

metropolis to help him or give him credit and standing in the courts.

There was a "Thomas Nicolls," living in London, who might have been the young Thomas N's uncle. He had translated and published a great book of 500 pages in folio for which the King had given him a special privilege as follows :

"Our faythful, well-beloved subject, Thomas Nicolls, cytezeine and goldesmyth of London," (in 1550), "hath not onely translated the hystorye by Thucydides the Athenian, out of Frenche into English, but also intendeth contynning in that his vertuous exercise, thereby to reduce and bring other profytable hystories out of Frenche and Latin into our said maternall language to the general benefit, comodytie and profyte of all our loving subjects, that shall well digeste the same."

Mr. Adlard says that John, Lord "Quondam," had a son Thomas, as well as a brother of the same name, but from the dates, "I presume the latter to have been the ancestor of the Dudleys of Massachusetts." Here is not the least evidence, or argument, to show that "Thomas" is really the right one to pitch upon, for our ancestor. Now, Mr. A. begins to speak of the lord "Quondam," as furnishing a reason why Gov. Thomas did not own up, that one of his remote forefathers was a brother to an old Baron Dudley, called "Quondam";—that it made our severe Puritan, Thomas, blush to think he had a remote ancestor, so unfortunate. What was that to be ashamed of, after he had shaken off the whole generation of cavaliers, and even given his king the cold shoulder? Why, he might have gloried in all the honors the Dudleys had received, to counterbalance that Quondam stigma. Besides, Quondam's son had been re-instated in his great possessions and titles. No! Gov. Thomas was more manly than Adlard presumes. His daughter, the poetess, said of him,—

"No ostentation, seen in all his ways,
As in the mean ones of our foolish days."

"His humble mind so loved humility
He left it to his race for legacy."

In this characteristic, we perceive the true reason of his silence about his pedigree. For my part I should not be so much ashamed of "Quondam," as of Adam, whom we know certainly to have been our ancestor. He lost all his landed estates for a mere trifle, and had to go to work for the common necessities of life, digging and sweating for bread. If it "harrows" up our feelings to think of such an origin, and we try to avoid it by ignoring the bible, then the "monkey theory" stares us in the face.