was creating a narrative in which the Governor was

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			fundamentally untrustworthy - first possibly disloyal in toasting a Catholic heir, then possibly treacherous in dealings with France. Each accusation reinforced the others. Kerr's offer to abandon the matter if the council deemed it harmful may reflect genuine concern for peace, or it may be tactical calculation that the false accusation was unravelling. By offering to recant, Kerr was positioning himself as reasonable and concerned for public order, rather than as a malicious accuser. The evening gathering allowed Kerr to plant the idea privately among influential men without facing immediate official scrutiny. The rumour, once shared, would spread through the planter network regardless of Kerr's own qualification or retraction.
132	110	After some Pause Replyed, I Beleive This Is as True as the Jesuits told the Govern.r I was a Jesuit. Immediately after M.r Hodgkinson said, Doctor, If you will Say Coming Then [fyrst]. We will persist not further. Doctor [Ken] Replyed yes I Come upon my oath, I Know what to say, But If you think It will be for the good of The Island. Do as you think fitt But I Desire you not to Disturb The publick peace of The said Island. Edward Bagley. Whereas. At a Court of Judicature, Held on Thursday The 20.th of Aprill Last. It was then ordered. That two persons should Apprase The Estate now In The Possion of Phillip [Karlick] formerly W.m Bowmans. And The said [Karlick] Give Security for The Same. The 2 Appraisers Henry [Coles] And [Lupin] Wills brought This Day an Inventory thereof, And The said [Karlick] p.rsentd W.m Marsh, and Jn.o Hemonss for His Security, who were Accepted of. Richard Gurling. Free planter Complaines ag.t [Madg.t] Cagnald saying, That her Decd: Husband Jn.o Cagnald, when He was building his house In the Coal-Vally Borrowed a parcell of Stones of him and Promised. To Lett him as many more when He wanted them, And Applying himselfe To The Widow Cagnald for The same, which she Refuses to The Meaning, That The Ground whereon the Stones Lay, Did Belonges to her Children, by John Cleverley her [first] Husband After Severall Debates. It Is ordered. That The Matter be Referred to a Jury At next Sessions.	After a pause, Kerr responded by repeating his earlier assertion - that the allegation was as credible as the Jesuits' claim that he himself was a Jesuit. Immediately after, Mr Hodgkinson said to Kerr: "Doctor, if you will [...], we will not pursue this further." Kerr replied: "Yes, I will appear to testify under oath. I know what I intend to say. But if you judge this will serve the island's welfare, proceed as you see fit. However, I ask that you do not disturb the public peace of this island." Whereas at a court of judicature held on Thursday, 20 April last, it was ordered that two persons should appraise the estate in Phillip Karlick's possession, which had formerly belonged to William Bowman. Karlick was required to post security for the property. This day, the two appraisers, Henry [...] and [...] Wills, delivered an inventory of the estate. Karlick named William Marsh and John Hemonss to stand as his securities. Both were approved. Richard Gurling, a free planter, brought a complaint against [Margaret] Cagnald. He stated that her deceased husband John Cagnald had borrowed a quantity of stones from him during the construction of his house in Coal Valley, and had promised to provide Gurling with additional stones whenever needed. When Gurling approached the widow Cagnald requesting the promised stones, she refused. Her reason was that the land where the stones lay belonged to her children from her first marriage, to John Cleverley. After substantial debate, it was ordered that the dispute be submitted to a jury at the next sessions. Interpretations Kerr's repeated use of the irony comparison - claiming his statement was "as true as" a false assertion - shows he was attempting to negate any seditious intent. If his own words lacked credibility, he could argue they posed no real threat to the Governor. Kerr's offer to recant on condition that the council accept his withdrawal demonstrates he was calculating the consequences. Recognising the accusation was failing to gain purchase, he sought to abandon it before facing more serious consequences. Kerr's emphasis on not disturbing public peace reveals awareness that his statement, though he claimed to disbelieve it, could cause genuine harm if it spread through the community. The damage from a rumour exists independent of the speaker's sincerity. The appraisers' inventory and the requirement for sureties show the council was taking systematic steps to protect the widow Bowman's interests. By establishing a clear record of assets and requiring named guarantors, the council was guarding against Karlick further depleting or concealing the estate. The widow Cagnald's refusal of the promised stones, based on her children's ownership of the land, shows she was acting as guardian of her minor children's interests rather than as owner in her own right. Speculations

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Kerr's eagerness to recant on conditions acceptable to the council suggests he was reading the room - recognising his accusation was not gaining credence and calculating that withdrawal would minimise damage to his own standing. The detail that the children belonged to Cagnald's first marriage to Cleverley suggests a remarriage, which explains the widow's refusal. She was protecting assets legally belonging to minors, over which she had limited authority. Gurling's stone claim threatened the children's inheritance. Gurling's decision to bring the matter to court rather than continue private negotiation suggests either the widow had become intractable, or the relationship between them had broken down entirely. A jury of planters would understand both the custom of borrowing and returning favours, and the obligation of a widow to protect her children's property.
133	111	Whereas. The old Churchwardens, and The new To Succeed Them This p.rsent Year, were Summoned To Appear before us That The old Might pass their Accounts with us It Is ordered. That Sam.ll Desfountain, and Edward Bagley be Appointed Churchwardens, To Succeed The old for This p.rsent Year 1704 And That Leonard Hunt Having Done Nothing Last year, Continue overseer, and Walter [Welward] To Act with him Robert Leach. Brought and Delivered Thi[s] Day an Account of His Brothers Estate &c. wherein It Did Appear He Stood Indebted To Them, In The Sum of £82. 19. with 8.r p.r Cent. Interest more. It Is Agreed. That Leonard Coulson Have. His Brother In Law James Leach for The Term of 5 Years, At The rate of 5.s for The Whole Time. But In Case The said James Dyes Before The first Year Is Expired Then The said Leonard Coulson To Abate 20.s And That The said Coulson [find] Brother In Law The said Leach In Sufficient meat, Drink, washing, and Lodging. And Apparell fitt for an Apprentice S.t Helena. y.e 2.d May 1704 Whereas. on Tryday 21.st Aprill. 1704 being Musterday. We und.rwritten, Acknowledge our Selves To Have Been P.rsent with His Wo.p. When His Worship felt Gov.r Poirier p.r Frank Lieu.t Heathes. Since which time We are Informed, M.r Jn.o [Ken] has Reported, That y.e	The former church wardens and their successors for the coming year were summoned to appear before the council so that the outgoing wardens could present their accounts and be discharged. Samuel Desfountain and Edward Bagley were appointed church wardens for the year 1704, to succeed the previous wardens. Leonard Hunt, having neglected his duties as overseer in the previous year, was to continue in that office. Walter [...] was to serve alongside him. Robert Leach presented an account of his brother's estate. The record showed that the estate owed a debt of Robert Leach presented an account of his brother's estate. The record showed that the estate owed a debt of £82 19s, with interest at 8 percent per annum accumulated. An agreement was reached regarding Leonard Coulson's care of his brother-in-law James Leach. Coulson was to employ Leach for five years at a wage of five shillings for the entire period. Should James die before the first year concluded, Coulson was to reduce the total payment by twenty shillings. Coulson was obliged to provide Leach with adequate food, drink, washing, lodging, and clothing suitable for an apprentice. St Helena, 2 May 1704 A statement signed by witnesses: On Friday, 21 April 1704, being muster day, we the undersigned testified that we were present with the Governor when the Governor [...] Frank Lieutenant Heathes. Since that time, we learned that Mr John Kerr reported that [text breaks off] Interpretations Leonard Hunt's continuation as overseer despite his documented failure to perform suggests either insufficient alternative candidates, or tolerance for his non-performance based on other considerations. His reappointment with [Welward] as co-overseer may have been an attempt to maintain continuity whilst adding oversight. The apprenticeship arrangement with James Leach at five shillings for five years was a welfare mechanism. The clause allowing Coulson to reduce payment if Leach died within the first year shows the council understood mortality risks and built flexibility into dependency contracts. The requirement that Coulson provide food, drink, washing, lodging and clothing suitable for an apprentice indicates the colony maintained standards for the treatment of dependents, though enforcement would depend on subsequent oversight and complaint. The incomplete statement about muster day, followed by mention of Kerr's report, suggests deliberate effort to document the Governor's presence and conduct on that day, presumably as protection

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			against accusations (such as Kerr had already made regarding the Governor's statements and loyalties). Speculations Hunt may have continued in office because replacement would have been difficult or contentious within the community, despite his demonstrated negligence. Pairing him with [Welward] was a compromise allowing continuity whilst adding accountability. The Leach arrangement shows the colony's poor relief mechanism. Rather than providing full support from communal resources, the council bound him to apprenticeship with modest compensation, expecting him to gain skills and subsistence whilst remaining productive. The muster day attestation may have been compiled specifically to counter Kerr's accusations. By gathering multiple witnesses to sign a statement about the Governor's presence and activities that day, the council was building documented defence against Kerr's allegations about the Governor's conduct or statements. Kerr's new report (the text breaks off before stating what he reported) suggests he was continuing or escalating accusations. The incomplete passage halted precisely where his latest claim was about to be documented, leaving the substance unknown.
134	112	The said Govern.r Did Then Drink a Health, To The Prince of Wales: Upon which his worship full hard Requiring this our Testimony. We Do Hereby Declare That we Heard noe such Health Drunk, or any p.rjudicial words spoken, by The said Govern.r As witn.s our hands. Jn.o Crowch. Sam.l Manning Saturday. May 6.th 1704 Whereas M.r John [Ken] Minister being Suspected of being a Jesuit Came this Morning To The Govern.r And Desires That He would be pleased, to Tender him the oathes of Allegiance, and Supremacy which The Govern.r Did as In Kilburnes Justice. fo: 306. 324. Having not never president of that Nature. As to The oath of Canonically obedience. fo: 324. In y.e said Kilburnes Justice 6th Edition. I do not think any oath obleidged, To Renew The Same before The Govern.r But for The Govern.rs Satisfacion. That He may be fully Satisfyed, I am Neither Papist, nor Jesuit, I have Submitted my opinion to His for peace Sakes To again Renew It before him as ordinary In Ecclesiasticall affairs, on this Island S.t Helena. Jn.o [Ken] As for The objecion. made by the said M.r [Ken] Concerning the oath of obedience Canonically. The Gov.r Denyes, That He will Impose The Same upon M.r [Ken] But onely Doss [&] Sent It to him, And God forbid I should meddle with The Reverend Bishops Affairs, But Rather Submit to Them, But first finding It In The said Book which Is for Justice of Peace to be Ruled by Thinks with Submission He may. Ely.	The Governor then raised a health to the Prince of Wales. Upon this, his worship insisted on receiving our testimony. We hereby testified that we heard no such health raised, nor any prejudicial words spoken by the Governor. As witness our hands: John Crouch, Samuel Manning Saturday, 6 May 1704 Mr John Kerr, minister, being suspected of being a Jesuit, came to the Governor this morning and requested that the Governor administer to him the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, which the Governor did, as detailed in Kilburne's Justice, folio 306, 324. There being no precedent of this nature, and as to the oath of canonical obedience (folio 324 in Kilburne's Justice, 6th edition), I did not believe any oath was obliged to be renewed before the Governor. But to satisfy the Governor's requirements and to demonstrate fully that I was neither Papist nor Jesuit, I submitted my position to his judgment for the sake of peace, and would again renew the oath before him as was customary in ecclesiastical matters on this island of St Helena. John Kerr As for the objection raised by Mr Kerr concerning the oath of canonical obedience, the Governor denied that he would impose the same upon Mr Kerr, but only [...] sent it to him. And God forbid I should interfere with the Reverend Bishops' affairs, but rather defer to them. However, finding it in the said book which governed justices of the peace, [he] thought, with respect, he might [do so]. [...] Interpretations The two witnesses' explicit testimony that they heard no health drunk to the Prince of Wales contradicted what Kerr had alleged. By requiring and obtaining this sworn statement, the Governor was building formal documentation against Kerr's accusations. Kerr's voluntary submission to the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy was his attempt to clear himself of the suspicion of being a Jesuit or Papist. By taking these explicitly Protestant oaths, he was demonstrating loyalty to the Crown and to the Protestant succession.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The dispute over canonical obedience was a technical point about ecclesiastical authority. Kerr objected that he might not be obliged to renew such an oath before a secular magistrate, but offered to do so anyway for the sake of peace. The Governor's deferential language about the Bishops' authority shows respect for ecclesiastical hierarchy whilst asserting that secular justices of the peace had authority to administer oaths under their jurisdiction. Speculations The witnesses' careful statement that they heard no prejudicial words from the Governor suggests they were countering Kerr's characterisation of the Prince of Wales toast as seditious or suspicious. This formally negated Kerr's interpretation of the Governor's conduct. Kerr's willingness to renew oaths and submit to the Governor's judgment, despite objecting to the technical requirements, suggests he was attempting to end the escalating dispute by demonstrating cooperation and deference. The Governor's assertion that he deferred to the Bishops on ecclesiastical matters may have been a calculated statement meant to reassure Kerr that he was not seeking to remove him from office or undermine his clerical authority, only to satisfy himself regarding Kerr's loyalty.
135	113	E.ly by The Consequence of his own Request Demands It Since It does Concern an Ecclesiasticall person, being The matter of being A Preist, or Jesuit of The Church of Rome. At any time when any Controversy arises, He Does alwayes Argue, To prove That The Church Is Infallible. When father Pascho an Italian Preist was here In The Sidney Cap.t Whitwell Comander. He Did Preach That He must Have a Complasance for Them; as Much as To Say A Tolleracon He Told me about a fortnight ago, In The p.rsence of my wife, after Supper That He Has Soe much Respect for Them That when Mons.r L Aboye of Lyons, who Is said, to be Bisshp of China once meeting him when He was Coming Down from Concord House The said Gentleman Going up To That Place. Did Kneel before Him, Craving His Blessing. Morrover It Is to be observed, That Ever Since The said father Pascho was here, He has Let his Beard grow and Does Shew The Crown of his head According To Their wayes. Besides He has Taken from The said Pascho A List of The Convents or Religious Houses, from The first Town In France To Rome To Goe when he pleases In That Road, without any Charges. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	[Ely?] by the consequence of his own request demanded it, since it concerned an ecclesiastical person and the question of whether he was a priest or Jesuit of the Church of Rome. Whenever any controversy arose, he always argued to prove that the Church was infallible. When Father Pascho, an Italian priest, was here aboard the Sidney under Captain Whitwell, [Kerr] preached that he must show complacence toward them - in other words, toleration. He told me about a fortnight ago, in the presence of my wife, after supper, that he had such respect for them that when Monsieur L'Aboye of Lyons, who was said to be Bishop of China, once met him as he was coming down from Concord House - the gentleman going up to that place - he knelt before Kerr, craving his blessing. Moreover, it was to be observed that ever since Father Pascho was here, Kerr had let his beard grow and displayed the crown of his head according to their (Catholic) ways. Furthermore, he had obtained from Pascho a list of the convents and religious houses from the first town in France to Rome, so that he could visit them whenever he wished on that route without incurring any cost. Interpretations Kerr's consistent argument for Church infallibility identifies him with Catholic theology. This doctrine is explicitly rejected by Protestants and the Church of England, making it a key marker of Catholic or Jesuit sympathy. His preaching of complacence (toleration) for Catholics when the Italian priest was present suggests either genuine sympathy for Catholicism, or deliberate accommodation of Catholic visitors in a way the Governor found suspicious and unwarranted. The story about L'Aboye kneeling before Kerr and seeking his blessing is presented as evidence that Kerr is recognised by Catholics as possessing ecclesiastical authority - suggesting he is either an ordained priest or has been recognised by the Catholic Church hierarchy. The tonsure and beard are visible signs that Kerr was adopting Catholic clerical appearance. The tonsure (shaving the crown of the head) was a specific Catholic practice, not worn by Protestant ministers. The list of convents obtained from Pascho suggests Kerr was prepared to travel through Catholic territories

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			using established networks of hospitality, indicating prior arrangement or integration with the Catholic Church hierarchy. Speculations Kerr may have been a Catholic priest operating under false Protestant credentials, or he may have been a Protestant who converted or developed Catholic sympathies during his time in the colony. The timing of the beard and tonsure adoption (after Pascho's visit) suggests either that Pascho instructed or convinced Kerr to adopt these markers, or that Kerr felt emboldened to display his true affiliations after experiencing Pascho's presence and validation. The convent list obtained from Pascho suggests the Italian priest was recruiting or preparing Kerr for travel to Catholic territories, possibly for ordination or further religious training at Rome. Kerr's willingness to recount the L'Aboye story to the Governor's wife suggests either genuine innocence about how damning the anecdote appeared, or calculated confidence that he was sufficiently protected that the Governor would not act against him.
136	114	May 11.th 1704 Whereas. MarGarettt Cagnald widdow Complaints to The Govern.r That her house In fort James was broke open Last week And Some Arrack and Sugar Stolen from her. Since which time The Govern.r being Credibly Informed That Bowles of punch Has been Drunk at Jn.o Cullers House where Thomas Dutton Soldier Lodges whom The Govern.r Sent for, and Examined upon the Same. The said Dutton. Saith That on Tuesday Last was Sevenight, He made 2 Bowles of Punch, At The said Jn.o Cullers House And Saith That he Invited Phillip Lodgett Corpor.l and Jn.o Scriven and others To partake and That he Bought a Gallon of Arack and Some sugar of a Seaman belonging to The Ship Lyampo now in the Road. John Scriven. Corpor.l Saith. That on Mounday The first of this Instant. He took Some Druggs out of The Store and not Liking The Same Sold it To Brig.t Sanderson for 1 dollar half of which he Soe Spent at his house, and The other at Lipin Wills, and That he Drank part of 2 Bowles at M.r Cullers House with Dutton, who Sold them Some. Phillip Lodgett. Saith, That this Day Sevenight In the Morning Corpor.l Scriven Came to him at the Sally fort Gate, Asking him to goe up the Vally To drink part of A Bowle of punch, which he did and when That Bowle was out They had another which was made of Batavia And yesterday The said Dutton Lett P.rter [Goss] Sold. have A pint of Batavia Arack, which they made Soe In punch [Now] And Scriven found Sugar Some of which was Compared with what Dutton had In his Custody, which M.rs Cagnald Sayes, Is Like unto That y.t was Stole from her. with Some Graines of Pepper In It.	11 May 1704 Margaret Cagnald, widow, complained to the Governor that her house in Fort James had been broken into the previous week and some arrack and sugar were stolen from her. Since that time, the Governor, being credibly informed that bowls of punch had been drunk at John Culler's house where Thomas Dutton, a soldier, lodged, sent for Dutton and examined him on the matter. Dutton testified: A week ago Tuesday, he made two bowls of punch at John Culler's house. He invited Phillip Lodgett, corporal, and John Scriven and others to partake. He purchased a gallon of arrack and some sugar from a seaman belonging to the ship Lyampo then in the harbour. John Scriven, corporal, testified: On Monday the 1st of this month, he took some drugs from the store and, not satisfied with them, sold them to Brigett Sanderson for one dollar. He spent half of this at his own house and the other half at Lipin Wills' house. He drank part of two bowls at Mr Culler's house with Dutton, who sold them some. Phillip Lodgett testified: A week ago this morning, Corporal Scriven came to him at the sally fort gate and asked him to go up the valley to drink part of a bowl of punch, which he did. When that bowl was finished, they obtained another, which was made from Batavian arrack. Yesterday, Dutton gave Porter [...] permission to have a pint of Batavian arrack, which they made into punch. Scriven located sugar, some of which was compared with what Dutton held in his keeping. Mrs Cagnald said this sugar resembled that which had been stolen from her, including grains of pepper in it. Interpretations The theft of specific goods (arrack and sugar) paired with their rapid appearance in punch at Culler's house strongly suggests Dutton's purchase story was false or incomplete. The presence of grains of pepper in both the stolen sugar and the sugar found in Dutton's custody is an identifying detail that directly linked the stolen goods to Dutton's possession. Multiple soldiers' involvement (Dutton, Scriven, Lodgett) suggests either a coordinated operation or widespread knowledge among garrison personnel that supplies from the store were being taken and sold without serious consequence. Scriven's casual admission that he took drugs from the store and sold them for cash demonstrates open disregard for store security and property. The pattern of theft (taking goods from the store, selling them, using the proceeds to purchase punch

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			ingredients) shows systematic operation rather than opportunistic crime. Speculations Dutton's story about purchasing from a seaman may have been partially true (he may have bought some goods) but used as cover for the theft from Cagnald's house. The distinctive pepper grains in the sugar suggests it was the stolen goods repackaged. The soldiers may have targeted Cagnald specifically because she was a widow without male household protection, or because her house was known to contain valuable goods worth stealing. Scriven's casual admission of theft and resale of store goods suggests he believed there would be no serious consequences, or that such behaviour was common enough to go unpunished. The decision to make punch at Culler's house rather than in the garrison suggests deliberate avoidance of official oversight or officer detection.
137	115	Further. Saith, That on Saturday Last The said Dutton made a Bowle of punch for Thomas Marley And does think, that the 2 Bowles he Drank this Day Sevene Night, took near a Gall arack. May 13.th 1704 M.r John [Ker] Complaines ag.t Corn: Sodington Deputy Governo.r for That He on the 9.th Day of February Last Did Give him The said Complain.t one violent Blow on the Head, whereof he Languished Sev.t Dayes, And the said Complain.t Being willing to pardon The said Cap.t Sodingtons offence Did In Father [Wood] promise he would never bring The Said ag.t him, In [some Christian] [Court] he did know oftener of this Nature. And whereas upon y.e 12.th Instant The said M.r Sodington Did In the House of the said Mr. [Ker] with.t any Cause or Invitacon, And offered violence to his person by pushing him down, and threatned to be Revenged off him. The Compl.t thought fitt to Lodge the same ag.t him, till further Course be taken In this matter. John [Ker] May 15.th 1704 Thomas Dutton Sold.r who stands Comitted upon Suspicion of breaking open M.rs Cagnalds house as Aforesaid prayed To be Admitted To the Govern.r who when Come made a Voluntary Confession. As followeth (vis.)	Further, Lodgett testified that the previous Saturday, Dutton made a bowl of punch for Thomas Marley. He estimated that the two bowls he drank a week ago consumed nearly a gallon of arrack. 13 May 1704 Mr John Kerr complained against Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor, alleging that on 9 February last, Sodington struck him a violent blow to the head, from which Kerr suffered for several days. Kerr, being willing to pardon Sodington's offence, did in Father Wood's presence promise that he would never bring the charge against him in [...] court, being of a nature he had encountered previously. And whereas on 12 May instant, the said Mr Sodington came to Kerr's house without any cause or invitation and offered violence to his person by pushing him down, and threatened revenge against him. The complainant judged it proper to lodge the complaint against him until further action be taken in this matter. John Kerr 15 May 1704 Thomas Dutton, soldier, who was held in custody on suspicion of breaking into Mrs Cagnald's house as aforesaid, requested an audience with the Governor. When he appeared, he made a voluntary confession as follows (namely)... Interpretations The nearly full gallon of arrack consumed in two bowls suggests either very large quantities of punch or the arrack was extremely concentrated. This volume supports the seriousness of the theft from Cagnald's house. Kerr's initial willingness to pardon Sodington and promise not to prosecute suggests either fear of Sodington's capacity for violence, or an attempt at genuine reconciliation following the blow. Sodington's second assault on Kerr in his own house, months after the apparent reconciliation, demonstrates that Sodington did not respect the peace agreement and continued to act violently. This pattern shows either uncontrolled aggression or deliberate intimidation. The timing of Dutton's request to confess comes after multiple witnesses had testified and the physical evidence (sugar with distinctive pepper grains) had been presented, suggesting he recognised the case against him was overwhelming. Speculations Kerr's promise not to bring charges "in court" may have been extracted under duress or implied threat from Sodington. The February blow may have been intended as a warning to silence Kerr regarding other matters. Sodington's second attack, occurring after Kerr had made further accusations about Catholic sympathies and

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Jesuit connections, suggests Sodington was seeking to intimidate Kerr into withdrawing all complaints. Dutton's voluntary confession may indicate he hoped that admission of guilt would result in lighter punishment than conviction after trial, or that he was genuinely remorseful. The escalating pattern of violence by Sodington against Kerr throughout this period suggests the two men were locked in escalating conflict, with each action prompting a response from the other.
138	116	May 15.th 1704 The Confession of Thomas Dutton Sold.r That on Wednesday 3.d of May Last, In the Night ab.t the Howres of 11. or 12: John Scriven Corporall Came To M.r Cullers Door In the Coal=Vally, and Caled, Dutton Dutton, I being there, and then In bed, got up, and Asked who was there He made Answ.r Scriven whereupon I Came Down Staires and opened the Door, who after Some few words past, Told me there was Some Arack and Sugar In M.rs Cagnalds House and Knew where it Stood, and asked me If I would Goe with him to Rob the House, which at first I Denied, but through his perswasion I went with him, and when Come to the back door the said Scriven pusht back the Bolt with a penknife and when in said House Broke open the Door Under the Staires and took out a Stone bottle w.th Contained ab.t 2 Gall arack, and Some Quantity of sugar Then went up Staires To The Chamber, where We found a Case Lock which we broke open, and took Thereout 3 Bottle bottles arack, All which We Carryed To M.r Cullers House where I Lodged, And when We Had Empyed The Stone Bottle, I Carryed It back againe To M.rs Cagnalds with.t bottle The other 2 bottles We hid In a Pumpkine bush. Further Confessed That The abovesaid John Scriven went Into The House of John Alexander at a window but brought Nothing out as he knowes of, and has told me Sev.l times That he went Into M.rs Colgraves house when In the Possion of M.r Gargen, and took out Some Table Linnen and other things, and at another time, That He the said Scriven went often Into M.r Carnes Garden and Stole oranges, and at one time went Into The said M.r Carnes House at the [Coal], and brought	15 May 1704 The confession of Thomas Dutton, soldier: On Wednesday, 3 May last, between 11 and 12 o'clock at night, John Scriven, corporal, came to Mr Culler's door in the Coal Valley and called out for Dutton. Dutton, who was in bed, rose and asked who was there. Scriven identified himself, whereupon Dutton came downstairs and opened the door. After exchanging a few words, Scriven told Dutton there was arrack and sugar in Mrs Cagnald's house, and that he knew where they were stored. He asked if Dutton would join him in robbing the house. Dutton initially refused, but after Scriven's persuasion, went with him. When they reached the back door, Scriven pushed back the bolt with a penknife. Once inside, they broke open the door beneath the stairs and removed a stone bottle containing about two gallons of arrack, along with some quantity of sugar. They then went upstairs to the chamber, where they found a case lock which they broke open and took out three bottles of arrack. They carried all the goods to Mr Culler's house, where Dutton lodged. After emptying the stone bottle, Dutton carried it back to Mrs Cagnald's house [...]. They hid the other two bottles in a pumpkin bush. Dutton further confessed that Scriven entered the house of John Alexander through a window but, to his knowledge, took nothing. Scriven also told him on several occasions that he entered Mrs Colgrave's house while it was in Mr Gargen's possession, and took out some table linen and other items. On another occasion, Scriven repeatedly entered Mr Carne's garden and stole oranges. At one point, Scriven also entered Mr Carne's house at [the Coal] and brought [text breaks off] Interpretations Scriven's detailed knowledge of where the goods were stored in Cagnald's house suggests prior reconnaissance or familiarity with the household. This was not opportunistic but planned theft, with a specific target and route. The use of a penknife to defeat the door bolt shows Scriven had experience with such methods. The location of valuables (under stairs and in a chamber lock) shows Cagnald had taken security precautions, but these were defeated by Scriven's prepared approach. The return of the empty stone bottle to Cagnald's house is unusual and suggests either an attempt to disguise the theft as on-site consumption, or to dispose of evidence that linked the empty bottle to Culler's house. The catalogue of Scriven's other thefts portrays a serial offender targeting multiple residents - Alexander's, Colgrave's, and Carne's houses, and Carne's garden. The pattern shows escalation from minor (oranges) to substantial (table linen, arrack, sugar). Dutton's confession implicates Scriven as the primary offender while positioning himself as a reluctant accomplice persuaded into the crime. Speculations Dutton's portrayal of himself as initially refusing and being persuaded by Scriven is likely intended to mitigate his own culpability. He may have been a willing participant from the outset, or even an initiator.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Scriven's repeated thefts of oranges from Carne's garden suggest these minor thefts were habitual and had escaped notice or punishment. The progression to house-breaking represents an escalation made possible by his earlier successes. The detail about Mrs Colgrave's house being "in the possession of Mr Gargen" suggests it was a vacant or temporarily-tenanted dwelling, making it a convenient target with reduced risk of confrontation. Dutton's willingness to provide such detailed information about Scriven's other crimes suggests either cooperation in hope of leniency, or a strategic move to ensure Scriven received the maximum penalty whilst Dutton was treated as a junior partner.
139	117	Brought out with him a Silver Spoon, w.ch He Gave To A Silver Smith Belonging To The Arabian Merchant. To make him a p.r of Buckles, and Saw the said Scriven Goe Into Brig.t [Sivors] House, at the Balcony Door w.ch was Lett open and brought out with him 2 Case bottles of Liquor and a pair of white Cotton Stockin's And at another time The said Scriven took a Ladder from the Side of Jn.o Goodwins house and Carried It To M.r Thomas Goodwins House. which he Sett und.r a window where he Entred The said house, and brought with him 5 Case bottles of Arack and a box of Sugar At which time told the said Dutton, That He had been and Robbed M.rs Coulsons House And Had Got her Money, 6 Dollars of which He Showed Him. Further Saith Not. [Poirier] Island S.t Helena. Tho: Goodwin Att a Consultacon Held on Wednesday the 17.th May 1704 At Fort James, Steph: Poirier Govern.r Present. Corn: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas. Henry Coles Marshall Did on Mounday Last, Refuse To Execute The Govern.rs warr.t for Apprehending John Scriven Upon Suspicion of Breaking open M.rs Cagnalds House, and Robbing her of Some Quantity of Arack and Sugar.	Scriven took a silver spoon from Carne's house and gave it to a silversmith aboard the <i>Arabian Merchant</i>, who was to make a pair of buckles for him. Dutton also saw Scriven enter Brigett [...] house through the balcony door, which was open, and emerge with two case bottles of liquor and a pair of white cotton stockings. On another occasion, Scriven took a ladder from beside John Goodwin's house and carried it to Mr Thomas Goodwin's house. He set the ladder under a window through which he entered the dwelling, and emerged with five case bottles of arrack and a box of sugar. At that time, Scriven told Dutton he also robbed Mrs Coulson's house and obtained her money, six dollars of which he displayed to Dutton. Further says not. [Signed:] Poirier Thomas Goodwin Island St Helena A consultation was held on Wednesday, 17 May 1704, at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor, was present. Cornelius Sodington, Deputy, and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, attended. Henry Coles, marshal, did on Monday last refuse to execute the Governor's warrant for apprehending John Scriven on suspicion of breaking into Mrs Cagnald's house and robbing her of arrack and sugar. [text breaks off] Interpretations The pattern of Scriven's thefts reveals a methodical approach: he scouted houses, employed tools (penknife, ladder), and disposed of goods either through consumption or by trading them with ships' artisans for personal items. The trade of the silver spoon with the silversmith aboard the <i>Arabian Merchant</i> shows Scriven was using ship visits as laundering opportunities. This explains how he profited from stolen items without immediate detection - the stolen goods left the island. The marshal's refusal to execute the warrant against Scriven is a serious breach of duty. As the officer responsible for enforcing the Governor's orders, Coles' refusal undermines the authority of the Governor and the legal system itself. The targets of Scriven's thefts include the homes of council members (Thomas Goodwin) and prominent residents (Coulson, Carne, Cagnald, Colgrave, Alexander). This range shows Scriven did not discriminate between high-status and low-status victims, suggesting he saw the entire community as fair game. Speculations Coles' refusal to execute the warrant may have stemmed from personal connections to Scriven (perhaps as fellow soldiers), fear of confrontation with him, or sympathy with his position. It could also indicate corruption or favouritism within the small garrison community. Scriven's targeting of council members' homes, including Thomas Goodwin's, shows audacity that suggests either contempt for authority or confidence that he would not face serious consequences. The use

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			of John Goodwin's own ladder to enter Thomas Goodwin's house is particularly bold. The ladder taken from John Goodwin's house and used to enter Thomas Goodwin's house suggests the two Goodwin properties were sufficiently close that one ladder could serve both. This convenience may have prompted the choice of target. Dutton's confession ending with "Further says not" suggests he was prepared to stop providing information at that point, possibly because he had given sufficient evidence to incriminate Scriven whilst limiting further implication of himself or others.
140	118	The said Henry Coles Appearing, and being asked, The Reason why he Did not Execute the said Warr.t Said The said Warr.t was not full Enough to Apprehend the Said Scriven, being not Impowred to Comand any p.rson To Aid, and Asist him as what In all warrants for the Apprehending any person Suspected of Felony. But this being a frivolous Excuse, he the s.d Coals not Alledging any Such thing when first refused To Execute s.d Warrant, and There being no occasion for any Asistance to Apprehend y.e said Scriven, he Not offering any Asistance. It is ordered. That y.e said Coales Be dismist y.e Comp.s Service dureing our pleasure, for this his obstinacy as afores.d Whereas M.rs Mercy Carne, wife of M.r George Carne, Did this Day p.rsent a petition, Setting forth. That her husband Had purchased a parcell of Land Lying In Port: James Vally Behind The House now In the possession of M.rs Marg.t Cagnald, which He has out of his Greenwill Given In the Possession of his Daughter In Law Honor Robbins, and being forbid by the Said M.rs Cagnald to build upon the Same. She pretending a title thereto. Requests That An Suer Be Entered ag.t The Said M.rs Cagnald, And That her Evidence may be taken She Haveing power To del but onely for her Children, And Likewise what Evidences are now Summoned, may be Sworn for fear of Mortality before next Court Day. Daniel Griffith being Attorney for M.rs Cagnald opposed The Examion of Witness untill the [Tryall] next Court Day, for That he That will Examyne Witnesses (In perpetuum Rei Memori [Cui Bono pro Memoria]) Must just Exhibite his Bill, and Show his title to the Thing, and That The Witnesses to prove It, are old,	Henry Coles appeared and was asked the reason why he did not execute the warrant. He said the warrant was insufficient to apprehend Scriven, since it did not empower him to command any person to aid and assist him, as was customary in warrants for apprehending suspected felons. This excuse was deemed frivolous, since Coles did not raise this objection when he first refused to execute the warrant, and there was no occasion requiring assistance to apprehend Scriven, as Scriven offered no resistance. It was ordered that Coles be dismissed from the Company's service at the council's pleasure for his obstinacy in this matter. Mrs Mercy Carne, wife of Mr George Carne, presented a petition setting forth that her husband purchased a parcel of land in Fort James Valley behind the house now in possession of Mrs Margaret Cagnald. He gave this land of his goodwill to his daughter-in-law Honor Robbins. Mrs Cagnald forbade them to build on the land, claiming title to it herself. Mrs Carne requested that a suit be entered against Mrs Cagnald, and that her evidence be taken (since she had power to act only on behalf of her children). She also requested that the witnesses already summoned be sworn for fear of mortality before the next court day. Daniel Griffith, acting as attorney for Mrs Cagnald, opposed the examination of witnesses until the trial at the next court day. He argued that whoever wished to examine witnesses (in perpetuum rei memoriam - for perpetual record of the matter [...]) must first present his bill and demonstrate his title to the property in question, and that the witnesses to prove it were old [text breaks off] Interpretations Coles' dismissal "during pleasure" (until further notice) was a serious sanction for an officer of the court. As marshal, his refusal to execute orders demonstrated either insubordination or partiality, and the council acted firmly to maintain authority and the integrity of the legal process. The land dispute involves multiple women acting in legal capacity: Mrs Mercy Carne petitioning on behalf of her stepdaughter Honor Robbins, against Mrs Margaret Cagnald. This shows women functioning as legal representatives for family property interests, despite limited legal capacity in their own right. Mrs Carne's note that she had "power to act only on behalf of her children" suggests she lacked full legal capacity to act independently, and was operating as guardian or trustee for minors. Her petition was thus protecting the next generation's inheritance. The "fear of mortality" justification for early witness examination reflects the practical reality of life expectancy in the colony. Witnesses who could prove a property purchase might die before a trial occurred, so preserving their testimony was urgent. Griffith's procedural objection - that a bill must be filed first and title demonstrated - reflects formal common law procedure being maintained even in this colonial setting. The technical requirements of in perpetuum rei memoriam depositions were apparently understood and applied.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Speculations Coles may have refused to execute the warrant from personal sympathy with Scriven (perhaps as fellow soldiers in the small garrison), fear of confrontation with him, or because Scriven had powerful Allises who deterred enforcement. His procedural objection appears to have been an after-the-fact justification. The disputed land lay behind Cagnald's house in Fort James Valley. Cagnald may have been claiming an adjacent right or boundary based on her own occupation, conflicting with Carne's documented purchase. Carne's gift of the land to his daughter-in-law Honor Robbins "of his goodwill" suggests a family arrangement to provide for the next generation. Cagnald's opposition may have been motivated by personal conflict with the Carnes, given the broader pattern of disputes involving George Carne in the colony. The mention of witnesses being "old" suggests Carne's claim depended on testimony from elderly residents who could verify the original purchase or boundary. The urgency to take their testimony before they died shows the fragility of oral and witness-based property records in a colonial setting where written documentation was incomplete.
141	119	And Decrepit and not Like To Live Long, whereby he is In Danger to Lose It, And Then pray a Comion. To Examin them and a Subpena To The parties Interested, To Show Cause if they Can To The Contrary It Is ordered. That The Determination of This Cause being a Litigious and Vexatious Suit, be referred To a Jury at next Quarter Sessions Samuel Jelley orphan p.rsented a Petition. Seting forth That M.r Thomas Goodwin Execut.r of his Mothers Last will and Testament, Has in his hands a Sum of Money, which he prays may be Delivered To him to buy Cattle, And That Edward Heath his brother In Law may be Accepted as his Guardian, But the said money being out at Interest, till January next. It Is ordered. That The said M.r Tho: Goodwin do Then Deliver The Said Money, and be Discharged from his Tutorship Whereas. In a Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 2.d of this Instant, Sev.l Witnesses were Sworn To Declare what they heard M.r [Ken] Say at M.r Carnes House To which The said M.r [Ken] Replied he would write his Declaracon. In The Afternoon In Answ.r thereto. The said M.r [Ken] was allowed his Request, But not p.rforming his promise and putting the Govern.r off from time to time the Govern.r for his better Evidence thought fitt to have y.e following p.rsons Declarations	Griffith further argued that the witnesses needed to support the case were old, decrepit, and unlikely to live much longer, putting Carne at risk of losing the case if they died before trial. The proper procedure, he stated, was to first request a commission to examine them and to issue subpoenas to the interested parties so they could show cause to the contrary. Since this case constituted contentious and troublesome litigation, it was ordered to be submitted to a jury at the next quarter sessions. Samuel Jelley, an orphan, presented a petition setting forth that Mr Thomas Goodwin, executor of his mother's last will and testament, held funds belonging to him. He prayed that these funds be released to him for purchasing cattle, and that Edward Heath, his brother-in-law, be accepted as his guardian. The funds being out at interest until next January, it was ordered that Mr Thomas Goodwin should then release the money and be discharged from his role as guardian. In a consultation held on Tuesday, 2 May, several witnesses were sworn to declare what they heard Mr Kerr say at Mr Carne's house. Mr Kerr replied he would write his declaration in the afternoon in response. Mr Kerr was allowed his request, but failed to fulfil his promise and continued to delay the Governor. The Governor, for the better gathering of evidence, thought fit to have the following persons' declarations recorded [text breaks off] Interpretations The detailed procedural requirements outlined by Griffith reflect formal common law procedure for examining witnesses before trial. Each step served a purpose: filing a bill established the claim, showing title proved standing, demonstrating witness frailty justified early examination, and subpoenaing the parties ensured fairness. The court's referral of Carne's case to the jury, despite the procedural objections, suggests they wanted community judgment on a complex land matter rather than deciding it within the council. The description of the case as "litigious and vexatious" suggests the council viewed it as troublesome and best resolved by community judgment. Samuel Jelley's petition demonstrates that orphans had legal standing to seek changes in their guardianship and to claim their inheritance. The council's role as

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			overseer of inheritances was clearly established and respected. The decision to wait until January, when the interest period ended, shows financial prudence on the council's part. Releasing the funds early would have meant losing the interest income, reducing the value of the inheritance. Kerr's failure to deliver his promised written declaration represents either an inability to formulate a defence, fear of committing his statements to writing, or deliberate obstruction. The Governor's response - taking others' declarations instead - shows how Kerr's evasion forced alternative evidence-gathering. Speculations Griffith's elaborate procedural argument may have served as both legitimate legal defence and delaying tactic. By insisting on every formal requirement, he could prevent the early examination of witnesses and force Came either to drop the case or face the loss of crucial elderly witnesses through death. Samuel Jelley's request to change his guardianship from Goodwin to his brother-in-law Heath suggests either dissatisfaction with Goodwin's stewardship or preference for a closer family member. Since Goodwin sat on the council, this petition required delicate handling. The intended cattle purchase suggests Jelley was approaching adulthood and beginning to establish his own economic base. The inheritance was being deployed for productive investment rather than mere consumption, indicating responsible planning. Kerr's repeated delays in providing his written declaration likely reflected awareness that anything written would constitute formal evidence against him. Verbal statements could be contested or denied; written ones would be permanent records of his claims and admissions.
142	120	Cap.t Sodington Declares, That Sitting In Councill The 2.d Instant. heard M.r John [Ken] Minister Say, That [...] no Jesuit Ever told him The Gov.r would Deliver up The Island, To The next French fleet, Neither did he Know The Govern.r Guilty of any Ill thing, but That He was true and faithfull, And If He might be allowed Time till The Afternoon, He would Deliver his Declara[...] In writing which Should tend To The Govern.rs Hond. and Advantages M.r Thomas Goodwin Saith, He heard The Minister M.r [Ken] promise To Deliver his Declaracon In The Afternoon, And That no Jesuit, nor noe man else Ever told him That The Govern.r [...] him That he would Deliver up the Island. To The next French f fleet, And That his Declaracon. Should tend more To The Govern.rs Advantage, than his Prejudice. Henry Coles Sworn Saith. That on The 2.d Instant. He heard M.r John [Ken] Minister Say, That no Jesuit, nor no man else Ever Told him That The Govern.r would Deliver up the Island To The next French fleet, That Came To The said Island, And never knew That The Gov.r was Guilty of any ill thing, but was always true, and faithfull, And would In The Afternoon Deliv.r his Declaracon, which Should be To his Hond. and Advantages. Henry Coles Daniel Griffith Sworn, Saith The Same. Daniel Griffith	Captain Sodington declared: While sitting in council on the 2nd of this month, he heard Mr John Kerr, minister, state that no Jesuit ever told him the Governor intended to surrender the island to the next French fleet. Kerr also said he knew of no wrongdoing by the Governor, who he affirmed was true and faithful. Kerr asked for time until the afternoon to deliver a written declaration that would benefit the Governor's reputation and standing. Mr Thomas Goodwin testified: He heard the minister Mr Kerr promise to deliver his declaration in the afternoon. He also heard Kerr state that no Jesuit, nor any other person, ever told him that the Governor [...] that he would deliver up the island to the next French fleet. Kerr further stated that his declaration would serve the Governor's interests more than damage them. Henry Coles, sworn, declared: On the 2nd of this month, he heard Mr John Kerr, minister, say that no Jesuit, nor any other person, ever told him that the Governor would surrender the island to the next French fleet to arrive. Kerr stated he never knew the Governor to be guilty of any ill action, but found him always true and faithful. He promised to deliver his written declaration in the afternoon, which would benefit the Governor's reputation and standing. Henry Coles Daniel Griffith, sworn, gave the same testimony. Daniel Griffith Interpretations The four sworn declarations form an unbroken chain of corroboration. Each witness independently confirms the same essential facts: Kerr's denial of the Jesuit allegation, his affirmation of the Governor's loyalty, and his promise of a written declaration favourable to the Governor.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The witnesses span varying status within the colony: Sodington (Deputy Governor), Goodwin (Ensign and council member), Coles (recently dismissed marshal), and Griffith (attorney representing Cagnald). Their consistent testimony strengthens the credibility of the record across different perspectives. The fact that Coles was called to testify despite his recent dismissal shows the council valued his evidence for its truthfulness, separate from his disciplinary failure. His testimony was treated as factually reliable regardless of his current standing. Kerr's repeated promises to deliver a written declaration that never materialised suggests deliberate avoidance. Whatever he stated verbally, he was unwilling to commit those words to permanent written form. All four declarations emphasise that Kerr's promised writing would benefit the Governor's reputation. This makes his failure to deliver it more significant - the Governor was waiting not merely for explanation but for vindication that Kerr had explicitly promised. Speculations Kerr's promise of a declaration favourable to the Governor may have been a calculated delaying tactic, hoping the matter would lose urgency before he had to commit anything in writing. The strategy of indefinite postponement allowed him to avoid both formal recantation and formal repetition of his earlier remarks. Alternatively, Kerr may have genuinely intended to write a declaration but found himself unable to compose one that would not contradict his earlier statements at Carne's house. The contradictions in his various accounts may have proved impossible to reconcile in writing. Coles' inclusion as a witness, despite his dismissal earlier in this same consultation, suggests the council deliberately demonstrated impartial truth-finding. His testimony confirmed Kerr's words even though Coles himself had fallen out of favour. Griffith's brief confirmation ("said the same") may indicate the witnesses were called in sequence, with later witnesses simply affirming the established account rather than restating it in full. This procedural efficiency preserved consistency whilst saving time. The Governor's systematic gathering of these declarations suggests preparation for more formal proceedings against Kerr - perhaps a trial, or a report to higher authorities such as the Bishop of London or the Company directors.
143	121	John French Gunner Sworn. Saith That The 2.d Instant He heard The Minister M.r [Ker] Say That no Jesuit, nor no Man else Ever told him That The Govern.r Standing to the great French f fleet when they Came next To The Island, And That He never heard any Ill thing That The Govern.r was Guilty of, But Said He was a true, and faithfull Subject to The Crown of England. John French. I do Hereby Depose. To The best of my Remembrance, That John [Ker] Minister on The 2.d of This Instant did Say That no Jesuit Ever told him That The Govern.r would Deliver the Island up To The next French f fleet That Came here And Said The Gov.r was a true, and faithfull Subject (or Servant) which of The two Cannot positively Swear, And If The Govern.r would Allow him an hour or two's time He would Deliver his Declaracon In The Afternoon which Should tend more To The Govern.rs Hono.r and Advantage[s] Then Disadvantages. John Alexander. Furthermore The Govern.r Desires That Paul Graton might be Sworn To Give his Evidence of what a Jesuit told him at M.r Doctor [Ker]	John French, gunner, sworn, testified: On the 2nd of this month, he heard the minister Mr Kerr say that neither any Jesuit nor any other person ever claimed to him that the Governor would surrender to the great French fleet when it next arrived at the island. Kerr further said he never heard of any wrongdoing committed by the Governor, who he affirmed was a true and faithful subject of the Crown of England. John French John Alexander hereby deposed, to the best of his remembrance, that John Kerr, minister, on the 2nd of this month, said that no Jesuit ever told him the Governor would surrender the island to the next French fleet that arrived here. Kerr also said the Governor was a true and faithful subject (or servant) - Alexander could not positively swear which of the two terms Kerr used. Kerr added that if the Governor would allow him an hour or two's time, he would deliver his declaration in the afternoon, which would benefit the Governor's honour more than damage it. John Alexander The Governor further desired that Paul Graton be sworn to give evidence about what a Jesuit told him concerning Mr Kerr.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Paul Graton. Deposeth That being Discoursing With a Jesuit Belonging to The Shipp Nathaniel. Cap.t Dennis Comander, whose Name was Colebart, He The Said Jesuit told this Depon.t That He found by The Minister M.r John [Ker]s Discourses He was no[t] A Jesuit, then a Minister of the Church of England. Paul Graton	Paul Graton deposed that whilst conversing with a Jesuit named Colebart, who belonged to the ship <i>Nathaniel</i> under Captain Dennis, the Jesuit told him that based on the minister Mr John Kerr's conversations, Kerr was not a Jesuit but a minister of the Church of England. Paul Graton Interpretations The cumulative testimony of six witnesses (Sodington, Goodwin, Coles, Griffith, French, Alexander) all agreeing on Kerr's statements creates an overwhelming evidentiary record. There can be no real dispute about what Kerr said on 2 May. Alexander's careful note about the uncertainty between "subject" and "servant" demonstrates the integrity and care of these witnesses. He admits what he cannot remember precisely rather than overstating his evidence, lending greater credibility to what he does affirm. Paul Graton's testimony about Colebart provides external corroboration that Kerr was not actually a Jesuit. A real Jesuit priest, after speaking with Kerr, concluded Kerr was Protestant. This independent verification undermines the suspicion that Kerr was a Catholic infiltrator. The Governor's inclusion of Graton's testimony shows judicial even-handedness. He presented evidence that contradicted the suspicion of Kerr being a Jesuit, building a comprehensive rather than one-sided record of the facts. The contrast between Kerr's Catholic-style appearance (beard, tonsure, convent list) and the Jesuit's identification of him as Protestant suggests Kerr's external displays may have been theological curiosity or ecumenical interest rather than secret Catholic identity. Speculations French's testimony differs slightly in wording from the others ("standing to" rather than "deliver up"), but the substance is identical. The variation likely reflects either different word choices by Kerr in repetition, or imperfect memory by the witness, but does not alter the meaning. Alexander's hedging on "subject or servant" suggests he was a particularly careful witness, possibly with legal training or a temperament that resisted exaggeration. His scrupulous accuracy on small details strengthens confidence in his testimony on the main points. Colebart's assessment that Kerr was Protestant - reached through conversations with him - is noteworthy. Kerr likely engaged in theological discussion with the visiting Jesuit, during which Kerr's Protestant doctrine became evident enough for the Jesuit to identify him as Anglican rather than Catholic. The Governor's careful gathering of contradictory evidence (Graton's testimony pointing to Kerr's Protestantism) suggests he was building a defensible record for higher authorities. The Bishop of London or the Company directors might review this evidence, and a partisan record could be challenged. Kerr's adoption of Catholic markers without actually being Catholic may reflect intellectual curiosity, ecumenical interest, or a personal exploration of religious practice. His doctrine, however, remained recognisably Protestant to those (like Colebart) qualified to assess it theologically.
144	122	M.r [Ken] Replies That he never knew any Person under The Character of a Jesuit That Belonged To The Ship Nathaniell. But ownes That he Saw a Shabby Ship fellow That went und.r The Name of [Colwort] One once with Govern.r Poirier, And afterwards Come with Hatt In hand To The Sessions House with a Note from one M.r William Marshall, Son To M.r Marshall Taylor In Carles Court, To Advance To The said Supposed	Mr Kerr replied that he never met any person identifying as a Jesuit aboard the ship <i>Nathaniel</i>. He acknowledged he saw a poorly-dressed seafarer who called himself Colwort. This man came once with Governor Poirier, and afterwards came hat in hand to the Sessions House with a note from one Mr William Marshall, son to Mr Marshall the tailor in [Carles] Court. The note requested Kerr to advance the supposed

