

DA
392
G 36

DA392
.G 36





DA392

E36

Price 2s. 6d.

THOMAS WINTER'S CONFESSION
AND THE GUNPOWDER PLOT.

BY THE

VERY REV. JOHN GERARD, S.J.



74332
REC'D
GOD

LONDON AND NEW YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS,
45, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

1898.



Class TA392

Book .G36

THOMAS WINTER'S CONFESSION
AND THE GUNPOWDER PLOT.

BY THE

VERY REV. JOHN GERARD, S.J.

D.A. 392
S. 36

—
THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS

LONDON AND NEW YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS,
45, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

—
1898.

20325
'02

THOMAS WINTER'S CONFESSION AND THE GUNPOWDER PLOT.

THOMAS WINTER—to adopt the form of his name now fixed by usage—is undoubtedly a witness of the first importance regarding the Gunpowder Plot. Of the three persons who first started the design, he alone survived to give evidence concerning it, his comrades, Robert Catesby and John Wright, being slain in the field, as was likewise Thomas Percy, who being initiated at an early stage of the Conspiracy, at once ranked with Catesby as its chief. Of the first five accomplices who were deepest in the matter, Guy Faukes alone shared Winter's captivity, and it appears improbable that he could tell as much as the others, being apparently enlisted as a man of action rather than of counsel, who was content to execute what his fellows planned.

Winter's testimony must accordingly be of the greatest interest to historians of the famous Conspiracy, and of all the evidence coming to us in his name incomparably the most important, or rather the only contribution of real importance, is that contained in the Confession attributed to him, detailing the particulars of the whole transaction, from the first broaching of the scheme to its final collapse. Upon the account furnished by this document, far more than upon any other evidence, is based the narrative which every history repeats, and if the Confession be really what it professes to be, the genuine production of Thomas Winter, there can be no doubt that, so far at least as its most characteristic features are concerned, this familiar tale must be accepted as authentic. If, however, on the other hand, as I venture to believe, this fundamental piece of evidence, given to the world by the Government of the day, and vouched for by them as Winter's, should prove to be a fabrication manufactured in his name, it is obvious that not only will the version of history based upon it be utterly discredited, but the doubts and suspicions thus aroused must attach themselves to more than this particular incident.

It is evidently a matter of no small importance that the true character of such a document should be satisfactorily determined, and in order to further this object the present publication has been undertaken. In the following pages will

be found the most accurate reproduction that could be procured of the original Confession itself, and of all known specimens of the undoubted handwriting of its supposed author, who is said to have written it with his own hand. All who desire to do so will thus be enabled to seek materials for a judgment at the fountain-head, and to form their own opinion from evidence at first hand.

The Original Confession, which is preserved at Hatfield, has been freely placed at my disposal by the Marquis of Salisbury, who has with the greatest liberality afforded every facility for my purpose.

The other documents reproduced are in the Public Record Office, where every assistance has likewise been rendered me, and I have in particular to thank Mr. Hubert Hall for valuable advice as to the mode of reproduction.

In the series of facsimiles, a continuous system of pagination has been introduced for purposes of reference, and the modern numerals now found on the originals, indicating their position in the volumes wherein they are placed, have been deleted. The various documents are distinguished by capital letters, and each is introduced by a brief heading. References will hereafter be given by pages and lines, the latter being indicated as *sup.* or *inf.* according as they are counted from the top or bottom of the page.

It will be well to add a few particulars regarding the document thus exhibited for scrutiny, and to indicate the grounds upon which its authenticity is challenged.

I.

Thomas Winter's Confession has come down to us in three contemporary forms.

(a) The so-called original, preserved at Hatfield, and here reproduced, which may conveniently be described as the "Hatfield Confession." A note at the end, written and signed by Sir Edward Coke, affirms that it was "Delivered by Thomas Wynter all written with his own hand, 25 nov. 1605." An introductory note, also of Coke's writing, describes it as "The voluntarie declaration of Thomas Winter of hoodington in the county of Worcester gent. the 25 of Nov. 1605, at the tower; acknowledged before the lords commissioners." Another introductory note, not in Coke's hand, nor Winter's own, originally dated it, "23 9ber 1605," but the "23" has subsequently been altered, apparently by Coke, to "25." An endorsement (P. 12), in the Earl of Salisbury's hand, runs thus—"25 9ber Mr. Tho: Wyntors declaration." Except for Coke's signature to the note mentioned above no names of witnesses appear. The catchwords and letters constantly occurring in the margin are Sir Edward Coke's.

(b) "Munck's Copy," made by Levinus Munck, private secretary to the Earl of Salisbury, and preserved in the Public Record Office,¹ dates the document "November 23, 1605." In this, some portions of the original are omitted, and a blank is bridged over, of which there will be more to say. Otherwise, except in regard of spelling, the original is closely followed. A note, an alteration of phraseology, and an addition in the King's hand, show that this copy was submitted to his Majesty. At the end the name of the signatory is omitted, the Confession concluding with "and so I remain yours &c." Beneath this is added, in Salisbury's hand, the following attestation:

"Taken before us

"Nottingham, Suffolk, Northampton, Salisbury, Mar, Dunbar, Popham,
Edw. Coke, W. Waad."

(c) The printed version, published in the "King's Book." This agrees exactly with Munck's copy, and includes the King's emendations,² as well as the list of witnesses in the precise form given by Salisbury.

¹ *Gunpowder Plot Book*, 114.

² *Viz.* (P. 7, l. 4, *inf.*) After the words "The Earl of Northumberland's rent," is inserted—"Which was about £4,000"—and (*ibid.*) for the phrase "his number was ten," is substituted "to the number of ten." The former, King James stigmatized as an "Uncleare phrase."

II.

Apart from the characteristics of the Hatfield document, to be examined presently, there are some circumstances connected with Winter's Confession which are not easily explained.

It is, as has been said, by far the fullest and most important disclosure ever made either by himself or any of his accomplices, containing much of prime importance not mentioned elsewhere; and it was evidently in the hands of his judges at least by the 25th of November. Yet, although Winter was undoubtedly examined on that same day, and again on Dec. 5th, Jan. 9th, and Jan. 17th,¹ he never mentioned his Confession, and although the information he imparted in these examinations was comparatively trivial, his questioners never referred him to its ample disclosures, nor made any attempt to pursue the topics therein introduced. This is the more remarkable, as on Dec. 5th Winter referred the Commissioners to his previous examination (of Nov. 25), saying nothing of the far more instructive Confession.² Is it conceivable that so potent an instrument for eliciting information should thus have been kept out of sight, had it been possible to quote it to its alleged author?

