Intellectual Life
in the Colonial South
1585-1763

.

RICHARD BEALE DAVIS

Intellectual Life
in the
Colonial South
1585-1763

Volume One

THE UNIVERSITY
OF TENNESSEE PRESS
Knoxville

Intellectual Life in the Colonial South
is published as a set of three volumes.

•
Subventions from the National Endowment for
the Humanities, Washington, D.C., and the John C.
Hodges Fund of the English Department of the Uni-
versity of Tennessee, Knoxville, toward publication
of these volumes are gratefully acknowledged.

•
Copyright © 1978 by The University of Tennessee Press.
All rights reserved.
Manufactured in the United States of America.
Second printing, 1979

•
Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Davis, Richard Beale.

Intellectual life in the Colonial South, 1585-1763.

Bibliography: p.

1. Southern States—Intellectual life—Colonial
period, ca. 1600-1775. I. Title.
F212.D28 975'.01 77-1370
ISBN 0-87049-210-1

FOR
Lois Bullard Davis

.

Contents

for the Three Volumes

VOLUME ONE

Acknowledgments for the Three Volumes	<i>page</i> xiii
Introduction for the Three Volumes	xxi
CHAPTER I. Promotion, Discovery, and History	I
CHAPTER II. The Indian as Image and Factor in Southern Colonial Life	103
CHAPTER III. Formal Education, Institutional and Individual	257
Abbreviations for the Three Volumes	386

VOLUME TWO

CHAPTER IV. Books, Libraries, Reading, and Printing	489
CHAPTER V. Religion: Established, Evangelical, and Individual	627
CHAPTER VI. The Sermon and the Religious Tract	701
CHAPTER VII. Science and Technology, Including Agriculture	801

VOLUME THREE

CHAPTER VIII. The Fine Arts in the Life of the Southern Colonist	1113
CHAPTER IX. Literature, Principally Belletristic	1307
CHAPTER X. The Public Mind: Politics and Economics, Law and Oratory	1507
Epilogue for the Three Volumes	1633
Index for the Three Volumes	1749

Illustrations for the Three Volumes

VOLUME ONE

Thomas Hariot; Sketch of Jamestown	<i>following page</i> 32
Jamestown Massacre; Title page of Smith's major work	64
Early map of Virginia; "An Indian in Body-Paint"	160
Cherokee Indian Embassy; Title page of Adair's major work	192
"Montanus Virginia 1671 Map"; Grammar school	288
Bethesda Orphan House; Kitchin's map of Maryland; Wren Building	320

VOLUME TWO

Bookplate of William Byrd II; Bookplate of James Hasell	580
Plan of one of the finest gardens; James Blair	612
George Whitefield; St. Michael's	676
Samuel Davies; St. James	708
Landon Carter; Earliest astronomical observation from southern colonies	836
Alexander Spotswood; John Tradescant the Elder	868
"The Chatterer"; Dr. Lionel Chalmers	900
"Village of Secoton"; John Custis IV	932

VOLUME THREE

Cupola House; Gunston Hall	1140
Christ Church; Gardens at Crowfield	1172
Eleanor Darnall; Thomas Sprigge	1236
Mrs. Charles Carroll; "A Prospect of Charles Town"	1268

· INTELLECTUAL LIFE IN THE COLONIAL SOUTH ·

Wall panel painting from Virginia; Eighteenth-century wall painting	1300
William Byrd II; "Westover"	1332
William Fitzhugh; Frontispiece and title page, Tuesday Club Record Book	1396
Dr. Alexander Hamilton; George Sandys	1428
Sweet Hall; St. John's Church; Governor Robert Dinwiddie	1556
Doughregan Manor; Benedict Leonard Calvert	1588

Acknowledgments

FOR THE THREE VOLUMES

RESEARCH for this study began more than twenty-five years ago and has continued along with all the stages of the actual writing during the past five years. The investigation required visits to the major repositories known to include colonial materials in this country and in the British Isles, and correspondence with curators in smaller libraries or with independent scholars on both sides of the Atlantic. Not all of them can be mentioned, but at least the major institutions offering information, and often temporary residence, will be named, and as many individuals as space will allow.

Much of the manuscript material, and some of the printed, for a study of the colonial mind still exists only in the British Isles. Visits to the National Library of Scotland and the University Library in Edinburgh and to the National Library and the Public Record Office of Ireland in Dublin were profitable. The Public Record Office of Northern Ireland in Belfast supplied useful materials but was not visited. In London the British Library, formerly the British Museum, and the Public Record Office were found to be the richest repositories of colonial material, especially manuscript. Their staffs were generous in their aid during a dozen stays in each institution. Helpful in London also were the libraries of Lambeth Palace, the S.P.G. and S.P.C.K., Dr. Williams, the Royal Society and the Royal Society of Arts, and Sion College. Several periods over a number of years were spent at the Bodleian in Oxford, the Cambridge University Library, the Pepysian Library of Magdalene College in Cambridge, and the All Souls College Library in Oxford. The Bedfordshire Record Office, the Kent County Archives at Maidstone, the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research at York, the Chatsworth Library of the Duke of Devonshire, and the John Rylands Library in Manchester were also useful and helpful.

In the United States papers and rare books concerning the original southern colonies are to be found in collections from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Most helpful have been the staffs of the Houghton Library at Harvard, the Boston Public Library, the Massachusetts Historical Society,

the Boston Athenaeum, the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, the John Carter Brown Library and the Harris Collection of American Poetry of Brown University in Providence, and the Beinecke and Sterling Libraries at Yale. In New York useful material with courteous advice was found at the New-York Historical Society, the New York Public Library, the Frick Art Reference Library, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and the Columbia University Library. In Pennsylvania, quite helpful were those in charge of the Presbyterian Historical Society, the Pennsylvania Historical Society, the Library Company of Philadelphia, and the Friends Historical Collections at Swarthmore and Haverford. In Michigan the Detroit Institute of Arts and the William L. Clements Library of the University of Michigan supplied scattered and rare materials. In Illinois the Newberry Library in Chicago was a source of Indian captivity narratives. In the Los Angeles area the Henry E. Huntington Library and the William Andrews Clark Library afforded examination of impressive collections, especially the former, of southern pre-Revolutionary literary and historical materials.

By far the largest and richest manuscript, book, and perhaps art materials remain, as they should, in the South Atlantic area in which they originated. In this region institutions and their staffs were especially cordial. The Winterthur Museum in Delaware supplied photographs and paintings and other art materials from the older neighboring colonies. In Washington, D.C., the National Portrait Gallery, the National Gallery of Art, and the Corcoran Gallery of Art contain pre-1764 materials of significance, and their curators and other officers were most helpful. In books, manuscripts, and maps the Folger Shakespeare Library and the Library of Congress offered assistance and study-room many times. In Baltimore early southern artistic, historical, and literary material was found in the Baltimore Museum of Art, the Maryland Historical Society, the Enoch Pratt Library (which includes much of the Peabody Institute collection), and the Maryland Diocesan Library (housed in the Maryland Historical Society). More exclusively Maryland material is at Annapolis in the Maryland State Library, the Maryland Hall of Records, St. John's College, and the United States Naval Academy, of which all were most cooperative. In Virginia, private and public institutions were most helpful: in Richmond, the Virginia State Library, the Virginia Historical Society, the Valentine Museum, the Union Theological Seminary, and the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts; the Norfolk Public Library; the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the College of William and Mary, and the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg; and the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia in Charlottesville.

In North Carolina I used impressive colonial materials in the North

· *Acknowledgments* ·

Carolina Room and the Southern Historical Collections of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; in the manuscript and rare book divisions of the Perkins Library of Duke University; in the Moravian collections in Winston-Salem and the Quaker Collection at Guilford College; and at the Department of Archives and History of the State in Raleigh. South Carolina repositories were generous and helpful in allowing use of splendid materials: the Charleston Library Society, the South Carolina Historical Society, the University South Caroliniana Society, the State Department of Archives and History, and the South Carolina State Library. In Georgia I was grateful for the use of manuscripts to the Georgia Historical Society, the State Department of Archives and History, the Special Collections Division of the University of Georgia Library, and the Emory University Library.

Individuals who have become personally interested in this project and have been of great assistance run into the scores. I wish to thank all of them before I single out a few who have been helpful in many ways over a long period of years.

My debt is greatest to Professor J.A. Leo Lemay of the University of Delaware, Newark, who has been an inexhaustible and generous source of information on dozens of literary works and writers as well as an invaluable commentator on Chapters I and IX; to Professor Milton M. Klein of the University of Tennessee, who has commented on Chapters I and X; and to Professor Louis D. Rubin, Jr., of the University of North Carolina, who read the whole manuscript.

For advice and information on many topics and occasions I would like also to express my appreciation to the following.

In Great Britain: E.G.W. Bill of the Lambeth Palace Library; Dr. Esmond de Beer, C.B.E., of London; Ms. Mea Allen of Suffolk; Alan F. Day of the Department of History of the University of Edinburgh; County Librarian W.J. Murison of Wakefield in Yorkshire; the late Colonel George O. Sandys of Graythwaite Hall, North Lancashire; the late Rev. Canon J.S. Purvis, D.D., O.B.E., of the Borthwick Institute in York; and Miss Daisy Hardy of Robin Hood's Bay, Yorkshire.

In Connecticut: Philip L. Barbour of Ridgefield, editor and biographer of Captain John Smith.

In Florida: Professor James A. Servies of the University of West Florida, Pensacola.

In Louisiana: Professor Joseph Ewan of Tulane University in New Orleans, my mentor in matters botanical.

In Ohio: Professor David Curtis Skaggs of Bowling Green State University, and Professor Robert D. Arner of the University of Cincinnati.

In Massachusetts: Nina Fletcher Little, the authority on American wall painting.

In New York: Professor Mary Young of the University of Rochester.

In Pennsylvania: Edwin Wolf, 2nd, of the Library Company of Philadelphia and the late Dr. Henry J. Cadbury of the Friends Historical Society.

In Maryland: Brice M. Clagett of Holly Hill; the Rev. Nelson Rightmeyer; Dr. F. Garner Ranney; Professor Jack P. Greene, Dr. Morris L. Radoff, and James H. Cassedy of the HEW Library of Medicine at Bethesda.

In Virginia: My good friends of the Virginia Historical Society, especially William M.E. Rachal, John M. Jennings, Virginius C. Hall, Jr., Howson W. Cole, and James Fleming; the Rev. Dr. H.M. Brimm of Union Theological Seminary; Dr. Milton C. Russell of the Virginia State Library; William H. Runge, Anne Freudenberg, Francis L. Berkeley, Jr., and Edmund Berkeley, Jr., of the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia; Edmund and Dorothy S. Berkeley of Charlottesville, who read Chapter VII; Professor Carl Dolmetsch of the College of William and Mary, Curator of Prints and Maps Joan Dolmetsch of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, and especially Dr. Edward M. Riley, Director Emeritus of the Research Division of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation; Mrs. William S. Portlock of the Norfolk Public Library; Mrs. Frances H. Chandler of Montross; Professor John W. Molnar of Longwood College; and the Rev. George J. Cleaveland, historiographer of the Diocese of Virginia.

In North Carolina: Professor George W. Williams of Duke University for his help on Charleston music; Professor William S. Powell of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Professor John R. Alden of Duke University, and Professor Richard Walser of North Carolina State University; Dr. Mattie E.E. Parker and George Stevenson of the State Department of Archives and History; Dr. Mattie Russell and the late Dr. Virginia R. Gray of Duke University Manuscript Division; and John B. Flowers III of the North Carolina Room at Chapel Hill.

In South Carolina: E.L. Inabinett of the University South Caroliniana Library; Charles E. Lee of the State Department of Archives and History; Professors George C. Rogers, Jr., and Walter B. Edgar of the University of South Carolina; Estellene P. Walker of the South Carolina State Library; Dr. Joseph I. Waring of Charleston; Virginia Rugheimer of the Charleston Library Society.

In Georgia: Mrs. Lilla M. Hawes of the Georgia Historical Society; Mrs. Mary Bryan of the State Department of Archives and History; Mrs. Susan B. Tate of the University of Georgia Library; and Dean Harold Davis of Georgia State University.

At the University of Tennessee: Reference Librarians Eleanor Goehring

and Robert Bassett, through the years major aids in time of stress; Professor Bruce Wheeler of the Department of History; David Harkness, Extension Librarian, who was most helpful on the Fine Arts chapter; and the late Professor John C. Hodges, Professor Kenneth L. Knickerbocker, Professor Bain T. Stewart, and Professor John H. Fisher, successively heads of the Department of English, who encouraged in many ways, including supplying funds for typing and duplication; and Professors Percy G. Adams and Nathalia Wright, who gave perceptive advice, the former especially on Chapter II.

Fellowships and grants directly and indirectly in support of this project go back to its beginning. A Guggenheim Fellowship in 1947-1948 particularly directed at a study of George Sandys laid the groundwork for the present study, and a second Guggenheim in 1960-1961 resulted in *Intellectual Life in Jefferson's Virginia, 1790-1830* (1964), in many respects a trial balloon for the present study. Specifically in whole or in part designed to assist in the research for this colonial project were short-term fellowships or grants-in-aid from the Henry E. Huntington Library, the Folger Shakespeare Library, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, the American Philosophical Society, the Graduate School and the John C. Hodges Fund of the English Department of the University of Tennessee. Primarily responsible for affording the time needed for writing the two final chapters was a 1974 Senior Fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities. I wish to thank everyone responsible for these grants for their confidence in the value of the undertaking.

Introduction

FOR THE THREE VOLUMES

THERE WERE five provinces in the South Atlantic region usually known as the colonial South. They began as the English Renaissance approached its height in the 1580s, developed during the period of the Commonwealth and the Glorious Revolution, and reached the golden age of their pre-national history as the Enlightenment in western Europe reached its climax in the 1760s. Roanoke Island in 1584, Jamestown in 1607, St. Mary's in 1634, the Carolinas in the 1660s and 1670, and Savannah in 1733 mark the beginnings. Then groups of men, at first principally English, stepped ashore onto a strange and wild and beautiful land with the intention of planting nations "where none before hath stood."

Roanoke Island, the lost colony, was not a false start or an incident in exploration unconnected with the later permanent settlements. For it left a stirring adventure-story description soon in print, the first book written both in and on North America by an Englishman, and a magnificent collection of drawings and watercolors of red men, birds, fish, plants, villages, and maps which when engraved were in western Europe for at least a century the major representation of English America. The book, the watercolors, and the engravings from the drawings remain to this day our most accurate impression of what these first Englishmen saw. Jamestown, technically or officially a business enterprise as in a somewhat different way Roanoke Island had been, held on tenaciously to survive, at least in recognizable ruins, as the physical symbol of the founding of British America. It also gave us the histories, and the myths, of Captain John Smith and Pocahontas and John Rolfe, of John Pory and the first representative legislative assembly in English America, of George Sandys and the first poetry, and of the 1622 Massacre, these but the beginnings of a story, or of its elements, now woven into the homespun of our early history. St. Mary's, the first seat of a Proprietary and owned by a Roman Catholic nobleman, is remembered for its early Jesuit fathers and their "relations" of life near the Chesapeake and of the initial proclamation of religious tolerance, and for the remains of a relatively imposing early architecture.

The Carolinas, beginning as a single Proprietary grant to eight nobles and gentlemen in the 1660s and officially settled at Charleston and the Cape Fear and Albemarle Sound and other points about 1670, started as a feudal domain with a hierarchy ranging from noblemen to serfs. But it soon altered most of its political and social and legal institutions to be more in line with those of the Chesapeake colonies: indeed much of the Lord Ashley-John Locke Fundamental Constitutions had never been implemented, especially in South Carolina. Almost at once the southern portion centered in Charleston, which soon became the metropolis and commercial mart of the area, the seasonal home of wealthy planters whose lands lay nearby and of traders with the Indians who ventured far into the interior. Charleston was also a haven for botanists, physicians, and other professional men of all sorts as well as for skilled craftsmen. It was settled first by Englishmen but soon added Scots, Scotch-Irish, Huguenots, Germans, and some New England and English Puritans to its population. The northern sector of Carolina, with smaller harbors and a stormy and treacherous coast, developed lesser towns such as Bath, Brunswick, Wilmington, and especially New Bern and Edenton. Many of its earliest settlers filtered down from Virginia, but it soon added to its English-born people Highland and Lowland Scots, Scotch-Irish, New England Puritans, Swiss, Germans, and French Huguenots. Although there were some large plantations in the Tidewater, this area became, more than the Charleston region, a land of moderate and small farms.

Georgia was planned and established by a philanthropic organization through its board of Trustees and General James Oglethorpe in 1733, just a generation before the Revolution. It was first of all a haven for the underprivileged of Britain and then all western Europe, and second a buffer state to protect the older colonies to its north from Spanish and French and Indians. But it was also to be a home for more fortunate Englishmen. The vanguard who laid out Savannah was English, but in less than a year Lutheran Salzburgers arrived in considerable numbers. They were soon followed by their fellow Germans the Moravians, who came in smaller numbers and did not remain. Then appeared Highland Scots and Jews, and within half a dozen years Piedmontese, Swiss, and Welsh, in addition to more of all the other groups except the Moravians. Within two decades Puritans from New England via South Carolina arrived in appreciable numbers, more Germans and a group of British Quakers. Georgia became a microcosm of the white ethnic groups and nations of western Europe between Scandinavia and Spain, but the British and English political, legal, and social institutions dominated and shaped the youngest colony as they had her older sisters, though at first in quite unusual ways.

These were only the beginnings. During the colonial era control of gov-

ernment shifted, usually permanently, from private business or Proprietary control to royal control. In religion, only in Virginia were the Anglicans always or perhaps ever a majority, but by the end of the period the Church of England was established in all the southern colonies. And though the black African slave introduced about 1620 seems to have been a relatively negligible factor in seventeenth-century southern thinking, religious or secular or economic or social or legal, in the eighteenth century he was a most significant element in all church policy, in law and industrial and agricultural economics, and even to a slight but significant extent in belletristic writing.

The mind or minds of these people who settled south of Pennsylvania in the almost two hundred years before the Stamp Act crisis and other pre-Revolutionary movements has never really been assessed, and for a number of reasons. First, during the period from 1790 to World War I the economic trials and tribulations of the area as part of a larger South were such that it produced few men who had time for the self-analysis needed, or who could or would attempt to locate and identify properly the earliest South in the national intellectual context. It is a threadbare truism that during this period New Englanders wrote all the influential histories of the United States and ascribed to their own region the dominant influence in the expanding and expansion of the nation, at least the admirable elements of that influence. The southern colony-states had always been, according to these accounts, backward in economic, educational, and artistic development, partly because of the institution of slavery and partly because of the inherent and persistent laziness of the Caucasian elements of the population. Since 1918 the trend has continued to the present day, with emphasis and concentration on the Puritan religious mind as the source of the American intellectual tradition and thus of the American spirit. Perry Miller found the source of our mind and achievement best and basically represented in the Puritan sermon and tract, which he declares differ in style, erudition, and rationale from those of the colonies to the south and west. His followers and those of Barrett Wendell and Samuel E. Morison and Kenneth B. Murdock have examined and explicated the New England mind with the assumption that it is the root, the fertile seed, of the living plant which is American cerebral activity. Edmund S. Morgan and Alan Heimert, though they bring in something occasionally about the middle colonies and Virginia, write essentially in this tradition. Carl Bridenbaugh, alluding to the Tidewater gentry of the southern colonies, has held that they lived a gracious but not cultured life. One recent scholar in studying the small town in America as a characteristic extrapolation of New England mentions several early "typical" planned or laid-out villages in the upper Middle West as drawn straight from northeastern colonial

models, when as a matter of fact two of his showcase examples were settled by Virginians and Marylanders whose extant letters show that their models were towns in the Chesapeake area.

One grants that the middle colonies have suffered from similar neglect, though perhaps not in as great degree. Admirable in many respects as the New England colonial civilization and intellectual character were, the weakness of many distinguished historians of that area is their myopia, their failure to see that the admirable elements of the Puritan Ethic were almost all shared equally by other colonials, who were perhaps more assiduous in pushing west and creating Emerson's real America than were the colonists east of the Hudson. Explicit and implicit in the writing of the New England general or intellectual historian, with Henry Adams as a conspicuous example, is the assumption that except in politics and law and perhaps agriculture the southerner before and after 1800 had no scientific inventive genius, no moral ethic, no appreciation of or creativity in the arts, and above all no sustained cerebration or rationally speculative mind. This major historian among the Adamses may, as he says, have drawn Jefferson carefully and slowly with the shadings of a fine pencil, but he ignored some of the shapes and shadows and colors that lay before him in the manuscripts he had available, and he thus produced, instead of a fine crayon sketch, a subtle caricature.

Many other reasons exist for the past neglect of or failure to study the early southern mind. Some of the fault lay in the region itself: there was in some quarters a simple indifference to the preservation of precious records as doorways to understanding, as Jefferson in certain of his letters mentions. Perhaps more significant is the disappearance and destruction of manuscripts and books and objets d'art, to an extent never equaled in other colonies, during the Revolution and the War of 1812 and the Civil War, especially in the more populous and richer provinces of Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. The fact that there was no printing press south of the Susquehannah which published books and pamphlets and newspapers before the second quarter of the eighteenth century certainly would account in large part for the disappearance of sermons known to have been preached, and for the absence of more complete collections of legal and political material, not to mention belles lettres. Then one should recall the pre-Civil War preoccupation with defense of slavery and postwar reaffirmation of the Lost Cause, which occupied the attention of so many effective writers. And one should consider at least Vann Woodward's view that the South after the Civil War had as a section to carry the main burden of defeat, a matter which engaged its writers' major critical faculties.

Recent considerable activity on the part of a small group of investigators, however, has resulted in the discovery of quite significant materials, in

private hands, private societies, state and county repositories, and university collections. The growth of interest in the southern past as an explanation of its present is, of course, concomitant with the region's accelerated artistic and general intellectual creativity. This active investigation has yielded unexpected treasures. From the attics or the trunks of southern colonists have come, or surfaced, precious documents, such as Fitzhugh letters from Mississippi and Pennsylvania, Byrd papers from several states including New York and California, or other writings by lesser writers, such as one poetry manuscript from under the rafters of an old house across the river from Jamestown. Then the state departments of archives and history which have printed or are printing official provincial papers are turning up and, more important, presenting to the public for the first time items of all sorts of intellectual interest, as the annotations for the chapters below testify. A major desideratum is that each state must publish all of its colonial wills and inventories, a mere handful of which appear among the official documents, for only then can there be a fully authoritative assessment of books and paintings and even architecture which is necessary to a comprehensive analysis of the southern colonial mind.

Southern general history, with particular emphasis on the political and economic, has been competently written from the time of Philip A. Bruce in Virginia in the 1890s. Bruce was a man who produced from county and colony documents of the seventeenth century an amazingly comprehensive series of studies of many things from politics to social life, though very little on belles lettres, for that one province. Wesley F. Craven's *The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, 1607-1689* (2d rev. ptg., 1970) is an excellent general history for the earlier half of our period, though with too little attention to intellectual life. The projected ten-volume series of *A History of the South* begun almost three decades ago, of which Craven's work is Volume I, is complete except for Volume II, which would take us from the Glorious Revolution of 1689 to 1763 and the American Revolutionary period. State colonial histories, most of them quite recent and referred to in the chapters of the present study, include those of M. Eugene Sirmans on South Carolina, Hugh T. Lefler and William S. Powell on North Carolina, Richard L. Morton on Virginia, and Kenneth Coleman on Georgia. Several older general histories of Georgia and Maryland contain a good deal on the colonial era. A series with a volume devoted to each of the original thirteen colonies, now under way, may give at least the background material for the mind of the colonial South in its political and economic aspects.

The present study, though formidable in size, makes no claim to be a definitive account of southern colonial intellectual life, nor is any single chapter an exhaustive exposition of its subject, though several chapters,

it is hoped, approach such a state. This is an assemblage, a reportage, when possible an interpretation, of documented facts which answer some of the questions to be listed in a moment and point to the sources of probable answers for many more, or to the directions in which the reader should proceed in looking for these further answers. This study attempts to demonstrate that the colonial southerner had a mind contemplative and introspective and articulate and creative and hedonistic and observant, following generally what C. Vann Woodward calls the Southern Ethic; that this mind was shaped by Britain and Europe and its peculiar situation in the New World; and—perhaps by implication—that this mind did at least as much toward the shaping of the later national mind as did that of New England.

Some of the questions to which, it is believed, at least a partial answer is given are here listed in groups, but the reader will find that the materials presented in individual chapters do much more than answer or attempt to answer these queries.

Was there persistent and sustained or sporadic or class or single-colony or single-period cerebration in the southern colonies? Were the intellectuals freaks or botanical "sports" in an agrarian society? Could the yardstick for measuring intellectualism or cerebration be at all in terms of theology or theological practice, as in New England?

If there was a southern mind, what were its origins? in Europe? in what New World conditions?

Was there any appreciable number of genuine intellectuals (as opposed to intelligent men) as compared with New England? If so, in what areas outside religion and politics did they manifest themselves?

If the culture was essentially secular, how fared religion? Were there projects or programs for the conversion of heathen red and black men? What elements of both Puritanism and puritanism may be found in each colony, and how early and how late? What is the story of Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, and Quakerism in these provinces? Were Anglican parsons generally dissolute and incompetent? What was the nature of "religious tolerance" in Maryland? Was there any in the other colonies? Of what degree and kind? How did it affect men's behavior and beliefs if and when it existed? Is there evidence that the southern provinces were as deistic as the middle and northeastern in the eighteenth century? What was the character of southern deism in the eighteenth century?

In what forms or kinds of writing did the southern colonial mind assert itself most frequently and in most distinguished fashion? What did it produce in promotional and descriptive-historical writing? In observing such elements of life as the Indian, plants, and animals, did it find in the New World an earthly paradise or a wilderness? Did it contribute to the

publications of the Royal Society and the Royal Society of Arts? Did it make public declarations on government and society? Was southern belletristic prose comparable in quantity and quality to that of New England? How does it differ in intent and imagery and form, as in the elegy and the satire, the letter and the essay, the religious tract? Is the sermon basically different? How did the Great Awakening affect the southern sermon, essay, or verse? Are there in writings here discussed the roots of humor presented in nineteenth-century backwoods tales or verses or in twentieth-century developments therefrom in the work of Faulkner and Warren and Barth, among others?

From the time of John Smith and Sir Thomas Dale to that of George Washington, were the southern colonies a peculiarly or characteristically military or militant area? Did the Scottish experience in Britain transfer with the emigrant to the southern provinces to produce a kind of belligerence? Do the abundance of military titles in these colonies symbolize an obsession with army or military organization? And though no definite answer is here proposed, somewhat obliquely suggested is the familiar question whether the presence of blacks created a preoccupation with militancy.

Was there a distinguished or even good southern theater by any Old World standard? Were there original native plays? Was playgoing a southern character habit? If so, do the titles of favorite plays suggest anything of the habits of mind of the spectators—social, political, or esthetic?

Did southern colonials display a rational good taste in the fine arts, including architecture, formal gardens, painting, and music, as well as the theater? To what extent or in what ways was this taste, if they had it, derivative? original? Which forms appear to have been adapted in the most original fashion to conditions in the New World?

Were the majority of southern colonials illiterate? Did an appreciable number of them lack educational facilities of any kind? What sorts of schools existed in the colonies? What were the purposes of a basic education? Who were educated abroad, and where? In comparison with those of other colonies, what was the proportion of educated men and women in these colonies? Where did they obtain theological, medical, or legal education? where training in the skilled trades?

Was agricultural method and product a major consideration of the southern mind? Who wrote on the subject between and including Thomas Hariot and John Mitchell?

In what technical or semitechnical or technical-artistic forms did colonials express themselves? Was there industry and industrial planning in the area? Were there genuine contributions to medicine? to cartography? Is there significance in these matters? What motivations lay behind the

work in botany of John Clayton II, John Banister, Dr. Alexander Garden, John Lawson, John Custis, and John Mitchell?

What besides agrarianism and Old World models shaped southern political theory? What are the major variations in that theory between Maryland and Georgia, and between individuals? Is there here an obvious relation between political and legal institutions adapted from English models and the later judicial and legislative-executive structure of the United States under the Constitution?

Is there strong evidence of the effect of the institution of slavery in politico-economic-belletristic writings, the legal trials, or the laws of the southern colonial? What are some of the southern attitudes toward the Indian, and what do they show about the thinking of the white settler?

Were English models in belletristic writing, political institutions, and social organization modified by the extraneous ethnic or national groups who in most colonies existed in appreciable numbers, as the Irish and Scots and Scotch-Irish and Welsh, the Germans and Swiss and French?

Was the average southern colonial a reader? What is meant by purposeful reading? Of the things he did peruse, what kinds seem to have affected his intellectual outlook most? Who were some of the holders of major libraries, and what were the books these libraries contained?

Are there in these discussions of southern settlers before 1764 as groups and individuals any reasons for Thomas Jefferson's faith in the tiller of the soil, or small farmer, as the noblest producer and product of free American institutions? Did this average colonist develop land, read, vote, resist oppression, enjoy good architecture, and show personal ambition? In what ways and for what reasons did he expand the American frontier?

In view of the materials presented in this book, could it be said that the multifaceted and complex southern mind now so significant a part of the growing United States is entirely from new seeds, or outside influences, which have come into the region since the Revolution? Or are there a few, many, or a moderate number of evidences that the intellectual flowering of the South in the twentieth century is obviously from seeds or roots planted by the colonists, white and black, who populated the region? That is, does the southern mind of our own time have clearly recognizable sources among settlers who began arriving almost four hundred years ago and continued to pour in for two centuries?

These are by no means all the questions which may arise from the discussions in this book. Nor does this book pretend to answer completely any of them, as suggested above. It is hoped that what is here will be informative and useful as intellectual history per se, but above all that it will suggest to interested and alert readers scores of investigations which they will pursue, and of studies which they will publish.

Whether they came from rural or village Yorkshire or Worcestershire or urban London or Plymouth or Bristol, the first settlers in the Chesapeake country brought two major life concepts with them, one an ideal of English farm life as it had long stood, and the other a delight in exploring and knowing and acquiring so inherent in the English Renaissance of which they were a part. Over and over again in the next century or two they and those who embarked after them expressed in one form or another the *translatio studii* or *mundi* theme, a consciousness that they were imposing, or wished to impose, the culture of an old world upon a new and a conviction that the ideal country life modeled upon but enriched beyond that of Britain might be realized in their sylvan Venice. Future emigrants to these colonies, British born or not, were likely to hold to this double vision of a modified English rural life and an expanded opportunity to observe the unknown and acquire the means for gracious living, though there were many instances of more idealistic and more ignoble reasons.

The southern provinces remained in much closer touch with Britain, except possibly during the Commonwealth years, than did New England, and their activities reflected in twisted or at least altered ways the changes in religion, science, architecture, painting, music, politics, law, and almost everything else in the mother country. As the seventeenth century progressed, the medieval style in building began to give way to the classical baroque and the neoclassical, and at last in its Georgian forms was dominant in the eighteenth-century South, all forms in turn affected by local conditions or by a few French and Dutch details which occasional individuals introduced. Science and literature especially reflected evolving Anglo-European tastes, with the major change, or acceleration, in science coming after the founding of the Royal Society in 1662. It is worth remembering that the scientific reports on a variety of subjects by southern colonials appeared in the first volume of the Society's *Philosophical Transactions*, and many more were contributed by these people through the years right up to the American Revolution. In literature, even when the subject is in succession the red man or Bacon's Rebellion or the Glorious Revolution in Maryland, the form evolves from robust Renaissance rhetoric to baroque or Donnesque punning irony or Royal Society plain-style prose to neoclassical and then to pre-Romantic imagery and rhythm. And yet certain American and what may be southern qualities run through it all.

But before the major body of scientific writing and extant belletristic verse and prose appeared, and partly as a result of the Sir Isaac Newton-John Locke philosophies and the Royal Society, there had come the English form of the Enlightenment with which every man who could read and write and some who could not came into contact during the full century immediately preceding the Revolution. These southern men of the

Enlightenment, like others, thought in terms of universals as well as in terms of free individuals. Rationalism was a dominant quality of the southern mind, however, from Captain John Smith and the early witchcraft trials straight through to Thomas Jefferson. It did not make its first appearance with the Enlightenment. And always it was accompanied necessarily by a secular culture.

The twentieth century has been called by historian-philosophers such as Toynbee the New Enlightenment. Its debt to the eighteenth century, its rationalistic and secular nature, is obvious. One of the two greatest American colonial exponents of the original Enlightenment, Thomas Jefferson, has only in our century received the recognition due him for the virtues he displayed so markedly in his own time. This fact is paralleled, one commentator has remarked, only by the belated recognition of the extent to which the early South contributed to American thought.

The story of the southern colonial mind begins in 1585 on a sand lagoon on the coast of North Carolina, for Raleigh's settlers under Lane and White and Hariot set traditions and patterns which were continued through Jamestown and beyond. Partly for convenience, partly on historical bases, in general it concludes with the year 1763, after which this mind became largely absorbed in the political and ethical problems which shaped it into a Revolutionary mind. Men and their activities, politics and law and rhetoric, literary fashions and ideas and themes, and many other elements which clearly existed before 1764 have been sometimes followed past that date, for they seem important in rounding off, or completing, this or that facet of colonial cerebration.

The southern settler came not to build a city upon a hill, and only rarely to prove himself one of a chosen people designed by God to carry out His will on this earth, though at the beginning London preachers told him that he was elected to this mission by the Deity. He came normally with other plans, and usually with determination. The paradise or the potential paradise in which he settled he expected would become a fruitful garden and a beehive of industry. He wished to cultivate a fertile valley until he had won for himself the good life, the American Dream as reality. Oxford scholar or Edinburgh physician or younger son or small farmer or London convict or Scottish Highlander, he saw at once that to achieve his goals he would have to adapt, and he did it remarkably well.

If he was literate, this southern colonial kept up with his blood kin in Britain or on the Continent at least for some years, and frequently saw to it that his children did so. A sense of family pervaded southern colonial life, as many a governor sent from Britain complained when he found himself facing a coalition of kinsmen. In general he was an orthodox Christian: the small farmers who were the majority of the provincials welcomed

clergymen and listened to sermons whenever they could. But usually he was also a hedonist, and Presbyterian as well as Anglican could welcome a frolic or even the theater and entertain a houseful of strange guests with a gaiety rarely noted among the American Puritans.

