

INTRODUCTION.

It is now twenty years since the genealogy of the descendants of Nathaniel Mowry was published. A few errors in the book have been found, and many additional facts have transpired which ought to be added to it. Many items of information, heretofore unknown to the writer, have been found, and some deaths have occurred which should be inserted. Since the book was published, that indefatigable genealogist, Mr. John O. Austin, of Providence, R. I., has discovered clear evidence that Nathaniel and John Mowry were sons of Roger Mowry, who came to this country in 1631. The evidence of this connection is given on page nine of the little pamphlet entitled "The Mowry Family Monument," which is presented in connection with this supplement. The family record, as it now appears, is as follows:—

ROGER MOWRY, born doubtless in England, married Mary, the eldest daughter of John Johnson, of Roxbury. Some have thought that she was his second wife, and that his first wife's name was Bethiah. It is very clear, however, that this is not true. The statement seems to have no foundation whatever.

His eighth child, Mehitable, married Eldad Kingsley, and the account which the Kingsleys give of their ancestry

says that Eldad Kingsley, of Rehoboth, Mass., married, May 9, 1662, "Mehitable, daughter of Roger and Bethiah Mowry." This statement is from Mr. H. S. Ruggles, of Wakefield, Mass., a lineal descendant of the eighth generation from Mehitable and Eldad Kingsley. This record is clearly an error. The probability is that whoever had the record made trusted to memory and gave the name Bethiah as the mother of Mehitable instead of her sister. That Mary was the only wife of Roger is made clear from the records of the First Church in Salem. These records show that in 1636, second day of the second month, was baptized "Jonathan, son of Roger and Mary Mowry."

Roger Mowry died in Providence, R. I., Jan. 5, 1666. His widow, Mary, afterward married John Kingsley, of Rehoboth, Mass. She died in January, 1679, and was buried at Rehoboth, Jan. 29, 1679.

It is known that Roger Mowry was in Boston in May, 1631; that he and Roger Williams applied together to be admitted freemen; that neither of them remained in Boston to accept freemanship; that subsequently they were both residents of Plymouth, after that at Salem, and then at Providence, where they both died. It is not known at what date Roger Mowry left Plymouth for Salem, or when he removed from Salem to Providence. Nathaniel Felton, of Salem, made a deposition Sept. 18, 1700, in which he declared that Roger Mowry had sold his land in the woods [that is, his farm in Danvers] to Emanuel Downing, and that he had removed from Salem "before the year 1644." This may be a mistake, because the Essex County Court papers, Vol. I, page 67, show that a

warrant was issued to the constables to summon "Roger Mowry" and John Elderkin as witnesses in a case before the court the twenty-ninth day of the tenth month, 1644. It would seem a proper inference to draw from this summons that at that time Roger Mowry was a resident of Salem. A singular difficulty appears in connection with the baptism of Roger's son Benjamin. The records of the First Church at Salem show that Roger's son Jonathan was baptized April 2, 1637; his daughter Bethia (recorded as Appia), June 17, 1638; his daughter Mary, Jan. 16, 1640; his daughter Elizabeth, Jan. 20, 1643; and his son Benjamin, May 20, 1649. These are all given as the children of *Roger and Mary*.

On the other hand, a record in Providence states that, Aug. 6, 1658, Roger Mowry testified that his son Benjamin was born in Providence May 8, 1649; his son Thomas, July 19, 1652; and his daughter Hannah, Sept. 28, 1656. The question arises how it could be that Benjamin, born in Providence the eighth of May, could be baptized in Salem twelve days later. At that time the journey from Providence to Salem would have been too difficult for the mother to take her son twelve days of age from Providence to Salem to be baptized. Two explanations of this may be given.

1. It might be that Roger did not intend to say that the child was born *in Providence*, but only that he was born at that date. The town clerk in taking it down may have inadvertently added that he was born in Providence, especially as the others were.

2. It might be that at this time (1649), when many