In regard of one point this practical neglect of the Confession is particularly strange. An English exile, Hugh Owen, serving as a soldier in Flanders, was beyond all others obnoxious to the English Government, who evinced the greatest anxiety to get him into their hands; and as he acted as an agent for his fellow-Catholics, this is not surprising. Every effort was accordingly made to persuade the Archdukes that he was implicated in the Powder Plot, and ought therefore to be given up.³ In order to convince the world of his guilt, there is no doubt whatever that, in one instance at least, the Government did not shrink from fabrication of evidence, namely in the declaration of Guy Faukes,⁴ published

¹ The originals of these examinations, subscribed by Winter, are in the Record Office. [*Gunpowder Plot Book*, Nos. 116, 146, 163, 170.]

² In the examination of Nov. 25, Winter spoke of various sums of money contributed by Francis Tresham, and of powers granted to Catesby and Percy for the enrolment of fresh accomplices.

On Dec. 5, of his own visit to Mr. Talbot of Grafton (Nov. 6), and of conversations with him and one Smallpeece, and again of Catesby's and Percy's powers.

On Jan. 9, of the mission abroad of Sir Edward Baynham (a matter not mentioned in the Confession).

On Jan. 17, of a journey he himself had made to Rome in 1599; of the part designed for the exile Hugh Owen, after the great blow should have been struck; of his own presence at Oxford when his brother Robert was initiated in the Conspiracy; and of sacramental confessions made by himself and others during their insurrection, to the Jesuit Hammond.

³ For some details of the elaborate negotiations on this subject, see *What was the Gunpowder Plot?* pp. 184, seq.

⁴ Although I consider this document no less suspicious than the other, I must at present be content to refer the reader to what I have already said concerning it. [*What was the Gunpowder Plot?* pp. 169, seq. and *The Gunpowder Plot and the Gunpowder Plotters*, pp. 7, seq.]

by them along with Winter's Confession of which we are now speaking—these being the only pieces of evidence made public. In the printed version of this declaration was interpolated a passage whereof no trace is found in the original,¹ to the effect that one object of Faukes' journey to Flanders, in the spring of 1605, was "to acquaint Owen with the particulars of the Plot."

Faukes' narrative was undoubtedly prepared at an earlier date than Winter's, and in the "King's Book," wherein both saw the light, the latter is introduced as "in substance agreeing with this of Faukes, only larger in some circumstances." So remarkable is the agreement, as to include the statement about Owen which Faukes never made, but which Winter nevertheless not only repeated but amplified, reporting that Owen "seemed well pleased with the business."² Yet, although all evidence connecting Owen with the Conspiracy was for the Government's purposes as valuable as it seems to have been hard to procure, this compromising statement was never cited against him, either in negotiation with the Archdukes, or before Parliament,³ nor was any attempt made to follow up the clue thus opportunely supplied, by extorting all the testimony concerning Owen which Winter himself or Faukes could impart.⁴

III.

Turning to the Hatfield document, which is the original of so remarkable a piece of evidence, we find that while it is expressly stated to be entirely written by Winter himself, it undoubtedly bears a striking resemblance to the known examples of his hand, so that were there no other circumstances to be taken into account, it would probably be accepted without hesitation. This is no doubt a fact of high importance, to which full weight must be given. At the same time, it is clear that the writing, if not Winter's own, was expressly intended to pass for his, and we know that the Government of the period had the means, which upon occasions they did not scruple to employ,

¹ *G. P. B.* 101.

² *P.* 7, l. 19, *sup.*

³ April 29, 1606. *Dom. James I.* xx. 52.

⁴ It is true that almost two months later (Jan. 17, 1605-6), Winter declared (examination of that date) that after the Plot had taken effect, Owen was to have instructed Baynham to signify the event to the Pope—which, however, does not necessarily imply more than that his co-operation after the event was counted upon.

A deposition of Jan. 20, attributed to Faukes, tells the story against Owen in terms which are most explicit, and bear a curious resemblance to those of Winter's Confession. It does not appear, however, that much weight can be attributed to this document, the original of which is not to be discovered, while the versions given by three different reporters are utterly dissimilar and inconsistent. There is an examination of Faukes of Jan. 20 in the Record Office; but this treats of matters totally different from any of the above versions, and says no word concerning Owen. [See *What was the Gunpowder Plot?* pp. 191, seq.]

of counterfeiting handwriting in such a manner as to deceive even those most familiar with the genuine article.¹ Whether, in truth, the evidence of the handwriting be in favour of the authenticity of the document or no, is a delicate question upon which I shall venture no opinion of my own, leaving it to the judgment of experts who are accustomed to grapple with such minutiae. There are other considerations of a less technical character, the examination of which will probably be more satisfactory for readers in general.

(a) Despite its undeniable likeness to Winter's, the handwriting may be said to furnish the most serious difficulty to the acceptance of the Confession as his. It resembles his writing, indeed, but his writing at another period, not what we find it to have been at the time when the Confession was produced.

On the 8th of November, when he was made prisoner, Winter was severely wounded, receiving a bullet through his shoulder, which lost him the use of his right arm. It would seem that for some time afterwards he was unable to write at all. The record of an examination which he underwent on the 12th is not signed by him.² On the 21st, Sir William Waad, Lieutenant of the Tower, wrote to Salisbury: "Thomas Winter doth find his hand so strong, as after dinner he will settle himself to write that he hath verbally declared to your lordship, adding what he shall remember."³ Of his writing four days later, Nov. 25, we have two specimens, the signature appended to his examination of that date already mentioned [P. 23], and a note of five and a half lines, written and signed by himself, which he addressed to the Commissioners. [P. 21.] From these specimens it is evident that he was still suffering from his wound, and was unable to handle a pen with his former freedom, a freedom which, as his subsequent signatures attest [P. 23], he to some extent afterwards recovered. The holograph note to the Commissioners, in particular, bears witness to having been laboriously written, and with a tremulous hand. It has been assumed, to meet this objection, that it was written in haste, and that the character of the writing is thus explained,—but such a plea appears to be suggested only by argumentative necessity, for there is no symptom of haste or speed in the penmanship, but quite the contrary, and a prisoner in the Tower had no possible motive to hurry himself, having leisure in superabundance, while haste would not make the hand tremble as Winter's undoubtedly did.