In the beginning he lived in crude domiciles without ornament, but generations before the end of the period this colonist, small or great planter or city merchant, built for himself a graceful dwelling and laid out his garden in geometrical patterns. Like the New Englander, he built beautiful churches, but of quite different materials and forms, relying until the mid-eighteenth century far more on the designs of Palladio and Vitruvius than did his Massachusetts contemporary. He laid out complex and intricate street plans for some towns and simple gridiron plans for others, and he drew colorful and accurate maps. He read his Bible and the Statutes of the province as well as of England, and he appears throughout the era to have been fascinated by history, from Rome with Sallust to Denmark with Molesworth or to London with Trenchard and Gordon.

The southern colonial white, perhaps because of his interest in the history of the western world, was as fully conscious as the New Englander that he himself was making history—from John Smith and R. Rich to Landon Carter and Richard Bland or the Maryland "rabble" of the 1650s to the South Carolina and Georgia mobs of the 1750s and 1760s. Sometimes, indeed many times from Virginia under the Company to Georgia under the King, he was disenchanted with government, law, economy, and land. But he knew he had a country of his own which was not Britain, and usually he tried in several ways to make his lot profitable and therefore pleasant. Almost without exception he was acquisitive, but he seldom allowed greed to obliterate a genuine interest in education, reading, law, politics, horticulture, or society *per se*.

This then is the story, or part of the story, of the nature and development of the southern mind in its first 175 years. The examples and the interpretations here presented will, it is hoped, be amplified and emended, and the interpretations qualified or confirmed or denied by hundreds of later students of the intellectual life of the region. These volumes are meant to be a starting point, to introduce relatively unfamiliar materials vital to a comprehensive understanding of the American mind.

CHAPTER ONE

Promotion, Discovery,
and History

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Promotion and Discovery	10
Before Jamestown	10
Virginia and Maryland in the Seventeenth Century	13
The Carolinas in the Seventeenth Century	44
The Five Colonies in the Eighteenth Century	52
History and Major Historians	66
Captain John Smith	68
Bacon's Rebellion	74
Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton	80
Robert Beverley	84
Hugh Jones	91
William Stith	96
Bibliography	391
Notes	399

~ ~ ~ I resolved indeed only to delight my selfe, and som who I am bound to be thankefull unto in that kinde, with the unworthy view of them, the rather, because I have seen many publications & impressions of those affairs, by those, whose books I should be proud to beare after them: but such is the perversenes of mankinde, such their incredulity of every thing, save what their eies tell them to be true: yea, such their backwardnes in the persuit of honorable enterprises, that . . . it were hard to say whether one of so many thousands as abound in *England*, might be moved to ioine with others right worthily disposed, to become a hartly and devoted furtherer of an action so noble, as is this, which thing if I faile in effecting, I shall not lose much labour, since when I undertook this taske, I imagined no such thing: but meerly my owne delight and content. . . .

My zeale to the Action, though I may seeme to have forsaken it, gives mee the heart to publish, what I know to the world.

—RALPH HAMOR, Dedication, *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia*

And daily how through hardy enterprize
Many great regions are discovered,
Which to late ages were never mentioned.
Who ever heard of th' Indian Peru?
Or who in venturous vessell measured
The Amazons huge river, now found true?
Or fruitfulest Virginia who did ever vew?

Yet all these were when no man did them know,
Yet from our wisest ages hidden beene;
And later times thinges more unknown shall show.

Why then should witlesse man so much misweene,
That nothing is, but that which he hath seene?

—SPENSER, *The Faerie Queene*, Proem, II, ii and iii

THE MOST PERSISTENT and voluminous record of the southern colonial mind, from its English origins in the late sixteenth century to the first decades of the Georgia settlement, lies in the tremendous body of writing devoted to describing the region and its events, a record intended primarily to shape the British-European concept of what existed between the Susquehannah and Florida. Motivations and forms were many and complex. The most obvious motivation was of course promotion, the basis for the come-hither literature inviting men and money to join in the enterprise. But an appreciable segment appeared as protest, a large part as document to inform and guide home governance of the plantations, and a goodly portion as explanation to satisfy European curiosity both general and scientific. Sometimes a colonial administration—especially a governor—was defended or attacked. More rarely this writing sprang from the pleasurable excitement of action and New World atmosphere. Politics, religion, and material wealth were elements of most of these motivations, in varying orders and degrees of emphasis. And in the last decades of the period an occasional southern colonist was often attempting to explain his region for his own people and for posterity.

The forms in which these motives inspired expression were also varied. There were no purely promotional tracts, but some of the most picturesque prose was primarily intended to entice ventures of purse and person. These tracts might be chronicles, descriptions, harangues, pious parallels, or a mixture of these with more. They might be records of fauna and flora, topography, climate, or ethnology. They could also be sermons, letters, or news ballads. Some were quasi-philosophical discourses on reasons for empire, converting the heathen, or gaining personal wealth. Many remained unprinted until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Many others survive buried in great collections of travels or in unique copies, even a few only in foreign tongues. If printed soon after composition, they usually appeared in London, at least until the first southern presses began their work in the eighteenth century. Even then many of the most significant appeared only in British imprints, for they were still designed to explain the southern seaboard to Europeans. Of the major historians only William Stith first published his work in his own colony, though extant library inventories remind us that many writers' fellow colonists owned and read what had been written among and about themselves.

The sheer quantity of this southern hortatory and expository writing

will amaze most readers not thoroughly acquainted with the period and region. It rivals, perhaps surpasses, in titles and number of pages the more celebrated theological writing of colonial New England and certainly is more voluminous than roughly parallel literature produced in the middle colonies. Sometimes a single work, or a group of works about a particular period in one colony, has epic quality. Certainly its central theme, European man developing through a series of heroic actions in a strange new world, is as genuinely epic in tone and total impression as the expression by the Puritan of his errand into the New England wilderness. Above all it is our fullest record of the evolution of the South Atlantic colonist from European to American.

A sizable amount of southern promotion literature and history was written by men (and a few women) who had never been in the colonies. Though even theirs is largely based on documents by others who had visited the area and presents original reaction and report secondhand, it also reflects the peculiar predilection or bias of its authors. Only the most notable examples of this European expression will here be discussed, though much of it is mentioned. But many of the earliest records of the region survive only in the verbatim or edited excerpts included in great collections such as those of Hakluyt and Purchas, and of course these must be noticed for themselves. The two great editors just named anticipate or often represent the same attitudes toward America as do those they quote, though to what extent may be a matter of speculation and argument.

These reporters, whether homeland recorders or interpreters or on-the-spot observers, are the British thread of a tradition of European travel-promotion writing which started in the Middle Ages and had already been extended to the New World by the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Italian, and the French from the days of Columbus. Though the exact date of the beginning of English emphasis on colonization may be hard to determine (it goes back at least to Richard Eden in 1553-1555), one may say that the Reverend Richard Hakluyt's *Divers Voyages Touching the Discovery of America* (1582) and *A Discourse of Western Planting* (1584) form a convenient and distinguished point in this genesis, appearing as they did just when Gilbert and Raleigh and Hawkins and Davis were making the island race conscious of lands beyond the seas. Certainly these writings indicate that by this time the realm was colonization-conscious. *A Discourse*, intended not for publication but to persuade government and capital into a program of overseas development, marked its author's complete commitment to the enterprise.

By 1589, after the first experiment in settlement in what is now North Carolina with its immediate failure but suggestive promise, and after British defeat of the Spanish Armada the year before, Hakluyt published

a full-scale folio (including significant reports from the Raleigh Carolina colony), as *Principall Navigations Voiages & Discoveries of the English Nation*.¹ This landmark of British popular prose was avowedly intended to promote greater overseas expansion for England, greater plunder in Spanish-Portuguese possessions, greater glory in feats of navigation—in other words, to suggest all the rewards and possibilities of empire. It urges, of course, the extension of God's kingdom among the heathen. Hakluyt begins by reviewing British naval feats in Roman times and the Middle Ages and continues with a justification of British rights in North America from legendary early Welsh explorations through the Cabots to his own time, employing ancient and contemporary sources. More than America was involved, but the world view of empire narrowed to a focus on this continent. Between 1598 and 1600 he brought out three volumes of an enlarged edition² containing new documents and records of events since 1588, the new work having even greater popularity than the earlier. In both had been incorporated letters, chronicles in prose and verse, and reports by men who had been part of the action in various regions of the world, but especially in America. Of these, more below.

The other great collected edition follows Hakluyt's example even in its title, Samuel Purchas' *Hakluytus Posthumous or Purchas His Pilgrimes* (1625), by another preacher who was more didactic and less objective than his predecessor. Purchas was also more of a journalist and less of a scholar than his mentor. His less reliable but more titillating account is doubly a guide to America and to heaven. The religious emphasis is already present in Hakluyt, but certainly not to the extent it colors the whole of Purchas. Here are simultaneous exhortations to extermination and conversion of the Indians, the incitement to military triumph over Spain through conquest of her American possessions and acquisition of her wealth, a defense of the management of the by-then-existent Virginia Jamestown colony, and direct appeal to personal ambition and desire for wealth and comfort. These appeals, though hardly novel, through this book had considerable effect on middle- and upper-class minds. One should always remember that few in the lower classes could read. Purchas' careless handling of facts, including omission of highly relevant details, has in recent years been much criticized. But his personal editorial comments are persuasive. "Virginia's Verger,"³ for example, a sermon-essay buried in his tenth book, is a well-reasoned argument for greater expansion in North America, including high moral reasons for taking land from the Indians. His argument is remarkably like that of southern Americans down through the presidency of Andrew Jackson, for in all instances they state or imply that the sparse inhabitants cannot begin to make use

of the land, and that Europeans (white men) may take possession "by Law of Nature and Humanitie," though Purchas cites biblical precedent as nineteenth-century southerners do not. Economic reasoning is also mixed with biblical—that the Indians are a backward people. Then he proceeds to justify colonization by right of discovery and settlement. Virginia, he tells his reader, is a vast, rich Eden waiting to supply living space for the poor of England. National defense, through advanced bases far removed from mother England, is an argument as relevant for our time as his, and between the two periods early southerners used it to justify all sorts of actions, especially frontier land-grabbing: "Now is our Seed-time. . . . God goeth before us"

Thus reasoned the English mind in the old age of Elizabeth and the whole reign of James I. Hakluyt and Purchas epitomize British attitudes towards North America, especially its southern coast, for almost all the seventeenth century and to some extent down through the first settlement of Georgia in the 1730s. Thus reasoned many or most of those who had ventured across the Atlantic themselves and who were quoted by the two geographers. And very much thus reasoned those who settled in the southern provinces. The New England colonists had considerably different motivation.

One striking distinction between northern and southern colonial concepts of the new land itself is suggested by these proponents of empire and usually by their observer-sources. By the 1580s, British eyes saw the area they would settle as a terrestrial paradise, implicitly a tropical or semi-tropical paradise. For most it was a new Eden, another land of Canaan. For some it was more nearly a pagan Arcadia which might be brought to Christ at the same time it became a comfortable and even luxurious home for Europeans. In contrast, Pilgrims or Puritans usually thought of their part of North America as a wilderness, often a howling wilderness.⁴ The different attitude toward the southern region had its origins in Spanish stories of lands of beauty and gold still farther south and in a good deal of wishful thinking, as well as in the actual obvious contrast in climate and vegetation between the New England-Newfoundland regions visited by the English voyagers and the Virginia-Carolina area their nation planned to settle, or on which they finally focussed early settlement. The wishful thinker saw the South Atlantic area as having richer soil and as more nearly tropical than it really was, for he was sometimes led astray by trying to find the same qualities in the same latitude in Eurasia and America. He also greedily devoured tales of great treasure, natural abundance, golden cities, and gentle, primitive peoples. Through the establishment of the last colony in the region, Georgia, despite frequent disillusionment from the

hard realities of experience, the southern settler continued to see his own province as at least a potential if not an actual Canaan. And perhaps more than his northern neighbors he believed he would find the Northwest Passage through his territory, his part of America.

Of the eight kinds of colonial promotion literature described by Howard Mumford Jones,⁵ all may be found in the body of material concerned with the southern settlements, though not all are represented by the work of men who had been to or remained in the colonies. The formal treatise on colonization, represented in two forms by Hakluyt's *A Discourse* and Bacon's *Of Plantations* (1625), was usually if not always written in England by Englishmen who had not seen America. So usually were the official laws and regulations (published as advertising) concerning the acquisition of land, though their composers often benefited from the advice of experienced colonists. Nor was the official request for a land patent (also used as advertising) written by the new American. But the official sermons by the great London preachers encouraging emigration had some colonial counterparts such as Alexander Whitaker's homily sent home from Virginia on behalf of the clergy. The reports of exploratory voyages by new settlers or by the sailors who carried them stressed the plenitude in the area selected for habitation. These accounts, from logs of ships or individuals to formal expositions of potential benefits (perhaps the most numerous of promotion documents), were often published. Pamphlets which were confutations of gossip about individual plantations were usually English-edited or -authored from American sources. The personal report by an interested observer is obviously the American-composed work most frequently met with, ranging from a single letter home to Captain John Smith's major writings and such vivid narratives as William Strachey's "A True Reportory." There is also a considerable amount of other writing not aimed directly at encouraging settlement, such as factual-statistical reports and letters intended primarily to satisfy the curious. And there are strong and satiric or occasionally semihysterical protests or avowals of disenchantment. Developing alongside or within promotional, antipromotional, and informative literature was the writing motivated by New World patriotism, perhaps clearly discernible first in Francis Yeardley's 1654 letter to John Ferrar (see below), but evident in most of the southern eighteenth-century historian-observers from John Lawson and Robert Beverley through William Stith. Imbedded in most of these forms of expression are also a number of scientific reports. The attitude toward the Indians expressed in these and other writings is such a significant aspect of the colonial mind that much of Chapter II is devoted to the subject. Large as the native American looms in the material mentioned in the present chapter, for the

moment he is given only incidental notice. Also the question of the red aborigine's and the black slave's conversion to Christianity, a major concern to many colonists, is discussed in later chapters on religion.

Motivations, already generally noted, are considered more specifically in assessing the major writings designed to promote and inform. Characteristic mental attitudes still existing in the South were incipient in some of the earliest accounts and by the mid-seventeenth century were well developed. Among them is the growth of sectionalism, in some respects a genuine patriotism, in others a sort of provincial chauvinism, perhaps most simply expressed by Francis Yeardley, most elaborately by William Byrd, and most vehemently by William Stith. It was already present in Captain John Smith, who spent as much time and effort on New England as on Virginia, but whose sympathies clearly remained with the latter. This particular sort of devotion to area seems to have no direct antecedent in England,⁶ despite the identification (largely by the lower classes) with shire or county. Concomitant with devotion is defensive attitude toward section. Then there is the early objective attitude toward nature, the interpretation of nature as subordinate to men and to human events: that is, nature as commodity. Another point of view is the imaginative appeal of wild nature (especially the exotic and the luxuriant), for delight or for knowledge. From Hariot and Pory to Bartram it provoked or incited colorful rhetoric and poetic language and philosophical ruminations. Still another attitude, perhaps no longer observable, was the southern interest in and attitude toward the frontier. This concern was to persist at least until the Civil War, for until then the region always had a real frontier. It too grew from a new experience, for it had no comparable English or European tradition or precedent. In general the southern colonist in the seventeenth century was optimistic regarding both dangers and material advantages of the frontier, though literary men, such as John Pory and George Sandys, found the frontier hostile to their esthetic needs. In the earlier eighteenth century Tidewater gentlemen like Beverley, Byrd, and Jones disapproved of the frontier, usually from a safe distance, though explorer-surveyors like Lawson and Byrd, and even Beverley in some respects, when they had come into definite personal contact with it might see its potential. What they really approved was what they saw or envisioned beyond the last settlements; what they disapproved was the slatternly way of life, godlessness, mere brutishness of the frontier, an attitude in which the later eighteenth-century Reverend Charles Woodmason of Carolina, missionary among the frontiersmen, fully concurred.⁷ That all the southern colonies had much in common beyond slavery is abundantly evident in the colonial promotion and travel literature. In fact, if one were to judge

by promotional literature alone, he would find these provinces from Maryland to Georgia astonishingly alike, and in many qualities markedly unlike New England in both literature and settlement.

PROMOTION AND DISCOVERY

BEFORE JAMESTOWN

Two reports from the earliest English colony on Roanoke Island differ markedly in content, style, and the intellectual acumen which produced them. But they differ most significantly in purpose. The first, by Ralph Lane (d. 1603), governor of the original colony, was a "Discourse" written to Sir Walter Raleigh to explain Indian tribes and villages, to suggest the prospects his exploration of two rivers offered for the future, to defend his break with the Roanoke natives, and above all, to excuse himself for abandoning the colony (by sailing away with Sir Francis Drake) on June 18, 1586.⁸ The second, by Thomas Hariot (1560-1621), Oxford scientist and technical observer as well as an administrative officer of the expedition, was designed to discourage adverse rumors about the first colony and give an intimate record of the activities of the little band of adventurers.⁹ In certain respects the two are complementary, in others antithetical, but both represent attitudes and forms to appear in later southern colonial writing. Though both deal more or less objectively with facts, the governor is in attitude or pose the realist (he may be concealing something), the scientist is the romancer in that he is pointing his information, shaping it (partly with the aid of John White's drawings), and coloring it in the roseate hues of an earthly paradise. Both accounts were included by Hakluyt in his 1589 collection,¹⁰ but Hariot's *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia* had been printed in quarto in London the year before and would appear again in folio with John White's drawings from a Frankfort press in 1590.¹¹ Thus it is the first book by an American resident written in English about the New World, or about the part of it within which that resident lived.

Lane's work was probably the earlier, somewhat rugged in style, written for one man's information with many matters understood but left unsaid between writer and addressee Raleigh. In letters to others, such as Walsingham, Lane acknowledges the great objects of the expedition, the increasing of Her Majesty's greatness by addition to the kingdom and the spreading of the "Church of Christ" by opposing Spain. That Sir Walter and his fellow entrepreneurs are to profit is also implied.¹² The "Discourse" rather inadequately supports these purposes. Clearly Lane was hazy about

the implications of future colonization presented by the exploring expedition which had been sent to Chesapeake Bay. He explains fairly satisfactorily why his Roanoke River voyage was a failure and why he finally felt compelled to abandon the colony and sail with Drake. On the surface at least, he appears to have been entirely frank. If so, he shows a certain lack of perception; if not, he was defensively dissembling. One should keep in mind that ostensibly he wrote for only one reader. Both the "Discourse" and the majority of his letters show his full realization of the obstacles to survival, from disease and food to Indians and inadequate support from home. Enthusiasm for the whole enterprise is guarded, or qualified, throughout most of his writing, though in one glowing burst of rhetoric to Richard Hakluyt the elder (cousin of the geographer), his optimism regarding the new land seems genuine:

It is the goodliest and most pleasing territorie of the world (for the soile is of an huge unknown greatnesse, and very well peopled and towned, though savagelie) and the climate so wholesome, that we have not had one sicke, since we touched land here. To conclude, if Virginia had but Horses and Kine in some reasonable proportion, I dare assure my selfe being inhabited with English, no realme in Christendome were comparable to it.¹³

Despite the fact that Lane's "Discourse" is basically a narrative and Hariot's a factual exposition organized by topics, it is the latter's work that comes alive. As David B. Quinn has suggested, Lane shows the Indian Wingina as an unpredictable savage, but Hariot sees him as an understandable human being deeply impressed by the power of the religion of the white "visitors." In fact, in this first American book in English, the author describes the Indian and his ways and, aided by White's drawings (in the 1590 edition), leaves us a vivid picture of the South Atlantic coastal Indians which was accepted as accurate by settlers for a century thereafter. Native crops, foods, villages, and, above all, potentiality are described or suggested. Optimistic but not gullible, Hariot with the magnificent assistance of his illustrations shows the aborigine as a significant and perhaps eventually-to-be-integrated element of the new British dominion.¹⁴ Thanks to writer and artist, the late sixteenth-century southern Indian is about as familiar to us as his Tudor English white contemporary. Even more original—for the Latin peoples had given extensive delineations of other American aborigines—were Hariot and White's contributions to natural history. Trees, plants, birds, fish, and animals are described systematically, with striking engravings from watercolors of many of them. The third major feature of the book was its cartography, with rough-sketch maps of the southern coastline called the best up to that time done by Europeans.¹⁵

Thus the first American book was authored by an Oxford-educated scientist and member of Raleigh's household who held an eminent position among contemporary intellectuals. Undoubtedly he had come to America with a set of definite instructions as to what sort of thing he was to record or note, the kind of instructions English-speaking New World explorers were to continue to follow on through the great expedition of Lewis and Clark to the Pacific more than two centuries later.¹⁶ Botanists and cartographers, settlers and their sponsors, and the avidly curious Renaissance European were to use Hariot's book in the 1590 deBry edition for a long time. Hariot was writing to attract settlers to a new, vast, and relatively unoccupied land. The world he depicted was in its particulars a down-to-earth, merchant-and-farmer's world, but quite a different one from the land the venturer would forsake. Skunks, pearls, and tobacco, warm and temperate climate, the "nature and manners of the people," Hariot saw as both interesting and useful, capable of procuring infinite improvement in the white Englishman's living standards. Though both he and Lane noted examples of Indian mendacity and treachery, Hariot saw, or thought he saw, the natives' reasons and believed that with proper treatment the primitives might develop as the civilized expanded. And his observations on their religion with its belief in immortality made him feel that in time they might be brought to Christ. Thus this first promotional tract depicts not an actual but a potential worldly paradise. It describes what *is* always with the implication of what *may be*.

A briefe and true report was promotional also in another sense. As Hariot points out in his prefatory address to "Adventurers, Favourers, and Well-willers of the enterprise for the inhabiting and planting in Virginia," it was necessary to defend the undertaking against the slanders and hearsay and even the ignorance of some temporary colonists who had never stirred beyond the confines of the fort or settlement. The best defense was facts well organized: that is, organized to show not only the abundant fruits but the illimitable promise of this American world.

Thus in the two accounts of Lane and Hariot patterns of report of the new-found southern land were permanently set. In revulsion or in personal defense, some men in the future would place the blame for failure on inadequate supply, living circumstances, and cruel and inhospitable red men, all of which in one way or another Lane intimates. Later would be added local or on-the-scene mismanagement. At the same time Hariot was putting forward—documented, described, and literally pictured by White and deBry—an opposite interpretation of the Indians along with a most favorable description of native resources of climate, soil, and plant and animal life. To Hariot's sort of promotional tract further inducements were later added, such as liberty of action and freedom in religion along with

good government and stronger lures for Christianizing or obtaining wealth. The patriotic, however, the enlarging of British dominion, was to remain an implicit or expressed underlying philosophy accompanying or preceding the other inducements.

Neither man assumed that here was to be established a city upon a hill, the haven for the saintly and the example to the ungodly. Here was the pragmatic Renaissance Englishman's natural combination of motives, in varying order, for God, for country, and for himself, all through an appeal to the adventurous spirit, the man of action, the man who held in equilibrium within himself spirituality, natural hedonism, and the hope of material security. The emphases were quite different in what New England promotional tracts there were, and even the pamphlets of the middle colonies could not (perhaps would not) stress all these elements.

John White's journal-report of his search for the lost colony, the letters and reports of Gilbert, Raleigh, Drake, and lesser men who had direct interest if not physical participation in the first English settlement, are minor examples of the literature of discovery and to some extent of promotion.¹⁷ Along with Hariot and Lane, they show that the intellectual thrust that was to create British America made not a false start off the Carolina coast, but a series of preliminary experiments in both action and communication which became the patterns for the later permanent colonization. Though there were to be scattered reports of reconnaissance and discovery between CROATAN (Roanoke Island) and the first letters back from Jamestown in 1607, they are hardly American in the same sense as *A briefe and true report*. For the topic and tone and temper of Hariot's book was picked up again only after some years had passed, when a number of lively reports were to be sealed and dispatched from the Chesapeake colony, which is called to this day Virginia.

VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

From the first landfall in Chesapeake Bay at least until the surrender to the Cromwellians almost a half century later, the second and permanent Virginia contained a remarkably large number of literate and articulate, even "literary," men. These men expressed themselves frequently, vividly, and cogently. They criticized as vehemently as they praised, but almost always constructively, with the implicit understanding that they believed in their own and the new land's mighty destiny under English rule. They included puritan clergy, professional soldiers of fortune, gentleman farmers (really country gentlemen who often knew too little about farming), sons of the nobility, a number of knights, and even a peer or two. Many were educated in the English universities, many more in the Inns of Court

or the great classical schools of London and provincial towns, but in at least one quite distinguished case apparently only in a village grammar school. That graduates of the last kind of institution might use the English language as an instrument of power and knowledge and art was probably known to every frequenter of the theater who witnessed the plays of the man from Stratford.

Every American should recall from his early school histories that a certain Captain John Smith complained that the first Jamestown company included too many gentlemen in proportion to craftsmen and laborers to perform the necessary tasks of building a frontier outpost-village and growing or procuring food, as indeed it did. But it was from some of these same lazy, inept, perhaps dissipated gentlemen, and their replacements as they succumbed to disease or Indians or somehow managed to return to England, that most of the great records of genesis sprang—the pamphlet narratives, private reports, personal letters, even news ballads—the actual description of events along with an emphasis on God's providence as determining England's fate, or place, in North America.

Background for this mélange of written expression from Virginia were the London sermons and promotion pamphlets urging the same cause, and frequently in turn based on earlier original reports, as previously noted. But the first concerns are the earliest reports which found their way back to the sponsors and the well-wishers (and in some instances opponents) of Britain's first major experiment in empire. That the colony was owned and founded by a joint-stock corporation, the Virginia Company of London, which by right of a series of royal charters was to control and profit by the enterprise, has often caused people to forget that other powerful elements, including the monarch and heir apparent and prominent individuals of Jacobean England, had an interest, perhaps an undercover stake, in the project, and certainly had personal agents or observers on the ground. Thus the first writings are by no means all official reports addressed to a home office. The written communications, official or private, one should also remember, were of vital interest and importance to foreign governments, especially the Spanish, which viewed with apprehension English encroachments on what they claimed or pretended to be their domain. The Spanish, through an efficient espionage system in London, managed to pick up a great deal of information. In fact, the only surviving copies of many communications sent back by the English to friends or superior administrators at home are the copies in Spanish sent from London to Madrid. These, retranslated into English, form an interesting but rarely significant part of the literature of American colonization.¹⁸

In early May of 1607 the first colonists decided upon the site they soon called James Towne or Jamestown as their permanent abode. Captain

Christopher Newport, who was "admiral" of the fleet of three tiny ships which had carried the settlers, was to return to England for more people and supplies as soon as he thought he saw this first group fairly well established. Before May was out, and on through June, various kinds of colonists were penning their impressions of the new land. Newport was back in England with some missives before the end of July. In 1608 and 1609 various ships carried many more. These sealed papers were probably the most carefully handled items of the first cargoes.

The first official report from the little governing Council in Virginia,¹⁹ dated June 22, 1607, to the Council of the Virginia Company in London, is clearly hurried and quite brief, a preliminary statement indicative of enthusiasm for "this most honourable accion." Immediately available but very homely and unglamorous products of this new region they returned as their first cargo—Virginia clapboard and sassafras—with an entreaty that the home Council enact stricter regulations for the conduct and labor obligation of the hired workmen of the expedition, an anticipation of troubles to come which the London governing board should have heeded at once. The writer for the little American Council gave incentives for his urgency:

The land would Flowe with milke and honey if so seconded by your carefull wisdomes and bountifull hands, wee doe not persuaide to shoot one Arrowe to seeke another but to finde them both—And wee doubt not but to send them home with goulden heads. . . .

wee are sett downe 80. miles within a River, for breadth, sweetness of water, length navigable upp into the contry deep and bold Channell so stored with Sturghion and other sweete Fishe as no mans fortune hath ever possessed the like. . . . [Trees yield] gummes pleasant as Franckumcense . . . [and] wee entreate your succours for our seconds with all expedition leaste that all devouringe Spaniard lay his ravenous hands uppon theas gold showing mountaines, which if we be so enabled he shall never dare to think on.²⁰

More elaborate were "A relayton . . . written . . . by a gent. of ye Colony," "The Discription of the now discovered River and Country of Virginia: with the Liklyhood of ensuing ritches, by Englands ayd and industry," and "A Breif discription of the People." Probably all were from the same hand;²¹ all are on themes somewhat anticipated by Lane and Hariot in the Roanoke colony but establishing the patterns as well as subjects of narration and description southern colonists were to follow for the next century and a half and longer. From Captain John Smith's and others' testimony, Gabriel Archer, certainly author of two if not all three of these, was an unscrupulous, ambitious, generally unsavory character. He had been educated at Cambridge and at Gray's Inn. "A relayton" is a narrative of recon-

naissance with Captain Newport to ascertain the nature of the land and tribes among whom they had planted themselves, with lists of the adventurers and names of chieftains and their people. Here are the first bits of evidence or hearsay about the region beyond the mountains and the abundance of oyster pearls and of wild fruits. Conversations and skirmishes with the Indians and interviews with the Queen of Appamatox and the King of Pamunkey are probably the most entertaining portions of the narrative. "The Discription" is much more concise, including a reasonably accurate estimate of the length of the James River, of its fish, and of the soil along its banks, with a note on the thriving condition of imported plants. In the even briefer "A Breif discription" the author mentions the great ruler Pawatah (Powhatan), whom he has not seen, and gives more details of the character and way of life of the red man. Though all three are promotion writing in that they were sent home to move someone to do something, they lack the excitement necessary to induce the commonalty to emigration. They might supply the raw facts for others to shape into imaginative persuasion literature.

"Robert Tindall, Gunner," later a ship master under Lord de la Warr and Sir Samuel Argall, is one of our better evidences of the youthful Prince Henry's considerable influence in the Virginia venture. Tindall apparently composed a "dearnall" account now lost, though a slightly later copy of his map of Virginia which accompanied it is of enormous interest to cartographers. His letter²² of June 22, 1607, to the heir apparent is certainly one of the earliest epistles dated from the colony. It is only tantalizing in what it suggests of the marvelous domain now added to His Majesty's possessions. About the same time gentleman William Brewster, soon to die of an Indian-inflicted wound, wrote that "nowe is the kinge[s] maiesty offered, the most statlye, Riche kingedome in the woorld, nevar posseste by any Christian prynce. . . . And you, yet maye lyve to see England, moore Riche, & Renowned, then anye kingdom, in all Ewroopa."²³ Such letters and reports remained long unprinted. Though in some degree designed to promote a specific element or the general welfare of the undertaking, they are only incidentally promotion literature, and they only hint or talk vaguely of discovery.

Sent back soon after Archer's reports was a far more important writing, only a fragment of which survives in *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, IV, 1685-1690.²⁴ This was "A Discourse of the Plantation of the Southerne Colonie in Virginia by the English, 1606. Written by that honorable gentleman, Master George Percy." Percy was brother of the Earl of Northumberland and himself an alert, opinionated, arrogant man who assumed command as his right. He is usually considered, and was indeed, a foil for Captain Smith as writer and administrator. The journal he almost surely kept during

his entire stay in Jamestown (until April, 1612) has not come down to us.²⁵ But what does survive, especially in his "Discourse," is one of the few extant contemporary accounts by which we may check John Smith's story of the earlier stages of the first Jamestown voyage and expedition. Each supplies details the other does not, and they are not hostile toward each other or contradictory.²⁶ Smith's first account of Virginia is possibly earlier than Percy's, but the two come close together. Like Byrd's later histories of the Dividing Line, both essays are distillations of daily journals. Percy's "Discourse" is our most complete account of the voyage through the Caribbean (March 23–April 10, 1607), probably written for the information of his brother the Earl or for some official of the Virginia Company at home. It also contains picturesque and quite valuable details of dress, oratory, and living conditions of the Indians. The style is alternately stiff and smooth and fluid. Percy concludes with a dreary diurnal necrology with the sombre "causes" of death. It is not history, as Smith's *A True Relation* and later *Generall Historie* are history. A fragment from William White (1608?), Magnel's "Relation," and Francis Perkins' letter retranslated from the Spanish, Peter Wynne's intelligent and learned epistle to Sir John Egerton, and Edward Maria Wingfield's "Discourse" make up the lesser literature of exploration and promotion under the first Virginia charter.²⁷ Of these, Wingfield's deserves particular notice.

Edward Maria Wingfield (c.1560–c.1613) is hardly an attractive figure, and his writing is more personal defense than history and certainly not promotion literature. A weak, vain man of good family and education, he was from the beginning a member of the Council in Virginia and for a time governor or president. *A Discourse of Virginia* was first published in 1860 from the manuscript in the Lambeth Palace Library.²⁸ As Howard Mumford Jones points out, it paints the petty side of the enterprise;²⁹ it is a weak personal defense; and though weak as an attack on Smith, it serves with Percy's "Discourse" as a check on and adjunct of Smith's *True Relation* and *A Map of Virginia*. Roughly and perhaps hurriedly and carelessly done, it is full of trivial and even pathetic details which though hardly good argument offer perspective on a number of things. Overly conscious of rank, Wingfield during the voyage caused Smith to be arrested and "restrained" for thirteen weeks and prevented Smith's being sworn as one of the seven councilors when they landed. As first president of the Council, Wingfield soon found himself in difficulty with nearly everybody and finally was himself arrested and displaced as president by Captain John Ratcliffe. The charges made against him indicate little more than that he was simply not equal to the situation. He sailed for England on April 10, 1608. His *Discourse* offers no evidence toward proving Smith an untrustworthy witness; at times Wingfield was hostile to Smith, as al-

readily noted, but he never proves the soldier a liar. Besides being a record of general bickering, Wingfield's account actually gives details of Smith's perseverance in search of food which support and round out Smith's own report.

