

The object of this pedigree was to show that several generations of Washingtons had been born at Warton, County Lancaster; that a Lawrence W. was born there in 1669, whose eldest son was Leonard W., born about 1595, the father of four sons and one daughter *baptized at Warton* in 1616, 1619, 1622, 1625, and 1627. The two younger sons were said to be Lawrence, baptized 1625, and John, baptized 1627, who were termed the emigrants to Virginia.

I will not waste time in refuting the innumerable blunders of the rest of the pedigree, but deal with the essential point here raised. Col. Chester printed a letter in the *New York World* of March 29, 1879, when he had seen the prospectus of Welles's book. He said:

"I at once recognized an old acquaintance, hawked about London some years ago, the original manuscript of which is in my own possession, and now lies on my table before me, where I keep it for the amusement of my friends. . . . I will simply select the crucial point of it, where it is stated that the two emigrant brothers, Lawrence and John Washington, were sons of Leonard Washington of Warton, and that they were respectively born and baptized in 1625 and 1627. The only possible source from which these two baptisms could be obtained is the parish register of Warton. I have examined the register personally and very carefully, and can declare that no such entries are to be found in it."

At this point I wish to introduce the evidence of the Rev. T. H. Pain, M.A., Vicar of Warton, given in a letter now before me, addressed to the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, dated January 25, 1889. He writes:

"I beg to say that I have not been able to find any entry of the baptism of Leonard Washington, said to have been born in Warton about 1595. As to the baptisms of his children, I send the following extracts:

Baptismata Anno Dom. 1616.  
Robertus, filius Leonardi Washington, baptiz. octavo die Septembris.  
Baptismat. 1619.  
Jane, daughter of Leonard Washington, bapt. 4th day of September.  
Bapt. Anno Dom. 1622.  
Francis, ye sonne of Leonard Washington of Warton, baptized ye 4th day of February.

"I have not been able to find an entry of the baptism of Lawrence, said to have been baptized at Warton in 1625, or of John, said to have been baptized here in 1627."

In the light of these two statements, no one can doubt that the pedigree is a rank and stupid forgery, made by the simple method of fastening upon Leonard Washington two sons of whom he had no knowledge, and without a word of proof.

It seems to me that Col. Chester's statement of the genesis of this forgery may be amusing and instructive. He wrote under date of June 16, 1879:

"If you could see the original, which strangely fell in my hands, you would see how the whole thing was concocted. It was got up some years ago by this 'James Phillippe' for John Camden Hotten, who died before publishing it, and his successors had too much good sense to carry out his intentions. It is evident that the compiler, after working out an elaborate pedigree, much of which I know to be false, looked about for a safe place where to put the two emigrant brothers. He finally decided to make them sons of Leonard Washington of Warton. Afterwards, probably thinking that he might be detected, he crossed out this affiliation. But, finding no better place for them, he finally wrote (as an instruction to the printer), 'This is correct.'

"Of course you would not find any proofs of his statements. This distinguished 'genealogist' never furnishes any. If asked for his authority in any instance, he draws himself up to his full height (6 ft. 4) and says, 'I am the authority'; and that is all any one can ever get out of him. . . .

"The 'Common Pleas Rolls' are as well known to every historical student and genealogist as the *Heralds' Visitations*. Like all similar records, they are more or less valuable, but they rank no higher, if so high, as the 'Chancery Proceedings.' Unfortunately, they are very difficult to search, from being entirely unindexed, and it is this fact of which 'Phillippe' takes advantage. He may almost with impunity say that his authority for a particular statement is a Common Pleas roll, for unless he also gave you, which he never does, the precise year, term of court, number of roll, and number of membrane, it would be almost impossible to test his statement. I spent weeks over these rolls of