¹ When Father Garnet was in the Tower, the letters for friends outside which he entrusted to his gaoler were copied, the originals being kept by the Lieutenant, and the copies forwarded to his correspondents, who, supposing them to be genuine, addressed replies to him which were treated in like manner, he being similarly deceived.

We also know upon Salisbury's own authority, that suspecting the character of a correspondence between Thomas Phelippes and Hugh Owen, he caused one Barnes to convey to the latter a letter purporting to be from Phelippes but "of Barnes' own handwriting." [Stowe MSS. 168.]

² Dom. James I. xvi. 59. ³ Brit. Mus. *Adl.* MSS. 6178, 84.

According to Coke, the Confession was written on this same day, the 25th; according to Munck, two days earlier, on the 23rd. Whichever it were, Winter's bodily state must have been the same as when he penned the five lines. Is it possible that at this same period he was in a condition to write ten folio pages in a hand so remarkably like his own before he received his wound, a hand, moreover, which, far from exhibiting any symptom of fatigue, grew better and freer as he proceeded, the tenth page being markedly superior to the first?

(b) It is still more extraordinary that in penning so notable a document the signatory should have forgotten the spelling of his own name, invariably adopted by himself and by the members of his family for a century afterwards. The form "Winter," which usage now prescribes, was, it is true, usually employed by Government writers at the time, but never, in any single instance known to us, by Thomas himself or his kindred, who one and all wrote the name "Wintour."¹

But the Confession is signed in the Government form, "Winter," although on the 25th of November itself, to which Sir Edward Coke assigns it, the supposed writer twice called himself "Wintour," according to his wont.²

Apart from the spelling, the signature is in many particulars singularly at variance with Winter's habitual practice. Instead of being, as should be expected, the point in which the document most closely resembles his undoubted handiwork, it is that in which the resemblance is least.

To explain away this remarkable discrepancy, various pleas have been raised. It is argued, in the first place, that at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the spelling of proper names was as arbitrary as that of other words, and that no argument can therefore be based upon a variation of this kind. Facts, however, will not be found to bear out the sweeping assertions frequently advanced on this point. It is true that the men of the period were quite reckless in their treatment of the names of others,³ and illiterate persons had no fixed principle regarding their own;

¹ Of Thomas Winter's undoubted signature, besides the eight examples here collected, an example is found attached to a deed relating to the Huddington estate (now belonging to Lord Edmund Talbot), dated 10 March, 1600. To this are likewise attached the signatures of his brothers, Robert and John. Of Robert, who was the squire of Huddington, there are two other signatures attached to deeds of the years 1595 and 1601, as well as at least eight examples in the Record Office, where also is found one of John's. In every instance the form used is "Wintour."

Other deeds in the collection above referred to show that although others wrote the name "Winter," the family, at least down to the reign of William III., uniformly retained the other spelling, which is also found on the sepulchral monuments of Sir George Wintour (grandson of Robert) and Sir Thomas Russell, whose daughter married Robert's son. [Nash, *Worcestershire*, i. 592; ii. 393.] On a vestment embroidered by Helen, Robert's daughter, now at Stonyhurst, there is the inscription, *Orate pro me Helena de Wintour*. Other instances are to be found both in England and amongst the first colonists of Maryland, which, however, are not so clearly original.

² See P. 21, and the first signature P. 23.

³ Thus on the Hatfield document itself Coke describes the writer as "Winter" (P. 1), and "Wynter" (P. 10), while Salisbury (P. 12) calls him "Wyntor," and on another occasion (P. 22), "Wintor."

but those who were in the habit of using a pen, then as now, necessarily acquired a habit of signing themselves in the same unvarying fashion, and almost mechanically. This is conspicuously the case with various individuals whom we constantly meet in the documents relating to the Powder Plot—such as Coke and Waad and Faukes, who consistently signed their names in a fashion which no one imitated in describing them. The point of the argument is that Thomas Winter did not vary his practice, nor sign himself in any form but one.

Indeed, Professor Gardiner, whose acquaintance with the writing of the period is so extensive, will not countenance the suggestion that “Winter” was written inadvertently.¹ He believes, instead, that the prisoner deliberately altered his style, in the hope of thus working on the compassion of his judges by using a form of the name familiar to them; but, despite the high authority upon which this suggestion comes, it does not appear to call for serious discussion. Another writer suggests that Winter’s intention was not to propitiate the Government, but to balk and baffle them; thus affording a striking instance of the fatal facility with which explanations may be devised when we give the reins to speculation.

(c) A feature of the original Confession which must strike the least observant, is the extensive emendation it has undergone, and this unquestionably appears to furnish a strong argument for its authenticity. If there were forgery, it may be argued, the story would have been carefully prepared before the forger was set to work, whereas Winter himself might naturally alter, or add, as he went along, especially as his letters show him to have been in the habit of doing so.

At the same time, it is fair to observe, the corrections of the Confession, while not precisely similar to those which Winter was accustomed to make, are such as would be made by one preparing a document for the press, rather than by a prisoner setting down the particulars of a desperate crime for which his life was forfeit. In his letters, Winter not unfrequently, while a sentence was still unfinished, changed his mind concerning it and its construction. In the Confession, phrases and clauses which are quite complete have been altered with no change of sense, but only of sound, in a fashion which would occur to none but a purist in style, and one more than usually fastidious.

Moreover, there are traces here and there of what can scarcely be called fair play. Thus, on the 2nd page (l. 15, *sup.*), the phrase, “you shall goe over,” is inserted in Sir Edward Coke’s hand, and appears, in the same hand, lower down as a marginal note, erased. In l. 17, the same phrase, about which the Attorney-General seems to have been so solicitous, appears in Winter’s handwriting. On the 4th page (l. 16, *sup.*), Coke is found to have interpolated the words, “by the hands of Gerrard [the Jesuit].”²

¹ *Athenæum*, Dec. 4, 1897.

² Those in brackets being cancelled.

On the 3rd page (l. 10, *sup.*), Coke has inserted the words, “or 4.” On the 3rd page (between ll. 2 and 3, *sup.*), there are manifest traces of an erasure,¹ which a prisoner in Winter’s circumstances would scarcely be allowed to make without more being heard of it. On the 5th page (l. 4, *inf.*), a statement concerning the conspirators’ designs, is struck out, which if Winter had made, he would either have allowed to stand, or blotted out entirely. As it is, it remains perfectly legible, and so for purposes of confession as serviceable as any other portion of the document.