The story of the Jamestown colony under the first charter now rests primarily, and probably always will, on two reports sent or taken home or composed in England by Captain John Smith (1579/80-1631). Smith was a native of Lincolnshire, a soldier of fortune on three continents, *de facto* founder of Virginia and "admiral of New England," and is usually considered the first major writer of English-speaking America. One might note here that his writings not only reveal an unusual individual and raise to heroic proportion the Virginia enterprise but also well represent attitudes, themes, and tones to remain characteristic of colonial southern literature. His earliest work, *A True Relation of such occurrences and accidents of noate as hath hapned in Virginia since the first planting of the said Collony . . . , Written by Captaine Smith one of the said Collony, to a worshipfull friend of his in England* (London, 1608), is the first expression in print of the story of the founding of the colony.³⁰

Some time before June 2, 1608, Smith dispatched, in the form of a letter, this first of the documents which were to give him a place both in history and among historians. It immediately aroused interest and was entered for publication August 13. Evidences of haste in printing are quite evident, and so is fairly extensive editing. A preface "To the Courteous Reader" contains the acknowledgment that certain matters of a private nature have been omitted. As it stands, its stylistic changes in pace and form, the glaring difference between the usually simple narration of grim and tragic events, and the optimistic rhetoric with which it concludes have caused some readers to feel that the work was tampered with in more serious ways than mere judicious or injudicious cutting.³¹ Clearly it was a front-line press dispatch written for those at home who were vitally interested in what was going on. It was hurriedly composed as well as hurriedly edited. In almost all his writings it is difficult to tell when Smith speaks in his own words and when he paraphrases others or quotes them verbatim. Like other writers of the South and elsewhere for three and a half centuries, Smith individually was certainly capable of pursuing a steady, factual, often terse and concise course and manner and then, impelled by incident or character or emotion, to turn for a time into an elaborate, prolix, and glowing rhetoric. Ellen Glasgow is but one later southern example, and though she was a writer of fiction (albeit somewhat historical by instinct), scores of professional and amateur southern historians display the same literary qualities. What we have in Smith's *True Relation* is a factual memoir of the colony, including his fellow settlers

and even Pocahontas (briefly), not so much designed to incite immigration as to explain to the Council at home the situation and what could and should be done in London to improve it. Sometimes awkward and journal-like, it contains graphic scenes such as Smith's seizure by Opechancanough's tribesmen or his reception in state by Powhatan. Altogether we see river and forest, Indian village and white settlement, negotiation and counter-negotiation, and an unremitting search for food and security from attack. It is not a hair-raising or terrifying narrative, as certain later antipromotion tracts and letters are, but at least some readers will hardly be prepared for the optimistic final paragraph, which is obviously-aimed-at promotion.

We now remaining being in good health, all our men wel contented, free from mutinies, in love with one another, & as we hope in a continuall peace with the Indians, where we doubt not but by Gods gracious assistance, and the adventurers willing minds, and speedie furtherance to so honorable an action in after times, to see our Nation to enjoy a Country, not only exceeding pleasant for habitation, but also very profitable for commerce in generall, no doubt pleasing to almightie God, honourable to our gracious Sovereigne, and commodious generally to the whole Kingdome.³²

Yet one cannot agree that this is an editor's addition, for it fits quite well attitudes that Smith, as the later more fully developed historian, would continue to display. He hews to the narrative line of facts in chronological order, facts happy or unhappy; he relishes the picturesque and emphasizes it; and here and later he concludes by urging that his expressed and implied facts are in actuality a continued or renewed incentive to establishing "so honorable an action." Here and later Smith saw Virginia as a *potential* paradise, especially because of its natural beauty and abundance; but never does he depict it as a utopia, either in human inhabitants or in their government, white or red.

Though Smith wrote tracts in both England and Virginia between *A True Relation* and his next venture into print on the Chesapeake Bay settlement, this second venture should be considered here, for it grew directly out of his experience under the First Charter (1606-1609) and from his notes taken in Virginia, and was composed or simply edited from his own work and that of friends who had participated in his adventures. This book, much longer than the first, was probably sponsored by two clergymen, William Crashaw and William Symonds, and presumably was published against the wishes of the Virginia Company of London. This is *A Map of Virginia. With a Description of the Countrey, The Commodities, People, Government and Religion. Written by Captaine Smith, sometimes Governour of the Countrey. Whereunto is annexed the proceedings*

of those Colonies, since their first departure from England, with the discourses, Orations, and relations of the Salvages, and the accidents that befell them in all their Journies and discoveries. Taken faithfully as they were written out of the writings of . . . [eight names]. And the relations of divers other diligent observers there present then, and now many of them in England, By W.S. At Oxford, Printed for Joseph Barnes. 1612. This long title reveals a great deal. Besides its now famous map, it shows, first, that the Reverend William Symonds acted as a sort of general editor; second, that it was printed at Oxford, perhaps half surreptitiously, for fear of being suppressed in London by influential members of the Company; and third, that it is really in two parts. Smith apparently wrote all of part one, "A Description of Virginia," though he gathered at least one bit of information from another source.³³ The second part, "The Proceedings of the English Colonie in Virginia," bears on its separate title page the names of *nine* contributors, including a doctor of physic and "the first provant maister," with Thomas Abbay in error for Jeffrey Abbot.³⁴ Both parts, as the most recent and ablest editor emphasizes, show Virginia through Smith's eyes, but they do not display him as the extremely self-centered being that nineteenth-century detractors tried to make him.

Dedicated to the Earl of Hartford by Smith and to other gentlemen by one Philip Fote, as well as "To the Hand" by T.A. (Jeffrey Abbot), the third dedication for the whole book states unequivocally that "it was penned in the Land it treateth of," a statement not to be taken entirely literally, though the notes on which it is based were written in America and certain narrative sequences are probably given verbatim from the notes. Smith's first part, "A Description," is preceded by an interesting Indian vocabulary, and the exposition begins much more in the tradition of the promotion pamphlet than does *A True Relation*. For Smith gives weather, topographical description, location of Indian villages and chiefs in the Jamestown region, as far north as the land of the Susquehanoughs, and east including the Delmarva peninsula. He writes of plants, trees, fruits, animals, birds, fish, rocks, native divisions of the year, native methods of agriculture, and a long discussion (the first recorded) of the appearance, possessions, manners, livelihood, weapons, boats, methods of hunting and fishing, treatment of enemies, and other details of the Algonkian tribes surrounding the little English settlement. Even their music, oratory, medicine, and surgery receive attention. And like dozens of other chroniclers earlier and later, he explains their religious customs and beliefs, as far as he understands them himself, and their forms of government. He includes a description of Powhatan. Here and in "The Proceedings" the emperor's daughter Pocahontas flits in and out, as yet without the aura of romance with which Smith was later to endow her. In this first half of the book

Smith plays little personal part, though there is an occasional reference to the time when he was a prisoner of the Indians. There is little the promoters of emigration could have found to fear from Smith's description until in conclusion he administers a sharp note of rebuke to the slanderers of the colony, who were never in Virginia, or, if they were, never stirred outside Jamestown or as merchants plying between England and America gave false reports to profit themselves. And he ends with scathing remarks to the two hundred idlers whose lives were preserved by the industry of thirty of his own dedicated followers, declaring that during all his months as administrator he lost "but 7 or 8 men, yet subjected the Savages to our desired obedience." Of the loss and recovery of the country since his time, its trials and tribulations, he refers his reader to more recent observers.

"The Proceedings," with another well-nigh interminable title and dedication to the reader, was avowedly an anthology of accounts by men who had participated in the action from 1607 to 1609 and even a year or two later. As already noted, these men saw things, or are edited (by either Smith or Symonds) so that they saw things, as Smith did, and quite obviously he is the hero of their conglomerate story. They trace the voyage and the first local expeditions of discovery, list the "planters" by social rank, and then divide the story into twelve chapters, or books, such as "What happened till the first supply." Their captain-protagonist is the man of action and decision, the ingenious and brave soldier, the persuasive orator and debater, the savior of a handful of men who were the true founders of a future nation: in a word, the epic hero.³⁵ Smith is pitted against Powhatan, wile against wile, and the Englishman wins. They also give details of the coronation of Powhatan by Captain Newport, Smith's rise to the presidency, his punishment of blasphemous idlers, the affection of Pocahontas for him, and his injury from the gunpowder explosion and return to England as the maimed hero. Since some of the authors of the account returned some time after Smith, they tell of Ratcliffe's slaying by Powhatan, of the arrival of Sir Thomas Gates and the more providential arrival of Lord de la Warr, and of Sir George Somers' dying at sea. The whole concludes with an optimistic note that de la Warr (who had been ill and returned to England) would go out soon with a new supply and with the hope that the experiences here related would aid in making the land as ideal "as this booke doth report" it may become.

Thus in his second publication Smith is not full-fledged as either historian or promoter. In a sense *A Map of Virginia* is amelioristic promotion, as indeed to a lesser extent *A True Relation* is, something that will assist in building the New Jerusalem in Virginia's green and pleasant land. Though the joints creak a little, it is not so hurried a production as the former work. It is unparalleled as the first full-length report on the site and

situation of the first permanent colony. Smith has developed as an observer, in his power to dramatize a situation, in his ability to depict white or red men in action. He follows Hariot in usually employing the form of the narrative-journal of discovery and in sincere faith in the rightness of "so honorable an action." In *A Map of Virginia* the fibre of the man shows through the Jacobean corselet, a "new gentleman" risen from the yeomanry, a leader who believed that character, common sense, and perceptivity were the only means of building a new nation among Stone Age savages in a land of natural abundance. Perhaps the caveats he intermingled with his notes on man and environment were in the long run more useful to the undertakers of the enterprise than were the sugared come-hither pamphlets. The Virginia Company at home never heeded his warnings sufficiently though their resident delegated officials tried to; but eventually, more than a decade later, a king and his counselors followed something of the course he suggested.

Most of the other writings concerning Virginia between Smith's two books were promotion literature, in form ranging from news ballad through sermon to prose tract. But Henry Spelman's manuscript account of his arrival in Virginia, escapes from "King Patomecke," and life among the Indians is real discovery-exploration material.³⁶ Not published until 1872, this unusual survey of Indian life is from the point of view of a boy of fifteen who "went native" and whose command of English was never sufficient for the composition of polished or even always intelligible prose.³⁷ Soon after his arrival, young Spelman claims, President Smith sold him to "the little Powhatan" (a subordinate chief) in exchange for the site for a town, probably near the present city of Richmond. For about a year, 1609-1610, Spelman was intermediary between red and white but spent most of his time with the former. Thus he was able to add further details of Indian life, especially of religion and marriage and burial customs, to Smith's. At the end of a good depiction of a guerrilla-like battle between two tribes he remarks drily, "Ther was no greater slawter of nether side." As a youngster interested in pastimes he notes that the Indian game of football is not very unlike the English. Incidentally, Spelman's is the only eyewitness account of the massacre of Captain Ratcliffe and his men. He probably wrote from memory about 1613, possibly during a visit to England.

Between the second and third charters of the Virginia Company, that is, between May 1609 and March 1612, there was enormous propagandistic activity urging both emigration and monetary investment. Inspired by that mixture of motives already noted and others discussed below—including the crisis of the starving time and near-abandonment of the whole enterprise—clergy, merchants, scholars, noblemen, and others contributed to

the outpouring of promotion literature. The alliance between piety and commerce brought among others the remarkable sermon-tracts of Robert Gray, Daniel Price, Richard Crakanthorpe, William Symonds, Robert Tynley, and William Crashaw during the 1609–1610 crisis in Company and colony,³⁸ followed by the first recorded Anglo-American sermon by Alexander Whitaker, of which more below.³⁹ In the period Richard Hakluyt translated and published a Portuguese account of Florida under the title *Virginia Richly Valued* (London, 1609), an attempt to bolster Virginia's claims to Edenic quality by showing how lovely her neighbor Florida was. Then appeared too Robert Johnson's *Nova Britannia. Offering Most Excellent Fruites by Planting in Virginia* (London, 1609), and three years later his *The New Life of Virginia: Declaring the former successe and present estate of that plantation, Being the Second part of Nova Britannia* (London, 1612),⁴⁰ both dedicated to Sir Thomas Smith (Smythe), treasurer of the Virginia Company, and obviously promotion tracts in behalf of the organization. Johnson recapitulates actual events such as the Bermuda shipwreck and events in Virginia as God's providence at work for the good of Englishmen and heathen. Like the preachers, Johnson emphasizes missionary zeal, expansion of God's kingdom for white Christians, and mixed patriotism and self-interest. Here is explicitly (it is almost always present implicitly) the appeal to Renaissance *virtù*, to what Howard Mumford Jones calls "that combination of a well-rounded activity with the promise of immortal fame which is in part heroic and in part polite."⁴¹

Even the 1609 Charter and accompanying instructions to Sir Thomas Gates in 1609 and to Lord de la Warr in 1609/10, like charters and instructions in 1606–1607 and 1618–1621, though not published until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, were well known to members of the stock company, potential subscribers, and many others.⁴² They are in a very small sense promotion literature, but in a very large one the raw material of history. More purely promotion, said to have been prepared by Sir Edwin Sandys with the probable assistance of Crashaw or some other clergyman, are *A True Declaration of the Estate of the Colonie in Virginia, With a Confutation of Such Scandalous Reports as Have Tended To Disgrace so worthy an Enterprize* and *A True and Sincere Declaration of the Purpose and Ends of the Plantation Begun in Virginia of the Degrees Which It Hath Received; and Meanes by which It Hath Beene Advanced*, both published by the Council of the Company in 1610.⁴³ Certainly not written in Virginia, these two are the very essence of the promotion tract, with the possible qualification that the emphasis in both is most strongly on religion, especially in the latter, which declares the first end of the plantation to be "to preach and baptize into [the] *Christian* Religion, and by

propagation of the Gospell, to recover out of the armes of the Divell, a number of poore and miserable soules, wrapt up unto death, in almost invincible ignorance." It should be remarked that Sir Edwin, in certain senses founder of both Virginia and New England, who himself had once been in holy orders and had written a popular book on the state of religion in Europe, may easily have composed the pious yet graceful exhortations pervasive in the two pamphlets. Two examples will indicate the style and tenor of *A True Declaration* (the writer is describing the wreck in Bermuda): "They fell betwixt a labarinth of rockes which they conceive are mouldred into the Sea, by thunder and lightning. This was not *Ariadnes* thread, but the direct line of God's providence," and "What is there in all this tragicall Comædie that should discourage us with impossibitie of the enterprise?" (p. 11). The author or authors rely on Hakluyt, and probably on Hariot and Smith if not others who had been on the ground. They discuss peculiar fauna and flora (raccoons and opossums, for example), divine providences and mutinous conduct, and the terrible starving time (yet vigorously deny that one man killed and ate his wife). With all the frank admissions and some direct or implied criticisms of the conduct of the enterprise in America, the pamphlet is a stirring call to venture and adventure.

If any man shall accuse these reports of partiall falsehood, supposing them to be Utopian, and legendarie fables, because he cannot conceive, that plentie and famine, a temperate climate and distempered bodies, felicities, and miseries can be reconciled together, let him now reade with judgment, but let him not judge before he hath read. . . . It is but a golden slumber, that dreameth of any humane felicity, which is not sauced with some contingent miserie. *Dolar & voluptas, invicem cedunt*, Griefe and pleasure are the crosse sailes of the worlds ever-turning-windmill.⁴⁴

More surely written in the Chesapeake region or by those who had recently been there is an assortment of discovery and promotion writing, often without much literary quality, but almost always adding a little information about southern North America or the attitude of mind of those who were establishing the English settlements. Among these are the journal of "The Voyage of Captain Samuel Argall, from James Towne in Virginia [begun June 19, 1610]," an account of an attempt to reach Bermuda which resulted in touching upon Cape Cod and the fishing grounds, and concluding with anchorage off Cape Charles.⁴⁵ This work offers specific evidence of the reconnoitering the Virginia settlers were doing in their whole area, especially that which could be reached by sea, and definitely presages Argall's more significant voyage and conquest of the French in 1613 at Mount Desert, a move which cleared Maine once more for English possession. Intrinsically more important is the work by Thomas West,

Lord de la Warr, *The Relation of . . . Lord Governour and Captaine Generall of the Colonie, planted in Virginea* (London, 1611),⁴⁶ a brief account by the leader whom Alexander Brown has called the true father of Virginia and the United States. At the time he wrote, de la Warr, whose timely arrival the year before had prevented the entire abandonment of the colonial enterprise, was back in England because of his severe illness. The brief essay is a defense of his conduct in going home and a glowing account of the attractive country of Virginia. Now, he remarked, kine flourish upon the wild grass they find even under the snow in winter, one of the many encouragements which causes him to lay his all upon the worth of this adventure. This he did, for he died on the voyage back to the colony.⁴⁷ This essay is the only known writing on Virginia extant from the pen of a leader in planning and implementing the settlement in the period after the first charter era.

Letters as a literary form will be considered in a later chapter, but as already incidentally noted in regard to Ralph Lane, many personal epistles were specific or implied promotion writing. Such is George Yeardley's letter of November 18, 1610,⁴⁸ to his friend Sir Henry Peyton, a sanguine present-state report. Such also is Sir Thomas Dale's much longer epistle to the Earl of Salisbury of August 17, 1611,⁴⁹ with the particular suggestion that the colony be supplied with a labor force by emptying the jails! Dale adds that these are by no means the worst sort of men in body, birth, or spirit, but that because of their situation many might wish to inhabit here "with all diligence, cheerfulness and Comfort." Unfortunately Dale's suggestion did not have to come from Virginia in the ensuing years, for within the next century and a little more the two Chesapeake Bay colonies and several farther south frequently complained of the convicts thrust upon them. Two or three more letters of this period will be noted below.

One of the more effective kinds of promotional literature was the news ballad, a form of great variety in theme and purpose. At least two remarkable ballads come down to us from the Company period in Virginia. The earlier, in twenty-two stanzas, was published in pamphlet form as *Newes from Virginia. The lost Flocke Triumphant. With the happy Arrivall of that famous and worthy knight Sr. Thomas Gates: and the well reputed & valiant Captaine Mr. Christopher Newporte, and others into England. With the maner of their distresse in the Iland of Devils (otherwise called Bermoothawes), where they remayned 42. weekes, & builded two Pynaces, in which they returned into Virginia. By R. Rich, Gent. one of the Voyage* (London, 1610). The story of the Bermuda shipwreck had leaked out, undoubtedly as a horrendous experience; as in other instances, the Virginia Company called upon someone who had been present or who could at least speak authoritatively to put the best face on the catastrophe

and to emphasize the more-or-less happy turn of events concluding the adventure. The author, probably a Richard (but possibly Robert) Rich, has not been fully identified though he may have been a nephew of the Earl of Warwick.⁵⁰ From his verses it is evident that he was a soldier by profession who had been a part of the Somers fleet of 1609 which headed for Virginia, though it is not clear whether he was on the wrecked vessel and had the forty-two-week stay in the bountiful Bermudas or was one of those who greeted these people upon their happy arrival in Virginia in May 1610. In his preface "To the Reader" Rich disclaims writing for money, acknowledges that he wishes to encourage the enterprise, and owns that he is a blunt soldier who must write in plain language. He employs verse "to feede [his] own humour," and he concludes that he must hurry, for "I am for Virginia againe, and so I will bid thee hastily farewell." Then he renders some cold statistics into verse, underplaying the Bermuda shipwreck and expatiating on Virginia itself. The promise of literally a chicken in every pot and a house and garden to boot he holds out to all those who "shall thither come." The best-known lines are almost good verse, and certainly good propaganda, with two familiar emphases on God and country.

Let England know our willingnesse,
for that our worke is good,
Wee hope to plant a Nation,
where none before hath stood.

To glorifie the Lord tis done,
and to no other end.

The second of the two principal first-generation examples of promotional verse came thirteen years later, when the news of the colony's next major catastrophe, the Indian massacre of 1622, had reached England and was destroying faith in the whole operation. This time the ballad writer was still in Virginia and sent his doggerel verses "from James his Towne this present moneth of March, 1623." The author is described as "a Gentleman in that Country." Discussion of its literary merits and priority as the first American verse may be reserved for a later chapter. But as promotion and historical data *Good Newes from Virginia*,⁵¹ published as a single broadside sheet in 1623, is one of the most interesting documents to appear from the colony during the years of the Company's control; that is, before 1624. Like the 1610 verses, these begin by admitting the catastrophe, but then immediately stress what retribution or revenge was taken by governor and Council. Individual stanzas are devoted to the deeds of such notables as Sir George Yeardley, George Sandys, and Captain Hamor, among others. To inspire renewed confidence in the colony and thus reencourage

emigration, it mentions the steady flow of new arrivals from England, including Governor Sir Francis Wyatt's lady, the abundance of food, and the plans for replanting iron works and sugar cane, indigo, and figtrees. The unknown author concludes:

Thus wishing God will turne the mindes
of many for to come:
And not to live like dormise still,
continually keeping home.
Who ever sees Virginia,
this shall he surely find:
What fit for men, and more and than
a Country man most kind.

One of the most ardent advocates of the colony under the Company charters was that godly missionary, the Reverend Alexander Whitaker, whose three letters and sermon-pamphlet sent home from Virginia are discussed in Chapters V and VI.⁵² His *Good Newes from Virginia* is a strong plea for additional clergy and funds for use in converting the Indians. Whitaker is one of those who saw the colony as the potential earthly paradise, at that time principally inhabited by red worshipers of Satan who must be saved for the Kingdom of God.

This brings us to the work of one of the primary writers contemporary with Captain John Smith (in his first two works) and with many of the lesser writers just mentioned. William Strachey (1572–1621) was the author of the most famous single letter written from the American colonies in the seventeenth century, a compiler of laws, lyric poet, and narrator-describer of the Bermuda storm and wreck and of Jamestown and Virginia under de la Warr and Gates.⁵³ Only one official letter from de la Warr (but perhaps composed by Strachey) to the Council of July 7, 1610, was written primarily as promotion, and even then it may be argued to be simply a present-state-of-the-colony report. But in three other compositions of distinction by Strachey, to be considered again in later chapters, are elements of discovery, propaganda, and certainly history. The earliest of these, "A True Reportory of the Wreck and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates, Knight" (1609),⁵⁴ is the best known because it is a probable source for Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, though if so, the playwright read it in manuscript. It is also Strachey's major contribution to the history of American colonization and stylistically one of the most consciously rhetorical and effective prose pieces emanating from the first decade of Jamestown.⁵⁵ Strachey wished to *entertain* the noble lady to whom he addressed his account of the storm and shipwreck, the voyage on to Virginia, and the first days of the colony under de la Warr. Clearly he intended it for the officials

of the company as well as the addressee. Mutinies and hunger and other problems are not glossed over, but the author, knowing his potential readers' interest in the picturesque side of colonization, gives in careful detail the sublimity of the storm, the terrifying wreck of the *Sea Venture*, the afflictions and improvisations of life on the islands (including food), and in Part III the happier voyage to Virginia, the constructive program undertaken amidst the desolation found there, and the dramatic and uncannily timely arrival of Lord de la Warr. Part IV recounts the beginnings of Lord de la Warr's administration and relationships with the Indians, concluding with a long quotation from the above-noted *A True Declaration of the Estate of the Colony in Virginia*.⁵⁶ Here is the most graphic and in some respects detailed description in existence of early Jamestown. The observer describes the first church and the scarlet-cloaked halberdiers in the stately weekly procession to Sunday service. Yet he notes that the settlement has unwholesome air and is located on marshy ground. Like some of the earlier letters and tracts, this is meant to warn, but it is a more tactfully written work than some of Smith's early pieces.

Strachey's *For the Colony in Virginea Britannia: Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, etc.*, based largely on Sir Thomas Dale's *Lawes for Governing the Armye in the Lowe Countryes*, should be mentioned here as a document of early colonial settlement. These harsh and often-criticized regulations are now beginning to be viewed in context of time and place as absolute necessity.⁵⁷ Perhaps the only literarily or emotionally moving portion, at least stylistically, is "A Praier duly said Morning and Evening upon the Court of Guard, either by the Captaine of the watch himselfe, or by some of his principall officers," an appendix probably composed by certain clergymen.⁵⁸

Strachey brought immense learning to the task when he composed *The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania* (1612).⁵⁹ Artistically this longer "history" is much less impressive than "A True Reportory," partly because it is in a sense fragmentary, probably all that Strachey composed of a more ambitiously planned history of the English in the New World. The *Historie* was already old-fashioned in style when it was written, resembling more the sixteenth-century compilations of discovery than the more neatly organized and unified works beginning to appear. Book One, for example, incorporates the greater part of Smith's *A Map* without change, and one chapter of Book Two is a condensation of John Brereton's account of Bartholomew Gosnold's voyage in *A Briefe and true Relation of the Discoverie of the North Part of Virginia* (1602). The dedication to George Percy's brother the Earl of Northumberland, then a prisoner in the Tower, is easily explained, for this nobleman was powerful even in captivity, and a generous patron of learning. The author does add con-

siderably to the details of Indian life and customs Smith had presented, and his Indian vocabulary is much more elaborate than Smith's. He is valuable too as a continuation of Smith, for he presents the nadir of the colony soon after Smith's departure, and its upswing and perhaps first real stability under Gates and de la Warr. Strachey begins to tell the story of this new stage of Virginia history, and then soon dwindles off into the account of Indians just mentioned, valuable enough in itself but not giving the facts of English living and building in Virginia. Perhaps he was frightened from his greater project by what he thought John Smith might write or what he knew Samuel Purchas was going to bring together. As it stands, Strachey's work is not quite history in the same sense that Smith's 1624 book and certain work of eighteenth-century southern writers are, and it forms but the substance or raw material for a promotion tract. Even his highly significant Indian data has not had an effect on our general knowledge and attitudes which the information supplied by Smith and lesser men had, for it did not get into print until the mid-nineteenth century. Of his several writings, "A True Reportory" remains his best-organized, most gracefully written, and most influential work.

In the above mentioned three American manuscripts, Strachey's major writings, there is a curious balance of stern reality and glamorous, imaginative excitement, of present danger and paradisaal promise. Better educated and more gifted as a writer than Smith, Strachey himself never became, certainly in the Virginia portion of his narrations, part of the action as Smith did, nor was he able to convey the impression that he had been.

The next two significant promotion pieces carry us to the years 1614-1615, one actually being printed as an appendix to the other. The appendix is a letter from Sir Thomas Dale to a clergyman in England emphasizing the religious nature of the undertaking, discussing the Christianization of Pocahontas, and concluding with a good promotional argument. The date was June 18, 1614, and the writer was marshal and sometime acting governor of Virginia.

Oh why should so many Princes, and noble men ingage themselves and thereby intermedling herein, have caused a number of soules transport themselves, and be transported thither? Why should they (I say) relinquish so glorious an *Action*: for if their ends bee to build God a *Church*, they ought to persevere: if otherwise, yet their honour ingageth them to be constant, Howsoever they stand affected, heer is enough to content them, Let their ends be either for *God*, or *Mammon*.

The epistle in which this paragraph occurs is among others of importance included at the end of Ralph Hamor's *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia, and the successe of the affairs there till the 18 of June*.

1614 (London, 1615).⁶⁰ The *True Discourse* is one of the more important firsthand observations of American life as well as a strong direct plea for support in men and money. It covers a period from Hamor's arrival in 1609/10 to his departure in June 1614. As in other cases, Hamor notes that he was moved originally to write for his "own delight and content." The favorable environmental qualities, lively and colorful descriptions of the Indians, and the only roughly assimilated accounts of Argall, Dale, and Gates are among the materials about Virginia and about colonization that Hamor includes. The style is awkward in its shifts from straight narration to exhortation to his reader and then to expository description of fish and fowl and fruit and opportunity. Conscious that he is writing in an established tradition, he notes that he has purposely omitted "commodities" (raw materials for the English market) "which every former treatise hath abundantly," though he does mention tobacco of his own raising, silk grass, and silkworms. Scholarly, loquacious, pious, fair in his estimates of Indian and fellow-colonist, Hamor has given us one of the more readable and useful accounts of the first decade of Jamestown.

That Hamor's work was accurate and promoted the interests of the colony is noted in Master John Rolfe's *A True Relation of the State of Virginia Lefte by Sir Thomas Dale Knight in May Last 1616*,⁶¹ a vigorous come-hither pamphlet with a present-state account complementary to Hamor's. Rolfe, husband of Pocahontas and father of tobacco-culture in the English New World, was showing London to his wife and her to the city and court. An interesting feature of his work is his contrast of the "Aristocracycall" government, now happily superseded, with the "mon-archall" government under which the colony was beginning to prosper. There are undertones of dissatisfaction with the home management of Treasurer Sir Thomas Smith and more than an intimation that things needed to be stirred up in London, something Sir Edwin Sandys and his faction were just about to begin. Rolfe thought that an accelerated activity at home, accompanied by less immediate concern for profits, was just what the present state of the colony required. He pictures a land of plenty for the settlers, who by this time sell the Indians corn instead of buying it, a land in which the now subdued (in Tidewater Virginia) natives mortgaged tracts as large as an English shire to obtain a winter's food supply. That Rolfe was intensely religious is to be noted in his letters quoted in chapters below. Here he insists that it is necessary "sincerely and unfaynedlie to seeke to aduance the Honor of God, and to propagate his Gospell [among red men and white]. . . . What need wee to feare, but to *goe up at once* as a *peculiar people* marked and chosen by the *finger* of God to *possess* it? for undoubtedly he is with us."

Despite men and supplies poured into Virginia, things continued to go

badly in many ways under Sir Thomas Smith's administration of the Virginia Company in London. After a brief and bitter and, as it turned out, ominous struggle for power, a Sandys-Southampton faction won over Smith and his coterie.⁶² Sir Edwin Sandys became officially "assistant treasurer" in 1617 and by 1619 treasurer or head of the Virginia Company, with the strong support of the Earl of Southampton, who was to succeed as treasurer when Sandys became unduly obnoxious to James I. By 1619 reforms inaugurated or proposed earlier were implemented. Included were attempts to cope with economic problems such as land monopoly and the single-crop (tobacco) system. By May 1620 the quarrel was very much in the open. Its documentary side, the writing of several of each party, is in some aspects promotion or anti-promotion literature, most of it, for the time at least, written in England.

After Hamor and Rolfe the first reporter-promoter of significance from Virginia was John Pory (1572-1635),⁶³ who had gone to America early in 1619 as secretary of state for the colony under Sir George Yeardley, who had married his cousin. Pory, Master of Arts of both Cambridge and Oxford, protégé of Hakluyt, translator of Leo Africanus, intelligencer or newsletter-writer extraordinary, and New World explorer, had been from 1605 to 1610 a member of Parliament. His politics followed the way he thought the wind was blowing, and his nose and palate the faintest aroma of wine or spirits. In spite of these shortcomings, when the first legislative assembly of the New World was convened on July 30, 1619, he was immediately elected its speaker. He composed and recorded the actions of that body (recently published in handsome format), minutes of proceedings and of laws enacted, which was sent home to the Council of the Virginia Company for perusal and undoubtedly for whatever promotional function it might serve.

Pory's epistles to friends and officials at home are in both style and content among the best of the seventeenth century. The letter to the "singular good Lorde" and the half-dozen to Sir Edwin Sandys are interesting reports, albeit somewhat obsequious or unduly ingratiating in tone and style, perhaps suggestive or anticipatory of the fact that in 1624 Pory would veer to the anti-Southampton-Sandys faction and become one of the Privy Council's commissioners to investigate the Company, by then nearly bankrupt.⁶⁴ At least one of the 1619-1620 letters, what Sir Edwin Sandys called "Mr Pories Panegyricks of Virginia,"⁶⁵ is vividly propagandistic:

Now that your Lordship may knowe, we are not the veriest beggers in the worlde, our Cowe-keeper here of James citty on Sundayes goes acowtered all in fresh flaming silkes and a wife of one that in England had professed the black arts not of a scholler but of a collier of Croydon, weares her rough bever hatt with a faire perle hattband, and a silken

suit therto correspondent. . . . [As for myself, at] length being hardned to this custome of abstinence from curiosity [about European affairs?], I am resolved wholly to minde my busines here, and nexte after my penne, to have some good book alwayes in store, being in solitude the best and choicest company. Besides among these Christall rivers, & odoriferous woods I doe escape much expense, envye, contempte, vanity, and vexation of minde.

And either wistfully or sanctimoniously to Sir Edwin: "for I thanke god, I drinke water here with as much (yf not more) pleasure and content, as dranke wine in those parts"—to which Sir Edwin adds in the margin, "Bravely Spoken and like a traviler."⁶⁶

Although most of Pory's extant letters from the 1619–1620 period may be a trifle sycophantic in tone, as far as concerned Virginia events, natural environment, and relationship to the Indians, they are usually realistic and factual.⁶⁷ The few letters and the *Proceedings* of the General Assembly present unusually effective prose. Rhetoric and sentiment in the letters are balanced by the equally impressive dignity of the more formal descriptions of that first legislative body in session. A sense of the historical significance of the latter is quite evident, though it is not belabored or overstressed. From our distance Pory appears to have been one of those unusually gifted and versatile gentlemen who, had he possessed the sturdiness or stability of John Smith, might have left his name among the makers of history, in a double sense. Perhaps as organizer and recorder of representative government he deserves more than the footnote in history he now occupies.

But neither Pory nor the events in London or Jamestown in 1619 brought forth any very effective propagandistic writing, though in 1620 the Virginia Company had printed such brief present-state optimistic pamphlets as *A Declaration of the State of the Colony and Affaires in Virginia*,⁶⁸ indicating the urgent need of new "planters." It was the Indian massacre of 1622, really the coup de grâce in a series of more-or-less severe misfortunes for the Company at home and the settlers in Virginia, which evoked more powerful promotional writing. Three appeared in that year alone, two being sermons by John Donne and Patrick Copland.⁶⁹ They follow much the argument of the 1609 sermons already considered, except that they carry the additional function of weighing the effects of the massacre and suggesting new as well as old reasons for optimism. The third major promotion piece of the year was also a commissioned work, Edward Waterhouse's aforementioned *A Declaration of the State of the Colony and Affaires in Virginia . . . , with a Relation of the Barbarous Massacre . . .*, the only contemporary account of the event by a gentleman who had not been in the colony. Waterhouse, secretary of the Virginia Company, relied on the dozens of letters emanating from Virginia, those written

Courtesy of the President and Fellows of Trinity College, Oxford

Thomas Hariot (1560–1621), author of the first American book

Peter Vander enlargement, 1707, from *Scheeps-Togt* . . .

Sketch of Jamestown, Virginia, 1622

before and after the event, including epistles by George Sandys, John Berkeley, and Sir Francis Wyatt. His conclusion enumerates the ultimately beneficial effects the massacre will have on the colony, especially in the extermination of the Indians and the propagation of the Christian religion! To make it a "complete" promotional pamphlet, Waterhouse includes the grim list of those massacred (this may suggest openings in occupations and lands!), a brief "Treatise of the Northwest Passage To the South Sea, through the Continent of Virginia . . .," an enumeration of gifts to college and charity school for religious purposes, and a list of the vital necessities with which each would-be colonist must supply himself.⁷⁰

The two news ballads of 1610 and 1623 written in Virginia or by persons who had been in the colony have been noted. But one other bit of verse, *A Poem on the Late Massacre in Virginia*,⁷¹ written in England by Christopher Brooke, is concerned with the same subject as the 1622 ballad and employs materials straight from the colony such as letters and reports. The author, a well-known lawyer and poet active in the affairs of the Company, lost several personal friends in the disaster. There is genuine grief over the deaths of William Powell and George Thorpe, and praise for heroes living and dead such as George Sandys, Sir Thomas Dale, and Lord de la Warr, who were or had been associated with the enterprise in America. Brooke's couplets are not bad verse, and his "Epitaph" for Thorpe is among the earliest elegies on those who died in America. Brooke soberly warns of dangers yet ahead, but he leaves no doubt that the building of the plantation must and will go on—for Virginia will be another phoenix.