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Jesuiti= call Rouge The Sum of 4 Dollars, which at a Second Appliacon, I the Said M.r [Ken] paid To him, But for any other Conversacon, or other Discourse I Declare I had none, Saving a Check I Gave him Either In or before The Surgens Door In The Court, for being Suspected of a Scandalous Attempt upon the Chastity of one In the Island. This Is All I Know In the matter. Witn.s my Hand, This 17.th Day of May. 1704 John [Ker] [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Island S.t Helena Att a Consultacon Held on Thursday the 18.th Day of May 1704 At Fort=James. Steph: Poirier Govern.r Present. Corn: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign	Jesuistical rogue the sum of four dollars, which Kerr paid at a second application. Apart from this, Kerr stated he had no further interaction or discussion with the man, with the exception of a reprimand he delivered to him, either at or near the surgeon's doorway in the court, for being suspected of a scandalous attempt upon the chastity of someone on the island. This was all he knew of the matter. Witness my hand, this 17th day of May 1704 John Kerr [Signed:] Poirier Thomas Goodwin Island St Helena A consultation was held on Thursday, 18 May 1704, at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor, was present. Cornelius Sodington, Deputy, and Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, attended. [text breaks off] Interpretations Kerr's account directly contradicts Graton's testimony. Whilst Graton claimed Colebart was a Jesuit who had theological discussions with Kerr, Kerr describes only a transactional contact (a loan repayment) and a single reprimand for misconduct. Both accounts cannot be fully true. Kerr's contemporary use of the phrase "Jesuistical rogue" to describe Colebart is revealing - he uses the very identification (Jesuit) that he otherwise denies confirming. This suggests he did regard Colebart as a Jesuit at some point, even whilst now distancing himself from the connection. The note from Mr Marshall requesting Kerr to advance money to Colebart suggests Kerr functioned as a contact or agent for travellers passing through the island. The formal note system shows organised communication between London and the colony. The detail about Colebart's "scandalous attempt upon chastity" suggests Kerr had sufficient interaction with him to know of his moral character, but Kerr frames this as merely a single corrective encounter rather than ongoing acquaintance. The contradiction between the two accounts presented the council with a credibility contest. They had to weigh whether Graton invented or exaggerated Colebart's testimony, or whether Kerr was minimising his actual interactions with the man. Speculations Kerr's careful description of Colebart as "Jesuistical" whilst denying he knew him as a Jesuit suggests strategic ambiguity. By using the suggestive term himself, Kerr could not be accused of total denial; by avoiding the direct admission, he protected himself from the implications of close association. The four-dollar advance through Marshall's note suggests an organised network of communication and credit between residents of the island and contacts in London. Kerr was apparently sufficiently established to be trusted with such transactions. Colebart's "scandalous attempt upon chastity" may indicate attempted sexual assault, possibly upon a slave, indentured servant, or local woman. Kerr's reprimand suggests he claimed moral authority over visiting seafarers, despite his own troubled position with the colonial authorities. Kerr's precise framing of his contacts with Colebart as brief and transactional appears designed to minimise his association with the alleged Jesuit. The actual relationship may have been more substantial than Kerr admits, particularly if Colebart did indeed assess Kerr's religious views through extended conversation. The Governor's gathering of contradictory testimony shows judicial completeness. By recording Kerr's denial alongside Graton's accusation, the council preserved both versions for higher review without preemptively judging between them.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
145	123	Whereas. M.r John Rogers Super Cargo P.rsentd his Petion Setting forth, That being Last Night At M.r John Lufkin's House, In Company with The said M.r Lufkin, and Divers others, There Came to the Door of The House, M.r Cornelius Sodington Deputy Govern.r The Door Being Shut, and forced the Door Contrary To the Leave of The said M.r Lufkin (as he himself afterwards told me) Where The said M.r Sodington Did Abuse M.rs Jane Goodwin, Although She Several times Requested him To be Civill, I asked him how he Could be Soe Rude To A woman, He told me, It was Impossible to be Rude To any woman, where Cap.t are p.rsent, He Cursed and Damnd me Saying, when he had Lost halfe his face He Could beat Such a pimp as I was, And That he would Kick, Cuff, box, bollock, and fight, with 10. Such Block- Heads as I was, At The Same time, Hunching and Striping me with his fist, Saying [...] how I Could Hinder you for which Affront, I Humbly Request Y.r Worship and Councill will Do me Justice. And You will obleidge Gentl. Y.r Humble Servant. S.t Helena: May. 18.th John Rogers: 1704 To Which The said M.r Rogers made oath. Upon	Mr John Rogers, supercargo, submitted his petition outlining the following events: Last night, while at Mr John Lufkin's house in company with Lufkin and several others, Mr Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor, came to the door. The door being shut, Sodington forced it open against Lufkin's wishes (as Lufkin himself later confirmed to Rogers). Once inside, Sodington abused Mrs Jane Goodwin, even though she repeatedly requested him to behave civilly. Rogers asked Sodington how he could be so rude to a woman. Sodington replied that it was impossible to be rude to any woman where captains were present. Sodington then cursed and damned Rogers, claiming that even with half his face lost he could still beat such a pimp as Rogers was. He boasted of his ability to physically dominate Rogers and ten others of his kind - through kicks, blows, and any form of combat - all whilst jostling and striking Rogers with his fist. He said [...] how he could hinder Rogers. For this affront, Rogers humbly requested the Governor and Council to do him justice. "And you will oblige, gentlemen, your humble servant." St Helena, 18 May 1704 John Rogers To which Mr Rogers made oath. [text breaks off] Interpretations Sodington's behaviour shows a continuing pattern of violence and abuse. He had already attacked Kerr in February and on 12 May, and now he has forced entry into Lufkin's house and assaulted Rogers. The frequency of these incidents suggests behaviour entirely incompatible with his office. The abuse of Mrs Jane Goodwin is particularly significant since she is presumably connected to Thomas Goodwin, the council member. An assault on the family of a sitting councillor made the offence personal to the council itself, raising the political stakes. Sodington's defence - that "it is impossible to be rude to any woman where captains are present" - is strange and almost nonsensical. It may suggest he believed the presence of higher-ranking officers somehow shielded his conduct, or it may reflect drunken incoherence rather than reasoned argument. The variety of physical threats against Rogers shows Sodington's aggressive boasting. The phrase "even with half his face lost" suggests Sodington had suffered some injury yet maintained extravagant claims of fighting prowess - the language of a man either drunk or habitually violent. Rogers's choice to file a formal petition rather than retaliate physically shows confidence that the colonial system would address his grievance. He acted as a supercargo (a ship's officer), whose standing required formal complaint rather than personal vengeance. Speculations Sodington's pattern of violence across multiple incidents suggests serious problems with alcohol or anger control. His position as Deputy Governor was being progressively compromised by behaviour that would have been intolerable in a private citizen, let alone the second officer of the colony. The forced entry into Lufkin's house may have been driven by intoxication or some pre-existing grievance. The mention of captains being present suggests this was a social gathering of ship officers and local residents, perhaps connected to ship business. Mrs Jane Goodwin's repeated requests for civility, and her presence at the gathering, suggest she was a woman of standing who could expect respectful treatment from senior officials. Sodington's failure to honour this norm made the affront more serious.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Rogers's formal complaint, following so closely on Kerr's complaints against Sodington, may have been calculated to create a documentary record. Multiple complaints from different complainants would build a case for removal or formal censure that no single complaint could achieve alone. The council faced a delicate task: addressing Sodington's behaviour whilst he remained Deputy Governor. The political and personal complications of disciplining their own deputy would shape how the matter could be handled.
146	124	John Lufkin. Saith, That the said Cornelius Sodington Deputy Governo.r Came Last Night To his Door which being Latched, opened the Said Door This Is all The forcing of my Door, as I Know of. John Lufkin. I Know what M.r Lufkin Declares To be True. Tho: Goodwin. Upon Consideracon. of the said Cornelius Sodingtons Rude Behaviour and Affronts To the said M.r Jn.o Rogers, &c and other Dis= orderly behaviour before Comitted, Having been Brotherly Admonished Sevrall times, and not Reclarming. It. Is. ordered. That According To The R.t Honoble Vorisset Companys our Masters orders bearing Date 17.th Day of February 1702. He The Said Cornelius Sodington for his Disorderly Behaviour. Be Suspended from his place, till further order. Whereas. The Worshipfull Stephen Poirier Esq.r And M.r Thomas Goodwin Ensign Have thought fitt. To Suspend me, Cornelius Sodington Deputy Govern.r Upon a frivolous, and Unjust	John Lufkin testified that Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor, came to his door last night, which was latched, and opened it. This was all the forcing of his door that he was aware of. John Lufkin Thomas Goodwin confirmed: I know what Mr Lufkin stated to be true. Thomas Goodwin Upon consideration of Sodington's rude behaviour and the affronts directed at Mr John Rogers and others, and his other disorderly conduct previously committed, after he was brotherly admonished on several occasions without reforming his ways: It was ordered that, in accordance with the Right Honourable [...] Company's (our Masters') orders dated 17 February 1703, Cornelius Sodington should be suspended from his office for his disorderly behaviour, until further order. Then Sodington responded: Whereas the Worshipful Stephen Poirier Esquire and Mr Thomas Goodwin, Ensign, thought fit to suspend me, Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor, upon a frivolous and unjust [text breaks off] Interpretations Lufkin's testimony partly moderates Rogers' account. The door was merely latched rather than locked, and Sodington opened it rather than sMarshing or forcing it. This nuance suggests the "forced entry" charge was somewhat exaggerated, even if Sodington's subsequent conduct inside remained inappropriate. Goodwin's brief confirmation of Lufkin's account ("I know what Mr Lufkin stated to be true") implies he was either present at the gathering or had independent knowledge of the events. His role as judge of Sodington whilst connected to the household may raise questions of impartiality, given that Mrs Jane Goodwin (likely a relative) had been abused. The reference to specific Company orders dated 17 February 1703 shows the suspension had formal institutional authority. The council was not acting on its own initiative but invoking established procedures from the East India Company directors. This gave the action legal weight. The "brotherly admonishment" language indicates prior informal attempts to correct Sodington's behaviour. The council had been reluctant to take this drastic step but Sodington's repeated misbehaviour left them no alternative. Sodington's protest as "frivolous and unjust" shows he did not accept the council's authority over him. His dispute would presumably be appealed to higher authorities, possibly directly to the Company directors in London. Speculations The discrepancy between Rogers' account (forced entry) and Lufkin's account (merely opening a latched door) may reflect different perspectives on the event, or Rogers' exaggeration of the initial offence to strengthen his complaint. Lufkin may have been minimising the entry to avoid appearing to invite Sodington in. Goodwin's role in confirming Lufkin's account may have been driven by family ties to Mrs Jane Goodwin, the abused woman. His position on the council judging

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Sodington whilst personally connected to a victim creates a potential conflict, though no formal recusal procedures appear to have applied. The Company orders from February 1703 likely established protocols for suspending colonial officers for misconduct. The Governor's ability to invoke these orders shows mature institutional infrastructure for managing colonial governance from London. Sodington's preparation to protest the suspension formally suggests he intended to fight for reinstatement, possibly through appeal to London or by exploiting his remaining influence on the island. The political situation of the colony was about to enter a more contested phase. The "until further order" qualification reveals that the suspension was conceived as temporary rather than permanent removal. The council preserved flexibility to lift the suspension - whether through Sodington's reformed conduct or through Company directors overturning the decision.
147	125	Complaint made against me the Said Sodington by Mr John Rogers 3.d Super=Cargo of The Alexander Galley belonging To The Hon.ble Company being moved by provoking words by The said Rogers To Use Expressions, which otherwise I should not have Done. Therefore I Protest ag.t The said Govern.r and M.r Goodwin's Suspending me, The said Deputy Govern.r And All matters Done by them Relating To The Affaires of my Hon.ble Masters the Hon.ble East-India Company of Merchants on This Island, without my Knowledge, and Consent. This Protest was Delivered, the Day, and hour Above Cited To The Govern.r and M.r Goodwin, In The presence of us. hereunder written, about 1 a Clock At Midday. Witn.s [...] Cor: Sodington. John Alexander. Tho: Goodwin George Carne. Geo: Hodgkinson. May. 19.th 1704 The Protestacon of M.r [Ken] Minister Against Govern.d Poirier. Whereas The Worshipfull Stephen Poirier Esq.r Govern.r Stands [...] Charged and Impeached with The Crime of Uttering Traiterous, and Seditious words Against The Crown and Dignity of our Sovereign Lady	The complaint against me was made by Mr John Rogers, third supercargo of the <i>Alexander Galley</i> belonging to the Honourable Company. Rogers' provoking words led me to use expressions that were not characteristic of my normal speech. Therefore, I protest against the Governor and Mr Goodwin for suspending me as Deputy Governor, and against all actions taken by them concerning the affairs of my Honourable Masters, the Honourable East India Company of Merchants on this island, without consulting me or obtaining my agreement. This protest was delivered on the day and hour cited above to the Governor and Mr Goodwin, in the presence of those listed below, at about 1 o'clock at midday. Witnesses: [...], Cornelius Sodington, John Alexander, Thomas Goodwin, George Carne, George Hodgkinson. 19 May 1704 The Protestation of Mr Kerr, Minister, against Governor Poirier: Whereas the Worshipful Stephen Poirier, Esquire, Governor, stands [...] charged and impeached with the crime of uttering traitorous and seditious words against the Crown and Dignity of our Sovereign Lady [text breaks off] Interpretations Sodington's defence - that Rogers' provoking words drove him to use unusual language - is a partial admission combined with mitigation. He does not deny the words spoken, but seeks to justify them as a reaction to provocation rather than habitual misconduct. The breadth of Sodington's protest - against not just his suspension but all actions taken by the Governor and Goodwin without him - shows he is treating the suspension as procedurally invalid. He claims the council cannot lawfully function without his participation, attempting to paralyse colonial administration. The witnesses to Sodington's protest include George Carne and George Hodgkinson, both of whom had prior conflicts with the Governor. Their presence reveals an emerging anti-Governor faction coalescing around Sodington's grievances. Thomas Goodwin's appearance among the witnesses is striking - he had voted for the suspension yet appears as witness to its formal contestation. He was acknowledging the delivery whilst maintaining his original decision, demonstrating procedural correctness. Kerr's protestation against the Governor immediately follows the Sodington suspension. By charging the Governor with treason and sedition, Kerr transformed himself from accused to accuser. The pattern reveals coordinated counter-attack rather than separate grievances. Speculations

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The timing of Kerr's protestation, on the day after Sodington's suspension, strongly suggests coordination between Kerr, Sodington, and others. The anti-Governor faction was making its concerted move, attempting to depose Poirier through formal accusations. Sodington's blanket protest against all council actions taken without him was a strategic manoeuvre to create legal uncertainty. By disputing every decision the Governor and Goodwin might take, Sodington created grounds for later challenge to anything done in his absence. The witnesses named - Carne, Hodgkinson, Alexander - constituted prominent residents with established grievances against the Governor. Their willingness to be associated with the formal protest indicates an organised opposition rather than isolated complaints. Kerr's charge of "traitorous and seditious words" reframed the entire dispute strategically. Rather than defending himself against accusations of being a Jesuit or spreading false rumours, Kerr made the Governor the defendant in a far more serious case - one that potentially carried capital consequences. "Our Sovereign Lady" refers to Queen Anne. Charges of speaking treasonously against the Queen would be grave indeed, possibly punishable by death. Kerr was likely repurposing the Governor's remarks about the Prince of Wales as evidence of disloyalty to the legitimate sovereign. The coordinated nature of these protestations suggests Kerr's earlier accusations about Jesuits and the surrender of the island may have been part of a broader political campaign against the Governor, even after multiple witnesses contradicted those claims. The faction was attempting multiple grounds for the Governor's removal.
148	126	Lady Queen Anne. Immediately upon The Happy News brought hither of her Majestyes Auspicious Accession To The Throne of her Royall Ancestors proved on Record by 3 Good Evidences. And Sent home y.t Sume Into England, In The Hono.ble Companyes Bookes. And It being true Evident, and Apparent To All her Majestyes faithfull Subjects Inhabitants on This Island, That The said Govern.r Poirier Is Dayly Indeavouring to make, and hath often made my Life most Uneasy, Upon The Account of my said Evidence In behalf of The Queens Majestye, And He Haveing Treated me Since That time worst then a Dogg, by Sometimes beating and frequently Starveing me and Denying me the Priviledges which former Chaplaines In this place Have Injoyed, And by Charging me with Popery Jesuitism, Drunkenes, Contention, which all The Good Sober people of this Island, Can, and Will attest To be notorious false, If they said God will Call them thereto. And Whereas In Conservacon, and Prudence for the p.rservacon of my Reputacon and Life, as a Naturall and freeborn Subject of The Crown of England, I Did with All Duty, and obedience upon the 13.th of this Instant Take The Oathes of Allegianse, and Supremacy To our Sovereign Lady Queen Anne. And for Corroborating My said Evidence already Given, and for other Reasons which Shall In Due time be Exhibited, Did think my Selfe obleidged. To Appeal Immediately To her Majesty, And mediately, To the Hono.ble Companyes for Justice.	Immediately upon the happy news arriving here of her Majesty's auspicious accession to the throne of her royal ancestors, I proved my evidence on record through three good witnesses, and sent that same evidence home to England in the Honourable Company's books. It was true, evident, and apparent to all her Majesty's faithful subjects inhabiting this island that Governor Poirier daily endeavoured to make - and frequently did make - my life most uneasy on account of my evidence given in support of the Queen's Majesty. Since that time, he treated me worse than a dog. He sometimes assaulted me, often deprived me of food, withheld the privileges that previous chaplains in this place received, and charged me with Popery, Jesuitism, drunkenness, and contention. All the good and sober people of this island could attest that these charges were notoriously false, if [...] God called them to testify. In care and prudence for the preservation of my reputation and life as a natural and freeborn subject of the Crown of England, I, with all duty and obedience, on 13 May of this month took the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to our Sovereign Lady Queen Anne. To corroborate my evidence already given, and for other reasons that were to be presented in due course, I considered myself obliged to appeal immediately to her Majesty, and through the Honourable Company directors for justice. Interpretations Kerr's reference to evidence given at Queen Anne's accession (March 1702) suggests he had participated in some formal loyalty testimony at that time. By invoking this evidence now, he established a record of long-standing loyalty to the Queen, framing himself as a loyal servant under attack rather than a troublesome subordinate.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The claim that Poirier persecuted Kerr because of his loyal testimony entirely reverses the narrative of the preceding investigation. Instead of Kerr as alleged Jesuit and seditious troublemaker, the Governor becomes the persecutor of a faithful Crown subject. This rhetorical inversion is the heart of Kerr's defence. The list of physical abuses - beating, starving, withholding chaplains' customary privileges - is specific and serious. If true, this represented grave misconduct by the Governor toward an ordained minister, and would be alarming to Company directors concerned with proper governance. Kerr's blanket dismissal of all charges (Popery, Jesuitism, drunkenness, contention) as "notoriously false" deals with multiple accusations at once rather than addressing each. This sweeping denial is rhetorically powerful but leaves the specific evidence (witnesses, his own admitted statements) unanswered. Kerr's taking of the oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy on 13 May is presented as proactive demonstration of loyalty, but in fact it came after the accusations against him became serious. It functioned as a defensive act after the fact, although Kerr framed it as principled action. The appeal to the Queen directly, and through the Company directors, was an ultimate procedural move. Kerr was bypassing the local council entirely and going to higher authorities. This made the dispute a matter of imperial politics rather than colonial governance. Speculations Kerr's "evidence" at Queen Anne's accession may refer to a routine loyalty oath taken in 1702 when she succeeded William III. By dramatically reframing this routine event as foundational loyalty service, Kerr inflated its significance to support his current position. The accusations of beating and starving may have some factual basis - perhaps the Governor had restricted Kerr's rations or used physical force in their confrontations. The specifics are not corroborated, but the pattern of the Governor's documented anger suggests not all such claims are fabricated. The timing of Kerr's protest is suspicious. He filed it only after extensive investigation had produced damaging testimony against him. This sequence suggests retaliatory rather than principled action, even though Kerr framed it as long-standing grievance. Kerr's appeal to "all the good sober people of this island" who would testify on his behalf "if God called them" is rhetorical rather than substantive. He named no specific witnesses who would actually testify - in contrast to the named witnesses who had already testified against his conduct. The taking of the oaths on 13 May, just days before filing this protest, suggests urgent strategic preparation. Kerr or his advisors may have recognised that formally renewed oaths would strengthen his position against accusations of disloyalty, even though the accusations involved different matters.
149	127	I Did Yesterday for The Reasons above Mentioned Renew The said Appeal. And Forasmuch, as The Said Gov.r Did p.rsently thereafter, In Contempt of The Law, and the Queen of England Endeav.r to weaken, and to bring Into Disrepute my said Evidence for her said Majestye, by Administring or Caused to be Administred, Judiciall oathes To Severall men. And by urging The Gentlemen of The Councill, To Declare words Derogatory To The Credit of The said Evidence. I Did then, And do now protest Against The said Illegall proceedings And more particularly Against the said Govern.r for Compassing And Continuing by Such Little Arts, and Shifts. To bring The said Evidence In Question. And Do Hereby Charge Him publicly Upon Record, with All Damages, and Losses, That may by this meanes Ensee, upon the	Kerr stated that he renewed his appeal yesterday for the reasons mentioned above. He further declared that the Governor, immediately afterwards, in contempt of the law and the Queen of England, endeavoured to weaken and bring into disrepute his evidence for her Majesty by administering, or causing to be administered, judicial oaths to several men. The Governor also urged the gentlemen of the council to declare words derogatory to the credit of his evidence. Kerr protested then, and again at this time, against these illegal proceedings, and particularly against the Governor for plotting and persisting in such petty tricks and devices to call his evidence into question. He publicly charged the Governor on record with all damages and losses that might result - to the Crown of

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Crown of England, The Hono.r and Interest of The Hono.ble Companys: And The Life, Reputacon, and Estate of My Selfe now her Majestyes Evidence. And Do Desire That this my Appeal, and Protestacon, may be Sent Home, To The Hono.ble Company. Witness my Subscripcon, Manuall, Place, and time aforesaid. John [Ker] The Govern.r Replies, He Doss Not Doubt but by This time The fallshood of the Said M.r John [Ker] Chaplain To The R.t Hono.ble Company. Is In Sight, In England S.b falss=	England, the honour and interests of the Honourable Company, and to his own life, reputation, and estate, as her Majesty's evidence. Kerr desired that his appeal and protestation be sent home to the Honourable Company. Witnessed by his signature, place, and time aforesaid. John Kerr The Governor replied that he did not doubt that by this time the falsehood of Mr John Kerr, chaplain to the Right Honourable Company, was visible in England [...] Interpretations Kerr's framing of the Governor's evidence-gathering as "contempt of law and the Queen" was a striking inversion. The Governor was following standard legal procedure by taking sworn testimony, but Kerr presented this as illegal interference with his loyal evidence to the Crown. The accusation that the Governor "urged" council members to declare words derogatory to Kerr implies coercion of testimony. This stood against the apparent voluntary nature of the depositions, where multiple witnesses (including Coles, recently dismissed) gave consistent accounts. Kerr's threat to hold the Governor liable for all damages to the Crown, Company, and himself was rhetorically powerful but legally weak. He framed the Governor as personally responsible for any consequences flowing from the proceedings, an accusation more emotional than substantive. The Governor's brief response - that Kerr's falsehoods were already known in England - suggested prior reports of Kerr's character had reached the Company directors. The Governor was confident the matter would resolve in London regardless of local outcomes. Speculations Kerr's self-description as "her Majesty's evidence" implied he was claiming a special status as Crown witness from prior testimony, possibly conferring some protection from local prosecution. This was strategic positioning rather than established legal status. The Governor's reference to Kerr's falsehoods being known in England suggested prior correspondence with the Company about Kerr's character. The Governor may have already prepared the ground for Kerr's accusations to be received sceptically by directors. Kerr's protestation echoed the structure of Sodington's protest from days earlier. Both suspended or accused officials adopted similar strategies of accusing their judges of bias and manipulation, suggesting either coordination or shared legal counsel.
150	128	ffallshood of the Said M.r [Ken] Chaplain To the Right Hon.ble Company Is brought To Light In England, Meaning, The fallshood he Laid on him Last year as well as In other matters, and Even by these Long persu= Just now writt Sheowes Malice To be black ag.t The Govern.r This P.rsent Man Relating To The former proceeding, as also Do weaken The Strong Argument That might be Drawn By Every Sensible person To prove The former fallshood, by a Continued false Informacon and Sumlacon ag.t The Gov.r as He hath Declared Lately at M.r Carnes House as may appear by George Hodgkinson, Charles Steward and Edward Bagley.	Continuing the Governor's reply: the falsehood of Mr Kerr, chaplain to the Right Honourable Company, was brought to light in England - meaning the falsehood he laid against him last year as well as in other matters. Even this long [...] just now written showed deep malice against the Governor in the present matter relating to the former proceeding. This also weakened the strong argument that might be drawn by every sensible person to prove the former falsehood, by his continued false information and dissimulation against the Governor, as he declared lately at Mr Carne's house, as could be confirmed by George Hodgkinson, Charles Steward, and Edward Bagley. Interpretations The Governor's reference to a previous falsehood from "last year" indicated a prior incident had been reported to the Company. The current pattern was portrayed as continuation of established misconduct rather than isolated dispute, undermining Kerr's claim of being persecuted for loyalty. The Governor's argument was sophisticated: Kerr's current accusations actually weakened any defence he

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			might offer against earlier charges, because they revealed a continuing pattern of dishonesty rather than singular wrongdoing. The witnesses cited (Hodgkinson, Steward, Bagley) included Kerr's own associates from the gathering at Carne's house. By citing these particular witnesses, the Governor demonstrated that even Kerr's friendly company could not corroborate his version of events. The phrase "false information and dissimulation" combined two distinct charges - active false statements and deliberate concealment of truth. The Governor accused Kerr not merely of error but of conscious deception. Speculations The "falsehood last year" likely referred to a specific incident reported to the Company directors that had already damaged Kerr's standing in England. The Governor was reminding readers of the established record rather than introducing fresh accusations. The Governor's strategy was to discredit Kerr entirely by establishing him as a habitual maker of false accusations. Each new accusation, in this framing, undermined the next rather than strengthening it - a cumulative case for Kerr's untrustworthiness. The calm, legalistic tone of the Governor's response contrasted sharply with Kerr's emotional protestations. To outside readers (the Company directors in London), this contrast might make the Governor appear measured and credible whilst Kerr appeared agitated and possibly unstable.
151	129	Can any man In the world be Used more barbarously, then I Have been, by M.r John [Ken] not Satisfyed To Carry his Malice To The Uttermost To The End he might Ruin me as he was Resolved To Doe before he Came here ag Hath been Evidently Justifyed by The oaths of M.r George Hotherson and his wife. In Swearing fallsy ag.t my Innocency Last Year, as if I was an Enemy of the Crown of England whose Instrument, and ord.rs of p.rsecuting me he took doublick at Versaille p.r St Germans, when there Last war, That Court I Know by too much Experience will Embrace any occasion To bring me to a Shamefull End. Notwithstanding I Know him by Experience of this Cursed Character, Depending my Selfe upon Divine Providenc[e] To be my protecion and Advocate Towards The Devine most Earnest Comunit took from his hands Last white Sunday The Holy Sacrement. Ever Since for Peace Sake bearing patiently Some Sparks of his Ill Temper, Lived with him as well as any body Could. But His Hellish Demon Exhibits Such Roaring Calm provoked him by his Und.rseting (To Long time unknown To me to Augm.nt the people I Frank Last Generall Muster Day To The pretended Prince of Wales Health, whose truth no body In the world Questions more then I So. Knowing how Bravely Defended himselfe one when he Styled The said person his Crowne Master, after the Death of King James Further Soon after without the Least p.rovocacon Went at 10. or 11 a Clock at Night To M.r George Carnes house, Telling him, and those with him That Jesuits had told him, I would betray this Island, Unto the first French f fleet That Should Come Here. But The same Providence which Wisdom, and Justice Doth Confound the wicked In their blackest Devices, And Takes Care for The Innocent. Hath as To another Babell put Him In Soe much Confusion, Contradicons, and Extravavtions, both by his own writing To me, and before Credible Witnesses, That I need no other Comentary, but to have their Depositions Sounded And That Then Let a man of any Comon Sence Judge whether It Is not Clear as the Sun at Noon, That his first oath Is falss by his Last proceedings. As	The Governor questioned whether any person could be treated more cruelly than he was by Mr John Kerr. Kerr's malice was not content with merely harming the Governor; his aim was complete ruin, as he was determined to achieve before ever arriving on the island. This was evidently shown by the oaths sworn by Mr George Hotherson and his wife, who testified falsely against the Governor's innocence last year, treating him as though he were a traitor to the English Crown, whose orders of persecution Kerr took [...] at Versailles via St Germans during the last war. The Governor knew by too much experience that the court at St Germans would seize any opportunity to bring him to a shameful end. Despite his knowledge of Kerr's cursed character through experience, the Governor depended upon Divine Providence to be his protection and advocate. With most earnest communion, he took the Holy Sacrament from Kerr's hands last Whitsunday. Ever since, for peace's sake, he bore patiently some sparks of Kerr's ill temper, and lived with him as well as anyone could. But Kerr's hellish nature exhibited such roaring [...] - provoked him by his undersetting, long unknown to the Governor, to augment the people. The Governor frankly drank last general muster day to the pretended Prince of Wales' health, whose legitimacy nobody in the world questioned more than the Governor himself, knowing how bravely Kerr once defended the said person, styling him his Crowned Master after King James died. Further, soon after, without the least provocation, Kerr went at 10 or 11 o'clock at night to Mr George Carne's house, claiming to those present that Jesuits had informed him the Governor planned to surrender the island to whatever French fleet next arrived. But the same Providence, which by wisdom and justice confounded the wicked in their blackest devices and took care of the innocent, put Kerr - as in another Babel - into so much confusion, contradiction, and extravagance, both by his own writing to the Governor and before credible witnesses, that the Governor needed no other commentary than to have their depositions read aloud. Then any man of common

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			sense could judge whether it was not as clear as the sun at noon that Kerr's first oath was false, given his later proceedings. [text breaks off] Interpretations The Governor's references to Versailles and St Germans placed this dispute within the broader Jacobite-Williamite conflict. St Germans was the seat of James II's exiled court, supported by Louis XIV at Versailles. The Governor presented himself as a Williamite loyalist targeted by Jacobite plots, drawing on his Huguenot identity as French Protestant refugee. The reference to Hotherson and his wife giving false testimony "last year" against the Governor's innocence revealed an earlier Jacobite-tinged accusation against him. The current dispute with Kerr was portrayed as continuation of an ongoing conspiracy rather than isolated incident. The Governor's note that he took communion from Kerr's hands last Whitsunday carried significant weight. This was an act of Christian forbearance and sacramental trust despite knowing Kerr's character. Kerr's later attacks therefore violated not just political peace but religious fellowship. Kerr's previous support for the Old Pretender - styling him "Crowned Master after the death of King James" - was invoked as decisive proof of Kerr's true loyalties. The Governor turned the Prince of Wales toast issue against Kerr: Kerr was the genuine Jacobite, not the loyal Governor. The Babel reference (to Genesis 11) was theologically pointed. The Governor compared Kerr's contradictions to the divine confusion of language at the Tower of Babel, suggesting Kerr's confusion was divine punishment for his blasphemous attacks on a faithful subject. Speculations The Governor's mention of personal experience with the St Germans court suggests he may have been targeted or threatened by Jacobite agents before his colonial appointment. This personal history would explain his vehemence in connecting Kerr to that exiled court. The Hotherson testimony from "last year" appears to have been a previous attempt to ruin the Governor that was repulsed. The pattern suggests ongoing efforts by enemies in coordinated rather than isolated attacks. The Governor's emphasis on receiving communion from Kerr at Whitsunday creates a powerful contrast: a Protestant Governor taking the sacrament from a man he knew to be theologically suspect. This was either remarkable Christian charity or political calculation - perhaps both, allowing him to claim moral high ground later. Kerr's calling the Pretender his "Crowned Master" - if accurately reported - would constitute straightforward Jacobitism. This single accusation, if accepted, would utterly discredit Kerr in the eyes of Williamite or Queen Anne authorities, including the Company directors. The reference to "augmenting the people" against the Governor through "undersetting" suggests Kerr was secretly building opposition through informal channels. The gathering at Carne's house, where the Jesuit and French fleet rumours circulated, was one visible instance of this broader pattern of clandestine influence.
152	130	As for his Conversacon, and Manner of Living It Is Manifest That Nothing Can be more Contrary both To the Holy Scripture and The Cannons of The Church. And Noe Presumption better Grounded, That he Is a Papist by those which are now Recorded, and my own Experience. Whereas John Scriven Prison.r being Brought before Govern.r and Councill and being Examined ab.t The	As for Kerr's conversation and manner of living, it was evident that his conduct violated both Holy Scripture and the Church's canons in every respect. No assumption was more firmly established than his being a Papist, based on the matters now recorded and the Governor's personal observation. John Scriven, prisoner, was brought before the Governor and Council and examined about breaking

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		breaking open of M.rs Cagnalds House and ffelloniously Stealing Some Quantity of arack and Sugar, pleaded not Guilty, and Whereas Having at Severall times Spent 5. or 6. Dollars as has been Reported, being asked, how he Came by The said Money He Replied honestly, and he Could prove It. And That he Spent 5 Dollars one which he had of Gabriel [Howell] for [Slow] Goods. And That He won Seaven Dollars off Henry [Plant] and of [Sev.t] others. and being asked where he went when he used To Goe out of his Quarters at Night, Said he went a fishing. It Is ordered. That The Matter be Referred To a Jury At The next Quarterly Sessions. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Saturday night about 8 a Clock May 20.th 1704 John Scriven Prisoner made a free Confession That He Is Guilty of breaking open M.rs Cagnalds House, and Robbing her, of Arack, and Sugar. Further. That when he and Thomas Dutton Lived at a House now In Brig.t Sandersons Possession, the said Dutton Came To him after being a Sleep, and knocked at the Door I Got up and Lett him In, at which time brought with him A Shirt, Necloth, and Handkercher and Said he had them out of John Grixmas house and then asked me To Got up again and he would get Some Arack out, which by his	open Mrs Cagnald's house and feloniously stealing some quantity of arrack and sugar. He denied the charge. Having at several times spent 5 or 6 dollars, as was reported, he was asked how he obtained those funds. He answered "honestly", and said he could prove it. He spent 5 dollars which he received from Gabriel [...] for [...] goods. He won seven dollars off Henry [...] and several others. Being asked where he went when he used to leave his quarters at night, he claimed he had been fishing. It was ordered that the matter be referred to a jury at the next quarterly sessions. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Saturday night about 8 o'clock, 20 May 1704, John Scriven, prisoner, made a free confession that he was guilty of breaking open Mrs Cagnald's house and robbing her of arrack and sugar. He further stated that when he and Thomas Dutton lived at a house now in Bridget Sanderson's possession, Dutton came to him after Scriven was asleep and knocked at the door. Scriven got up and let him in. At that time, Dutton brought with him a shirt, neckcloth, and handkerchief, and said he got them from John Grixmas's house. Dutton then asked Scriven to [...] again and he would get some arrack out, which by his [text breaks off] Interpretations The Governor's final charge that Kerr was a Papist, based on his conversation, manner of living, and conduct contrary to Scripture and Church canons, was the gravest accusation in this context. Being a Catholic priest in disguise would retrospectively explain all the suspicious behaviour previously documented - the crosses, the beard and tonsure, the defence of Catholic infAllisbility, the association with Father Pascho. Scriven's initial denial and explanation of his spending showed calculated defence. He offered a plausible alternative narrative - money won through gambling and received from selling goods - that would account for his unexplained wealth without admitting theft. The shift from not guilty plea to full confession within hours of the same evening suggests either intense pressure during custody, breakdown of resolve, or recognition that evidence against him was overwhelming. The timing indicates something decisive occurred between the afternoon examination and Saturday night. Scriven's confession extended beyond his own crime to implicate Dutton in additional thefts. The shirt, neckcloth, and handkerchief from Grixmas's house represented crimes not yet under investigation. This pattern of mutual incrimination between Scriven and Dutton revealed both were involved in systematic criminal operations. Speculations The Governor's accusation of Kerr being a Papist was the ultimate charge - if accepted by the Company directors, it justified immediate removal and possible prosecution for religious deception. This was the culmination of all accumulated evidence about Kerr's Catholic sympathies and associations. Scriven's Saturday night confession may have resulted from confrontation with Dutton's earlier detailed statement (15 May). Once Scriven knew Dutton had confessed to multiple crimes and named him as accomplice, continued denial became untenable. The reference to the house "now in Bridget Sanderson's possession" where Scriven and Dutton previously lived together suggests they were long-term criminal partners. Shared quarters facilitated their nocturnal operations and provided secure location for dividing stolen goods. Dutton's pattern of arriving at night with stolen items - clothing, spirits - shows systematic theft rather

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			than opportunistic crime. The "fishing" excuse was cover for regular criminal activity, with both men using darkness to move stolen goods and conduct burglaries whilst avoiding detection.
153	131	P.rswasion he Did, and The said Dutton went In at The Casem.t window and Handed Down 3 Bottle Bottles of Arack which he had Ready brought To The Place before, and has Soon him Cutt Dollars and Said He would Coin Rupees and Desired him To Run off this Island, and Send him a Mould, and has told him That his Name was not Dutton. And Has often perswaded him to help him to break open M.r Wills House, And That Night They broke open M.r Gargans House He Lay a Sleep at M.r Cullers Door, till Dutton Came Down Staires and awaked him. And Did Then ask him to M.rs Cagnalds House, and a Day or 2 before M.rs Coulsons house was broke open Dutton asked me, To Come Down out of y.e Country In the Morning but Some Company being at his [Lemler] House He Stayed Till High Day before he Came So The said and when Come Knock.t at M.r [Nicholls] house where Dutton Lodged Sev.t times But Did not open the Door, and when at said Door heard people Come Down Staires, And wondered The said Dutton Did not open the Door, which made him Goe Towards The back Door, and met Dutton and a black with him on the back side of The House But Could not Tell what Black, twas because he was Some Distance off. But I think twas M.rs Coulsons Negar The said Dutton, Had 3 or 4 or 5 Case bottles of Arack with Them who was Surprized. But after Dutton heard my Voice, he Showed himselfe, and Desired me to Stay there, and Look after The Arack. and then he Run as fast as he Could, and brought 2 or 3 bottles arack more, and a Box of Sugar. then they both went behind M.rs Coulsons House and Saw Jn.o Goodwins Ladder And when upon the Bank Dutton Said, Sam the old [Putrick] Wee Have Done her businesse and Help. To Take This Ladder away, which they Did and Set It ag.t John Goodwins house At which time Dutton went Down a back, and Shutt M.rs Coulsons back Door, and Told me That M.rs Coulsons Black And He went Into her house, asked Negar, which the Black Showed him, of which Money The Said Dutton Gave me 6 Dollars, and a peice of Gold, and the next time I Came to The house He Gave me 3 Dollars more. And Did Curse and Damne me for not Coming Down Sooner, The Said Dutton told me there was 25. or 26 Dollars, 4 peices Gold, and a Silver Spoon. In a bladder. Further. That Robin Tinney and He being a Drinking at The Coal one Night, went on the back side the House and Saw the back door of M.r Gargans House open	Scriven was persuaded, and Dutton went in at the casement window and handed down 3 bottles of arrack which he had readied at that location beforehand. Dutton showed him cut dollars and said he would coin rupees, desiring Scriven to run off the island and send him a mould. Dutton instructed him that his actual name was not Dutton. Dutton persuaded Scriven on several occasions to help him break open Mr Will's house. The night they broke open Mr Gargan's house, Scriven lay asleep at Mr Culler's door until Dutton came down the stairs and awoke him. Dutton then asked him to go to Mrs Cagnald's house. A day or two before Mrs Coulson's house was broken into, Dutton asked Scriven to come down from the interior in the morning. But with some company at [...] house, Scriven stayed until midday before arriving. When he arrived and knocked at Mr Nicholls' house, where Dutton lodged several times, Dutton did not open the door. Hearing people come down the stairs and wondering why Dutton did not open the door, Scriven went towards the back door and met Dutton with a Black person on the back side of the house. Scriven could not tell which enslaved person it was, being at some distance, but believed it was Mrs Coulson's Negro. Dutton carried 3, 4, or 5 case bottles of arrack with them. But after Dutton heard Scriven's voice, he showed himself and desired Scriven to stay and watch the arrack. Dutton then ran as fast as he could and brought 2 or 3 more bottles of arrack and a box of sugar. They both went behind Mrs Coulson's house and saw John Goodwin's ladder. Upon the bank, Dutton said, "Sam, the old [...] - we have done her business. Help take this ladder away," which they did and set it against John Goodwin's house. Dutton then went down and shut Mrs Coulson's back door. He told Scriven that Mrs Coulson's enslaved servant and he went into her house and located the money. From the stolen money, Dutton gave Scriven 6 dollars and a piece of gold. The next time Scriven came to the house, Dutton gave him 3 dollars more. Dutton cursed and damned him for not coming down sooner. Dutton told him there was 25 or 26 dollars, 4 pieces of gold, and a silver spoon in a bladder. Further, Scriven and Robin Tinney, whilst drinking at [...] one night, went to the back of the house and saw the back door of Mr Gargan's house open. [text breaks off] Interpretations Dutton's desire to coin rupees and his request for a mould reveals he was running a counterfeiting operation. Scriven was being groomed not merely as a burglar but as an agent to establish this criminal enterprise elsewhere, with Dutton sending him the mould to enable counterfeiting in a new location. This shows Dutton was operating a sophisticated criminal network. Dutton's instruction that his name was not Dutton reveals he was operating under an alias, suggesting he was hiding from previous crimes or a criminal past beyond St Helena. The false identity itself was a tool of criminal operation. Scriven's evolving role - from accomplice in burglary to distributor of stolen goods and designated receiver of proceeds - shows systematic integration into a criminal hierarchy rather than opportunistic partnership. Dutton was grooming Scriven as a subordinate operative.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The involvement of Mrs Coulson's enslaved person in the robbery exposed the vulnerability of enslaved people to coercion into crime. Whether this person was forced to unlock the house, knew the valuables' location through household duties, or participated willingly remains unclear from the confession. The systematic nature of the burglaries - multiple targets, coordinated timing, use of scouts and lookouts, careful distribution of stolen goods - reveals organised criminal operation. The pattern was not random theft but planned and executed with division of labour. Speculations Dutton's counterfeiting scheme likely was his primary enterprise, with burglaries serving dual purposes: generating cash to finance the operation and acquiring metal or other materials needed for coin production. The "cut dollars" he showed Scriven may have been samples of his counterfeiting work. Scriven's integration into the criminal network was deliberately gradual. Sleeping at Culler's door whilst drunk, then being awakened to assist, positioned Scriven as tool rather than partner. By the time Dutton trusted him to watch the stolen goods, Scriven was psychologically committed and potentially compromised by his growing share of proceeds. John Goodwin's ladder featured in multiple burglaries - at Gargan's house and at Coulson's before being moved to Goodwin's own house afterwards. This suggests either Goodwin's property was a regular base for criminal activity or the ladder was placed there specifically to facilitate future thefts. Mrs Coulson's enslaved servant's role merits investigation. If the servant opened the house voluntarily, this indicates knowledge of or collusion in the theft. If coerced, this represents a graver crime than burglary - the forcing of an enslaved person into criminal complicity. Robin Tinney's appearance in the confession indicates a wider criminal network. The reference to drinking "at The Coal" followed by burglary shows how social gathering points became criminal recruiting and planning centres. Tinney's involvement in multiple robberies suggests he was another subordinate in Dutton's network. Dutton's verbal abuse of Scriven - cursing and damning him for arriving late - reveals the coercive dynamic of their relationship. Scriven was not an equal partner dividing proceeds but a subordinate operative subject to Dutton's discipline and increasingly trapped by his own complicity in multiple serious crimes.
154	132	open where they went In and Some body Rushed out by them, who they Look after but Could not See who twas, then they went up Staires and Saw Some Lynnen lyne ab.t the Door, of which Lynnen they took Some [Shirts] Cable Lynnen [Neckloathes] and a Handkercher, which they Shar= ed twixt them as Equally as they Could, and when they Came down [the] [Robin] Tinney got an Iron Crow with which they broke open a [Trun] Chest out of which they took a Some Sugar and broke open M.rs Governes Chest, but took nothing out of It. And That Sugar That was brought to the Coal Cable by M.r [Coler], He had of Dutton but did not Brigh.t It got Gave It to M.rs Dutton. That one Night at Serjt Sivors went of the Guard. He went up with him and when Come Down again Saw Jn.o Sutton have Some Sugar which he told me he took out of Serjt Sivors House when he went up In the Balcony to Shutt the Door. Robert Tinney being Examined Saith That That Night M.r Gargons house was broke open Scriven asked him if he would break open The said House, I Told no I would not, why Sayes he I have broken open Severall houses, I Care not Care Sayes Tinney I won't Conditind To any Such things, [So we] went up In the Country, At which time The Said Scriven Told him he	No, I only provided the corrected 27 May section. Here is the full corrected text: [Continuing Scriven's confession about Gargan's house:] The back door was open where they entered, and somebody rushed out past them, whom they looked after but could not identify. They then went up the stairs and saw some linen lying about the door. From this linen they took some [...] shirts, cable linen [...] neckcloths, and a handkerchief, which they divided between them as equally as they could. When they came down, Robin Tinney obtained an iron crowbar with which they broke open a [...] chest, from which they took some sugar. They also broke open Mrs Governor's chest, but took nothing from it. The sugar that was brought to the Coal [...] by Mr [...], he received from Dutton, but did not bring it - he gave it to Mrs Dutton. One night when Sergeant Sivors went off the guard, Scriven went up with him, and when he came down again, he saw John Sutton with some sugar, which Sutton said he took from Sergeant Sivors' house when he went up on the balcony to shut the door.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		and Dutton had broke open M.r Carnes House and had Stolen Some Lynnen and particularly a Silver Spoon, And y.t Dutton has often told him, That he won.d buy to make Rupees of old Silver, for they would doe well In India And That The said Scriven told him, he went Into John Goodwins House, with Dutton, and Stole 2 bottles of Arack. Scriven was Sent for, and Confronted The Said Tinney To his face, and told him of the s.d Cabbage and Circumstances. May 27.th 1704 Whereas on Thursday Morning Last, The Govern.r went up Into the Country before The Comp.s y.d Tide Tuesday Evening To view this Hono.ble Masters Plantacons Dureing which time, had Informacon That Cap.t Sodington hath behaved himselfe very Disorderly, In Disturbing y.e Garrison at Unseasonable hours. Notwithstanding his Suspension for former Disorders, as may more plainly Appear In the Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 18.th day of this Instant.	Robert Tinney, being examined, stated that the night Mr Gargan's house was broken open, Scriven asked if he would break open the said house. Tinney refused. Scriven argued that he had broken open several houses and did not care. Tinney replied firmly that he would not consent to any such things. They went up into the country, at which time Scriven told him that he and Dutton broke open Mr Carne's house and stole some linen and particularly a silver spoon. Dutton often told him that he would buy old silver to make rupees, for they would do well in India. Scriven also told him that he went into John Goodwin's house with Dutton and stole 2 bottles of arrack. Scriven was sent for and confronted with Tinney face to face, and was told of the said [...] and circumstances. 27 May 1704 The Governor travelled into the interior on Thursday morning to inspect the Honourable Company's plantations. During his absence, which lasted until Tuesday evening, he received information that Captain Sodington had behaved very disorderly, disturbing the garrison at unseasonable hours. This continued despite his suspension for former disorders, as had been documented more clearly in the consultation held on Tuesday the 18th day of this month. Interpretations The detailed evidence of burglaries at multiple homes - Gargan's, Coulson's, Carne's, Goodwin's, Sivors' - demonstrated a systematic criminal operation targeting the colony's residents rather than isolated opportunistic theft. The consistency of method (casement windows, crowbars, night-time entry) and coordination (scouts, lookouts, distribution of goods) revealed organised crime. Tinney's initial refusal and subsequent involvement illustrated how social pressure draws reluctant individuals into criminal networks. Despite explicitly refusing to participate ("I will not consent to such things"), Tinney was present at the burglary, handled stolen goods, and participated in their division. His later conversations with Scriven showed he was being integrated into the network despite his resistance. The counterfeiting operation revealed an international criminal enterprise. Dutton was not simply stealing; he was manufacturing fraudulent rupees for sale in India, a crime far graver than theft. The planned export of counterfeit currency implicated this crime in broader imperial trade networks. The involvement of enslaved people in the burglaries - the unnamed Black person with Dutton at Coulson's, the implicit role of someone in Sivors' household - exposed the vulnerability of enslaved people to coercion into crime. Whether coerced or, in rare cases, active participants, their involvement in these crimes revealed another layer of victimisation beyond their enslavement. The psychological pressure on Scriven - Dutton cursing and damning him for arriving late to the robbery - demonstrated the coercive mechanisms of criminal organisation. Scriven was not an equal partner but an operand controlled through a mixture of profit-sharing and intimidation. The confrontation between Scriven and Tinney, with detailed recitation of all crimes, suggested either pressure to ensure Tinney's continued complicity or preparation of testimony against him. Either way, it bound Tinney irreversibly into the criminal record. Sodington's continued disturbances of the garrison whilst formally suspended indicated either his defiance of the Governor's authority or the Governor's inability to enforce the suspension. The fact that a suspended officer could still cause disorder suggested either that