Still more remarkable is a hiatus of which mention has already been made (P. 3, l. 1, *inf.*). Speaking of his return from Flanders with Faukes, in the spring of 1604, the writer says: “We took a payr of ores, and landed at _____, and came to Mr. Catsby.” Had Winter, writing eighteen months after the event, not remembered at which of the London stairs he landed, it can scarcely be supposed that he would have thought of naming so trivial a circumstance, or considered it sufficiently important to leave a blank for the name should it afterwards occur to his memory. For the composer of a fictitious narrative, on the other hand, while details of the kind are precious as lending verisimilitude to his tale, it is just as to such points that it is difficult to be precise.²

Evidence still more vital is supplied in connection with the same corrections. The great bulk of these, whether textual or marginal, were evidently made before Munck took his copy, in the text of which they are incorporated. Two marginal additions, however (that on P. 1 and the second on P. 4),³ appear also in the margin of the copy, showing that they were inserted after the said copy was taken—that is to say, after the Confession had passed from Winter’s hands into those of Salisbury and Munck. Nevertheless, these additions are supposed to be in his writing, being exactly similar to the rest of the document. Is it likely that the Confession would be sent back to the prisoner for the sake of these additions, neither being of the smallest practical value?⁴ Or is it not rather more natural to argue that, the

¹ These are quite visible in the original, and in photographs from it, but can hardly be seen in our reproduction.

² In Munck’s copy, the passage runs: “We took a pair of oars, and so came up to London, and came to Mr. Catesby.”

³ The other on P. 4, containing the form of the conspirators’ oath, does not appear at all in Munck’s copy, nor in the printed version. Upon this Professor Gardiner (*Athenæum*, Dec. 4, 1897) founds an elaborate hypothesis, which would require a more lengthy discussion than its value appears to justify, it being based on nothing more substantial than the merest speculation.

⁴ It is true that Professor Gardiner considers the marginal note on P. 4 to be of very great importance. On the back of the Confession (P. 12) are found four entries:

The form of the Othe
The time Robert Keys came in
What ll. [lords] were wished emonst them to be
warned to be absent and by whom
What money was expected.

These, says Mr. Gardiner, were evidently points upon which the Government demanded fuller information. As to the last two none was ever elicited, so far as the Confession was concerned, and as to the first, none was obtained in

evidence furnished by the copy being overlooked, these notes were thoughtlessly supplied in the same handwriting as the rest?

(d) There are some peculiarities observable in the Hatfield document which seem to show that the writer who penned it had a draft before him to copy, for he makes mistakes natural for a copyist which could not be made by one expressing his own ideas.

Thus on the 5th page (l. 11, *sup.*), speaking of the mine dug by the Conspirators, he says: "So as we all five entered with tools fit to begin our work." In the first instance, however, instead of "tools" he wrote "took," a word manifestly making nonsense of the passage, and one which Winter could not possibly use in such a place. But it is obvious that the letters *ls* might easily be mistaken for a *k*.

In the following line the words "bakt meats" [baked meats] were apparently a puzzle to the writer, who contented himself with copying their general appearance, as we do in the case of an address which we cannot read; but he did this in a manner so unsatisfactory that the correct version had afterwards to be interlined.

Still more noteworthy are various instances in which the writer appears to have been on the point of falling into an error familiar to copyists, known to the learned as "parablepsy," or, in plain language, "skipping." That is to say, he was on the point of omitting a line of his original and passing prematurely to the next.

Thus on the 7th page, speaking of Fauke's mission to Flanders to disclose the Plot to Stanley and Owen, he says, "We agreed that he should provided that he gave hitt them with the same oath that we had taken it before:" but at first [l. 10, *sup.*] instead of "oath" he wrote "reasons," which again makes no possible sense. In the following line, however, we find "reason" in its proper place.

Similarly P. 8, l. 13, *inf.*, we find "and" erased at the beginning of a line, and occurring in the next: P. 9, l. 18, *sup.*, we find "so;" and P. 10, l. 9, *sup.*, "then." In the last instance the space between the erasure and the recurrence of the word erased, is almost identically the same as in the first, as though this were the measure of a complete line in the original draft.

It is likewise evident that should this supposition be correct, a serious objection

time for official purposes,—for the form of the oath is not given at all in Munck's copy, nor in the printed version. But as to the time of Keyes' enlistment, he argues, the required information was supplied by the said marginal note, "Abought a moneth before Michelmas."

If this were so, the note would doubtless be of the highest importance, but Mr. Gardiner has omitted to notice that the information regarding Keyes had already been inserted in the text of the Confession [top of P. 5], and then crossed out, a fact which obviously disposes of the significance he attributes to the endorsements.

It may be further remarked that, according to his theory, the Confession must have been *twice* returned to Winter, the form of the oath being added on the second occasion. To this, he contends, the Government attached supreme importance, so as not to consider the Confession complete till it was inserted. It is hard to discover in the tame, and rather commonplace terms of this engagement, anything which can warrant such a supposition.

to the charge of forgery will be met. It has been urged that if so great pains were taken to imitate Winter's writing, his usual signature would have been carefully copied. But if a draft were prepared, his name would doubtless be appended in the form habitually used by Government officials, and the scribe, not venturing to depart from his copy, would confine his attention to the formation of the individual letters according to his alphabet of Winterian characters.

IV.

Other considerations to like effect are suggested by Levinus Munck's official copy.

(a) In connection with the point last discussed, it is somewhat remarkable that the copy, as already noted, should not exhibit the deponent's signature in any form. The original concludes, "And so I remain your Honors poor humble and penitent prisoner Thomas Winter," which in Munck's version, and that printed in the "King's Book," becomes simply, "And so I remain yours &c." Obviously, if a bad blunder had been made and afterwards observed, it might be considered inadvisable to call attention to it by either repetition or alteration, and it may possibly be on this same account that the original, unlike other documents of its kind, was removed from the public archives to the privacy of the Chief Minister's own strong room.

(b) It is clear, moreover, that from the moment it was made, the copy superseded the original as the ultimate authority regarding the Confession. From it the printed version was taken, and to it Lord Salisbury appended with his own hand the list of witnesses whose names publicly guaranteed its authenticity, though they certainly did not witness the document which Winter is said to have written and delivered in their presence.