Printed in Susan Myra Kingsbury's *Records of the Virginia Company of London*, along with the Waterhouse piece and other statements by the Company, are scores of letters which show at least a tinge of promotion or antipromotion, and certainly preserve a great deal of factual detail. Among the more interesting in stouthearted courage and wise withholding of judgment are the letters of the learned Pierre Arundell (or Erondelle), former popular French teacher and translator for Hakluyt, at that time a colonist in Elizabeth City county in Virginia at Buckroe, who is not uncritical of local and home management, but urges, "Lett them every one, zealous to increase the Church of God, by propagating the Gospell, and to augmente the greatenes and glorie of his King & country lay his helping handes to this Christian, and ever famous action."⁷²

The dissolution of the Virginia Company in 1624 and the plantation's "reversion" to the Crown did not mean a loss of interest in the colony, but it did mean that as a crown province it would not be advertised in the same way in which the joint-stock company, as a business enterprise, had declared its marvels and its opportunities. In fact, by 1626, Virginia had largely passed out of the first, or elementary phase, of propaganda litera-

ture. But accounts of discovery, tales of the Northwest Passage to India, individual planters' (as William Byrd's) advertising for settlers for his personal estates, continued to be among the forms of writing which included more than a little promotional quality. And the general promotional tract did not entirely disappear.

A few more early Virginia accounts of discovery deserve at least some mention, though several of them will be considered in later chapters in other connections. In 1631 Captain Henry Fleet, apparently a cousin of Sir Francis Wyatt and a man who had been in Virginia as early as 1621, arrived in the Chesapeake with a trading ship. He kept a fairly lively "Journal" concerning his traffic with the Indians of the region of the Potomac now within the District of Columbia. The fur trade, the tribes of the region, and physical conditions fill most of a manuscript written to entertain Fleet's friends back in England.⁷³

More exciting is *A Voyage to Virginia* (c. 1650),⁷⁴ by Henry Norwood, a kinsman of Sir William Berkeley, who set sail for Virginia in mid-September 1649 aboard *The Virginia Merchant* along with a full shipload of would-be colonists bound for Jamestown. His vivid record of shipwrecks, cannibalism, kind Indians, and hospitable planters includes elements as gruesome as one finds in Edgar Poe's *Narrative of A. Gordon Pym*. He describes voyage and storm and shipwreck off the Delmarva peninsula in probably the best sea tale—and a true one—of the seventeenth century. As the leader of the shipwrecked remnant, he brought his people from islands and sand shoals to mainland, through semistarvation and unscrupulous greed (with the resulting cannibalism) to friendly aborigines (noting that he remembered Indian words from having read John Smith's travels in these parts) and to their king and queen and finally to Argall Yeardley's plantation, where in Yeardley's Netherlands-born wife, a Custis, he found an old childhood friend. In a brief time he crossed the Bay and found himself among such notables as the Wormeleys and Ludwells, who received him cordially. Aggressive yet self-disparaging, for he entertained no illusions about himself, Norwood displays just what qualities it took to survive such ordeals in mid-seventeenth-century Virginia.

Norwood's is the story of a cavalier who, despairing of his fate in England, sought Virginia with others of his political way of thinking. *A Voyage* is probably our best literary or documentary evidence that during the Commonwealth men of station, along with others almost surely affiliated politically with them, sought escape in the South. They found, of course, or at least Norwood did, Berkeleys and Chicheleys and Ludwells who were as royalist as they, and who in some sense still ruled in Virginia. In a short time Norwood was back in England, in 1654 was appointed by the exiled Charles II treasurer of Virginia, and in 1661 received for his private use

the Virginia quitrents concomitant with his earlier appointment as well as other royal favors. The rest of his life as a military officer was full of adventure, but he is to be remembered for this voyage of recovery and discovery, its marvels and its perils, all of which he recorded with a steady and vigorous pen and a mind full of the consciousness of God's providence. At times his account reminds one of William Byrd, at others of Defoe's Robinson Crusoe, though he is never as complacent as the one or as sanctimonious as the other. Howard Mumford Jones rightly calls his *A Voyage* "almost the first full-blooded adventure story in American literature." But though Norwood's whole intent is on survival, he incidentally gives more convincing evidence of the natural abundance of the Chesapeake paradise than does any promotion tract aimed at doing just that.

There were at least two genuine promotion pamphlets at mid-century, one of them voicing what is among the earliest possible colonial expressions of discontent with royal government. This was William Bullock's *Virginia Impartially Examined* (London, 1649),⁷⁵ by a man who had at least been in the colony. The author speculates on the reasons for the colony's slow progress, which he considers partly the economy (at home and in Virginia), partly politics, partly Indian hostility, and partly malicious slander. Bullock balances the censure, however, with an exaggerated picture of natural resources and of opportunity. He urges both free and indentured to venture thither. *A Perfect Description of Virginia* (London, 1649)⁷⁶ is a brief anonymous compilation, the first part allegedly sent directly from the colony. It is Cavalier rather than Roundhead in its leanings, for the Church of England establishment is described in favorable terms, and Sir William Berkeley's proposed journey across the mountains to discover a northwest passage is reviewed at some length, with emphasis on the benefits it may bring the Virginia planter.⁷⁷ This hodge-podge collection of data concludes with recent news of abundant crops and fruits, the first free school, and a list of fauna and flora.

Sir William Berkeley himself, after the restoration of the Stuarts, went to England as agent to plead the colonists' cause against the Navigation Act. Probably while on this mission he wrote *A Discourse and View of Virginia* (London, 1663),⁷⁸ an analysis of the land he had grown to love and was to live to fear. He begins with the usual description of the country and its products and defends the province against the charge that it is primarily the refuge of the lowly and the criminal. He grants that both sorts of men have helped to make Virginia, as they did ancient Rome: "But this is not all truth, for men of as good families as any Subjects in England have resided there, as the Percys, the Barkleys, the Wests, the Gages, the Throgmortons, Wyats, Digges, Chicheleys, Moldsworths, Morrisons, Kemps, and hundred others, which I forbear to name, lest I should

misherald them in the Catalogue." And he adds that "it is hope and a proposed end that quickens our industry, and bridles our intemperance . . . for we find there that if we will be provident and industrious for a year or two, we may provide for our Posterity for many Ages." He goes on to confess that there is the ever-present need of more able workmen, takes a blast at the tobacco one-crop system as the root of economic evil, notes the hampering of Virginia expansion by the creation of Maryland and what was to be Carolina (though he himself was to become a Proprietor), and concludes that though among the colonies the Barbadoes is now more useful in that it produces a variety of commodities, the future potential is all in favor of Virginia. Even younger brothers (of the gentry and nobility), he declares, need no longer be a burden, for a small money stake will set them up in Virginia on the road to wealth and distinction. Though his argument is centered in Virginia, it includes all colonial enterprise, with the implication that Great Britain should not kill the goose now laying its golden egg by discriminatory customs duties, for one-fourth of British wealth already comes from the American plantations. It may be hard for some to imagine the legendary colonial tyrant as a pioneer protestor against taxation, but such he appears here to be. Gallant but proud and rigid and perhaps untactful, he was generally unsuccessful in his plea.⁷⁹

During this second half of the seventeenth century Virginia officials and traders were responsible for a number of journeys of discovery into the interior. Both journeys and records are of some significance and of considerable interest. As already noted, Berkeley allegedly planned⁸⁰ a western expedition at least as early as 1649. The nearest he came to leading such an enterprise at this time was his authorization for the southern expedition of Edward Bland, Abraham Wood, Sackford Brewster, and Elias Pennant.⁸¹ This was a journey in a southwesterly direction, from Fort Henry at the falls of the Appamattox through the Virginia piedmont to the present site of Clarksville (at the juncture of the Dan and Staunton rivers). Though the explorers make it clear that the ground covered was already familiar to Indian traders, they thought it no longer a part of Virginia and named it "New Brittain." Bland wrote a brief account as *The Discovery of New Brittain Began August 27. Anno Dom. 1650 . . . From Fort Henry . . . to the Falls of Blandina* (London, 1651).⁸²

In November 1652 Captain Henry Fleet (noticed above) and Major Abraham Wood and associates were given monopolies in trade and choice of lands in any western regions where they explored. A Virginia Assembly order of July 1653 also permitted a body of gentlemen "to discover the Mountains." Their identity is undetermined, and the persistent colonial statement that Abraham Wood explored several branches of the Ohio and Mississippi between 1654 and 1664 cannot be or at least has not been

verified.⁸³ The date for the latter discovery should probably have been 1671–1674, when Wood's men did explore branches of the two rivers. There is record of authorization for a 1658 expedition, but nothing of results.⁸⁴ Actually John Lederer (c. 1644–after 1675), a German physician, was the first European to explore the Blue Ridge mountains and leave a record. His book made a great impression in England and on the continent. He helped to open the Indian Trading Path to the southwest for furs, impressed geographers with his sometimes erroneous descriptions of the southeast, and gave valuable comments on the Indians he encountered. As a human being he remains shadowy. His book, *The Discoveries of John Lederer In three several Marches from Virginia to the West of Carolina, And other parts of the Continent. . . . Together with a General Map* (London, 1672), was edited and translated from Latin by Sir William Talbot, Bart., secretary of the Province of Maryland.⁸⁵ Lederer had managed to get himself in the bad graces of some members of the second expedition who were powerful in the Virginia colony. Soon he moved to Maryland, taking his manuscript with him. He went to England for a year, 1674–1675, though Talbot had carried the manuscript to London some time before, as the date of publication indicates. Talbot dedicated the printed work to a Carolina proprietor, the later Earl of Shaftesbury, perhaps because Lederer seemed to show the long-sought route to the Indian ocean as leading through Carolina.

The "three several Marches" follow a general introduction on the topography of North America and some account of the Indians of western Virginia and Carolina, parts of the latter drawn from José de Acosta and perhaps John Smith. The first expedition carried Lederer from the York River at least to the top of the Blue Ridge; the second from the falls of the James in a general southerly direction to what he thought were the Appalachians but were actually South Carolina hills; the third from the Rapahannock at Robert Taliaferro's to the top of the Blue Ridge. One may call the first a personal reconnoiter, the second a series of reports of things he or his companion, Major Harris, thought they saw in places where they could not have seen them,⁸⁶ and the third a genuinely scientific journey (he was accompanied by the surveyor-mathematician Colonel John Catlett) with a good look into the Shenandoah Valley. The book concludes with conjectures as to the land beyond the mountains, instructions as to equipment and procedure for future explorers, and advice as to trade with the Indians.

Curiously and grossly inaccurate in places, Lederer's account represents what an educated man thought he saw. His descriptions of the Indians are demonstrably accurate, and he showed southerners once and for all that their mountains could be climbed and crossed. His search for a passage

to the China Sea, the will-of-the-wisp of a Northwest Passage, he modified as he proceeded but never relinquished. He was a fine topographer who was able to shape his own observations and Indian hearsay into an anticipation of the true vastness of the American continent. Probably he was backed by Berkeley, and equally probably he was resented by Virginia planters who did not relish a non-Englishman's leading their first real expeditions to the West. It was along the routes Lederer describes and followed during his first two journeys that the hundred-mule caravans of William Byrd I and others soon followed, or had already travelled.⁸⁷

Very soon after the third Lederer expedition, plans were being made to push farther west. On September 1, 1671, under the auspices of Abraham Wood of the 1650 southwesterly journey, the first recorded English expedition to reach the headwaters of the Mississippi filed out from near Fort Henry. It consisted of Captain Thomas Batts, Robert Fallam, and Thomas Wood, the last probably a kinsman of Abraham Wood, accompanied by a former indentured servant and an Appomattox chief. Fallam kept the journal of the expedition. Their commission was for locating a path of "discovery of the South Sea." Their route led somewhat west-southwest touching near the present city of Roanoke, then to the New River valley, and on to Peters' Mountain in Giles County, back to New River, and return. They thought they had seen a fog and a glimmer of water which might be the western sea.⁸⁸ The next recorded major expedition is that to the present state of Tennessee. Not only is Abraham Wood again involved, but his letter to John Richards of London is our document of the exploration.⁸⁹ Richards, treasurer for the Lords Proprietors of Carolina, had been in Virginia. Wood's letter passed to the Earl of Shaftesbury, and then to his secretary, John Locke, who annotated it. Published first in this century, it is a significant account of exploration. Wood tells of his sending out on April 10, 1673, a party of two Englishmen and eight Indians with supplies for three months. The white explorers were James Needham, former gentleman freeholder in South Carolina, and Gabriel Arthur, an illiterate but ingenious young man who was probably an indentured servant of Wood. After one abortive start, they followed the trading trails into the Carolina Blue Ridge, crossed this first chain of mountains, and after traversing a luxuriant valley saw the fogs which give the Great Smokies their name. A visit to the Cherokees was followed by Needham's murder by an Occaneechi Indian. Young Arthur was saved by a Cherokee chief and participated in forays by that chief's people on Florida Spanish missions, was captured by Shawnees, escaped hostile Occaneechis, and reached Fort Henry June 18, 1674.

Thus ends the first cluster of narratives of true inland exploration. A real frontier class was developing, ranging in wealth and power from

Wood and the Byrds to indentured servants employed by them. Needham opened the Cherokee trade to the Virginians and allied that nation to the English interest. The written accounts indicate primarily economic motives behind all these expeditions, but the writers almost always had eyes for the curious and picturesque. Most interestingly, they offer evidence that even on grounds of priority of discovery the southern Americans of English origin had as much right to the lands to the Mississippi if not the whole northern Mississippi basin as did the French. Not only was Abraham Wood a great and unappreciated founder of English dominion in Carolina and Virginia; he was also a natural raconteur. He and his friends and contemporaries mixed visions of far seas and tropical islands in the West with practical observations on topography and red men which they could turn to immediate and real economic purposes.

There are a few other documents of a promotional nature in the later seventeenth century, some concerned with Virginia and others with both the Chesapeake colonies. Thomas Glover, who had been a "chirurgion" for many years in Virginia, published "An Account of Virginia, its Situation, Temperature, Productions, Inhabitants and their manner of planting and ordering tobacco" in the *Philosophical Transactions* of the Royal Society of June 20, 1676.⁹⁰ He describes curious fish, a precious stone from the bed of a river, rattlesnakes, and the mockingbird. The accounts of the Indians and of tobacco planting are not unusual. And not especially interesting is Cuthbert Potter's "Journall and Narrative of a Journey . . . from Virginia to New England" (1690).⁹¹ Most of the significant letters not already mentioned belong to areas other than colonization and discovery. Present-state-of-the-colony reports except for those expanded or developed into what may be called genuine history are largely still in manuscript, though many were printed in abstract form in British and Virginia state papers. The others worth noticing deal with both Virginia and Maryland and will be considered with the writings of the latter colony. And some of the many reports concerning Bacon's Rebellion (1676-1677) are discussed below with history and the major historians.

Most of the early Maryland colonization tracts will be dealt with later for the light they shed on religion and religious tolerance or intolerance in Maryland. But this province, first settled in 1634 as a proprietary belonging to Lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic, had its promotion literature some time before the first colonist set his foot upon its shore and for some time afterwards, though perhaps in quantity less than any other southern colony. This literature was perhaps also less exaggerated and more specific in its appeals than that of other southern settlements.⁹² Two major facts were to affect the nature of its earliest promotional writing: it was the first

proprietary colony of the original thirteen later to form the United States, and its owner's particular religious faith was not Protestant.

Its charter (apparently of 1632—grant of June 30) from Charles I is, like the three charters of the Virginia Company of London, something of a promotional tract. Its owner looked upon Maryland, not as a London business venture in organization, but as a grant made within the conventional rights of the landed class to which he belonged. Maryland was to be a "county palatine" with authority vested in the Proprietor equal to that held by the Bishop of Durham, really the greatest degree of independent authority consistent with allegiance to the King. Though apparently it was never intended as a purely Catholic colony (neither Baltimore nor Charles I would have dared to make it so had he wished), there rose immediately the problem of allaying Protestant suspicion by an effective series of promotion pamphlets offering inducements the Virginia Company had been unable, or unwilling, to offer.⁹³ The result was that the most significant group of promotion pieces appeared in close proximity, during the 1630 decade.

Probably the earliest of these is the royal charter just noted, which seems to have been printed as part of a larger and more inclusive propaganda piece, *A Relation of Maryland*, in 1635.⁹⁴ The charter says little directly of religion except that it be Christian, but its allegedly liberal land provisions, its fairly liberal trading privileges, and the immediate permission to establish a general assembly indicate that the royal government (and Lord Baltimore) had learned at least something from the mistakes of the early years of the Virginia settlement. The modern reader's first impression of the charter may be that it is, above all, designed to protect the proprietor's interest and to emphasize a unified power, but upon reflection he will realize that this delegated despotism might seem also an assurance if not a guarantee of security to the potential emigrant.

Though there seems no way of determining the proportion of Roman Catholics and Protestants settling in Maryland in 1634, most of the literature of the period was authored by Catholic priests. The major name among the writers is that of Father Andrew White, S.J., who was apparently the author of several tracts, some of which do not bear his name.⁹⁵ He was almost surely (since it is made up of material officially attributed to him in a later form) the author of the first genuine come-hither pamphlet, *A Declaration of the Lord Baltemore's Plantation in Maryland. Wherein is set forth how Englishmen may become Angels* (probably printed March 1633, new style).⁹⁶ The material of this tract is that of the better-known *A Relation of the Colony of the Lord Baron of Baltimore, in Maryland*, found in Latin in 1832 in the Jesuit Archives in Rome by Father William McSherry, and since published several times with varying titles in English

and Latin.⁹⁷ *A Declaration* is an early English version, perhaps the earliest, published in London as advertising. The Latin form of this "Declaratio" was also intended as special pleading, to secure from the General of the Society of Jesus approval for sending a Jesuit mission to Maryland with Baltimore's first settlers. In both versions its religious zeal and easy style are among its distinctions.

Close kin in material is *A Relation of the successfull beginnings of the Lord Baltimore's Plantation in Mary-Land* (London, 1634).⁹⁸ The most inclusive of the early tracts, a sort of prospectus, is *A Relation of Maryland; Together, With a Map of the Countrey, The Conditions of Plantation, His Majesties Charter to the Lord Baltemore . . .* (London, Sept. 8, 1635). This is one of the most elaborate promotion tracts prepared for any American colony. Among its features not fully indicated in the title are a brief account of the 1634 settlement, a fairly full description of the country, the promise of abundant rewards for industry, outline of a generous Indian policy, and details for would-be emigrants taken almost verbatim from Smith's *Generall Historie*. All the above tracts attributed to White are written with a certain dignity and quiet force and with literary grace, at least in English versions.

For a long time *A Relation* was considered the last of the first-generation promotion pieces, but about 1923 another pamphlet, which had grown out of the struggle between Proprietary and Parliamentary parties, was discovered. For in 1646 Lord Baltimore had issued *A Moderate and Safe Expedient*, both a defense of his government and a plea for enactment of laws making it easier for Roman Catholics to sell their estates in England and remove to Maryland. Though not written in the colony, it sprang out of Maryland politics. It may have been written by Father Blount, who was English Provincial in 1633.⁹⁹

Thus ended on a religious note what may be called the first period of promotion writing in and for Maryland. It included a considerable quantity of travel and discovery narrative, and much of the potential of the new province. It was accompanied by a fair number of front-line despatches or state-of-the-colony reports, such as the annual letters to the English Province of the Society of Jesus, which are concerned with proselytizing whites and converting Indians but contain other interesting detail. Then there were Governor Leonard Calvert's account of piracy and of his expedition against William Claiborne at Kent Island. These preceded 1640. Between 1653 and 1655 appeared a series of polemical, bristling arguments, partly political but social and above all religious in origin, which reflect the troubles of the Proprietor as he strove to preserve his domain under the Commonwealth. These accusations and counteraccusations, alleged affronts and insults, and even some stories of skirmishing, are considered

in Chapter VI. They indicate a number of things about Maryland in the period, chief among them being the insufferable bigotry and intolerance of the Puritan element to whom Lord Baltimore had offered haven a few years before.

Maryland during the second half of the seventeenth century continued, contrary to some historians, to produce some promotion literature, albeit all of it has other striking qualities which have caused its propagandistic function to be overlooked or understressed. Two concern both of the Chesapeake Bay colonies. Nathaniel Shrigley, who claimed he had been in this part of America, issued in London in 1669 *A True Relation of Virginia and Mary-land; With the Commodities therein*, a brief, tabular presentation of the wild and cultivated products of the two colonies, stressing the variety and abundance of nature. He concludes with the observation that "their Religion is free to all that profess to believe in Jesus Christ." More significant in every way is John Hammond's *Leah and Rachel; or, the Two Fruitful Sisters Virginia and Mary-Land* (London, 1656),¹⁰⁰ a much longer account written by a man who had spent nineteen years in the elder and two in the younger colony. Possibly like Norwood a military man, Hammond (fl. 1640-1660) gradually assumed what may be called an American point of view. He spent the greater space on Virginia, not only because he had lived there longer but because he rightly felt that opportunities and living conditions in the two provinces were much the same. In tracing Virginia's progress he was anti-Company and proroyal government in outlook, and incidentally did some of the earliest evaluating of that colony's history. And in depicting Maryland he was pro-Proprietary and anti-Puritan-Roundhead. Richard Bennett and William Claiborne, Virginians who had joined the Puritan Maryland forces though at least the latter had previously had strong royalist affiliations, were to Hammond ungrateful scoundrels. Hammond had had to flee Maryland for his life, and after a stay in Virginia had returned to England to publish his account.

Though politics is a major element of *Leah and Rachel*, the little book is a labor of love and of patriotism of a new kind, an identification with the colonies in which the author had lived and to which he planned to return. He depicts the Chesapeake region not as a paradise but rather as a land of opportunity (despite what he rightly felt was a temporary troubled situation in Maryland), and he offers all classes of Englishmen a guide as to how they can get there and what they will find. Indentured servants or free yeomen or gentlemen, they will find its very air invigorating after the burdensome rural or degrading—and smoky—urban life of England. He cites opportunities for women in domestic work and in marriage, for indentured servants in building a modest fortune for themselves even before

they complete their terms of servitude, and for the criminal or jailbird the chance to begin again. Every class enjoys greater recreational time and facilities than they can ever experience at home. He emphasizes Virginia's openhanded hospitality, a trait which was to grow into a southern tradition.

In characteristic promotional fashion Hammond declares that the two colonies enlarge England's glory and that the lying calumnies heaped upon both areas must be refuted. He omits geographical description, already well done many times. But he is specific as to those who should emigrate and how they must proceed. He notes that ordinary Londoners dress and live in a "condition . . . far below [that of] the meanest servant in Virginia." He concludes with the ring of sincerity: "I know of no country (although I have travelled many) that I more affect, more esteem . . . in a few words, it is that Country in which I desire to spend the remnant of my dayes, in which I covert [covet?] to make my grave."¹⁰¹ Here is the promise of and the affection for this southern part of North America which has been voiced by later natives down through Thomas Wolfe and William Faulkner.

Perhaps George Alsop (b. 1638) was one of the Englishmen Hammond's pamphlet reached, for Alsop arrived in Maryland as an indentured servant in 1658, possibly for political reasons. He too was a good royalist, and after the Restoration made his way back to England. In London in 1666 he published *A Character of the Province of Mary-land: Wherein is Described . . . The Scituation and plenty of the Province . . . The Laws, Customs, and natural Demeanor of the Inhabitant . . . The worst and best Usage of a Mary-land Servant . . . The Traffique, and vendable Commodities of the Countrey. Also a small Treatise on the wilde and naked Indians . . . their Customs, Manners, Absurdities, & Religion.*¹⁰² This garrulous, droll, ribald, amusing, and instructive book is *sui generis*, as much so as any American book of the century. Early critics condemned its coarseness and curious whimsicality; more recent readers applaud it for the same and other traits. Dedicated to Lord Baltimore, who may have paid the former indentured servant for writing so favorable an account of his proprietary at a crucial time, it is a mixture of straight descriptive promotional material concerning the opportunities and physical attractions of the province, of interesting verses at the ends of chapters and elsewhere to emphasize various points, of humorous asides, and finally of letters written at sea or from Maryland to relatives and friends. The epistles also include some of Alsop's better poems. His prose more clearly represents his idiosyncratic character. After one panegyric on Trade, the author abruptly pulls himself up short: "But stop (good Muse) lest I should, like the Parson of Pancras, run so far from my Text in half an hour, that a two hours trot back again would hardly fetch it up." A good Church of Eng-

land man who admits his province's tolerance of most sects, he notes: "The Adamites, Ranters, and Fift-Monarchy men, Mary-land cannot, nay will not digest within her liberal stomach such corroding morsels: So that this Province is an utter Enemy to blasphemous and zealous Imprecations, drain'd from the Lymbeck of hellish and damnable Spirits, as well as profuse prophaness, that issues from the prodigality of none but crack-brain Sots."

Sometimes too obviously under the influence of contemporary British modes in style, Alsop is also vigorous, satiric, learned. He may be part of a satiric tradition developing in the South during the next century, and his poetry has several qualities of interest which will be pointed out in later chapters. Not so consciously American as Hammond, he joins the latter in celebrating the same virtues of the land he advertises, and he shows an interest in the Indian already becoming traditional in southern American writing. But perhaps he is at his best when he is fulfilling the announced intention of his tract—praise of the province. Here, incidentally, he gives an early illustration of another American literary trait:

The Trees, Plants, Fruits, Flowers, and Roots that grow here in Maryland, are the only Emblems or Hieroglyphicks of our Adamitical or Primitive situation, as well for their variety as odoriferous smells, together with their virtues, according to their several effects, kinds and properties, which still bear the Effigies of Innocency according to their original Grafts; which by their dumb vegetable Oratory, each hour speake to the Inhabitant in silent acts, That they need not look for any other Terrestrial Paradise, to suspend or tyre their curiosity upon, while she is extant. For within her dwell so much of variety, so much of natural plenty, that there is not any thing that is or may be rare, but it inhabits within this plentiful soyle.¹⁰³

Descriptions of various aspects of Maryland life continued throughout the seventeenth century and indeed to the Stamp Act period. In unofficial letters, sermons, and Quaker autobiographies one continues to learn much of what Maryland was. But one learns much more from official letters, governors' and proprietors' reports, and acts of the Assembly—probably the best-preserved and best-printed records of any southern colony in the *Archives* series. Some of these are deliberately and some incidentally promotion writing or accounts of discovery but the vastly larger proportion displays the Maryland mind in other aspects—political, scientific, educational, and economic.

THE CAROLINAS IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Though the literature of discovery and promotion in the Carolinas follows in general outline that of Virginia and Maryland, it also presents

some striking differences. Forms of government and kinds of people appealed to are obvious reasons for distinctions. But these later southern colonies (for a generation legally one province) had learned from the experiences of their elders, and they consciously tried to avoid some of these elders' mistakes and to profit by their successes. "Commodity," or the mercantilist side of colonization, the exploitation of native products, had always been a portion of the appeal of the Chesapeake pamphlet; but in the Carolinas it became the major appeal, especially when combined with the alluring prospect of fortunes made by trade with the Indians in the interior of the continent. Naval stores (pitch, tar, and pine masts) were to be had here for the taking more easily than anywhere else on earth, their pamphlets insisted, and the trade with the red man for furs was even more lucrative. And they called attention to the constant stream of other raw materials also pouring from their hitherto untapped resources.

The warmer climate and fertile soil of the coastal low country seemed indeed to promise an Eden such as hard experience had proved Virginia and Maryland might never become. Cotton, silk (the perennial southern colonial dream), rice, and indigo all flourished or seemed to, and there were dreams of citrus and other subtropical plant culture. Land offers, both as to size of plot and conditions of obtaining, were relatively generous even at the beginning, and the size of the tracts grew larger as time passed and the lands were farther removed from the relative security of the coastal settlements.

Fewer permanent planters sent back to London their observations to be printed as come-hither pamphlets. There were plenty of firsthand observers among the writers, though in many instances their letters or other comments were absorbed into official or semiofficial publications put together in Great Britain. Then the nature of the governments of the Carolinas differed sharply from those of the Chesapeake colonies. Virginia's history of joint-stock company and then royal province, and Maryland's of single-proprietor rule, were not paralleled by Carolina's eight-proprietor colony organized quite soon into a peculiar kind of joint-stock company. Though eventually the Carolinas were to have the Church of England as the established religion, that church was never in a clear majority. In fact, many of the proprietors were dissenters or had strong dissenting connections. Socio-religious politics color a great many of the promotion pamphlets.

Two of the greatest English thinkers of the century 1660-1760 had a part in producing Carolina promotion literature, John Locke in the *Fundamental Constitutions* having political structuring as his chief aim, and Daniel Defoe in *Party-Tyranny* attempting a political defense of Carolina dissenters. The Carolinians tried to use their Constitutions and Char-

ters as propaganda even more than Virginia and Maryland had employed theirs and, one must admit, with less apparent reason, for the elaborate hierarchy or system of nobility set up by Locke could have appealed only to a few. Since religious toleration such as even Maryland did not know was a principle of the Carolina proprietors, they were able to appeal to the refugees from or the oppressed of many continental nations and to certain non-British elements in England. Huguenots both before and after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes were appealed to in French and English, two or three pamphlets were printed in Dublin to entice Irishmen (apparently Protestant ones), and Scotch-Irish and Highland Scots were courted successfully in various ways, as were Scandinavians, Dutch, Germans, and Swiss in South Carolina alone. The Carolinas attracted Quakers and a few New England Puritans, though the settlements of these were often only semipermanent. There was of course a large segment of Englishmen in both colonies. The majority of the pamphlets were printed in London, in most instances for English consumption. More important here, almost all of them appear to have been written by men of English birth, though there are a few notable Scottish exceptions.

Their writing, whether of promotion or discovery or present-state conditions, is colored by their enormous interest in and contact with the hinterland. It was probably in the Carolinas, especially South Carolina, that the first real thrust west, the course of manifest destiny, came in America. There was constant association with the Indian, trading for furs in his own country, bringing him to visit the Great White Father in Charleston or Brunswick or elsewhere, and bargaining with him for land. Some of this activity appears openly in accounts of discovery or invitations to settle (in the latter case as reassurance), and much more is implicit in the accounts which deal ostensibly with the economic and social and political actions of the colonists among or between themselves.

Also avowed or implicit, as suggested above, is the belief in or hope for a southern utopia. Various promoters again called attention to the fact that Palestine and the Land of Canaan and the supposed site of the Garden of Eden were along the same parallel as the middle of North Carolina. Some explorers named rivers for biblical streams that were supposed to border the Garden of Eden. William Byrd was not merely punning on the name of a Carolina governor when he called his holdings in that province the Land of Eden. Mingled in all this is of course southern hedonism, which, with love of the land and affinity for religion combined with a certain kind of tough materialism (here primarily mercantilism), went to make these deeper-South writings direct intellectual and artistic ancestors of modern southern literary expression.

Carolina promotion-discovery writing really begins some time before

the colony (later colonies) was chartered, with three 1649 descriptions of the country, two of them ostensibly of Virginia, but not one by a person who had been in America. William Bullock's *Virginia Impartially Examined*, discussed above, includes a separate description of the Roanoke Island area based on Lane, Hariot, and Smith. A recently discovered newspaper notice appeared in *The Moderate Intelligencer* (April 26–May 2, 1649) concerning a "Gentleman going over Governour into Carolana in America" with several accompanying families.¹⁰⁴ It notes that the place is not so hot as the Barbadoes (from which a little later many future Carolinians were to migrate) nor as cold as Virginia. As Professor Lefler points out, this plan to settle a government in the Albemarle Sound region, when Carolina was still considered by most (despite the Heath patent of 1629) a part of Virginia, is at least interesting. The third piece of the year, *A Perfect Description of Virginia . . . Also, A Narration of the Country within a few dayes journey of Virginia, West and by South, where people come to trade; being related to the Governour . . .* (London), includes a report by John Pory on the exploration of the Chowan River region.

In 1650 appeared two editions of Edward Williams' *Virgo Triumphans; or, Virginia richly and truly valued; more especially the South part thereof: viz. The fertile Carolana, and no lesse excellent Isle of Roanoke. . . . Humbly presented as the Auspice of a beginning Yeare, To the Parliament of England, and Councel of State* (London).¹⁰⁵ Stating twelve advantages to be gained by settling the south parts of Virginia, the author includes all the old reasons for settlement, adding that this is the most estimable part of America, as Sir Walter Raleigh claimed long before. Williams cites Lane, Hariot, Pory, and Sir William Berkeley as sources of information. Virginia is compared with Persia and China, and in the second edition in a supplement he asks and most eloquently answers the question why this "South of Virginia" is to be preferred over the North.

Edward Bland's *Discovery of New Brittain* (1651) noted above¹⁰⁶ traces a journey into upper North Carolina and was probably accompanied by a map of the same date. R[oger] G[reen]'s *Virginia's Cure*, primarily a religio-political pamphlet considered in Chapter VI, mentions the author's land grant in North Carolina and describes the boundaries of Virginia. In this instance the author had been in America. The land and inhabitants of eastern North Carolina are also described in Virginian Francis Yeardley's letter to England of his explorations in 1654.¹⁰⁷

Charters covering the territory now composing the two Carolinas go back as far as Sir Humphrey Gilbert in 1578 and include the three charters of the Virginia Company of London and the grant to Sir Robert Heath in 1629 before they came to the first official grant to the Proprietors of March 24, 1663.¹⁰⁸ This last, as well as a revised charter of June 30, 1665, and

a "Concessions and Agreement" document between the Lords Proprietors and Major William Yeamans and others of January 7, 1665, tells a great deal about the powers of the owners, the boundaries of the colonies, and the plans for government and territorial divisions; but one doubts they were of much use or were even known in detail to many persons other than those named within them. The Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina, which survive in at least five or six versions dated between 1669 and 1698, are, however, of much more significance as public proclamations of the nature and ownership of the plantation. By not later than 1670 printed copies were in circulation.¹⁰⁹ Almost always considered to be the work of John Locke while he was secretary to Lord Shaftesbury, a major proprietor, and usually included in Locke's works, there now seems reason to think that several proprietors had a hand in the composition, with Locke and Shaftesbury as the principal authors.¹¹⁰ This "Grand Model" provided a governmental, a social, and an economic system for the province with the same Bishop-of-Durham clause the Maryland charter contains. It was usually termed a feudal manorial system, including a provincial hierarchy primarily of nobility (landgraves and caciques), the next level of freemen, then the leetmen (tenants of noblemen and other lords of manors who were bound to the land like medieval serfs), and below them the slaves (bound to their masters but not to the land). Counties, a palatine's court and lower courts, a grand council, a general assembly, and municipal officers were elements of the organization. Thus the Fundamental Constitutions provided for a form of government such as the Proprietors intended to create, not such as already existed.