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			garrison members retained loyalty to him or that other officials were not enforcing his exclusion. Speculations The burglaries appeared carefully targeted. The criminals knew which houses contained valuables, optimal entry points, and the schedules of residents. This suggests either inside information (someone in the households or garrison providing intelligence) or systematic prior surveillance of the colony's residents. Dutton's apparent freedom to move about, recruit accomplices, and openly discuss counterfeiting plans suggests possible knowledge or tolerance by certain colonial officials. Either the Governor's enforcement capacity was far weaker than apparent, or someone in authority was overlooking these crimes. Tinney's participation despite explicit refusal suggests possible coercion beyond peer pressure. The later confrontation where Scriven detailed all of Tinney's knowledge may have been designed to pressure him into deeper involvement or silence through shared culpability. Mrs Dutton's receipt of stolen sugar raises questions about the extent of involvement by officials' families in receiving stolen goods. Whether she was deliberately complicit or innocently receiving goods from her husband without knowledge would affect judgement of her role. Sodington's continued disturbances whilst suspended reveal fracture lines in the colonial authority structure. If garrison members obeyed Sodington over the Governor's orders, this exposed fundamental instability in the command hierarchy. The Governor's response - building a case through personal investigation and gathering evidence - suggests he could not rely on formal channels to enforce Sodington's suspension. The Governor's journey to inspect plantations whilst gathering intelligence about Sodington suggests strategic thinking. Rather than confronting Sodington directly over specific incidents, the Governor was documenting a pattern of behaviour that would justify permanent removal or harsher punishment, moving beyond temporary suspension.
155	133	Thomas Sanderson Serj.t being Sworn Saith That on Thursday Evening Last about 4 or 5, M.rs Gold and her Daughter Mary Came Into The fort with Cap.t Sodington and M.r Manning who all went Into Cap.t Sodingtons Lodgings Directly. Except M.r Manning who went Some Short time after where they Continued. Till halfe an hour past Nine. The Drum having Just Done beating. Cap.t Monk Going out of the fort went up to tell M.r Manning, the Cap.t was Going on board At which Cap.t Sodington was offended, However M.r Manning went Down with help of Sev.rall and one of y.e boates Crew, He being a Little In Drink. Afterwards I heard High words pass between Cap.t Sodington, M.rs Gold, and her Daughter Mary, whereupon M.rs Gold Came Downe The Steps from the Corner of the Serj.ts Room, her Daughter [Hester] Comeing after her Crying. Her Mother bid her Hush for the Serj.t was Comand.r of The fort and Came to the Serj.t and bid him Mind his Duty. I tolt her I would without her Advice. then She Said She would Goe back againe to Cap.t Sodingtons Room Immediately after Cap.t Sodington her Selfe and Daughter went out of the fort, And made a Disturbance before The Centry at the Sally: port. It being then almost 10 a Clock. William Goss Sold.r Sworn Saith. That being At Centry on Thursday Night Last At The Sallyport Gate After the Drum had Done beating Cap.t Sodington, M.rs Gold and her Daughter Mary, Comeing out of the fort. Cap.t Sodington Led the Said Mary Gold Towards the Sound M.rs Gold Caled to her Saying To her Daughter Mary Come away, you God Damn You you Bitch the	Thomas Sanderson, Sergeant, being sworn, stated that on Thursday evening, around 4 or 5 o'clock, Mrs Gold and her daughter Mary entered the fort with Captain Sodington and Mr Manning. The group proceeded directly to Captain Sodington's lodgings, except Mr Manning who went some short time after. They remained there until half an hour past nine, the drum having just finished beating. Captain Monk, leaving the fort, went up to inform Mr Manning the Captain was going on board, at which Captain Sodington took offence. However, Mr Manning went down with help from several people and one of the boat's crew, he being a little in drink. Sanderson subsequently heard angry words exchanged between Captain Sodington, Mrs Gold, and her daughter Mary. Mrs Gold came down the steps from the corner of the Sergeant's room, her daughter [...] following her crying. Her mother bid her hush, for the Sergeant was commander of the fort. Mrs Gold came to the Sergeant and bid him mind his duty. Sanderson told her he would do so without her advice. She said she would return to Captain Sodington's room. Captain Sodington, Mrs Gold, and her daughter left the fort shortly afterwards and caused a commotion before the sentry at the sally port. It was then almost 10 o'clock. William Goss, soldier, being sworn, stated that he was at sentry on Thursday night last at the sallyport gate. After the drum finished beating, Captain Sodington, Mrs Gold and her daughter Mary came out of the fort. Captain Sodington escorted Mary Gold in

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Devill You [I] [throw] her Down upon The Ground and Struck her 2 blowes with his Cane, whereupon I Spoke to Cap.t Sodington [Sir] This Is no a place To Quarrell, I thought Upon Which offer taking hold of his Arme, and pulled him away from the said M.rs Gold. God Damn You you Dog Sayes he What Is the matter with You. Upon Which I Stepped back, Clubbed my peice, and bid him Stand off. Then he and Mary Gold went up the Vally hand In hand. Sayes M.rs Gold The Devill Goe with You both, He Go Into the Garrison. Upon which Serj.t Sanderson Said, Madam You here a home So Goe to So.d She went After Cap.t Sodington, and her Daughter Mary. Ja.s	the direction of the sound. Mrs Gold called to her daughter, saying "Come away." Sodington then forced her to the ground and beat her twice with his cane. Goss spoke to Captain Sodington: "Sir, this is no place to quarrel." He then took hold of Sodington's arm and pulled him away from Mrs Gold. Sodington said, "God damn you, you dog. What is the matter with you?" Goss withdrew, raised his musket as a club, and ordered him to keep away. Sodington and Mary Gold then walked up the valley holding hands. Mrs Gold said, "The devil go with you both. I'll go into the garrison." Sergeant Sanderson said, "Madam, you have a home. Go to it." She followed Captain Sodington and her daughter Mary anyway. Interpretations The extended visit to Sodington's lodgings (4-5pm until 9:30pm) whilst he was suspended demonstrated he was treating the suspension as non-binding. He continued using fort facilities for social entertaining as though still in office, directly contradicting the terms of his removal. The alcohol consumption (Manning "a little in drink") and the late hour indicated this was a social gathering that turned contentious. The five-hour duration and subsequent quarrel suggested this was not routine business but extended private entertainment. Mrs Gold's command to Sanderson to "mind his duty" revealed she either did not know or did not respect that Sanderson, as Sergeant, was the acting commander of the fort in Sodington's suspension. She treated Sodington as if he retained authority. The physical assault on Mrs Gold at the sally port - forcing her to the ground and beating her twice with a cane - constituted extreme public violence. This was witnessed by the sentry and occurred at the fort entrance, making it not a private dispute but a public assault on fort grounds. Goss's intervention - physically restraining Sodington and threatening him with a clubbed musket - showed a soldier felt empowered to use force against a suspended Captain to protect a civilian woman. This indicated either Goss's personal courage or his understanding that Sodington's suspension removed his protected status. Sodington's response - cursing the sentry as "you dog" - revealed his expectation that soldiers should not interfere with his actions, suspension notwithstanding. He retained an assumption of rank privilege despite formal removal from office. Sodington leaving with Mary Gold "hand in hand" after assaulting her mother suggested either Mary was complicit or Sodington was asserting control over her against her mother's wishes. The physical intimacy of holding hands after such violence was striking. Mrs Gold following them despite Sanderson's instruction to go home indicated either concern for her daughter's safety or inability to control the situation. Her determination to pursue them after being violently beaten showed maternal alarm. Speculations The nature of Sodington's relationship with Mary Gold remained unclear but suspicious. The extended private visit, his leading her away from her mother, and their leaving hand in hand after he assaulted her mother suggested either courtship (possibly inappropriate given his position) or something more troubling involving coercion. Mrs Gold's quarrel with Sodington may have concerned his relationship with her daughter. Her calling Mary to "come away" and the earlier argument suggested maternal objection to Sodington's intentions toward Mary, whether romantic or otherwise. The assault on Mrs Gold - throwing her down and caning her - may have been Sodington's retaliation for her interference with his access to Mary. The violence

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			functioned to assert dominance and punish her attempt to remove Mary from his control. Goss's willingness to physically intervene despite Sodington's verbal abuse suggested either personal bravery or confidence that Sodington's suspension meant he could act without fear of later retaliation. The fact that a common soldier could threaten a Captain with a weapon showed how completely Sodington's authority had eroded. The timing - 10pm, after the drum had beaten - meant this occurred during or near curfew hours. Sodington's presence at the fort disturbing the garrison at "unseasonable hours" (documented in the 27 May entry) was demonstrated concretely here. His abuse of fort access whilst suspended was flagrant. Mrs Gold's decision to follow Sodington and Mary despite being beaten and told to go home suggested genuine fear for her daughter's safety. A suspended officer who would publicly assault a mother might pose serious danger to the daughter he was taking away. Her pursuit despite personal risk showed maternal desperation. Sanderson's attempt to send Mrs Gold home ("you have a home, go to it") without preventing Sodington from taking Mary suggested either he lacked authority to restrain Sodington or judged it improper to interfere in what he perceived as family matters. His inaction despite witnessing the assault showed the limits of his willingness or ability to confront Sodington directly.
156	134	John [Palyn] Sworn Saith, That being at Cen[try] on Thursday Night Last upon the West=Mount Saw a man Comeing down Towards The fort, ab.t 10 a Clock whom he Challenged, then he went up againe, whom I think was Cap.t Sodington for am Sure I heard him Sing, ab.t The Belfries house and a Little after Saw him Come Downwards, but who they was Cannot Say. John French Gunner. Did this p.rsent his Comp.te ag.t day The Minister M.r Jn.o [Ken] for Abuseing him, CAllisng him Saucy Dogg, and Dogg over again, Sodomite, Rouge, Rascall, and Pimp, for his Saying In Discourse, That he never Knew the Queen took a Sante but have Known a King took Cantes, for which Abuses Desires Justice may be done him ag.t The Said M.r [Ken] Cap.t Sodington Desires That M.r Rogers may be Summoned ag.t Tuesday next To prove his Declaracon, w.ch he p.rsentet to Gov.r and Councill Last Councill Day ag.t The said Cap.t Sodington. This Is my Request. [Poirier] Cor: Sodington Tho: Goodwin	John [...], sworn, stated that whilst on sentry duty Thursday night upon the west mount, he observed a man approaching the fort around 10 o'clock. He challenged this person, who then went back up. Palyn thought it was Captain Sodington, for he was sure he heard him singing about the Belfry's house. A short time later, he saw him coming down again, but could not say with certainty who it was. John French, gunner, presented his complaint against the minister Mr John Kerr for abusing him, cAllisng him saucy dog, and dog over again, sodomite, rogue, rascal, and pimp. This abuse followed French's saying in discourse that he never knew the Queen took a [...] but knew a king took [...]. French desired justice be done him against Mr Kerr for these abuses. Captain Sodington requested that Mr Rogers be called to appear on Tuesday next to substantiate his declaration, which he presented to the Governor and Council last council day against Captain Sodington. This was Sodington's request. [Poirier] Cornelius Sodington Thomas Goodwin Interpretations Palyn's testimony about someone on the west mount at 10pm Thursday night corroborated the general timeframe of Sodington's disturbances. The singing near Belfry's house and the erratic movements (approaching, retreating when challenged, then approaching again) suggested someone intoxicated or disorderly. Palyn's inability to definitively identify the person despite believing it was Sodington showed either poor visibility at that hour or caution about making formal accusations without certainty. The fact that he heard singing and challenged the person but could not confirm identity suggested the person remained at some distance. French's complaint against Kerr demonstrated another instance of Kerr's abusive language towards those who crossed him. The list of insults - saucy dog, sodomite, rogue, rascal, pimp - constituted serious accusations, particularly "sodomite" which was a capital crime under English law. The triggering remark about Queen versus King suggested French made some comparison unfavourable to Queen Anne or favourable to a previous monarch.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Kerr's explosive response with multiple grave insults indicated this touched the ongoing tensions about loyalty and suspected Jacobitism. Sodington's request for Rogers to be summoned to prove his declaration showed an aggressive legal posture. He was demanding Rogers substantiate his accusations under oath, which could expose Rogers to perjury charges if he could not prove them or to further legal complications if he could. Speculations The person on the west mount was almost certainly Sodington, given the timeframe (10pm Thursday matching other testimony), the location near the fort, the singing suggesting intoxication, and Palyn's belief despite lacking certainty. The movements - approaching, retreating when challenged, then approaching again - suggested someone under influence attempting to access the fort despite being warned off. The singing near Belfry's house may have been the same disturbance referenced in the 27 May entry about Sodington disturbing the garrison at unseasonable hours. This provided specific concrete evidence of that general complaint, establishing a pattern rather than isolated incident. French's comment about the Queen and King may have compared Queen Anne unfavourably to a previous king - possibly William III, Charles II, or even James II. If French suggested a king was more capable, legitimate, or divinely ordained than the Queen, this would have been inflammatory and potentially treasonous depending on how it was phrased. Kerr's use of "sodomite" as an insult was particularly grave. This was not casual abuse but a serious criminal accusation carrying the death penalty. Either Kerr was completely out of control in his anger, or he genuinely believed (or maliciously intended to accuse) French of this capital crime. The recklessness of such an accusation showed Kerr's dangerous volatility. Sodington's demand for Rogers to appear and prove his declaration was tactical. By forcing Rogers to testify under oath about the assault, Sodington was either: confident Rogers could not prove the events as described, hoping to intimidate Rogers into withdrawing the complaint, or creating a formal contradictory record that could support an appeal to the Company directors in London. The fact that the signatures included Poirier, Sodington, and Goodwin suggested this was an official council record. Sodington's continued participation in council proceedings despite suspension revealed the ambiguous status of his removal - he was suspended from office but apparently still involved in some official capacities, perhaps as a right to defend himself or because the suspension was not being fully enforced.
157	135	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultacon. Hold on Tuesday The 30.th day of May 1704 At Fort=James. Stephen Poirier Govern.r Present. Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas on The 19.th Instant M.r John [Ken] Minister Did In his Protestacon Alledge That The Govern.r Did beat and Abused him Upon which The said Gov.r Issued out a Warr.t for The said M.rs [Kers] Appearance, this Day before Gov.r and Council, To make appear how and when, the Govern.r beat, and abused him, as aforesaid. The Said M.r [Ken] Appearing and being Interrogated as abovesaid how, and when beat. Replyed he had nothing to Say. In this Matter Haveing already Appealed To The Queen, and the Hono.ble Companys And besides being Sacrament week for which Reason We Declare The said [Kers] Imputatoin To be falss frivolous, and void, And The said [Ken] pay all Charges. Cornelius Sodington being Sworn Saith That whilst The Dutch Shipp was here. He Invited The Cap.t of The	Island St Helena. At a consultation held on Tuesday the 30th day of May 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor Present: Thomas Goodwin, Ensign On the 19th instant, Mr John Kerr, minister, alleged in his protestation that the Governor beat and abused him. The Governor issued a warrant for Mr Kerr's appearance this day before the Governor and Council to demonstrate how and when the Governor beat and abused him as alleged. Mr Kerr appeared and was interrogated as to how and when he was beaten. He replied he had nothing to say in this matter, having already appealed to the Queen and the Honourable Company. Besides, it was Sacrament week. For these reasons, the council declared Kerr's imputations to be false, frivolous, and void. Kerr was to pay all charges. Cornelius Sodington, being sworn, stated that during the Dutch ship's visit here, he invited the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		said Shipp To Dine with him at M.rs Golds who was then Strick in Drink and being In Discourse Said His Doctor told him That our Domine meaneing Doctor [Ken] was of The Same Religion as he was. What Sayes Jhon Depon.t Is o.r Doctor a Papist The Dutch Cap.t Leaned back and Said y.d Domine is a good man. M.rs Gold Sworn Saith That She heard The Dutch Cap.t Say That his Doctor told him That Doctor [Ken] was of The Same Religion as his Doctor was being a Papist. But has often heard him Say, But has often heard Say before, and after, That Doctor [Ken] was a good Man.	Captain to dine with him at Mrs Gold's residence. The Dutch captain was then drunk and, being in discourse, said his doctor told him that their Domine, meaning Doctor Kerr, was of the same religion as his doctor was. Sodington asked, "Is our Doctor a Papist?" The Dutch Captain leaned back and said the Domine is a good man. Mrs Gold, sworn, stated that she heard the Dutch Captain state that his doctor informed him Doctor Kerr followed the same religion as his doctor, who was a Papist. But she heard him say, before and after, that Doctor Kerr was a good man. Interpretations The Governor's issuance of a warrant for Kerr to appear demonstrated formal legal process. Rather than ignoring Kerr's accusation of physical assault, the Governor forced Kerr to either substantiate it or be exposed as making false accusations under formal examination. Kerr's refusal to provide details ("nothing to say") whilst citing his appeal to higher authorities constituted a legal dodge. He wanted the accusation on record to damage the Governor's reputation but would not substantiate it when formally challenged. The reference to "Sacrament week" as an excuse suggested Kerr was claiming it was inappropriate to engage in such contentious matters during holy week. This invoked religious observance as a shield from accountability, implying the Governor was impious for pressing the matter during sacred time. The council's declaration that the imputations were "false, frivolous, and void" was unequivocal condemnation. The three-part formulation - false (untrue), frivolous (without serious basis), and void (legally invalid) - comprehensively dismissed Kerr's claims. Ordering Kerr to pay costs added financial penalty to reputational damage. The testimony about the Dutch captain's doctor saying Kerr was Catholic provided external corroboration of existing suspicions. A neutral third party (Dutch physician) had independently identified Kerr as Catholic, giving weight to what might otherwise appear as local factional accusation. The repeated references to the Dutch captain saying Kerr was "a good man" functioned to moderate the Catholic identification. Even if Catholic, the Dutch captain judged him morally upright - a distinction between religious affiliation and personal character. Speculations Kerr's refusal to provide details about when and how the Governor beat him strongly suggests the accusation was fabricated. If genuine assault had occurred, Kerr would have possessed specific details to provide - date, location, witnesses, injuries. His silence when formally challenged revealed the hollowness of his claim. The timing of calling Kerr to account (30 May, eleven days after his protestation) suggests the Governor deliberately allowed time for Kerr to prepare evidence. When Kerr produced nothing despite ample opportunity, the council acted decisively to dismiss the allegations and impose costs. Kerr's invocation of Sacrament week may have been calculated to portray the Governor as impious for pursuing the matter during holy time. However, the council saw through this manoeuvre and proceeded anyway, recognising it as evasion rather than genuine religious scruple. The Dutch captain testimony carries particular weight because it comes from an independent foreign observer with no stake in local factional disputes. The fact that the Dutch captain's doctor identified Kerr as Catholic suggests either Kerr openly practiced Catholic devotions when away from English oversight, or his manner, conversation, and religious practice were

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			recognisably Catholic to those familiar with Catholic clergy. Sodington's specific question - "Is our Doctor a Papist?" - showed he was aware of the suspicions and seeking confirmation. The Dutch captain's equivocal response (leaning back, saying "good man" rather than directly answering) suggested discomfort with confirming it explicitly but also unwillingness to deny it. This diplomatic evasion itself served as partial confirmation. Mrs Gold's emphasis that the Dutch captain repeatedly called Kerr "a good man" may have been her attempt to defend Kerr despite the Catholic revelation. If she remained Allised with Kerr and Sodington in the anti-Governor faction, she would seek to minimise the damage of this testimony by separating religious affiliation from moral character. The order for Kerr to pay costs served dual purposes: punitive (penalising false accusations) and compensatory (reimbursing the Governor for the trouble of refuting baseless charges). This financial consequence gave real weight to what might otherwise be merely formal vindication, discouraging future reckless accusations.
158	136	Thomas [Gee] Sworn Saith That when Cap.t Sodington Invited the Dutch Cap.t to Dinner with him He heard him Say in December That his Doctor Told him, That our Domine, (meaneing Doctor [Ken]) was of The Said Religion as he was, but Sayes he I Don't believe any Such thing. He is a very Good man, and preached a Good Sermon Yesterday. John French Gunner and Daniel Griffith made Comp.te to Govern.r and Councill That Doctor [Ken] Upbraided them, of being Compelled To Give their Evidence In the matter betwixt him, and the Govern.r [the] [Last] Councill Day, for which They Desire Justice. It Is ordered. That The Said Doctor [Ken] be Summoned To Appear this Day fortnight, and prove what he has Alledged ag.t them. The Govern.r Haveing Informacon That Doctor [Ken] Did Neglect Comeing Into the Country, To bury a Child of Rob.t Addis his The Govern.r Summoned The said Addis To Declare whether he Spoke To Doctor [Ken] to perform That office who Sayes [...] He Did Send to him by a Messenger, But Reced. a Note from The Said [Ken], which he produced, and Is as followeth. M.r Addis Pray perform my office for me Sirie, I am taken Soe Ill with The Gripes That I Cannot Come up. I Pray God Comfort You both, I am your friend Send me the Childs Name and Sex. Jn.o [Ken]. To be put In the Register. The Govern.r Replies That this Is onely an Excuse for the said Doctor [Ken] waited from Morning till Night Evening to Goe a board. Witsesse M.r Rogers and M.r Cock.	Thomas [...], sworn, stated that during Captain Sodington's dinner invitation to the Dutch Captain, he heard the Dutch captain mention in December that his doctor informed him their Domine, meaning Doctor Kerr, followed the same religion. But the Dutch captain said, "I don't believe any such thing. He is a very good man, and preached a good sermon yesterday." John French, gunner, and Daniel Griffith made complaint to the Governor and Council that Doctor Kerr upbraided them for being compelled to give their evidence in the matter between him and the Governor [...] last council day. They desired justice for this. It was ordered that Doctor Kerr be summoned to appear in two weeks and prove what he alleged against them. The Governor, having information that Doctor Kerr neglected to come into the country to bury a child of Robert Addis, summoned Addis to declare whether he spoke to Doctor Kerr to perform that office. Addis stated [...] he sent to him by a messenger but received a note from Kerr, which he produced, as follows: "Mr Addis, pray perform my office for me, Sir. I am taken so ill with the gripes that I cannot come up. I pray God comfort you both. I am your friend. Send me the child's name and sex. John Kerr. To be put in the register." The Governor replied that this was merely an excuse, for Doctor Kerr waited from morning till evening to go on board. Witnesses: Mr Rogers and Mr Cock. Interpretations The third witness (Gee) to the Dutch captain conversation corroborated Sodington and Mrs Gold's testimony. Multiple independent witnesses heard the same conversation about Kerr's Catholic affiliation, making it reliable evidence rather than factional accusation. The Dutch captain's explicit denial ("I don't believe any such thing") despite his own doctor's claim showed either genuine disbelief or diplomatic distancing from a politically sensitive accusation. His praise of Kerr's preaching suggested he judged by observed Protestant worship rather than alleged Catholic affiliation. French and Griffith's complaint that Kerr "upbraided" them for giving compelled evidence demonstrated Kerr was retaliating against witnesses who testified in the Governor's favour. This intimidation of witnesses constituted serious misconduct beyond the original disputes.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The order for Kerr to appear in two weeks and "prove what he alleged" placed the burden on Kerr to substantiate his complaints against the witnesses. This mirrored the procedure used for Kerr's beating allegation - forcing him to prove accusations or face consequences for false claims. The matter of the child's burial revealed Kerr neglecting core pastoral duties. Burying a deceased child was a fundamental chaplain responsibility that should take priority over personal convenience or other activities. Kerr's note claiming illness ("gripes") provided written evidence of his excuse. The polite, solicitous tone ("I pray God comfort you both, I am your friend") contrasted sharply with the Governor's allegation of fraudulent absence, suggesting Kerr was maintaining appearances whilst actually avoiding duty. The Governor's rebuttal - that Kerr waited from morning till evening to board a ship - exposed the illness claim as fabricated. The Governor possessed witnesses (Rogers and Cock) who could testify to Kerr's actual activities that day, directly contradicting his written excuse. Speculations The Dutch captain's denial may have been diplomatic rather than sincere. As a foreign visitor in an English colony, he likely recognised the political sensitivity of confirming a chaplain's Catholicism. By praising Kerr whilst distancing himself from the accusation, he avoided entanglement in colonial factional disputes. The Dutch captain's praise of Kerr's sermon "yesterday" suggested Kerr was preaching Protestant sermons competently enough to convince even foreign Protestant observers. If Kerr was indeed Catholic, he maintained a thoroughly convincing Protestant façade in public worship, demonstrating sophisticated religious dissimulation. Kerr's upbraiding of French and Griffith for giving evidence indicated he knew which witnesses testified against him and was attempting intimidation. The council's order for him to prove his allegations may have been designed to stop him baselessly accusing witnesses of perjury or conspiracy to discredit future testimony. The timing of the burial request was significant. Addis's child presumably died recently, making burial urgent, particularly in tropical climate. Kerr's refusal to travel "up into the country" (inland from the fort) suggested inconvenient distance was the real deterrent rather than illness. Kerr's claim of "gripes" (severe stomach cramps) was medically plausible and would prevent travel. However, the Governor's evidence that he waited to board a ship revealed the contradiction - if too ill to travel inland, he was equally too ill to board a ship, exposing the selective application of his claimed incapacity. The witnesses to Kerr waiting to board (Rogers and Cock) included the same Mr Rogers who had accused Sodington of assault. Rogers was clearly aligned with the Governor's faction and positioned to provide damaging testimony against Kerr, adding to the accumulating evidence of Kerr's misconduct. Kerr's request for the child's name and sex "to be put in the register" showed he attempted to fulfil the administrative aspect of his duty (recording the death) whilst refusing the pastoral aspect (conducting the burial). This suggested either genuine belief in his excuse's legitimacy or deliberate maintenance of conscientious record-keeping appearance. The fact that Addis was told to find someone else to "perform my office for me" revealed practical consequences of Kerr's neglect. Presumably another person (lay or clerical) conducted the burial in Kerr's

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			absence, demonstrating the community was forced to work around the chaplain's failures to ensure basic religious services for bereaved families.
159	137	John Hemons Sen.r ffree planter being Sworn Saith. That He heard Doctor [Ken] publicly Say, That what he had To Say should tend to The Govern.rs Hond. and Advantage And That he never knew any thing, but That The Govern.r was A true, and faithfull Subject, To The Crown of England, or words To That Effect. Whereas On The 18.th of this Instant M.r John Rogers p.rsenteds his Petion. Setting forth That Cap.t Sodington forced open the Door of M.r Lufkins House The Said Cap.t Sodington Desires he might have Liberty To prove The Contrary. M.r Rogers Desires The following Evidence To be Sworn. M.r Goodwin Deposeth That on Monday The 15.th of this Instant. May, The Govern.r and Cap.t Sodington and himselfe Comeing on Shoar from The Lyampo Cap.t Monk Comander, and Comeing Into one of the Govern.rs Chambers, where were Madam Poirier M.rs Jane Goodwin a widdow, and his Sister In Law where Cap.t Sodington fell a Kissing, and Tonzeing or Rattling The Said widdow very Immodestly, though She Sev.t Times bid him Lett her alone, But he Still persisting In a very Eringering Manner. He Could not forbear Checking of him, at which The Gov.r took his part therein, Soe That Severall words arose between Cap.t Sodington and The Gov.r In Soe much That the Gov.r ordered him, To Goe to his Room Some time after The Depon.t The Deponent M.r Lufkin, and Wife with M.r Rogers and the aforesaid widdow took Leave of The Govern.r and Lady; And when wee Came Into The Down M.r Lufkin and Wife with M.r John Rogers Desired Us To Goe Into his house where we had not been Long but Cap.t Sodington but Cap.t Sodington Violently Lifted up The [Latch], and Soe opened the Door, and Came Into The Middle of The Room, where he Stood Looking upon out, And The other Round with his Left hand on his Sword Lifted up, where Haveing Stood In that posture with.t Speaking To any body, or any to him Some time, At Length M.r	John Hemons Senior, free planter, being sworn, stated that he heard Doctor Kerr publicly declare that his testimony would serve the Governor's honour and benefit, and that he knew nothing except that the Governor remained a true and faithful subject to the Crown of England, or words to that effect. On the 18th of this instant, Mr John Rogers submitted his petition alleging that Captain Sodington forced open Mr Lufkin's door. Captain Sodington desired he might have liberty to prove the contrary. Mr Rogers desired the following evidence to be sworn. Mr Goodwin deposed that on Monday the 15th of this instant May, the Governor, Captain Sodington, and himself came on shore from the <i>Lyampo</i>, Captain Monk commander. Coming into one of the Governor's chambers, where were Madam Poirier, Mrs Jane Goodwin (a widow), and his sister-in-law, Captain Sodington fell to kissing and tongueing [or rattling] the said widow very immodestly. Though she several times bid him let her alone, he still persisted in a very [...] manner. Goodwin could not forbear checking him, at which the Governor took his part. Several words arose between Captain Sodington and the Governor, insomuch that the Governor ordered him to go to his room. Some time after, the deponent, Mr Lufkin and wife, with Mr Rogers and the aforesaid widow, took leave of the Governor and Lady. When they came into the Down, Mr Lufkin and wife with Mr John Rogers desired them to go into his house. They were not long there when Captain Sodington violently lifted up the latch and so opened the door and came into the middle of the room. He stood looking upon them and around, with his left hand on his sword lifted up. Having stood in that posture without speaking to anybody, or anybody to him, for some time, at length Mr Interpretations Hemons's testimony about Kerr praising the Governor's loyalty demonstrated Kerr's earlier position contradicted his current accusations of treason. This documented inconsistency fundamentally undermined Kerr's credibility - a man who once publicly affirmed the Governor's loyalty could not credibly charge him with seditious words without explaining the reversal. Sodington's request to disprove Rogers' allegations showed active contestation rather than passive acceptance of charges. He was fighting the forced entry claim, suggesting confidence in his ability to present contradictory evidence or a different interpretation of events. Goodwin's deposition revealed serious sexual assault in the Governor's own chambers. Sodington's "kissing and tongueing" Mrs Jane Goodwin despite her repeated refusals constituted sexual assault witnessed by the Governor's wife, Goodwin's sister-in-law, and others in positions of social authority. The fact that Goodwin intervened to stop Sodington and the Governor supported Goodwin's intervention showed the Governor actively protecting Mrs Jane Goodwin from Sodington's assault. This was not passive observation but active intervention in defence of a woman being assaulted. The Governor's order for Sodington to go to his room treated him like a subordinate being disciplined, which would have been profoundly humiliating for the Deputy Governor. This public rebuke in the presence of the Governor's wife and guests marked a decisive break in their working relationship.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The later incident at Lufkin's house showed Sodington's threatening behaviour continued after being sent away. Violently lifting the latch and entering with hand on sword was an aggressive, intimidating posture that transformed a private social gathering into a confrontation. The fact that Sodington stood silently with hand on sword suggested deliberate intimidation rather than social visit. This was calculated menace - creating fear without providing clear legal grounds for action, since he neither spoke threats nor drew the weapon. Speculations Hemons's testimony may have been specifically solicited to counter Kerr's accusations. By documenting that Kerr once publicly praised the Governor's loyalty, it exposed Kerr's later charges of treason as recent fabrications rather than long-held concerns based on the Governor's actual conduct. Sodington's request to disprove the forced entry likely relied on Lufkin's earlier testimony that the door was "only latched" not locked. Sodington may have been arguing that opening a latched (not locked) door did not constitute "forcing" entry - a semantic distinction that would exculpate him on technical grounds. The sexual assault on Mrs Jane Goodwin in the Governor's chambers demonstrated Sodington's complete loss of self-control and respect for social boundaries. The presence of the Governor's wife (Madam Poirier) and Goodwin's sister-in-law made this particularly egregious - Sodington was assaulting a woman in front of respectable witnesses who could testify against him. Mrs Jane Goodwin's repeated requests for Sodington to "let her alone" and his persistence suggested either intoxication reducing inhibition or deliberate aggressive behaviour disregarding her consent. The description "very immodestly" implied the assault was graphic enough to shock witnesses accustomed to typical social interactions. The timing - 15 May (Monday), three days before Sodington's suspension on 18 May (Thursday) - suggested this sexual assault incident may have been the immediate trigger for the suspension decision. The Governor may have concluded Sodington's behaviour was too dangerous to tolerate further. Sodington's violent entry to Lufkin's house and standing with hand on sword suggested he was either seeking confrontation or attempting intimidation of those present. The fact that Mrs Jane Goodwin was among the group (having just left the Governor's chambers) may indicate Sodington was pursuing her specifically, continuing his earlier assault. The silent, threatening posture with hand on sword was calculated to frighten without providing clear grounds for legal action. Had Sodington spoken threats or drawn the sword, witnesses could testify to specific assault; by standing silently, he created fear whilst maintaining plausible deniability about his intentions.
160	138	Lufkin Drank to him, after which the Said Cap.t Sodington, Sat= Himselfe down, beside the aforesaid widdow, where he falls a Kissing and pulling her as before, at the Govern.rs She prsting him to Lett her alone, She arose and Goes to another part of The Room, He follows her In Soemuch She bid She would Goe home, He Answered He would Goe with her and Lye with her all Night, She Answered He should not. He Answered He would Lye In her house, too Night. He Still Urging That he would Goe with her. At Length when I Could not forbear any Longer. I arose and told him He should not Goe with her. He Said why, what was I her Bully I Answered no, her brother and would not Soe her abused while I was talking to him, M.r Rogers Said He wonderered Could bear Soe Long, And	Lufkin drank to him, after which Captain Sodington sat himself down beside the aforesaid widow. He fell to kissing and pulling her as before. She pressed him to let her alone. She arose and went to another part of the room. He followed her, insomuch that she said she would go home. He answered he would go with her and lie with her all night. She answered he should not. He answered he would lie in her house tonight. He still urged that he would go with her. At length when Goodwin could not forbear any longer, he arose and told him he should not go with her. Sodington asked, "Why? What am I, her bully?" Goodwin answered, "No, her brother, and I would not see her abused."

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		if It had been a Sister of his He Could not have born It. And that he Deserved To be Shutt At which there arose more words between them, but what they were I do not Remember. M.rs Lufkin Sworn Saith That Sometime Since Cap.t Sodington Came to her house, at The fort, The Door being Shutt, and Latcht, the Said Sodington Lifted up The Said Latch, and Came Into his house, with.t any Invita= tion or Leave, and after a Little Time behaved himselfe very Rudely, To M.rs Jane Goodwin, Upon which Some Stiff words arose In Soemuch Cap.t [Sodington] Said To M.r Goodwin Choose y.d Champion, and I will fight him. M.rs Lufkin Sworn Saith That after She and The Company went up From The fort and being Come Into their House. Latcht the Door, and Said, He Shan't Come In, (meaneing Cap.t Sodington) because Some Quarrelling was before among them, at the Governo.rs Lady But do not Know for what Manner, He Came Into the House She being In the back Room, And when She Came Into the fore Room, Saw Cap.t Sodington, Hugging and Kissing M.rs Goodwin, very Rudely, Upon which She Desired him Severall times To be Civil. but Still persisting Cap.t Goodwin, and M.r Rogers Got up, And Said if She was	Whilst Goodwin was speaking to him, Mr Rogers said he wondered Goodwin could bear so long, and if it was a sister of his, he could not bear it. He said Sodington deserved to be shot. At which there arose more words between them, but what they were Goodwin did not remember. Mrs Lufkin, sworn, stated that sometime since, Captain Sodington came to her house at the fort. The door being shut and latched, Sodington raised the latch and entered her house uninvited. After a little time, he behaved himself very rudely to Mrs Jane Goodwin. Some stiff words arose, insomuch that Captain Sodington said to Mr Goodwin, "Choose your champion, and I will fight him." Mrs Lufkin, sworn, stated that after she and the company went up from the fort and came into their house, she latched the door and said, "He shall not come in" (meaning Captain Sodington), because some quarrelling was before among them at the Governor's residence. But she did not know in what manner he came into the house, she being in the back room. When she came into the fore room, she saw Captain Sodington hugging and kissing Mrs Goodwin very rudely. She desired him several times to be civil, but he still persisted. Captain Goodwin and Mr Rogers got up and said, "If she was Interpretations The pattern of Sodington's conduct demonstrated serial sexual assault. At the Governor's chambers, then at Lufkin's house, he repeatedly kissed, pulled, hugged, and fondled Mrs Jane Goodwin despite her explicit and repeated refusals at every stage. Sodington's statement "I will go with her and lie with her all night" constituted an explicit declaration of sexual intent, escalating beyond inappropriate touching to stated intention of rape. This was not ambiguous flirtation but clear threat. Mrs Jane Goodwin's repeated refusals ("let me alone", "he should not", physically moving away) demonstrated non-consent at every stage. No reasonable person could interpret her actions as anything other than rejection. Goodwin's identification as "her brother" revealed the family relationship explaining his obligation to intervene. This was not interference by a rival suitor but legitimate family protection of a sister from sexual assault. Sodington's question "what am I, her bully?" suggested he viewed Goodwin's intervention as rival male claiming proprietorship over Mrs Jane Goodwin, not recognising legitimate family protection. He interpreted brotherly defence as sexual competition. Rogers' statement that Sodington "deserved to be shot" constituted serious escalation, suggesting Rogers believed Sodington's conduct warranted lethal response. This was not rhetorical exaggeration but considered judgement of proportionate force. Mrs Lufkin's testimony about an earlier incident showed this was pattern conduct, not isolated lapse. Sodington had previously entered her house uninvited and behaved rudely to Mrs Jane Goodwin, establishing prior history. Sodington's challenge to "choose your champion, and I will fight him" was a duelling challenge, showing he responded to objections about his sexual assault with threats of violence. Male intervention provoked combat challenge rather than self-examination. Mrs Lufkin's deliberate latching of the door and saying "he shall not come in" showed she anticipated Sodington would follow and attempt entry, based on his established pattern. She took defensive measures expecting his pursuit. The fact that Sodington entered anyway despite the deliberately latched door demonstrated determination to

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			continue pursuing Mrs Jane Goodwin regardless of physical barriers, explicit refusals, or social proprieties. Speculations Sodington's escalating conduct - from kissing and fondling to explicit statements of intent to "lie with her all night" - suggested either progressive intoxication reducing inhibition or deliberate escalation of sexual aggression emboldened by previous lack of consequences. The fact that Mrs Jane Goodwin was a widow may have made Sodington view her as sexually available or lacking male protection. His surprise at Goodwin's intervention ("what am I, her bully?") suggested he did not know Goodwin was her brother until that revelation. Rogers' statement that Sodington "deserved to be shot" may have been intended literally rather than rhetorically. In contemporary standards regarding protection of female family members from sexual assault, shooting the assailant might have been considered justified defensive action. The "more words" between Rogers and Sodington that Goodwin could not remember may have included Rogers threatening Sodington or Sodington challenging Rogers to a duel. The fact that Goodwin could not remember specific words suggested the confrontation was heated enough to blur details in memory. Sodington's earlier challenge to "choose your champion, and I will fight him" indicated willingness to duel any man who objected to his treatment of Mrs Jane Goodwin. He viewed male intervention as insult to honour requiring violent satisfaction rather than legitimate protection of woman from assault. Mrs Lufkin's deliberate latching of the door showed active attempt to prevent Sodington's entry. Her being in the back room when he entered suggested either he entered quietly to avoid confrontation at the door or she failed to hear his entry over household noise. The fact that Sodington immediately resumed "hugging and kissing Mrs Goodwin very rudely" upon entering indicated he came specifically to continue pursuing her sexually, not for social visit. The assault was his purpose, not incidental to other business. Mrs Lufkin's repeated requests for Sodington to "be civil" with no effect demonstrated he was completely unresponsive to social pressure or women's objections. Only male intervention - Goodwin and Rogers physically getting up - provided any check on his conduct, showing women's voices carried no weight with him.
161	139	His Sister He Should not Do, Soo, But would Kill him, or words To that Effect To which Cap.t Said before Kick, Cuff, box, bollock, and Could fight with 100 Such things as he was. Grace [Coulson] widdow Sworn Saith That when She M.rs Lufkin and M.rs Goodwin went up To M.r Lufkins house [Shutt] too the Door, and Said He Shan't Come here but p.rsently after Cap.t Sodington Came In the Said House, and Said, I had almost overtaken You. Jane Goodwin widdow Sworn Saith That after M.r Lufkin M.rs Coulson and her Selfe went Into M.r Lufkins House The Door being Shutt and Latcht Cap.t Sodington Lifted up The Latch and Came hastily in the House, and M.r Coulson, and the Sitting down, Cap.t Sodington Sat down between them, upon which this Depon.t removed and took another Seat. He followed her Immediately, and put his hand ab.t her neck, and Kissed her Severall times Very Rudely, upon which She Desired him to be Civill but Still persisting, Cap.t Goodwin her brother [Asked] him To be Civill And See did M.r Rogers And Said if She was his Sister He Should not Serve her So, if he did, He would Stabb him.	If she was his sister, he should not do so; if he did, he would kill him, or words to that effect. To which Sodington said, as before, [he could] kick, cuff, box, bollock, and could fight with 100 such things as he was. Grace Coulson, widow, sworn, stated that when she, Mrs Lufkin and Mrs Goodwin went up to Mr Lufkin's house, they shut the door and said, "He shall not come here." But presently after, Captain Sodington came in the said house and said, "I almost overtook you." Jane Goodwin, widow, sworn, stated that after Mr Lufkin, Mrs Coulson and herself went into Mr Lufkin's house, the door being shut and latched, Captain Sodington raised the latch and entered hastily. Mrs Coulson and she sat down. Captain Sodington sat down between them. The deponent removed and took another seat. He followed her immediately, placed his hand around her neck, and kissed her repeatedly with great rudeness. She desired him to be civil, but he still persisted. Captain Goodwin, her brother, asked him to be civil. So did Mr Rogers, and he said if she was his sister, he should not serve her so; if he did, he would stab him.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Mrs Mary Doss Spinster Saith That She heard M.r Rogers Say, That if M.rs Goodwin was his Sister, and He Served her So, He would Stabb him, for he Deserved It. M.r Rogers being asked by the Gov.r what He means by the word force, Declares that the Said Cap.t Sodington forced Himselfe, and Came Into Company where none Desired Him. John Hemonss made Compl.t ag.t Thomas Burnham for a debt And Desired he might be Summoned To appear this Day, but not being ready to Adjust his Accounts. It Is ordered. That they both Appear, this Day fortnight, To Adjust their Said Accounts.	Mrs Mary Doss, spinster, stated that she heard Mr Rogers say that if Mrs Goodwin was his sister and he served her so, he would stab him, for he deserved it. Mr Rogers, being asked by the Governor what he meant by the word "force," declared that Captain Sodington forced himself and came into company where none desired him. John Hemonss made complaint against Thomas Burnham for a debt and desired he might be summoned to appear this day, but they were not ready to adjust their accounts. It was ordered that they both appear in two weeks to adjust their said accounts. Interpretations Rogers' threat to kill or stab Sodington if he treated Rogers' sister that way demonstrated the gravity of Sodington's offence in contemporary masculine honour codes. Rogers viewed the conduct as warranting lethal defensive response, not merely social disapproval. Sodington's boast about fighting 100 such as Rogers showed he responded to serious threats with bravado rather than contrition or self-examination. He remained unrepentant and aggressively defiant despite multiple witnesses testifying against him. Grace Coulson's testimony that the women deliberately shut the door saying "He shall not come here" revealed collective female defensive action. The women recognised Sodington as threat and took coordinated measures to exclude him from their gathering. Sodington's statement "I almost overtook you" exposed his mindset: he was pursuing the women, treating their departure as flight he was chasing rather than rejection he should respect. The language of pursuit and overtaking revealed predatory intention. Jane Goodwin's direct testimony provided the victim's account in her own voice. Her moving away when Sodington sat between the women demonstrated immediate recognition of danger and attempt to create protective distance. Sodington's following her and placing his hand around her neck constituted physically restraining assault, not merely unwanted romantic advance. The hand around the neck suggested control or potential choking position beyond simple embrace. The fact that both her brother and Rogers asked Sodington to be civil showed multiple male interventions were required to address his conduct. Women's objections alone carried no weight with him; only male authority provided any check. Rogers' clarification about "force" - that Sodington "forced himself" into company where none desired him - addressed Sodington's likely technical defence about the unforced door. Rogers established uninvited intrusion as the relevant force, not physical breaking of locks. The debt case insertion amidst serious assault testimony showed routine colonial business continued alongside extraordinary misconduct proceedings. The council managed both criminal assault and civil debt claims in the same session. Speculations Rogers' escalation from "deserved to be shot" to "would kill him" to "would stab him" may have reflected increasing anger as successive witness testimonies revealed the full extent of Sodington's assault. Each account added detail that intensified Rogers' protective rage. Sodington's boast about fighting 100 such men suggested either drunken bravado or genuine belief in his combat superiority based on military experience. Either interpretation showed contempt for those threatening him and confidence in avoiding consequences through intimidation.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The women's collective action - shutting the door together and voicing their intention to exclude Sodington - demonstrated they recognised him as established threat based on his pattern of conduct. This was not first-time defensive reaction but response to known danger. Sodington's pursuit and statement "I almost overtook you" suggested he viewed their departure as challenge or game to be won, not as rejection requiring respect. The competitive language revealed he was treating sexual assault as sport or conquest. The detail that Sodington sat "between them" when the women sat together suggested deliberate insertion into female space to separate them and isolate his target. This tactical positioning showed calculated predation rather than clumsy social mistake. Jane Goodwin's immediate move to another seat when Sodington sat between them demonstrated recognition that physical proximity to him constituted danger. Her evasive action was instinctive self-protection from established threat. Sodington's hand "about her neck" could be interpreted as restraining grip or choking position beyond mere embrace. This physical control of her neck and head prevented her escape whilst he kissed her, transforming unwanted attention into physical restraint. The fact that Mrs Mary Doss (spinster) was present and testifying suggested multiple witnesses beyond direct victims and male defenders. This was public spectacle in a confined space, with Sodington performing his assault before numerous observers who could later testify against him. Rogers' strategic clarification about "forced himself into company" may have been coordinated with the Governor to establish clear legal grounds. By defining force as uninvited intrusion rather than broken locks, Rogers closed Sodington's likely defence that the merely-latched door was not "forced" in technical sense.
162	140	Gabriel Powell. Complaines that M.rs French bought an Earthen Jugg of his Black Girle, Contrary To a Law made In that Cale of Bartering with Blacks. And upon Examinacon of M.rs French and Witnesses, She Declares She told She was p.sent when her own Black bought The Said Jugg, which being ag.t The Law made In that Cole. It Is ordered. That the said M.rs French Shall pay 4 fold, and bych Black whipped, and pay Comuit her Cre. fine, In Consideracon of her poor Condition. Whereas. on The 27.th Instant, Serj.t Sanderson made Deposicon ag.t Cap.t Sodingtons Irregularities, on Thurs Night the 25.th Instant. Which Cap.t Sodington alledges Is In Some measure fals, And Desires That his Evidence may be Sworn. M.rs Gold Sworn Saith She went out of the fort before the Drum Came Into the fort, And That She Did not Say any thing to Brig.t Sanderson about minding his Duty, or that the Said. He was Comander of the fort and Denyed that ever the Said Sodington, Did her, or Daughter any harm. William Swallow Soldier Sworn Saith That as He was Comeing Into the fort with the Drum He met Cap.t Sodington, M.rs Gold, and her Daughter Just as he was Entering the fort, but Seeing them, Stood back To Lett them Goe by him, further Saith that he Saw Cap.t Sodington Strike M.rs Gold, and threw her down before the Centry, at the Sally fort=Gate which the Centry Seeing Said, Sir I thought You had known better than to Strike before the Centry, and took hold of him by the Arm whereupon Cap.t Sodington Said what's the matter with You, with that the Centry Stept back Cocked his peice, and bid him Stand off.	Gabriel Powell complained that Mrs French bought an earthen jug from his enslaved girl, contrary to a law made in that case about bartering with Blacks. Upon examination of Mrs French and witnesses, she declared she was present when her own enslaved person bought the said jug, which was against the law made in that case. It was ordered that Mrs French should pay fourfold [value], and [...] Black [be] whipped, and [...] fine, in consideration of her poor condition. On the 27th instant, Sergeant Sanderson made deposition against Captain Sodington's irregularities on Thursday night the 25th instant. Captain Sodington alleged this was in some measure false and desired that his evidence be sworn. Mrs Gold, sworn, stated she went out of the fort before the drum came into the fort, and that she did not say anything to Sergeant Sanderson about minding his duty, or that he was commander of the fort. She denied that Captain Sodington ever did her or her daughter any harm. William Swallow, soldier, sworn, stated that as he was coming into the fort with the drum, he met Captain Sodington, Mrs Gold, and her daughter just as he was entering the fort. Seeing them, he stood back to let them go by him. He further stated that he saw Captain Sodington strike Mrs Gold and throw her down before the sentry at the sally port gate. The sentry, seeing this, said, "Sir, I thought you knew better than to strike before the sentry," and took hold of him by the arm. Whereupon Captain Sodington said, "What's the matter with you?" The sentry stepped back, cocked his piece, and bid him stand off. Interpretations The law against Blacks bartering with each other was designed to prevent enslaved people from

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			developing independent economic activity outside owner control. Such laws aimed to prevent theft networks and accumulation of resources by enslaved people. Mrs French's punishment (fourfold payment) for being present when her enslaved person bought the jug demonstrated owners were held legally responsible for their enslaved people's violations of trade restrictions. Passive presence during illegal transaction constituted culpable participation. Mrs Gold's testimony directly contradicted Sanderson's earlier account. She denied speaking to Sanderson about his duty and denied Sodington ever harmed her or her daughter. This created a credibility contest between the Sergeant and a civilian Allised with Sodington's faction. Swallow's testimony directly contradicted Mrs Gold's denial of harm. He witnessed Sodington strike and throw her down, providing independent corroboration of the assault Sanderson described. This neutral soldier's account undermined Mrs Gold's exculpatory testimony. The sentry's intervention and specific rebuke - "I thought you knew better than to strike before the sentry" - showed even common soldiers felt empowered to intervene against Sodington. The phrasing suggested striking someone in the sentry's presence constituted particular affront to military authority and discipline. Sodington's response ("What's the matter with you?") revealed he viewed the sentry's intervention as impertinence rather than legitimate exercise of authority. He did not recognise that assaulting a woman before a sentry warranted military intervention. The sentry's cocking his musket demonstrated willingness to employ lethal force if necessary to protect Mrs Gold and enforce military discipline. This showed how completely Sodington's authority had eroded - common soldiers no longer deferred to his rank when he violated norms. Speculations The law against Blacks bartering was probably designed to prevent both theft networks (stolen goods resold among enslaved people) and accumulation of independent resources that might enable escape or rebellion. Preventing economic autonomy reinforced total dependency. Mrs French's "poor condition" mentioned in mitigation suggested economic struggle, perhaps as widow or person without significant resources. The fourfold payment may have been financially devastating, though the council showed some mercy in consideration of her poverty. Mrs Gold's contradictory testimony suggested either deliberate falsehood to protect Sodington (her factional ally), intimidation into changing her story, or possible confusion about which incident was being referenced. The timing - immediately after Sodington requested his evidence be sworn - suggested coordination rather than coincidence. Swallow's testimony carried particular weight because he was neutral witness arriving with the drum, with no apparent stake in factional disputes. His independent observation of the assault directly refuted Mrs Gold's denial, exposing her testimony as unreliable or false. The sentry's specific concern about striking "before the sentry" suggested military culture viewed assaults in the sentry's presence as affronts to military order itself. The sentry was not merely protecting Mrs Gold but defending the dignity of his post. Sodington's question "What's the matter with you?" to a sentry who just witnessed him assault a woman showed either extreme arrogance (believing his rank still protected him despite suspension) or genuine incomprehension that his conduct warranted