In explanation of this singular circumstance, it has been suggested by Professor Gardiner,¹ that another copy, now lost, precisely similar to Munck's, was first prepared; that this, and not the original, was delivered by Winter before the Commissioners and attested by them; that from it Munck's copy was taken for Salisbury's own use, who himself added the attestations, including his own—apparently to refresh his memory. But what is the value of an hypothesis such as this, resting on no more solid foundation than the necessities of an argument? Of the invaluable copy thus postulated no vestige remains. Why should Munck have

¹ *Athenæum*, Dec. 4, 1897.

omitted the attestations, if they formed so important a part of the document he was set to copy? Why should Salisbury have deemed it necessary to remind himself of the names of his fellow-commissioners, with whom he was acting every day? Why, above all, if there were an original that could safely be exhibited, and a duly signed and attested copy, were neither of these presented to the King, but the unsigned and unwitnessed copy of a copy?

V.

Winter, as we have seen, received his wound on the 8th of November, and would appear for some time afterwards to have been unable to write at all, and his examination of November 12th is unsigned.¹ On the 21st, Waad, the Lieutenant of the Tower, wrote to Salisbury:² “Thomas Winter doth find his hand so strong, as after dinner he will settle himself to write that he hath verbally declared to your Lordship, adding what he shall remember.” It would thus appear that upon this day Winter was but beginning to recover the power of writing, and moreover that he proposed to set down on paper something in the form of a confession. It might, therefore, seem natural to argue that here we have the promise of that very Confession which we are examining, said to have been prepared just at this period, viz., between November 21st and 25th, although Waad’s information clearly increases the difficulty of supposing a man in Winter’s case to have been capable of executing so formidable a piece of work. We learn, however, again from Waad, that during these same days Winter *did* write a confession, and one which Salisbury had required him to compose, which, however, was *not* the confession found at Hatfield. On the 26th of November, Mr. Lieutenant addressed to the Minister the following information:³ “It may please your ho. L. Thomas Winter hath set down in writing of his own hand, as he was directed, the whole course of his Employment into Spain, wh. I send to your L. herein closed. W. Waad.”

But this, it is clear, was something quite different. Winter’s “employment into Spain,” in connection with what is known as the “Spanish Treason,” took place under Queen Elizabeth, and was over a year and a half before the Gunpowder Plot was thought of.⁴ There is no word concerning it in the Hatfield Confession, which cannot therefore be the document of which Waad speaks. Is it to be supposed that Winter’s hand so speedily regained its strength as during these five days to pen

¹ *Dom. James I.* xvi. 59. ² *Brit. Mus. Add. MSS.* 6178, 84.

³ *Hatfield MSS.* cxiii. fol. 44.

⁴ According to Sir E. Coke, in his speech at the conspirators’ trial, and at that of Father Garnet, Winter was sent to Spain in December, 1601, and returned to England about a month before Christmas, 1602.

two Confessions, one of them, at least, of extreme prolixity? Is it not strange, moreover, that Waad should make no mention of that which was incomparably the more important, observing the same mysterious reticence in its regard as Winter himself and the Commissioners?

The confession dealing with the Spanish Treason has disappeared, but an interesting trace of it remains in the note of November 25th, of which so much has already been said. [P. 21.] This is clearly meant to supplement some information already given, and that it refers to Winter's Spanish expedition is equally evident, for it was Monteagle, Catesby, and Tresham who sent Winter to Spain to solicit the assistance of King Philip III.¹

In the opinion of Professor Gardiner, however, the fact that Winter did write a confession at this time suffices to prove that he was capable of such a feat of penmanship as the production of the Hatfield document required. "After this," says Mr. Gardiner, "I hope we shall hear no more about Winter's being unable to write at length."² But in the first place, we cannot tell what was the length of the Spanish confession. The whole story, to judge by its substance as afterwards produced by Coke, might well have been narrated on a single page, nor is there any reason to assume that Winter indulged in a style so diffuse as the Hatfield document exhibits. Moreover, the question is not of the quantity written, but of the quality of the penmanship. What reason is there to believe that Winter wrote the confession mentioned by Waad in a style different from that of the note which was an appendix to it?

VI.

The Hatfield volume of MSS. in which the Confession is placed, contains also the following letter addressed on November 27th, by Sir Thomas Lake, to Salisbury.³

"My duty etc. . . . His Ma. this evening after his return from his sports commanded me to put your LL. in mind of a thing in the examinations, whereof he doth not remember that you are yet cleared. That is that where at Lambeth, at the house whither the powder was brought by the porters, there was a young man that received it, which his Ma. and your LL. conceived at first conceived [*sic*] to be Wynter, but now as his Highness judgeth could not be so, because the examina-

¹ It is likewise evident that if the note had reference to the Gunpowder Plot, it must follow that Monteagle was one of the plotters; and what will then become of the famous story of the discovery of impending danger by means of that nobleman?

It will be seen that in the note, as in other instances, an attempt has been made to obliterate Monteagle's name, over which a piece of paper was also pasted, the Government being desirous to conceal the fact that he had been on terms of intimacy with the principal conspirators, and had even co-operated with them in previous conspiracies.

² *Athenæum*, ut sup.

³ Hatfield MSS. cxiii. 48. The letter is dated from Hampton Court.

tions make mention that young man had no hayre on his face, which is otherwise in Wynter. He would therefore know whither your LL. have yet found who was that receiver of the powder, or if he has not yet been enquired of by reason of the multitude of other things, that you bestow labor to discover it.”

From this it appears that two days at least after the Confession is said to have been delivered, the King was not only ignorant of its disclosures, which throw light upon this very point, but was unaware of any evidence directly connecting Winter with the Conspiracy. What could be the motive for inquiring whether he had received powder-barrels at Lambeth, if he had already told all about the mine and the cellar and the storing of these same barrels beneath the House of Parliament?

VII.

Other points might be raised in support of the inference which those above indicated seem to suggest, but they are such as will probably occur to any one who seriously examines the document, and my present object is merely to afford the fullest opportunity for such examination by pointing out what might otherwise escape attention.

In conclusion, I would ask whether a document round which so many suspicious circumstances are found to gather, from whatever point of view it be regarded, would receive unhesitating acceptance were it not for the prescriptive authority it has come to enjoy. Had not the tale which Winter's Confession relates become a prime article of national faith, it can hardly be thought that the difficulties above exhibited, and others like them, would be lightly set aside, and it would be interesting to learn the opinion of continental critics, for whom the Gunpowder Plot has no such associations as it necessarily has for Englishmen, and is but an historical incident to be treated according to the ordinary laws of evidence.