Never fully or largely implemented, the Constitutions' effect in the development of the Carolinas is difficult to assess. Leetmen were never bound to the land save by their own volition, and serfdom never developed, nor did a landed nobility. Governmental agencies for many decades, however, show the influence of the "Grand Model," and the General Assembly did not for a long time develop the power and independence it held in Virginia and Maryland. What did develop from it, especially in South Carolina, and much more quickly than its parallel in the Chesapeake Bay country, was a social system of large-scale planters who also formed and controlled its economic and ultimately much of its political system. Surviving records in both colonies and in London indicate that a good deal of violence and confusion resulted from attempts to enforce the laws or simply from their existence. The question remains as to whether the Fundamental Constitutions hindered or slowed immigration. Curiously, there is little or no evidence that they did. Gentlemen of substance at home hoped to profit by them in the form of grants of land and the social prestige of titles. The ordinary freeman appears to have taken for granted that his

liberties would be protected here as in other colonies. Any who might be skeptical of due respect for individual rights might, like the Highland Scots several generations later who moved inland as rapidly as possible from the Cape Fear region, seek territories almost if not entirely beyond the reach of potential seignorial oppression. Later seventeenth-century promotion-exploration literature takes little notice of the Fundamental Constitutions, nor of the rebellions, inept governments, and failing settlements which marked the years before 1689 in the North Carolina area at least. South Carolina had its problems too, in its case alleviated in the years between 1670 and 1682 as the influential settlers from the Barbadoes gradually rose to leadership and control in the colony.

During this whole period of attempt to establish a government stable enough to support a profitable economy, occasional publications on Carolina appeared. Just five months after Charles II granted his original charter to the Lords Proprietors, William Hilton of Barbadoes led an expedition to Carolina, exploring the coast in the Port Royal and Cape Fear regions especially. In *A Relation of a Discovery Lately Made on the Coast of Florida . . . Together with Proposals made by the Commissioners of the Lords Proprietors, to all such persons as shall become the first settler on the Rivers, Harbors, and Creeks there* (London, 1664),¹¹¹ Hilton traces his travels, including encounters with Indians, and gives pleasant details of their way of living and of natural abundance in animals and plants. He is writing, he says, to counteract the false reports in disparagement of the region, especially Cape Fear, written by certain "New-England-men."¹¹² The "Proposals" in conclusion are indeed enticing; they include generous allotments of land for almost any sort or condition of newcomer, the quantity dependent upon his age and contribution to the settlement of a town. Item XVI specifically grants to freeholders the privilege of an annual assembly to enact their own laws, immunity from customs, and liberty of conscience in religion. This religious freedom guaranteed obliquely in the Fundamental Constitutions and explicitly in these "Proposals" was almost surely more an enticement for dissenters than an expression of the Proprietors' generous purposes, despite the fact that there were dissenters among these owners. The result of the "Proposals" was not unnaturally the establishment of former Barbadians at Cape Fear, though for a complexity of reasons they abandoned their settlement three years later. How many settlers Hilton's work persuaded to come from England is less certain, but the vital statistics in the colonial records would indicate that this first real Carolina advertising pamphlet had also its influence in the England in which it had been printed.

In 1666, the year before the failure of the first Cape Fear project, appeared what may be the most significant of all early Carolina tracts. This

was *A Brief Description of the Province of Carolina On the Coasts of Florida* (London, 1666),¹¹³ printed at the suggestion of the Proprietors. Perhaps written by Robert Horne, this pamphlet reviews the Proprietors' promises to those who "shall go thither"—from England, Virginia, Bermuda, Barbadoes, or New England—to commission one as governor, and to permit self-government, the usual freedom of worship and exemption from customs, and quite liberal terms for land acquisition. Interesting are the other inducements, of soil and air and timber, though they are hardly new. As in earlier Virginia, they solicited younger brothers and unmarried women under fifty. It is a good piece of advertising, but in subject hardly American or Carolinian.

In the same year a former Barbadian who had settled at Charles Town on the Cape Fear River sent his account of his voyage of discovery to Port Royal to seek more suitable places for settlement. *A Relation of a Voyage on the Coast of the Province of Carolina*, by Robert Sandford, was addressed to the Proprietors and was not published until the nineteenth century.¹¹⁴ It is a good voyage narrative, describing not only Port Royal but the site on the river Ashley (which Sandford says he named) for the future permanent Charles Towne or Charleston. Included is a good deal about the Indians, with whom one of the party, Dr. Henry Woodward, of whom more below, elected to remain. The manuscript concludes with a testimonial signed by six gentleman companions of Sandford extolling the territory surveyed. Thus, as the promotion tract had always done, Sandford combined valuable data of exploration with strong recommendations for settlement.

John Ogilby's *America* (London, 1671), one of the first major assessments of the whole of the New World, contains a chapter, "Carolina," seemingly drawn from new sources with an occasional hint that the author knew the Horne tract. It is a glowing promotional piece concluding with a summary of the Fundamental Constitutions, but there is no evidence of the author's personal contact with America. Richard Blome as publisher, in *A Description of the Island of Jamaica; With the other Isles and Territories in America, to which the English are Related* (London, 1672), brought together present-state reports of governors and other officials in an up-to-date account, which devotes nine pages to "A Description of Carolina," including extensive quotations from John Lederer, though Lederer's book appeared the same year. Blome's work also is laudatory and by a person who had never visited the British colonies. He mentions the two prosperous settlements in existence on the Albemarle and Ashley rivers. Incidentally, one should recall that Lederer's recounting of his explorations, noted above in connection with Virginia, were probably read also for the details of Carolina topography and resources they contained.¹¹⁵

More revelatory of the thinking and observation of the colonist on the ground than Ogilby or Blome is the long letter of the Dr. Henry Woodward mentioned above, *A Faithful Relation of my Westoe Voyage*, addressed to the Earl of Shaftesbury and describing the "chirurgion's" journey with members of the Westo tribes from Charles Towne to their home territories. The letter was not printed until a century ago;¹¹⁶ it is significant principally as early evidence of the potentialities of the Charleston trade with the interior, with incidental contributions to Indian lore. Deerskins, furs, and young slaves (red men captured by the Westoes in war) were the trading profits of the expedition. Woodward was a far-sighted, practical, generally intelligent man who was the father of the Indian-trade side of Carolina mercantilism.

Two descriptive tracts appeared in French, addressed to Huguenots and perhaps Dutch Protestants. *Description du Pays nommé Caroline*, apparently published in London in 1679, is a brief and simple explanation clearly intended to interest French Protestants. Slightly more elaborate is the second chapter in Charles César de Rochefort's *Recit De L'Estat Present Des Celebres Colonies De la Virginia . . . Carolina* (Rotterdam, 1681), which devotes four paragraphs to the excellent colony of Carolina and insists that foreigners there will have the same freedom and franchise as Englishmen. It concentrates on the Ashley-Cooper settlement, ignoring the rest of the Carolinas.¹¹⁷

Between 1680 and 1689, after the present site of Charleston had been settled, the Proprietors undertook an intensive publicity campaign, during which at least ten promotional tracts and a number of scattered notices appeared.¹¹⁸ In one year alone four or five were published. T[homas] A[sh]'s *Carolina; or a Description of the Present State of that Country and the Natural Excellencies thereof* (London, 1682) was written by the clerk on board a vessel sent to ascertain and report on conditions in the colony. Ash reviews briefly the colony's history and expatiates on wild and cultivated plants and on animals. He is at his best in describing what was to the Englishman exotic, as the opossum, the hummingbird, and the firefly. He also may be noting the making of the first corn whiskey. His descriptions are worth quoting.¹¹⁹ He is down-to-earth, acutely observant, and sympathetic. R[obert] F[erguson]'s *The Present State of Carolina with Advice to the Settlers* (London, 1682) is by a friend of Shaftesbury who was the author of many religious and political tracts and claims that he writes from personal observations and reliable authority. It is in many respects similar to the T.A. account above, but brings in slavery probably for the first time and devotes more space to the Indians. At the end it mentions Nathan Somers, an "engineer," who will clear land for cultivation at a set price. Somers himself published a broadside, *Proposals for Clearing*

Land in Carolina [and other colonies] (London, 1682), describing the method he proposed to follow. *A true Description of Carolina* (London, 1682), is a brief anonymous account valuable principally for its map, probably the most accurate outline of the southern coast so far to appear. Its text is almost verbatim from R.F.'s *Present State*. Certainly best known and perhaps most valuable is *An Account of the Province of Carolina in America* (London, 1682), by Samuel Wilson, secretary to the Proprietors. Wilson avers that he can document with letters anything he has claimed for the province. Though he mentions the Albemarle colony, he devotes most of his attention to the Ashley River settlement. To the old inducements he adds natural fodder for cattle and little need of clothing for slaves. His claims for wine and olive oil were of course to prove exaggerated.

In 1683 John Crafford, a supercargo on a ship from Scotland to Port Royal, described his voyage and the country he visited in *A New and Most Exact Account of the Fertile and Famous Colony of Carolina* (Dublin). He may have written to appeal to Scottish, Scotch-Irish, or Irish potential emigrants, but he gives only the usual comments with some emphasis on the future of Bermuda-Carolina trade. Another Dublin-printed tract is *Carolina Described more fully than heretofore* (1684), which takes Wilson to task for inaccurate or misleading statements, though in the end it encourages emigration and lists the schedule of vessels from five Irish ports. Another 1684 piece is Walter Gibson's *Proposals* (Glasgow?), a broadside appealing to the Scots to remove to Carolina. And to the end of the century Carolina continued to be advertised in such publications as [Nathaniel Crouch's] *The English Empire in America* (London, 1685); [Richard Blome's] *The Present State of His Majesties Isles and Territories in America* (London, 1687); and [John Peachie's] *Some Observations upon the Herb Cassiny; Imported from Carolina; Showing Its Admirable Virtues in Curing the Small Pox. Written by a Physitian in the Country to Esq: Boyle at London* (London, 1695).

THE FIVE COLONIES IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Promotion literature *per se*, and even accounts of exploration, became much less frequent in the eighteenth century for the four now established southern colonies. South Carolina within two decades became a royal province, and in 1729 North Carolina was purchased from the Proprietors by the Crown. Maryland, which had one fairly brief royal period, was returned to the Proprietor and remained his until the Revolution. Virginia had since 1624 been a Crown province. The Chesapeake colonies, which had by the 1730s (Maryland earlier) printing presses of their own, still welcomed immigrants, especially those who would settle on their western

frontier. But they did little direct advertising in print in Great Britain, and only a little in their own gazettes. They were concerned, at least until the French and Indian War, with internal affairs of government, church, and education. South and North Carolina, which set up their own presses in 1732 and 1749 respectively, continued with colonization schemes and some promotion literature. And the Georgia colony, the youngest, in this period developed propaganda writing roughly comparable, but with distinctive qualities, to that of her elder sisters in the preceding century.

In the older colonies there was some self-assessment, or stocktaking, in the form of brief histories, the most significant remaining unpublished until the nineteenth century; and the present-state reports were still sent frequently, usually annually, to the Board of Trade and Plantations. In Maryland appeared an anti-utopian or anti-promotional poem, a savage satire designed to show things as they were. Much of the propaganda in favor of the colonies has a religious cast, consisting of letters and tracts begging for church libraries and more clergy. A great deal of this centers in the Carolinas, to which in 1701 the newly organized Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts began to devote a great deal of attention.¹²⁰

In 1705, when the establishment of the Church of England in South Carolina outraged an apparent majority, who were dissenters, a major English writer was drawn into writing about that colony as John Locke had done for different reasons a generation before. Daniel Defoe, using the manuscript accounts of the situation by two Carolina emissaries to the Proprietors, John Ash and Joseph Boone, composed tracts more political than promotional, *Party-Tyranny, or an Occasional Bill in Miniature; as now Practiced in Carolina. Humbly offered to the Consideration of both Houses of Parliament* and *The Case of the Protestant Dissenters in Carolina* (both London, 1705 and 1706).¹²¹

The two sources for Defoe were present-state, socio-political reports. Ash, whose work was being printed when he died (only two pages actually were set up), left in manuscript *The Present State of Affairs in Carolina*, which was published in part the next year, 1706. This is a prejudiced account significant largely as representative of the troubled times.

A fairer account of Carolina at the turn of the century, an attempt at reconciliation of warring elements, is John Archdale's *A New Description of that Fertile and Pleasant Province of Carolina: with a Brief Account of its Discovery, Settling, and the Government thereof to this Time. With Several Remarkable Passages of Divine Providence during my Time* (London, 1707).¹²² The author, a Quaker, had been governor and was a proprietor of the province. He was also a man of ability and tact. His "Description of Carolina" near the beginning is an effective piece of writing, perhaps

most distinguished for its piety and such remarks as that concerning "the first Settlement of Carolina, where the Hand of God was eminently seen in thinning the Indians, to make room for the English." He traces American history to the Cabots, tells some good stories, extols Carolina climate and topography, suggests means of educating the Indians in the faith, and documents with letters the struggles of his own time. His design, he declares, is to make Carolina "a suitable Bulwark to our American Colonies." It is not accidental that "Divine Providence" is alluded to in this tract more than in any other from the colonial South. His is the puritan spirit manifested by most early Quakers—in practice, and practical.

The Whig historian John Oldmixon in *The British Empire in America* (2 vols., London, 1708, 1741 and rev. ed.) attempted a comprehensive survey of the English New World in a work drawing upon many sources. It was remarkably influential in shaping Europe's, especially Great Britain's, concept of her American possessions. The Virginia chapter drew the indignation of Robert Beverley and the assistance of William Byrd, the latter in what was probably a revision before first printing. Oldmixon claims that he had read every chapter of his book to inhabitants of the colonies treated therein. If so, says one modern historian, the reader or listener to the two chapters on South Carolina must have indeed been ignorant of the facts of his home region.¹²³ What Oldmixon used, and perhaps carelessly, in these two were several promotion pieces and early brief histories of the province or of America in general. He is confused and confusing in his first chapter on colonial history. The second chapter, on the geography and natural attractions of the country, is interesting and useful, though it still has to be used with caution. He concludes with some observations on a French dancing master who in Craven County was teaching the Indians to play on the flute and hautboy, and with regret that the red men have learned one of the whites' worst vices, drinking. Oldmixon actually devoted more care and space to the southern colonies than did other "imperialists" among the British historians, as the later William Douglass and John Mitchell.

But by 1710 the two Carolinas had officially separate governments and were recognized for what they had long been, distinct political and economic entities. Several promotion pieces from the more southern colony came out in the generation after the legal separation. In 1712 John Norris, probably at some time a resident of the province, published in London a promotional pamphlet rather unusual in form, *Profitable Advice for Rich and Poor, In a Dialogue, or Discourse between James Freeman, a Carolina Planter, and Simon Question, a West-Country Farmer. Containing a Description, or True Relation of South Carolina*.¹²⁴ Dedicated to town and country shopkeepers, parish clerks, innkeepers, or masters of public

houses, it contains a quantity of information on every subject the author thought might be pertinent. Though datelined in 1710, Thomas Nairne's *A Letter from South Carolina; Giving an Account of the Soil, Air, Product, Trade, Government, Laws, Religion, People, Military Strength, &c. of that Province* (London) was not published until 1718.¹²⁵ It includes useful statistics regarding the relative proportion of various religious sects. Covering much more territory, including the Mississippi Basin, is Daniel Coxe's *A Description of the English Province of Carolana, by the Spaniards call'd Florida and by the French La Louisianne. . . . And a Preface Containing Some Considerations on the Consequences of the French Making Settlements there* (London, 1722).¹²⁶ Descriptive of a vast territory later to become part of the South, it is one of our earliest printed records of direct concern with the French as southern neighbors and rivals. Much narrower in scope is a work of provincial agent and councilor under the royal government Francis Yonge, *A View of the Trade of South-Carolina, with Proposals Humbly Offer'd for Improving the same* (London, 1722).¹²⁷ This treats of economic difficulties in the early 1720s, especially resulting from the Yemassee War in 1715, hardships from customs duties, and remedies proposed, none very original nor feasible.

Jean Pierre Purry's proposals to Swiss Protestants in 1731, to produce happy results in the founding of Purrysburgh, were translated from the French and appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* during 1732 as "A Description of the Province of South Carolina, Drawn Up at Charles Town, in September 1731."¹²⁸ Purry tried for ten years under the Proprietors to establish a Swiss colony, but he succeeded only when the Crown took over and the new government approved his plan.

Perhaps even more significant is Governor James Glen's *A Description of South Carolina; Containing, Many curious and interesting particulars relating to the Civil, Natural and Commercial History of the Colony* (London, 1761),¹²⁹ finished originally in 1749 but adulterated with additional material before publication. Yet it remains a well-written, even moving account, beginning with the usual descriptions of the country and its products. More unusual are the tables showing climate and rainfall and above all the survey of the Indian and frontier country and the forts built there, with some account of tribes and trade. Begun as an answer to queries from the Board of Trade, this careful description by the ablest of South Carolina's colonial governors is a modest forerunner, as is one of the more formal histories noted below, of Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia*, which also originated in a series of inquiries.

Composed in 1763 but not published until 1770 is Dr. George Milligen-Johnston's *A Short Description of the Province of South-Carolina, with an Account of the Air, Weather, and Diseases, at Charles-Town*

(London).¹³⁰ The author was once confusing to historians because, under the name of Dr. George Milligen, he was a surgeon in military service in South Carolina and Georgia for a number of years and then a prominent Charleston physician. This fresh, hopeful account of Carolina and the Cherokee War is in marked contrast to his pessimistic observations in 1775, when he was compelled as a Loyalist to leave America forever. As his editor notes, there is a poignancy in Milligen-Johnston's final remark that "South Carolina was at this period [1763?] the most thriving Country perhaps on the Globe and might have been the happiest At last the Demon of rebellion took possession of their hearts, and almost banished humanity among them, with every other virtue."¹³¹ Thus South Carolina's promotion-description literature, written up to the very first years of rebellion, ends for the British Loyalist on a note of disillusionment, even though it is private disillusionment expressed in a manuscript note to a printed volume designed to advertise this thriving country.

One must glance back briefly to the beginnings of the eighteenth century in North Carolina. Some of the tracts just noted were used to advertise both colonies, or the two as one, as did Daniel Coxe's work. For North Carolina alone very little promotion-discovery literature exists. There was Hugh Meredith's "An Account of the Cape Fear Country 1731," printed in two issues of the *Pennsylvania Gazette*.¹³² A former printer and partner of Franklin, Meredith had sold out and moved to North Carolina, from whence he sent the two-installment account. He describes topography, a canoe trip, eighteen-foot-high Indian corn, and the areas of fertile land. A typical governor's answer to official query, probably by Arthur Dobbs himself, is the reply to "Quere 1." in 1761 as to the general state of the province from the Lords Commissioners of Trade and the Plantations. The answer, in first person, is a useful survey of Indians, government, French and Spanish settlements, and quitrents and other taxes, with answers to sixteen other queries as well.¹³³

But far more significant as history, literature, and scientific observation than any other writings from North or South Carolina are two books intended for promotion purposes, though the first has at times been considered primarily as serious history. The second, in large part a blatant plagiarizing of the first and of other books, is still valuable for its original scientific materials. Both will be considered again for various reasons in Chapters II and VII.

The earlier of these accounts is the only book composed both in and of Carolina during the Proprietary period. John Lawson's *A New Voyage to Carolina* (London, 1709)¹³⁴ went through several editions in the eighteenth century and in the twentieth, sometimes under the title *A History of Carolina*. The latter title is a misnomer, for the book is essentially a

promotion-discovery tract, albeit the greatest of them, dedicated to the Lords Proprietors in the latter years of their control of the twin colonies. The author, an educated gentleman and scientist, lived in the Carolinas, principally in the northern province, from 1700 to 1708/9, was surveyor-general of North Carolina and a cofounder as well as planner of two of its important towns. He returned to England and brought out his book, went back to the colonies, became a commissioner of the Virginia-Carolina boundary line, and in 1711 was tortured and executed by some of the Indians he had befriended while he was on an exploring expedition with the Baron von Graffenreid to discover a more convenient route to Virginia.

The book is in five parts, several of which will be considered in different chapters for the evidence they afford of intellectual and cultural interests of the colonists. The full title of *A New Voyage* claims that his journey covered one thousand miles. More exactly it was about 550 from Charleston, where he landed, by a circuitous horseshoe-shaped route to the plantation of one Richard Smith, on Pamlico River, in the vicinity of the present Washington, North Carolina. His small party had crossed swamps, paddled treacherous rivers, and visited Indians of several tribes and a number of isolated white settlers, all in winter with only the aid of Indian guides. Part One is the journal of this remarkable trek. The second part, "A Description of North Carolina," traces history, topography, coastal outline, geology, and products in detail, with learned and usually quite accurate comments on plants and animals. In Part Three, "The Present State of Carolina," he explains location of settlements, the colony's situation in relation to Virginia, its fine livestock and other natural and cultivated assets, with the usual come-hither tract's emphasis on abundance and ease of living but also with a number of perceptive comments on the longevity of the natives, trade with the Indians, and freedom from frontier fears, the last tragically ironic in the light of his own painful death. Perhaps most useful has been the fourth part, "The Natural History of Carolina," in which he displays acute observational powers and an immense knowledge of fauna and flora, really giving his reader a comparative treatise on European and American wild life. His concluding fifth division is valuable for its data: "An Account of the Indians of North Carolina" is a concise encyclopedia of aboriginal life to be considered in more detail in Chapter II. He ends with a plea that the red man be converted to Christianity not through the Spanish way of a field of blood, but through mild inducements to schooling and to learning crafts.

This is but a bare outline of his substance. He writes with an earthy humor resembling William Byrd's but not quite so sophisticated in tone, and the two men share love of a good story of life in the woods. Lawson depicts or discusses the droll or ridiculous appearance of a noseless Indian

witch-doctor, the appetite shared by white men and red women for bed-fellows of another race, even the sex life of the opossum. Indian religion and conjurations, the burial of a warrior struck by lightning, and native medicines and remarkable cures are among matters discussed with sympathy and at times dry wit.

Certainly one if not two of the ablest colonial southern writers after Lawson borrowed liberally and without acknowledgment from his book. In 1737 a physician of Edenton in North Carolina, Dr. John Brickell, "plagiarized" extensively from *A New Voyage* in his own *The Natural History of North Carolina* (Dublin).¹³⁵ A great portion—about animals, plants, topography, and Indians—is straight from Lawson, though Brickell, himself a scientist, adds some new and useful information (even though at times inaccurate) in every category. His preface acknowledges the book as "a compendious Collection," and claims the double purpose of satisfying the curiosity of the European intellectual and supplying vital information for those inclined to live in Carolina. Thus it remains in the promotion-tract tradition. In style it suffers badly in comparison with Lawson, and it lacks his humorous observations.

At least two scholars consider the German-language promotion piece, *Neu-gefundenes Eden* (Bern, 1737), an even more amazing plagiarism.¹³⁶ In recent years this tract, aimed at obtaining Swiss settlers for William Byrd's backcountry lands, has been translated into English and its authorship assigned to Byrd himself,¹³⁷ though from internal evidence it seems fairly clearly to have been put together by a European land speculator named Samuel Jenner, probably from materials supplied by Byrd. The little compendium is a series of extracts straight from Lawson (perhaps taken from either one of the German versions or any of the several English), concluding with two documents or letters concerning his 40,000-acre tract signed by William Byrd. Whether Byrd actually furnished all of the material or not, the natural descriptions which simply substitute the name *Virginia* for *Carolina* were, for most eighteenth-century writers, in the public domain in a wider sense than they would be today. Throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, at least, such borrowing for such a purpose and even for genuine histories was as frequent without acknowledgment of source as with casual recognition of indebtedness. The use of John Smith's writings up to at least 1750 is a classic case in point. The material in the present instance was used purely for propaganda purposes, with no announced author, just as advertising still carries none. The *Neu-gefundenes Eden* must remain of interest, however, not as a brazen plagiarism, but as an evidence of Lawson's repute as an accurate reporter and of the fairly late use, for the upper southern colonies, of promotion

pamphlets. As already noted, this is not a colony advertising, but one or two individuals advertising for their private gain.

Perhaps the greatest of all literary productions of the colonial South designed to promote the sale of lands and attract settlers was written by William Byrd II, probably between 1732 and 1740. But it had absolutely no influence on prospective emigrants from the Old World, for it remained unpublished until 1841.¹³⁸ This was the masterpiece of the owner of Westover, his *History of the Dividing Line betwixt Virginia and North Carolina Run in the Year of Our Lord 1728*. Byrd's *Secret History of the Line*, a shorter and quite different version which remained in manuscript until 1929, was written for entertainment, and probably earlier than the *History*. But employing the same materials as went into the *Secret History*—notes, diaries, documents, and letters—Byrd “fleshed out” (his own term) his story, adding materials which pointed to Virginia as the Eden among American colonies (he disparages directly North Carolina, Maryland, and New England). And he composed it during a decade when he was absorbed in attempting to populate his vast landholdings. The *History* is far more than a come-hither pamphlet or even a travel account or a present-state report, but it is aimed at extolling the abundant natural and human or humane virtues of his native province. This book will be considered in greater detail later, but it must be registered as perhaps the last and greatest of the Virginia literature of discovery and promotion beginning a century and a half earlier with Hariot and Smith and Strachey.

As writers and explorers on and in Virginia gave the first glimpses in literature of what became North Carolina, so pamphleteers ostensibly discussing South Carolina promoted the land of Georgia long before that last of the southern colonies was chartered or settled. Thomas Nairne, Indian agent for South Carolina, had in the 1710 *Letter* noted above urged the establishment of a settlement west of the Savannah to check Spanish Florida and develop fur trade. *A Discourse Concerning the design'd Establishment of a New Colony to the South of Carolina, in the Most delightful Country of the Universe* (London, 1717), Sir Robert Montgomery's dream of a real utopia in an area about that of modern Georgia indicates that the British mind seems to have been forming the concept of a new colony combining altruism with economic gain and the political strategy of a buffer state guarding against the Spaniards and Indians.¹³⁹ The Scottish baronet's proposals to establish the Margravate of Azilia in what is now Georgia were made to the Lords Proprietors in June 1717 and were readily accepted. The scheme included two stages of settlement: the immediate setting up of the first District of Azilia, a manufacturing-ship-

trade unit, which would be the exclusive property of subscribers who would realize quick profits—under the most feudal of American governments; the second, more utopian stage, which would include a second, smaller district, with the Margrave's residence and government houses in a kind of fort, in turn surrounded by a city, in turn surrounded by square-mile estates of the landed gentry, and outside this a strip of settlement for former indentured servants who had completed their time. Every subscriber of five hundred pounds would be entitled to a square-mile estate, to be developed independently by himself. Much of all this scheme derived from earlier English utopian literature such as Harrington's *Oceana* (1656) and even perhaps More's *Utopia*, from Bacon's *Of Plantations*, and from the example of the baronies of South Carolina established under Locke's Fundamental Constitutions.

Though Montgomery apparently raised £30,000, sufficient to carry five or six hundred settlers to his margravate, the politico-economic difficulties and technicalities were never solved or overcome. For some years the baronet and his friends advertised a revised Azilian scheme of settlement for "the Golden Islands," just off the Georgia coast. But Proprietors, Crown, and Crown advisors could never agree, and the great dream faded. Sir Robert died in 1731, just two years before the actual successful planting of Georgia began. His scheme remains of interest as the most ambitious and highly organized colonization plan proposed by a private person, and in many respects the most visionary, though it came very close to some sort of realization. Above all, it reflects vividly and directly the utopian atmosphere in which Georgia was to be conceived and as far as possible implemented.

Another dreamer, the Jean Pierre Purry mentioned above, before his South Carolina promotion and settlement, proposed "a perfect bulwark against the French and Spaniards," to be called Georgia or Georgiana, in *A Memorial Presented to . . . the Duke of Newcastle* (1724);¹⁴⁰ but, despite a friendly Board of Trade, by 1726 this scheme had collapsed. A London merchant, Joshua Gee, in *The Trade and Navigation of Great Britain Considered* (London, 1729),¹⁴¹ urged in a widely read and often-reprinted pamphlet that the region must be settled, perhaps by convicts and the unemployed. These tracts are hardly American in authorship or origin of ideas, but they did anticipate in one way or another much of what went into the economic and political planning and practice for Georgia when it was chartered in 1732 and settled in 1733. For here is the idea of a utopian society, of a haven for the underprivileged and distressed of the European continent as well as of Great Britain, and of a buffer state protecting the older colonies against the French, Spanish, and Indians. Here, too, long beforehand are the extravagant claims for soil and

climate which were to produce an unusual degree of disenchantment among an appreciable number of early Georgians. But most interesting is that here is something, though not all, of the philanthropic idealism which was actually to go into the shaping of government and society which, for a time at least, worked. For Georgia did become the haven of many people from many lands, and from several British prisons.

The Georgia charter was granted by the King on June 9, 1732, to General James Oglethorpe, Lord Perceval (later Lord Egmont), and nineteen other prominent men for "settling poor persons of London" on a tract to the southwest of Carolina. The group of recipients of the charter had grown out of Dr. Bray's Associates, a religiophilanthropic body interested largely in the educational aspects of missionary endeavor. These twenty-one formed the first board of Trustees to manage the colony and were given definite powers. A smaller body called the Common Council, requiring a quorum of only eight, could act on smaller matters. The "trust" was limited to twenty-one years with the design by the Crown of its taking over with little expense to itself. The British government was motivated by self-interest of several kinds, such as protection for South Carolina and increased imperial trade. The board of Trustees had quite different motivations and designs. Oglethorpe, Perceval, and Benjamin Martyn (London secretary throughout the life of the board) were attempting the greatest philanthropic and social experiment of the age. They ruled largely through "regulations," which were not subject to the King's veto, rather than through enacted laws. For all these and other reasons all Britain became interested in Georgia, and the advertising and promotion literature, much of it written entirely in England by men who had not been to America, resembles somewhat in volume that of the initial Anglo-American undertakings of 150 or 125 years earlier, though it lacks the stately and sinewy Elizabethan-Jacobean rhetorical style. The Trustees' ideal state and even plans differed not too much in some respects from those of the earlier Azilia, and the intense conviction that they were doing good caused them to be obstinate and to ignore the facts of life in what they liked to think was at least a natural demiparadise. The rigidity of some of their rules was to bring their eventual downfall.

Much of the promotion material was written by Secretary Benjamin Martyn, poet and playwright and a man of inflexible integrity. His *Reasons for Establishing the Colony of Georgia with Regard to the Trade of Great Britain* (London, 1733) hews the line the Trustees were usually to follow: Georgia would make England independent of foreign sources for wine, hemp, flax, and potash; she would produce more than enough silk to supply England (actually she did produce more silk than any other colony but not in marketable quantities); she would give new opportunities to

the poor and unfortunate and relieve overpopulation in England; and she would offer refuge to oppressed Protestants anywhere in Europe. The arguments differ little from those used by the older colonies, but there is a great difference in emphasis. Martyn also was probably the author of the most famous of these pamphlets, *A New and Accurate Account of the Provinces of South Carolina and Georgia* (London, 1732),¹⁴² which rhapsodizes on Georgia air and soil and points out proof of the healthfulness of the place in that one Florida Indian king was 300 years old and his father 350. Another Martyn pamphlet, once attributed to Oglethorpe, is *Some Account of the Designs of the Trustees for Establishing the Colony of Georgia* (London, 1732), a beautiful prospectus with elaborate engravings.¹⁴³ Within the first year or two of settlement several tracts appeared. *A Brief Account of the Establishment of the Colony of Georgia, under Gen. James Oglethorpe, February 1, 1733*¹⁴⁴ includes proceedings of the Trustees, a list of designs for the colony and an announcement of the arrival of the first settlers at the port of Charleston and their gradual movement toward their future home, together with Oglethorpe's conference with the Indians and his speech before the General Assembly of South Carolina.

After 1733 and before 1740 Georgia publicity dwindled but did not disappear entirely. One interesting feature is the poetic tributes. In 1736 appeared "Georgia, a Poem," "Tomo Chachi, an Ode," and "A Copy of Verses on Mr. Oglethorpe's Second Voyage to Georgia," all long ascribed to Samuel Wesley, but more recently on good evidence shown to have been written by Wesley's friend and colleague, the Reverend Thomas Fitzgerald.¹⁴⁵ Journals of the day, such as the *Scot's Magazine* and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, frequently carried poems on Oglethorpe and Georgia. James Thomson and Aaron Hill were among the well-known poets who praised the enterprise in their verse. The whole concept had caught the imagination and gained the sympathy of the British public.