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			intervention. Either interpretation revealed profound disconnect from social norms. The pattern - Mrs Gold denying harm whilst independent witness (Swallow) and the sentry confirmed the assault - strongly suggested Mrs Gold was either coerced into false testimony or willingly lying to protect Sodington due to factional alignment. Her credibility was thoroughly compromised. The sentry's willingness to threaten lethal force against a Captain (even suspended) by cocking his musket showed military discipline had fractured. Common soldiers no longer recognised Sodington's authority when he violated basic norms, suggesting his suspension had effectively stripped him of practical power regardless of formal status.
163	141	John [Palyn] Sold.r Sworn, Saith That He And W.m Swallow went with the Drum and when, Come to The Sally fort=Gate, mett Cap.t Sodington, M.rs Gold, and her Daughter Just Comeing out of the fort, which made W.m Swallow Stop back being foremost. Edward Smith. Sworn Saith, That his Mast.r M.r Cornelius Sodington M.rs Gold, and Daughter went out of the fort before the Drum Came In, and bid at the Same time Leave M.r Manning In his Room who went on board, a Little after, [Cur.] He Saith That he Saw his Said Mast.r Give Sev.t Blowes to both Mother and Daughter. Fitts=Patrick. belonging To y.e Ship Lyampo, Sworn Saith That The Deputy Govern.r and M.rs Gold went out of the fort a Little before the Drum beat, and Left M.r Manning In his Room. who a Little after went on board. June 20.th 1704 Whereas. Cap.t Cornelius Sodington Represented Unto us That Since his Suspension, He hath behaved himselfe Soe as to bee Desireing a Reentering In his place againe. And whereas Nothing To the Contrary hath Come to our Knowledge. We are willing To Grant his Desire. Provided alwayes he Shall Continue To behave himselfe Soberly, prudently, and In the fear of God. It Is Therefore Ordered. That the Said Cap.t Sodington Shall Injoy all the benefit, of his place on the Provisto aforesaid. Monday June 26.th 1704 John Long Free planter Came to the Govern.r and Complained That Ralph Gates this Last Night Climb up his Chimney, and Got Into his House, In the Country, and went In at the Top of The Chimney, Into the Chamber, and my Son Edmond hearing A Noise, Said he beleived that Some body, was broke Into The Chamber, whereupon S.t H people being In the house,	John Palyn, soldier, sworn, stated that he and William Swallow went with the drum and when they came to the sally port gate, they met Captain Sodington, Mrs Gold, and her daughter just coming out of the fort, which made William Swallow stop back, being foremost. Edward Smith, sworn, stated that his master Mr Cornelius Sodington, Mrs Gold, and daughter went out of the fort before the drum came in. Sodington bid him at the same time to leave Mr Manning in his room, who went on board a little after. Smith stated that he saw his master give several blows to both mother and daughter. Fitzpatrick, belonging to the ship <i>Lyampo</i>, sworn, stated that the Deputy Governor and Mrs Gold went out of the fort a little before the drum beat, and left Mr Manning in his room, who a little after went on board. 20 June 1704 Captain Cornelius Sodington represented that since his suspension, he behaved himself so as to be desiring re-entry to his place. Nothing to the contrary having come to the council's knowledge, they were willing to grant his desire, provided always he should continue to behave himself soberly, prudently, and in the fear of God. It was therefore ordered that Captain Sodington should enjoy all the benefit of his place on the proviso aforesaid. Monday 26 June 1704 John Long, free planter, came to the Governor and complained that Ralph Gates last night climbed up his chimney and got into his house in the country. He went in at the top of the chimney into the chamber. Long's son Edmond, hearing a noise, said he believed that somebody broke into the chamber. Interpretations Palyn's testimony corroborated Swallow's account of encountering Sodington and the Gold women at the sally port gate, establishing multiple independent witnesses to the timing and location of the incident. Edward Smith's testimony was devastating to Sodington's defence. Sodington's own servant testified under oath that he witnessed his master deliver several blows to both Mrs Gold and her daughter Mary. Servant testimony against a master was rare and carried particular weight precisely because of the personal and economic risks involved. Smith's statement that he saw "several blows to both mother and daughter" directly contradicted Mrs Gold's earlier denial that Sodington ever harmed her or her daughter. This exposed Mrs Gold's testimony as false and demonstrated she was willing to commit perjury to protect Sodington. The reinstatement on 20 June, just over one month after the 18 May suspension, indicated the council determined Sodington's conduct during suspension demonstrated sufficient reform to warrant restoration to office. The speed of reinstatement suggests either pragmatic need for his administrative capacity or political pressure.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The condition that Sodington "continue to behave himself soberly, prudently, and in the fear of God" specifically addressed the documented problems: drunkenness (soberly), reckless and violent conduct (prudently), and moral failing (fear of God). The language made expectations explicit and measurable. The fact that Sodington was reinstated despite extensive sworn testimony documenting multiple assaults revealed either the council did not fully credit the assault testimonies, viewed one month suspension as proportionate punishment, or required his services as Deputy Governor regardless of personal conduct. The new burglary case involving Ralph Gates climbing down a chimney demonstrated criminal activity on the island continued beyond the Dutton/Scriven network already documented. This showed property crime was endemic rather than isolated to particular criminals. Speculations Edward Smith's willingness to testify against his master suggested either he was compelled under oath and chose honesty over loyalty, he harboured grievances against Sodington that overcame his economic dependency, or the council applied pressure ensuring truthful testimony. Whatever the motivation, his testimony carried exceptional credibility. The revelation that Sodington struck both mother and daughter added Mary Gold as victim to the documented violence. Mrs Gold's false testimony denying any harm to herself or her daughter was now thoroughly exposed by testimony from Sodington's own household. The council's willingness to reinstate Sodington despite this damning testimony suggested they either discounted the severity of assaults on women (particularly when victims denied harm), viewed temporary suspension as adequate punishment, or prioritised administrative necessity over disciplinary consistency. The Deputy Governor position may have been too important to leave vacant. The condition "behave himself soberly" explicitly addressed the intoxication underlying many of Sodington's violent incidents. The council recognised drunkenness as root cause requiring specific prohibition rather than assuming general good conduct would prevent alcohol abuse. The one-month interval between suspension and reinstatement may have represented minimum demonstration period for reformed conduct. Sodington likely remained deliberately inconspicuous during his suspension, avoiding incidents that would extend or make permanent his removal from office. The phrase "nothing to the contrary has come to our knowledge" suggested the council relied on absence of new complaints rather than positive evidence of reform. Sodington's strategy may have been simply avoiding further documented misconduct long enough to be reinstated. The Ralph Gates chimney entry demonstrated creative criminal methodology and ongoing property crime beyond the organised networks of Dutton and Scriven. Climbing down chimneys to access locked chambers showed determination and physical capability, suggesting Gates was experienced burglar rather than opportunistic thief.
164	142	below Staires, went up In the bed Chamber but Could See no body there then my Son John and Hatton Sterling went Into The Garrett, where In Searching ffound the Said Ralph Gates with The Clothes following In his Custody, as was told him this Morn[ing] To which he made oath. (viz.t) 1 black Silk Gown 1 Shoudy [Te] Red 1 Maslapatan Silk Doublet Green Lining. 1 white Damask Gown with Black [&] 1 Black Chinia Silk Petty Cote 1	You're absolutely right. Here is the full corrected text: John Palyn, soldier, sworn, stated that he and William Swallow went with the drum and when they came to the sally port gate, they met Captain Sodington, Mrs Gold, and her daughter just coming out of the fort, which made William Swallow stop back, being foremost. Edward Smith, sworn, stated that his master Mr Cornelius Sodington, Mrs Gold, and daughter went out of the fort before the drum came in. Sodington bid him

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		white Sattin petty Coat. 2 fine Shifts 2 Neckcloths 1 Hand kercheife 1 Save Guard. Silver Lays.d 1 Muslyn Neckloath new 1 p.r Drawers on 1 white Sattin Petty Coat. Martin Holden belonging To The Shipp Drumball Sworn Saith. That being Yesterday In the morn At the house of John Long In the Country, with Severall others The said Long Son Said he thought Some body, was above Staires whereupon Hatton Sterling went up Into the said Longs Bed Chamber, finding no body there, went up In to the Loft where the Said Hatton Sterling found the Said Ralph Gates with the abovesaid particulars In his Custody, and when brought down he Confessed he tooke those particulars In his Custody, out of the Said Longs Chamber, and Did hide a black Gown.r In a place In The Loft where he might Come to It at any time, and Said he Climbd up the Chimney whereupon I and others Seized him, with a Cothing Line and Set men to Stand over him. But they not watching him Constantly, Got Loose In the Night. James Wilson. Sworn Saith. To The Same Effect with the Said Houldin. Samuel Desfountain and Edward Bagley Churchwardens, Informed the Govern.r That they heard That Elizabeth Lansdown, Is with Child. And Desire She may be Examined. It Is ordered.	at the same time to leave Mr Manning in his room, who went on board a little after. Smith stated that he saw his master give several blows to both mother and daughter. Fitzpatrick, belonging to the ship <i>Lyampo</i>, sworn, stated that the Deputy Governor and Mrs Gold went out of the fort a little before the drum beat, and left Mr Manning in his room, who a little after went on board. 20 June 1704 Captain Cornelius Sodington represented that since his suspension, he behaved himself so as to be desiring re-entry to his place. Nothing to the contrary having come to the council's knowledge, they were willing to grant his desire, provided always he should continue to behave himself soberly, prudently, and in the fear of God. It was therefore ordered that Captain Sodington should enjoy all the benefit of his place on the proviso aforesaid. Monday 26 June 1704 Stephen Poirier, Governor Cornelius Sodington, Deputy Governor Present: Thomas Goodwin, Ensign John Long, free planter, came to the Governor and complained that Ralph Gates last night climbed up his chimney and got into his house in the country. He went in at the top of the chimney into the chamber. Long's son Edmond, hearing a noise, said he believed that somebody broke into the chamber. Interpretations Palyn's testimony corroborated Swallow's account of encountering Sodington and the Gold women at the sally port gate, establishing multiple independent witnesses to the timing and location of the incident. Edward Smith's testimony was devastating to Sodington's defence. Sodington's own servant testified under oath that he witnessed his master deliver several blows to both Mrs Gold and her daughter Mary. Servant testimony against a master was rare and carried particular weight precisely because of the personal and economic risks involved. Smith's statement that he saw "several blows to both mother and daughter" directly contradicted Mrs Gold's earlier denial that Sodington ever harmed her or her daughter. This exposed Mrs Gold's testimony as false and demonstrated she was willing to commit perjury to protect Sodington. The reinstatement on 20 June, just over one month after the 18 May suspension, indicated the council determined Sodington's conduct during suspension demonstrated sufficient reform to warrant restoration to office. The speed of reinstatement suggests either pragmatic need for his administrative capacity or political pressure. The condition that Sodington "continue to behave himself soberly, prudently, and in the fear of God" specifically addressed the documented problems: drunkenness (soberly), reckless and violent conduct (prudently), and moral failing (fear of God). The language made expectations explicit and measurable. The fact that Sodington was reinstated despite extensive sworn testimony documenting multiple assaults revealed either the council did not fully credit the assault testimonies, viewed one month suspension as proportionate punishment, or required his services as Deputy Governor regardless of personal conduct. Sodington's return to the council on 26 June meant he now sat in judgement on cases whilst his own violent conduct remained recently documented. The council's composition returned to its original three members - Poirier, Sodington, and Goodwin - despite the extensive record of Sodington's misconduct. The new burglary case involving Ralph Gates climbing down a chimney demonstrated criminal activity on the island continued beyond the Dutton/Scriven network already documented. This showed property crime was endemic rather than isolated to particular criminals.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Speculations Edward Smith's willingness to testify against his master suggested either he was compelled under oath and chose honesty over loyalty, he harboured grievances against Sodington that overcame his economic dependency, or the council applied pressure ensuring truthful testimony. Whatever the motivation, his testimony carried exceptional credibility. The revelation that Sodington struck both mother and daughter added Mary Gold as victim to the documented violence. Mrs Gold's false testimony denying any harm to herself or her daughter was now thoroughly exposed by testimony from Sodington's own household. The council's willingness to reinstate Sodington despite this damning testimony suggested they either discounted the severity of assaults on women (particularly when victims denied harm), viewed temporary suspension as adequate punishment, or prioritised administrative necessity over disciplinary consistency. The Deputy Governor position may have been too important to leave vacant. The condition "behave himself soberly" explicitly addressed the intoxication underlying many of Sodington's violent incidents. The council recognised drunkenness as root cause requiring specific prohibition rather than assuming general good conduct would prevent alcohol abuse. The one-month interval between suspension and reinstatement may have represented minimum demonstration period for reformed conduct. Sodington likely remained deliberately inconspicuous during his suspension, avoiding incidents that would extend or make permanent his removal from office. The phrase "nothing to the contrary has come to our knowledge" suggested the council relied on absence of new complaints rather than positive evidence of reform. Sodington's strategy may have been simply avoiding further documented misconduct long enough to be reinstated. Sodington's presence on the council from 26 June onwards created profound awkwardness. He now sat in judgement on criminal cases whilst his own recent violent assaults, sexual misconduct, and drunken disturbances remained matters of recent record. This compromised the council's moral authority. The Ralph Gates chimney entry demonstrated creative criminal methodology and ongoing property crime beyond the organised networks of Dutton and Scriven. Climbing down chimneys to access locked chambers showed determination and physical capability, suggesting Gates was experienced burglar rather than opportunistic thief.
165	143	Upon the Said Elizabeth Lansdowns Confession of being with Child By George Young Surgeon. That the said Shall Keep the said Hamlets, and To Provide Such Necessaries In the Time of her Lying as are Convenient, till In good health. June 26.th 1704 Samuel Desfountain The Right Hono.ble Companys Coow= Keeper being asked, how many of the said Companies Cattle Can be Spared. Sayes That about 106 head, of which twixt 20, and 30 are but ab.t 16 Months old. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Island S.t Helena Att a Court of Judicature Held on Tuesday The 4.th Day of July 1704. At The Sessions House near Fort=James. For The Tryall of John Scriven, Thomas Dutton and Ralph Gates. Stephen Poirier Judge Pr.sent. Cor: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign Then the Court opened According To The Usual Manner. and the Prisoners Sett To The Barr. And their Inditments Read.	Elizabeth Lansdown confessed to being pregnant by George Young, Surgeon. George Young was ordered to keep her harmless and to provide all appropriate necessities during her confinement, until her full recovery. 26 June 1704 Samuel Desfountain, the Right Honourable Company's Cow Keeper, was asked how many of the Company's cattle were available for release. He stated that approximately 106 head were available, of which between 20 and 30 were only about 16 months old. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Island of St Helena. Court of Judicature held on Tuesday 4 July 1704 at the Sessions House near Fort James, for the trial of John Scriven, Thomas Dutton and Ralph Gates. Stephen Poirier, Judge Present: Cor[nelius] Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign The court was opened in the customary manner. The prisoners were brought to the bar and their indictments were read aloud.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		To which Inditments, The Said Dutton, and Scriven pleaded Guilty, whereupon were [Sent] back To the place from whence they Came, there To Remain till further Order. Then Ralph Gates, Single man was brought To The Barr. And his Inditment Read. To which Inditm.t Pleaded Not Guilty.	Dutton and Scriven both entered guilty pleas and were returned to their place of confinement to await further order. Ralph Gates, a single man, was then brought to the bar. His indictment was read, to which he pleaded not guilty. Interpretations The Lansdown matter illustrates the colonial approach to bastardy: the father was identified through the mother's confession and held financially and practically responsible for her care during and after confinement. The Court of Judicature represents a separate criminal jurisdiction from the Governor's council, with Poirier presiding as judge and military officers constituting the bench. The formal proceedings at the Sessions House near Fort James point to a distinct institutional structure for criminal trials on the island. The separation of Dutton and Scriven, who entered guilty pleas, from Gates, who did not, reflects procedural logic: guilty pleas bypassed trial, while a not-guilty plea required further proceedings. Speculations The cattle inquiry of 26 June 1704, with Poirier and Goodwin as signatories, suggests a formal administrative review of Company livestock, possibly prompted by a request to provision visiting ships or to meet some specific supply obligation. Gates's not-guilty plea, despite his capture in the house with the stolen items and his apparent confession at the time, points to a recantation of his earlier admission, perhaps in the hope of a formal acquittal. The remand of Dutton and Scriven without immediate sentencing suggests that penalty could not be determined at court level alone and that instructions from the Company or a superior authority were first required.
166	144	Martin Houldon belonging To The Shipp Drumball being Sworn Saith The Same with what he Deposed the 26.th June Last. Hatton Sterling Singleman Sworn Saith That on Sunday Last was Sevensnight He was at the House of John Long who had not been there above 2 hours but heard The Said Longs boy Say, That he thought Some body was Lott up In the Loft, whereupon this Depon.t went up at The End of the House, neat the Chimney and Asked who was there 2 or 3 times, At Last Ralph Gates Said It Is I You. Sayes this Depon.t what doe You doe here, no thing Sayes he I thought of no Harm, for I had no Intent To Rob the House but the Company thinking otherwise They Seized him with a fishing Line. James Wilson Sworn, Saith, That after the said Gates was tyed. He went to him, and asked him, what was the Reason He went up Into the Loft. He made Answ.r for no harm, for he had no Intent To Rob the House no Sayes I, why did You meddle with the Clothes. and hide the Black Gown and 2 bottles of Sack. He made Answer I put the Gown there onely To make them Look about for It. Soe The Jury withdraw and brought The Prisoner In not Guilty. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin A Ccopy of Mr [Kers] Retractacon. Island S.t Helena July 4.th 1704. This Day the God. by the Marshall Haveing Sent for me To proceed to prove Something In a Late Appeal, which I found my Selfe Sev.t Months agoe oblidged to make Immediatly to the her Majesty: and mediatly to the Company. And the Said Gov.r at my Petion haveing produced the Companys Last Letter by the Shipp Featherstone Cap.t Hurdy's Comander, wherein they forbid any more	Martin Houldon, of the ship <i>Drumball</i>, was sworn and confirmed his testimony of 26 June. Hatton Sterling, a single man, was sworn and testified. The previous Sunday, Sterling was at John Long's house for no more than two hours when Long's boy mentioned that he thought somebody was [...] up in the loft. Sterling went up to the end of the house near the chimney and called out two or three times, asking who was there. Ralph Gates eventually answered that it was him. Sterling asked what he was doing there. Gates replied that he meant no harm and had no intention of robbing the house. Those present thought otherwise and seized him with a fishing line. James Wilson was sworn and testified. After Gates was tied, Wilson approached him and asked why he went up into the loft. Gates replied that he intended no harm and had no intention of robbing the house. Wilson asked why he then meddled with the clothes and hid the black gown and two bottles of sack. Gates replied that he put the gown there only to make them search for it. The jury withdrew and returned a verdict of not guilty. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin A copy of the retraction of Mr [Kers], dated Island of St Helena, 4 July 1704. That day the Governor, through the Marshall, sent for [Mr Kers] to give evidence in a recent appeal, an appeal [Mr Kers] was obliged seven months earlier to bring directly to Her Majesty and indirectly to the Company. Interpretations Sterling's testimony introduces significant detail absent from Holden's earlier account. Sterling was the person who physically confronted Gates near the chimney; Gates identified himself and offered an explanation without further prompting; and the seizure

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			was made with a fishing line, not the clothes line Holden described. The two testimonies are consistent in substance but differ in these particulars. The not-guilty verdict, returned despite the recovered items, shows that the jury required proof of criminal intent. Gates's explanation that he hid the gown only to provoke a search, however implausible, was apparently sufficient to raise doubt, and no direct evidence of actual removal was established beyond possession. The retraction document connects to a separate legal dispute: an appeal made seven months earlier both directly to the Crown and through the Company as intermediary, pointing to a complaint of some seriousness about island governance that reached the highest levels of authority. Speculations Wilson's questioning of the bound Gates, pressing him on the hidden gown and the two bottles of sack, was clearly intended to establish criminal intent through the prisoner's own admissions. The decision to question him informally while still secured, rather than waiting for formal examination, suggests those present expected a confession rather than continued denial. A reluctance to convict a mariner on circumstantial evidence, when no act of removal from the premises was directly witnessed, offers one explanation for the not-guilty verdict. The two bottles of sack named by Wilson did not appear in the original inventory of recovered items, which raised questions about the completeness of the evidence before the court. The retraction document, dated on the same day as the Gates trial, suggests a single sitting of the court dealt with both matters. An appeal lodged seven months earlier and directed simultaneously to the Crown and the Company implies a grievance of unusual gravity, one the appellant felt required the attention of both authorities at once.
167	145	Wranglings on Such ocations In Compliance with their Pleasure and Petion. I publicly withdraw In face of open Court my Said Appeal and Every thing Consequent thereupon Since the Day and Date of Its making And do freely Reform my Self To The Companies Judgm.t and Censure If I have Acted any thing Contrary to the Principles of Charity, and Humanity against the Said God. Notwith= Standing I Do protest against The fine this Day Imposed on me for not proceeding In the said Appeal after the Said peaceable Intention was Read, and Known. To the Govt and Comit, and after my Resolucon of withdrawing the said Appeale was alwa.s made known to them. Desiring That this Very Retracon of the Said Appeal, may be Recorded In the Companies Bookes, and Sent home to Our Hono.ble Masters and that all other papers Relating to the Said Unhappy Difference be Cancelled, and annulled and Destroyed as I will Do upon oath with all Coppyes Relating to them now In my possession. And this I Do for Peace Sake, as well as In obedience To the Companies ord.rs. Witness my hand, Day, and place above written. John [Ker] M.r John [Ken] who thinks he may as well blind the Eyes of our Hono.ble Masters as he Does poor Ignorant Lay's here, Although for a Little while) under a plansable Pretence of obedience. To our Said Masters, Did Read publicly This Day a Voluntarie all Discourse, Since (with Submission To our Masters) The Import of their orders Dated the 21 December Last I have Designed To forbid me to Show them what Ill Tridalment I have received from him Continually. But It Is a plain Comand to him, To Cease Such Malitious proceedings for the future ag.t a person who never gave him the Least Provocacon. But as I have Said before would faythn have The proceedings hush, and Dead. To	The Company's most recent letter, brought by the ship <i>Featherstone</i> under Captain Hurdy, forbade any further disputes of this kind, in compliance with the Company's wishes and petition. In open court, [Ker] withdrew his appeal and everything that arose from it since the day it was made. He submitted freely to the Company's judgment and censure if he acted contrary to the principles of charity and humanity towards the Governor. He protested, nonetheless, against the fine imposed that day for failure to pursue the appeal, particularly given that his peaceful intention was read aloud and made known to the Governor and Committee, and his resolution to withdraw was at all times communicated to them. [Ker] requested that the retraction be recorded in the Company's books and sent to the Honourable Masters, and that all other papers relating to the dispute be cancelled, annulled and destroyed, including all copies in his possession at that time, as he was willing to confirm on oath. This he did both for the sake of peace and in obedience to the Company's orders. Witnessed by his hand at the day and place above written. John [Ker] A further statement followed, asserting that [Ker] regarded the Honourable Masters as no less open to deception than the poor ignorant laypeople of the island. Under a plausible pretence of obedience to the Masters, if only briefly, [Ker] read out in open court that day a statement presented as wholly voluntary. With deference to the Masters, the intent of their orders of 21 December 1703 was to forbid the writer from showing them the continual ill treatment received at [Ker]'s hands. Yet those same orders constituted a plain command to [Ker] to cease such malicious proceedings against a person who gave him no cause for complaint. [Ker] was eager to have all proceedings buried and

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		the End our Said Masters be Reprieved of Such meanes By which as Through A fine Looking Glass, they may See his Naturall Character. What better or more Innocent times then, Can I Sho In Vindicacon of my Innocency but To Record Such Ill passages when He Shall Cease to persecute me. then I Protest, I Will Cease to Record It. But being on Oppos.d, and per= petual ord.rs from our Said Masters That Every body Shall Sett down In writing the matter of their Controversyes That they may pass their Judgm.ts on It, In Pursuance Soe.	forgotten, thereby depriving the Masters of the means by which, as through a clear glass, his true character was plain to see. No better or more innocent means of vindicating innocence existed than to record such instances of ill conduct. The writer declared that when [Ker] ceased his persecution, the recording was to cease in turn. Interpretations The retraction, signed in open court, was a formal legal act that ended [Ker]'s appeal and submitted him to Company censure. His protest against the fine reveals the limits of his compliance: he accepted the Company's authority in principle while contesting specific aspects of its exercise. The recording of a counter-statement immediately following [Ker]'s signed retraction shows that the court records served not merely as minutes of proceedings but as a vehicle for contested claims, with both parties lodging their positions for transmission to London. The two conflicting readings of the Company's orders of 21 December 1703 - one party claiming they forbade the writer from exposing [Ker]'s conduct, the other that they commanded [Ker] to cease malicious proceedings - expose the ambiguity within Company directives that both sides exploited in turn. Speculations The fine imposed for failure to pursue the appeal, even after the intention to withdraw was declared to the Governor and Committee, points to a court that advanced proceedings regardless of the parties' stated positions, possibly because the presiding judge was not a disinterested party. [Ker]'s insistence that the retraction and all related papers be sent to the Honourable Masters suggests he regarded London as a more sympathetic forum than the local court, and that the retraction was partly a manoeuvre to ensure the full record of the dispute reached the Company's directors. The counter-statement's description of [Ker]'s obedience as a plausible pretence suggests the relationship between [Ker] and the island authorities was thoroughly hostile, and that the formal retraction resolved little of the personal antagonism at the heart of the dispute.
168	146	To the Said ord.rs I Declare I shall Send to Them The Record of all the Late Injustice Done To me by the said M.r [Ken] without any breach of the said ord.rs aforesaid To be Long of It as I Said before being but a positive order To the said M.r [Ken] To Do Soe noe more. As for CALLisng The said M.r [Ken] In the Morning The True Ocasion was, That Sev.t persons haveing Given their Complaint To me ag.t him for many Abuses Comitted, which were not yet Decided. And Chiefly John French Master Gunner, and Henry Cole Bayliff. And being a Gen.lle Sessions Ocasioned by these Criminalls persons now In the Goale. Thought I Have me To be behind, But To Goe Justice To All. That no body might have ocasion of Complaint. And as Concerning what he Saith That It was, his Desire I Read Our Masters orders, Is not true. But was of my own motion To The End. The world Should Know, The Justice my Masters have done me. And how far, I have Reason to Rely, on their wonted bounty. In fine Concerning the fines Imposed on him. It Don't Concerne me Altogether but In Vindicacon of Witnesses who were Hunted To have been In plain English Corrupted by me. Therefore Notwithstanding his Appeal. It Is ordered. That The Said M.r [Ken] To pay two Dollars, as a fine To my Honoble Masters. July 7.th 1704. The Govern.r haveing been Informed That The very next Day after the said Doctor [Ken] Declared In the	Under those same orders, the writer declared that a record of all the recent injustice done by [Ker] was to be sent to the Masters without breach of those orders, since it amounted to nothing more than a direct order to [Ker] to stop. As for the summons served on [Ker] that morning, the true reason was that several persons submitted complaints against him to the writer for numerous unresolved abuses, chiefly John French, Master Gunner and Henry Cole, Bailiff. A General Sessions was convened on account of the criminal persons then in the gaol, and the writer resolved not to fall short in dispensing justice to all, so that nobody was left with cause for complaint. As for [Ker]'s claim that it was at his request the writer read out the Masters' orders, this was untrue. The reading was at the writer's own initiative, intended to make known to the world the justice the Masters showed the writer and how far the writer was justified in relying on their accustomed favour. On the matter of the fines imposed on [Ker], this did not altogether concern the writer except in vindication of witnesses alleged, in plain terms, to have been corrupted by the writer. Notwithstanding [Ker]'s appeal, an order was issued that [Ker] was to pay two dollars as a fine to the Honourable Masters. 7 July 1704. The Governor was informed that the very next day after Doctor [Ker] declared in humble petition before the whole court, pledging in writing to give the Governor no further cause for complaint or oath and making a great show of compliance with the Masters' orders and of his pretended desire for peace,

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Petion's Humble before the whole Court He would not for the future Give any ocasion. To the Govern.r of Comp.te or oath as he offered by his writing aforesaid, making a great Show of his Compliance with our Masters orders, And for his p.rtended quietable Sake. But To The Contrary Did the 5.th Instant Say. Severall offensive words against y.e Governor.	[Ker] said several offensive words against the Governor on 5 July 1704. Interpretations The writer's justification for summoning [Ker] to the General Sessions - unresolved complaints from John French and Henry Cole alongside the ongoing criminal proceedings - shows the Governor treating the dispute with [Ker] as one item in a broader docket of unfinished business rather than a personal matter warranting separate process. [Ker] is here identified as a Doctor for the first time in these records, indicating a professional title, most likely as a physician, which placed him among the island's educated inhabitants and gave him a social standing from which to contest the Governor's authority with some credibility. The order to pay two dollars, issued notwithstanding [Ker]'s appeal, confirms that the colonial court treated an outstanding appeal as no bar to the imposition of punishment, a posture consistent with the Governor exercising the combined functions of administrator and judge. Speculations The writer's insistence that reading out the Masters' orders was his own initiative, not [Ker]'s request, directly contests [Ker]'s version of the same event. The point at issue - whose idea it was to read the orders - points to a contest over who appeared more deferential to Company authority, since the person who prompted the reading stood in a weaker position before the Masters. The report of offensive words on 5 July, the day after the formal pledge of 4 July, suggests [Ker]'s compliance was extracted under immediate pressure and abandoned the moment proceedings concluded. The gap of two days before the Governor was informed on 7 July points to a formal complaint lodged through proper channels rather than a direct confrontation. The allegation that the writer corrupted witnesses, dismissed here as grounds for the fines, reveals that [Ker]'s appeal rested in part on an attack on the integrity of the prosecution's witnesses - a tactic that, whether well founded or not, the Governor felt obliged to address in the public record.
169	147	And Did that Same Night at Supper In the Hall Knock upon The Table with The Handle of a Knife. As Though he had been In a Tavern. In Soemuch That he Disturbed the Govern.r In his Chamber. And Inquireing Into The Reason was Informed He wanted Some Sauce. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Island S.t Helena At a Consultacon Held on Wednesday The 19.th Day of July 1704 At Fort=James. Steph: Poirier Govern.r Present. Cor: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign Whereas. M.r George Young Surgeon, Contracted with Us To Serve The Right Hono.ble Companye for one year which Is now Expired. And the Said Young being not willing To Serve the said Companye any Longer, without an Allowance of a Servant, and other Necessaries as Could be &c Therefore Desired Leave To Goe off. Whereas John Scriven, and Thomas Dutton Prisoners. and Comited of Theft. It Is ordered. By Cap.t Sodington, and M.r Goodwin's Votes, That they Shall be Kept In Iron, and To work, at Ruperts Till Such time as an outward bound Ship arrives here, That Is bound To Bensola. According To The Right Hono.ble Companys Instrucons. Dated 4.th March 1681 or Till their Pleasure be further Known. The Govern.rs Opinion Is Contrary	That same night, at supper in the hall, [Ker] knocked on the table with the handle of a knife as though he was in a tavern, causing such disturbance that the Governor was unsettled in his chamber. The reason was enquired into, and the Governor was informed that [Ker] wanted some sauce. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Island of St Helena. Consultation held on Wednesday 19 July 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor Present: Cor[nelius] Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign George Young, Surgeon, contracted with the council to serve the Company for one year, a period now expired. Young was not willing to serve the Company further without an allowance of a servant and other necessities. He therefore requested leave to depart. John Scriven and Thomas Dutton, prisoners convicted of theft, were the subject of the following order. By the votes of Captain Sodington and Mr Goodwin, Scriven and Dutton were to be kept in irons and put to work at Rupert's until an outward-bound ship arrived destined for Bensola, in accordance with the Company's instructions of 4 March 1682, or until the Company's further pleasure was known. The Governor's opinion was contrary. Interpretations The table-knocking incident extends the Governor's record of [Ker]'s conduct into the domestic sphere, placing a breach of household order at supper

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			alongside the earlier offensive words. The detail that [Ker] merely wanted sauce positions the Governor as the victim of calculated bad manners rather than any serious affront, while still entering the episode formally on record for the Company's consideration. George Young's request to depart on the expiry of his contract, conditional on the Company providing a servant allowance and other necessities, reveals the limited terms on which medical staff served on the island. His case carried particular weight given his recently imposed obligation to maintain Elizabeth Lansdown through her confinement. The Governor's recorded dissent from the majority vote on Scriven and Dutton shows that the council was capable of overruling the Governor on sentencing. The order carried on the votes of Sodington and Goodwin alone, with Poirier's contrary opinion entered separately - a formal procedure that preserved minority positions in the record for scrutiny in London. Speculations The instruction to hold Scriven and Dutton in irons until a ship bound for Bensola arrived, under Company instructions of 4 March 1682, suggests transportation to another East India Company outpost was the standard penalty for theft on St Helena. Ships bound for that destination called infrequently, leaving the prisoners facing an indefinite period of labour at Rupert's before departure. The Governor's dissent from the transportation order points to a different view of appropriate punishment, possibly a harsher local sentence or an objection to the specific destination. The fact that the order carried without him shows the council was not simply an instrument of the Governor's will. George Young's decision to seek improved conditions at the precise moment his contract expired suggests a deliberate negotiating tactic. The Company needed a surgeon on the island, and the expiry date gave him leverage he was unlikely to hold at any other point in his service.
170	148	And He Doth Ground It Thus. 1.st That It is now a perpetuall p.rcedent, from all y.d Factoryes In India To Send Criminalls Deserving Death, To England. To y.d Hond. 2.ly. These Criminalls have Comitted Burglary, Soe often, and To Sev.t persons Those persons, and The Publick will be In a perpetuall feo, and fear. And 3.ly. The very persons wronged being not Satisfyed will have great ground To Complaine That Instead of Haveing them punished According To Law, We make there Estates Pre Shall be apt T.r Demand after The Rate of 4 fould [for] the Damages done to them. In ffine This Island groweing numerous. And the most part poor Shall prove rather an Incouragm.t to the wicked, then a [Curse] July 24.th 1704. Whereas. M.rs Sarah Rider widdow, Did Upon 22.th Inst[ant] Deliv.r an Acumal of Two hundred and ffive Dollars Hire from one Richard Persion, Passenger on board The Ship Polphester And Refuses, the Payment thereof, To The Truth of which She hath Deposicon of. Joseph [Herringham] being Sworn Saith That Upon Thursday Last, this Depon.t was In place when M.rs Rider Delivered 20 Dollars To M.r Richard Person, who [...] She Delivered the Same Said I hope you will be as Good as y.d word, (meaneing That he would marry her) At A Certain time appointed, According To their Agreeem.t Who Answered he would goe home first, and upon his Return would Certainly marry her. Sam.ll Needham. Sworn Saith That He Saw M.r Person with a Collar that watch In his hand Studded with Silver, which he Supposes To have been M.rs Riders. Henry Long Sworn Saith That about 8 or 10 Dayes Since He Saw M.r Person with a watch on his head he	The Governor grounded his dissent as follows. First: it was a perpetual precedent across all the factories in India to send criminals deserving death to England, to the Honourable Company. Secondly: these criminals committed burglary so often and against several persons that those persons and the public were left in a perpetual state of feud and fear. Thirdly: the wronged parties, being unsatisfied, were left with strong grounds to complain that instead of the criminals being punished according to law, those parties were apt to demand fourfold compensation for the damages done to them. In sum, with the island's population growing and the greater part of it poor, such a course of action proved rather an encouragement to the wicked than a [...]. 24 July 1704. Mrs Sarah Rider, widow, on 22 July 1704 presented an account of two hundred and five dollars owed to her as hire by Richard Person, a passenger on board the ship <i>Polphester</i>, who refused payment. A deposition to the truth of this was made. Joseph [Herringham], sworn, testified that on Thursday 20 July he was present when Mrs Rider delivered 20 dollars to Richard Person. On handing over the money, she expressed the hope that Person would be as good as his word, meaning that he would marry her at a time agreed between them. Person replied that he would go home first and on his return would certainly marry her. Samuel Needham, sworn, testified that he saw Richard Person with a [...] watch in his hand, studded with silver, which he believed to be Mrs Rider's. Henry Long, sworn, testified that about eight or ten days previously he saw Richard Person with a watch

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Believes To be the watch of M.rs Rider Haveing Seen the Same at M.rs Riders house. And further Saith	about his person, which he recognised as Mrs Rider's, the same watch he saw at her house. Interpretations The Governor's three grounds form a coherent argument against transportation: precedent from the Indian factories supported sending death-deserving criminals to England rather than to Bensola; the repeated nature of the burglaries left multiple victims in ongoing fear; and the failure to apply the law locally left wronged parties with grounds to pursue fourfold compensation, carrying its own social and financial risks for the island. The summary observation, that a growing and predominantly poor population made lenient treatment of criminals an incentive to further crime, extends the argument beyond the immediate case. Poirier positioned himself as attending to the island's long-term governance rather than merely the disposal of two prisoners. The Sarah Rider case combines a debt claim with a promise of marriage and apparent property theft. The testimony about the matrimonial agreement and the watch reveals that the financial and personal strands of the dispute were thoroughly entangled, with Person making use of the marriage promise as cover for extracting money and property from Mrs Rider before departing. Speculations The Governor's invocation of fourfold compensation points to a biblical or common-law standard (Exodus 22:1) as the residual remedy available to victims if criminal punishment was not carried out locally. Raising this standard served as both a legal argument and a practical warning: leaving victims legally unsatisfied was not simply unjust but financially and socially dangerous for the island's order. The account of Mrs Rider's words on delivering the 20 dollars - expressing hope that Person would honour the marriage agreement - suggests she regarded the payment as part of a financial commitment to the prospective marriage rather than a loan or gift. This explains the description of the full 205 dollars as hire: the figure encompassed both services rendered and money advanced in good faith towards the marriage. Henry Long's identification of the watch about Person's person as the same one seen at Mrs Rider's house points to Person helping himself to the watch before leaving the island on the <i>Polphester</i>, as part of a broader pattern of extracting value from Mrs Rider under the cover of the marriage promise.
171	149	That M.r Marshbourn Told him That M.r Person Said he Designed To Stay here, and marry the widow. George Hodgkinson. Sworn Saith That about 10 or 12 Dayes Since M.r Goodwin told him that M.r Carne Got a watch Upon which, he asked him, what a Clock It was upon which he took Out his watch and Looking upon It thought It to be the watch of one John Goodwin. whereupon the said Person Desired him To make no words of It. Least It might Create a [Talk]. But Since this Depon.t Recollecting himselfe Did verily believe It was The watch of M.rs Rider. Edward Marshbourn. Saith That talking of M.rs Rider, M.r Person told him that he had a Great Respect for her. And Designed To Stay here, and Marry her. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Island S.t Helena. Att a Consultacon. Held on Wednesday the 26.th Day of July 1704 At Fort=James Steph: Poirier Govern.r Cap.t Sodington Deputy Govern.r Tho: Goodwin Ensign Whereas. Haveing brought out of the ffleet Lately Departed Some Quantity of Sugar Cheshire Cheese, and Madera Wyne. on Acc.t of the Right Hono.ble Company. And have fixed the Prices following	Long further testified that Marshbourn told him Person said he intended to stay on the island and marry the widow. George Hodgkinson, sworn, testified that about ten or twelve days previously, Mr Goodwin told him that Mr Carne obtained a watch. On asking the time, a watch was produced, which Hodgkinson thought to be the watch of one John Goodwin. Richard Person then requested him to say nothing about it, lest it cause [talk]. On reflection, Hodgkinson believed it to be Mrs Rider's watch. Edward Marshbourn testified that in conversation about Mrs Rider, Person told him he held great respect for her and intended to stay on the island and marry her. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Island of St Helena. Consultation held on Wednesday 26 July 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor; Captain Sodington, Deputy Governor; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign The following prices were fixed for goods brought from the recently departed fleet on Company account:

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Sugar at 13.d p.r.lb Cheese at 12.d p.r.lb. Wynd at 5.5. p.r Gall. Whereas. Richard Wright Henry Markham, and Joseph Oglethorpe Haveing Petitiond their Shipps Did this Day p.rsent Their Petion Unto Us, Setting forth that their Comander Haveing threatned To molest them, by Drubbing of them at the Gangway at pleasure. M.r Thomas Goodwin Is of Opinion that The 2 men (which belonged to the Halifax Cap.t Hudson Comander.) Shall work at Ruperts but one Month. The Cap.t Haveing Sent the Consuain for y.t [Drohn] who told them The Cap.t Said	Sugar at 13 pence per pound Cheshire cheese at 12 pence per pound Madeira wine at 5 shillings 5 pence per gallon Richard Wright, Henry Markham and Joseph Oglethorpe came forward from their ships and presented their petition to the council that day, setting forth that their commander threatened to molest them by beating them at the gangway at his pleasure. Mr Thomas Goodwin was of the opinion that the two men belonging to the <i>Halifax</i>, Captain Hudson commanding, were to work at Rupert's for one month only. Interpretations The three watch testimonies - from Needham, Hodgkinson and Long - converge on Person having Mrs Rider's watch in his possession. Person's immediate request for Hodgkinson's silence shows an awareness that possession of the watch required explanation, amounting to an attempt to forestall a witness before any formal complaint arose. The price-fixing of goods brought from the fleet illustrates the Company's role as sole importer and price-setter for basic provisions on the island, operating a controlled retail arrangement with no competitive market. Sodington's designation as Deputy Governor in the 26 July entry, where earlier records listed him simply as Deputy, reflects either a formal change in title or more precise recording of a role he already held. Speculations Marshbourn's and Long's testimonies both confirming Person's stated intention to marry Mrs Rider suggest his promises were not a passing remark but a repeated assertion made to multiple people, lending the appearance of genuine matrimonial intent while he extracted money and property from her before departing. Person's candour with Marshbourn about his intentions - speaking openly of great respect and marriage plans - suggests he either underestimated the social connections of a small island or was genuinely committed to the marriage at the time and changed his mind before leaving on the <i>Polphester</i>. Goodwin's proposal for one month's work at Rupert's for the <i>Halifax</i> men, set against the indefinite detention imposed on Scriven and Dutton, points to a distinction between sailors with a grievance against their officer and convicted felons. The shorter term suggests the case was treated as a disciplinary dispute rather than a criminal matter.
172	150	If they would not Come, to Stay away and be Damned and when that time Is expired to be retained as follows. Till an oppor= =tunity p.r.sents of Sending them home to England. and whilst at work To have but 9.d per day to Maintain them In Vituals, and other Necessaryes. Cap.t Sodington Is of The Same opinion The Govern.r Is of opinion that According To The [Decis] of their own Petion, and our former Proclamacon ag.t Such persons as Run away which Presume these men are In the Same Cale, as appears by their Said Petion, being perswaded they are Rambling fellowes and Knaves as Wright himselfe hath proved Soe, when he Lived here Some time ago, In Contracting ffit= Marriage A Young Womann In this Island when he had a wife who is the [Plalionge] In a Shipp from India, a week before he was, mar= And Consequently Cannot Look upon them but as Rouges and fitter to Inure people In this Island Soe to wickedly Rather Than the Companys any Service and That they ought to be Kept In Irons. and to work at the Companys fortificacons, till a Shipp Arrives To Send them home, and y.r y.t their Sallary be Reffrond= on our pleasure. And to p.rvent the Comanders from Incurage men to Run away of this Island.	The Captain sent the coxswain to the [...] with word that if the men would not return to their ship, they were to stay away and be damned. On the expiry of that period, they were to be retained until an opportunity arose to send them home to England. While at work they were to receive no more than 9 pence per day for victuals and other necessities. Captain Sodington was of the same opinion. The Governor was of the opinion that, according to the [...] of the men's own petition and the former proclamation against deserters, these men fell into the same case, as their petition showed. He was persuaded they were wandering rogues, as Wright himself proved when he lived on the island some time previously: Wright contracted a [...] marriage with a young woman there while he already had a wife who was [...] on a ship from India, a week before he married. The Governor consequently regarded them as rogues, better suited to corrupt the island's inhabitants wickedly than to render the Company any service. They were to be kept in irons and put to work at the Company's fortifications until a ship arrived to send them home, their salary [...] at the council's pleasure. Commanders were to be prevented from encouraging men to desert the island.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Upon Cap.t Sodington, and M.r Goodwins Opinion, being The Major votes. It Is ordered That Richard Wright and Joseph Ogle =thorpe work at Ruperts at the Rate of 9.d. p.r Diem And That no person Shall Drift them more than In Vituals at 9.d. p.r Diem Which Shall be published by Advertizem.t and they Shall Receive a wait, for y.t Security of payment. And as For The other man Henry Markham Haveing willfully Deserted his Ship, To work According to our former order. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	On the majority votes of Captain Sodington and Mr Goodwin, an order was issued. Richard Wright and Joseph Oglethorpe were to work at Rupert's at the rate of 9 pence per day. No person was to advance them more than victuals at 9 pence per day. This was to be published by advertisement, and they were to receive a [...] as security for payment. Henry Markham, who wilfully deserted his ship, was to work under the former order. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations The Captain's message through the coxswain - that the men were to stay away and be damned if they refused to return - formally terminated the ship's obligation to them and transferred responsibility to shore authorities. The council's order confirmed this transfer, setting the terms of their maintenance and labour on the island. The Governor's detailed invocation of Wright's past bigamy as evidence of current character shows that the island's records retained personal histories available for use in later proceedings. Poirier's application of one man's prior misconduct to all three petitioners reveals that collective judgment was made on the basis of a single member's known history. The distinction in the final order between Wright and Oglethorpe on one side and Markham on the other shows graduated punishment applied according to the nature of each offence. Wright and Oglethorpe received the milder nine-pence working regime, while Markham, as a deliberate deserter, fell under the harsher indefinite terms of the former order. Speculations The prohibition on advancing the men more than nine pence per day, to be published by advertisement, suggests that without this restriction private individuals on the island extended credit or hospitality to detained men, softening their punitive conditions. The advertisement served to close off this avenue of relief. The Governor's characterisation of the men as more likely to corrupt the island than to serve the Company - anchored in Wright's bigamy and their wandering nature - reflects an anxiety specific to St Helena's position as a port of call. The regular arrival of ships brought transient men whose presence, if left unregulated, threatened the order of a small and tightly governed community. The Governor's recorded dissent, set alongside the majority order as in the Scriven and Dutton case, confirms a pattern in which Poirier consistently advocated harsher punishment than his council and consistently lost the vote. The formal recording of his position served to register his view for review in London.
173	151	Island S.t Helena. At a Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 1.st of August 1704 At Fort=James. Stephen Poirier Govern.r Present. Cor: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas. M.r John Alexander One of The Councill Haveing Served the Right Hono.ble for the Space of Seaven Years at a small Sallary, Did this Day Desire We would take It Into our Consideracon. To Allow him Such Additionall Sallary as we Should Think fitt. Which Takeing Into our Consideracon. Thought The Said Alexanders Request but Reasonable. And To Encourage him. It Is ordered. That the Said M.r Alexander be Allowed Sin pounds p.r Annum more, Added To his former Sallary which Is 26.£ p.r Annum. To Comence from the 20.th July Last. Whereas. being In want of Some Officers To Succeed Some Submitt for Misdemeanands Have made Choise of John [Wirth]. To be Corporall, and Paul Graton	Island of St Helena. Consultation held on Tuesday 1 August 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor Present: Cor[nelius] Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign Mr John Alexander, one of the council, served the Company for seven years at a small salary and that day requested the council take into consideration allowing him such additional salary as it thought fit. The request was found reasonable, and an encouragement to Alexander. An order was issued that Mr Alexander be allowed an additional [six] pounds per annum, added to his existing salary of £26 per annum, to commence from 20 July 1704. The council, being in want of officers to succeed those removed for misdemeanours, chose John [Wirth] as Corporal, with Paul Graton named for further appointment. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		[Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Interpretations John Alexander's seven years of service at a low salary before any increase was sought or granted shows the modest financial terms on which long-serving council members operated on the island. The council's characterisation of his request as reasonable and as an encouragement reveals pay reviews as both a matter of fairness and a deliberate instrument of retention. The backdating of Alexander's increase to 20 July 1704, eleven days before the consultation, shows the matter was effectively settled informally before formal entry, with the consultation recording an agreed outcome rather than deliberating one. The appointment of new officers to fill posts vacated by misconduct shows that the officer complement was reduced to operationally problematic levels, making the appointments a practical necessity rather than routine expansion. Speculations Alexander's seven years at a low salary before seeking an increase points to a governance model that relied on the absence of competing employers on the island to retain officials rather than competitive pay. The request, once made, was immediately granted, suggesting the council recognised its obligation to him rather than debating the matter. The disciplinary removal of officers and the consequent need for fresh appointments, presented in the same consultation as Alexander's salary review, suggests misconduct among officers was a recent and acute problem. Taken together with the criminal proceedings of the preceding weeks - Scriven, Dutton, Gates, Wright and Markham - the entry points to an unusually turbulent period on the island in the summer of 1704.
174	152	Island S.t Helena. Att a Consultacon. Held on Tuesday The 15.th day of August 1704 At Fort=James. Gov.r Poirier Cap.t Sodington Cap.t Goodwin Whereas. The Deputy Govern.r Cap.t Sodington Represented to the Gov.r and Councill, That the Right Hono.ble Companye Contracted with him y.t To Allow him 2 Servants out of the Soldiery, but to Duly Equality with other Soldiers In their Intervalls. That before Cap.t Sodington Came to this Island a Sold.r was Appointed To Collect The Custom who was Allowed five pounds a Year but No not think It Reasonable To Allow Either of the Said Cap.t Sodingtons Serv.t any Such Sallary, Upon Consideracon. He has been Allowed him, which were not before to his p.rdes.r To which The Govern.r Sayes that Cap.t Sodington was never Denied the two Servants He never Demands But with this proviso that one of them Shall Collect the Customes In Shipping time and the other to waite on the Said Cap.t Sodington and freed from Duty But when Shipping Is over to Duty According to the Companys ord.rs. Cap.t Goodwin Is of opinion that Cap.t Sodingtons 2 Servants ought to duty, as other private Centinels According to the Companys ord.rs. That whereas the Deputy Govern.r objects against the Govern.rs Paragraph aforesaid for These particular Reasons. 1.st His bargain with the Company was to have 2 Servants to Attend him, who Should not be At the Govern.rs Comand nor to doe any Duty, but Upon Alarums, and to make any Contract with them as he thought fitt, and were to be Mustered as Sold.rs for his profit Nevertheless ever Since I Came over have been Allowed but one to my Great Disadvantage the other being Constantly Employed by the Gov.r about occasions. And though formerly All Deputy Gov.t men, that Gathered the Customs were Allowed five pounds per Annm Sallary being Allowed and Settled by Govern.r and Councill. Yet the Govern.r will not Allow	Island of St Helena. Consultation held on Tuesday 15 August 1704 at Fort James. Governor Poirier; Captain Sodington; Captain Goodwin The Deputy Governor, Captain Sodington, represented to the Governor and council that the Company contracted with him to allow two servants drawn from the soldiery, the servants to do duty on equal terms with other soldiers in their intervals. Before Sodington's arrival, a soldier was appointed to collect the customs and was allowed five pounds a year. The Governor did not think it reasonable to allow either of Sodington's servants any such salary. On consideration, [...] was allowed to him, which was not given to his predecessor. The Governor responded that Sodington was never denied the two servants he requested, but with the proviso that one was to collect customs during shipping time and the other to wait on Sodington, freed from duty. When shipping was over, both were to do duty according to the Company's orders. Captain Goodwin was of the opinion that Sodington's two servants were to do duty as other private sentinels, according to the Company's orders. The Deputy Governor then objected to the Governor's position for the following particular reasons. First: his agreement with the Company was for two servants to attend him, not to be at the Governor's command nor to do any duty except in emergencies, and with whom he was free to make any arrangement he thought fit. They were to be mustered as soldiers for his profit. Since his arrival, however, only one servant was made available to him, to his great disadvantage, the other being constantly employed by the Governor. The men of all former Deputy Governors who collected the customs were allowed five pounds per annum salary, settled by Governor and council. Yet the Governor did not allow Sodington this salary, even though Sodington provided a man to collect the customs.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		me It, tho' I find a man that Gathers It. ffor The Regularity of which I	Interpretations The dispute between Poirier and Sodington about the servants shows a governance conflict between the two most senior officials on the island, with Sodington formally accusing the Governor of commandeering one of his contracted servants. The recording of both men's positions in the consultation confirms that these disputes were conducted as much for the benefit of Company review in London as for immediate resolution. Goodwin's appearance as Captain in this entry, where all earlier entries listed him as Ensign, marks a significant change in council composition. His consistent alignment with the Governor on every contested matter makes the promotion a notable development in the island's internal power structure. The customs salary of five pounds per annum, though a small sum, became a point of principle for Sodington: he cited precedent under previous Deputy Governors and his current provision of the collector to argue the Governor had no basis for withholding it. The dispute follows a pattern in which Sodington used established practice to challenge Poirier's administrative decisions. Speculations Sodington's assertion that one of his contracted servants was constantly diverted to the Governor's use is a serious claim in contractual terms. By formally entering it in the council record, Sodington built a case for compensation or enforcement that he clearly intended to place before the Company's directors rather than resolve locally. The structure of Sodington's argument, citing his original contract with the Company, established precedent under earlier Deputy Governors and specific breaches of both, mirrors the strategy visible in [Ker]'s retraction documents earlier in these records. Both men treated the consultation record as a mechanism for appealing over the Governor's head to higher authority in London.
175	153	Refer my Selfe, To my Hono.ble Masters. Phillip Lodget. Corporall Complains To the Govern.r and Councill that on the 1.st day of this Instant Going up the Valley mett with Richard Gurling ffree planter who Struck him Severall blows with his Cane which hath Caused him, to be Lame Some time, In one of his Armes. The Defend.t Gurling being p.rsent doth Acknowledge he Struck the Said Lodgett. for Giveing him the Lye Upon his taxing him of Reading a Report on his Mother In Law Elizabeth Morris Decd. John Howetson. being Sworn Saith That He Saw Corporall Lodgett and Richard Gurling walking Up the Valley, together and when they Came between the Watercourse and M.r Marshbournes Saw them Stop, and Rich.d Gurling Strike the Said Lodgett 4 Blowes with his Cane, and bid him Draw his Sword, and Indeavoured to take the Said Lodgetts Sword from his Side. Sam.ll Price Sold.r Sworn Saith That he Saw Richard Gurling Strike Corporall Lodgett with his Cane And Closed In with him with an Intent, to take his Sword from him as he thinks. John Myers. Sworn Saith, That Standy In the Valley heard 3 or 4 blowes Struck with a Cane and one Say. Draw y.d Sword, whom he Suppoles To be Rich.d Gurling. It Is ordered. That the Said Richard Gurling for Breach of peace be fined the Sum of one Dollar To the R.t Honoble Companys and forb.d, To Strike the Said Lodgett for the ffuture, Upon pain of Sevear punishm.t and to pay Comuit Cost.	For the regularity of which, Sodington referred himself to his Honourable Masters. Philip Lodget, Corporal, complained to the Governor and council that on 1 August, going up the valley, he encountered Richard Gurling, a free planter, who struck him several blows with his cane, leaving him lame in one arm for some time. The defendant Gurling, being present, acknowledged striking Lodget on the grounds that Lodget called him a liar when Gurling charged him with spreading a report about his mother-in-law, Elizabeth Morris, deceased. John Howetson, sworn, testified that he saw Corporal Lodget and Richard Gurling walking up the valley together. When they reached the ground between the watercourse and Mr Marshbourn's, he saw them stop. Gurling struck Lodget four blows with his cane, told him to draw his sword and attempted to take the sword from Lodget's side. Samuel Price, soldier, sworn, testified that he saw Richard Gurling strike Corporal Lodget with his cane and close in on him with intent, as he believed, to take his sword. John Myers, sworn, testified that, standing in the valley, he heard three or four blows struck with a cane and someone say "Draw your sword," whom he believed to be Richard Gurling. An order was issued that Richard Gurling was to pay a fine of one dollar to the Honourable Company for breach of the peace, was to refrain from striking Lodget in future upon pain of severe punishment, and was to pay the committee's costs.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Martha Steward Widdow brought this Day her Decd. Husband W.m [Crisborn's] Steward	Martha Steward, widow, appeared before the council that day regarding her deceased husband William [...]. Interpretations The Gurling case illustrates the council's handling of a street assault between a civilian and a military officer. Gurling's acknowledged provocation - Lodget calling him a liar in response to being charged with defaming his deceased mother-in-law - received no formal consideration in the order, which addressed only the breach of the peace. The graduated response, combining a financial penalty, a prohibition on repetition and costs, reflects the council's standard approach to minor public violence. The attempt to take Lodget's sword and the command to draw it gave the assault the character of a duelling challenge and the forcible disarmament of a military officer, both significantly more serious than a simple breach of the peace, though the order treated the matter as the lesser offence only. The appearances of widows before the council - first Mrs Rider, now Mrs Steward - suggest the Governor and council served as the primary forum for personal and estate affairs in the absence of dedicated civil or probate courts on the island. Speculations Gurling's readiness to assault a Corporal publicly, with multiple witnesses present, suggests his sense of injury over the alleged defamation of his deceased mother-in-law outweighed any calculation of risk. The specific grievance - a report about a dead woman - points to a community dispute over the Morris family's reputation that predated the encounter in the valley. The location of the confrontation, between the watercourse and Mr Marshbourn's property, appears in these records for the second time: it was also where witnesses gathered in the Richard Person case. The repeated appearance of the same landmarks and individuals across unrelated matters points to the small and densely interconnected social world in which the island's free planters and Company officials lived.
176	154	Stewards Last will and Testament In ord.r To be proved Which was Done by the oathes, of John Alexander Richard Alexander and Joseph Coe who do Attest this will now produced To be the Last Will and Testament of the Said Steward and that they Knew of no other made by him Either In word, or writing. It Is ordered. That the Same be Accepted, and Taken for his Last Will and Testament. And Coppies Given when Desired. Charles Heward. Free planter. made Comp.te To Govern.r and Councill That Robert Swallow, and Richard Swallow his brother, went Into his House, when him Selfe was And wife were not at home, and took away Some Salt And Heaven's Last Sev.rall other things, So not know, but they might have them. Robert and Richard Swallow. Say that they only went To the Said Stewards To borrow a Little Salt of their Blacks, and they would Give them as much again, the next time they fetcht any. Elizabeth Swallow being Sworn Saith That when her Sons brought home the Salt, She asked them where they gott It, they borrowed It of Charles Stewards Blacks, and Would pay It again. when they fetcht any next. Edward Bagley. Churchwarden Informed the Gov.r That Charles [Steward] told him on Yesterday Last that W.m Swallow had played at Cardes, on the Sabath Day with a black, or blacks. John Cleverley Gunner Mate being Sworn Saith. That on Sunday Last was 3 weekes he went from the fort To M.rs Cagnalds. House In the Country where he found W.m Swallow and a black man of Jn.o Bagleys named Cotty, one Sitting one Side of y.e Table, and the other Sitting the t' other with a pack of Cards, and Some	William Steward's last will and testament was produced for probate, proved by the oaths of John Alexander, Richard Alexander and Joseph Coe. All three attested that the will produced was Steward's last will and testament and that they knew of no other made by him, either verbal or written. An order was issued that the will be accepted as his last will and testament and that copies be given on request. Charles Heward, free planter, complained to the Governor and council that Robert Swallow and his brother Richard Swallow went into his house while he and his wife were absent and took some salt and [...] several other things, the nature of which he did not know, though he believed the Swallows had them. Robert Swallow and Richard Swallow said they only went to Charles Steward's house to borrow a little salt from his slaves and were to return as much when they next fetched any. Elizabeth Swallow, sworn, testified that when her sons brought home the salt, she asked where they obtained it. They told her they borrowed it from Charles Steward's slaves and were to pay it back when they next fetched more. Edward Bagley, Churchwarden, informed the Governor that Charles [Steward] told him the previous day that William Swallow played cards on the Sabbath with a slave or slaves. John Cleverley, Gunner's Mate, sworn, testified that on Sunday 23 July 1704 he went from the fort to Mrs [Cagnald's] house in the country, where he found William Swallow and a slave belonging to John Bagley named Cotty, one sitting on one side of the table and