JOHN GERARD, S.J.

to
25 Nov 1605

pag 4

The voluntary declaration of Thomas Lambert
of hoodington in the county of Worcester gent
the 25 of Nov: 1605 at the towne of
My most honorable Lords acknowledged before the Lords Commissions

~~to~~
A

Not out of hope to obtaine pardon; for speaking of my
temporal part I may say the fault is greater then can
be forgiven; nor ~~affording~~ ^{appealing hereby} to the title of a god subiect,
for I must redeem my country from as great a danger
as I have hazarded the bringing her into, before I
can purchase any such opinion. But at your honours
command, I will briefly set downe mine own accusation,
and howe far I have proceeded in this business; wch I
shall the faithfuller doe, since I see each courtes I are
not pleasing to Almighty God, and that all or the most
materiall part have bin already confessed.

in the year of our
lord 1603. the first
of King James

I remained in the country wth my brother from allhartwell
until the beginning of Lent, abought wth some Mr Cusby
sent thither ~~some~~ ^{me} entreating to come up to London
wher he and other my friends would be glad of ~~my~~ ^{the see me}
company. I desired him to excuse ~~me~~ ^{me}, for I found ~~my~~
my self very well disposed; and (wch had never hapned
to me before) returned the messenger wthout my company
shortly I received a second letter in any wise to come,
and wth second sentence I presently came up and found
him wth Mr Wright Lambeth, wher he trat wth me how
necessary it was ~~not~~ ^{not} to forsake our country (for he
knew I had ~~the~~ ^{the} a resolution to go over; but to believe her
one of the servants she remained, or at least to assist
her wth our utmost endeavors. I answered that I had
often hazarded my life for lighter causes, and
now would not refuse any good occasi, wher I
might do my service to the Catholick religion, but
for my self I knew no mean ~~probably~~ ^{probably} to succeed; and
he answered sayd I he had ~~found~~ ^{found} ~~no~~ ^{no} way
to deliver us fro all our bonds, and wthout
any furthe help to replant againe of Ca: religion
and shall could me ~~it~~ ^{it} was to blow up the powder
with powder wth Gun powder. for sayd he in that place
have they did us all the mischief, and perched
God hath defined y place for their punishment.

note

h

venter their lives when forsake her - this is very. and
 to add to our ^{to our} more ^{as a} ~~as a~~ ^{fit} ~~fit~~ ^{mad} ~~mad~~ ^{both} ~~both~~ ^{for} ~~for~~ ^{us} ~~us~~ ^{and} ~~and~~
 executed ^{missed} ~~missed~~ ^{for} ~~for~~ ^{M^r Fants} ~~M^r Fants~~, who I had heard good
~~and~~ ~~end~~ ~~of~~. he ^{would} ~~would~~ ^{me} ~~me ^{of} ~~of~~ ^{gratitude} ~~gratitude ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{so} ~~so~~
 left. but ~~found~~ ^{he} ~~was~~ ^{then} ~~at~~ ^{Brussels}, and ^{that} ~~it~~ ^{he} ~~came~~ ^{not} ~~as~~ ^{happily} ~~he~~ ^{might} ~~before~~ ^{my} ~~departure~~, ^{he} ~~would~~ ^{send} ^{him} ^{shortly} ^{after} ⁱⁿ ^{England}; I ^{went} ^{soon} ^{after} ^{to} ^{London} ^{where} ^I ^{was} ^{as} ^{then} ^{was} ^{not},
 but ^{came} ^{two} ^{days} ^{after}, I ^{remained} ^{with} ^{him} ^{three}
 or ^{four} ^{days} ~~there~~ ^{for} ^{the} ^{time} I ^{asked} ^{him} ^{if} ^{the} ^{Case} ⁱⁿ
 England ^{should} ^{do} ^{any} ^{thing} ^{for} ^{to} ^{help} ^{them} ^{selves}
 whether ^{he} ^{thought} ^{the} ^{Dutch} ^{would} ^{second} ^{this}
^{he} ^{was} ^{forced} ^{to}, ^{for} ^{at} ^{this} ^{parts} ^{was} ^{so} ^{generally} ^{so} ^{per}
^{the} ^{England}, ^{as} ^{they} ^{would} ^{end} ⁱⁿ ^{no} ^{speech} ^{of} ^{this}
^{enterprise}. ^{either} ^{were} ^{it} ^{fit} ^{to} ^{said} ^{he} ^{to} ^{bring} ^{any}
^{provid} ^a ^{fact} ^{with} ^{the} ^{peace} ^{to} ^{conclude}, I ^{told}
^{him} ^{that} ^{there} ^{was} ^{no} ^{such} ^{refusal}. ^{and} ^{so} ^{fit} ^{to} ^{discuss}
^{of} ^{other} ^{matters} ^{which} I ^{came} ^{to} ^{speak} ^{of} ^{M^r Fants}
^{whos} ^{company} ^{to} I ^{wished} ^{our} ⁱⁿ ^{England}, I ^{asked}
^{of} ^{his} ^{sufficiency} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{matters} ^{and} ^{would} ^{him} ^{use}
^{should} ^{need} ^{such} ^{if} ^{needed} ^{required}. ^{and} ^{as} ^I ^{was}
 G J / ready ^{to} ^{depart} ^{for} ^{newport} ^{and} ^{saving} ^{my} ^{leave}
^{of} ^{I^r willis}, ^{men} ^{our} ^{company} ^{came} ^{M^r Fants}, ^{and} ^{sat}
^{or} ^{saturday} ^{is} ^{the} ^{general} ^{said} ^{I^r willis} ^{that}
^{you} ^{wished} ^{for}: ^{and} ^{so} ^{was} ⁱⁿ ^{braced} ^{again}. I
^{told} ^{him}: ^{some} ^{good} ^{fruits} ^{of} ^{his} ^{wished} ^{his} ^{company}
ⁱⁿ ^{England}, ^{and} ^{that} ^{if} ^{he} ^{pleased} ^{to} ^{come} ^{to}
^{D^r Sker} ^{we} ^{would} ^{have} ^{further} ^{discourse}. ^{whether}
^I ^{was} ^{then} ^{going} ^{to} ^{save} ^{my} ^{leave} ^{of} ^{the}
^{both} ^I ^{wish} ^{to} ^{depart}. ^{where} ^{two} ^{days} ^{after}
^{he} ^{came} ^{to} ^{D^r Sker}, ^{where} I ^{told} ^{him} ^{that} ^{we}
^{were} ^{up} ^{on} ^a ^{resolution} ^{to} ^{do} ^{some} ^{not} ^{what} ⁱⁿ ^{England}
^{if} ^{it} ^{was} ^{the} ^{Spain} ^{helped} ^{us} ^{not}. ^{but} ^{had} ^{as} ^{yet}
^{resolved} ^{up} ^{on} ^{nothing}. ^{so} ^{at} ^{the} ^{last} ^{we}
^{passed} ^{at} ^{Greenwich} ^{where} I ^{lay} ^{for} ^a ^{week}, ^{and}
^{when} ^{it} ^{was} ^{time} ^{to} ^{depart} ^{to} ^{Greenwich}
^{near} ^{the} ^{place} ^{we} ^{took} ^a ^{pair} ^{of} ^{ores} ^{and} ^{landed}
^{at} ^{the} ^{and} ^{came} ^{to} ^{M^r Catby}, ^{who} ^{was}~~~~