In 1740 a new era of propaganda literature began, not all of it praise. Many colonists, dissatisfied with the land-tenure system and the prohibition of rum and slaves, were criticizing the Trustees and Oglethorpe caustically. This period is marked by one famous antipromotion tract, actually written in Georgia and South Carolina by a group of disgruntled colonists who had fled to Charleston. This is the oft-cited *A True and Historical Narrative of the Colony of Georgia in America* (Charles Town, S.C., 1741)¹⁴⁶ by Patrick Tailfer, Hugh Anderson, David Douglas, and other former planters. Prefaced by a biting satiric dedication to Oglethorpe with scathing language about the whole administration of the colony, the main text is more temperate in tone but loaded with abuse and alleged evidences of failure and mistake, and buttressed by documents and letters, including

some to Oglethorpe and Martyn. In conclusion it summarizes the grievances, taking Trustees to task for misrepresenting the country in glowing terms, for oppressive land-tenure practices, for denying the lawful liberties of Englishmen, for neglecting manufactures such as silk—twelve in all. The dedication belongs to a long tradition of satiric political writing in the colonial South, and the main text to an equally long tradition of declaration of rights, both to be considered later, in Chapter IX. But more immediately the tract was a culmination of a series of criticisms the Trustees had been facing at home and in Georgia for some years.¹⁴⁷

In a pamphlet printed in December 1740, *An Impartial Inquiry into the State and Utility of Georgia* (London), Benjamin Martyn had already anticipated or faced much of the criticism, and the Earl of Egmont (Perceval) saw to it that Parliament, the King, and the royal family received copies. A second answer was in the better-known folio, *An Account Shewing the Progress of the Colony of Georgia in America from Its First Establishment* (London, 1741; Annapolis, 1742), some copies at least including an engraved map of the coast from Carolina to St. Augustine.¹⁴⁸ When the Tailfer attack arrived, Egmont led the Trustees in denouncing it before the British Cabinet. Also as an antidote the three-volume *A Journal of the Proceedings in Georgia, beginning October 20, 1737* (1741?) was printed in a small edition for the information of the Trustees.¹⁴⁹ While William Stephens, the Trustees' resident secretary in Georgia, continued to support his own and the Trustees' policies in *A State of the Province of Georgia, attested upon Oath in the Court of Savannah. November 10, 1740* (London, 1742),¹⁵⁰ his son Thomas attacked the establishment in *A Brief Account of the Causes that have retarded the Progress of the Colony of Georgia* (London, 1743). Thomas presumably thought himself an economic realist, or perhaps he and those for whom he was agent were simply greedy.

Such was the controversial "promotion" writing produced by British and British-born proadministration and antiadministration elements. As already noted, most was written in England and published there; but all of it used letters and data straight from the colony. William Stephens, Tailfer et al., and perhaps others wrote in or near Georgia, and at least two tracts were published in other southern colonies. But there was an additional segment of Georgia propaganda writing often overlooked, the Swiss-German accounts of the settlement. Most of these were in German, but some were translated contemporaneously and used to buttress one position or the other, usually the Proprietors'. In recent years several other German letters, tracts, and questionnaires originating in Georgia or advertising it have been translated and published in English. Since they too reflect the early southern mind, they should at least be noted. Nor should

Whitefield's pleas throughout America and Great Britain for his orphanage at Bethesda be overlooked as a facet of Georgia promotion.

The Salzburgers, Lutherans persecuted in their native mountains in central Europe, began arriving in Georgia eleven months after Oglethorpe's first party set out. Led by John Martin Bolzius and the younger Baron Von Reck, they landed at Savannah but soon removed to a spot on the bank of the river they named Ebenezer, later moving to a healthier location bearing the same name. They continued to arrive in small numbers until by the 1740's there were 1,200, the largest single population element in early Georgia. Moravians came a little later but soon departed, to be followed by Scottish Highland and Puritan groups. Though all of these and a fine Jewish enclave in Savannah left their mark on early Georgia life, only the Salzburgers left it in literary form.

The best-known of these German-Swiss writings translated into English and published at the direction of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, is *An Extract of the Journals of Mr. Commissary Von Reck, Who Conducted the First Transport of Salzburgers to Georgia: and of Reverend Mr. Bolzius, One of their Ministers. Giving an Account of their Voyage to, and happy Settlement in that Province* (London, 1734).¹⁵¹ This orthodox voyage-promotion tract appealed to potential colonists and to those philanthropists who might contribute funds for sending more of "our persecuted Protestant Brethren" to the colony. It is in journal style, succinct enough to be choppy but it could and should have been effective as a simple testimony of fact. The recently published *Henry Newman's Salzburger Letterbooks*¹⁵² covers the period 1732 to 1735. Only in the letters from such men as Bolzius is there anything resembling propaganda, but the whole volume reveals much of the history of these admirable people in the southernmost colony. Some time before 1740, perhaps in 1734, Bolzius sent home a report on the religious situation in Georgia, viewing it realistically, lamenting present but not despairing of future religious education for all Protestants there.¹⁵³ Bolzius is the principal author in the Reverend Samuel Urlsperger's *Der ausführlichen Nachrichten von der Königlich-Gross-Britannischen Colonie Saltzburgischer Emigranten in America . . .* (in 19 parts, 3 vols., Halle, 1735-1752) and in other tract series or collections on America and Georgia. Embedded in this lengthy work are two questionnaires of about 1751 with answers, "vivid and earthy," now recently translated. They are by Bolzius, and they reveal as much of Georgia life, including Indians, agriculture, white servants, blacks, and manufactures as any promotion tract could.¹⁵⁴ They form an optimistic yet realistic and temperate report on affairs which should have been an inducement to keep the Salzburgers and others coming. Today, literature in German on all the southern colonies from Maryland to Geor-

From *Historia Americae* (1634)

The Jamestown Massacre, 1622, from the engraving by Theodor deBry

gia is gradually being translated and printed. In the main, it differs from most other promotion material in that it seems to convey a deep, underlying gratitude for the *freedom* the American colonies afforded and a sturdy determination to make the most of it.

Perhaps the story of voyage-promotion-travel writing in the southern colonies before 1763 would not be complete without some notice of the prose, and the verse for that matter, of Edward Kimber (1719-1769), young English journalist and man of letters who published in the *London Magazine*, of which his father was editor, his "Itinerant Observations in America."¹⁵⁵ Kimber had reached New York in 1742, traveled immediately by ship to Maryland, from thence proceeded slowly through the Chesapeake Bay colonies, taking ship again to Georgia, and then on to South Carolina. From Charleston he returned to Europe. Kimber thus observed, and had something to say about, four of the five southern colonies. While in America he also wrote verse published in various colonial gazettes as well as in Great Britain.¹⁵⁶ His account continues a tradition of descriptive travel, but it is much more specific than most earlier southern observations, giving even details of buildings in such villages as York Town, Virginia, and of harbors and estates, with mention by name of prominent citizens. Though he is probably aiming more to satisfy the curiosity of the British reader than to encourage emigration, Kimber is in some respects the beginning of a new tradition in outsiders' observations on America, that which is more fully developed in the decade just before the Revolution and the first generation of the new republic. The travelers in this new tradition were residents of other colonies, of Great Britain, or of Europe, and they wrote to inform, to entertain, and perhaps to prejudice, depending upon their own views or their readers'.

Though promotion writing in one form or another was to continue well into the national period and, in specific situations or cases into our own time, it has ceased to be a form of literature in any esthetic sense. The account of exploration has remained alive, as the American people themselves have become its avid readers, most notably in the early national period in the journals of the Lewis and Clark expedition and of other great western treks, and in our own century in accounts of journeys to the arctic and antarctic poles. The moon explorers have been seen rather than read. But southern Americans' interest in faraway places, as their own land once was to their ancestors, has continued, perhaps merged with a general national curiosity about strange places and stranger imagined beings. The peculiarly southern search for a paradise, or a potential paradise, in his own region is still represented in the individual southerner's hedon-

ism and perhaps in the savage-wistful yearnings of author and personae in Faulkner's "The Bear" or Warren's *All the King's Men*. Disillusioned as the modern southern writer may appear, he often seems still to be asking why there cannot be, for one brief shining moment or for ages, a Camelot located in his own land. And he often supplies his own answer.

HISTORY AND MAJOR HISTORIANS

As the reader will already have observed, where the writing of the literature of promotion and discovery ends and the writing of history begins is in many instances difficult if not impossible to determine. Often it is a matter of emphasis more than of point of view or subject matter. If society and the development of social institutions are the true matter of history,¹⁵⁷ the works discussed above are only in certain instances, or portions, and often only incidentally, history. During the period from 1585 to 1763 there were, however, if one accepts a fairly broad definition of social institutions, a few writings by southern colonials which were actual histories. These differ in primary intention or total effect from the writings of Hariot or Strachey or Lawson. They are all concerned with one colony, Virginia, though sometimes with a glance at her nearer neighbors. A few are pamphlets, but most are full-length books, each reflecting among other things the stylistic fashions of its own time and in more or less degree the historical methodology of particular periods.

They are not imperial histories reflecting the aspirations for national expansion which the British such as Ogilby and Oldmixon wrote. They are not God's remembrancers, as the New England histories and historians were. Though three of the more prominent southern historians were clergymen, they were not recording or analyzing their spiritual evolution in America, albeit the conversion of the Indians may be an incidental theme and church as related to state a prominent element. Rather, they were looking at what transplanted Europeans along the south Atlantic coast had done, were doing, and might do in developing a new society in an exciting environment. Even John Smith, the earliest of them, is more than half-conscious of this formation of a new society. The last of them, William Stith, is fully aware of what the society he chronicles has led to, and what it should become.

It has been suggested that the New Englanders wrote more history because they had more dramatic confrontations, such as the Anne Hutchinson controversy, the Roger Williams case, or the Half-Way Covenant dispute, which were inciting or exciting themes. But surely the southern colonies

had enough of this raw material of history, for there were dramatic confrontations of Puritan and Proprietor and Puritan and Catholic in Maryland, Dissenters vs. Church of England in South Carolina, Berkeley vs. Bacon in Virginia, and a dozen lesser tense and complex socio-political-religious facedowns. Any look at colonial insurrections and movements, down to the Regulators of the two Carolinas and the Pistole Fee and Parson's Cause controversies in Virginia, will show that the South throughout the period had its share of involved and dramatic controversy. Yet, so far as is yet known, only one of these, Bacon's Rebellion, incited genuine historical interpretation.

The focus of the Puritan colonial historian is on the people as they build their city upon a hill in this howling or mighty wilderness, a spiritual city for a spiritually chosen people. "Wilderness" and "Providence" are pervasive terms in New England's chronicles. God had always provided for His people in the scriptural deserts. The focus of the southern colonial was on the place, the natural paradise or the potential Garden of Eden and what men might become within it or make of it if they were wise. "Canaan," "paradise," and "Eden" are the recurrent southern terms, biblical enough in their origin, but carrying in their connotations as much of Renaissance and Enlightenment classicism or secularism as of Christianity. The southerner's terrain was somewhat different, but the way he looked at it made the real difference. He did indeed identify with his environment. Except for the weather, the shore of the James was almost as bleak and desolate in 1607 as was the rockbound Massachusetts coast in 1620. Yet John Smith refers rarely, perhaps only once or twice, to "the desolate wilderness," and then hardly in the New England sense. No fitter place for man's habitation, he suggests, exists in the physical world. As Roanoke Island had been to Lane and Hariot, so was Virginia—in its natural state—to Smith, Beverley, Jones, and Stith, and even to the less emotionally attached Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton. "Providence" is noted many times in Smith, but without the moral complacency usually present in a Bradford, a Winthrop, or a Cotton Mather. Later Virginians use it rarely, and then more or less as a vague figure of speech.

Unlike the relatively considerable number of diaries, verses, plays, and prose satires by southerners discovered in manuscript only within the past century, the southern histories, except for two relatively brief pamphlets to be considered, were read in print by the contemporaries of their authors. The intention was to explain, to demonstrate, their region for these contemporaries, usually those in Great Britain but certainly in the later period for their neighbors as well. Britons did read them, but so did southern colonists. The inventories of almost all fair-sized libraries in Virginia and

Maryland, and sometimes in the two Carolinas, include the works of John Smith, Robert Beverley, Hugh Jones, and William Stith, and sometimes the smaller book of Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton.

Lying undiscovered or irretrievably lost are the histories of Virginia written by such able and intelligent men as William Fitzhugh, William Byrd, and Sir John Randolph, though the last never completed his. Their manuscripts were read by at least a few of their contemporaries, and all three intended some day to publish. Probably many other southerners had the urge to write, and perhaps did write, the stories of their respective colonies, for by the earlier eighteenth century these people were conscious of their possible or probable place in the history of the western world.

CAPTAIN JOHN SMITH

John Smith (1580–1631), "President of Virginia and Admiral of New England," has received more attention for his historical writing than has any other colonial American, Cotton Mather not excepted. Part of the reason is that he has been a controversial figure, denounced for supreme egotism and mendacity and equally praised as the last knight-errant or the first gallant southern gentleman. If he did not himself create a myth, he gave the materials from which one of the most American of our myths was formed, the story of his rescue by the Indian princess Pocahontas. He prepared the way for or gave examples of other American traits, or traits Americans like to think of as theirs, such as the equality of men of every degree faced with the problems of self-preservation. The America he anticipated by his own example was not for the lily-fingered or the blue-blooded, but for the aggressive, resourceful, and courageous. And he recorded a persistent southern trait, one which Robert Beverley and Hugh Jones agreed existed—laziness—with its remedy. Sheer indolence, sloth, was a major cause of the first catastrophes of starvation and Indian attack at Jamestown, as they have been on a larger scale a regional characteristic down to the twentieth century.

Two of his major writings, *A True Relation* and *A Map of Virginia*, have been noted above. Both have elements of history, and perhaps *A True Relation* is, with the work here to be discussed, one of his two genuinely historical works. *A Map of Virginia* became part of the *Generall Historie*, slightly edited from its original to fit somewhat different aims. The later *True Travels* is autobiography. *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New-England, and the Summer Isles* (London, 1624), in six large books, is Smith's major claim to serious consideration as a historian in an age of great events. It has been read, borrowed from, assailed, and admired through three and a half centuries. As mentioned above, promotion litera-

ture owed much to him. Succeeding Virginia historians all acknowledged their indebtedness, as did almost every British historian of empire. In the nineteenth century American historians, especially but not entirely New England ones, believed they had proved him a contemptible liar in his belatedly recorded Pocahontas-rescue episode. They had no evidence either way on the story, but they cited the "proved" falsehoods of his *True Travels* in eastern Europe and concluded that, if he were proved a liar once, he was always a liar. By 1891 the distinguished historian J. Franklin Jameson could say that the legend of Pocahontas must go!¹⁵⁸ He was but following such historians as Charles Deane and Henry Adams, the latter having mounted a prejudiced, perhaps unethical attack with inaccurate data to get himself started in the profession. Even though today a few cautious historians disbelieve, most admit the episode could well have taken place. This is largely the result of the pioneering investigations of Bradford Smith and Laura Polanyi Striker, together with the imaginative researches and real proofs unearthed by Philip L. Barbour, which prove what can be proved—that in every instance which has been checked (and there are hundreds) Smith told nothing but the truth in his *True Travels*. Thus historians, sometimes grudgingly, admit that Smith was probably or surely telling the truth in his account of Virginia, most surely of course in the part of the *Generall Historie* which concerns Virginia while he was in the colony.¹⁵⁹ In other words, what the sometime president, councilor, and explorer had to say about the first two years at Jamestown is to be taken seriously.

The paragraph above is a drastic condensation of a long and complex critical controversy, here perhaps oversimplified. The other major charge against Smith, and it of course has relation to his veracity, is his alleged inordinate egotism. The egocentricity is there, in the accounts of actual events in Virginia or the explorations in New England in which he had a personal part, and in other sections. It is particularly evident in his continual reminders that, had his advice been followed in the governing of Virginia and the treatment of the Indians, the miseries of that first settlement might never have come upon it. But throughout the *Generall Historie* there is the sometimes haunting suggestion that this is a story of and by a man who realized he never quite achieved what he sought to achieve, a man of damaged ego. As Philip Barbour has suggested, this most ambitious in scale of Smith's works was the author's apologia, or defense, and his memoirs. The twentieth-century reader is not likely to find Smith objectionably egotistic, though he will note a total lack of modesty.

The *Generall Historie* is indeed Smith's apologia, but it is also much more. Its origin, as at least two recent scholars think, may lie in a motion of April 12, 1621, in a meeting of the Virginia Company of London by

another John Smith who was to go to Virginia, to the effect that "a faire and perspicuous history" be compiled of that colony, "and to have the memory and fame of many of her worthies though they be dead to live and be transmitted to all posterities."¹⁶⁰ This our Smith may have been suggesting at the beginning of Book III, when he mentions "the eternizing of the memory of those that effected [established] it,"¹⁶¹ though he is here saying that so many calamities have occurred that only now is the eternizing taking place. Strachey's earlier plan for a general history may have been in Smith's mind. And in September 1622 he may have conferred with Purchas on the idea, or with someone else of the Council for Virginia who was interested in such a literary project. At the conclusion of Book IV Smith asserts that he wrote at the request of the Company, though no record of such a request exists and the explicit and implicit criticism of the Company's administration is frequent in Books II-IV. Perhaps he means that the old Company thought he might bring together a book which would show the progress of the colony, however slow or halting, and that the Company unofficially sponsored the beginning of his writing in 1621-1622. After the massacre of 1622 he was still writing and did not finish until the Commission appointed by the Crown to investigate the Company was already at work, as he observes. In other words, Smith's motivations may have changed as he wrote. There were severe critics of the Company's policies who remained loyal to that organization, notably Governor Sir Francis Wyatt and Treasurer George Sandys in Virginia, officials who wrote scathing letters about the measures of their London relative Sir Edwin Sandys and their friend Deputy John Ferrar. It is quite clear that Wyatt and George Sandys by no means wanted a complete takeover by the Crown.¹⁶² Smith, though later he was to appear to approve royal government (he could hardly do anything else in print) was probably in much the same mood or temper as the two officials in the colony, that of a friendly critic within the family.

But to return to the *Generall Historie's* history. Smith found a printer, Michael Sparkes, and he began to collect his materials, including copper plates of maps. Then he proceeded rapidly. He added, shaped, rephrased various sources. Of the six books, one was soon completed. Then Smith issued a prospectus and sought a patron. He found this patron, or patroness, in the great Duchess of Lennox and Richmond, a proud and powerful lady whose portrait adorns most copies of the *Generall Historie*. With her help he was able to publish a handsome folio with engraved title page, four engraved maps, and in some copies portraits of Pocahontas as well as of the duchess. Two printers worked simultaneously on different parts of the book, a fact which accounts for certain missing signatures within the

volume and for some paddings of commendatory verses at inappropriate places.

The *Generall Historie* is not quite history in the modern sense, but it is history more nearly in that sense than is Francis Bacon's writing on English kings or Hakluyt's on English voyages and discoveries. In general outline it is somewhat like Hakluyt, a compendium of facts held together by the author's egocentric point of view. Even when he quotes long passages from his companions in peril in Virginia, his reader soon realizes that, as in *A Map of Virginia* the companions see through Smith's eyes, they see as Smith does. Certainly even as early as *A Map of Virginia* Smith was rephrasing his sources and even his own quoted letters, and he continues to do so here.

Book I is Smith's condensed and edited gathering of pre-Jamestown New World history from Hakluyt, John Brereton, and manuscripts Purchas was also then using for his *Pilgrimes*. Nothing is new here, but it formed a handy and necessary introduction for Books II–IV. Probably after he had written his first book Smith took a careful look at George Sandys' *A Relation of a Journey begun . . . 1610* (London, 1615), the most popular seventeenth-century travel account in English (on Mediterranean countries, including the Holy Land) by a poet-traveler who was at the moment (1622–1623), as Smith knew, Treasurer of the colony in Virginia. Barbour makes a strong case for Smith's adoption of Sandys' form and general style, including plentiful engravings and quotations from ancient authors, borrowings from contemporary guidebooks and from geographers, historians, and philosophers. Barbour also points out Smith's extensive use of Martin Fotherby's *Atheomastix* as a source for many of his poetic quotations. Though these quoted embellishments are not always so apt as Sandys', the *Generall Historie* is much the more vigorous and readable of the two books. Whether the Virginia treasurer's travel volume was the specific model or not, Smith's later five books indicate an attempt at learned and literary ornament, at extensive use of older authorities, at smoothness of style.

Book II is principally from "A Description of Virginia" in his own *A Map of Virginia*, with few revisions but with some of the polishing and ornamentation just noted. Based on the "Proceedings" or second section of the 1612 *A Map of Virginia* and employing the narratives of his old Virginia compatriots but with considerable rewriting and addition, Book III is generally considered the best of the whole volume and the part on which Smith's reputation as a historian must largely rest. It is primarily a recounting of events during the author's 1607–1609 sojourn in Virginia. Book IV continues a roughly chronological tracing of events from a variety

of contemporary narrative sources, with interspersed documents such as Smith's letter to Queen Anne on Pocahontas, and lists of adventurers. Included are the best existing account of the 1622 massacre based upon a number of sources but composed by Smith himself and his offer to the Company to go to the colony and clean up the mess; also his "brief relation" to the commissioners appointed by the King, with his answers to their questions, all with seeming candor and some tactful avoidance of placing blame on any particular person—only on policies—for the troubles of the colony.

Book V is concerned with the Bermudas and is based primarily on Nathaniel Butler's unpublished manuscript. Book VI is a reprint with variations of Smith's *Description of New England* (1616) and *New England's Trials* (1620) with extracts from such pamphlets as *Mourt's Relation* (1622) and Winslow's *Good News from New England* (1624). As has often been observed, at the end of the *Generall Historie* there is no peroration, no real conclusion on a high or low note of enthusiasm, despair, or encouragement. Actually the last two parts are in most respects quite detached from the first four, in effect forming a sort of double appendix. The *True Travels* (London, 1630) does include a brief "continuation" of the *Historie*, but it is a mere filling in of events between 1624 and 1629, which comprise short chapters on the three colonies.

Thus the *Generall Historie* is no unified work. But there are relative unities within the work, if one will take the first four books as an account of Virginia from 1584 to 1624, or II and III as the Virginia Smith and his friends knew, or simply Book III as the kernel, the genuine recorded history of the province in a crucial two-year period. A great deal is to be said for taking the first four books as the most accurate and comprehensive history—in its coverage of all features and activities—of a seventeenth-century American colony. Smith concludes Book IV with his remark, "Thus far I have travelled in this Wildernesse of Virginia," and the final words: "But here I must leave all to the triall of time, both my selfe, *Virginia's* preparations, proceedings and good events; praying to that great God the protector of all goodnesse to send them as good successe as the goodnesse of the action and Countrey deserveth, and my heart desireth."¹⁶³

Book II describes topography, commodities, and aborigines. The Indian section is especially varied and dramatic, giving the details of the manner of life, including hunting, which were to be borrowed by many later writers. What today one might call the romanticizing of Pocahontas is begun here with several brief appearances, no longer Powhatan's pre-adolescent daughter, but the fawnlike child of nature who adores Captain Smith and many times—not simply in the rescue scene—saves the colo-

nists from starvation or more brutal annihilation. The new Indian princess, who continues through Books III and IV, is emphasized by the author's phrasing: "His dearest daughter *Pocahontas*"; "*Pocahontas*, his dearest jewell and daughter, in that darke night came through the irksome woods, and told our *Captaine*"; "*Pocahontas* hid [*Wyffin*] for a time, and sent them who pursued him the clean contrary way"; "*Pokahontas* the Kings daughter saved a boy called Henry Spilman"; "the poore innocent *Pocahontas* [and her perfidious capture]"; and "the Lady *Rebecca*, alias *Pocahontas*."¹⁶⁴ These are a few of the phrases and clauses denoting her presence and its significance. One should note that she saves at least two other individuals besides Smith and also that the almost casual mention of her intercession is in easily believable terms. In his letter to Queen Anne, incidentally often criticized as an entirely unnecessary intrusion into the narrative, Smith is chronologically perfectly in order and offers as gallant a tribute to womanhood as colonial American literature presents. It was but eminently fitting that he should implore Her Majesty to receive this regal wife of a poor English commoner, "seeing this Kingdome may rightly have a Kingdome by her meanes."¹⁶⁵ Thus "the Mother of us all" was prepared for American mythology through history. For, as Smith later commented, "History is the memory of time, the life of the dead, and the happiness of the living."¹⁶⁶ The copper-colored spirit of the time and place was to become in future centuries the symbol of the brave new world and, dressed in crinoline, the ideal of southern womanhood. She represented all at once a region, a nation, and a state of mind.

The Pocahontas relationship, the stern measures taken with indolent and profane loiterers among the colonists, the hand-to-hand combat with an Indian chief, are among the many autobiographical elements of the *Historie*. This personal quality gives the book interest and at the same time subjects it to suspicion as prejudiced writing, or special pleading. Yet that Smith was accurate whenever he wrote from firsthand observation or participation has been abundantly proved by Philip Barbour, as already noted.

As personal narrative, collection of voyages and travels, chronicle of the English settlement of North America, the *Generall Historie* suggests at least three major facts: America, southern branch particularly, was a natural paradise; unfit and evil men, red and white, threatened to spoil this Eden; and the author alone knew what to do to prevent catastrophe. There is also pervasive patriotism and full realization as to what "this deare bought Land with so much bloud and cost"¹⁶⁷ should become beyond a natural paradise. That is, the author had a sense of high destiny for British America, especially Virginia, a sense that most of the major Virginia historians

to be discussed below shared with him, and in their case with more palpable evidence of that promise before them. But he more than they is the participant-historian.

Smith's style, in those parts of the *Historie* pretty clearly of his composition, is for his age and despite the borrowed poetic embellishments, plain, unadorned, though in his dramatizing he becomes perforce somewhat rhetorical. His changes in mood are reflected in changes in style—from the indignation of the Hotspur rhetoric replying to early Company criticisms, to grim and sober rhythms of sadness at the loss of good and brave friends, to irritation with inept Captain Newport in mocking or sardonic terms, to soaring sanguinity in his again rhetorical exhortations to adventure. In his polishings for the *Historie* he often becomes sententious, but he is often too most effective in the axiomatic rhetoric of these later observations. For the Jacobean-Caroline British nation he seems to be saying, as he expressed it in 1631, that this work is the record of the nation's ideals and aspirations: "Seeing honour is our lives ambition, and our ambition after death, to have an honourable memory of our life: and seeing by no meanes we would be abated of the dignitie and glory of our predecessors, let us imitate their vertues to be worthily their successors."¹⁶⁸

Partly because he spent only two years in that colony of which he principally wrote and derived his materials for other periods at secondhand, Smith has sometimes been labeled the precursor, rather than the first, of New World colonial historians. He is radically unlike the Puritan historians of that land of which he liked to call himself Admiral. But he shares with later southern historians from Beverley to Stith, and actually on to Jefferson and Ulrich B. Phillips, a preoccupation with environment and external nature. With most of them he shares an interest in the Indians, both good and bad, and in the implementation of laws in society, the good and evil of local government and government from across the seas. Like most of them, he is in some way even in his strictures promoting what he considers to be the welfare of the colony. He sees that in such a natural paradise the combination of hedonism and laziness will produce infinite, perhaps fatal, ills: like later southerners and critics of southerners, he argued that "heaven and earth never agreed better to frame a place for mans habitation . . . were it fully manured and inhabited by industrious people."¹⁶⁹

BACON'S REBELLION

If the best of colonial histories did indeed spring from confrontations, the accounts of Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia, 1675-1677, should be among the major writings of the period. The story of the violent and

dramatic confrontations of testy, crafty, vindictive old Governor Sir William Berkeley and courageous, impulsive, yet wily young Nathaniel Bacon, Junior, with the conflicting views of the causes of their differences, the seriocomic maneuvers of Berkeley, the rhetoric and alleged rabble-rousing of Bacon, the fatal illness of the rebel with the gradual collapse of his movement, and the tragic and unnecessary wholesale execution of Baconians by Berkeley, produced at least a huge number of letters, petitions, statements of grievances, and legal enactments; three notable poems; official reports back to England; two contemporarily printed news accounts; and perhaps some three discourses which may be called history. No contemporary account offers a satisfactory explanation for the whole affair. Sophisticated old Sir William, anxious to exonerate himself in his report to the home government, suggested that it all sprang from God's providence or judgment on him for his pride in his twenty-four years as governor, and on Bacon for his atheism.¹⁷⁰

In addition to contemporary reporters, historians such as Robert Beverley, whose father was very active on Berkeley's side, devote some attention to the matter. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries historians, novelists, and poets have seen in it, as Hawthorne saw in Endicott or the regicides in New England, prophetic anticipations of the Spirit of 1776. The sequence of events continues even now to furnish at least background for romances. But it is the historians who have been as much at odds in their interpretation of the significance of these events as were the opposing sides in the actual turmoils. Thomas J. Wertenbaker saw Bacon as the torchbearer of the Revolution, the champion of human liberty; Wilcomb E. Washburn more recently has depicted him as the hot-headed young rebel concerned primarily with protecting himself and his property against the Indian menace. Richard L. Morton, who devotes four chapters of his *Colonial Virginia* to the Rebellion, is inclined to stand somewhere between, for he asserts that "the full story is worth telling because it was a struggle for liberty as well as an Indian war; because it gives an insight into conditions in the Colony at that time; and because of its dramatic and controversial character."¹⁷¹ Unfortunately for the interested modern reader, the surviving papers, with the exception of a few minor pieces such as two letters from Bacon's wife, are ostensibly pro-Berkeley or at least certainly not pro-Bacon. Perhaps no seventeenth-century writer dared to take sides openly with Bacon. In the end Berkeley was supported by royal edict and royal troops as well as viceregal power from his commission as governor. Yet authors Cotton and Mathew were not enamored of Berkeley even when they showed their distrust of Bacon. A later colonial historian such as Stith, had he got as far into Virginia's history as 1675-1677, might well have been a Baconian. Even then, Stith wrote so long after these events

that he would not have had the kind of authority the historian son of Robert Beverley, Senior, has.

As the contemporary documents stand, only a few deserve consideration as literature, and perhaps of them two or three as history. The pamphlets printed at the time of the Rebellion, *Strange News from Virginia. Being a full and true Account of the Life and Death of Nathaniel Bacon, Esquire*, and its sequel *More News from Virginia*, both appearing in London in 1677, are brief and sketchy in detail, and authored from incomplete data by someone in England.¹⁷² In *An Historical Account of Some Memorable Actions, Particularly in Virginia*, Sir Thomas Grantham included several letters and other official documents and an egotistical memoir of his own experiences published many years after the events recorded, with some very flimsy evidence of his self-declared part in bringing an end to the whole action. "Virginia's Deploured Condition. Or an Impartiall Narrative of the Murders committed by the Indians there, and of the Sufferings of his Ma[jes]ties Loyall Subjects under the Rebellious outrages of Mr. Nathaniel Bacon Junr: to the tenth Day of August A. Dom. 1676,"¹⁷³ not published until a century ago and now known to have been written by William Sherwood, is a fairly detailed partisan and vicious attack charging all the blame to Bacon. A reasonably balanced manuscript report, showing the author's dislike of Berkeley but placing most of the blame on Bacon, is that of the commissioners sent by the King, with troops, to settle the whole affair. This is John Berry and Francis Moryson's "A True Narrative of the Rise, Progresse, and Cessation of the Late Rebellion in Virginia."¹⁷⁴ In the plain style, without rancor, this account traces the principal events and gives in a tightly packed paragraph what is perhaps the best contemporary character sketch of Bacon. Though the authors had no sympathy with "the populace," as Bacon's supporters were called, they can at times justify their leader's own measures, and they have little good to say of the courage or resourcefulness of most of Berkeley's supporters. A forceful narrative in terse language anticipating the writing of the eighteenth century, the Berry-Moryson document lies somewhere between official state-of-the-colony report and historical literature.

"An Account of Our Late Troubles in Virginia. Written in 1676, by Mrs. An. Cotton, of Q. Creeke" is a letter which condenses one of the major writings of the period and employs many of its phrases.¹⁷⁵ It was probably written by a Mrs. Ann Cotton of Queen's Creek near Williamsburg.

Clearly related to the letter just mentioned is the earlier of two major, genuinely historical accounts. It was first published in 1814 by the Massachusetts Historical Society from a mutilated manuscript called the Burwell Papers, deriving the name from a Virginia congressman who appears to have lent these family documents to Josiah Quincy in 1812 with per-

mission to print. After a more accurate reprinting in 1866, the manuscript was returned to Virginia.¹⁷⁶ For a number of reasons this is one of the most interesting documents to come out of the colony. The author was probably John Cotton, son of a puritan Anglican Eastern Shore clergyman and himself clearly a well-educated man (despite idiosyncratic spelling) of considerable literary talent. His style looks backward as that of Berry-Moryson looks forward, for his prose is that of a seventeenth-century euphuist (a little old-fashioned even in his own time), full of puns, (often atrocious), antitheses, alliteration, half-ribald jokes, literary allusions, and learned references. He has read *Scoggan's Jestes*, mentions the Ptolemaic and Copernican theories, the Koran, *Reynard the Fox*, and scores of other authors and books. There is throughout an atmosphere of levity, though one may discern that the author was serious in his attitudes towards all the movements and the participants in his mock-heroic story. Though most readers have concluded that he was anti-Baconian, his sardonic thrusts at the rebel leader and his followers are no sharper than those he directs at Berkeley and the governor's retinue. Actually the author seems to have about the same degree or kind of sympathy for the Baconians—that is, a strictly limited but nevertheless real sympathy—as the commissioners had for them. Included are two famous antithetical elegies on Bacon, which have for some readers shown the author as a secret Baconian struggling to conceal his true emotions. This or the reverse may be read into the text.

Cotton, or whoever the writer was, has much the same attitude toward his subject, or theme, as had New Englander Nathaniel Ward and Marylander George Alsop toward theirs. Like them, he clothed a serious subject in motley and adorned it with cap and bells. He had a tragic story to relate, and he was well aware of it. Though the first lines of the manuscript are worn away, the surviving text indicates that he had organized his material into three parts, "The Indians Proseedings," "Bacon's Proseedings," and "Ingrams Proseedings," and that he used a chronological narrative pattern. Yet one grows a little weary of keeping the events in order beneath the welter of words, such as "this strange and unexpected news put him, and som with him, shrodely to there trumps, beliving that a few such deales, or shuffles (call them which you please) might quickly ring the cards, and the game too, out of his hand," or the axiomatic "Bad Ware requires a darke store, while Sleeke and Pounce inveagles the Chapmans judgment," or the simile "[the] Accomackians, who (like scholars going to schoole) went out with hevie harts, but returned hom with light heeles." Yet beneath this, or amidst this, are straightforward descriptions of the topography of Jamestown and the performance of individuals and groups, as well as the grim and sardonic paragraph on Bacon's death. The author indicates his distrust of Bacon's demagoguery and his disgust at Berkeley's

intransigence and cruelty. Ingram, Bacon's successor as rebel chief, he likes least of all. The tone of the skeptic is never relieved, save possibly in the first of the two elegies, the majestic pro-Bacon piece, and in the conclusion, mutilated by loss of manuscript portions, where he depicts the courage and dignity of Drummond on the way to his execution.

Thus in the garb of Harlequin a Virginia philosopher told a dramatic story which is history. Character vignettes; stratagems; foolhardy, brave and ingenious actions; and shrewd analyses of motives and results lie within the somewhat tiring rhetoric. In the eighteenth century satire was to become more explicitly the guardian of the public weal. Here a narrative employing gnarled and graphic detail depicts the follies and vices of real men in tragic conflict. The reader may decide for himself whether this scathing history has a moral.