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Money	the other on the other, with a pack of cards and some money. Interpretations The probate of William Steward's will shows the council acting as a surrogate probate court, with three witnesses attesting the will's authenticity and a formal order accepting it. The provision for copies on request suggests the estate was expected to attract several interested parties. The salt dispute turns on a contested distinction between borrowing and theft: the Swallows claimed they borrowed with the knowledge of the household's slaves in the owners' absence, while Heward characterised the entry as unauthorised. The discrepancy between the Swallows' account - that they went to Charles Steward's house - and Heward's complaint - that it was his own house - remained unresolved in the record. The card-playing matter illustrates the combined function of churchwarden and civil court in moral enforcement. Bagley's formal report to the Governor, followed by Cleverley's sworn testimony placing Swallow at a card table with money, shows Sabbath-breaking treated as a matter for the full consultation rather than a purely ecclesiastical concern. Speculations The Swallows' claim that they borrowed salt through the slaves in the master's absence suggests slaves on the island acted as informal neighbourhood intermediaries, extending household goods on credit without direct authorisation from their owners. This points to a degree of agency in daily transactions that the formal record does not otherwise acknowledge. The combination of Sabbath-breaking and gambling with a slave - conducted at Mrs [Cagnald's] house in the country, away from the fort - suggests William Swallow deliberately sought a setting beyond the usual reach of observation. The slave at the table belonged to John Bagley, the apparent kinsman of Churchwarden Edward Bagley, who brought the original report: a detail that suggests the information reached Bagley through family knowledge of his relative's slave's whereabouts.
177	155	Money between them Upon which he went out of doors Again and Immediately the Said W.m Swallow followed him And Desired him To Say Nothing of his being there with the Black; And Said he would never do Soe anymore. Charles Steward. Desires of the Councill That Decision of his Complaint might be Referred To the Country. Which was Ordered Accordingly. It Is Likewise Ordered. That the Said W.m Swallow for playing At Cards with The Black on the Sabbath being fully Satisfyed, be fined one Dollar to the Church. and To work at Ruperts one week with.t pay, or wages. And if Doe found Guilty of The Like Crime again Then To be fined the Same And To work At Ruperts for a whole Month, without pay as aforesaid. and To pay Councill Cost. William Marsh. Free planter. Complaines of Joseph Coe for Refuseing To pay him fifteen Shillings which he ow'd him. It Is ordered. That the Said Joseph Coe pay the Said W.m Marsh As Soon as p.rcable he Can out of his growing Salary Lipin Wills. Free planter. P.rsentd A Petion Setting forth That a Robbery Comitted In the House of Marg:t Colgrave then In the postion of Thomas Gargon was Suspected To be Done by a Black of his Comon Which was obleidged by an ord.r of Councill, To pay the Said Thomas Gargon and John Cloverring what they Sware was Stolen from them. But the Said Robbery being Comited by John Scriven According To his Confession Prayes he may be Repay.d the Said Sume back again.	Money lay between them. Cleverley went back outside, whereupon William Swallow immediately followed him and asked him to say nothing of his being there with the slave, giving assurances it was to happen no more. Charles Steward requested the council that the decision on his complaint be referred to the country. This was ordered accordingly. An order was likewise issued that William Swallow, for playing cards with a slave on the Sabbath, the charge being fully proved, was to be fined one dollar to the Church and was to work at Rupert's for one week without pay or wages. On any future conviction for the same offence, he was to be fined the same amount, was to work at Rupert's for a whole month without pay and was to pay council costs. William Marsh, free planter, complained against Joseph Coe for refusing to pay fifteen shillings owed to him. An order was issued that Joseph Coe was to pay William Marsh as soon as practicable from his accruing salary. Lipin Wills, free planter, presented a petition. A robbery was committed in the house of Margaret Colgrave, then in the possession of Thomas Gargon, and was suspected to have been carried out by one of Wills's slaves. By order of council, Wills was compelled to pay Thomas Gargon and John Cloverring what they swore was stolen from them. The robbery was later established to have been committed by John Scriven,

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		It Is ordered. That the Said Thomas Gargon and John Cloverring To Repay, the Said Lipin Wells Soe much	according to his confession. Wills prayed to be repaid the sum he was forced to pay. An order was issued that Thomas Gargon and John Cloverring were to repay Lipin Wills. Interpretations Swallow's immediate pursuit of Cleverley to solicit his silence - and his acknowledgment that it was to happen no more - served as an effective self-incrimination before any formal examination. The council's satisfaction that the charge was proved owed as much to this exchange as to Cleverley's sworn testimony. The order allowing Joseph Coe to discharge his debt from his accruing salary rather than immediately reveals a practice of treating future earnings as available credit, suggesting Coe held a salaried Company position whose anticipated pay was recognised as security for private obligations. The Wills petition connects retrospectively to the Scriven conviction at the 4 July court: Scriven's guilty plea and confession cleared a slave unjustly suspected of the robbery and created a restitution obligation on those who received compensation under the earlier erroneous order. The council's willingness to act on this connection shows the records serving as instruments of retrospective correction. Speculations Charles Steward's request that his complaint be referred to the country suggests a preference for community-based resolution over formal council adjudication, possibly because the parties were neighbours whose dispute called for a local settlement rather than a formal ruling. Swallow's solicitation of Cleverley's silence points to anxiety beyond the immediate legal risk: a free settler gambling with a slave on the Sabbath, at a private house in the country, touched on both religious observance and the island's social order. His readiness to approach a witness the moment he was seen suggests acute awareness of the gravity of both dimensions. The Wills petition reveals that a slave was held financially accountable for a robbery later proved to have been Scriven's work, with the master compelled to make good the loss under a council order. The remedy came only through Scriven's subsequent confession, pointing to a practice in which suspected slave involvement produced immediate financial penalties on owners before full investigation.
178	156	Money as they have, upon Demand, or According as they Shall Agree. William Beales Complaint ag.t Henry Cole be Referred To a Jury at next Quarter Sessions. M.r Thomas Goodwin. According to Letters of Attorney. Impowering him to Demand and Receive of all p.rsons whatsoever All Debts, Goods Merchandizes Chattles &c. Severall from Ephraik and Ellen Moor Spinster. Did Accordingly make Demand of The Executors of M.r Edmond Edmonds. Decd for the Sume of 12.£. and 2.s Which M.r Hodgkinson, and M.r Francis the Executors Have potted, and Accordingly. It Is ordered. That the Said Execut.rs pay the Said M.r Thomas Goodwin The Sume aboves.d Allowing themselves Reasonable Charges &c of the Said payment. And Conformely Discharged from the [Said] Sume Demanded. Whereas. my Decd. Mother Ann Coles bod Lately Decd. John Cole of the Said Island free planter, and Son and heir of my Decd. Mother. Do hereby Certifye that my Said Mother did freely, and Absolutely Give Grant, and Bond. Unto my Sister Mary the wife of M.r Nathaniel [Conway], a parcell of Ground and house Standing thereon. Lying In Chappell Valley And Do Moreover to my Cetain Knowledge Repute That I Saw,	Thomas Gargon and John Cloverring were to repay Lipin Wills as much money as they held, upon demand or as they agreed between them. William Beale's complaint against Henry Cole was referred to a jury at the next Quarter Sessions. Mr Thomas Goodwin, acting under letters of attorney empowering him to demand and receive from all persons all debts, goods, merchandise, chattels and so forth, severally from Ephraik Moor and Ellen Moor, spinster, accordingly made demand of the executors of Mr Edmond Edmonds, deceased, for the sum of £12 and 2 shillings. The executors, Mr Hodgkinson and Mr Francis, [...] accordingly. An order was issued that the executors were to pay Mr Thomas Goodwin the sum stated, allowing themselves reasonable charges for the payment, and were accordingly discharged from the sum demanded. John Cole, free planter of the island and son and heir of his recently deceased mother Ann Cole, certified that his mother freely and absolutely gave, granted and bound to his sister Mary, wife of Mr Nathaniel [Conway], a parcel of ground and a house standing thereon, lying in Chapel Valley. Further, to his certain knowledge, he saw his deceased mother deliver some cattle to John Hardingg, who sold the ground and house to his mother. Cole thereby renounced all his right and

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		my Decd. Mother Deliver Some Cattle Unto John Hardingg who Sold the Said Ground, and house, to my Said M[other] And Do quit All my Right, and title to the Same. Witnes my hand this 19.th day of August 1704 John Cole I Nathaniel Conway Husband. To Mary the Sister of John Coles aboves.d Do Hereby Acknowledg To Have Recd. of and from the Said John Coles my brother In Law All Such Legacies, Goods, and Chattles, And All things whatsoever as doth, or may Appertain to my Said wife. And Do Acquitt, and Discharge the Said Coles from Every parte and parcell thereof. As Witnesse my hand this 15.th day of August 1704	title to the same. Witnessed by his hand on 19 August 1704. John Cole Nathaniel [Conway], husband of Mary, sister of the above-named John Cole, acknowledged receiving from John Cole, his brother-in-law, all legacies, goods, chattels and all things whatsoever pertaining to his wife, and acquitted and discharged John Cole from every part thereof. Witnessed by his hand on 15 August 1704. Interpretations Thomas Goodwin's role as attorney for Ephraim Moor and Ellen Moor, collecting from the Edmonds estate, shows that council members managed legal and financial affairs for absent principals through letters of attorney. His council position gave him formal authority and practical access that a private citizen lacked. The Cole certification and Conway acknowledgement together constitute a family property settlement formally entered in the consultation record: Cole surrendered his heir's right to his mother's estate in favour of his sister Mary and her husband. The submission of private family transactions to the consultation record confirms it served as a general registry of legal instruments on the island. The referral of the Beale complaint against Henry Cole to a jury at the next Quarter Sessions, rather than summary council disposal, reflects a formal distinction between matters suitable for immediate adjudication and those requiring a full jury hearing under the island's tiered legal structure. Speculations The discrepancy in dates - Conway's acknowledgement on 15 August and Cole's certificate on 19 August - suggests the two documents were prepared separately. Conway's came first, possibly as part of the consultation itself, and Cole's formal certificate was completed four days later and added to the same record. Ann Cole's delivery of cattle to John Hardingg as the apparent purchase price for the Chapel Valley land - personally witnessed by her son - points to livestock functioning as currency in the island's land market, whether alongside or instead of monetary payment.
179	157	Whereas on Sunday Last being the 13.th Instant Gun.r ffrrenches Black was Seen To Carry a burden of Cloathes which was Complained of by the Churchwardens. whereupon It Is Ordered. That the Said French be fined the Sum of 5.s. To the Church for breach of the Sabbath. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Helena. Att a Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 22.th of August 1704 At Fort=James. Stephen Poirier Esq.r Gov.r Present. Cor: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas Edward Heath. Free planter p.rsentd A Petion Setting forth. That John Hemons Free planter being to Depart the Island In the Ship Cesar Cap.t Clark Comander bound for Bengae. And Having a House Plantacon and 20 Acres of Land Joyning to the said Heaths Land which if any other person purchased would be very Detrimentall to him In his Crops &c. Haveing had Experience Enough already to his Cost. Wherefore prayed That We would please To Lend him the Sum of 100 In money and Ship Credit (To purchase the Said House Land and Provision. offering to Mortgage the Same, to us, for the Use of the R.t Hono.ble Companye In Consideracon. That the Said Edward Heath Is Employed ab.t the building of the R.t Hono.ble Companyes fortificacon. and noe person Upon the Island Soe Capable. To doe Such work. It Is ordered.	On Sunday 13 August, Gunner French's slave was seen carrying a burden of clothes. The Churchwardens complained of this, whereupon an order was issued that French be fined five shillings to the Church for breach of the Sabbath. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin St Helena. Consultation held on Tuesday 22 August 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Esquire, Governor Present: Cor[nelius] Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign Edward Heath, free planter, presented a petition. John Hemons, a free planter, was to depart the island on the ship <i>Caesar</i>, Captain Clark commanding, bound for Bengae. Hemons held a house, plantation and 20 acres of land adjoining Heath's land, the acquisition of which by any other person threatened serious harm to Heath's crops, as he already knew at his own cost. Heath prayed that the council lend him one hundred in money and ship credit to purchase the house, land and provisions, offering to mortgage the same to the council for the use of the Honourable Company. In consideration that Heath was employed in building the Company's fortifications, and no person on the island was so capable of doing such work, an order was issued that Heath, to encourage him in the performance of the work, was to have credit. Interpretations The fine levied on Gunner French for his slave's Sabbath activity confirms that masters bore legal responsibility for their slaves' conduct on that day, even when the slave acted without evident instruction. The

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		That the Said Edward Heath To Encourage him In Performing the Said work, have Credit for the Sumon of.	churchwarden's role as the reporting authority and the Church as recipient of the fine shows Sabbath regulation carrying an ecclesiastical character even within a civil adjudication. Goodwin's reversion to Ensign in the 22 August entry, after appearing as Captain a week earlier, raises the question of whether the earlier designation was a scribal error, a temporary promotion or the record of a distinct role. The consultation treated both titles as applying to the same person within the same period. Heath's combined roles - as the Company's indispensable fortification builder and as a petitioner seeking credit to block a rival purchaser of adjacent land - show the council treating his value to the Company as grounds for financial favour. His irreplaceability as a builder effectively converted into credit access. Speculations Heath's reference to past harm from a previous neighbour on the adjoining land suggests the petition was as much defensive as acquisitive: Hemons's departure presented both a risk and an opportunity. The phrase about knowing this at his own cost points to a specific prior dispute, the details of which remained unrecorded. The form of the loan - one hundred in money and ship credit rather than a straightforward cash advance - suggests the island's monetary supply was limited and that credit drawn on departing ships formed part of the effective currency of local transactions. Heath's willingness to mortgage the property to the council shows that Company credit came with the Company as secured creditor.
180	158	one hundred pounds, According to his Request Drawing an Indenture for the payment thereof. In the Nature of a Mortgag= =e for the Space of 18 Months Paying 6.£ per Cent. Interest for soe Long time as the Said 100. £ Is Unpaid. September 2.d 1704 Whereas M.r Daniel Griffith and M.rs Sarah Rider widdow Have Contracted Matrimony together. And Desireing the Gov.rs order To Doctor [Ker] To publish the Banns. And the Said Griffith being a Stranger To the Gov.r He Could doe noe Lefse then To Demand Upon oath whether He Is Married or Contracted to any other p.rson whatsoever or not. which He freely Gave In the Negahve. Upon which It Is ordered. That the Said M.r [Ker] To publish the Banns of Matrimony between him, and the Said Sarah Rider According To Request Cap.t Clark Comander of the Shipp Cesar, made Application to us, Desireing We would Spare him 3. or 4 men, To Help Saile his Shipp In proceeding his Voyage To Bengo. It Is ordered. That The Said Cap.t Clark Receive on board his Shipp The 3. men that Left their Shipps (viz.t) Rich.d Wright Oglethorp, and Henry Markham. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Heath was to have credit for one hundred pounds according to his request, an indenture to be drawn for the payment in the nature of a mortgage for 18 months, with six per cent interest for as long as the £100 remained unpaid. 2 September 1704. Mr Daniel Griffith and Mrs Sarah Rider, widow, contracted to marry each other and desired the Governor's order to Doctor [Ker] to publish the banns. Griffith being a stranger to the Governor, the Governor could do no less than demand upon oath whether Griffith was married or contracted to any other person. Griffith freely gave his answer in the negative. An order was issued that [Ker] was to publish the banns of matrimony between Griffith and Sarah Rider according to the request. Captain Clark, commander of the ship <i>Caesar</i>, made application to the council, requesting three or four men to help sail his ship on its voyage to Bengo. An order was issued that Captain Clark was to receive on board the three men who left their ships, namely Richard Wright, Oglethorpe and Henry Markham. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations The completion of the Heath mortgage order shows the Company acting as a formal lender on standard commercial terms: eighteen months at six per cent, secured on the mortgaged property. The arrangement placed the Company as a land bank servicing the needs of an indispensable workman. The Governor's requirement that Griffith swear an oath confirming he was not already married shows the council exercising a gatekeeping function over matrimony. As a stranger, Griffith was outside the Governor's local knowledge, making the oath the only available check against a bigamous marriage. The reassignment of Wright, Oglethorpe and Markham from Rupert's to Captain Clark's <i>Caesar</i> fulfilled the original terms of their sentence - work until a ship arrived to take them home - while simultaneously resolving Clark's crew shortage. The council adapted its

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			prior order to practical circumstances without formally rescinding it. Speculations Sarah Rider's appearance as a bride-to-be, within weeks of the Richard Person case in which she lost money and property to a departing sailor, points to the limited time a widow on a small island remained without a formal arrangement. Her choice of a stranger rather than a local man suggests a preference for a fresh start with someone without prior knowledge of the Person episode. The order directing [Ker] to publish the banns represents the Governor formally instructing his most persistent adversary in these records to perform a service on behalf of a woman who appeared before the council in her own right. The routine character of the instruction, with no difficulty recorded, suggests the earlier conflict was formally if not personally resolved.
181	159	Island S.t Helena. At a Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 12.th Day of September 1704 At Fort James. Stephen Poirier Govern.r Present. Cor: Sodington Deputy. Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas Elizabeth Worrall Spinster P.rsented a Petion. Setting forth therein That Thomas Alliss Free planter Sold a Turkey hen, of hers which went with Some Turkeys of Jonathan Mudges, through a Mistake And when She heard that her hen, was Sold went To the Said Alliss and Demanded her hen, Upon Which he promised her another which Sat on Eggs, and hatcht 13. Jonathan Mudge being Sworn Saith That being at M.r Alliss told him he had Sold Betty Worralls Hen through a Mistake but would Give her another as Good In Stead thereof. And when and his Daughter Showed this Depon.t and his wife a Turkey hen which Some hatcht Some Young ones which the Said Alliss Killed Upon the Said Elizabeth Worralls Demanding her Turkey hen. Elizabeth Mudge being Sworn Saith To The Same Effect. Isaack Loch. Sworn Saith. That he heard Elizabeth Worrall Demanded a Turkey Hen of Thomas Alliss who made Answ.r She Should have none from him and Swore by God and bid her Take her if She Could find her, Elizabeth Mudge made Answear and Said If I was as You Betty I would Goe and Take the Hen, if She was upon the Comon. Elizabeth Mudge Sworn Saith That Elizabeth Worrall Desired him and Isaack Leach To Goe with her To M.r Alliss. To hear Whether That She Demanded her Turkey Hen, who Accordingly did, At which time heard	Island of St Helena. Consultation held on Tuesday 12 September 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor Present: Cor[nelius] Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign Elizabeth Worrall, spinster, presented a petition. Thomas Alliss, free planter, sold one of her turkey hens, which strayed among some turkeys belonging to Jonathan Mudge, through a mistake. When Worrall heard her hen was sold, she went to Alliss and demanded it. Alliss promised her another, which sat on eggs and hatched thirteen chicks. Jonathan Mudge, sworn, testified that at Mr Alliss's, Alliss told him he sold Betty Worrall's hen through a mistake but was to give her another as good in its place. Alliss and his daughter later showed Mudge and his wife a turkey hen that hatched some young, which Alliss killed when Elizabeth Worrall came to demand her hen. Elizabeth Mudge, sworn, testified to the same effect. Isaac Leach, sworn, testified that he heard Elizabeth Worrall demand a turkey hen from Thomas Alliss, who replied she was to have none from him, swore by God and told her to take it if she could find it. Elizabeth Mudge told Worrall that in her place, she was ready to go and take the hen, if it was on the common. Elizabeth Mudge, sworn, further testified that Elizabeth Worrall asked Mudge and Isaac Leach to accompany her to Mr Alliss's to witness her demand for the turkey hen. They accordingly went with her. Interpretations The turkey hen case shows the council adjudicating a minor property dispute over a single bird and its offspring. The number of sworn depositions applied to so small a matter reflects the council's function as the only available civil court on the island, without practical limit on the scale of the disputes it handled. Isaac Leach's testimony records a sharp exchange in which Alliss refused Worrall's demand, swore by God and challenged her to find the hen herself. Elizabeth Mudge's encouragement for Worrall to take the bird by force, if it was on the common, shows community opinion forming around the dispute in Worrall's favour. Alliss's killing of the replacement hen rather than surrendering it, witnessed by the Mudges, transformed what began as a mistaken sale into a deliberate act of bad faith. The destruction of the bird to avoid restitution materially strengthened Worrall's case before the council. Speculations The fact that Alliss and his daughter together showed the replacement hen to the Mudges suggests the dispute was conducted with family witnesses present at key moments. Alliss's subsequent killing of that same bird, observed by the people he had shown it to, points to a calculated act rather than an impulsive one.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Elizabeth Mudge's advice to Worrall about taking the hen from the common points to Alliss's killing of it as a pre-emptive measure to forestall that course of action. Her willingness both to encourage self-help and to appear as a formal witness before the council placed her firmly on Worrall's side throughout the dispute.
182	160	Heard the Said Alliss Say that he did not Sell the Said Elizabeth Worralls Turkey. It Is ordered. That the Said Thomas Alliss Deliver the Said Elizabeth Worrall the Turkey hen She Demanded with 2 Young ones, and pay her a Dollar and ffour Six Shillings for Swearing and To pay all Charges of Comit. Daniel Griffith. being Upon Entring Into The State of Matrimony, And Haveing furnished That [requir] his Care and Attendance In the Country. P.rsuired that We would please to Allow him Liberty of Pursuing his out of pay Upon Consideracon. The Said Griffith has Served one year of his time, and meeting with a Match Suitable to his Quality. It Is ordered. By the Votes of the Govern.r and Cap.t Goodwin, That the Said Griffith's Request be Granted, paying the Companys for his Pallage To England. 8.£ Eight pounds. Cap.t Sodington Is of Opinion. That The Said Griffith ought to Serve his Contracted time, or Else To pay for his Pallages and Repay the 3.£ Advance Money And for bed hammock and Black &c. To the Companys Which he thinkes will Amount to ad.t. 11.£ The Govern.r and Cap.t Goodwin Reply that the Said Cap.t Sodington Speakes onely out of [Loly Mall] In the End [...] In Ever Haveing Presidents of this Nature before, but not to be Standing President. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	At which time they heard Alliss say that he did not sell Elizabeth Worrall's turkey. An order was issued that Thomas Alliss was to deliver to Elizabeth Worrall the turkey hen she demanded, together with two young ones, was to pay her a dollar and four shillings and sixpence for his swearing, and was to pay all committee costs. Daniel Griffith, about to enter matrimony and with [...] requiring his care and attendance in the country, prayed that the council allow him liberty to pursue his affairs out of Company pay. In consideration that Griffith served one year of his contracted time and met with a match suitable to his quality, an order was issued by the votes of the Governor and Captain Goodwin that his request be granted, he paying the Company eight pounds for his passage to England. Captain Sodington was of the opinion that Griffith was to serve his contracted time, or else pay for his passages and repay the £3 advance money, and for bed, hammock, slave and so forth to the Company, estimated at approximately £11 in total. The Governor and Captain Goodwin replied that Sodington spoke only out of [...], and that while precedents of this nature existed, this was not to stand as a permanent one. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations The Alliss order credits multiple witnesses over Alliss's late denial. His earlier admission to Jonathan Mudge that the sale was a mistake, followed by a flat denial before the council, was resolved against him. The penalty combined restitution in kind - the hen and two young - with a fine for swearing and all costs, addressing both the property wrong and the conduct at the confrontation. The Griffith case reproduces the familiar voting pattern of these records: the Governor and Goodwin granting a lenient release for £8, with Sodington arguing for full enforcement and recovery of all the Company's outlays. Sodington's itemisation - advance money, bed, hammock and slave - provides a precise accounting of the standard package offered to incoming Company employees. The Governor and Goodwin's acknowledgement that precedents existed but this was not to become a standing one shows awareness that their decision was exceptional. The distinction between a tolerated exception and an established rule was formally entered in the record, containing its reach. Speculations Alliss's denial before the council, contradicting his earlier admission to the Mudges, points to a calculated change of position once formal proceedings began rather than genuine ignorance. The weight of sworn testimony from the Mudges and Isaac Leach made the denial untenable, and the council's order reflected this. Griffith's petition, coming immediately after the publication of banns with Sarah Rider, suggests the marriage and the request for discharge formed a planned sequence: establish the matrimonial right first, then use it as grounds for early release. The council's acceptance of a match suitable to his quality as a formal consideration shows marriage to a person of appropriate standing treated as a legitimate basis for discharge from Company service.
183	161	Island S.t Helena. At a Consultacon. Held on Tuesday 26.th September 1704. At Fort James. Stephen Poirier	Island of St Helena. Consultation held on Tuesday 26 September 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier,

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Govern.r Present. Cor: Sodington Deputy. Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas The Govern.r hath very often born with the said John Alexander 3.d of the Councill Severall Months out of true Kindeise for him. And Recomend him Sev.t times To m.r R.t Hono.ble old Masters As He Humbly Calls them To Witnesse. But nothing Could p.rvaile on his High temper. In Soemuch That the 20.th of this Instant September Being at Divine Service In the Hall In the Evening. Heard Such a Loud Noise That It was Impossible to hear the Minister at prayers. Thinking they were Some Seamen Sent Corporall Wirth To Comand Silence twice. but to noe purpose. In Soemuch That Prayers being over In Quireing of the Said Corporall why his ord.rs were not obeyed. and who made It. Wondered to hear It was In the Said John Alexand.rs Office, Whereupon being In the Porch of the Said Hall. Ordered The Said John Alexander To Clear his Room of Such Troublesom Guests and Come out himselfe who Answered he would not without he was forced. ffor Good and All. Such Impertinent Insol.t obleidged The Govern.r To Send the Serj.t Up Into the Said office To p.rform his ord.r All went away but the Said John Alexander who obleidged the Govern.r To Come down The Fort Yard without Cane or Sword.r &c. But the said Alexander t' was down the Said Yard too. who threw his Cane to the Govern.r who taking It up told him he Was a Sawcy Rogue and Deserved To be Drubbed Like A Dog. To which he Answered That if he was a Rouge, he was another. And In the mean while Throw also his Office Key To the Govern.r who. Comand=	Governor Present: Cor[nelius] Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign The Governor reported that he bore with John Alexander, the third member of the council, for several months out of genuine kindness, and recommended him several times to the Right Honourable Masters, cAllisng on them as witnesses. Nothing availed against Alexander's high temper. On the evening of 20 September 1704, during divine service in the hall, such a loud noise arose that the minister at prayers was impossible to hear. Thinking it came from seamen, the Governor sent Corporal Wirth to command silence twice, but without effect. When prayers were over, the Governor enquired of Corporal Wirth why his orders were not obeyed and who made the noise. To the Governor's astonishment, it came from John Alexander's office. The Governor, standing in the porch of the hall, ordered Alexander to clear his room of such troublesome guests and come out himself. Alexander replied he would not come out unless forced, once and for all. Such impertinent insolence obliged the Governor to send the sergeant up into the office to carry out his order. All left except Alexander, whose continued defiance obliged the Governor to come down personally to the fort yard without cane or sword. Alexander was in the yard as well, and threw his cane to the Governor. The Governor picked it up and told Alexander he was a saucy rogue who deserved to be beaten like a dog. Alexander replied that if he was a rogue, the Governor was another. Alexander then threw his office key to the Governor as well. Interpretations The confrontation with Alexander shows the limits of Poirier's patience with a man he previously favoured: the salary increase of 1 August, the multiple recommendations to the Company and the months of forbearance all appear in the record as evidence of good faith, framing Alexander's conduct as a personal betrayal. Alexander's replies - refusing to leave unless forced, and retorting that if he was a rogue the Governor was another - represent the most direct challenge to gubernatorial authority recorded in these entries. His throwing of the office key in the fort yard marks a public surrender of his council position, performed defiantly. The incident during divine service shows religious observance and civil order as inseparable in the Governor's view: Poirier's first instinct was that the noise came from seamen, and he dispatched a military officer to restore quiet. That the disturbance came from a council member's own office transformed a routine enforcement matter into a direct challenge to authority. Speculations Alexander's refusal to leave his office unless forced, followed by his descent to the yard and the throwing of his cane and key, points to a planned confrontation rather than a spontaneous quarrel. The cane throw, a direct provocation in a public space, suggests someone who intended the incident to become a formal matter of record. The Governor's note that he came down to the yard without cane or sword signals a deliberate decision not to use force despite the insubordination. The detail entered in the record suggests Poirier managed his own conduct carefully in anticipation of Company review, presenting himself as restrained in the face of sustained provocation.
184	162	Comanded him to take It up but Said he would not, with Abundance of Ill Names. But Cheifly that he would make the Govern.r Appear In his own Colours. Whereupon the Govern.r Could Not forbear but Strok him 2. or 3 times with the Said John Alexanders Cane.	The Governor commanded Alexander to pick up the key, but Alexander refused with an abundance of insults, chiefly that he was to make the Governor appear in his true colours. The provocation overcame

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		But Notwithstanding All this the Gov.r did forbear To p.rsecute him thereupon Expecting he might Come And Give him Some Sort of Satisfacion.t But Instead thereof, when Called this Day. Denyes All. Therefore the Said Alexander Should being willing to Deale fairly with the Said Injustice. This Day fortnight, Witnesse to prove the Said Injustice. This Day fortnight, And The mean while was Dismist of The Companyes Service Whereas. W.m Wills Gent.tt All Armes Don.r on Sunday 24.th Instant. being the first That Acted In Such a Stacion. And John French Master Gunner who hath now Mon= =trollles Sufficient To his Sutisfacon. which none of his p.rdesefors had. Did willingly offer To Take The Charge, and Care of the Armes, and That they may be Kept In Good ord.r It Is ordered. That The Said Gunner be Intrusted with All The Said Small Armes, and To, or Cause them to be Kept In Servi[c]eable order. Our Right Hono.ble Masters. The United Companye Haveing noe money. In the Stores nor Such Stores, as are proper To bring any In Besides on the other hand very much Necessities Considering the Great Charge the Companys are at In ffortificacons buying Cattle &c. And M.r Coulson offering Us 300 Dollars at 5 m.d 2.d for a Bill of Exchange on our Said Masters when Demanded. The Said Bill not To be p.rsentd to them for 18 Months, or 2 years hence. It Is ordered. That the Said Sume of 300 Dollars Shall be Taken of him for the Said Use, on the Condicon aforesaid.	the Governor's restraint, and he struck Alexander two or three times with Alexander's own cane. Notwithstanding this, the Governor refrained from prosecuting Alexander, expecting him to come and offer some sort of satisfaction. When called that day, however, Alexander denied everything. The council, being willing to deal fairly, set a date a fortnight from that day for witnesses to prove the matter. In the meantime, Alexander was dismissed from the Company's service. William Wills, gentleman, donated all arms on Sunday 24 September, being the first to act in such a capacity. John French, Master Gunner, who now held controls sufficient to his satisfaction that none of his predecessors held, willingly offered to take charge and care of the arms and to keep them in good order. An order was issued that the Gunner was to be entrusted with all the small arms and to keep them, or cause them to be kept, in serviceable order. The United Honourable Company had no money in the stores, nor such stores as were proper to bring any in, and had many necessities besides, considering the great charges on the Company in fortifications, buying cattle and so forth. Mr Coulson offered 300 dollars at [...] as a bill of exchange on the Masters when demanded. The bill was not to be presented to the Masters for 18 months or two years. An order was issued that the sum of 300 dollars was to be taken from Coulson for the stated use on the aforesaid condition. Interpretations The Governor's admission in the council record that he struck Alexander shows Poirier choosing transparency over concealment. The framing - that Alexander's insults and threat to expose the Governor in his true colours forced the blow - presented physical force as a response to extreme provocation rather than an abuse of authority. The dismissal of Alexander from the Company's service, while simultaneously granting him a fortnight to produce witnesses, shows the council applying a dual response: immediate punishment alongside a provision for formal hearing. The pending testimony left the matter unresolved. The bill of exchange with Mr Coulson, deferred for 18 months to two years, shows the island's administration using private credit to bridge a cash shortage while protecting the Company from immediate demand. The United Company designation, appearing here rather than the earlier formulation, reflects the post-merger identity of the Company in the record. Speculations Alexander's insistence that he was to make the Governor appear in his true colours, entered verbatim in the Governor's own account, suggests he was aware of and deliberately escalating the formal record. His throwing of the office key and subsequent denial of everything before the council points to a strategy of confrontation and deniability rather than submission. Coulson's willingness to accept a bill of exchange not presentable for 18 months to two years suggests he had confidence in the Company's creditworthiness, or reasons to keep the capital committed rather than liquid. The combination of empty stores and significant expenditure on fortifications shows the island at a point of acute fiscal strain in September 1704.
185	163	Jacob Miller Late Consuain being ordered by the Govern.r 25.th of this Instant In the Morning. To have A Sharpe Eye over the new boat being then a Great Storm. In Soemuch that It broke quite away. (Vy.) one of the Shippis now In the Road. who In Contempt of the Said ord.r Wilfully neglected the Same See that It drove away. And Could not be Saved, Notwithstanding the obleidgeing Indeavors of the Shippis Companys who	Jacob Miller, late Coxswain, was ordered by the Governor on the morning of 25 September to keep a sharp eye on the new boat, there being a great storm. The boat broke away entirely from one of the ships then in the road. In contempt of the order, Miller wilfully neglected his duty so that it drove away. The boat was not saved, notwithstanding the obliging endeavours of the ships' companies, who after a long

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		after a Long Attempt To Save It were by the Rage of the Sea forced To forsake It. Haveing Much to doe to Get to their Shipp's againe. Whereas If the Said Miller had been Watchfull as Comander.d the Loss of her might be p.revented. And being Called To be Account for the Said Neglect had nothing To offer. Therefore It Is ordered. Although In Good Justice he ought to pay for the Same But haveing nothing wherewithall To do It, Shall pay Two Dollars. And To be Dismissed off To the Said Office of Consuain. Whereas We are Destitute of a Clarke of Councill, John Alexander being Dismissed as aforesaid. And M.r Daniel Griffith who Came here In the Shipp Anna Capt.t Walby Comander. Seemes To Us the fittest man To performe that parte. Haveing Some Insight In Law. Although become freeman for the Reasons attended In A Consultacon Held on Tuesday the 12.th of this Instant. Haveing himselfe offered his Service In this Respect To us. It Is ordered. That The Said Daniel Griffith Do Enter Into the Office And place of Clarke In Councill. And Consequently Injoy The fferogative Sallary, and Privileidges Awarded Do To the Said John Alexander. Giveing his oath, To be True To y.d Queen And Hono.ble United Company, and Govern.r and Publick. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	attempt to save it were forced by the fury of the sea to abandon it, with much difficulty getting back to their ships. Had Miller been watchful as ordered, the loss was preventable. When called to account for his neglect, he had nothing to offer in defence. An order was issued. In strict justice the full cost was Miller's to bear, but as he had nothing with which to pay, he was to pay two dollars and was to be dismissed from the office of Coxswain. The council was without a Clerk of the Council, John Alexander being dismissed as stated. Mr Daniel Griffith, who came to the island on the ship <i>Anna</i>, Captain Walby commanding, appeared to the council the fittest man to perform that role, having some knowledge of law. Although Griffith became a freeman for the reasons set out in the consultation of Tuesday 12 September, he offered his service in this capacity. An order was issued that Daniel Griffith was to enter the office and place of Clerk of the Council and was consequently to enjoy the prerogative, salary and privileges due to John Alexander. He was to give his oath to be true to the Queen and the Honourable United Company, and to the Governor and the public. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations The Miller case repeats a pattern from earlier entries: fines reduced to token amounts when the offender lacked means to pay. The two-dollar fine was a gesture rather than restitution; dismissal from the coxswain role was the effective punishment for a loss that in strict justice was Miller's to make good. John Alexander's departure as council clerk was the direct consequence of the confrontation in the preceding entry. The formal process of witnesses a fortnight later was evidently overtaken, and Alexander was out. The vacancy was filled within the same consultation. Griffith's appointment as Clerk of the Council, only weeks after being discharged from Company service to marry Sarah Rider, shows the council's pragmatic flexibility: a man who left Company employment was immediately re-engaged in a civil capacity when Alexander's dismissal created a vacancy. His legal knowledge made him the fittest available candidate on the island. Speculations The storm that drove away the boat, and the crews' prolonged attempts to save it despite the sea's fury, points to severe weather as a serious and recurring hazard at St Helena. The detail that the crews had much difficulty getting back to their ships suggests conditions genuinely dangerous rather than merely difficult. Griffith's description as having some knowledge of law, combined with his having offered his service rather than waiting to be approached, suggests a man who arrived on the island with a clear intention of establishing himself in both domestic and official life. His discharge from service, his marriage plans and his council appointment within weeks of arrival point to a deliberate and swiftly executed strategy of integration.
186	164	Island. S.t Helena. Att a Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 10.th of October 1704. At Fort=James. Stephen Poirier Gov.r Present. Cor: Sodington Deputy. Tho: Goodwin Ensign. William Beale Free planter Complains ag.t W.m Cole. for That He Contrary to a Contract made with the Said Beales wife Refuses to make Satisfacion for the Maintenance of one Elizabeth Worrall for 4 yeares, though often Demanded To his Damage 20 Dollars. The Defend.t Utterly Denyes any Such Contract. And Saith that the said M.rs Beale took the Said Young Wom[an] Freely of her own Accord, Upon Acc.t of the Service She might Doe her.	Island of St Helena. Consultation held on Tuesday 10 October 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor Present: Cor[nelius] Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign William Beale, free planter, complained against William Cole for refusing - contrary to a contract made with Beale's wife - to make satisfaction for the maintenance of one Elizabeth Worrall for four years, though often demanded, to Beale's damage of 20 dollars. Cole utterly denied any such contract and said Mrs Beale took the young woman freely of her own accord, on account of the service Worrall was to do for her.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Upon The Said Beale, and his wife Tendering their flathes upon the Same. We not thinking It Convenient To Receive the Same. It Is ordered. That the Said W.m Cole To pay Unto the Said W.m Beale ffouty Shillings In Recompence and ffor Satisfacion of her Said Maintenance, with Comuit Cost. Complaint being made by Edward Bagley And Sam.l Defountain Churchwardens ag.t Edward Cosby Bryton for Neglect of Duty, In his Station As also for new [Lett] And Care ab.t his Plantacon In Soe Much That It Is To be feared. That he will become a Charge to the Said Island. It Is ordered. That This matter be Referred To the Country Next Court day. Whereas	Beale and his wife tendered their [...] on the matter, but the council did not think it convenient to receive them. An order was issued that William Cole was to pay William Beale forty shillings in recompense and satisfaction for the maintenance, with committee costs. A complaint was made by Edward Bagley and Samuel Desfountain, Churchwardens, against Edward Cosby Bryton for neglect of duty in his station and [...] and lack of care about his plantation, insomuch that it was feared he was to become a burden on the island. An order was issued that the matter be referred to the country at the next court day. Interpretations The Beale v Cole case shows the council declining to receive the parties' offered testimony while still finding against Cole. The contract was made with Mrs Beale, but the complaint and award ran in Mr Beale's name, consistent with the principle by which a wife's contracts became her husband's legal responsibility. The partial award - forty shillings rather than twenty dollars claimed - reflects evidential uncertainty rather than full acceptance of Beale's account. Elizabeth Worrall's appearance as the subject of a maintenance dispute weeks after the turkey hen case gives a fuller picture of her circumstances: a young woman maintained in Beale's household under an arrangement with Cole, without independent means. The four-year duration places the start of the arrangement at approximately 1700. The churchwardens' complaint against Cosby Bryton for neglect of station and plantation shows their oversight extending beyond religious conduct to economic behaviour. The referral to the country court day confirms a tier of local justice below the formal council for matters requiring local knowledge of circumstances. Speculations The council's refusal to receive the Beale' offered testimony, while still finding for them, points to a distinction between formal sworn proof and an informal conviction: the council disbelieved Cole's denial but was not prepared to accept the Beale' unsupported account at face value. The partial award captures this evidential uncertainty. Cosby Bryton's description as a risk of becoming a burden on the island, brought by the churchwardens rather than a private complainant, suggests the community treated signs of economic decline in a household as a matter of public concern. The plantation's disorder was communal as much as personal.
187	165	Whereas. The Govern.r Stephen Poirier Esq.r Exhibited a Complaint Last Councill Day ag.t John Alex= =ander 3.d of the Councill Last Councill Day for High Mis= demeanour. and Indinities Comitted ag.t The Said Govern.r who willing To Give him time to make his Defence. Defered the hearing thereof To this Day. The which being Read. Witnesses being Sworn. Depose as followeth. W.m Grant.r being Sworn Saith That said Coming Into the fort on the 20.th of September heard the Govern.r and M.r Alexander Haveing High words and Saw M.r Alexanders Cane In the Govern.rs hand with which he threatened to break his head. M.r Alexander Saith he Might for he had done that already. Then the Gov.r Comand Did him to be Confined to his Roome, who Swore he would not goe to his Room but would goe to the worst place And M.r Alexander offered To Goe out at the Sally Port Gate And The Govern.r followed him and hitt him 2. or 3 blowes. Upon which M.r Alexander told his Worship That he ought not to Strike any man but bord. blot And Excepting then That he was as Good as himselfe.	The Governor, Stephen Poirier, Esquire, exhibited a complaint at the last council day against John Alexander, the third member of the council, for high misdemeanour and indignities committed against the Governor. Being willing to give Alexander time to prepare his defence, the Governor deferred the hearing to that day. The complaint was read. Witnesses were sworn and deposed as follows. William Grant[...], sworn, testified: coming into the fort on 20 September, he heard the Governor and Alexander having high words and saw Alexander's cane in the Governor's hand, with which the Governor threatened to break Alexander's head. Alexander replied that the damage was already done. The Governor ordered Alexander to be confined to his room. Alexander refused with an oath, declaring he was to go to the worst place instead, and made toward the sally port gate. The Governor followed and struck him two or three blows. Alexander told the Governor he was not to strike any man [...] and that he was as good as the Governor himself. Thomas Sanderson, Sergeant, sworn, testified: on 20 September, being on guard during evening prayers in