the game very good
 and I was very glad
 of his sufficiency in
 the matters and would
 he use should need such
 if needed required
 and as I was
 ready to depart for
 Newport and saving my
 leave of I^r willis, men
 our company came M^r
 Fants, and sat or
 Saturday is the general
 said I^r willis that
 you wished for: and
 so was in braced
 again. I told him:
 some good fruits of
 his wished his
 company in England,
 and that if he
 pleased to come to
 D^r Sker we would
 have further
 discourse. whether
 I was then going
 to save my leave
 of the both I wish
 to depart. where
 two days after he
 came to D^r Sker,
 where I told him
 that we were up
 on a resolution to
 do some not what
 in England if it
 was the Spain
 helped us not. but
 had as yet resolved
 up on nothing. so
 at the last we
 passed at Greenwich
 where I lay for a
 week, and when it
 was time to depart
 to Greenwich near
 the place we took
 a pair of ores and
 landed at the and
 came to M^r Catby,
 who was

#

Then what lords we should save from the Parliament
 it was agreed in general, as many as we could that
 were Catholic or so disposed. ~~But~~ ^{next} when further business
 we should acquaint ~~it~~ ^{with} this before, or ~~for~~ ^{with} after
 for this point we agreed, that first we could enjoy ~~the~~ ^{the} Princes
 in ~~the~~ ^{the} secrecy we oblige them by oth, so to be secure of their
 private. beside we know not whether they would approve the
 point or distrust hit. and if they did allow thereof, to
 prepare before might begett suspition. ^{in private} and ~~not~~ ^{with} the
 business were acted, the same letter that carried news of the
 thing done, might as well entreat their help and for
 the same. Spence were to buy it to show in his preparations
to keep any good for in the first activities, and
frank to near and so dangerous, ~~not~~ ^{with} the shipping
of Holland were feared if at the world might most
away us. but ~~while~~ ^{while} we was in the middle of the defence
 set, we heard ~~of~~ ^{of} parliament should be anew agreed
~~with~~ ^{with} after Michaelmas; ~~upon~~ ^{upon} ~~the~~ ^{the} tidings we had of
 both defence and working ~~with~~ ^{with} after Christmas.
 although Candlemas we brought over in a boat the powder
~~it~~ ^{it} we had provided at Lambeth, and layed hit in Mr
 Percys house because ~~we~~ ^{we} were willing to have all our dangers
 in one place. we wrought ^{all} another fortnight in the mine
 against the stone wall ~~it~~ ^{it} was ~~but~~ ^{but} very hard to beat
 through; and near unto easter as we wrought the third
 time; opportunity was given to hire the seller in ~~it~~ ^{it} we
 resolved to buy the powder, and leave the mine.
 Now by reason that the charge of maintaining us ~~at~~ ^{so long}
 there, beside the number of general houses ~~it~~ ^{it} for several
 was had bin hired: beside being of powder, had laine
 heavy one Mr Cuffy. ~~alone~~ ^{so} ~~supper~~ ^{supper}. it was necessary
 for him to ~~come~~ ^{come} in some other ~~and~~ ^{and} that end desired
 leave that ~~he~~ ^{he} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~the~~ ^{the} other might acquaint such as
 he thought good for whom they thought fit and willing
 to the business. for many sayd he may be so content that I
 should know, who would ~~therefore~~ ^{not} if at the company should
 be acquainted ~~with~~ ^{with} their names. to this we ^{all} agreed.



at the time we
 could in first
 night.

Mr Percy and a
 third who they
 should call.

when the powder after this Mr. Fawks laid in the
 seller with he had ^{many} taken a thousand of bills and
 a hundred fagots, and with that covered the powder,
 because we might have the house free, to suffer any one
 to enter it ^{to} ~~the~~ Mr. Casby wished us to consider
 whether it were not necessary to send Mr. Fawks out
 both to oblige himself for a time as also to acquaint
 Sr William Standley and Mr. Owen with ^{the} ~~the~~ ^{matter} ~~the~~ we agreed
 if he should, provided if he gave ^{them} ~~the~~ ^{the} same
~~secret~~ oath that we had ^{it before} taken, ^{to} keep his
 secrets from all the world. the reason why we desired to
 have Sr William Standley ^{should be acquainted} ~~acquainted~~ ^{with} ~~with~~ was, to have him with
 us so soon as he could. and for Mr. Owen he might
 hold good correspondence after with foreign Princes.
 To Mr. Fawks departed about Easter for Flanders.
 And returned toward the latter end of August
 he told me ^{when he} ~~at~~ his arrival at Driffells Sr William
 Standley was not returned from Spain, so as he uttered
 the matter to Owen, whom who seemed well pleased with
 the business, ^{but} ~~but~~ ^{secretly} told him that Sr William would
 not be acquainted with any plots, as ^{handing} ~~handing~~ ^{businesses} ~~businesses~~ now
 afoot - the court of England, ^{but} ~~but~~ ^{he} ~~he~~ ^{would} ~~would be always
 ready to tell him, and send him away as soon as
 his were done. about this time did Mr. Casby and
 Mr. Percy meet at the Bath where they agreed if the
 company being as yet but few Mr. Casby should have
 the chief authority to call in any two who he thought
 best, ^{with} ~~with~~ ^{the} ~~the~~ ^{authority} ~~authority he could in after Sr Eustace
 Digby, though at what time I know not, at and last
 of all Mr. Francis Triffid. the first provided as I
 heard Mr. Casby say five hundred, the second
 two thousand pound. Mr. Percy him self provided all
 that he could get of the Earl of North Berlands rent
 and to provide many gallowing horse horses his
 number was twelve. ^{mean while} ~~mean while~~ Mr. Fawks and my self
 about, bought some new powder, as suspecting the first
 to be damp, and conveyed him ^{to} ~~to~~ the seller~~~~