Another significant account, written by an observer and even unwilling participant, is "The Beginning, Progress, and Conclusion of Bacon's Rebellion, 1675-1676," written by T[homas] M[athew], a merchant-planter of the Northern Neck of Virginia.¹⁷⁷ His seat was in the parish of Bowtracy (really Fairfield) at Cherry Point in Northumberland County, though he also had extensive landholdings and mercantile enterprises in frontier Stafford. In the pro-Bacon General Assembly of 1676 he like Colonel George Mason was a burgess for Stafford and for a time supported Bacon, apparently through force or fear, so that he was at first exempt from the general amnesty. He wrote this account in 1705 for Robert Harley, later Earl of Oxford, at the time Queen Anne's principal secretary of state. It was a command performance, perhaps because Harley knew of Mathew's firsthand knowledge of the action in Virginia and wanted what might be, because of the lapse of time as well as the author's presumed ability to see both sides, an authoritative commentary or history. Whatever Harley's purpose, Mathew considered that he was writing a "little Treatise of History," as he mentions in the dedication to Harley.

Washburn considers this 1705 narrative dubious as authentic history because of the lapse of time, Mathew's official record as an opponent of Berkeley, and Mathew's suggestion that the rebellion was motivated by a desire to reform abuses in government. Washburn seems to give certain facts too little weight: that the account in itself is for the most part impartial though finally partial to Berkeley's administration and that the Indian troubles are acknowledged as the first step in the chain of circumstance and as a major factor throughout. In general, nevertheless, historians at least from C.M. Andrews through Richard L. Morton have seen T.M.'s "little Treatise" as the most reliable and effectively written of the Rebellion documents.

Mathew's style is somewhere between the old fashioned baroque-euphistic

of Cotton and the Royal Society plain style¹⁷⁸ of the Berry-Moryson report. It is seventeenth-century in its grammar and sentence structure but lacks the elaborate and sometimes tortured figures of Cotton's lines. Mathew's errors of memory are quite few, even without allowing for the thirty-year interval, for almost everything he says is borne out by at least one other writer who recorded his observations on the spot. Naturally his is not as colorful as Cotton's account, though there are three or four dramatic incidents.

Mathew begins by pointing out ominous portents in 1675 which pre-saged the tragic events—a streaming comet, an endless flock of pigeons which darkened the sky, and swarms of insects rising from holes in the ground and causing great damage to vegetation during the month before they returned to the earth. Then he recounts the story of the murder of his Stafford plantation overseer by Indians, an act which may have set the whole series of events in motion; Brent's and Mason's immediate and indiscriminate retaliation not only on unfriendly but also (by mistake) on friendly Indians; and the general consequences of panic, attacks by and upon red and white, and the killing of Bacon's overseer and servants. Within the first portion of this straightforward narrative Mathew includes one of his dramatic scenes, that in which an Indian child seems to have been brought back to life by Christian baptism. This story, he says, came from his overseer Mr. Pimet, who witnessed the apparent miracle.

Condensing yet conveying the sense of confusion, fear, and rage which caused the frontier settlers to choose Bacon to lead them against the Indians, Mathew gets quickly to Bacon's encounter with Berkeley when the governor offers and accepts the rebel's parole. The ensuing scenes between the major antagonists are set down with detachment, with the interesting background of the session of the Assembly of which the author himself was a part and an unwilling member of a "Committee for the Indian Affaires." Then the reader gets a brief but significant glimpse of the Queen of the Pamunkeys as she appeared before the Assembly to express her sorrow and sense of the injustice done her and her tribe. At this point, at least, the author's sympathies are only with the Indians, despite his awareness of his personal losses brought about by individuals among the tribes. He introduces his reader to Mr. Lawrence, the thoughtful philosopher among the Baconians, and to the elder Nathaniel Bacon, the rich and childless relative who designed his whole estate to go to his rash young cousin but was himself a loyal Berkeleyite. One sees the writer gradually forced by circumstance toward the Berkeley side through Bacon's extravagance of action and temper, though not before T. M. makes it clear that county militia commanders would have served under Bacon on the frontier had the governor granted him a legal commission. Mathew tells of his

being forced to act for a time as Bacon's secretary, with the implication that this may have brought him into disfavor with the governor. The months of tumult, marching and countermarching, capture and burning of Jamestown, danger of insurrections in Maryland, down to Bacon's return from his last expedition sick of the flux are all packed into a few brief pages. Succinctly delineated are Mathew's conversations with his friends Mason and Nicholas Spencer and with "the sober Scotch Gentleman," Mr. Drummond, Berkeley's cruel and dramatic greeting to Drummond when that rebel was captured, and the disappearance of Lawrence into ankle-deep snow. Unlike Cotton, Mathew spends little or no time on the months of Ingram's last-ditch skirmishing and evasions, but comes rapidly to a conclusion with the arrival of the fleet with the commissioners and a brief comment upon Berkeley, at long last in London: "a report was Whisper'd about, that the King did Say 'That old fool has hang'd more men in that naked Country than he had done for the Murther of his Father,' whereof the Governour heareing dyed soon after without having seen his Majesty; which shuts up this Tragedy."

There is a rather startling appendix, in which the timid yet perceptive Mathew makes the suggestion that behind the Rebellion lay not the younger Nathaniel Bacon, but that "thinking Man" Mr. Lawrence, who seized the opportunity to "improve" the Indian quarrel by making it the means of relieving the unendurable oppressions of the governor. For Lawrence, the wealthy innkeeper and Oxford graduate, suffered a deep sense of injustice. And the wastrel Bacon was too young, too precipitate, as Mathew saw him, to implement the whole affair, "had not thoughtfull Mr. Lawrence been at the Bottom." This, he avers, was "a received Opinion in Virginia."

Mathew comes as close to being the disinterested historian as Bacon's Rebellion produced. Undoubtedly in 1705 he was not simply remembering, but was working from elaborate notes. About 1682 his friend William Fitzhugh, just returned from a visit to Cherry Point and Mathew, was puzzled that his old friend occupied all their conversation time enquiring about names of persons. T.M. must thus early have been gathering notes on an action in which he had been participant and onlooker, committed to neither side, but quite conscious that he had been a part of a major tragic confrontation in Virginia history.

HARTWELL, BLAIR, AND CHILTON

Written in 1697 but not published until 1727 was a present-state report which is not only a bit of promotion literature for the new College of William and Mary and a survey of Virginia ninety years after its found-

ing, but an illuminating historical prelude or preface to the work of Robert Beverley and Hugh Jones. This socio-political appraisal is often entirely overlooked in the brief surveys of colonial southern historiography which have so far appeared, though Moses C. Tyler thought it expertly written and a significant analysis of the colony at the moment in its development when it was actually becoming a royal province in fact as well as in name.¹⁷⁹ *The Present State of Virginia, and the College*¹⁸⁰ was the joint composition of Henry Hartwell, James Blair, and Edward Chilton, two of them lawyers and the third a clergyman. All the authors were British born and apparently visiting or residing in London when they wrote, though all had lived in the colony and attained considerable eminence there; Blair was to return to Virginia and remain in the colony until his death nearly a half century later.

The work originated, as did Jefferson's *Notes on the State of Virginia*, as a series of answers to a questionnaire. The newly reorganized Board of Trade had begun in 1696 an extensive investigation of the state of affairs in the colonies. It had been instructed to ascertain what manufactures and commerce might be developed in America without harm to Britain, and to discourage manufactures which might be competitive. Among the former American residents summoned to appear before this body were Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton. Soon the three were instructed to prepare a joint statement on conditions in Virginia. The result was a manuscript presented as their report on October 20, 1697, to William Popple, secretary of the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations. "An Account of the Present State and Government of Virginia" remained in some official pigeon-hole until it was published in 1727, probably for the benefit of the College of William and Mary, for the royal charter of that first southern university is appended.

Only in its first section does it deal directly with resources for commerce and manufactures, though II and III are at least obliquely concerned with the direct questions raised by the Board of Trade. The point of view is that of the ruling class in Virginia, especially its legal and ecclesiastical elite. Chilton and Hartwell were, with William Fitzhugh, perhaps the leading lawyers of the colony in the years before their return to England in 1694 and 1695. Blair, to be discussed in more detail in chapters on religion, was simply temporarily in London on business, to secure support for the college and to try to oust Sir Edmund Andros from the colonial governorship, in which endeavor he was successful. Blair was the Bishop of London's Commissary (representative) for Virginia and president of the college. Presumably he had much more ax grinding to do in his part of the discussion than did the two lawyers, though we know that both the latter were in regular correspondence with Virginians in America about

juridical and political matters. Naturally the outlook of all three would differ considerably from that of a Virginia-born Robert Beverley II or a William Byrd II, or even of a Hugh Jones, who though born in Britain spent most of his long life as a colonial parish priest close to people of all social and economic levels. The authors of this 1697 manuscript were royalist in outlook. In the case of Blair, who later was frequently to appear to take the side of church laity against governor and local clergy, the royalist bias was both conviction and necessity, the necessity coming because only through Crown beneficence would his college be firmly established. His long series of quarrels with royal governors, his frequent meddling in viceregal administrative affairs, and his personal avarice are factors to be weighed, though they were not fully apparent to his contemporaries until years after this treatise was written. Already Blair's long and unsuccessful attempts "to reform" the Anglican church in Virginia were in progress, though their ultimate aim or focus, as Chapters V and VI will suggest, is still difficult to determine.

The economic point of view here presented does not take into consideration Virginia's yeoman class, which had been harmed by such measures as the Navigation Acts. Like many British trade commissioners and colonial administrators before and after them, the writers deplore the one-crop tobacco economy and repeat the plea of the earliest promotion pamphlets for diversification, particularly to "commodity," natural and manufactured, which would be useful to Great Britain and, they perhaps thought, enriching to themselves or their class. Thus there is the tone and concomitant physical description of a Land of Eden, plenteous in resources, wholesome in air, boundless in fertile land. Like many others in the preceding one- or two-score years, they plead for establishment of towns in which children can be educated, manufactures established, and shipping concentrated. They remained, like most of their contemporaries, oblivious of the need for free artisans, not Negro slaves, if what they advocated was to develop. They blame selfish governors, obstinate countryfolk who do not want to become urbanites, and the lack of an adequate monetary system for Virginia's failure to realize its potential. They were at least half right, for they recognized the inadequacy even when often they failed to understand its causes.

Among the ecclesiastical matters which had been and were to remain with Virginia and Maryland throughout the colonial period were the perennial Chesapeake area problem of the variability and uncertainty of clergymen's salaries paid always in tobacco, the concomitant reluctance of local vestries to induct their ministers, and irregularities and laxity in observing the forms of worship. A festering sore in Blair's side during all his long life was the fact that neither he nor any other commissary had any

real power except to call conventions, since the governor retained all the temporal power of the Church such as probates and induction and appointment of clergy.¹⁸¹ What the Commissary failed to perceive—or refused to admit—was the now-obvious fact that the “abuses” he observed all grew naturally out of the isolated agrarian way of life in the tobacco country.

The two authors charged with reporting on legal matters criticize the irregular character of the judicature of Virginia, especially the mixed nature of county courts and the general provincial court. They find the system of appeals particularly weak, for, without commission to be so, the Council and governor were *de facto* the highest tribunal of the colony. They criticize the ignorance and amateurishness of county commissions of the peace without making any allowance for or admission of certain advantages in a lay judiciary. Finally, they show that the one office of the secretary of the colony “comprehends all the offices in England” (having to do with records) and that the infinite variety of duties performed by the official and his assistants makes for inefficiency and confusion.

The plan of *The Present State of Virginia, and the College* is simple and familiar enough to anyone who has read the pages on promotional literature above. The natural advantages of the country, its several sorts of inhabitants, and the system of land tenure is taken up in the first three “Sections.” Then separate sections are devoted to the governor, the Council, the laws and legislative power, and the administration of justice. The secretary’s office is the subject of a whole, though brief, eighth division. The last two usual promotional-historical chapters are concerned with money-revenue-tobacco and the militia; then the last chapters, XI, XII, and XIII, are devoted respectively to the Church and religion, the college, and the royal charter for the college. The whole of the politico-economic-juridical portion is an insistence by these tidy-minded legal authors that a thorough *ordering* of affairs is a prime necessity if the colony is to prosper in the fashion in which the Board of Trade thinks it should. And order of his own kind is also what Blair in the three concluding chapters (he probably wrote other parts as well) is insisting upon.

This is no chronological narrative, as were the Rebellion accounts or in its peculiar way John Smith’s *Generall Historie*. But as a whole and in any part it is an easy, clear exposition, one might almost say without what might be labeled a style, though in the discussion of the secretary’s office, a matter on which the author had strong feelings, there are noticeable rhythmic prose patterns. The college-promotion segment is really an appendage, and the reform-bias of the rest does not keep this interesting brief book from being history—the *record* of the status-quo of a particular decade and *suggestions* of the apparent potential of social institutions in the colony at the end of the seventeenth century. As in southern writing

and southern character down to the present day, in Hartwell-Blair-and-Chilton politics, the land, and religion are of paramount importance. And though less widely accepted as a regional characteristic, the interest in education is a pervasive element in southern colonial documentary literature, as a later chapter will elucidate.

ROBERT BEVERLEY

In the very year in which T.M. was dedicating his manuscript history of Bacon's Rebellion to Secretary of State Robert Harley, there appeared in London a printed work on Virginia also dedicated to Harley. The two accounts have little in common as to purpose or content, for even the brief portion of the published book devoted to Bacon's Rebellion places the blame squarely on the rebel. But *The History and Present State of Virginia, in Four Parts, by R. B., Gent.*, "a Native and Inhabitant of the Place" (London, 1705)¹⁸² is the first significant account of a whole province by an American, and one of the major works of colonial historiography. Though it is not Whig history in the sense or to the extent that William Stith's later work may be, it is in part a study of the past with reference to the present, without any indication of deep desire to understand the past for its own sake.¹⁸³ In a larger sense it is a nobly motivated attempt to explain "the ancientest, as well as most profitable Colony" to the British people, in "Justice to so fine a Country" as Virginia. Thus it is the first genuinely patriotic prose treatise by a colonial southerner, an author who shows a real delight and pride in his natural environment, including its fauna and flora; an absorbing interest in and knowledge of the vanishing red men who lived around him; some sense of the relation between past and present even when he is borrowing from Captain John Smith; and a comprehension of the structure and the problems of colonial government. Like patriot writers who have loved and lashed before and since, especially in America, he criticizes sharply the characters of Virginia's Crown-appointed governors, the laziness of his fellow colonists, and some other particular shortcomings of Virginians.

The author was Robert Beverley II, son of the aggressive, avaricious Berkeleyite of the Rebellion who as clerk of the House of Burgesses had later stoutly maintained his (and the Burgesses') independence by refusing to deliver up his books to a tyrannical administration and actively defied royal and gubernatorial edicts in a tobacco plant-cutting episode.¹⁸⁴ The elder Robert Beverley was imprisoned for a time and penalized, whether justly or unjustly it is now impossible to determine. At all events, the son's knowledge and perhaps remembrance of some of his father's experiences may have partially motivated his caustic comments on gov-

ernors. The younger Beverley, born about 1673, was educated in England, possibly at Beverley Grammar School in Yorkshire. He held various colonial governmental clerkships and in 1699 was elected to the House of Burgesses. Though he inherited fairly extensive lands in Gloucester County, he made his permanent home his estate in the frontier section of King and Queen County. In 1697 he married the sixteen-year-old Ursula Byrd, daughter of William Byrd I and sister of William II. Though she died at the birth of their son William, he never remarried. He lived quietly on his estate, "Blandfield," as a wealthy gentleman who was clerk of King and Queen County until he was dismissed about 1703 because of his attacks, during a visit to England, on Governor Nicholson and Robert Quarry, the surveyor of customs. He had charged them with plans to subvert the liberties of Virginians, especially of the House of Burgesses.

Personal interest undoubtedly had some part in Beverley's attack on Crown representatives. Although he had gone to England to try to secure rights to certain large landholdings which these officials were opposed to his acquiring, he must have held some of his father's prejudices against those who would circumscribe the legislative rights of the House of Burgesses. And he was certainly also motivated by his own spirit of personal independence and pride in his native land when he sat down to write his *History*. His letters support the larger work in demonstrating the intensity of his feeling.¹⁸⁵

It was during his long stay in England that the bookseller Parker asked him to correct the Virginia chapter in John Oldmixon's *The British Empire in America*, the imperialistic history which was not to appear in print until three years after Beverley's own work. Incensed at what he considered the errors and distortions in Oldmixon, and deciding that the work was too garbled to admit revision, he determined to write his own account of the colony. He had with him numerous notes on the subject, and he worked rapidly enough to have his book appear in 1705. Oldmixon's 1708 edition contained a much altered section on Virginia which had profited from Beverley's own printed work and from another authority on the colony; but it still infuriated Beverley to such an extent that in his 1722 revised edition of the *History* he included four pages listing errors in Oldmixon. The Englishman had the last word, however, for in a second edition of *The British Empire in America* he pointed out that "R.B." had "corrected" even some of the data taken from his own book.

The curious and significant thing about all this is its relation to the materials with which Beverley and Oldmixon worked and the relation of both historians' labors to a now-lost account of Virginia by Beverley's brother-in-law William Byrd II. In his 1708 edition Oldmixon acknowledges as his principal source a history of the colony by a gentleman of the

province, and in the 1741 edition he specifically names the author of this source as "Col. Bird, whom the author knew when he was of the Temple."¹⁸⁶ The story of Byrd's almost lifelong plan to write a history of Virginia will be reserved for Chapter IX, where it is considered along with that remarkable man's other writings. A comparison of the two editions of Oldmixon does not reveal marked differences between them beyond an updating of the materials, for which the author relied heavily on Hugh Jones' work to be discussed below. A few obvious errors appear in 1705, as in dating and in calling Nathaniel Bacon, Senior, the *father* of the rebel; but in almost every case they must have sprung from Oldmixon's inferences from, rather than the data of, his sources. The errors in both printed editions are relatively minor. Generally both refer to R.B. as a source for particular bits of information, but the intriguing fact is that certain elements not attributed to Beverley are remarkably similar to his and yet must have come from Byrd. Nowhere does Beverley acknowledge an awareness that his brother-in-law supplied Oldmixon with material, and the few surviving letters between the two Virginians reveal that they were on friendly terms. Beverley deleted references to the first Colonel Byrd and his garden in the second edition certainly not because of enmity for the son, but because the father was living when Beverley was composing the 1705 version but died just as it appeared.¹⁸⁷ The younger Byrd and Beverley were both in England in 1703-1705 period, and it seems entirely possible that Byrd may have furnished some of Beverley's as well as Oldmixon's materials. Though the brothers-in-law in London appear to have moved in somewhat different circles and had distinctly different tastes, they must have seen something of each other in England.

But whatever Beverley's sources were, and they were often printed as well as personal experience or observation, the book he produced was far more original than anything that had hitherto appeared on Virginia, including Smith's *Generall Historie*. The author is self-consciously American, in a secular and realistic and environmental sense in which his New England contemporaries such as Cotton Mather never wished to be. His plain style smells of his own woods and streams as Mather's more ornate prose smells of the lamp. He calls himself "an Indian" in his use of language, a term which identifies him with his native atmosphere and with a major subject of his discourse. "Truth . . . like beauty, is rather concealed than set off by ornament," he avers, and indeed simplicity was one of his obsessions. Probably he had an extensive library rivalling those of the Byrds, the Randolphs, and the Carters. At any rate, in his letters and in his *History* he unobtrusively, perhaps despite himself, shows that he was widely read.

Beverley's *History* is organized very much like the promotion tracts

and earlier general histories already noted, and indeed, somewhat like Oldmixon's work, which has eight chapters roughly corresponding to Beverley's four "books." Book I traces the history of the colony from the first settlement to his own time, Book II presents the natural products and the "conveniences" of the country suited to trade and "improvement," Book III is concerned with the religion, customs, laws, and appearance of the Indians, and Book IV concludes with a summary of the present state of the province in governmental polity and improvement of land. As history its value lies in Beverley's firsthand observations; as literature, in his expression of these in his own individual and effective style.

Book I, which leans heavily on Smith's *Generall Historie* for the period to 1625, so condenses the narrative that it is the opposite of Stith's prolix coverage. Beverley weighs his materials, however, and frequently comments as to the extent of his disagreement with statements which seem to him "chimerical." He tells the Pocahontas story, including Smith's letter to Queen Anne about the Indian princess, and ends with the laconic comment, "She left Issue one Son, nam'd *Thomas Rolfe*, whose Posterity is at this Day in good Repute in *Virginia*."¹⁸⁸ The years of the Company's control are depicted as a period of such extreme maladministration that in order to keep the colony alive King Charles had to take over, a minor error in dating with which he ends his third chapter of Book I. Since there was little available material on the years before Bacon's Rebellion, he hurries through the 1644 massacre, the settlement of Maryland, and the Commonwealth period, characterizing Sir William Berkeley as the wise and industrious leader before, during, and after Cromwell. He notes the Batts explorations, and then turns to Bacon's Rebellion. He gives as possible causes the same ones suggested in some of the accounts already here discussed in other respects—principally tobacco and the imbalance of exchange, the splitting of the colony into large tracts, or proprietaries, the heavy restraints imposed on trade by the English Parliament, and the disturbances by the Indians. He again hurries through the episodes of the uprising and concludes quite differently from Mathew, for he declares that Berkeley's conduct through the whole affair was highly approved by His Majesty. One reads this remembering that Robert Beverley I had not only been a loyal follower of the governor throughout the insurrection but personally had profited enormously by confiscation of rebel property.

In the same chapter Beverley comes to Governor Thomas Lord Culpeper, the first of a series of viceroys he sees as grasping and avaricious and often brutal and stupid men: "*This Noble Lord* was skilful in all the Ways of getting Money, and never let slip any Opportunity of doing it. To this End he seem'd to lament the unhappy State of the Country, in relation to their Coin."¹⁸⁹ The next governor, Lord Effingham, is let off with a few

words regarding his greed, but Nicholson, then lieutenant governor, was to Beverley a *bête noire* from this time forth. Sir Edmund Andros, who sought to impose English law as the sole authority in Virginia courts, he treats with relative impartiality. That is, he balances the bad with the good. He uses an alleged meeting between Andros and an old couple in Stafford who were one hundred and seventy-six years old respectively, with a twelve-year-old son, to insinuate that longevity and fertility resulted from living in Virginia. He then returns to Nicholson, now full governor, and devotes several pages to a scathing indictment, charging, among other things, hypocrisy in religion, vanity in building Williamsburg, Machiavellianism in politics, and scandalous behavior as chief judge. Personal motivation for this attack has already been noted, as has Beverley's genuine patriotism. He deleted these attacks in his second edition perhaps because he wished to use that edition (as others had somehow used the first) to persuade Europeans to settle in the colony.

Book II, "Of the Natural Product and Conveniences of Virginia; in Its Unimprov'd State before the English went thither," harks back in its emphasis or thesis to Hariot and Smith and others of the earlier generation and their dream of a southern Eden. Chapters on rivers and the bay, earth and soil, wild fruits, fish, and hunted game are based largely on his own observations, with occasional reference to sources as ancient as Peter Martyr, Verbiest, Lahontan, Hariot, Purchas, and Smith. He includes here, as he does later in other sections on the Indians, reproductions of the deBry-John White engravings. He goes out of his way to tell the story of his finding a tuliplike flower resembling in its shape the human genitalia and showing it to a "grave Gentleman" who was disgusted and "asham'd of the Waggy of Nature."

This survey of nature in Virginia leads naturally to Book III, in which he describes the red man in his native habitat. Some of the material is from Hariot and Smith, and he employs a number of the deBry illustrations. Incidentally he proves that Indian dress and manner of living had not changed greatly in the century and a quarter since the drawings were made. Again the most interesting and significant passages are based on his own observation. He had remnants of tribes living around him and had made several hunting excursions farther afield into their westward territories. He was most intrigued by their religion and devotes his longest chapter to it, a descriptive *mélange* from literary sources and his own experience. He records having once had an experience like that of his relative William Byrd II: he met an Indian who was coaxed, in his own instance with strong quantities of cider, into explaining his ideas of God. The Indian described a beneficent deity. When Beverley then asked why the red men are said to worship the Devil more than God, he received a logical reply,

perhaps the most revealing explanation of aboriginal religion any colonial ever received. God, said the Indian, has bestowed his gifts upon men but leaves it to their free will to employ them properly. But if they do not propitiate the Evil One, he will take away the health, peace, and plenty God has granted. When asked about the worship of the moss-stuffed images in their temples, the Indian replied stumbingly and hesitantly that it was their priests who made the people believe in such things, "and then gave me hopes that he wou'd have said something more, but a qualm crost his conscience, and hinder'd him from making any farther Confession."

Beverley tells another story set at the Henrico plantation of William Byrd I at a time when the tobacco was being ruined by drought. A neighboring Indian offered to bring rain for two bottles of rum. After an agreement was reached, the Indian went into a *Pauwawing* (powwow) which brought a good shower and saved the crop. Most amusing is Colonel Byrd's subsequent conversation with the red man upon the subject. Beverley also discusses Indian adolescence-initiation rites, their form and purpose, rites which Smith had described without comprehending.¹⁹⁰ And he tells a suspense-filled story of his friends and himself chancing upon a temporarily unoccupied Indian house of worship in the woods. They examined it carefully, all the while fearing some Indians might return to it and witness this desecration. No white Virginian had ever before seen the inside of one of these temples, Beverley declares, and he made the most of his opportunity. The result is our most revealing description of late seventeenth-century Indian religious paraphernalia, from ceremonial tomahawks and human thigh bones to the component materials of an okee, or devil-idol. This okee might look venerable anywhere, he observes, but is particularly impressive in the "glimmering light" of the windowless temple of the woods. All this is invaluable to American ethnologist and historian alike.

Book IV, in two major parts, deals first with Virginia government and then with the husbandry and improvements by then made possible in the country. Governor, Assembly, counties, parishes, the Northern Neck Proprietary, the naval districts, and the functions of each, are discussed succinctly. Revenues and public funds, levies for payment of public debts, the militia, the courts of law, the college, and the established church are passed over rapidly. He notes three small meetings of Quakers and two groups of Presbyterians, the two sects having gained a foothold only where there was such poor tobacco that the Anglican clergy could not be paid. He adds that the only thing he ever heard the clergy complain of was the precariousness of their livings, for very few were inducted, i.e., given tenure.¹⁹¹ He is more obviously writing from personal concern in his chapter on servants and slaves, where he denies ill treatment or overwork of servants, gives the office of overseer a good name, and

outlines the laws regarding treatment of slaves and indentured servants.

Chapter VIII of this last Book, "Of the Liberties and Naturalization of Aliens in Virginia," probably indicates that even in this first edition of his *History* Beverley had in mind more than the vindication of his country in British eyes. He makes a great deal of the settlement of French refugees in Virginia especially in 1699, and of the many attractions which he hopes will bring more of these people. The elder Colonel Byrd, he observes, has been particularly kind to them, an interesting comment in that the *second* Colonel spent much of the latter half of his life trying to persuade Huguenots to settle on his lands. This appeal, along with other features of the *History*, caused promoters interested in colonization to have three editions in French published between 1707 and 1712.¹⁹²

Part II of this section, "Of the Husbandry and Improvements of Virginia," may also be taken as colonization propaganda or as vindication. Here Beverley is endeavoring to correct a number of false impressions, among them the social quality of people in Virginia, who since the Cromwellian period had been more and more augmented by "good Cavalier Families," a declaration corroborating that of Sir William Berkeley thirty-odd years earlier. Though the descriptions of buildings, food, fuel, clothing, and temperature are meant to be impressive, most attractive is Beverley's panegyric:

I believe it is as healthy a Country, as any under Heaven: but the extraordinary pleasantness of the Weather, and the goodness of the Fruit, lead People into many Temptations. . . . Here they enjoy all the benefits of a warm Sun, and by their shady Groves, are protected from its Inconvenience. Here all their Senses are entertain'd with an endless Succession of Native Pleasures. Their Eyes are ravished with the Beauties of Naked Nature. Their Ears are Serenaded with the perpetual murmur of Brooks, and the thorow-base which the Wind plays, when it wantons through the Trees; the merry Birds too, join their pleasing Notes to this rural Consort, especially the Mock-birds, who love Society so well, that whenever they see Mankind, they will perch upon a Twigg very near them, and sing the sweetest wild Airs in the World.¹⁹³

The *History* is rounded out with a recital of further inducements, from recreations to practical commodities. Beverley's final word is sharply critical however, of "this slothful Indolence of [his] Countrymen," who must be aroused from their lethargy if they are to create a suitable habitation for civilized man in this natural Eden. As William Byrd II in his *History of the Dividing Line* criticized the laziness of the so-called North Carolinians on what were soon to become Byrd's lands, partially to indicate what the industrious might do in the same place, so Beverley may have been suggesting what some industrious Huguenot or Switzer might get

from the abundant land others had failed to utilize properly. But more than Byrd, Beverley was urging his countrymen to keep their hedonistic proclivities in proper perspective and proportion and get to work.

The past is obviously here, but is used only to explain or amplify the present. The present suggests what the future may be. Beverley believed in developing a self-sustaining plantation, and incidentally a self-sustaining civilization, in Virginia. To that end he made his own wine from his own grapes and his furniture from the trees in his forests. Temperate yet hospitable, in 1716 he supplied the Spotswood tramontane expedition with wine of his own vintage as well as joined the exploring party himself. John Fontaine, chronicler of the expedition, recorded that this wealthy man lived quite plainly. In this, Beverley was the opposite of Byrd, who imported luxuries and other British goods on every available ship. But like Byrd and the John Banister he mentions in his preface, he loved nature for her own sake and in the *History* records significant observations, though he was aware of his lack of training. In his last years he seems to have mellowed, if the deletions of highly critical matter in the 1722 *History* are in part the result of a growing tolerance. And in these later years (he died at forty-nine) he compiled, as had other Virginia country gentlemen, *An Abridgement of the Public Laws of Virginia* (London, 1722) and dedicated it to a colonial governor, his friend and exploring companion Colonel Spotswood.

Despite his disclaimers, in the *History* Beverley developed a fluid, graceful, and appropriate style. He employed authorities as no Virginia historian before him had done, weighing them in the scales of his own experience and logical mind. When he was critical, he was constructively so. His book, perhaps more than any other colonial history, bears the characteristics which later came to be considered southern, one of them being his joy, or his moral hedonism, in the natural world around him. He saw the attractiveness of primitive Indian life as it must have been before the white man came, and alongside it the notable failure of the white Virginian, at least partially through laziness, to attain any kind of civilized state which might compensate ethically or socially for this lost innocence. In his *History* Beverley analyzes and anticipates, and he hopes that posterity at least will do justice to so fine a country. Far more than other southern colonial historians, he suggests the social distance between Anglo-Americans and Englishmen. His is a notable book.

HUGH JONES

In 1724, two years after the appearance of Beverley's second edition, an entirely new account of the colony of Virginia was published in London.

Although the author has no dedication, in his introduction he acknowledges that he was urged to undertake the work "by a noble patron," probably Robert Harley, first Earl of Oxford, to whom T. M.'s account of Bacon's Rebellion and Beverley's *History* were dedicated. Apparently both Harley and the scholar-clergyman who composed the work believed that there was still more to be said about England's oldest colony and its neighbors. *The Present State of Virginia . . . From Whence Is Inferred a Short View of Maryland and North Carolina*, by Hugh Jones,¹⁹⁴ does indeed indicate that there was something more to be learned about the provinces of the upper South. But the book served other purposes as well.

Jones declares that the work was designed to supplement earlier books such as John Clayton's description of Virginia in *Miscellanea Curiosa*¹⁹⁵ and the histories of Beverley and Smith. For one thing, he notes, matters must be brought up to date (Beverley really never goes far beyond 1705 observations in his 1722 edition); and for another, previous authors have known so little of the subjects he wishes to emphasize that they could not have discussed them had they desired to do so. In addition, like most of his predecessors, he wishes to correct erroneous impressions of this part of America. He declares modestly that only truth and public service are qualities to be commended in his work.

To understand why the Reverend Mr. Jones wrote as and what he did, it is necessary to know something about the man. First, he must be distinguished from at least two other Hugh Joneses who were clergymen in Virginia and Maryland in his time and at least one of whom was a writer.¹⁹⁶ The author of *The Present State of Virginia*, born about 1692, matriculated at Oxford in 1709 and received the B.A. in 1712 and the M.A. in 1716. In the last year he announced his intention of going as a clergyman to Virginia. At about the same time, he was ordained and recommended by the Bishop of London for the vacant professorship in natural philosophy and mathematics at the College of William and Mary, a position which at least up to that time had been held by a clergyman. He reached Williamsburg in the spring of 1717 and by the next year was chaplain of the House of Burgesses and assistant rector of Bruton Church in addition to being a professor in the college. He became a close friend of Governor Spotswood, accompanying the governor to the Indian school at Fort Christanna, and in a 1719 convention of the clergy at the college heading the party which supported the governor in his running feud with crafty Commissary Blair. Blair's attitudes toward vestries, clergy, and the matter of clerical induction did not at all agree with Spotswood's. The clergy, finding that their Commissary sided in most matters with the prominent laymen of the vestries, were perforce supporters of the viceroy, who by law could have them appointed to and inducted in parishes and who wished to do so. The accu-

sations against Blair were a mixture of major charges and trivialities, but they definitely made Jones *persona non grata* to the powerful Commissary, who managed to rid Virginia of a number of governors and undoubtedly felt he could dispose of clerical opposition. Despite this, Jones seems to have remained at his post in the college until he went to England in 1721 for a three years' stay, certainly to present his case and that of the clergy and perhaps to let the strife subside. When he returned to America, Blair saw to it that he was sent to a difficult parish in King and Queen County. Jones suffered in this post but a short time, for by 1726 he was settled in the pleasant William and Mary parish of Charles County in southern Maryland.¹⁹⁷ Here he worked hard for five years, especially with the Negro slaves of the community. In 1731 he moved to Sassafras Parish, Cecil County, on the upper Eastern Shore, a pleasant situation in which he remained as rector the rest of his long life, dying in 1760 a fairly wealthy and certainly well-known man.