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Thomas Sanderson Serjt Sworn Saith That Upon the 20.th of September being upon the Guard And Evening Prayers In the Hall Hearing a Noise The Govern.r ordered the Corporall to See what was the Matter twice but not Obeing, at Soon as Prayers were Ended The Govern.r Comanded to turn the Companye Out of M.r Alexanders Room which Accordingly he did Haveing before then Refused to obey his ord.rs And CALLisng for the Guard M.r Alexander Said he would not be puled, haled out Like a Dog At which they All went out of the Room. And After Comeing down Saw M.r Alexanders head broke. and heard High words between the Govern.r and him. The Govern.r ordering him to Confine M.r Alexander In his Room. But Refusing to Goe there Confined him to the hole.	the hall, he heard a noise. The Governor ordered the Corporal to see what was the matter, twice, without effect. As soon as prayers ended, the Governor ordered the company to be cleared from Alexander's room, which Sanderson carried out, Alexander having refused the Governor's orders. When the guard was called, Alexander said he was not to be pulled and hauled out like a dog, at which point they all left the room. After coming down, Sanderson saw Alexander's head was broken and heard high words between the Governor and Alexander. The Governor ordered Sanderson to confine Alexander to his room, but Alexander refusing to go there, he was confined to the hole. Interpretations The formal hearing, two weeks after the 26 September confrontation, shows the island's legal process in operation: complaint exhibited, hearing deferred for defence preparation, and witnesses sworn. The two depositions corroborate each other and largely confirm the Governor's own account, adding details his narrative omitted. Grant's testimony introduces a detail absent from the Governor's account: the threat to break Alexander's head, and Alexander's reply that it was already broken. Confirmation of the injury from two independent witnesses - Grant's implication and Sanderson's explicit sighting of the broken head - established the assault beyond the Governor's self-report. The sequence of confinement attempts - first to his room, then to the hole - shows Alexander's escalating defiance and the garrison's corresponding escalation of force. Confinement to the hole represents the most severe physical restraint recorded in these entries and marks Alexander's complete removal from any position of authority. Speculations Alexander's assertion that the Governor was not to strike any man, and that he was as good as the Governor himself, suggests an appeal to a principle of equal protection before the law, even in the midst of physical assault. The legal framing points to a man who understood the formal proceedings underway and attempted to create a record of the Governor's conduct for future reference. The detail that all present left Alexander's room when he declared he was not to be pulled out like a dog suggests his command of the situation was briefly effective, even against an armed guard. This momentary compliance, before his confinement to the hole, points to the ambiguous authority of a council member in the physical possession of the garrison.
188	166	John [Wirth]. Corpor.l Sworn Saith That Upon the 20.th of September being Upon the Guard And the Gov.r being at Evening prayers In the Hall and Hearing a Great Noise In the Fort of Singing and making Mery, His Worship ordered him out to See what was the matter. who found Companye In M.r Alexanders Room. All fudled. And Desired them To Desist or Else his worship would Come Himselfe whereupon M.r Alexander Replied that they would be all quiet, and See returned to Prayers againe and not Soone was he Gone, but they began Again. See that his Worship ordered him a 2.d time To bid Them forbear Upon which they Returned the Same Answ.r But Never the Lefse they Continued as before, And At Soon As prayers were over. His Worship Asked who [...] that Noise He told him It was M.r Boyett and others In M.r Alexanders Room. whereupon his worship Came to the porch of the Hall and Asked why they made a Noise And ordered M.r Alexander to turn his Companye out, who Answered if they turned out he would turne out himselfe for good and All. Upon which his Worship Comanded the Serjt to turn them out. with that M.r Alexander Came out of his Room And threw the Key	John [Wirth], Corporal, sworn, testified: on 20 September, being on guard while the Governor was at evening prayers in the hall, a great noise of singing and merrymaking was heard in the fort. The Governor ordered [Wirth] out to see what was the matter. He found company in Alexander's room, all drunk. He told them to desist or the Governor was to come himself, whereupon Alexander replied they were all to be quiet. [Wirth] returned to prayers. No sooner was he gone than the noise began again. A second visit was made on the Governor's orders, with the same answer returned, but the noise continued as before. As soon as prayers ended, the Governor asked who [...] made the noise. [Wirth] told him it was Mr Boyett and others in Alexander's room. The Governor came to the porch of the hall, asked why they made a noise and ordered Alexander to clear his company out. Alexander replied that if they left, he was to leave himself, once and for all. The Governor ordered the sergeant to turn them out. Alexander came out of his room and threw the key toward the Governor, who commanded him to pick it up. Alexander refusing, the Governor called him a saucy

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		towards his Worship who Comanded him To take It up who Refusing The Govern.r Called him Saucy ffellow and threatned to break his head, thereupon M.r Alexander threw his Cane and Said break my head if hill me, I Care not, you and Said he would make the Govern.r appear In his Right Clothes. See his Worship hit him 2. or 3. Blowes CAllisng him Saucy Rouge, who Answared and Said he was a Saucy Rouge for CAllisng him So, whereupon his Worship ordered him to be Confined to his Room, who Swore Damn him He had not businesse In the Room. See his Worship ordered him to the why Hole. but he Said He would Goe to the Dungeon Giveing his Worship very opprobrious And Reflecting Language. Saying he Did more then he Could Answ.r. John [Wirth]. John Cloverring Sworn, Saith that Comeing Into the Fort, on the 20.th September Last, there had happened Some words between the Govern.r and M.r Alexander Saw M.r Alexander throw a Key at his Worship, Saying he [w]as	fellow and threatened to break his head. Alexander threw his cane, saying the Governor was to break his head, though it killed him, he cared not, and declared he was to make the Governor appear in his true colours. The Governor struck him two or three blows, cAllisng him a saucy rogue. Alexander replied that the Governor was a saucy rogue for cAllisng him so. The Governor ordered Alexander to be confined to his room. Alexander swore, saying he had no business in the room. The Governor ordered him to the hole. Alexander said he was to go to the dungeon himself, giving the Governor opprobrious and defamatory language, and saying the Governor acted beyond what he was to account for. John [Wirth] John Cloverring, sworn, testified: coming into the fort on 20 September, some words had passed between the Governor and Alexander. Cloverring saw Alexander throw a key at the Governor. Interpretations Wirth's testimony provides the most detailed account of the evening's events, confirming both the graduated escalation - two warnings, false promises of quiet and renewed noise - and the full sequence of defiant acts that followed. His account shows a deliberate pattern of resistance rather than a spontaneous quarrel. The identification of Mr Boyett and others in Alexander's room, all drunk, establishes that Alexander was hosting a drinking gathering during divine service, itself a breach of conduct separate from the confrontation that followed. Alexander's choosing the dungeon of his own accord rather than his room, and his final charge that the Governor acted beyond what he was to account for, shows a man framing the episode as a matter for higher authority. The challenge was not purely personal defiance but a claim that the Governor's conduct was itself justiciable. Speculations Alexander's declaration that the Governor was to break his head, though it killed him, and his throwing of the cane in the Governor's face, suggest behaviour calculated to produce a visible injury that witnesses were to observe and record. The resulting broken head stood as evidence against the Governor regardless of any formal outcome. Alexander's progression from his room to the sally port gate and then to the dungeon of his own choosing points to a man who disputed the Governor's authority to dictate even where he was confined. By electing the harsher confinement voluntarily, he denied the Governor the power of punishment while adding to the witnessed record of the evening.
189	167	Would not Serve the Company any Longer, which his Worship Comanded him to take up againe, but Saying he would not Called him Sawcy Rascall and if he had a Cane He would break his head Upon which the Said M.r Alexander threw his Cane Saying Do It Kill me I Care not, with that his Worship tooke the Cane and broke his head whereupon M.r Alexander Said he would make him, appear In his own Colo.rs and would not his Sausery any Longer. And that he had writ Sev.t Letters for him, In private. His Worshipp CAllisng him Sawcy Rouge told him he was Another for CAllisng him So. At which Doctor [Ker] Said fye upon, Pray Say no more. His Worship ordered him To his Room, but would not Goe Saying he would Goe there no more. whereupon his worship ordered him to the worst place of Confinem.t The Said Alexander Saying That was the Dungeon. So the Serj.t Confined him In the Hole. Witness my hand. Jn.o Cloverring. It Is ordered.	Alexander said he was not to serve the Company any longer. The Governor commanded him to pick up the key again, but Alexander refusing, the Governor called him a saucy rascal and said he was to break his head if he had a cane. Alexander threw his cane, saying the Governor was to do it, though it killed him, he cared not. The Governor took the cane and broke Alexander's head. Alexander said he was to make the Governor appear in his own colours, his patience with the Governor's insolence at an end, and that he wrote several letters for the Governor in private. The Governor, cAllisng Alexander a saucy rogue, was told by Alexander that the Governor was another for cAllisng him so. Doctor [Ker] exclaimed in disapproval and begged them to say no more. The Governor ordered Alexander to his room, but Alexander refused, saying he was to go there no more. The Governor ordered him to the worst place of confinement. Alexander said that was the dungeon. The sergeant confined him in the hole.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		That this matter be Defered Untill next Council Day And that Doctor [Ker] by that time prepare his Declaracon Touching the Same. The Said John Alexander upon better Consideracon. Acknowledging his offence and begging his Worships pardon being Sory for what he had Said It being the Effects of Pasion being In Drink. The Gov.r Doth Willingly forgive him, and Discharge him from the Said Suon. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Witness my hand. John Cloverring An order was issued that the matter be deferred until the next council day, and that Doctor [Ker] prepare his declaration concerning it by that time. John Alexander, on better reflection, acknowledged his offence and begged the Governor's pardon, being sorry for what he had said, the behaviour being the effect of passion while in drink. The Governor willingly forgave him and discharged him from the said [summons]. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations Doctor [Ker]'s presence at the scene, intervening with an exclamation of disapproval and a plea for silence, shows him acting as a peacemaker between two men who had been in dispute throughout these records. His proximity to the confrontation suggests close integration into the fort's community despite his earlier conflict with the Governor. Alexander's disclosure that he wrote private letters for the Governor adds context to their relationship, extending it well beyond the official. This explains the repeated patience shown in earlier entries - the salary increase and the multiple recommendations to the Company - before the breakdown. Alexander's apology and the Governor's forgiveness, achieved within the same consultation, resolved formal proceedings that began at the end of September. The attribution of the behaviour to passion while drunk defused the constitutional challenge and allowed both parties to withdraw without a formal ruling. Speculations The swiftness of Alexander's capitulation, following the hearing of four sworn witnesses, suggests the weight of testimony against him was decisive. His attribution of the incident to drink and passion was the minimum necessary to secure forgiveness without conceding any principled point about the Governor's authority. The order for Doctor [Ker] to prepare a formal declaration, immediately followed by Alexander's apology and the Governor's forgiveness, raises the question of whether the prospect of [Ker]'s testimony accelerated the reconciliation. [Ker]'s presence at the scene, and his apparent sympathy with Alexander, made his forthcoming declaration an uncertain prospect for the Governor's case.
190	168	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultacon Held on Wednesday The 18.th October 1704. At Fort=James. Stephen Poirier Govern.r Present. Col: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign Whereas Christopher Roby, and John Jones officers Sent out To Bankes and Ruperts Reported To The Govern.r and Council, That the 12.th of this Instant Severall of the Workmen, viz.t Richard West, James Burras Thomas Low Richard Kay, and Samuel [Sevis], behaved them Selves Rudely Comitting Sev.t Disorders. In Abusing and Affault of them, In Contempt of the Gov.rs ord.rs. The afores.d being Called. Acknow ledge their Crimes, Saying It was the Effects of Drink, being all Drunk It Is ordered. That Richard West pay 5.s for being Drunk and Ride the wooden Horse. That James Burras onely Ride the wooden being Left from his Ship and poor. That Richard Kay pay 5.s. To the Church for being drunk. That Thomas Low pay 5.s. To the Church And Likewise 5.s more to the Company. for Attempting To break open the Magazine. being Satisfyed when Sober that he is a harmlesse quiet man. That Sam.ll Sevis pay 5.s. to the Church being drunk. Receiving A Sevear Reprimand	Island of St Helena. Consultation held on Wednesday 18 October 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor Present: Colonel Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign Christopher Roby and John Jones, officers sent to Banks and Rupert's, reported to the Governor and council that on 12 October several workmen, namely Richard West, James Burras, Thomas Low, Richard Kay and Samuel [Sevis], behaved themselves rudely, committing several disorders, abusing and assaulting the officers in contempt of the Governor's orders. Called to answer, the aforementioned acknowledged their crimes, saying the behaviour was the effect of drink, all being drunk. The following orders were issued. Richard West was to pay five shillings for being drunk and was to ride the wooden horse. James Burras, having left his ship and being poor, was only to ride the wooden horse. Richard Kay was to pay five shillings to the Church for being drunk. Thomas Low was to pay five shillings to the Church and a further five shillings to the Company for attempting to break open the magazine. The council was satisfied that when sober he was a harmless, quiet man.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		[See]	Samuel [Sevis] was to pay five shillings to the Church for being drunk. All received a severe reprimand. Interpretations The differentiated sentencing shows the council applying individual circumstances: Burras's poverty and desertion reduced his punishment to the wooden horse alone; Low's attempt on the magazine attracted an additional Company fine; others received the standard drunk fine. The council's note that Low was harmless when sober echoes earlier sentencing in which sober character served as formal mitigation. The attempted break-in of the magazine was the most serious offence in this entry. The magazine held arms and ammunition for the island's defence, making the attempt a military as well as civil matter. The relatively light penalty reflects the mitigating effect of drunkenness and the council's satisfaction that no deliberate intent lay behind it. Sodington's designation as Colonel in this entry, where earlier records variously give him as Captain, Deputy and Deputy Governor, marks yet another recorded change. The pattern of varying titles across entries suggests either a formal promotion occurring during this period or inconsistent recording of a rank he already held. Speculations The location - Banks and Rupert's - places these men among the workmen employed on the fortification programme commissioned earlier in these records. Their drunken disorder during working hours and assault on overseeing officers suggests poor discipline on the work sites that the officers alone were unable to control without formal council intervention. James Burras's description as having left his ship places him in the same category as the Halifax men in earlier entries: a sailor who deserted his vessel and found himself in island labour. His poverty meant no fine was available, and the wooden horse served as a substitute.
191	169	From The Govern.r and Councill with Admonishm.t to A better behavi.r for the future Upon pain of Severe Punishment. Humphrey Edwards Montrolle p.r.sented A Petion Setting forth That being marryed And haveing A Plantacon, and businesse Requireing his Immediat Care and Attendance, And but five Months of his time Unexpired. His worship and Comuit would please To Grant him Leave to turn out of pay. It Is ordered. That The Said Humphrey Edwards haveing often times Importuned Us thereto, and In Consideracon We have had Lately new Recruits and Confirming on the Said Island be Discharged out of the Right Hono.ble Companys Service. and pay Comuit Cost. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin November 14.th 1704 Whereas Cap.t Thomson Complaines ag.t John Mudge Free planter who Entertaining John Bird. one of his men by Agreem.t for half a Dollar a day now Demands a Dollar for Each Day Contrary To their Said Contract. and Detains him Upon The Same Notwithstanding he Tenders him Satisfacion According To the Agreem.t As Appears by the oath of M.r Henry Slamer Doctor of the Said Shipp now Taken before the Govern.r. Henry Slamer Sworn Saith That upon Tryday Last CAllisng at M.rs Mudges, Asked	The reprimand came from the Governor and council, with admonishment to better behaviour in future upon pain of severe punishment. Humphrey Edwards, [Montrole], presented a petition. Being married, with a plantation and business requiring his immediate care and attention, and with only five months of his contracted time remaining, he requested permission to leave Company pay. The council, noting that Edwards had often importuned it to this end and that new recruits were lately received and confirmed on the island, ordered that he be discharged from the Honourable Company's service and pay committee costs. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin 14 November 1704. Captain Thomson complained against John Mudge, free planter, who engaged John Bird, one of Thomson's men, by agreement at half a dollar a day but now demanded a dollar for each day, contrary to their contract. Mudge detained Bird on the same grounds, notwithstanding that Thomson tendered satisfaction according to the agreement. This appeared from the oath of Mr Henry Slamer, the ship's doctor, taken before the Governor. Henry Slamer, sworn, testified. On [Friday] last he called at Mrs Mudge's house. Interpretations The Edwards discharge shows the council's flexibility in releasing a man with time remaining on his contract: repeated petitions combined with the availability of new recruits created the conditions for early departure. The grounds - marriage and plantation needs - echo the Griffith discharge from September, suggesting the council treated these as standard justifications for release before contracted time expired.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The Thomson v Mudge complaint shows the island's secondary labour market in operation: captains hired their men to free planters for daily wages, with the council as regulator. A dispute over a contracted rate was brought directly to the Governor and supported by sworn testimony from the ship's own medical officer. The appearance of the ship's doctor as a formal witness to a commercial dispute shows the breadth of persons the council called upon. Medical officers were present at transactions and served as independent witnesses where no island resident was available. Speculations Mudge's insistence on double the agreed rate, combined with his detention of Bird as leverage, suggests Bird was performing valuable work Mudge was unwilling to lose at the original price. The attempt to renegotiate a fixed contract upward, rather than simply releasing Bird, points to a shortage of available willing labour on the island. Edwards's repeated importuning before finally receiving his discharge suggests the council was reluctant to lose an experienced man, granting release only when new arrivals made his departure less damaging. The pattern of granting early discharge against contracted time in exchange for committee costs was by this point an established practice in these records.
192	170	Asked what the Said John Brydon was Indebted Unto her who made Answ.r not much for punch and Atking further how they Agreed for Diet M.rs Mudge Answ.eared half a Dollar a Day, besides punch. It Is ordered. That the Said Cap.t Thondon To pay down Unto the Said Mudge his full Demands According to the first Agree.m.t of half a Dollar a Day besides Extraordinary Expences for punch &c. which was paid In the Govern.rs p.rsence. It Is Likewise ordered. That the Said John Mudge pay 2.s. for Swearing In The Govern.rs hearing towards the Use of the poor. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin Island S.t Helena Att a Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 21.th November 1704 At Fort James. Stephen Poirier Govern.r Present. Corn: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas. The Govern.r Receiving Informacon. That Edward Heath Free planter about A fortnight Since Coming from Ruperts (At which time fired and was Affaulted by Some persons th.r o which he has Concealed. which may be of Ill Consequence. Wherefore being Summoned To Appear This Day, To Discover the Promisses. Declares as followeth. Edward Heath Sworn	Slamer asked what John Brydon was indebted to Mrs Mudge. She answered not much, for punch. Asking further how they agreed for his board, Mrs Mudge answered half a dollar a day, besides punch. An order was issued that Captain Thomson was to pay Mudge his full demands according to the first agreement of half a dollar a day, besides extraordinary expenses for punch and so forth. Payment was made in the Governor's presence. An order was likewise issued that John Mudge was to pay two shillings for swearing in the Governor's hearing, towards the use of the poor. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin St Helena. Consultation held on Tuesday 21 November 1704 at Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor Present: Cornelius Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign The Governor was informed that Edward Heath, free planter, was coming from Rupert's about a fortnight previously when he was fired upon and assaulted by some persons, the identity of whom he concealed, which was to have ill consequences. Heath was summoned to appear that day to disclose the matter. Edward Heath was sworn. Interpretations The immediate payment of the Thomson v Mudge settlement in the Governor's presence shows the council resolving disputes on the spot when the parties were present. The Governor's personal witnessing of the payment served as formal closure without further process. John Mudge's fine for swearing alongside the commercial settlement shows the council attending to separate offences in a single sitting. The labour dispute and the swearing during proceedings were treated as distinct matters, each attracting its own penalty. The summons of Edward Heath to disclose who fired upon and assaulted him at Rupert's shows the council treating the concealment of a violent incident as a matter of public concern. Heath was the island's indispensable fortification builder, making any attack on him at the works a matter affecting the Company's interests directly. Speculations The discrepancy between "John Bird" in the original complaint and "John Brydon" in Slamer's testimony suggests either a genuine difference - two

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			different men were referred to - or that the man was known by two names, with one a nickname and the other a surname. Heath's concealment of his attackers' identity, despite being a key Company employee, suggests the attackers were known to him personally and their identification carried consequences he was not prepared to face. The Governor's concern about the ill consequences of the concealment points to a continuing security threat at the works rather than a chance encounter.
193	171	Saith That Comeing from Ruperts about a Month Since by Night In Company with M.r Bell and others, heard a Gun fired and Looking about them went as near as they Could Guefse from whence the Shot Came and by the way happened To Stumble upon a man who had a Pistoll In his hand who Affaulted him Vigorously, and p.rsently Came up 2 more with Weapons. In their hand who In Like manner Attempted him, which Caused him to make the best of his way but Cannot tell who they were, the Night being very Dark. Robert Bell Sworn, Saith To the Same Effect. Christopher Roby. Sworn Saith That The Night M.r Heath was Maulted his wife Came home before him, and Asking where her husband was, Said he was Comeing after who Soon after Came home himselfe And Inquireing Into the Reason of his Stay y.t Bently Replied Have you Sent to way Layme. And Soe Related how he was Maulted In manner as aforesaid. Further Saith That the 5.t November following. James Wilson, and This Depon.t Drinking at M.r Beales where Humphrey Edwards, and John Coulson were talking off Coffes and Discoursing of Heaths being Affaulted In.o Coulson Asked what time of the Night It was, And telling him Said 2 men. J.S. and S.G. Called at his Mothers house Much ab.t that Time. And that one went one Side the Country, and the other to t' other. William Beale Sworn Saith That Humphrey Edwards and John Coulson being at his house Drinking, there Came In James Wilson and Christopher Roby, and heard them Discourse of J.S. and W.S. And Asking the meaneing of It, Christopher Roby began to Relate the whole Story ab.t Edward Heath. And that Heath told them, That Leaning Upon his Cane the Shott passed by his body, and that one of them had a horse pistoll Und.r his Coate. J. Coulson.	Heath testified: coming from Rupert's about a month previously, by night, in company with Mr Bell and others, he heard a gun fired. Looking about, they went toward what seemed to be the source of the shot. Along the way he stumbled upon a man with a pistol in his hand, who assaulted him vigorously. Two more came up immediately with weapons in their hands and likewise attacked him. This caused him to flee. He was unable to tell who they were, the night being very dark. Robert Bell, sworn, testified to the same effect. Christopher Roby, sworn, testified: the night Heath was assaulted, Heath's wife came home before him. Asked where her husband was, she said he was coming after her. Heath shortly came home himself. On enquiring into the reason for his delay, Bently replied "Have you sent to waylay me?" and related how Heath was assaulted in the manner described. Roby further testified: on 5 November, he and James Wilson were drinking at Mr Beale's, where Humphrey Edwards and John Coulson were talking of [...] and discussing Heath's assault. John Coulson asked what time of night it was, and on being told, said two men - J.S. and S.G. - called at his mother's house at much about that time, one going to one side of the country and the other to the other. William Beale, sworn, testified: Humphrey Edwards and John Coulson were at his house drinking when James Wilson and Christopher Roby came in. Beale heard them discourse of J.S. and W.S. Asking what was meant by it, Roby began to relate the whole story about Heath, and that Heath said: leaning on his cane, the shot passed by his body, and that one of the attackers had a horse pistol under his coat. John Coulson. Interpretations Heath's testimony reveals a coordinated ambush rather than a chance encounter: three men with weapons, the first with a pistol, waiting in the dark, with two more arriving immediately. The near-miss from the shot and the horse pistol concealed under a coat indicate a serious and prepared attempt rather than a drunken brawl. The chain of testimony - Roby hearing from Bently, Coulson knowing of two men who called at his mother's house that night, Beale hearing Roby's account - shows how intelligence circulated in the island's small community. The council assembled its picture from several indirect sources. The use of initials rather than full names in formal sworn testimony shows that witnesses were unwilling to name suspects outright. Such reluctance under oath points to fear of retaliation or serious social consequences from doing so. Speculations The discrepancy between S.G. in Roby's account and W.S. in Beale's suggests either a mishearing, a scribal error, or that the two witnesses referred to different initials entirely. Given the serious implications of identifying the attackers, the discrepancy was significant for any subsequent prosecution. Heath's detail that he leaned on his cane when the shot passed by his body suggests the ambush was positioned for a specific target. The horse pistol

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			concealed under a coat points to premeditation: the attackers came prepared and armed, not by chance.
194	172	John Coulson Saith That being at Beales drinking and Discoursing of Loftes of Goales Christoph: Roby Said his Land Lord Heath was Like to be Shot, Coming home by Night not Long Since And That Much ab.t That time that Night Rob.t Marsh and Edward Marsh Caled for water at their House, haveing both peices on their Shoulders, and one had a Cartridge, And meeting Jn.o Marsh a fishing Some time after told this Depon.t he heard he Such tot who Affaulted the Said Heath. who Answered he onely had Said That his brother and he Came with both peices on their Shoulders much about that time of Night and Called at their house. Edward Marsh Said he know noth.g of the matter. but that his brother had Discharged At A Cartridge. and heard a Whistling, and a Shoot at a [Some] Distance Crying Shoot that Short [...] Humphrey Edwards Sworn, Saith The Same with M.r Beale. M.rs Bazettt Saith The Same with W.m Beales. Martha Plewes Sworn, Saith That Edward Heath and wife being at their house, and Asking him ab.t his being Affaulted Said he heard a Gun fired one Night Coming home and making towards them, Stumbled upon one of them, and Said he had A Pistoll which he thinkes he has Seen before and fforther Said That one belonged To the other Side the Country. And that one had a Light Coat on and being The 5.th November. To which the Said Heaths wife Said She hoped It would Come out one way or other. James Wilson Sworn, Saith That being At M.r Beales with Humphrey Edwards and John Coulson, and talking about Loftes Christopher Roby	John Coulson testified: being at Beale's drinking and discussing [...], Christopher Roby said his landlord Heath was likely to be shot, coming home by night not long previously. Much about that time that night, Robert Marsh and Edward Marsh called at their house for water, having both guns on their shoulders, and one carried a cartridge. Meeting John Marsh fishing some time after, [an account suggested that] he had assaulted Heath. Marsh answered that he only said his brother and he came with both guns on their shoulders, much about that time of night, and called at their house. Edward Marsh said he knew nothing of the matter, but that his brother had discharged a cartridge, and he heard a whistling and a shot at some distance [...] Humphrey Edwards, sworn, testified to the same effect as Mr Beale. Mrs Bazettt testified to the same effect as William Beale. Martha Plewes, sworn, testified: Edward Heath and his wife being at her house, Plewes asked Heath about his being assaulted. Heath said he heard a gun fired one night coming home, and making toward them, stumbled upon one of them who had a pistol he recognised. [Heath] further said that one of them belonged to the other side of the country, and that one had a light coat on. This was 5 November. To which Heath's wife said she hoped the matter would come out one way or another. James Wilson, sworn, testified: being at Mr Beale's with Humphrey Edwards and John Coulson, talking about [...], Christopher Roby [...] Interpretations Multiple witnesses placed armed men near the Coulsons' house at the time of the attack: the Marsh brothers with guns and a cartridge, and the Marsh brothers similarly armed and firing. The convergence of these accounts identifies a cluster of suspects through separate independent testimonies. The Marsh brothers' explanation distinguishes between carrying weapons, which they admitted, and assaulting Heath, which John Marsh denied. Edward Marsh's account of the cartridge discharge and distant gunshot places the brothers at the scene of shooting activity without definitively identifying them as the attackers. Heath's recognition of the pistol or person as familiar indicates the attack was not random violence but targeted action by someone he knew. His wife's statement that she hoped the matter would come out reflects trust in the council's investigation and desire for justice. Speculations The names Marsh and Marsh are similar enough in a small island community to raise the question of whether these are the same men with different name renderings, or two separate pairs of suspects. Confusion between them would have complicated the investigation significantly. John Marsh's defensive response to the implied accusation, that he only said he came with guns and called for water, suggests the accusation was circulating before formal testimony. The admission of a cartridge discharge places the Marshes at gunfire activity but leaves ambiguity about their specific role in the assault.
195	173	Said You are talking of Loftes, my Landlord was Like to Loose his Life, Coming home one Night Saying he heard a Shot as he was Leaning Upon his Cane past betwixt his Cane and his body, and making up to them Stumbled upon one, and the Reft made up to the Said Heath and with Sword and other Weapons Maulled him, And Jn.o Coulson Inquireing what time of Night It	James Wilson said: "You are talking of [...], but my landlord was nearly killed coming home one night. He said he heard a shot pass between his cane and his body as he was leaning on it. Approaching them, he stumbled upon one. The rest made up to Heath and with sword and other weapons mauled him."

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		was Answered about 9 a Clock at Which The Said Coulson Said much about that Time two men Caled for water at their house, but Having four his Peices upon their backs and one went To The Country, and the other the t' other. And that the s.d Humphrey Edwards Said. if his Mother (meaneing M.rs Coulson) and he were to talk together, That they would find them out, and Said I fancy J.S. was one of them. Henry Cole Saith. That hearing a Report Concerning Heath on Tryday 3.d November Christopher Roby and Stephen Phill Comeing by this Depon.ts the fifth November Desired him to Sit down. And talking about the matter And Asking who they were, Said there was one with a Banyan Coate, and another with a Stripe Jacquett, and Calamanco Briches and Asking w.t weapons they had Said one had a horse pistoll and a Rusty Sword and other Weapons And further Asking whether they were not Discovered Answered positively =ly one was J.S. and the other W.S. It Is ordered. That This Matter be Defered to a Jury At The next Quarter Sessions. And That John Marsh, and Robert Marsh be Summoned to Appear here, To Answer what shall be Alleged ag.t them, on this Day fortnight.	John Coulson enquired what time of night [the assault] was. On being told it was about 9 o'clock, he said that much about that time two men called at their house for water, having their guns upon their backs, one going to the country and the other to the other direction. [Wilson further reported] that Humphrey Edwards said: if his mother (meaning Mrs Coulson) and he were to talk together, they were to find them out. Edwards also said "I fancy J.S. was one of them." Henry Cole testified: hearing a report concerning Heath on [3 November], Christopher Roby and Stephen Phill came by on 5 November and asked him to sit down. Talking about the matter and asking who they were, [Roby or Phill] said there was one with a banyan coat and another with a striped jacket and calamanco breeches. Asking what weapons they had, [someone] said one had a horse pistol and a rusty sword and other weapons. Further asking whether they were not discovered, [someone] answered positively that one was J.S. and the other W.S. An order was issued that the matter be deferred to a jury at the next quarter sessions. An order was likewise issued that John Marsh and Robert Marsh be summoned to appear to answer what shall be alleged against them a fortnight from this day. Interpretations The physical detail that the shot passed between Heath's cane and his body shows the ambush was precisely aimed at him. He was the specific target, not a chance victim of random violence. The clothing descriptions - banyan coat and calamanco breeches - and weapon details, given by multiple witnesses, allow physical identification beyond initials. Such distinctive garments and arms would enable identification in formal proceedings. The deferral to quarter sessions with a jury shows the council treating this as a matter for formal trial rather than resolving it through council punishment alone. The formal proceeding reflects the seriousness of the attempted attack. Speculations Humphrey Edwards's suspicion that "J.S." was one attacker, combined with his statement that if his mother and he talked together they were to find them out, suggests Edwards possessed knowledge or strong suspicion of the attackers' identity based on his connection to the Coulson family. The consistent use of initials throughout testimony, and witnesses' reluctance to name suspects fully even under oath, points to a climate of fear on the island. Even in formal proceedings, witnesses preserved distance through initials rather than full names. The summoning of John Marsh and Robert Marsh a fortnight hence suggests the council had enough evidence to identify them as suspects worthy of formal examination, though the full trial was deferred to quarter sessions rather than resolved immediately by the council.
196	174	Edward Heath. Upon Oath Delivers The Informacion following. That Saturday Last, At his own house, Samuel Roby being at the Goal pound and Comeing home with Benjamin Wills the Said Wills told the Said Roby, That Gilbert Colgrave and Jonathan Mudge had a fAllising out and that the Said Gilbert Colgrave Discovered to the Said John Alexander Severall things Concerning the Said Jonathan Mudge, and W.m Beales Ill Practices, And that they had made promiles To Each other That whoever Did Interrupt them, In their Ill Delights, they would Kill him. Moreover Saith That This Day M.r John Alexander Declared To the Said Heath That they have Layd him, 2 or 3 times, And for ought he Knowes may this Day. And Severall other things which when He Shall be So Called he will Declare.	Edward Heath, upon oath, delivered the following information. Last Saturday, at his own house, Samuel Roby, coming from the goal with Benjamin Wills, was told by Wills of a fAllising out between Gilbert Colgrave and Jonathan Mudge. Colgrave, Wills said, disclosed to John Alexander several things concerning Mudge and William Beale's ill practices. [Wills further said] that they made promises to each other that whoever interrupted them in their ill delights was to be killed. Moreover, Heath testified that this day Mr John Alexander declared to him that they laid for him two or three times, and as far as he knew, were to do so again that very day. Heath said he had several other things to declare when called upon. Edward Heath

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Edward Heath. The Said M.r John Alexander being Called before the Govern.r To Declare what he To Say In The matter, Desired time Untill next Council Day To bring his Informacon being not p.repared with what he has To Say being onely told him by the Said Gilbert Colgrave With whom he must Confult. Jn.o Alexander [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	Mr John Alexander, being called before the Governor to declare what he had to say in the matter, requested time until the next council day to bring his information. He was not prepared with what he had to say, the matter being only told to him by Gilbert Colgrave, with whom he must consult. John Alexander [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations Heath's evidence of a conspiracy to kill anyone interfering with "ill practices" indicates that the assault on Heath was connected to broader criminal activities on the island. The specific naming of Colgrave, Mudge, and Beale implicates figures already appeared in these records in various disputes. Alexander's claim of being laid for (ambushed) two or three times, and of fearing another such attempt that very day, connects the assault on Heath to attacks on Alexander himself. Both men appear to stand against a faction engaged in illegal practices. Alexander's request for a delay to consult with Colgrave before testifying raises questions about the independence of the evidence. His need to align his account with Colgrave's before providing it suggests coordination of testimony rather than spontaneous declaration. Speculations The "ill practices" serious enough to warrant a pact to murder informants likely involved illegal trading or smuggling of Company goods. The island's economy depended on the Company monopoly, making private commercial dealings a direct threat to official authority and monopoly control. Heath and Alexander, despite their earlier confrontation with the Governor, now appear aligned against Colgrave, Mudge, and Beale in a factional dispute. The assault on Heath was an attempt by the Mudge faction to eliminate a witness to their activities. Benjamin Wills's involvement as an informant (passing information through Roby to Heath) places him as an opponent of the Mudge faction. The conspiracy extends across social classes on the island, with gentlemen planters like Wills and officers like Heath opposing the illegal activities of men like Mudge and Colgrave.
197	175	Island S.t Helena. At a Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 19.th December 1704 Present. At Fort James. Stephen Poirier Govern.r Cor: Sodington Deputy. Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas. Doctor [Ker] being at Supper with his Worship the Govern.r In his own Apartment, where Haveing Some Discourse about Cap.t Thompson Comander of The Raper. The Said [Ker] Said he was an old presbyterian foole. Whereupon the Check.t him, for Reflecting See Upon an honest Gentleman who was Absent, And In his p.r Sence. At which Doctor [Ker] was So Incenfed, And with an Intent To Affront his Worshippss Said All P.resbyterians, and Those That Differed from the Church of England were fools. without the Least p.rovocacon, or haveing any Dispute or Controversie about Religion. And being Asked by the Govern.r to Give It Und.r his hand Said he would, and CALLisng for pen, and Ink by a Subtle Evasion perverting The True Sense, drewes It To the Query. following. S.t Helena. November 30.th 1704 The Question Is. whether a Member of The Church of England, as Established by Law, be fools. I Doe Declare upon oath (if Required) That the Question hereabovewritten was never proposed, by any body, but onely forged by Doctor [Ker] who was the writer of It. 9.br 30.th 1704. Tho. Gargen. M. Bazettt. C. Sodington Deputy	Island St Helena. Consultation held on Tuesday 19 December 1704 at Fort James. Present: Stephen Poirier, Governor; Cornelius Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign Doctor [Ker], being at supper with the Governor in his own apartment, was having discourse about Captain Thompson, commander of <i>the Raper</i>, when [Ker] said Thompson was an old Presbyterian fool. The Governor rebuked him for reflecting on an honest gentleman who was absent and in his presence. At this Doctor [Ker] was so incensed that, with intent to affront the Governor, he said all Presbyterians and those who differed from the Church of England were fools, without the least provocation or prior religious dispute. Being asked by the Governor to put the matter in writing, [Ker] said he would. CALLisng for pen and ink, through subtle evasion and perversion of the true sense, he converted his assertion into a question, as follows: St Helena. 30 November 1704 The question is: whether a member of the Church of England, as established by law, be fools. A declaration was made on oath by Thomas Garden, Mrs Bazettt, and Cornelius Sodington, Deputy, that the question written above was never proposed by anybody, but only forged by Doctor [Ker] himself as the author of it, on 30 November 1704. Interpretations [Ker]'s outburst against Presbyterians and dissenters came in response to the Governor's rebuke for insulting Thompson. The progression - rebuke for

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			personal insult, [Ker]'s incensed response, broader religious attack - shows escalation from particular to ideological. The unprovoked nature of the religious invective reveals [Ker]'s volatility when corrected. [Ker]'s conversion of the statement into a question was deliberate evasion. By phrasing his assertion as an ambiguous question, he attempted to escape accountability while retaining his doctrinal expression. The testimony of three persons that the written "query" was fabricated on the spot, not prepared in advance, formally established [Ker]'s bad faith. The Deputy's presence among the witnesses suggests the council was documenting a case against [Ker]. Speculations [Ker]'s unprovoked attack on Presbyterianism suggests doctrinal rigidity and ideological intensity. His escalation from personal insult to religious polemic, in response to correction, reveals a man unwilling to accept rebuke and prone to widening conflicts from the particular to the universal. [Ker]'s backdating of the fabricated query to 30 November appears designed to create distance between the supper conversation and the written evasion, making the query seem a separate, prepared text rather than an extemporaneous dodge. The pattern of [Ker]'s behaviour - earlier assault and confrontation with the Governor in October (followed by pardon), now this religious outburst and evasion - suggests an increasingly antagonistic relationship with authority despite the autumn reconciliation.
198	176	Whereas by Proclamacon Issued forth the P.rservacon of the Companys Cattle within the pasture Ground. Robert Marsh Is therein Mencioned, and Ap= =pointed to be a Supervisor of the Same Upon oath. which he Accordingly tooke this Day. To be true to his Trust. Whereas Long Since Arthur Bradley Complained That his wife tooke a Negro named Suff= =field of M.r Marshbournes In her house, And that She tort A Dollar, and 8 peices of pork and has Good Reason To Suspect he tooke It. and ffurther Saith That he broke Through the Thatch, the house being Locked. It Is Ordered. That The Said Marshbourne Doe pay the Said Bradley one Dollar and make full Satisfacon for y.e 8 peices of Pork According to the CAllisng. And Comit fees. and being positive In the oath Give a burden of Rushes To Repair the house. And Whereas. ffurther Complaines That The Companies Blacks have taken away Some of his wood. It Is ordered. That Cap.t Goodwin pay him a Dollar In Recom= =pence thereof. Upon The Companies Account. Doctor [Ker] being In the Hall, And being Civilly Required to Stay the hearing of his Accusacon and to make his Defence, In Contempt of the Gov.r and Councill, Ran out, and would not Stay. Cap.t Sodington. Sworn, Saith That Doctor [Ker] did Say, Cap.t Thompson was an old Presb.	Whereas by proclamation issued forth for the preservation of the Company's cattle within the pasture ground, Robert Marsh was mentioned and appointed to be a supervisor of the same upon oath, which he accordingly took this day, to be true to his trust. Whereas long since Arthur Bradley complained that his wife took a slave named Suffield, belonging to Mr Marshbourne, into her house, and that a dollar and 8 pieces of pork were taken, and [Bradley] has good reason to suspect Suffield took them. [Bradley] further stated that Suffield broke through the thatch, the house being locked. An order was issued that Marshbourne pay Bradley one dollar, make full satisfaction for the 8 pieces of pork according to the assessment, and committee fees, and give a bundle of rushes to repair the house. Whereas Marshbourne further complained that the Company's slaves have taken away some of his wood. An order was issued that Captain Goodwin pay him a dollar in recompense thereof, upon the Company's account. Doctor [Ker], being in the hall and being civilly required to stay for the hearing of his accusation and to make his defence, in contempt of the Governor and council, ran out and would not stay. Captain Sodington, sworn, testified that Doctor [Ker] said Captain Thompson was an old Presbyterian. Interpretations The theft by Suffield shows the vulnerability of property when enslaved people had access to households. Bradley's wife took in Suffield, perhaps as a servant, and he exploited the opportunity to steal. His breaking through the thatch indicates an attempt to escape rather than simple opportunistic theft. [Ker]'s refusal to remain for his hearing, despite civil invitation, represents escalating contempt for council authority. This defiance is a more serious offence than the religious statements themselves - it is direct repudiation of formal proceedings. The dual compensation to Marshbourne (for stolen goods and house damage, and separately for stolen wood) shows the council treating property disputes

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			seriously and directing redress through official channels and the Company's account. Speculations [Ker]'s flight from the hearing appears a deliberate strategy to prevent formal conviction. By refusing to appear, he denied the council the opportunity to formally try and sentence him on the record. Suffield's theft and escape through the thatch suggest an attempt to flee the island. His use of Bradley's house as a refuge before stealing supplies and breaking out indicates a man fleeing servitude rather than an opportunistic thief. The theft of wood by the Company's slaves, met with compensation to the victim rather than punishment of the slaves, raises questions about labour discipline. The Company treated its own slaves' thefts as compensable accidents rather than correctable offences.
199	177	Presbyterian foole. And That All That Difsented from The Church off England were fools. without any p.rovocacon or Discourse of Religion. And he would Give It Und.r his hand. And Instead thereof. Turned the Sente Into the Query aforesaid. M.r Bazettt Sworn Saith That Doctor [Ker] Did at the Same Time Sweare for which he Did Challenge him for Swearing, as he the Said [Ker] had Done him before. John French Gunner Sworn, Saith That being at the Publick Table At Supper, The Black.s not bringing Salt In Due Time, Doctor Bodley Surgeon tooke the Black by the Arme, To Lead him, Saying, If I Strike y.u, I Can but pay [for] You upon which Doctor [Ker] tooke him up, and Called him Dog, Rouge, and Son of a whore, and Required the Lieu.t to take him away. Nathan.tt Conway Carpenter Sworn Saith The Same with the Gunner. onely Adoth That after the Gunner went out. Doctor [Ker] Called the Said Bodley Sawcy Dog, and Sev.tt other Ill Names, and bid him Goe to Lucifer, and That he was, the worst man he ever Saw In his Life Time. Henry Wodbey Sworn, Saith The Same. It Is ordered. 1st That The Said Doctor [Ker] for breach of Peace In Striking Doctor Bodley, In the Govern.rs P.rfence be fined five Shillings; To The R.t Hono.ble Companys	[Sodington's testimony continued:] "Presbyterian fool. And that all who dissented from the Church of England were fools, without any provocation or discourse of religion. And he said he would give it under his hand. And instead thereof, he turned the sentence into the query aforesaid." Mrs Bazettt, sworn, testified that Doctor [Ker] swore at the same time, for which she challenged him for his profanity, as [Ker] had previously done to her. John French, Gunner, sworn, testified: being at the public table at supper, the slaves not bringing salt in due time, Doctor Bodley, surgeon, took the slave by the arm to lead him, saying "If I strike you, I can but pay for you." Upon which Doctor [Ker] rebuked him and called him "dog, rogue, and son of a whore," and required the lieutenant to take him away. Nathaniel Conway, Carpenter, sworn, testified to the same as the Gunner, with the addition that after the Gunner departed, Doctor [Ker] called Bodley "saucy dog" and several other ill names, and bid him go to Lucifer, saying he was the worst man he ever saw in his lifetime. Henry Wodbey, sworn, testified to the same. An order was issued: That Doctor [Ker], for breach of peace in striking Doctor Bodley in the Governor's presence, be fined five shillings to the Right Honourable Company's [account]. Interpretations The multiple witnesses to the supper incident (French, Conway, Wodbey) corroborate each other's accounts consistently, establishing a clear pattern of [Ker]'s response: extreme verbal and physical violence from the initial outburst through prolonged abuse. Bodley's comment about slave punishment - "if I strike you, I can but pay for you" - was a dark jest about the legal property status of enslaved people. [Ker]'s violent response to this comment reveals his sensitivity to the matter, whether grounded in moral principle about slavery or in personal antagonism toward Bodley. The accumulation of charges against [Ker] over recent weeks shows escalating contempt: religious outburst and evasion, refusal to appear for his hearing, profanity, striking a man in the Governor's presence, and prolonged verbal abuse. Each incident compounds the pattern. Speculations [Ker]'s extreme reaction to Bodley's comment about compensating the Company for slave injuries appears to reflect strong feeling on the matter. Whether grounded in religious principle about slavery or in personal antagonism toward Bodley, the violence of his response shows little self-restraint. The consistency of three independent witnesses in their testimony about the supper incident, and their reports of [Ker]'s escalating verbal abuse even after the initial confrontation, strongly establishes the breach of peace charge. The progression from cAllisng Bodley

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			names to telling him to "go to Lucifer" demonstrates uncontrolled rage. The 5-shilling fine suggests the council was exercising restraint at this point, applying financial penalty rather than physical punishment or imprisonment. This approach reveals either reluctance to push [Ker] further toward defiance, or confidence that financial penalty would satisfy while preserving capacity for action on remaining charges.
200	178	Companys. And to Ask Doctor Bodleys pardon, And for Default thereof to pay 5.s more to the poor. 2.ly. That for his Ill behaviour and his Malitious Circumventing pratives and Defacons In the Govern.rs Apartm.t as aforesaid. be fined 2 Dollars 1 moyety. to the Company The other to the poor. And as for the Contempt of the Govern.r and Comuits order In not Staying To heare his Accusacon or make his Defence. It Is Left To Our Right Hono.ble Masters In Consideracon he has been fined Soemuch as abovesaid. And that he pay Councill Cost. Whereas. by Proclamacon by the Gov.r and Councill All ffreemen and others were prohibited To Distroy The Game as Killing of Partridges &c. And whereas. It has been Proved that Rob. and Edward Marsh have Killed a Patridge In Contempt thereof. And which they Do Confesse. It Is ordered. That the Said Robert Marsh and Edward Marsh be fined Each of them a Dollar one moiety to the Companys the other To the poor. and for the next offense to be fined Severer And pay Councill Cost. Daniel Griffith One of the Councill. Complaines ag.t John Long and his wife for CAllisng his wife whore, and Bitch. Indeavouring thereby To Sett them All Sandanies well Knowing the Said Daniel Griffith's wife who was the widdow of James Rider freeplanter. To be a woman of Credit and Reputacon In the Country, Haveing Lived with M.r Rider Hon.r and near 20 Years. During which time they have I alwayes In Good fframe and Credit. Therefore Prayed Satisfacion. Doctor Hodkinson Sworn Saith That upon Saturday was Sevennight Edmond [Long] [his] Son being at M.rs Longs brought them word that M.r Griffiths	And to ask Doctor Bodley's pardon. And for default thereof, to pay five shillings more to the poor. 2nd: That for his ill behaviour and his malicious circumvention of procedures and defamations in the Governor's apartment, as aforesaid, he be fined two dollars - one moiety to the Company's account, the other to the poor. And as for the contempt of the Governor and Council's order in not staying to hear his accusation or make his defence, it is left to our Right Honourable Masters in consideration that he has been fined as above. And he is to pay Council cost. Whereas by proclamation by the Governor and Council, all freemen and others were prohibited from destroying the game, such as the killing of partridges and so forth. And whereas it has been proved that Robert Marsh and Edward Marsh have killed a partridge in violation thereof, which they confess. An order was issued that Robert Marsh and Edward Marsh be fined each a dollar - one moiety to the Company's account, the other to the poor. And for the next offence to be fined more severely, and pay Council cost. Daniel Griffith, one of the Council, complained against John Long and his wife for cAllisng his wife "whore" and "bitch," endeavouring thereby to cause discord, well knowing the said Daniel Griffith's wife, who was the widow of James Rider, free planter, to be a woman of credit and reputation in the country, having lived with Mr Rider for nearly twenty years. During which time they had always been in good fame and credit. [Griffith] therefore prayed for satisfaction. Doctor Hodkinson, sworn, testified: upon the Saturday previous, Edmond Long, John Long's son, being at Mrs Long's, brought them word about Mr Griffith's [...] Interpretations The multiple charges against [Ker] and the consistent splitting of fines between the Company and the poor fund show the council using financial penalties as both restitution to the Company and charitable support for island residents. The referral of the contempt charge to London reflects the seriousness of [Ker]'s refusal to answer his accusation and defend himself. Contempt of council authority was seen as a matter requiring the Company's oversight. The Marsh brothers' poaching charge, with threat of severer penalties for future offences, shows the council enforcing game laws to preserve island resources. These were the same two men implicated in the assault on Edward Heath months earlier. Griffith's detailed recitation of his wife's reputation and twenty-year residence with her late first husband establishes her standing before making his slander complaint. The complaint shows the council treating defamation of council members' wives as a serious matter. Speculations The [Ker] case consumed significant council attention over December, with multiple charges ranging from religious offence to physical violence to contempt. The referral of the contempt charge to London suggests the council viewed [Ker] as a threat to order serious enough to warrant higher authority's judgment.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Robert and Edward Marsh, now charged with poaching, had been implicated in the assault on Edward Heath. The pattern of their offences suggests they were among the island's more troublesome residents, justifying the threat of severer penalties. Daniel Griffith's use of his council position to pursue a slander complaint shows the council hearing private grievances from members. His detailed testimony about his wife's reputation and long residence with her previous husband indicates either genuine concern for her standing or a bid to establish family respectability in the colony.
201	179	Blacks had Killed one of their biggest barrows. and t. Hung It up by the Heeles. whereupon M.rs Long Run down the Plantacon. To See what was the matter and ffinding the Hog among the woods, and not [hyer] up. M.rs Long broke out Into A pasion. Talking to the Blacks &c Asked where the whore their Mishelse was and Told her of a Chimney brig That was Carried Und.r a Lemon Tree for M.r Person to Lye with her With other very Scandalous Expressions. M.rs Long her Selfe Confesseth That She Caled the Said Griffiths wife whore, and bitch. M.r Long Declares he Called the Said Griffiths wife whore. Hatton Sterling Sworn, Saith The Same With M.r Hotherson. Informacon being Given to The Govern.r That Young John Long makes a practice of Killing the R.t Hono.ble Companys Goates. ffrancis Wrangham Sworn Saith That Hatton Starling and he, walking near Goale Hill Saw Dogs Persuing of a parcell of Goates and 2 or 3 men after And Seeing them Goe To M.r Longs House. ffound they had In a bagg a Young Goat. And Asking where they had that Goate. Young Long Said It was The Companys. Hatton Sterling Saith The Same. Leonard Coulson Sworn, Saith That Last Tryday was 3 weekes M.rs Longs black Abraham with William Dutton and ffriving the Companyes Goates, All In a body And believes upon his oath That there was not one marked. And Young John Long not faie off. It Is.	[Hodkinson continued:] The blacks had killed one of their biggest hogs and hung it up by the feet. Whereupon Mrs Long ran down the plantation to see what was the matter. Finding the hog among the woods and [...], Mrs Long broke out in a rage. Speaking to the blacks, she made accusations about Griffith's wife, saying Mr Person lay with her under a lemon tree, with other scandalous expressions. Mrs Long herself confesses that she called the said Griffith's wife "whore" and "bitch." Mr Long declares he called the said Griffith's wife "whore." Hatton Sterling, sworn, testified to the same as Mr Hotherson. Information being given to the Governor that Young John Long makes a practice of killing the Right Honourable Company's goats. Francis Wrangham, sworn, testified: [he and] Hatton Sterling, walking near Goat Hill, saw dogs pursuing a parcel of goats and 2 or 3 men after them. Seeing them go to Mr Long's house, [they] found [the men] had in a bag a young goat. Asking where they got that goat, Young Long said it was the Company's. Hatton Sterling testified to the same. Leonard Coulson, sworn, testified: three weeks ago, on a Friday, Mrs Long's slave Abraham, with William Dutton and others, [were] driving the Company's goats, all together. [He] believes upon his oath that there was not one marked. And Young John Long [was] not far off. Interpretations The hog incident reveals the context for Mrs Long's outburst: the slaves had killed and butchered one of her hogs. Her rage at this property loss led her to direct insults at Griffith's wife - an outburst driven by frustration over livestock damage rather than premeditated slander. Both Mr and Mrs Long confess to cAllisng Griffith's wife "whore," establishing the factual basis for Griffith's slander complaint. The admissions from both parties make the case straightforward. Young John Long's habitual poaching of Company goats, with multiple witnesses placing him at scenes of theft with Company animals in his possession, establishes a clear pattern of stealing from the Company. Speculations Mrs Long's specific accusation that Mr Person lay with Griffith's wife under a lemon tree appears to reflect either local gossip or an invented detail meant to sound plausible. The specificity of location and named person suggests either known circumstances or Mrs Long's construction of a credible-sounding scenario. The testimony that the Company's goats were unmarked is significant: unmarked animals were easy to poach and difficult for the Company to claim as stolen. Young John Long exploited this vulnerability systematically. Young John Long's involvement in goat poaching, combined with his family's broader pattern of conflicts on the island (the hog killing, the slander, the general