219

x

#

B 3

#

AA

and sett hit in order as was refused. hit should stand
 there was the parliament anew proposed with the 5 of
 November, so as we all were done with some ten days
 before. when Mr Casby came up with Mr Faule was a
 road by Exeter chape couched wher he would whether I
 came to them, and said Mr Casby wished me to enquire
 if the young Prince came to the Parliament I would bid
 I as my L. M. Deagle passed by Richmond he went in
 kiss the Princess hands, and amongst other speeches was
 directed by his Grace thought that to be they, and then
 must we have our horses sayd Mr Casby beyond
 the water, and provided of more company, to surprise
 the Prince and bring the young Prince about. one
 day after being Sunday at night in came one
 to my chamber and told me of a letter had be-
 given to my L. M. Deagle: in this effect: that
 he wished his lordships absence from the Parliament
 because a blow would then be given, one the morrow
 I went to whigwits and shuld hit Mr Casby after
 saying ^{in my wife} that the matter was disclosed. &
^{in my wife} wishing him to forsake his entry: he would me he
 would see further as yett, and refused to send Mr
 Faule to try the utmost protesting if the part belonged
 to him, he would try ^{in some adventure} with him self: one wednesday Mr Faule
 went and returned at night, of wt we were very glad.
 and Thursday I came to London. and Friday Mr Faule
 Casby in Freshe and I mett at Dartmouth. when we
 questioned how this letter should be sent to my L. M. Deagle
 but could not concur, for Mr Freshe forswore it
 whom we only suspected. one Saturday night I mett
 Mr Freshe againe in Lincoln Inne walk, wherein he told
 such speeches that my L. of Salisbury shuld see to the
 King as I gave hit ^{the next time} off again, and repeated the same
 to Mr Casby. who hear upon was refused to be gone but
 stayed to have Mr Percy, who's consent therein was
 wanted. one Sunday night came Mr Percy, and in way
 but would not abide the utmost for wt and he
 went one Monday to Lion saying, if engher be amysse
 I knew they would slay me.

with letter he present
 by carried to my L.
 of Salisbury.



FF
 FF
 FF
 FF
 FF

when I came, I found Mr Casby reasonable well, Mr Percy
 both the wrights Mr Punctwood and Mr Grand. when
 I asked them what they refused to do, they answered
 we mean hear to die, I sayd againe I would take such
 part as they did. about a lieuen of the clock came
 the company to besett the house, and as I walked in
 the court was shot into the shoulder, w^{ch} left me the
 use of mine arme, the next shot was the elder wright
 then stone dead, after him the younger Mr wright, and
 forthy Ambrose Punctwood. then sayd Mr Casby to me
 standing before the door they were so close stand by
 me Tom and we will dye together, but I have
 lost the use of my right arme and I fear that
 will cause me to be taken so as we stood close together
 Mr Casby Mr Percy and my self, they two were
 shot (as I far as I could go) w^{ch} was one bullet
 and then the company entered upon me, hurt
 me in belly w^{ch} a pite and soon gave me other
 wounds, w^{ch} with one came behind and caught hold
 of both mine armes, and so I remain your

Honour your husband and

prominent prisoner.

Thomas Winter

Delivered by Thomas Winter
 all written with his own
 hand. 25 NOV: 1605

T. Winter
 3



The forms of the letter
 The James Dodd's help carried in
 what he was wished amongst them to be
 named the applicant and of whom
 what money was deposited



power 259 Ave. !
 Mr. J. J. J.
 my father's delecta
 ration

(1)

Mr. J.



Thoughe I have bin at the fountaine of news, yett can I
learne littell to purpose, only a supply is expected by the
Spaniards; some forty were taken in a littell castell, w^{ch} was
surprised by our L: Deputy, than they confess that the rest
are in some distress: having no store of victuals nor
almost wood at all, and littell ~~great~~ ordnance asilen
Count Mauris is risen from Sidemgambes, some
report wth losse of 1500 men and most of his great
ordnance, others say he was rayset only by frost and
hard weather, so this is uncertaine whether is true.
Ostend is hardly pressed and likely to be won either by
the Land or the Sea. This is all our news.

Comend me to your mother and my sisters,
wth your sister Mary that my lady Montague is
in the entry, but I will shortly make a voyag
thither on your purpose, in her behalfs.
So fare you well - This 4 of December.

your loving brother
J. Walsome

I had thought to have come downe before this, but busines
hath hitherto and will yet linger & keepe me awaye.
I am now goinge to the bath wth my li. M^{rs} M^{rs} sagle,
and from thence into Lankeſſire. my fortunes are so
poore that they will ^{not} leave me more owne man, if they
did, Iack, thou shouldst have more of my company.
Comend me to my sister, and wth next rich, K^{ings}
are allupe. A Di

London this 22th of Februry.
my li. M^{rs} M^{rs} sagle will receive
your letter betwixt this and
and Easter keepe me at what
time he goeth into Lankeſſire.



Your loving Brother

J. G. W. W. W. W. W.



Let certain friends of mine write wth you on
Monday night or Tuesday at the utmost, I
pray you v^oyd your house of Morgan and his
flee mate, or other company ~~at~~ whatsoever they be:
for all your house will scarce lodge the company
the Jokin man is come, ^{but} your robe of durane
as yett nott finished. I have sent ^{you} ten pounds
wth I wonder att my self for doing, having
neither kin^e nor corne or s^{it} as you have,
but a chert to lay to p^{an}de or so, when I want
m^{ony}. If you commend him to you and his
- good health. Forwth Comend me
to his.

This last of August.

your, JH

In the message that was delivered me from my ^{Moniz}
egle ~~Cathy~~ and ~~Josphan~~ it was thought I was willing
to say that these three were of a quality most convenient
for if greater proficiencies should have been; the rest of
class of England would have had this in more
suspicion, and

Thos: WINTOUR.



Endorsements to Note of Nov. 25.

25-9675 1605
25-9675 1605
The Examiner
of Writors

Nov. 25, 1605.

Thomas Winter

Dec. 5, 1605.

J. Winter

Jan. 9, 1605-6.

J. Winter

Jan. 17, 1605-6.

J. Winter

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 006 745 332 3



This preservation copy
was created, printed, and bound
at Bridgeport National Bindery, Inc.,
in compliance with U.S. copyright law.
The paper used meets the requirements
of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992
(Permanence of Paper).

P A

2009