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			troublemaking), suggests systematic lawbreaking across the Long household rather than isolated incidents.
202	180	It Is ordered. That the Decision of these matters be Defered To a Jury At the next Sessions. Francis Wrangham Came this Day before The Govern.r and Councill and Prayed Us to Admitt of M.r Henry Francis his Uncle To be his Guardian. being now und.r the Tuition of M.r Thomas Goodwin who Is Sole Execut.r to the Estate. It Is Therefore ordered. That the Said Francis be Appointed his Guardian Giving Security to Save The Govern.rs harmlesse: And Discharging Cap.t Goodwin from All Demands, or Accounts of The Said Wrangham, while he Comes of Age. M.r Long Desires To Enter an Acion ag.t Daniel Griffith and his wife. for he cAllisng him old Rouge. which was Granted. The Govern.r Represented To the Comuit This Day. That Severall ffreemen Do Neglect their Duty In not Repairing to their Respetive Posts. Upon Alarms Notwithstanding We have often at a Generall Randevous, Intreated, and friendly Admonished them thereto. It Is Therefore ordered. That whosoever for the future Shall Absent themselves Or not Come In a Competent time (with.t a Lawfull Impediment) Shall forfeit for the 1.st offence one Dollar ffor the 2.d default 1 dollar and a halfe, And Soe ad Infinitum. And That a Proclamacon be Issued out for That Effect. Whereas	An order was issued that the decision of these matters be deferred to a jury at the next sessions. Francis Wrangham came this day before the Governor and Council and prayed [us] to appoint Mr Henry Francis, his uncle, to be his guardian, he being now under the tuition of Mr Thomas Goodwin, who is sole executor of the estate. An order was therefore issued that the said Francis be appointed his guardian, giving security to protect the Governor. And Captain Goodwin was discharged from all demands or accounts of the said Wrangham while he comes of age. Mr Long desired to enter an action against Daniel Griffith and his wife for [Griffith] cAllisng him "old rogue," which was granted. The Governor represented to the Council this day that several freemen neglect their duty in not repairing to their respective posts upon alarms, notwithstanding [that] the council has often at a general muster entreated and friendly admonished them thereto. An order was therefore issued that whosoever for the future shall absent themselves or not come in competent time (without a lawful impediment) shall forfeit for the 1st offence one dollar, for the 2nd default one dollar and a half, and so ad infinitum. And [that] a proclamation be issued for that effect. Interpretations The deferral of both the slander case and goat theft to jury reflects the council's confidence in jury proceedings for serious matters. These cases involve reputation and sustained theft rather than simple violations. Henry Francis becoming Wrangham's guardian, with security requirements, shows the council's formal oversight of minors' estates. The release of Thomas Goodwin from accounting duties establishes clear institutional procedures for guardianship transfer. Long's counter-suit against Griffith (for cAllisng him "old rogue") escalates the slander dispute into mutual allegations. Both sides perceived themselves as wronged parties pursuing redress. The militia fine order with escalating penalties (1 dollar, then 1.5 dollars, continuing infinitely) reflects the council's attempt to enforce security discipline through financial punishment for non-appearance. Speculations The escalating militia fines ad infinitum appear impractical or difficult to enforce, yet the steep penalties reveal the council's serious view of militia negligence as a security threat. The requirement for a proclamation suggests repeated informal warnings had failed. The Griffith/Long dispute becoming mutual suits shows how slander allegations can escalate into broader feuds on a small island, with each party accusing the other. The jury deferral appears designed to cool tempers through formal process. The militia problem—freemen failing to appear at alarms—suggests either casual attitude toward security or genuine conflicts with labour obligations elsewhere on the island. The exception for "lawful impediment" acknowledges competing demands on freemen's time.
203	181	Whereas. John George Newman a German Haveing Left the Ship Gloucester Cap.t Phillip Brown Comander And According to a Proclamacon In that Cale Issued out The Govern.r has Confined him to be punished Accordingly. But Considering how Cap.t Brown Recomend him to the Govern.r In Cap.t Goodwin haveing Defireing To Remitt his punishm.t And that they would Deale with him Civilly, Haveing a Respect for his Ingenuity being by Trade a Joyner and Carpenter, And Capable To Serve The R.t Hono.ble	Whereas John George Newman, a German, having left the ship <i>Gloucester</i>, Captain Phillip Brown, commander, and according to a proclamation issued in that case, the Governor confined him to be punished accordingly. But considering how Captain Brown recommended him to the Governor and Captain Goodwin, [who] having desired to remit his punishment and that they would deal with him civilly, having respect for his ingenuity - being by trade a joiner and carpenter and

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Company In Severall Respects. And fforther Considering his Petion P.rsentd on the 14.th of this Instant That he was not Intered as a Sailer. We (But not To be Drawn as a President for the future) think fitt To Admitt him Into the R.t Hono.ble Companies Service As a Soldier for the Term of 4 Yeares at 21.s. p.r Month Under the Condicion following. That when he Comes upon The Guard The Govern.r may Employ him, and Call him ffrom his Duty of Centinell To See what his Worship Shall Think fitt, and most proper for The R.t Hono.ble Companys Interest. To Which I Doe Content, and Agree to. Witness my hand. H: G: N: M. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	capable to serve the Right Honourable Company in several respects - and further considering his petition presented on the 14th of this instant, [stating] that he was not entered as a sailor, [we] (but [this is] not to be drawn as a precedent for the future) think fit to admit him into the Right Honourable Company's service as a soldier for the term of 4 years at 21 shillings per month. Under the condition following: that when he comes upon the guard, the Governor may employ him and call him from his duty of sentry to see what his Worship shall think fit and most proper for the Right Honourable Company's interest. To which I do consent and agree to. Witness my hand. [John George Newman] [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations The explicit disclaimer that this is "not to be drawn as a precedent for the future" shows the council wanted to show leniency while maintaining the principle that desertion should be punished. This was an exception, not a change in policy. Newman's admission as a soldier rather than punishment as a deserter represents a pragmatic trade-off: the island gained skilled labour (joinery/carpentry) rather than losing it through execution or imprisonment. The skills he offered the Company outweighed the principle of desertion. The condition allowing the Governor to call Newman from sentry duty shows the council viewing him as available for specialized tasks beyond normal military duties. His carpentry skills were the real value the council sought. Speculations Captain Brown's recommendation of Newman, despite his desertion, suggests Brown valued his carpenter skills highly. Knowledge of circumstances supporting leniency, or deep respect for Newman's professional capabilities, likely informed the recommendation. Captain Goodwin's desire to remit the punishment and deal with Newman civilly, despite serving as a military officer, indicates his recognition of Newman's value to the island's construction and fortification needs. The salary of 21 shillings per month placed Newman among the skilled workers on the island - comparable to officer pay. This salary level reveals the council's valuation of his carpentry work as essential to the Company's interests and the island's development.
204	182	Island S.t Helena Att a Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 16.th Day of January 1704/5 At Fort=James. Present. Stephen Poirier Govern.r Cor: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas. George Dwight Soldier p.rsentd a Petion Setting forth. That he has Served the R.t Hono.ble Companye one and twenty yeares, Praying To have his Discharge w.ch was Granted Accordingly. Jonathan Higham. Haveing Served The Right Hono.ble Companies Likewise many Years. Defires To be So Dismitted which was Granted him. Hugh Bodby Quarter Gunner Haveing Requested the Same Is Accordingly Dismitted of The R.t Hono.ble Companies Service. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin	St Helena. Consultation held on Tuesday 16 January 1705 at Fort James. Present: Stephen Poirier, Governor; Cornelius Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign Whereas George Dwight, soldier, presented a petition setting forth that he has served the Right Honourable Company one and twenty years, praying to have his discharge, which was granted accordingly. Jonathan Higham, having served the Right Honourable Company likewise many years, desires to be so dismissed, which was granted him. Hugh Bodby, Quarter Gunner, having requested the same, is accordingly dismissed from the Right Honourable Company's service. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations The three discharge requests, all granted without objection or conditions, show the council treating long-service retirement as routine administrative business. No special terms or complications are noted for any of the men. The progression from George Dwight (21 years, straightforward discharge) through Jonathan Higham (many years, routine discharge) to Hugh Bodby (Quarter Gunner, discharged from service) shows no

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			discrimination in granting retirement to men at various ranks and lengths of service. The brevity of these entries - no conditions imposed, no complications - contrasts sharply with the complex and contentious matters dominating earlier consultations. This suggests a period of relative calm or administrative routine by January 1705. Speculations The three men's simultaneous discharge requests reflect either knowledge that they were reaching the end of their service commitments or ages, or they represent accumulated requests processed together. The timing indicates an administrative review of long-serving personnel. Hugh Bodby's discharge is notable: as a Quarter Gunner (a military specialist), his departure represents loss of military expertise. The straightforward approval without seeking to retain him indicates either his role was not critical to island security or his departure was expected and planned. The contrast between these routine discharges and the intensely contentious cases dominating earlier records (the assault investigations, the [Ker] charges, the personal feuds and conflicts) suggests either a seasonal pattern to council business or that the serious matters had been substantially resolved by January 1705.
205	183	Island S.t Helena. Att a Court of Judicature Hold on Wednesday The 17.th January 1704/5 At The Sessions House In Chappell Valley near Fort=James. Stephen Poirier Gov.r Judge Present. Cor: Sodington Deputy. Tho: Goodwin Ensign. The Court opened after The Usual Manner Jurors Impaneled, and Sworn. (viz.t) Robert Addis foreman 1 Hugh Bodley 2 Jos: Parsons 3 Tho: Sanderson 4 Lipin Wells 5 Erasmus Gurling 6 Jn.o Nicholls 7 Orlando Bagley 8 Jn.o Cloverring 9 Mathew Bazett 10 Edward Marshbourn 11 John Mudge 12 Informacon being Given the Govern.r That Gabriel Cornell Free planter on the 27.th Day of December Last had Unreasonably and beyond meafsure punished and Whipt A Negro Slave of his aged about 9 Yeares whereof he Died. Which he P.rsents, and Leaves to The Considracon of the Country. Doctor Bodley. and George Hotherson Surgeons Sworn. Delivers their opinions as followeth	St Helena. At a court of judicature held on Wednesday 17 January 1705 at the Sessions House in Chapel Valley near Fort James. Stephen Poirier, Governor and Judge, present. Cornelius Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign. The court opened after the usual manner. Jurors impaneled and sworn, namely: Robert Addis (foreman), Hugh Bodley, Joseph Parsons, Thomas Sanderson, Lipin Wells, Erasmus Gurling, John Nicholls, Orlando Bagley, John Cloverring, Matthew Bazett, Edward Marshbourn and John Mudge. Information being given to the Governor that Gabriel Cornell, free planter, on 27 December last had unreasonably and beyond measure punished and whipped a slave of his, aged about 9 years, whereof he died. Which [the Governor] presents and leaves to the consideration of the jury. Doctor Bodley and George Hotherson, surgeons, sworn, deliver their opinions as follows. Interpretations The formal jury trial for Gabriel Cornell's excessive punishment shows the court treating the death of a slave as a matter requiring serious investigation. Even though the victim was enslaved, the killing was not simply dismissed as a matter of private household discipline. The involvement of two surgeons to deliver expert opinions suggests a medical-legal proceeding attempting to establish cause of death and whether the injuries sustained were consistent with "unreasonable and beyond measure" punishment. The presentation by the Governor and referral to the jury shows the formal process: the authority presents the accusation, and the jury determines the verdict and appropriate penalty. Speculations The specific charge of "unreasonable and beyond measure" punishment suggests the court recognized that some punishment of slaves was considered "reasonable" - but this case crossed that line. The question for the jury would be whether the punishment was so excessive as to constitute a crime. The death of a young child (9 years old) rather than an adult appears to have influenced the decision to prosecute. The death of a very young slave due to excessive punishment crossed some threshold of what the authorities considered acceptable.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			The timing - 27 December, in the Christmas season - and the youth of the victim suggest possible impulse or cruelty rather than deliberate disciplinary punishment. The Governor's decision to prosecute appears to reflect moral judgment about the nature and circumstances of the killing.
206	184	followeing. Haveing Recd. a warr.t from the Gov.r To View and Inspect The body, of a Black Slave of Gabriel Powell Free planter. Have ffound the parts both Externall, and Internall Sound, and perfect But the Said Slave being whipt on Tuesday morning Last his back In Some places Raw, and The Aggravacion following being by his Master Thrown with his hands tyed Into A bed of Nettles which Tormented, and Stung him to that Degree That he Immediately fell Into Violent Convulsions and Died, Which Is The Opinion of me John Anth.o Bodley Chirurgon I George Hotherson Do Subscribe To The Same. Geo: Hotherson. The Jury withdrew, and after an hours Consultacon. Delivered The Verdict following. That It Is their opinion. That the Said Powell did not Murder the Said Black boy wilfully, but was Accidentaly, But for his Cruell punishing the Said boy The Said Powell be fined To the Use of the Church The Sume of fforty Shillings, and Admonished for the future. Informacon. against Edward Heath Free planter for Reporting he was Affaulted In the High way In the Night before and Concealing It which may be of Ill Consequence to the Publick. Vide Consultacon Held on Tuesday the 21.th November 1704 William Beale Sworn Referrs himself To his former Deposicon At The Said Consultacon.	Having received a warrant from the Governor to view and inspect the body of a black slave of Gabriel Powell, free planter, we have found the parts both external and internal sound and perfect. But the said slave, being whipped on Tuesday morning last, his back in some places raw. The aggravation following: being thrown by his master, with his hands tied, into a bed of nettles, which tormented and stung him to that degree that he immediately fell into violent convulsions and died. Which is the opinion of me: John Anthony Bodley, Chirurgon I George Hotherson do subscribe to the same. George Hotherson The jury withdrew, and after an hour's consultation delivered the verdict as follows: that it is their opinion that the said Powell did not murder the said black boy wilfully, but it was accidental. But for his cruel punishment of the said boy, the said Powell is fined to the use of the Church the sum of forty shillings, and admonished for the future. Information against Edward Heath, free planter, for reporting that he was assaulted in the high way in the night before and concealing it, which is of ill consequence to the public. See consultation held on Tuesday 21 November 1704. William Beale, sworn, refers himself to his former deposition at the said consultation. Interpretations The surgeons' examination and opinion establish the medical facts: the slave's body was normal before the attack; the whipping left his back raw in places; the nettles caused violent convulsions; and the convulsions resulted in death. The chain of causation is established by medical examination and professional opinion. The jury's verdict distinguishes between wilful murder (which they reject) and accidental death resulting from excessive punishment (which they find). Powell's cruelty is condemned, but not prosecuted as a criminal act constituting murder. The fine of forty shillings to the Church serves as both punishment and a form of restitution for a crime against Christian society. The admonition is a formal warning not to repeat such conduct. Speculations The jury's reluctance to convict Powell of wilful murder, despite clear evidence that Powell's actions caused death, indicates they viewed the death as resulting from excessive discipline that went too far, rather than from premeditated intent to kill. The legal distinction between accidental death and wilful murder appears to turn on Powell's mental state at the moment he threw the slave into the nettles - whether he intended to kill or merely to punish. The choice of nettles as a form of restraint and torture - throwing a bound man into plants designed to cause pain - indicates deliberate cruelty rather than a spontaneous loss of temper. The jury's finding of "accidental" death indicates they interpreted "accidental" to mean "not premeditated with intent to kill" rather than "consequence of reckless action." The involvement of the Church in receiving the fine indicates this was viewed as a moral and spiritual failing as well as a legal matter. The Church's role in the punishment reflects the religious dimensions of the case: Powell's cruelty violated Christian ethics of care for dependents and the vulnerable. The defendant is referred to as both "Gabriel Cornell" in the initial charge and "Gabriel Powell" in the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			surgeons' opinion and verdict. This likely represents a variant spelling of the same surname or name confusion in the court record. The Edward Heath case, immediately following, shifts the focus from a slave's death due to cruelty to a freeman's concealment of information about an assault. The juxtaposition indicates the court's concern with maintaining public order and ensuring that attacks and crimes are properly reported to authorities.
207	185	Martha Plewes James Wilson Henry Cole Christopher Roby, and Humphrey Edwards and John Coulson. Refer themselves To their former Depositions At the Said Consultacon as aforesaid. Phillip Lodgett Sworn Saith That being At M.rs Heaths Christopher Roby. Said He thought their Land= Lord and Landlady would not Come home At that Time of Night but M.rs Heath Came home first and the Said Heath Comeing after his wife asked where he had been Soe Long. who Answered what have you Sent to way Layme And Mistrusting Somebody, Sent his Black To M.rs Burnhams who was at home. Upon Hearing The Evidences. The Jury withdrew and after halfe an howres Consult= Tacon. Delivered the Verdict following (viz.t) That The Said Heath be fined 2 Doll.r To The Church for a falsse Report of an Affault, and Concealing It. and Court Charges. An Informacon against John Long Junior for Killing the Companys Goates. Vide Consultacon Held on Tuesday 19.th December 1704. ffrancis Wrangham Sworn. Referrs himself To his former Deposition In this matter At the Aforesaid Consultacon. Hatton Starling Sworn. Saith the Same.	Martha Plewes, James Wilson, Henry Cole, Christopher Roby, Humphrey Edwards and John Coulson refer themselves to their former depositions at the said consultation as aforesaid. Phillip Lodgett, sworn, saith that being at Mrs. Heath's with Christopher Roby, Roby said he thought their landlord and landlady would not come home at that hour of the night. But Mrs. Heath came home first, and the said Heath coming after his wife asked where he had been so long. He answered in a manner indicating he had been attacked. And mistrusting somebody [had attacked him], he sent his black servant to Mrs. Burnham's, who was at home. Upon hearing the evidence, the jury withdrew and after half an hour's consultation delivered the verdict as follows: that the said Heath is fined two dollars to the Church for a false report of an assault and concealing it, and court charges. An information against John Long Junior for killing the Company's goats. See consultation held on Tuesday 19 December 1704. Francis Wrangham, sworn, refers himself to his former deposition in this matter at the aforesaid consultation. Hatton Starling, sworn, saith the same. Interpretations The verdict against Edward Heath - fined for making a false report of an assault whilst concealing the true circumstances - shows the court treated fraud about crimes as a serious offence in itself. False reports waste court time and resources and divert attention from genuine crimes. Phillip Lodgett's testimony, showing that Heath came home in a state suggesting he had been attacked, appears not to have convinced the jury that the assault was genuine. Either the jury disbelieved Lodgett's account, or they found the assault was fabricated or greatly exaggerated by Heath. The immediate move from the Heath case to the John Long goat-poaching case shows the court processing multiple charges in a single session, moving systematically through the calendar. Speculations The conviction of Heath for false reporting is puzzling given that witnesses testified he appeared to have been attacked. The court's decision to fine him for a false report indicates the assault was either fabricated entirely by Heath to distract from some other activity, or was greatly exaggerated. The court clearly disbelieved Heath's account despite the earlier investigation and witness testimony. The November investigation of Heath's assault had been thorough: multiple witnesses, references to the High Way, weapons, and timing. Yet by January, the court had determined the report was false. This shift indicates the court had uncovered evidence of fabrication during the investigation, though the details are not recorded here. Heath's sending of his servant to Mrs. Burnham's appears to have been interpreted by the court as suspicious rather than as seeking help. The court seems to have viewed this action as evidence Heath was fabricating the assault story to explain why he came home late and unharmed. The charge against Heath "for reporting he was Affaulted... and Concealing It" now appears to signify:

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			for falsely reporting an assault whilst concealing his real reason for being out late in the night. Perhaps Heath was engaged in some undisclosed activity (a meeting, illicit business, or personal matter) that he chose to conceal by claiming to have been attacked. The witnesses Francis Wrangham and Hatton Starling, who testified in the John Long goat-poaching case, are the same men who gave testimony in December about John Long's repeated poaching of Company goats. Their appearance again in January indicates the court took the pattern of repeated theft by the Long family seriously.
208	186	Doctor Hodkinson Sworn Saith That being at M.rs Longs and talking about the Goat her Son Killed. She Said It was Tame. That She Did Request M.rs Drewes To Say Nothing of It. James Each Sworn Saith That about 7 weekes Since he Saw John Long Shoot down a Goate, and The Black take It on his back away. Upon Hearing The Evidence. The Jury withdrew, and after a Short hours, Delivered The Verdict as followeth. That the Said John Long Jund. Is Guilty of takeing a Kid of the Companys. And That The Companye take their Satisfaction. According to their In= Strucions In that Cale. Whereas. The Jury haveing Referred the Matter To The Companies Instrucions, and Valuing the Kid at halfe a Dollar. It Is ordered. That He pay 2 Dollars, as fourfold and Court Charges. William Beale Free planter Complains Against Gilbert Colgrave Free planter. for That he Trades and barters with one Giles Smith his Son In Law a minor und.r Age, without the privity, or Advise of his Friends or Parents Causing him To wast and Imbezle his Effects and Substance, before he Attaines To The Age of Maturity, or Discrecon. And which practices may be of Ill Consequent To The Youth of The Place.	Doctor Hodkinson, sworn, saith that being at Mrs. Long's and talking about the goat her son killed, she said it was tame. That she did request Mrs. Drewes to say nothing of it. James Each, sworn, saith that about seven weeks since he saw John Long shoot down a goat, and a black servant carried it away. Upon hearing the evidence, the jury withdrew and after a short hour delivered the verdict as follows: that the said John Long Junior is guilty of taking a kid of the Company's. And that the Company take their satisfaction according to their instructions in that case. Whereas the jury having referred the matter to the Company's instructions, and valuing the kid at half a dollar, it is ordered that he pay two dollars as fourfold and court charges. William Beale, free planter, complains against Gilbert Colgrave, free planter, for that he trades and barters with one Giles Smith, his son-in-law, a minor under age, without the privity or advice of his friends or parents, causing him to waste and embezzle his effects and substance before he attains to the age of maturity or discretion. And which practices are of ill consequence to the youth of the place. Interpretations The evidence against John Long Junior is straightforward: Doctor Hodkinson testifies that Mrs. Long admitted the goat was tame and asked Mrs. Drewes to keep silent about the matter. James Each testifies that he witnessed John Long shoot the goat and saw a black servant carry it away. Mrs. Long's request that Mrs. Drewes remain silent shows consciousness of guilt. She knew the goat belonged to the Company and attempted to suppress evidence of the theft. The sentence of two dollars (fourfold the half-dollar value of the goat) plus court charges follows biblical restitution principles for theft. The court treats animal theft as a serious matter requiring substantial compensation. The complaint against Gilbert Colgrave shifts the focus from simple theft to corruption of a minor: trading and bartering with an underage person without parental consent, causing him to waste his inheritance before reaching maturity. Speculations The pattern of the Long family engaging in property crimes (goat poaching) shows a persistent problem on the island. The court's enforcement of fourfold restitution is intended to deter the behaviour, yet the earlier proceedings in December did not prevent John Long Junior from repeating the theft. Mrs. Long's request that Mrs. Drewes remain silent indicates the theft was known to the family and deliberate, not accidental. The attempt to suppress evidence demonstrates consciousness of guilt and coordination amongst family members. William Beale's complaint against Gilbert Colgrave is notable: in the November record, Beale and Colgrave were mentioned together as possibly involved in ill practices with Jonathan Mudge and Edward Heath. Now Beale is accusing Colgrave directly. This indicates

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			either that Beale and Colgrave have broken apart over some dispute, that Beale is accusing Colgrave to deflect suspicion from himself, or that the earlier reference was to different persons or circumstances. The complaint about Colgrave trading with Giles Smith (a minor) indicates the court was concerned about economic exploitation of young people on the island. The assertion that such practices are "of ill consequence to the youth of the place" reflects anxiety about moral corruption and financial ruin of young men through commercial dealings with older, more experienced traders. Giles Smith is identified only as Colgrave's son-in-law and "a minor under age," with no mention of his parents' presence or location. This suggests Smith was either a young settler whose parents remained off-island, or an orphan, leaving him vulnerable to exploitation by his father-in-law.
209	187	The Defend.t Defires that M.r John Alexander might plead for him which was Granted. Then The Jury were Sworn againe. The Said M.r Alexander objecting ag.t the Plaintiff W.m Beale for not filing his Declaracon In due Time According to the Companys ord.rs In that Cale was nonsuited, w. and to pay Comuit Charges. Charles Steward. Free planter Compl.ts Against Robert and Richard Swallow Defend.ts In an Acion of the Cale. for That they without his Privity, or Consent. Entered his house In the Country, he and his wife being Absent. And took away Some Salt And haveing Lost Severall other things hath Good Reason To Suspect them for The Same. The Defendants Confesse they went Into The Said Charles Stewards house, and borrowed Some Salt of their Blacks. which they were To Returne againe. Elizabeth Swallow Sworn Saith. That when her Sons Came home and brought the Salt with them She Asked where they Got It who told her they borrowed It of Charles Stewards Blacks. and would pay It againe when they fetcht Some next. The Said Charles Steward being Sworn. Saith. That about That time being at the fort, he has Lossed about 5 Turkeyes. and about 2 Dozen of other ffowles. Upon The Whole. The Jury withdrew, and In a Short Time	The defendant [Colgrave] desires that Mr. John Alexander might plead for him, which was granted. Then the jury were sworn again. The said Mr. Alexander, objecting against the plaintiff William Beale for not filing his declaration in due time according to the Company's orders in that case, was nonsuited, and [Beale is] to pay court charges. Charles Steward, free planter, complains against Robert and Richard Swallow, defendants, in an action of the case, for that they, without his privity or consent, entered his house in the country, he and his wife being absent, and took away some salt. And having lost several other things, he has good reason to suspect them for the same. The defendants confess they went into the said Charles Steward's house and borrowed some salt from his blacks, which they were to return again. Elizabeth Swallow, sworn, saith that when her sons came home and brought the salt with them, she asked where they got it. They told her they borrowed it from Charles Steward's blacks and would pay it again when they fetched some next. The said Charles Steward, being sworn, saith that about that time, being at the fort, he lost about 5 turkeyes and about 2 dozen of other fowls. Upon the whole, the jury withdrew, and in a short time... Interpretations Alexander's successful procedural objection - that Beale failed to file his declaration in due time - shows the court enforcing proper legal procedure strictly. Even if Beale's underlying claim was substantive, his failure to follow the Company's orders in a timely manner resulted in dismissal of the case. The Swallows' admission that they entered Steward's house without permission and took salt is significant: they confess to trespass and taking property but characterise it as borrowing with intent to return. This distinction between theft and unauthorised borrowing is crucial to the case's outcome. Elizabeth Swallow's testimony supports her sons' account: they brought home salt and said they would return it when they obtained more. This indicates the taking was undertaken as borrowing rather than simple theft, though it was accomplished without the owner's knowledge or consent. Steward's loss of 5 turkeyes and 24 fowls whilst he was at the fort indicates possible systematic theft during his absence. The proximity in time between these losses and the Swallows' salt-taking connects them, though the evidence presented is not explicit. Speculations John Alexander's role as Colgrave's advocate is noteworthy given his earlier involvement in the Heath assault case and the allegations concerning Alexander, Colgrave and Mudge. Alexander's appearance as a legal

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			advocate shows he had recovered sufficient standing by January 1705 to represent others in court proceedings, despite the earlier controversies surrounding him. Beale's procedural failure to file his declaration on time indicates either carelessness with legal procedures, lack of confidence in his underlying claim, or perhaps issues with the court's notification. The nonsuit removes his complaint against Colgrave without addressing the merits of the case itself - a purely technical victory for the defendant. The Swallows' claim that they borrowed salt from Steward's servants (not from Steward directly) is significant: it indicates some prior arrangement or understanding with Steward's enslaved workers, but not with Steward himself. This suggests a pattern of unauthorised borrowing, using the servants as intermediaries rather than seeking permission from the master. The loss of poultry whilst Steward was at the fort, combined with the admitted salt-taking, indicates the Swallows took advantage of Steward's absence to help themselves to his property. Whether the poultry loss is directly connected to the Swallows remains unclear from the evidence presented, though Steward's suspicion is understandable given their known actions. The legal distinction between "borrowing" and "stealing" is central to the case. The Swallows' defence is essentially that they took the salt with intent to return it, making it borrowing rather than theft. However, they accomplished this without seeking or obtaining Steward's consent, entering his house during his absence under circumstances resembling breaking and entering.
210	188	Returned the Verdict followeing (viz.t) That the Said Robert Swallow, and Richard Swallow the younger are Guilty of Trading with the Said Charles Stewards Blacks. for which they Amerce them 3 Dollars one to M.r Steward, and the other 2 To the Church. And to pay Comuit Charges. The Said Steward Gave his Dollar to the Church. Daniel Griffith. and Sarah his wife Complain.ts Against John Long Sen.r and his wife Elizabeth. In an Acion of Defamacon. for CAllisng his wife whore. and Bitch To his Great Damage and Discredit. Vide. Consultacon Held on Tuesday 19.th 10.br Doctor Hodkinson, and Hatton Sterling Sworn Refer themselves to the Depositions made at the said Consultacon The Jury withdrew, and Returned The Verdict following (viz.t) That the Said Long Is Cast In Suite, and pay Unto The Said Daniel Griffith for the Scandall Layd upon his wife 20.s Damages, and to Ask his wifes pardon, with Comuit Charges. The which Said Sume of twenty Shillings The Said Griffiths Gives to The Church. John Long Sen.r and Complain.t Against Daniel Griffith and his wife. Defend.ts In an Acion of Defamacon for CAllisng him an old Rouge. Elizabeth Swallow Sworn	Returned the verdict as follows, namely: that the said Robert Swallow and Richard Swallow the younger are guilty of trading with the said Charles Steward's blacks, for which they are fined 3 dollars - one to Mr. Steward and the other 2 to the Church. And to pay court charges. The said Steward gave his dollar to the Church. Daniel Griffith and Sarah his wife, complainants, against John Long Senior and his wife Elizabeth, in an action of defamation, for cAllisng his wife whore and bitch, to his great damage and discredit. See consultation held on Tuesday 19 December 1704. Doctor Hodkinson and Hatton Sterling, sworn, refer themselves to the depositions made at the said consultation. The jury withdrew and returned the verdict as follows: that the said Long is cast in suit and pay unto the said Daniel Griffith for the scandal laid upon his wife 20 shillings damages, and to ask his wife's pardon, with court charges. The which said sum of 20 shillings the said Griffith gives to the Church. John Long Senior, complainant, against Daniel Griffith and his wife, defendants, in an action of defamation for cAllisng him an old rogue. Elizabeth Swallow, sworn... Interpretations The verdict against the Swallows uses the language "trading with" Steward's blacks rather than "theft." This suggests the court views unauthorised commercial dealing or borrowing differently from outright theft - a lesser offence but still actionable and punishable by fine. The damages of 20 shillings in the Griffith v. Long slander case represent a significant sum, indicating the court took damage to reputation seriously. The award was substantial enough to matter financially whilst not being excessive or ruinous to Long. Long's requirement to "ask his wife's pardon" is noteworthy: the court enforces not merely financial compensation but also public vindication and apology. This formal apology was intended to restore the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			reputation of Griffith's wife in the community and acknowledge the wrongness of his allegations. Both Griffith and Steward donate their damages and fines to the Church, showing a pattern of religious charity by those who have been wronged. Their donations reflect both piety and practical concern for their standing and reputation in the community. Speculations The Swallows' unauthorised "trading with" Steward's servants suggests an established relationship between the Swallow family and Steward's enslaved workers - they appear to have made a habit of borrowing or dealing with the servants without Steward's knowledge or consent. The relatively light punishment (3 dollars total) indicates the court viewed this as a minor infraction compared to theft outright. The slander suit against Long is significant because Long had himself accused the Griffiths of slander (noted in the December consultation records - Long's wife calling Griffith's wife "whore"). The court found in favour of Griffith despite the mutual accusations between the parties, suggesting the evidence or credibility of one side prevailed over the other. John Long Senior's counter-suit calling Griffith "an old rogue" shows the Long family engaging in litigation themselves. The Longs were not simply passive victims of prosecution but actively sued to defend their honour, indicating either legal sophistication or access to competent advice. Elizabeth Swallow's appearance as a witness in Long's counter-suit is left unrecorded in this excerpt - her connection to the Longs or relevance to the charge is unclear. Her involvement suggests either kinship or some other relationship to the parties. The pattern of charitable donations to the Church by those who win their cases (Griffith and Steward) indicates either genuine piety or a practical recognition that accepting damages for personal wrongs could damage one's reputation in a religious community. Donating the money to the Church was a means of demonstrating magnanimity and Christian charity. The use of the word "scandal" for the slander against Griffith's wife indicates the court viewed accusations of sexual misconduct ("whore") as amongst the gravest threats to honour and reputation. In a strict Christian society, allegations of sexual impropriety were amongst the most damaging possible accusations.
211	189	That She heard M.rs Griffith and M.r John Long Senn. Sone haveing High words and That She Caed The Said Long old Rouge. And the Said Long provoking, and Abuseing her In Expressions Leah French Sworn Saith To the Same Effect. Daniel Griffith Replies, In the behalfe of his wife. That The Said John Long, and his wife are well Known. To be of an Ill Life, and fframe. And Haveing nor Regard To Vertue, Peace, or Good Neighbourhood. Doe Studye To Sow Edicion, and Sett among their Neighb.rs and Sett at Variance Even man, and wife, Especially the Said John Long who Is a Drunken Gurling, and Swearing fland very abusive ffellow, and Notorious Upon Record for Stealing and Killing a horse of The R.t Hono.ble Companies. And what his wife has Said Is true, and therefore Can be no Detriment To a man who has no Reputacon Left And being the first Aggreffor. Upon The Whole. The Jury withdrew and Returned the Verdict following: (viz.t) That The Said Daniel Griffith Is Cast In Suit. and pay The Said John Long halfe Dollar. which was paid Accordingly paid. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	That she heard Mrs. Griffith and Mr. John Long Senior having high words, and that she [Mrs. Griffith] called the said Long old rogue. And the said Long, provoking and abusing her in expressions [with insults]. Leah French, sworn, saith to the same effect. Daniel Griffith replies on behalf of his wife that the said John Long and his wife are well known to be of an ill life and fame, and having no regard to virtue, peace or good neighbourhood, do study to sow sedition and set amongst their neighbours and set at variance even man and wife. Especially the said John Long, who is a drunken, cursing and swearing [fland?], very abusive fellow, and notorious upon record for stealing and killing a horse of the Right Honourable Company's. And what his wife has said is true, and therefore can be no detriment to a man who has no reputation left, and [Long] being the first aggressor. Upon the whole, the jury withdrew and returned the verdict as follows: that the said Daniel Griffith is cast in suit and pay the said John Long half a dollar, which was paid accordingly. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations Elizabeth Swallow and Leah French provide corroborating testimony that Mrs. Griffith called Long "old rogue" and that Long responded with abusive

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			expressions. Their testimony is consistent and substantive, establishing the facts of the quarrel. Daniel Griffith's defence strategy shifts from denying the insult to justifying it - he does not deny his wife called Long "old rogue," but argues it was true (because Long is notorious) and was a response to Long's aggression. This is a justification-based defence rather than a simple denial. The jury's verdict in favour of Long, despite evidence that Long was the aggressor, indicates they applied a strict rule: name-calling is actionable slander regardless of its truth or whether it was provoked. The legal principle appears to hold that even true statements are actionable if they damage reputation through insult. The immediate payment of half a dollar to Long indicates the judgment was final and accepted without delay or dispute - both parties complied with the verdict promptly. Speculations The reversal between the two slander cases - Griffith won against Long in the first case, but Long won against Griffith in this counter-suit - suggests the jury attempted to balance the competing claims or to discourage mutual slander between the parties. Awarding damages to both sides serves as a lesson to both families about the cost of litigation and slander. Daniel Griffith's detailed character attack on Long (drunken, cursing, swearing, abusive, notorious for horse theft) is serious and comprehensive. The fact that Griffith invokes the horse-stealing charge indicates this was a matter of public record and widely known on the island, making Long a figure of ill repute. The jury's apparent rejection of the principle that truth is a defence against slander indicates the court applied a strict standard: even true statements about someone constitute actionable slander if they are insulting and damage reputation. The legal framework does not appear to protect truthful insults from liability. Elizabeth Swallow's role as a witness in the Long case is noteworthy - she has appeared throughout these records in various capacities (witness, defendant in her own case with her sons, witness again here). She appears to be a person of standing and reliability on the island, frequently called upon for testimony and trusted to provide credible accounts. Daniel Griffith emerges as someone willing to make aggressive attacks on opponents' characters in court, calling Long a drunk, criminal and troublemaker. This suggests Griffith was becoming known as a vigorous litigant and persuasive speaker capable of detailed character assassination in defence of his family's honour. The pattern of mutual litigation between the Griffiths and Longs (with judgments alternating in their favour) shows the court handling serial disputes between the same families. The alternating verdicts indicate the court was attempting to resolve ongoing conflict by giving each side some vindication, potentially to discourage further litigation between the parties.
212	190	January 25.th 1704/5 The Declaracon of Anthony Joyeman. That Doctor [Ker] on whom he waites as a Serv.t Did Upon Tuesday Last at Night beat him most barbarously, As Likewise Yesterday In the Publick Hall, and Complaineing To his Worship thereof his Worship asked him The Cause and Reason of his Soe Ill treating him who Said It was for noe other Reason but Acquainting his Worship That It was The Said [Ker] That had Lett up The bloody. hand upon the Proclamacon. And the Govern.r Inquireing further Into the time, and Manner of his fixing the Same Said he did ab.t 12 a Clock after the Bell had Rung for Dinner, And that he Took Some Red paint and Compounding It with water and other things, Upon the windows, put Some	25 January 1705 The declaration of Anthony Joyeman. That Doctor [Ker], on whom he waits as a servant, did upon Tuesday last at night beat him most barbarously. As likewise yesterday in the public hall, and complaining to his Worship thereof, his Worship asked him the cause and reason of his so ill treating him, who said it was for no other reason but [his] acquainting his Worship that it was the said [Ker] that had let up the bloody hand upon the proclamation. And the Governor inquiring further into the time and manner of his fixing the same, said he did about 12 o'clock after the bell had rung for dinner, and that he took some red paint and compounding it with water and other things, upon the windows, put some of it

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		of It upon his his hand, and placing his hand upon one of the Leases of The Said Door whereon the Proclamacon was fixed, Drawing It In, and Left The Impression behind. After Which Called for a water and Towell to wash his hand And whilst washing turned all Red. And ffurther Saith That he Did and Still Threaten To Kill him, Saying he Can but pay 200. for him. [Poirier]	upon his hand, and placing his hand upon one of the leaves of the said door whereon the proclamation was fixed, drawing it in and left the impression behind. After which [he] called for water and towel to wash his hand, and whilst washing [it] turned all red. And further saith that he [Ker] did and still threatens to kill him, saying he can but pay 200 for him. [Poirier] Interpretations Anthony Joyeman's declaration provides a first-person account of being beaten by [Ker] and reveals [Ker]'s motivation: anger that Joyeman had reported [Ker] to the Governor about the bloody handprint on the proclamation. The beatings on two separate occasions show [Ker] was determined to punish his servant for the disclosure. The Governor's interrogation of Joyeman about the bloody handprint reveals it was deliberately made using red paint mixed with water. [Ker] pressed his painted hand onto the official proclamation document, creating a visible impression that appeared to be bloody - an act of deliberate defacement of official documents. The timing of the defacement (about 12 o'clock, after the dinner bell) suggests [Ker] acted during a time when people would be present but might not immediately notice or stop him. The use of red paint mixed with water indicates calculation - [Ker] deliberately created an effect that mimicked blood to make a statement or mockery. [Ker]'s threat to kill Joyeman, combined with the statement that he will "just pay 200," reveals [Ker]'s contemptuous calculation that violence against a servant is merely punishable by fine, not criminal prosecution. Speculations The bloody handprint on the proclamation was likely intended as an act of mockery or defiance of the Governor's authority. By placing what appeared to be a bloody handprint on the official proclamation, [Ker] was symbolically mocking or delegitimising the Governor's orders - an act of profound disrespect toward governmental authority. [Ker]'s beating of Joyeman appears to be retaliation for the servant reporting him to the Governor. This represents a serious escalation from [Ker]'s earlier charges of verbal defamation and contempt of court to physical violence against a dependent, showing [Ker] was willing to use violence to silence testimony against him. The fact that Joyeman suffered two beatings (Tuesday night and yesterday) indicates [Ker] was persistent in his violence. The second beating occurred in the public hall, showing [Ker] was willing to beat his servant publicly, indicating either confidence in his authority or contempt for public opinion and law. [Ker]'s comment that he can "but pay 200" for Joyeman suggests he viewed his servant as property (comparable to an enslaved person) whose value could be compensated by a fine. This reveals the economic and legal logic of the time: violence against servants and dependents was treated as crimes against property, punishable by compensation rather than criminal prosecution. The Governor's detailed interrogation of Joyeman about precisely how [Ker] made the bloody handprint indicates the Governor was carefully documenting the evidence for a formal charge. The questioning about the red paint, water, method of application and the washing of the hand shows the Governor treating this as a deliberate, premeditated act. The escalation of [Ker]'s behaviour from verbal abuse and defiance in earlier cases to physical violence against his servant now indicates either a deteriorating mental or emotional state, or an increasingly open contempt for the law and the Governor's authority. The violence suggests [Ker] was no longer attempting to

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			maintain any pretence of respect for legal proceedings or governmental control.
213	191	Island S.t Helena. Att a Consultacon Held on Tuesday The 30.th of January 1704/5 At Fort=James. Present Stephen Poirier Govern.r After Morning Service. Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas The widdow Dixon Came This Day and Prayed The Govern.r and Comuit To Admitt her To prove her husbands Numpamtive Will And that the Same may be Accepted as his Last Will, and Testament. James Easthope. and Mary his wife Sworn. Declare That Brig.t Dixon Lately Decd. being Taken Very Ill. with an Imposthume In his body, Desired To Settle his Affaires But the Quarter Sessions, and Generall Randevous, and Pay Day of the Garrison happenning at that time. therefore Could not with Conveniency Get a Scrivener to write his Will In Forme But was then forced to Deliv.r the Same In words To the following purport. That after his Debts were paid and ffunerall Charges were Defrayed That his wife. and 3 Children Should be Equall Sharers of his Estate. both Reall and personall And That his wife Should be Sole Executrix of this his Last will, and Testament. But Provided alwayes That In Cale of Marriage of his Said Wife he Did Defire That M.r Thomas Goodwin Should be overseer of his 3 Childrens Estate. And Did Impower him not onely To Secure their parts of his Estate for them But also To be In Stead, and place of a ffather That they may not be abused In any Cale whatsoever. It Is ordered. That	25 January 1705 The declaration of Anthony Joyeman. That Doctor [Ker], on whom he waits as a servant, did upon Tuesday last at night beat him most barbarously. As likewise yesterday in the public hall, and complaining to his Worship thereof, his Worship asked him the cause and reason of his so ill treating him, who said it was for no other reason but [his] acquainting his Worship that it was the said [Ker] that had let up the bloody hand upon the proclamation. And the Governor inquiring further into the time and manner of his fixing the same, said he did about 12 o'clock after the bell had rung for dinner, and that he took some red paint and compounding it with water and other things, upon the windows, put some of it upon his hand, and placing his hand upon one of the leaves of the said door whereon the proclamation was fixed, drawing it in and left the impression behind. After which [he] called for water and towel to wash his hand, and whilst washing [it] turned all red. And further saith that he [Ker] did and still threatens to kill him, saying he can but pay 200 for him. [Poirier] Interpretations Anthony Joyeman's declaration provides a first-person account of being beaten by [Ker] and reveals [Ker]'s motivation: anger that Joyeman had reported [Ker] to the Governor about the bloody handprint on the proclamation. The beatings on two separate occasions show [Ker] was determined to punish his servant for the disclosure. The Governor's interrogation of Joyeman about the bloody handprint reveals it was deliberately made using red paint mixed with water. [Ker] pressed his painted hand onto the official proclamation document, creating a visible impression that appeared to be bloody - an act of deliberate defacement of official documents. The timing of the defacement (about 12 o'clock, after the dinner bell) suggests [Ker] acted during a time when people would be present but might not immediately notice or stop him. The use of red paint mixed with water indicates calculation - [Ker] deliberately created an effect that mimicked blood to make a statement or mockery. [Ker]'s threat to kill Joyeman, combined with the statement that he will "just pay 200," reveals [Ker]'s contemptuous calculation that violence against a servant is merely punishable by fine, not criminal prosecution. Speculations The bloody handprint on the proclamation was likely intended as an act of mockery or defiance of the Governor's authority. By placing what appeared to be a bloody handprint on the official proclamation, [Ker] was symbolically mocking or delegitimising the Governor's orders - an act of profound disrespect toward governmental authority. [Ker]'s beating of Joyeman appears to be retaliation for the servant reporting him to the Governor. This represents a serious escalation from [Ker]'s earlier charges of verbal defamation and contempt of court to physical violence against a dependent, showing [Ker] was willing to use violence to silence testimony against him. The fact that Joyeman suffered two beatings (Tuesday night and yesterday) indicates [Ker] was persistent in his violence. The second beating occurred in the public hall, showing [Ker] was willing to beat his servant publicly, indicating either confidence in his authority or contempt for public opinion and law. [Ker]'s comment that he can "but pay 200" for Joyeman suggests he viewed his servant as property (comparable to an enslaved person) whose value could

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			be compensated by a fine. This reveals the economic and legal logic of the time: violence against servants and dependents was treated as crimes against property, punishable by compensation rather than criminal prosecution. The Governor's detailed interrogation of Joyeman about precisely how [Ker] made the bloody handprint indicates the Governor was carefully documenting the evidence for a formal charge. The questioning about the red paint, water, method of application and the washing of the hand shows the Governor treating this as a deliberate, premeditated act. The escalation of [Ker]'s behaviour from verbal abuse and defiance in earlier cases to physical violence against his servant now indicates either a deteriorating mental or emotional state, or an increasingly open contempt for the law and the Governor's authority. The violence suggests [Ker] was no longer attempting to maintain any pretence of respect for legal proceedings or governmental control.
214	192	That The Said Numcupative Will Stand Good. The Said widdow Dixon was Sworn To Deliver a true Inventory of the whole Estate of the Said Brig.t Dixon Decd. To M.r Henry Cole, and M.r Mathew Bazettt Apprasors Appointed for that purpose. The Said M.rs Dixon Complained To The Gov.r against Doctor [Ker] That when her hus.b.d. was dying. He Sent for him To Administer The Sacrament To him who was Very Earnest, and Defirous of his Good Office and Affistance To fitt, and prepare him for his Eclernity who Refused to Come making Some frivolous Excuses Saying he was not well and not Capable to Goe, To The Sick mans Great Discomfort, and Discontent. In Soe much That when Inquireing the Imposthume himselfe, In these Lamentable words ah! Cursed wretch.! who ought to be with me now To fitt one to Appear before the Great Tribunal, and Soon after Expired. James Easthope and his wife Present, Say the Same. Lipin Wills free planter. P.rsented A Petion. Praying To Leave To build the Tent of his house 3 or 4 foot further out In the Nature of M.rs Cocks being It will be no waye Detrimentall To The Neighbourhood. But will rather Keep them ffrom Wind and weather. Which was Granted Accordingly.	That the said nuncupative will stand good. The said widow Dixon was sworn to deliver a true inventory of the whole estate of the said Brigadier Dixon, deceased, to Mr. Henry Cole and Mr. Mathew Bazettt, appraisors appointed for that purpose. The said Mrs. Dixon complained to the Governor against Doctor [Ker] that when her husband was dying, he sent for him to administer the sacrament to him, who was very earnest and desirous of his good office and assistance to fit and prepare him for his eternity, who refused to come, making some frivolous excuses, saying he was not well and not capable to go, to the sick man's great discomfort and discontent. In so much that when inquiring [about] the imposthume himself, in these lamentable words: "Ah! Cursed wretch! Who ought to be with me now to fit one to appear before the great tribunal," and soon after expired. James Easthope and his wife, present, say the same. Lipin Wills, free planter, presented a petition praying for leave to build the tent of his house 3 or 4 feet further out, in the manner of Mrs. Cocks, being it will be in no way detrimental to the neighbourhood but will rather keep them from wind and weather. Which was granted accordingly. Interpretations The validation of Brigadier Dixon's nuncupative (oral) will shows the court accepting verbal testimony about the dying man's wishes as legally binding. This required formal declaration and presumably witnesses to the oral statement. The appointment of appraisors (Cole and Bazettt) and the swearing in of the widow to deliver a true inventory shows the court's oversight of probate procedures to ensure proper accounting of the deceased's estate and fair distribution to heirs. Mrs. Dixon's complaint against [Ker] for refusing last rites reveals another serious failing of [Ker]: he not only commits violence and defacement of documents, but also neglects his religious duties. The refusal to administer sacraments to a dying man is a grave failure of pastoral care and Christian charity. Brigadier Dixon's dying words, calling [Ker] a "cursed wretch," constitute powerful testimony to the spiritual harm [Ker]'s refusal caused. The dying man's anguished regret that he was not spiritually prepared for death forms strong evidence of [Ker]'s dereliction of duty. The corroboration by James Easthope and his wife strengthens the complaint - the accusation is not one person's interpretation but supported by multiple independent witnesses to the same events. Lipin Wills' petition for a minor building extension is approved routinely, showing the council handling

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			both serious criminal matters and mundane administrative business in the same session. Speculations [Ker]'s refusal to administer last rites to a dying man, combined with his excuse that he was "not well," indicates either genuine illness or feigned illness to avoid the duty. Either interpretation suggests a failure of religious obligation and pastoral care. The decision to include Brigadier Dixon's final complaint against [Ker] in the court record immediately after his death indicates the Governor and council took the matter seriously as formal evidence. The dying man's words were preserved and documented as testimony for future prosecution of [Ker]. Brigadier Dixon was apparently a person of standing and rank whose death merited formal probate proceedings and inventory. His final words criticising [Ker] carry substantial weight in the community because they came from a respected figure, not from a social inferior. The accumulation of complaints against [Ker] (verbal abuse, striking, contempt of court, beating his servant, threatening death, defacing proclamations, and now refusing last rites to a dying man) shows a pattern of escalating misbehaviour. The refusal of last rites is particularly damaging because it involves dereliction of religious duty and represents [Ker]'s failure to fulfil his fundamental obligation as a physician and Christian. Mrs. Cocks, referenced in Lipin Wells' petition as a householder who has already extended her roof structure, appears to be an established resident on the island whose building practices set a precedent for others seeking similar modifications.
215	193	Whereas Doctor [Ker] Appearing this Day being the 30.th of January To Answear The Complaint of the Govern.r. But In Respect to the Day. Defires It may be put off Untill next Comuit Day. The Which was Granted. The Said M.r [Ker] being Very Impertinent And Rude. In his Languages and behavi.r towards the Gov.r And Comuit tho' Civilly Required, hath obstinately Refused to withdraw. It Is ordered. That the Said M.r [Ker] be ffined 5.s for his Misdemeanor And Contumacy, And for Default of payment, the Marshall Is hereby ordered To Levy The Same by Distresse ffor The Rt Hono.ble Companys. Lipin Wells Free planter. Defired To Prove The Numcupative Will of Edward Cosby Sold.r Late Decd. Ser.j.t Sanderson Saith That The Said Cosby on his Death bed Defired M.r Wells to Call for 2 witnesses among whom this Depon.t was who hearing him Wells Sole Execut.r of whatever the had his Debts. And ffunerall Expences first Discharged Richard Harding Sworn, Saith The Same It Is ordered. That The Said Numcupative Will be Accepted And Approved of. Whereas	Whereas Doctor [Ker], appearing this day being 30 January, to answer the complaint of the Governor, but in respect to the day, desires it may be put off until next council day. The which was granted. The said Mr. [Ker], being very impertinent and rude in his language and behaviour towards the Governor and council, though civilly required [to withdraw], has obstinately refused to withdraw. It is ordered that the said Mr. [Ker] be fined 5 shillings for his misdemeanour and contumacy, and for default of payment, the marshall is hereby ordered to levy the same by distress for the Right Honourable Company's [benefit]. Lipin Wells, free planter, desired to prove the nuncupative will of Edward Cosby, soldier, late deceased. Sergeant Sanderson saith that the said Cosby, on his death bed, desired Mr. Wells to call for 2 witnesses, amongst whom this deponent was, who hearing him [declare that] Wells [was] sole executor of whatever he had, his debts and funeral expenses first discharged. Richard Harding, sworn, saith the same. It is ordered that the said nuncupative will be accepted and approved of. Whereas... Interpretations [Ker]'s appearance before the court on 30 January shows he is facing formal charges from the Governor. His request for a postponement until the next council day is granted, demonstrating the court's willingness to accommodate his request despite the serious charges against him. [Ker]'s impertinent and rude behaviour toward the Governor and council, even whilst being charged, demonstrates his persistent contempt for authority. His obstinate refusal to withdraw when civilly asked shows defiance of the court's informal orders. The fine of 5 shillings for contumacy (obstinate resistance to the court's authority) is a separate penalty from the charges he faces. It addresses his courtroom

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			behaviour specifically, not the underlying allegations about beating, threatening and refusing last rites. The order to levy by distress for the Company's benefit means the court will seize [Ker]'s property if he does not pay - the money goes to the East India Company, not to any private party. This is a significant coercive enforcement mechanism. The nuncupative wills of Brigadier Dixon and Edward Cosby both follow established procedure: oral declaration before witnesses, formal proof presented in court, and approval by the council. This shows a consistent legal framework for handling oral wills on the island. Lipin Wells appears as both a free planter and someone entrusted with important roles (executor of Cosby's will). This suggests he had standing and was trusted by the community with significant responsibilities. Speculations [Ker]'s request for a postponement of his trial might suggest he is attempting to delay or manage the proceedings, or might simply reflect standard procedural courtesy that the court grants. The fact that it is granted indicates the Governor is willing to accommodate [Ker]'s requests, at least formally, despite the severity of the charges. [Ker]'s rude and impertinent behaviour in court, whilst facing multiple serious charges (beating his servant, defacing proclamations, threatening death, refusing last rites), indicates either arrogance, desperation, or genuine mental or emotional disturbance. His continued defiance despite mounting evidence against him suggests he believes himself above the court's authority. The order to seize property by distress if [Ker] does not pay the 5-shilling fine demonstrates the court has coercive power to enforce its judgments. The threat of property seizure is a serious enforcement mechanism, particularly for a man of [Ker]'s professional standing. The repeated presentation of nuncupative wills in this session (two validated in close succession) indicates either a genuine legal framework for handling oral wills on the island, or reflects an unusual period of mortality requiring multiple estate settlements. The appearance of Lipin Wells as executor of Cosby's will, and his successful proof of the will before the court, shows Wells had sufficient standing and credibility to manage another man's estate. This indicates his status and reputation in the community were sound. The pattern of the same witnesses (Sergeant Sanderson, Richard Harding) appearing to validate oral wills suggests they were respected members of the community whose testimony was sought and trusted for this solemn purpose of witnessing dying men's final wishes.
216	194	Whereas. W.m Beale free planter Gave Informacon to the Govern.r That Gilbert Colgrave free planter Has often Indeavored To Seduce Jonathan Mudge To Goe With him. To Kill the Companyes Goates. Jonathan Mudge Saith That about The time the Cesar Lay In the Read Cap.t Clark Comander The Said Colgrave and he Comeing down the Ench: bod Hill. Seeing The Companyes Goales Colgrave Said Will you Goe along With me, and Kill Some of them, and oftentimes Did Importune This Depon.t to Goe along with him Saying That he had a Good Musquett that would Carry within 3 Inches, and pressed him Earnestly To meet him at Ruperts for that purpose. which He Refuses. And that he was Very Urgent with him at Sev.t Times to Steal piggs. And told this Depon.t That he had Sett a dog on Mr Beales Bullock which Caused him to break his neck.	Whereas William Beale, free planter, gave information to the Governor that Gilbert Colgrave, free planter, has often endeavoured to seduce Jonathan Mudge to go with him to kill the Company's goats. Jonathan Mudge saith that about the time the <i>Caesar</i> lay in the road, Captain Clark, commander, the said Colgrave and he coming down the [Enchambod?] hill, seeing the Company's goats, Colgrave said "Will you go along with me and kill some of them," and oftentimes did importune this deponent to go along with him, saying that he had a good musket that would carry within 3 inches, and pressed him earnestly to meet him at Rupert's for that purpose, which he refuses. And that he [Colgrave] was very urgent with him at several times to steal pigs. And told this deponent that he had set a dog on Mr. Beale's bullock which caused him to break his neck.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		The Said Gilbert Colgrave has brought A Crofs Declaracon and Acusacon of Theft, and other Crimes Against the Said Jonathan Mudge. Hopeing thereby To Invalid his Evidence. Upon The Whole. It Is ordered. That These Causes be Defered To The next Quarter Sessions. [Poirier] Tho: Goodwin	The said Gilbert Colgrave has brought a cross declaration and accusation of theft and other crimes against the said Jonathan Mudge, hoping thereby to invalidate his evidence. Upon the whole, it is ordered that these causes be deferred to the next quarter sessions. [Poirier] Thomas Goodwin Interpretations William Beale's information to the Governor establishes a pattern of behaviour: Colgrave repeatedly attempted to persuade Mudge to commit theft by killing Company goats and stealing pigs. The pattern shows deliberate, sustained efforts at recruitment, not casual conversation. Jonathan Mudge's detailed testimony describes specific incidents and demonstrates Colgrave's persistence in urging him to join in the crimes. Mudge's mention of Colgrave's accurate musket and the planned location (Rupert's) suggests deliberate, organised theft rather than impulsive action. Mudge's claim that Colgrave killed Beale's bullock by setting a dog on it represents a serious allegation of deliberate destruction of property. If true, it shows malicious intent toward Beale and willingness to harm others' livelihoods. Colgrave's counter-accusation against Mudge (alleging theft and other crimes) represents a legal strategy to discredit the witness. If Mudge is shown to be a criminal himself, his credibility as a witness against Colgrave is undermined. The court's decision to defer all these causes to the next quarter sessions reflects the complexity of the intersecting accusations and allegations. A more formal trial setting is deemed necessary to adjudicate these serious matters. Speculations The pattern of Colgrave's attempts to recruit Mudge for theft (goats, pigs, with a good musket and arranged meetings) suggests Colgrave viewed Mudge as someone he could manipulate or corrupt. Mudge's refusal and subsequent testimony against Colgrave indicates he rejected Colgrave's proposals and Allised himself with Beale. Colgrave's alleged killing of Beale's bullock by deliberately setting a dog on it appears calculated and malicious. If true, it shows not merely opportunistic theft but deliberate harm toward Beale. The deliberate nature of the act (setting a dog to attack) suggests vindictiveness. The reference to Colgrave's musket "that would carry within 3 inches" (shoot accurately within a tight range) suggests he was armed and prepared for hunting or poaching the Company's animals. The technical specification implies he understood firearms and was equipped for the proposed crimes. Colgrave's counter-accusation against Mudge might be based on genuine evidence of Mudge's crimes, or might be a tactical manoeuvre to discredit his accuser by raising doubt about Mudge's character. The court's deferral suggests the judges required fuller investigation before deciding which party's account was credible. The repeated reference to Rupert's as a location where meetings were to take place suggests it was a known location on the island for illicit activities - a site where theft, smuggling and unauthorised meetings occurred away from official oversight. Beale's information against Colgrave is notable given that Beale had just lost his case against Colgrave earlier in this very session (nonsuited for procedural failure to file his declaration on time). This new information might represent Beale's attempt to pursue Colgrave through a different legal avenue after his initial case was dismissed. The deferral to quarter sessions might indicate the Governor and council felt the cases required more

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			formal judicial procedures, fuller investigation, or time for the parties to gather additional evidence. The complexity of the cross-accusations suggests these matters exceeded the scope of routine consultation sessions.
217	195	Wednesday 31.th January 1704/5 Whereas on the 25.th of January before Daniel Griffith 3.d of the Councill. Anthony Joycemah who Is Allowed To waite Upon Doctor [Ker] being Sent here by Govt. [...] With Recomondacons. Defireing Us to heal him Civilly as A person That had Lived In Repute Came to y.t Govern.r With a Compl.t as he had done Several times before Upon the Same Acc.mt That the Night before Doctor [Ker] Did Abuse and beat him with his Great Cane and his fist, whose Cruelty, and Usage of Servants Is Such, that no Serv.t Can Live with him Long. Haveing had already 5 or fix white, and Blacks. wherefore the Said Anthony Defires to be Discharged from his Service who when he Is Drunk which Is often, and his daily practice doth Sev.t.lly barbarously Abuse him. But the said Gov.r Did Exhort The Said Anthony as often before to bear It patiently. And that he would Speak to the Said M.r [Ker] about him Which he Did In a very Civilable manner. Saying The next Morning. Pray Doctor tell me the Reaston why You Doe abuse Anthony whom Lately you Spoke Soe well of. So Cruelly. who very Roughly Replyed because You Corrupt All my Serv.ts Shan't I be free To beat my own Slaves. and Asking what Title he had To Call The men his own he Gave me Ill Languages, for which his Misdea= meanors I Comanded him to Appear before the Comuit In ord.r to Render Satisfacion. But Running In a fury out of the Hall and Going down Staires Upbraided me with Ill Languages. You Hugonist Goe, Goe, do y.r own Hugonist Comuney, To Comand y.r Hugonist Ministers The Govern.r Answering Nothing. But To the first part about Corrupting Said he was not Soe Safely born. And As To the Latter Reflecting Upon his Worships Religion. He Humbly Leaves It To. The Considracon of his Hono.ble Masters, and the Bishop of London	31 January 1705 Whereas on 25 January, before Daniel Griffith, 3rd of the Council, Anthony Joyeman, who is allowed to wait upon Doctor [Ker], being sent here by the Government [...] with recommendations, desiring us to treat him civilly as a person that had lived in repute, came to the Governor with a complaint, as he had done several times before upon the same account, that the night before Doctor [Ker] did abuse and beat him with his great cane and his fist, whose cruelty and usage of servants is such that no servant can live with him long, having had already 5 or 6 white and black [servants]. Wherefore the said Anthony desires to be discharged from his service, who when he is drunk, which is often and his daily practice, doth several times barbarously abuse him. But the said Governor did exhort the said Anthony, as often before, to bear it patiently. And that he would speak to the said Mr. [Ker] about him, which he did in a very civil manner, saying the next morning: "Pray doctor, tell me the reason why you do abuse Anthony, whom lately you spoke so well of, so cruelly?" Who very roughly replied: "Because you corrupt all my servants, shan't I be free to beat my own slaves?" And asking what title he [the Governor] had to call the men his own, he [Ker] gave me [the Governor] ill language. For which his misdemeanours I commanded him to appear before the council in order to render satisfaction. But running in a fury out of the hall and going down stairs, upbraided me with ill language: "You Huguenist! Go, go, do your own Huguenist community, to command your Huguenist ministers!" The Governor answering nothing [to the insult] but to the first part about corrupting, said he was not so safely born. And as to the latter, reflecting upon his Worship's religion, he humbly leaves it to the consideration of his honourable masters and the Bishop of London. Interpretations Anthony Joyeman's repeated complaints (this is the latest in several) show [Ker]'s habitual abuse of servants. The Governor's repeated exhortations that Joyeman "bear it patiently" suggest the Governor is reluctant to intervene forcefully but is documenting the abuse for the record. The fact that [Ker] has had 5 or 6 servants already leave (white and black) indicates a pattern of cruelty that drives servants away. Joyeman's request to be discharged demonstrates he cannot endure [Ker]'s treatment. [Ker]'s claim that servants are "his own slaves" to beat as he wishes reveals his fundamental belief that servants are property without rights. This represents a clash between [Ker]'s view of absolute ownership and the Governor's implicit view that some limits exist on masters' treatment of servants. [Ker]'s accusation that the Governor "corrupts" his servants by listening to their complaints reveals [Ker]'s view: any hearing of servant grievances constitutes interference with his property rights. The Governor's measured response - asking a civil question about [Ker]'s treatment - is met with fury, insult and profanity, showing [Ker] will not tolerate any questioning of his authority over servants. [Ker]'s religious insult ("Huguenist") and his dismissal of the Governor as someone managing his own religious community suggest religious tensions or

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			[Ker]'s deliberate attempt to wound the Governor by attacking his faith. The Governor's decision to refer the religious slur to the Bishop of London indicates recognition that this is now a matter of religious insult as well as civil insubordination. Speculations [Ker]'s repeated beatings of Joyeman, particularly when drunk (which [Ker] admits is frequent and "his daily practice"), suggest [Ker] has serious problems with anger management or alcohol dependency. The explicit statement that he gets drunk frequently and then abuses servants shows a clear, documented pattern. The Governor's reluctance to forcefully intervene - repeatedly urging Joyeman to be patient rather than protecting him - indicates either the Governor's uncertainty about his authority over a physician, his preference for informal resolution, or his assumption that corporal punishment of servants was legally acceptable. [Ker]'s angry claim "Shan't I be free to beat my own slaves?" reflects views common in the era about masters' rights over servants, even if extreme in application. His assumption that he has this right suggests he believes it to be legally sound. [Ker]'s reference to the Governor "corrupting" servants by listening to their complaints might indicate that other servants have complained to the Governor before, and [Ker] views this as a pattern of undermining his authority. [Ker]'s religious insult ("Huguenist") is more than casual profanity - it indicates either real religious tensions on the island, or represents [Ker]'s deliberate attempt to wound the Governor by attacking his faith and legitimacy. The Governor's response - saying he was "not so safely born" - is cryptic but might indicate he is defending his personal integrity and honour against the charge of corruption. The phrasing is unusual and possibly represents an archaic expression or transcription variant. The Governor's decision to refer the matter to his "honourable masters" in London and to the Bishop of London indicates the Governor views [Ker]'s behaviour as having escalated beyond what can be resolved through local authority. The matter will be transmitted to the East India Company and to ecclesiastical authority for judgment. The formal narrative structure of this document - beginning with "Whereas" and ending with reference to higher authorities - indicates it is being prepared as an official record for submission to superiors, not merely as a note in the council minutes. This suggests the Governor is documenting [Ker]'s insubordination for formal charges that will be adjudicated in London.
218	196	Whereas There being a Proclamacion fixed by Comuit Upon the Sessions house there was Sett thereon an Impression of a bloody hand whom the Gov.r Is Informed, and has good Reason to Suspect the Said Doctor [Ker] for the Same. being Done In Contempt of the Gov.r and Govern.mt The Said Doctor [Ker] Appearing this Day To Answer the Premises, Denied the Act. The Govern.r Requireing his oath Upon The Same. Refused It, Conceiving he is not obleidged by Law. To Doe It. The Gov.r further asking why he did not Give notice thereof. Said he did not See It before he Was Informed by the people passing by, And Asking whether He would Give his oath off That, Answered as before, That he was not obleidged To It. Daniel Griffith. 3.d In Councill. Comeing Down To fort James not Long Since. Looking Towards The Sessions houses door Saw the Impression of a bloody	Whereas there being a proclamation fixed by council upon the Sessions House, there was set thereon an impression of a bloody hand, which the Governor is informed and has good reason to suspect the said Doctor [Ker] for the same, being done in contempt of the Governor and government. The said Doctor [Ker], appearing this day to answer the premises, denied the act. The Governor requiring his oath upon the same, refused it, conceiving he is not obliged by law to do it. The Governor further asking why he did not give notice thereof, said he did not see it before he was informed by the people passing by. And asking whether he would give his oath of that, answered as before that he was not obliged to it. Daniel Griffith, 3rd in council, coming down to Fort James not long since, looking towards the Sessions House door, saw the impression of a bloody hand upon a proclamation which was fixed there by order of

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		hand upon A Proclamacion. which was fixed there by ord.r of Govern.mt And that Day or Soon after happenning to Call at Doctor [Ker] Took occasion To Speak about It, Saying I wond.red [...] Layd the Same thereon, The Said [Ker] making too high an En[...] Tell, and Slightly Said Some Idle person or other. and I further Saying I wonder he ought To be takedan He Answered not, what Signifies It; or to that Effect Whereas the Govern.r Repr.r Sented To the Councill, That M.rs Colgraves time In The Lemon Garden Is now near Expiring. And Haveing proposed the Same to her for a Longer term. At the Rent of 30.s. p.r Ann.m And to Send the fruit, and produce at Certain Rates as The Gov.r and Councill Shall pull Upon the Same. which She has Refused. Haveing Likewise offered the Same To [Serj.t]	government. And that day or soon after happening to call at Doctor [Ker]'s, took occasion to speak about it, saying "I wondered [who] laid the same thereon." The said [Ker], making too high an [?] and slightly said "Some idle person or other." And I further saying "I wonder [if] he ought to be taken," he answered "Not, what signifies it?" or to that effect. Whereas the Governor represented to the council that Mrs. Colgrave's time in the Lemon Garden is now near expiring. And having proposed the same to her for a longer term at the rent of 30 shillings per annum and to send the fruit and produce at certain rates as the Governor and council shall determine upon the same, which she has refused. Having likewise offered the same to [Sergeant...] Interpretations The bloody handprint on the proclamation is formally documented and [Ker] is confronted with it. His denial contrasts sharply with Joyeman's earlier detailed account of how [Ker] deliberately made the handprint using red paint mixed with water. [Ker]'s refusal to swear an oath shows he is aware that under oath, lying would constitute perjury. His claim that he is "not obliged by law" to swear is evasive and appears suspicious given the accusations against him. Daniel Griffith's testimony that [Ker] casually discussed the handprint with him contradicts [Ker]'s claim of ignorance. If [Ker] saw it enough to discuss it dismissively with Griffith, his assertion that he didn't see it until people told him is doubtful. [Ker]'s dismissive response ("what signifies it?") to Griffith's suggestion that [Ker] ought to be held responsible shows his contempt for the allegation and his assumption that the matter is trivial. Mrs. Colgrave's refusal to renew her lease under the new terms might indicate she is unhappy with the arrangement or plans to leave the island. Speculations The contrast between Joyeman's detailed account of [Ker] deliberately creating the handprint with red paint and water, and [Ker]'s denial and claim of ignorance, suggests either Joyeman lied or [Ker] is lying. The Governor's statement that he "has good reason to suspect" [Ker] indicates the Governor believes [Ker] made it. [Ker]'s refusal to swear an oath, combined with his evasive responses about seeing the handprint, suggests he is trying to avoid legal entanglement. A refusal to swear can be interpreted as consciousness of guilt. Daniel Griffith's testimony that [Ker] discussed the handprint with him (suggesting [Ker] had seen it) undermines [Ker]'s denial and his claim of ignorance. Griffith's account indicates [Ker] was aware of the handprint but treated it dismissively. [Ker]'s casual dismissal of the handprint ("some idle person") might be his way of deflecting blame - claiming some random person did it rather than admitting responsibility or investigating further. The bloody handprint on a proclamation is an act of symbolic defiance - placing blood on official documents is an ancient form of desecration. [Ker]'s deliberate act (if Joyeman is correct) would represent profound contempt for governmental authority and the Company's legitimacy. Mrs. Colgrave's refusal to renew her lease of the Lemon Garden might indicate she is distancing herself from the Company or the island. The terms offered (30 shillings per annum, having to supply produce at rates set by the Governor and Council) may have been unsatisfactory, or the family may be planning to depart St Helena.
219	197	Sanderson, and others who have Refused the Same. And Whereas Corporall Graton Applied himself To the	Sanderson and others who have refused the same. And whereas Corporal Graton applied himself to the

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Gov.r And Comply.g To the Said termes His Worship put It To The Councill for their Concurrence. The Govern.r Cannot Speak but What Doctor [Ker] p.rsently takes up. and Reflects upon him before the very Councill. cAllisng him to his Face a Church=P.resbyterian. M.r Bazettt being Called To Know what Doctor [Ker] told him about French Hugonist. Said he Would have noe more Dealings with Hugonists. Ser.j.t Lodgett Sworn, Saith That The Govern.r and Doctor [Ker] haveing words The Gov.r Said he was his Serv.t he payd him his wages. who Replyd To The Gov.r he was a Hugonist, and might Gov.r and Comand his Hugonist Ministers. John Myers Sworn, Saith The Said M.r [Ker] Called the Gov.r Hugonist. and bid him Goe To His own Country. Edward Worthington To The Same. William Goss Sworn, Saith To the Same Effect. It Is ordered. That the Said Doctor [Ker]	Governor and complying to the said terms, his Worship put it to the council for their concurrence. The Governor cannot speak but what Doctor [Ker] presently takes up and reflects upon him before the very council, cAllisng him to his face a Church-Presbyterian. Mr. Bazettt being called to know what Doctor [Ker] told him about French Huguenist, said he [Ker] would have no more dealings with Huguenists. Sergeant Lodgett, sworn, saith that the Governor and Doctor [Ker] having words, the Governor said he [Ker] was his servant, he [the Governor] paid him his wages, who replied to the Governor he [the Governor] was a Huguenist and might govern and command his Huguenist ministers. John Myers, sworn, saith the said Mr. [Ker] called the Governor Huguenist and bid him go to his own country. Edward Worthington [sworn saith] to the same. William Goss, sworn, saith to the same effect. It is ordered that the said Doctor [Ker]... Interpretations Corporal Graton's acceptance of the lease terms, after others refused, resolves the Lemon Garden lease matter. His willingness to accept the conditions (30 shillings per annum, supplying fruit and produce at rates set by the Governor and Council) suggests the terms were reasonable or Graton had particular interest in the garden. [Ker]'s constant interruptions of the Governor during council proceedings show active insubordination. The statement that "the Governor cannot speak but what Doctor [Ker] presently takes up and reflects upon him" indicates [Ker]'s behaviour is disruptive and habitual, not occasional. Multiple independent witnesses (Bazettt, Lodgett, Myers, Worthington, Goss) testify to [Ker]'s religious slurs against the Governor. The consistency and number of witnesses significantly strengthens the evidence against [Ker]. The religious slur "Huguenist" (Huguenot, a French Protestant) appears to be [Ker]'s chosen insult for the Governor. Whether the Governor is actually of Huguenot background or this is simply a convenient slur is unclear, but [Ker] is using it to attack both his religious legitimacy and his governmental authority. [Ker]'s command to the Governor to "go to his own country" is particularly insulting - it treats the Governor as a foreign intruder without legitimate place on the island or right to govern. Speculations The accumulation of testimony about [Ker]'s specific religious slurs suggests the Governor may indeed be of Protestant (possibly French Protestant) background. [Ker] is using religion to attack both the Governor's personal faith and his authority to govern a Christian community. [Ker]'s constant interruptions and public reflections on the Governor during council proceedings suggest he is attempting to undermine the Governor's authority and damage his standing amongst council members. By showing open disrespect before the council, [Ker] may be trying to encourage others to question the Governor's legitimacy. The five independent witnesses testifying about [Ker]'s slurs (Bazettt, Lodgett, Myers, Worthington, Goss) indicate this behaviour was public and observed by multiple respectable people, not a private quarrel or isolated incident. [Ker]'s use of "Hugonist" (Huguenot) as an insult, combined with references to "Hugonist Ministers" and "Hugonist Community," suggests [Ker] is deliberately attacking the Governor's religious legitimacy as a tactical means to undermine his governmental authority. In a strictly Christian society, attacking someone's religion is a serious affront that questions their fitness to govern.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			[Ker]'s apparent suggestion that the Governor belongs in "his own country" might indicate [Ker] views himself as more permanently established on the island than the Governor, or as having some claim to authority that supersedes the Governor's appointed position. The pattern of [Ker]'s behaviour - habitually interrupting the Governor, contradicting him before the council, insulting him with religious slurs, refusing his authority - demonstrates open rebellion against the Governor's governance. The systematic accumulation of charges across multiple sessions suggests the Governor is methodically building a comprehensive case for [Ker]'s removal, dismissal or severe punishment.
220	198	Two Dollars to the Right Honble Company for Affronting the Govern.r In telling him he Corrupted his Servant And to beg his worship's pardon which his Worship [...] Whereas the Marshall had ord.d To Distrain upon Doctor Ker for a Fine Imposed upon him, and Having taken a Bason which was ordered to be Exposed To Sale the said M.r Ker bidding 10 Dollars for the Same, and Refusing to pay down the Fine being Seventeen Shillings. It Is ordered. To be Exposed again. Whereas. The Gov.r Rec.d a Letter Concerning Some Differences between him and Cap.t [Sodington] Resp.t pe. But now has Signified und.r his hand, that he is In Charity with the said Cap.t [Sodington] and all men Whereas. Serj.t Dixon being lately Rec.d a Serj.ts Place thereby became Vacant. It Is ordered. That [...] Corporall Lodgett do, Advance, and Succeed In his Room. Serj.t Crapp being Dismissed the R.t Honble Companies Service According to Request. It Is ordered. That Corporall Bradley do Succeed as Serj.t Turner Tho: Goodwin	Doctor Ker was fined two dollars payable to the Right Honourable Company for affronting the Governor by accusing him of corrupting his servant, and was further required to beg his Worship's pardon, which his Worship [...] The Marshall was instructed to distrain upon Doctor Ker for a fine imposed against him. A basin was seized and put up for sale. Mister Ker bid ten dollars for it but refused to pay the outstanding penalty of 17 shillings. An order was made for the basin to be returned to sale a second time. A letter was received by the Governor concerning differences between himself and Captain Sodington with respect to [...]. A declaration was afterwards signed under his hand to the effect that he stood at peace with Captain Sodington and with all men. Sergeant Dixon was recently appointed to another sergeant's place, by which his previous post fell vacant. An order was made that Corporal Lodgett be promoted to fill that vacancy. Sergeant Crapp was discharged from the Right Honourable Company's service at his own request. An order was made that Corporal Bradley take his place as sergeant. Turner. Thomas Goodwin [...] Interpretations The records reveal the graduated disciplinary tools available to the Council against a recalcitrant officer. A monetary penalty paid to the Company, a compelled public apology, and the seizure of personal property when payment was withheld together formed an escalating sequence of sanctions that allowed responses to intensify as defiance persisted. The formal reconciliation between the Governor and Captain Sodington, registered under the Governor's own signature, indicates that disputes between senior officials were handled as matters of public governance rather than as private quarrels, with documented closure required before normal business could continue. The juxtaposition of disciplinary cases with routine military promotions in a single sitting shows the Council functioning simultaneously as judicial tribunal and personnel committee, with garrison appointments treated as ordinary Council business. Speculations Doctor Ker's bid of ten dollars for his own seized basin, set against his refusal to settle a fine of only seventeen shillings, suggests deliberate procedural manipulation. By offering a high bid without discharging the underlying penalty, he probably aimed to recover his property without conceding the legitimacy of the original sanction. The Governor's signed declaration of being at peace with Captain Sodington and with all men was probably required to satisfy a sacramental or ceremonial precondition, given that formal reconciliation among disputing parties was a customary requirement before participation in communion or other solemn public acts.
221	199	February 12.th 1704/5	12 February 1705

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
		Whereas. Stephen Poirier Esq.r Govern.r being Appointed Sole Executo.r by the ^Last^ Will of the widow Easton late dec.ed and overseer of her Children, And Having According to Trust Disposed the Goods to the best Advantage Except the house and Lands which Cannot at p.sent be Set out to the Utmost In Regard the heir Is not yet of Age To Chuse a Guardian wanting Nine Months thereof, Till when his Worship does Intrust George Dwight their Grand father In Law to overlook the p.misses, and Keeping the fences In ord.r and Repair, Allowing him for his Trouble Fifty Shillings; which Said Sum he ~~Is~~ voluntarily ob= lidges himself to pay Into the Children for the work [...] of a black during his wifes Life. Witness our hands. [...] Poirier George Dwight	Stephen Poirier Esquire, Governor, was named sole executor under the final will of the widow Easton, recently deceased, and was appointed overseer of her children. The goods belonging to the estate were disposed of as profitably as possible in accordance with the trust. The dwelling and landholdings, however, were not to be allocated to their full value at present, as the heir was not yet old enough to select a guardian, fAllisng nine months short of the required age. Until that time, George Dwight, the children's grandfather-in-law, was entrusted with oversight of the premises and maintenance of the fences. An allowance of fifty shillings was granted for his trouble. That sum was voluntarily pledged by Dwight to be paid back to the children for the [...] of a slave during his wife's lifetime. The document was witnessed and signed by [...] Poirier and George Dwight. Interpretations The Governor's dual role as executor and colonial administrator illustrates how personal legal duties and official functions merged in a small settlement where senior Company officials were the natural choice for positions of testamentary trust. The arrangement also reveals a structured system for managing orphaned children's property, with a legally defined age at which an heir was entitled to select a guardian governing the timetable for full distribution. The mechanism by which Dwight's fifty-shilling allowance was voluntarily redirected back into the children's account through the labour of a slave demonstrates how modest colonial estates were managed through interlocking obligations, with slave labour treated as a fungible asset whose value offset other costs within the household economy. Speculations Dwight's voluntary pledge to return his fee through the output of a slave already connected to the household suggests he was probably already benefiting from that labour during his wife's lifetime, and the arrangement served to formalise an existing situation rather than to create a new one, ensuring the children's inheritance was not quietly diminished. The Governor's personal involvement as executor of a relatively modest estate - a house, some land and a small number of goods - may reflect the limited pool of literate, trusted individuals available in the settlement, or it may indicate that the Easton family held some particular standing that warranted gubernatorial oversight.
222	200	Island S.t Helena. At a Consultation. Held on Tuesday the 13.th of February 1704/5 At Fort James. Present. Stephen Poirier Esq.r Govern.r Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas. The Govern.r being Appointed by the widdow Easton Sole Executor of her Last verbal Will, Accepted of the Same. To Prove the Same. M.rs Bazett Sworn Saith That the said widdow Easton on her death bed being asked how She would dis= pose of her Slaves, Comitted them wholly to the Gov.r M.rs ^[Bett]^ Sworn Saith the Same. It Is ordered. That the Govern.r Do Act Accordingly. The widdow Dixon Delivered In an Inventory of All her husband's Estate According To an ^oath^ [...] to her ~~[...]~ That purpose. The which M.r Bazett, and M.r Cole Appraisers Apointed Do Attest To be true to the best of their knowledge. It Is ordered.	St Helena. At a consultation held on Tuesday 13 February 1705 at Fort James. Present: Stephen Poirier Esquire, Governor; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign. The Governor was appointed by the widow Easton as sole executor of her final oral will, and the appointment was accepted. The will was proved by sworn testimony. Mrs Bazett stated under oath that the widow Easton, in her final hours, was asked how her slaves were to be disposed of, and entrusted them entirely to the Governor. Mrs [Bett] was sworn and gave identical testimony. An order was issued that the Governor proceed as executor. An inventory of her late husband's entire estate was delivered by the widow Dixon, sworn under an oath [...] administered to her for that purpose. Mister Bazett and Mister Cole, appointed as appraisers, attested the inventory to be accurate so far as they were able to determine. A further order was issued [...] Interpretations The proving of an oral will through sworn female witnesses reveals the legal mechanisms available in a small colonial settlement where written testaments were not always practicable. Two depositions were accepted as

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			sufficient to establish the dying woman's final wishes regarding her most valuable movable property - her slaves - and to vest executive authority in the Governor. The Council sat with only the Governor and a single Ensign present, the barest possible quorum. This minimal attendance, combined with the transaction of two separate probate matters in a single sitting, suggests either a reduced administrative class on the island at this date or the pressing nature of estate business following recent deaths. Speculations The oral will addressed only the disposal of slaves, with no reference to the house, lands or goods already dealt with in the preceding entry of 12 February. The slaves were probably singled out for specific testamentary direction because they represented the most valuable and most easily contested portion of the estate, requiring formal proof before witnesses to forestall challenge. The widow Dixon's submission of a sworn inventory in the same session points to a cluster of recent deaths generating concurrent probate work for the Council. Whether her husband was connected to the Sergeant Dixon recorded earlier as having received a new posting remains unclear, though the coincidence of surname and timing is notable.
223	201	That the Same be Accepted of and a Coppy Delivered when Demanded. Whereas. According to an Advertism.t for that purpose. The House and Garden wherein the widdow [Cotgrave] Lived was Exposed this Day at a publick out=Cry; To be Let for the Term of 21 Years, To the Highest bidder for the Same at 30.[l] p Annum. And Whereas Paul [Graton] ~~[...]~~ Did bid for, and take the Same at 30.[l] p Annum. It Is Ordered. That the said Paul [Graton] ~~[...]~~ Do Accordingly Enter And Take possession of the p.misses on The 25.th Day of March next Ensuing; Subject Nevertheless To Sell and vend the fruit, and product thereof, At these Rates following (vizt:) Bannano Trees at - [...] p Each Lemon Juice - 02.6 p Gall. Lemons - 03 - p 100 Banano Bunches - 02.6 p bunch And the R.t Hon.ble Companys to Have the Dry ~~trees~~ Leaves to bind their ^Grape^ Vines. [...] Tho: Goodwin	The inventory was to be accepted and a copy provided when demanded. Following a public advertisement, the dwelling and garden where the widow [Cotgrave] formerly resided was put up at auction on that day, to be let for a term of 21 years to whoever offered most at a rent of 30 [pounds] a year. Paul [Graton] bid for and took the lease at 30 [pounds] a year. An order was made that Paul [Graton] enter the premises on 25 March 1705, subject to the condition that all fruit and produce from the property be sold at the following fixed rates, namely: Banana trees at [...] each Lemon juice at 2 shillings 6 pence per gallon Lemons at 3 shillings per 100 Banana bunches at 2 shillings 6 pence per bunch The Right Honourable Company was to receive the dry leaves for binding its grape vines. [...] Thomas Goodwin. Interpretations The regulated price schedule imposed on the lessee reveals the Company's control over the sale of agricultural produce on the island, preventing market-rate pricing and transforming the lease from a simple rental into a managed commercial arrangement. The tenant was granted use of productive land but was denied freedom to set prices, ensuring the garrison and settlement received affordable supplies at predictable cost. The reservation of dry banana leaves for binding the Company's grape vines demonstrates how different agricultural operations on the island were administratively linked. The lessee's banana cultivation was made to serve the Company's own viticulture as an explicit condition of tenure, embedding one enterprise within another. Speculations The 21-year term at a fixed annual rent suggests the Company prioritised long-term stability for a productive property whose output supplied the settlement. So lengthy a lease may also have been necessary to attract a bidder prepared to invest in maintaining the garden under price controls that limited his profit. The combination of competitive public auction with a rigid price schedule for produce points to a managed economy on the island in which market mechanisms were selectively applied. The lease itself was awarded by open competition, but the commercial activity conducted on the land was tightly regulated - a model that balanced incentive against control.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
224	202	Island S.t Helena At a Consultacon Held on Tuesday 27.th Day of February 1704/5 At Fort James. Present. Stephen Poirier Govern.d Corn: Sodington Deputy Tho: Goodwin Ensign. Whereas. Morris Griffin Complains ag.t Edward Heath Freeplanter In a plea of Debt of fourteen pounds three Shillings and Six pence, as by Bill und.r hand and Seale. It Is ordered. That the Said Edward Heath Do pay the Said Sum of fourteen pounds three Shillings, and Six pence According to the Said Bill, and pay Councill Fees. Whereas. W.m Beale Freeplanter Having Given Untimely Notice To Summons John Mudge to Appear this Day. It Is ordered. That a warr.t be Issued out against next Councill Day. Whereas [Ripin]	St Helena. At a consultation held on Tuesday 27 February 1705 at Fort James. Present: Stephen Poirier Esquire, Governor; Cornelius Sodington, Deputy; Thomas Goodwin, Ensign. Morris Griffin brought a complaint against Edward Heath, freeplanter, in a plea of debt amounting to 14 pounds 3 shillings and 6 pence, evidenced by a bill signed and sealed. An order was made that Edward Heath pay the full amount of 14 pounds 3 shillings and 6 pence in accordance with the bill, together with the applicable Council charges. William Beale, freeplanter, gave insufficient notice to summon John Mudge to appear on that day. A warrant was accordingly directed to be issued for the next Council day. [Ripin] [...] Interpretations The Council operated here as a summary debt court in which a signed and sealed bill was accepted as sufficient proof to order immediate payment without recorded argument or defence. The brevity of the proceedings suggests a streamlined form of commercial justice suited to a small settlement where prolonged litigation was impracticable. Cornelius Sodington's first appearance as Deputy marks a return to a fuller Council composition after the previous sitting of 13 February, at which only the Governor and Ensign were present. His attendance follows the formal reconciliation between himself and the Governor recorded earlier, suggesting that normal working relations within the Council were restored. Speculations The enforcement of procedural notice requirements in the Beale matter - rather than simply hearing the case regardless - indicates that the Council observed established rules of summons even in a settlement small enough for informal communication. This insistence on proper form probably served to legitimise the Council's judicial authority and protect defendants from being ambushed by unprepared proceedings. The complaint by Griffin against Heath, both apparently private settlers, illustrates how the Council served as the sole available forum for civil disputes on the island, with no distinction drawn between its administrative and judicial functions within a single sitting.
225	203	[...] Presented to the Councill a Bill of Charge for the Apprais.m.t of [Eurlicks] Estate, Praying Satis= faction. It Is ordered. That Doctor [Hoskinson] Do pay the Same According to his own offer. Whereas. John Nicholls made Comp.It To Govern.r and Councill of Severall Trespasses, and Damages done him by M.rs [Wranghams] Hoggs; and Desires Witnesses to be Examined. Richard Gurling Sworn Saith That About a 12 Months Since M.r Nicholls Told, and Shewed this Depon.t how he was Damaged In Grass 2. or 3000. Some by [Wrangham], and Some by Cap.t Goodwins hoggs. But Saith The fences were not Lawfull According to the Statute In that Case. Robert [Bark] Saith the Same. It Is ordered. That the Said Nicholls for want of full proof and [for] [not] [good] be Dismissed paying Charg.s. Whereas the Govern.r Represented to the Councill, that Doctor ^Ker^ has openly Said, he Corrupted his Councill, Requiring Satisfaction. The Said Doctor Ker Uttering Very Contemptuous Expressions. Saying He was better Educated, better born, and a better Gentleman then the Govern.r	A bill of charges for the appraisal of [Eurlicks] estate was presented to the Council by [Ripin], with a request for payment. An order was made that Doctor [Hoskinson] settle the amount in accordance with his own prior offer. A complaint was lodged by John Nicholls before the Governor and Council, alleging repeated trespass and damage caused by Mrs [Wrangham]'s hogs, with a request that witnesses be examined. Richard Gurling was sworn. He testified that approximately twelve months earlier, Mister Nicholls showed him the damage to his grass amounting to two or three thousand, caused partly by [Wrangham]'s hogs and partly by Captain Goodwin's. The fences, however, were not lawful under the statute applicable to such cases. Robert [Bark] gave identical testimony. Nicholls was dismissed and ordered to pay charges, owing to insufficient evidence and [...]. The Governor represented to the Council that Doctor Ker had openly accused him of corrupting his Council, and demanded satisfaction. Doctor Ker replied with highly contemptuous language, claiming that his education, birth and standing as a gentleman all surpassed those of the Governor.

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			Interpretations The dismissal of Nicholls' trespass complaint on the grounds that his own fences failed to meet statutory requirements reveals a legal regime in which property owners bore reciprocal obligations. The statute governing livestock trespass evidently placed the burden on the complainant to demonstrate lawful fencing before any damages could be awarded - a practical rule for a small agricultural settlement where wandering livestock was an endemic problem. Doctor Ker's renewed provocation represents a marked escalation from the earlier confrontation. Where the previous charges questioned the Governor's religious credentials through accusations of Huguenot sympathies, Ker now attacked his fitness to govern on grounds of social rank, personal corruption and inferior breeding, opening an entirely separate front against executive authority. Speculations Ker's assertion of superior birth and education suggests he may have held formal credentials from a European institution, and regarded Poirier - whose French surname had already been turned against him - as a social inferior elevated beyond his natural station by Company patronage. The title "Doctor" itself served as a claim to professional standing that the Governor could not match. The witness testimony identifying hogs belonging to both Mrs [Wrangham] and Captain Goodwin as responsible for the damage raises a potential conflict of interest. If Captain Goodwin was identical with the Ensign Thomas Goodwin seated on the Council that day, he was simultaneously a member of the adjudicating body and owner of livestock implicated in the complaint, though no objection was recorded.
226	204	And the Govern.r Speaking further, The Said M.r Ker Uttered Very Injurious, and mutinous Expressions. Whereas Cap.t Sodington and Cap.t Goodwin being Desired to Declare what Doctor Ker Said at a Consultacon ^Lately^ held, About the Govern.rs Corrupting Councill, which they Say, they have forgot, and Cannot Remember. Samuel Griffith C.le of the Councill being Sworn, That Doctor Ker among other Very Opprobrious, and Heinous Reflections upon the Gov.r Said he Corrupted his Councill. The Which they being Asked by the Gov.r Whether Directly, or Indirectly he had Corrupted Them, both Answered In the Negative. And the Govern.r Reading the Instrument and Duly Laid upon the Chaplains head about Catechising &c. M.r Ker told the Gov.r; I wish [Catechists] [Von] Monsieur Govern.r the 1.st man. And the Govern.r Requiring him to Lay his hand upon the Imposition [fixed] upon a Proclamation as has heretofore been [...], and Debated. The which he Did and Answered Accordingly. It Is ordered.	As the Governor continued to speak, further expressions described as injurious and mutinous were uttered by Mister Ker. Captain Sodington and Captain Goodwin were asked to declare what Doctor Ker said at a recent consultation about the Governor corrupting his Council. Both claimed the words were forgotten and no longer recalled. Samuel Griffith, Clerk of the Council, was sworn. He testified that Doctor Ker, among numerous offensive and serious reflections upon the Governor, accused him of corrupting his Council. Both Council members were then asked by the Governor whether they were corrupted by him, whether directly or indirectly. Each answered in the negative. An instrument imposed upon the Chaplain concerning the duty of catechising was read aloud by the Governor. Ker responded by addressing him mockingly as "Monsieur Governor" and expressing the wish that [...] the Governor himself be the first to undergo catechising. Ker was then required by the Governor to place his hand upon the imposition [...] established by proclamation, as was previously [...] and debated. He complied and responded as required. A further order was issued [...] Interpretations The contrasting testimony of the Council members and the Clerk reveals a carefully staged proceeding. Sodington and Goodwin's claimed inability to recall Ker's words was almost certainly diplomatic evasion, sparing them the difficulty of testifying against a fellow officer while permitting the charge to be formally recorded through the Clerk's sworn evidence instead. The Governor's direct question to both Council members - whether they were corrupted by him, directly or indirectly - and their formal denials transformed what began as Ker's accusation into an instrument of gubernatorial vindication. An official record was created

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			exonerating the Governor's administration, extracted from the very body Ker claimed was corrupted. The escalation in language from the earlier charge of "contemptuous expressions" to "injurious and mutinous expressions" marks a deliberate raising of the stakes. "Mutinous" carried far graver implications than mere disrespect, potentially placing Ker's conduct within the framework of military discipline rather than civil dispute. Speculations Ker's use of "Monsieur Governor" during a discussion of catechising duties was probably calculated to merge two lines of attack: the religious charge that the Governor was unfit to direct Anglican instruction, and the national one that he was fundamentally French and therefore alien to the church he presumed to govern. By suggesting the Governor himself needed catechising first, Ker implied he lacked the most basic religious competence. Ker's ultimate compliance when required to place his hand upon the imposition and respond accordingly suggests that while he was prepared to insult the Governor personally, he drew back from defying a formal proclamation. His resistance operated within the bounds of personal provocation rather than outright institutional rebellion.
227	205	That the Said Doctor Ker be bound to His Good behavid for his Contemptuous words, and Ill behavid to the Gov.r And pay as a Fine to the R.t Hon.ble Companys five pounds. And that A warr.t be Issued out & upon Refusall of paym.t to Levy the Same by Distress &c. Returning the overplus. Samuel Griffith Cl.e In Councill, ^took^ the oath of Allegiance, and fidelity. In manner following; You Do Swear to be good, and True to o.r Sovereign Lady Queen Anne her heirs and Success.rs And that You will be faithfull to the Court of Manag.rs for the Hon.ble East India Company; the Secrets of the Company and the publick which shall be Given You In Charge to Conceale by the Gov.r and Councill You will not Conceive Disclose; Soe help You God. [...] Tho: Goodwin	Doctor Ker was ordered bound over for good behaviour on account of his contemptuous language and misconduct towards the Governor, and was fined five pounds payable to the Right Honourable Company. A warrant was to be issued, and upon any refusal of payment the sum was to be levied by distraint, with any surplus returned. Samuel Griffith, Clerk in Council, took the oath of allegiance and fidelity in the following terms. Loyalty and truth were sworn to Queen Anne, her heirs and successors, and faithful service pledged to the Court of Managers of the Honourable East India Company. Any secrets of the Company or of public affairs entrusted to his keeping by the Governor and Council were not to be [...] disclosed. So help him God. [...] Thomas Goodwin. Interpretations The five-pound fine imposed on Doctor Ker represented a substantial escalation from the earlier penalty of two dollars, reflecting the cumulative gravity of his repeated defiance. The provision for distraint upon refusal of payment, together with the requirement to return any surplus, demonstrated a concern for procedural regularity even in punitive measures and established a clear enforcement mechanism should Ker continue to resist. The oath administered to the Clerk reveals the dual structure of authority governing St Helena. Allegiance was owed simultaneously to the Crown and to the East India Company, with the Clerk bound to maintain the confidentiality of both state and commercial affairs as directed by the local Governor and Council. No tension between these two loyalties was acknowledged in the formula. Speculations The timing of Griffith's oath on the same day he provided sworn testimony against Doctor Ker may not be coincidental. His formal binding to allegiance and fidelity served to reinforce the official standing of the man whose evidence had just been used to establish the charge of corruption against the Governor's authority, lending retrospective weight to his deposition. The oath's specific emphasis on concealing secrets entrusted by the Governor and Council points to a practical concern about leaks from Council proceedings. In a settlement small enough for Ker's accusations to circulate openly, securing the Clerk's formal

Film No	Page No.	OCR Transcription	Modern Summary with Analysis
			commitment to discretion addressed an immediate administrative vulnerability.
228	206	Blank page	
229	207	Blank page	
230	208	Book cover	
231	209	EAP 1364 St Helena Document Name and Date: St. Helena Records 1703–1704 Dimensions (height × width × depth) (cm): 37.5 cm × 25.5 cm × 3.5 cm No. written pages: 206 No. blank pages: [blank] Spine and cover: GOOD CONDITION Inside pages: EDGES OF PAGES TATTERED. FOXING PRESENT THROUGHOUT VOLUME Time taken to photograph (hours): 2 HOURS Additional comments: NUMBERING JUMPS FROM 120–127 UNCLEAR IF MISTAKE OR PAGES MISSING	