Jones had too active and versatile a mind to remain merely a parish priest. In the immediate line of duty he published a widely read sermon, *A Protest against Popery*,¹⁹⁸ in 1745. Earlier, while at the College of William and Mary or during the years in England when he probably expected to return to his professorial post, he composed three treatises, apparently intended as manuals or as textbooks in the education of adults. Two of them, on Christianity and on mathematics, are not known to have been published; but at about the same time *The Present State of Virginia* was printed and from the same publisher appeared *An Accidence to the English Tongue, Chiefly for the Use of Such Boys and Men as Have Never Learnt Latin Perfectly, and for the Benefit of the Female Sex: Also for the Welch, Scotch, Irish, and Foreigners. Being a Grammatical Essay Upon Our Language, Considering the true Manner of Reading, Writing, and Talking Proper English*, perhaps the first textbook on English grammar written for southern colonials. The methods it advocates will be noticed further in Chapter III. Later, during his years in Maryland, Jones wrote several mathematical and scientific essays for British journals such as the *Gentleman's Magazine* and published *The Pancronometer, or Universal Georgian Calendar*. By 1732 he was the chief mathematician for Lord Baltimore in the boundary dispute between Maryland and Pennsylvania.

Frequently Jones journeyed to nearby Philadelphia, where he became the personal friend of such versatile gentlemen of the Enlightenment as Richard Peters, Francis Alison, James Logan, William Smith, and Benjamin Franklin. In Maryland Lord Baltimore and his governors, at least until Horatio Sharpe, remained his personal friends, dependent upon him for advice in many scientific matters. As he notes in his history, he always found it advantageous to associate with persons of distinction.

One would expect from such a clergyman-educator-mathematician a very different sort of account of Virginia from what a planter and amateur investigator such as Beverley would write. Beverley was the well-read and largely self-educated patriotic native; Jones, the highly educated scholarly English-born devoted Anglican sincerely attached to the Chesapeake area. In *The Present State of Virginia* Jones clearly identifies with Virginia, but at the same time his early environment and education gave him a kind of disinterested zeal for certain causes in the colony, notably the established church and education, which were by no means Beverley's major concerns. Despite his scholarly training, however, Jones was more accurate in describing the "present state" than in outlining the history of the colony, probably because he did not have available the several printed histories or treatises Beverley had.

Jones' organization, in four parts of several chapters each and four appendices occupying half the space the main text does, is only in rough outline close to Beverley's or to Hartwell-Blair-Chilton's. His parts and their chapters are often hodgepodes or catchalls for a disparate variety of things. Part I, in two brief chapters, speculates first as to the origin of the three races—black, white, and red—inhabiting Virginia, and gives a brief disquisition on the Indians, principally secondhand. In the latter section he tells of Spotswood's tramontane expedition, the golden horse-shoes, and the inscription *Sic jurat transcendere montes*. His most interesting information concerns Spotswood's Indian school at Christanna, which he had visited. Part II opens with a quick two-page survey of the history of the English settlements in Virginia, including the old error of giving Charles I the credit for dissolving the Virginia Company, and in 1626 instead of the actual 1624. Most of this reads like garbled Beverley. In the second chapter of this portion, however, Jones presents an invaluable picture of Williamsburg as he knew it, including street plan and all major buildings, the organization of the College, and the dwellings of the "thriving city." In another chapter he discusses the origin, character, and languages of the Negroes as well as the various woods for building and the two staple crops, corn and tobacco. Miscellaneous Chapter V includes one of his most frequently quoted sentences:

If New England be called a receptacle of dissenters, and an Amsterdam of religion, Pennsylvania the nursery of Quakers, Maryland the retirement of Roman Catholicks, North Carolina the refuge of run-aways, and South Carolina the delight of buccaneers and pyrates, Virginia may be justly esteemed the happy retreat of true Britons and true churchmen for the most part, neither soaring too high nor drooping too low, consequently should merit the greater esteem and encouragement.¹⁹⁹

He follows this with a very different sort of observation reminiscent of Beverley's, that Virginians are "climate-struck," the easy living and hot summers making them a lazy people. On the same page he extols their hospitality and openhanded generosity, all qualities which observers including John Clayton, William Byrd II, and Robert Beverley agreed these colonials possessed, though Byrd makes his lazy Virginians into North Carolinians.

Chapter V is another catchall, the most interesting portion being the description of Spotswood's iron furnace and village of workers at Germanna. Part III, "The Church and Clergy of Virginia," presents a subject close to the author's heart, including a survey of the functions of the Commissary, priests, and vestries. He considers the problems of admission of the unbaptized and unconfirmed to the sacraments and hopes that the Book of Common Prayer may be slightly altered to fit the colonial situation. Part IV, the last of the main text, is another miscellany naming authors who have written of Virginia, listing all grades of officials, and making some comparison of Virginia with North Carolina and Maryland.

As exhortations to action and revelations of the interests of Jones himself the four appendices are the most important parts of the book. The first appendix, addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, then chancellor of William and Mary, is an elaborate scheme of reform and expansion for the College and its grammar and Indian schools. The second is a recommendation to the Bishop of London, within whose jurisdiction Virginia lay, for a similar reform and expansion of the religious structure, a recommendation which includes the appointment of a dean until a bishop can be procured, and a detailed outline of the proposed ecclesiastic's duties. The two last, addressed to the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations, are concerned with potential crafts and manufactures in Virginia and with improvement of trade. This thoughtful and educated observer still offers some old remedies such as gathering up the beggars and jailbirds and parish poor from English towns and countrysides, training them, and sending them to the colony as artisans. He warns that the "vast Shoals of Negroes" being imported will in the end ruin Virginia economy. He urges the promotion of malt-brewing, wine making, paper mills, and ironwork. The final appendix is a plea that British government and people will assist Virginia in bringing his suggestions to pass, for by so doing they will be aiding themselves. His last word is that the Chesapeake colonies must have a naval force to put down the pirates who prey on shipping.

The recommendations regarding trade, manufactures, and trained artisans may not have been very original, but if the Board of Trade had heeded them, the story of the agrarian South might have been quite dif-

ferent. Jones's ideas on church and education are more original and are discussed in the appropriate chapters below. The "gentlemen of distinction" who urged him to add and elaborate in his appendices surely included Spotswood and, most probably, British churchmen and university educators.

Jones has not the sense of style Beverley has, for his plain language, though urbane, is relatively colorless. Though he admired the style of the *Tatler* and *Spectator*, that of *The Whole Duty of Man* was to him the finest in English. Jones neither sees nor feels the past in relation to the present. He is intensely concerned with the present and future, and his plans reflect his disinterested zeal for the common good. Although the book reveals an unusual and versatile man, it remains most useful as a history of contemporary Virginia, of the earlier eighteenth century in this foremost of southern colonies. It is genuinely history in its great concern with a society, religious and academic and economic, and with that society's development under peculiar conditions. It is the history not of a chosen people on an errand into the wilderness, but of a people who, if they gathered the human dregs of the Old World and trained them, might create with their aid a new Canaan in this garden of the New World. Thus Jones, like Beverley, was far closer to the main stream of American historiography, or the American dream, than Bradford or Winthrop or Mather or Edwards. And in his advocacy of a middle way or golden mean in other matters as well as religion, he becomes a part of a southern planter tradition enduring for at least a century.

WILLIAM STITH

The last of the major southern colonial historians is, in almost every respect save for an intense affection for his native Virginia, quite different from his predecessors. He was an early American Whig in politics who wrote English-style-and-method Whig history. That is, he was a contemporary in thinking of Richard Bland and Peyton Randolph and the young Thomas Jefferson, and not much older in years than any except the third of these. He interpreted the past of his native country in terms of the social and political situation of his own day, as English Whig historians had done before him and as historians on both sides of the Atlantic were to do for generations to come.²⁰⁰

This historian was, like Blair and Jones, a clergyman of the established church but, unlike these two, was a native of the colony. At the time he composed his book he was rector of Henrico Parish, but he was also chaplain of the House of Burgesses, a former head of the grammar school of William and Mary, and a future president of that college. He was William Stith (1707-1755), grandson of William Randolph of Turkey Island,

brother-in-law of President William Dawson of William and Mary, nephew of Sir John Randolph, and cousin of Peyton Randolph and Thomas Jefferson. He attended the grammar school of William and Mary himself probably in 1720–1724, and in 1724 matriculated at Queen's College, Oxford, which over a long period had intimate connections in personnel and epistolary communication with the Virginia college. Many native Virginians attended Queen's, and many Queen's alumni, not necessarily colonial-born, came to serve on the Williamsburg faculty, perhaps because a Bishop of London most interested in education and the church in Virginia was himself a Queen's man.²⁰¹ Stith received the bachelor's degree in 1724 and the master's in 1728. Immediately upon his return to Virginia he was made master of the grammar school of William and Mary, taking his place among an able and in certain instances distinguished faculty.²⁰²

In Williamsburg he probably saw a good deal of his remarkable uncle Sir John Randolph during the five years he occupied the mastership, and he may have imbibed some of his liberal religious ideas²⁰³ and political Whiggism²⁰⁴ from Sir John and the circle of planter-lawyer-physicians who lived in the little capital or frequented it in "public times." Weary of presiding over boys of secondary school age, Stith resigned his post to remove to the rectorship of Henrico Parish, where he remained for sixteen years. He was frequently in Williamsburg even then, as chaplain for the Burgesses, and preached two of his three printed sermons during these years. As the preface to his history tells the reader, he often conversed with Sir John concerning the knight's proposed history of the commonwealth and later used the books and manuscripts in his uncle's library. He also was invited by William Byrd II to read certain manuscripts in the Westover library, and he had at his disposal all the printed materials of that greatest of southern colonial book collections. During Stith's years in his semirural parish on the glebe near Varina both Randolph and Byrd died, but not before the young clergyman had talked with them of Virginia history, perhaps especially as it was recorded in the unique manuscript materials each owned and in the partially preserved official records in the capital town as well as in the varieties of histories and other printed books in the two remarkable libraries.²⁰⁵

It was perhaps after the death of Sir John in 1737 that his nephew definitely decided to undertake a history, though he was toying with the idea some time earlier. Stith's preface informs us that Sir John's was to have been "an Historical Account of our Constitution and Government," that is, a juridical-political history. As Stith reminds his reader, he was no lawyer and made no attempt to interpret or construe nice legal points, though his history is in another fashion strongly political. He acknowledges reasons other than his uncle's example and purpose for his own

undertaking. He has thought it high time, since 140 years had passed since the first settlement, since early records were fast disappearing, and since no satisfactory history of the colony had ever been written except for Smith's "excellent but confused Materials," that a genuinely comprehensive history be composed. Perhaps most important, he has judged that his "perfect Leisure and Retirement" might allow him to employ his "vacant Hours" to some purpose. He proposes a history of "his country" which will go from its beginning to his own period. But either in aim or in execution he was greatly mistaken. That is, he could not or at least did not gauge time and materials together. His own prolixity, joined to the intricacies of even the rather one-sided version of early Virginia history his sources presented, resulted in a large volume that carried the story only to 1624 and the dissolution of the Virginia Company. He entitled his book *The History of the First Discovery and Settlement of Virginia: Being an Essay towards a General History of the Colony* and had it published by William Parks at Williamsburg in 1747.²⁰⁶ Though the records or inventories of every good-sized later eighteenth-century Virginia library included Stith, he complained that he lost £50 on the edition and made many enemies because of its contents.²⁰⁷ Old friends in England praised the work, including one fellow of Queen's College at Oxford, and certainly someone among them assisted in getting out the 1753 edition.²⁰⁸ Tired from his labors and discouraged at the reception of the volume, Stith for some years discontinued the arduous research necessary for a second installment. But in 1752 he was elected president of the College of William and Mary, winning the position on a close vote largely through the support of his old pupils of the grammar school, now members of the college's Board of Visitors. Again busy in his profession, he was also politically active in the Pistole Fee case in opposition to Governor Dinwiddie, acting with his friends Peyton Randolph, John Mercer, and perhaps Landon Carter and Richard Bland, from a Whiggish position somewhat anticipatory of the Revolution. But in 1753 he wrote Daniel Dulany of Maryland that, despite heavy presidential duties, now that he was back in Williamsburg close to the necessary materials he expected to begin a second volume.²⁰⁹ He died rather suddenly in 1755, like his uncle Sir John Randolph, before his time. Any writing he did between 1753 and 1755 has disappeared.

What remains is a unified segment of Virginia's story, carrying it from the Roanoke Island and Jamestown periods to the withdrawal of the Virginia Company charter and the assumption of royal government. As Stith tells the reader, for the first years of Roanoke Island and Jamestown, he had available deBry's *Harriot* with the John White drawings and maps, Purchas, Peter Heylen, and Captain John Smith, among other printed

materials. Undoubtedly he also had an opportunity to examine other histories and promotion pamphlets in Byrd's collections, perhaps some of those others he mentions in his text. In manuscript there were Sir John's collection and the old records in the capital already noted, and the London Company of Virginia's minutes for the 1619-1624 period together with some other manuscripts from Byrd's library. Stith describes the Virginia Company records which through Thomas Jefferson have now come to repose in the Library of Congress. They are partisan and definitely hostile to James I and to two allegedly greedy members of that monarch's court, and in equal measure sympathetic to the Earl of Southampton and Sir Edwin Sandys. In his preface Stith defends his obvious distaste for James I, who, though a royal personage, was far enough removed in time to be viewed and criticized as objectively as any other historical figure.

Because he possessed ample or at least abundant materials for certain years and very few for others, the coverage of events is quite disproportionate. More than three-fourths of the book is concerned with either the years Smith was in the colony or the 1619-1624 period of the Virginia Company court minutes; or, putting it another way, about one third is devoted to Smith's two years in the colony and about one half to the last five years. Though there were fragmentary materials for the ten-year period 1610-1619, they were indeed relatively few, while for 1607-1609 Smith's *Generall Historie* and for 1619 the manuscript Virginia Company records were available.

More than one historian or historiographer has speculated as to where Stith acquired the pronounced Whig bias in his history. Surely much of it came from the antiroyal, Protestant, natural-rights-of-Englishmen atmosphere and "party" which was developing in Williamsburg throughout the middle third of the century among his relatives and friends, almost all natives of the province. Some of it probably came from the Lockean principles he might have picked up anywhere, and from the apparently strong proofs of royal pusillanimity, chicanery, immorality, and intransigence attributed to King James as he appears in the Virginia Company's records.

As has been noted, it is somewhat difficult to decide just where Smith's sympathies in the *Generall Historie* lay politically so far as King vs. Company was concerned. Because of other influences on Stith's mind, as this later historian read the Company records, he interpreted Smith as pro-Company in some situations and in others pointed out his own reasons for believing that Smith was in error. For the later period his only major source was the Company records, though he does compare them with Smith's secondhand account of these years and weighs the evidence, almost always coming to agree with the Company's version of events. This is

natural and logical scholarly decision, for Stith could see as well as we do that Smith's information for the 1619-1624 period was sketchy and obviously often inaccurate. But Stith also came to feel that the Company, for all its fine qualities, never did right by Smith.

Compared with Stith, Oldmixon and Beverley and Jones are mere sketchers and decidedly amateurish. For the first time a southern historian was building his work upon "useful Papers and Records," consulting dozens of printed books, and giving a detailed survey of a relatively brief period. In other words, within limits, Stith was employing the method of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century historian. Wherever or whenever he had more than one source, he drew his own conclusions, and even when there was only one source, he inserted comments such as "This cannot be true," or an observation that the earlier narrator misunderstood the situation or what he thought he saw. Darrett B. Rutman finds examples of Stith's highly sophisticated use of evidence, as in the conclusion from the assembled materials that a retreat to the Eastern Shore was contemplated after the 1622 massacre, though no single source includes a positive statement to this effect.²¹⁰

As he moves into the last five years of his story, where he had such abundant sources, some previously unused, Stith employs them frequently to correct Beverley and Oldmixon and feels more and more the necessity for specific facts to buttress his conclusions. He would not guess beyond his evidence, although it is known today that he sometimes had only part of what existed or one side of the facts. He saw history in terms of men who themselves made events, not in terms of God's providence, as the New England historians saw it. Like other Whig historians before and since, he saw politically good men resisting bad men, in situations suggestive of his own time. Only incidentally does his personal political philosophy appear, as when he criticizes the power of the Council (despotic) as opposed to that of the Burgesses (representative). Unlike modern historians and indeed unlike Beverley or Jones, he really does not consider social (as distinct from socio-political), intellectual, or economic developments as causes or results. Liberty, to Stith and to many of his eighteenth-century contemporaries, was the natural state of man. To go against this nature, to subvert it, was the greatest of political crimes. It was in this light that he saw King James in his treatment of the Virginia Company. Yet Stith knew enough of joint-stock companies past and present to be fully conscious that they were not themselves champions of personal liberty. They were too close in structure and goals to the two surviving proprietaries of his own time, Maryland and Pennsylvania, which as governments were inherently evil to Whigs such as he. He is content to say in conclusion, in a sort of dirge for the end of the Virginia Company,

that this was "one of the noblest, most illustrious, and publick-spirited Societies, that ever yet perhaps engaged in such an Undertaking." But he goes on to comment that "we in *America* find by experience, that it is better to be under a Royal Government, than in the Hands of Proprietors, in what Shape or Manner soever."²¹¹

Stith's is a sophisticated yet plain style (which his kinsman Jefferson thought was wretched) with that quality of eloquence reflected in the best of his own sermons and most frequently in southern colonial legislative discourses in which assemblymen were simply talking to one another. But learning is ever present, in casual mention of a host of English antiquarians of his own stamp though by no means all agreeing with him in politics; in stories emanating from Richard Corbet or George Chapman; in his knowledge of George Sandys' translation of Ovid, most of which, as he knew, was written in Virginia; and in his charming and perceptive vignettes of his dramatic personae, including Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Richard Grenville, Captain Newport, Captain Smith, Sir Thomas Dale, and Powhatan's daughter. If the villains of his story were James I, Sir Thomas Smythe, and the Earl of Warwick, his heroes were Sir Edwin Sandys, John Ferrar, and Sir Walter Raleigh. In telling of Pocahontas he transforms Smith's description of "the King's dearest Daughter" to "the King's Darling Daughter," and so she has remained in romance to this day. Smith laid the framework and foundations for Virginia mythology. Upon Smith's foundations, Stith built, in a new and more liberal frame of reference, the myths by which later southerners might live—the gracious and farsighted and liberal Sir Edwin Sandys; the doughty John Smith, who saw to it that privilege or rank did not prevail while he was in the infant colony; the sturdily honest Sir Thomas Dale, the noble, self-sacrificial de la Warr, the greedy Argall; the slippery John Pory; the treacherous Nathaniel Butler. He saw in the Company's struggle to survive "a remarkable Aera in the *English* History, which gave rise to two professed Parties, the one for the King's Prerogative, and the other for the Rights of Parliament and the Liberty of the Subject."²¹²

Though certain historians today have "balanced" the picture, they have too frequently done so by going to the other extreme and declaring the Sandys-Southampton management inept to the point of criminality, utterly selfish, grasping, and dictatorial. With some new evidence in documents and a considered review of the facts and the supposed facts on both sides, one may see Stith beginning to emerge as closer to the truth than some of the earlier twentieth-century revisionists. He voices the spirit just beginning to become articulate in his time, for he opposed taxation from Britain without legal consent from the colonies, and he saw his principle or concept violated in that earliest South which he depicts. He was both

idealist and materialist, in eighteenth-century terms, and he never quite grasped, as Thad W. Tate has shown, the essence of the early seventeenth century. But he certainly belongs to the tradition of early Virginia revolutionaries, and there can be little doubt that he would have stood beside Richard Bland and other contemporaries had he lived.

One cannot fully agree, as at least one recent critic has declared, that Stith improves on Smith and other sources as he retells their stories; but he was a charming if prolix raconteur. If the reader can slow his pace and retain his patience, he will read with pleasure this eighteenth-century version of the loss of an early American Eden. Though the author was a clergyman, his secular account sees nothing of God's providence, but a great deal of man's greed and man's nobility as determining the nature of a colonial society.

The promotion literature of colonization, the accounts of discovery, and the histories, the three forms overlapping in content and purpose, show that the English-settled provinces from Maryland to Georgia, from 1585 to 1763, had something in common besides agriculture and slavery. Unlike the New England Puritans, their colonists were in America partly out of patriotism, a desire to expand or extend British dominion because they and their sponsors at home saw that only in people's going forth and settling could the nation survive. Thus, together with the middle colonists, they painted a rosy picture to attract settlers. Yet they came to build not a holy city, but a kind of utopia in a subtropical paradise such as Genesis and their personal observations told them they possessed or were to possess. Theirs was a utopian ideal always existing side by side with a practical interest in real estate speculation and commercial trading and profits. Like the Puritans, these southern settlers brought with them a feeling for the rights of individual Englishmen; unlike the New Englanders, for they lived widely separated or in isolation, they implemented their rights through representative assemblies rather than through direct vote in town meetings. Their basic religion differed little from New England's, but its proportionate place or degree of emphasis in men's lives differed. Short winters and long, warm months meant that southern settlers might enjoy the pleasures of their natural environment while their New England contemporaries struggled with Calvin or sin by their fireplaces within doors. Hedonism was a quality of character common to all southern classes from Councilor to black slave, objectionable or sinful only if it induced obviously harmful laziness or indolence. All this and much more one may learn about the colonial southern settler from his first writing, the come-hither pamphlet which gradually became a mildly self-analytical history.

CHAPTER TWO

The Indian as Image and
Factor in Southern
Colonial Life

CONTENTS

Introduction	105
Southern Anglo-American Literary and Philosophical Concepts of the Red Man	113
The Red Man as His White Neighbor Saw Him	117
Indian Personal Character in General	117
Portraits of Individual Indians	122
General Impressions of Indian Life: The Body of Literature	130
Dancing and Music	142
Sports and Games	152
Medicine	154
Marriage and Burial	161
Utopias	168
White Ideas of Red Origins	172
Native Religion and Christian Conversion and Education	176
The Frontier: Its Effects on Red Man and White	196
Policy: White with Some Red	197
The Special Problem of the Trader	201
Regarding Acquisition of Indian Land	204
The Indian Agent	208
The Frontier Indian Abroad: His View of the White Man	211
Accounts of Captivity and Torture	215
Communication: Practical and Artistic	220
The Intermediary: The Interpreter and His Role	221
White-Indian Oratory: Formal and Informal	230
The White-Indian Treaty: Politics and Art	239
Bibliography	415
Notes	429

~ ~ ~ But we chanced in a lande, even as God made it. Where we found only an idle, improvident, scattered people; ignorant of the knowledge of gold, or silver, or any commodities; & carelesse of any thing but from hand to mouth, but for baubles of no worth; nothing to encourage us, but what accidentally wee found nature afforded.

—JOHN SMITH, *A Map of Virginia* (1612)

~ ~ ~ And surely so desirous is man of civill society by nature, that he easily yields to discipline and government, if he see any reasonable motive to induce him to the same. . . . for it is not the nature of man, but the education of men, which makes them barbarous and uncivill, and therefore change the education of men, and you shall see their nature will be greatly rectified and corrected: seeing therefore men by nature so easily yeelde to discipline and government upon any reasonable shewe of bettering their fortunes, it is everie mans dutie to travell both by sea and land, and to venture either with his person or with his purse, to bring the barbarous and savage people to a civill and christian kind of government, under which they may learn how to live holily, justly, and soberly in this world, and to apprehend the means to save their soules in the world to come.

—ROBERT GRAY, *Good Speed to Virginia* (1609)

Wild as they are, accept them, so were we,
To make them civill, will our honour bee,
And if good workes be the effect of mindes

That like good Angells be, let our designs
As we are Angli, make us Angells too
No better work can Church or statesmen doe.

—WILLIAM STRACHEY, "Ecclesiae et Reipub:"

IN THE BOOKS and pamphlets in which the southern colonial explained his New World situation first to Britons and then to himself he had a great deal to say about his aboriginal neighbor, the red Indian. For the savage was a most significant part of the American scene and was for a variety of reasons enormously interesting to the European. During the seventeenth century this strange, uncivilized human being represented the marvelous and exotic upon which the Renaissance mind delighted to ponder. During the eighteenth century he was an object of the growing scientific curiosity of the Enlightenment. In spite of a series of obstructions and disappointments, the native's conversion to Christianity was a continually avowed and implemented aim of governors and churchmen in the southeastern region, pursued with a persistence the missionary impulse did not always maintain in the northeast. By 1700 the coastal settlements had ceased to fear for themselves the red war whoop and surprise attack; but a continuing series of raids, skirmishes, intertribal feuds, and full-scale wars along the western boundaries reminded them that the Indian remained a threat to peace and to orderly government and progress. But from the beginning he saved Virginia settlers from starvation, and from the beginning his skins and furs were principal items of a lucrative trade which enlarged and endured far into the national period.

From the Indian the white man learned much about clothing, traveling, farming, woodcraft, and even fighting in the trackless forests. From him the white obtained three of the world's most valuable crops—corn, potatoes, and tobacco—and at least fourscore other products of the soil for food and medicine. Not all these originated in the southeast, but most of them reached northern Europe from that region. From him the white learned practical and decorative arts still noticeable in our culture, games still being played, and a host of names still applied to streams and mountains and towns and geographical areas. It is no wonder that the Indian remained close to the front of the southern colonist's mind, and that from the southeastern region, from Thomas Hariot in 1588 to James Adair in the 1760s, came the most discerning and complete discussions in existence of the American red man as the white Englishman found him.

Many questions naturally arise, not all of which can be answered in

this chapter. Was the white-Indian experience of the Southeast different from that of Pennsylvania, New York, and New England, different because of topography and climate, the particular tribes encountered, the particular white men who settled the different regions? There is of course no single or simple answer. All British America shared many white-red relationships and problems, or had them in common, as treaties at Lancaster or Albany or Logg's Town suggest. But Chesapeake Bay Powhatan Algonkians or southern mountain Cherokees of Iroquoian stock were not northern Iroquois or Narragansetts, though there were varying degrees of blood-and-culture relationships among all these eastern peoples. And during the period one southern group, Tuscaroras of Iroquoian stock, migrated to their kinsmen in the northeast and formed a sixth to add to the famous Five Nations of the Pennsylvania-New York-New England area. Climate and topography clearly affected Indian-white relations as well as Indian ways of life.

Why is it that the captivity narrative is the principal literary form in which northeastern (and later western) Indians survive? And despite notable captivity tales from John Smith's most romantic rescue through John Lawson's torture and execution to Appalachian terror stories, why is it that the great quantity of southeastern literary expression regarding the Indian concerns more peaceful things, really economic or ethnological or anthropological matters? How does the fur trade from 1620 in New England and 1585 in Carolina compare through almost two hundred years as an economic-political factor in the two regions, in both of which it is of great significance? There will be space here to consider only obliquely the southeastern trade, a relatively negligible factor in Maryland, important in Virginia, and perhaps vital in eighteenth-century South Carolina and Georgia. And a dozen other questions will be raised and usually answered by implication in this chapter.

Much of the Indian-as-subject literature of the Southeast is, like that of the middle colonies and Northeast, infused with the idea or the perspective of what Roy Harvey Pearce calls "savagism," the belief that civilized men were once like preliterate societies which the colonists found in North America and that, insofar as savage society impeded the advance of civilization, it had to be destroyed. Though this perspective was made most explicit in writing during and after the Revolution, as Pearce shows, it was at least implicit as early as Johnson's 1609 *Nova Britannia*.¹ The colonist thus studied himself as well as the Indian. Call the perspective "savagism" (a good term under these definitions) or what you will, the culture the white man fought or destroyed or recorded with his half-comprehending eyes offered him new and exciting areas of interest. The southern colonial such

as Hariot or LeJau became the first Anglo-American anthropologist or ethnologist. He became a student of comparative religion or of *materia medica* from southeastern flora and a searcher for fertile (and from his point of view unused) lands. The "savagism" divided itself into questions of government, agriculture, and war and peace, and the means to both (treaties), and it produced a respect for aboriginal dignity and oratory, dance and drama and ritual, for the utility of Indian shoes (moccasins), for Indian marriage and burial customs, and for native ways of hunting and fishing and planting.

Before proceeding to a direct discussion of the writing about the Indian in the colonial southeast, the reader should know at least certain basic facts about the tribes and the linguistic stocks they represented and the probable length of their residence in the area.² Geologically and geographically, the region inhabited by the red man with whom the southern settler came into contact was one of the newest as well as richest parts of North America, ranging in altitude from coastal flats and sands just above sea level to the highest mountains (land masses) east of the Rockies. The red population figure for the area from the Chesapeake to Texas and the Atlantic to the Mississippi has been conjectured by James Mooney for the period 1600-1650 as 171,900, a figure John R. Swanton feels is somewhat high. This figure includes a considerable proportion of people and tribes with whom the southern colonial had little or no contact before 1763. Of the red people the settler did know a single mountain nation, the Cherokees, was the most numerous, exceeding 20,000. Next came the Creeks and Choctaws of the southern and southwestern segments of the region, the Choctaws probably leading in population density. They were followed in size or number by the Powhatans of Virginia, the Timucuans and Apalachees of Florida, the Chickasaws of northern Mississippi, the Catawbias of both the piedmont Carolinas, and the Tuscaroras of the North Carolina piedmont.

Generally speaking, the horticultural tribes of the interior, the corn-growers, were the most numerous, but coastal groups were dense in such areas as the Sound region of Virginia and North Carolina, the similar coastline from Charleston, South Carolina, to the St. John's River, and other areas in West Florida and the bayous of the Mississippi. Though judging by their different names those with whom the settlers came into contact were numbered by the score, actually all of them represented only a few linguistic stocks, primarily the Muskhogean (such as Seminoles, Chickasaws and Choctaws, the Yamassees, and others of their or related groups); the Tunican (such as the Yazoos); the Uchean or Yuchi (in three or more divisions in the Carolinas); the Siouan (with one division including the Catawbias and other Cape Fear and Tutelo divisions with varying tribal

names); the Iroquoian (Tuscaroras, including the Meherrins and Nottoways, and the Cherokees); and the Algonkian or Algonquian (principally coastal divisions such as Powhatans, Machapungas, Pamlicos, and Hatteras). The Shawnees were marginal, though they are mentioned in southern writing.³

The traditions of most southeastern tribes, as well as their linguistic kinship with other outside peoples, suggest that they came into the area from the west or north, probably the northwest. The few contradictory migration legends can easily be explained away, the ethnologists tell us.⁴ All traditions of the Siouan tribes, for example, point to a northwestern origin. Stories of Algonkian origin are reinforced by linguistic similarities and obvious kinship in names and certain aspects of culture. All or almost all the southeastern peoples were relatively late comers to the region. The aboriginal remains now being excavated and studied by anthropologists and archaeologists in certain instances go back thousands of years to peoples different from those the Spanish and French and English found, and in other instances they represent contemporaries of the first Englishmen. Since the Indians of the historical period had no written language, though in a few exceptional cases they had some rough but still undecipherable hieroglyphics, today one must depend largely on what the colonial white wrote concerning them to understand what sort of people they were. This historical and literary record is of course constantly being enlarged and enriched by the systematic and archaeological research just noted.

Though there were at least six lesser groups, the coastal Virginia-Maryland-North Carolina Algonkians, the people with whom Hariot and White and Smith and Strachey and the Calverts first came into contact, were primarily members of the powerful Powhatan confederation under the chief or emperor of that name, who had expanded his inheritance of six villages to more than two hundred. In 1622 Governor Francis Wyatt had to face and defeat a force of more than a thousand of these people, but by 1705 they had shrunk to twelve villages. On their reservation in King William County, Virginia, the mixed-blood remnants of these mighty relatives of Pocahontas still survive in a shrunken corner of their "original" historical territory. They seem never to have been able to migrate, or never to have wished to try, and were gradually decimated by disease and the white man's other weapons—and strategies—until they were relegated to the place they now occupy. But for several generations the white writers (and even one remarkable painter) of the Chesapeake area focussed upon them. Today there remains much material to indicate their character individually and collectively, including anything and everything from oratory and dancing to government and religion.

West of, or behind, the Algonkians of the Bay country lived and wan-

dered in the time of Captain Smith Siouan peoples such as the Saponis, who gradually drifted south from the Rivanna River to the Roanoke and still later to North Carolina, where John Lawson found them in 1701. They were often accompanied by some of the Tutelos, with whom they eventually settled near Fort Christanna on Meherrin River, where they are mentioned by Spotswood and William Byrd II. The third Virginia linguistic cluster was of Iroquois stock, principally the Meherrins, the Nottoways, and the Tuscaroras. All three of the last enter colonial literature and white governmental record.

Through much though not all of the colonial period Maryland made treaties and maintained peace with its Algonkian natives and with the Nanticokes (allied linguistically with the Delawares) and with the Susquehannocks or Susquehannas or Conestogas, of Iroquoian and other stocks, people who were so badly decimated before the end of the seventeenth century that most of them joined remnants of other tribes in the Carolinas. Semmes estimates about five thousand Indians for seventeenth-century Maryland, about two thousand of Iroquoian stock and the rest Algonkian.⁵

In North Carolina the Roanoke Island pioneers encountered an Algonkian people close kin in culture and language to the Powhatans, a fact which helps to explain why John White's 1585-1589 drawings and paintings of North Carolina Indians were accepted and used as accurate representation of most Chesapeake and Carolina red men for at least a century and a quarter thereafter. It was these people Francis Yeardley and his friends visited in 1654. Some of Yeardley's group also visited the Tuscaroras, other whites met the Hatteras (perhaps the friendly Croatans of Raleigh's colony), again Algonkian, and trader-explorers such as Abraham Wood met the Chowans, the Weapemeocs, Machapungas, Pamlicos, and other Algonkian tribes. The Neuses were Iroquoian like the Tuscaroras, while the Cape Fear Indians may have been Siouan, as were the seven Tutelo tribes. Finally, just east of the mountains were the Siouan Catawbas, who occupied a territory now partly in both Carolinas. And beyond the mountains and in the mountain valleys was the great Cherokee nation of Iroquoian stock, a people destined to be related more directly to South Carolina and Virginia during the colonial era than to North Carolina. Most of these North Carolina tribes have also a part in the story of South Carolina.⁶

The South Carolina tribes were highly diversified in linguistic origins, but all possessed certain traits in common. All had attained a fairly diversified state of agriculture, all were village dwellers, and all built permanent or semipermanent dwellings. In appearance they were much like

the Virginia-Carolina Algonkians. The Cusabos, It(t)iwans, and eastern Coosas, probably of Muskogean stock, lived in the early colonial period along the western half of the coastline, though by 1715 they had all together shrunk to about five hundred people. Like the Virginia Powhatans, they did not migrate but were absorbed as mixed-bloods into white and Negro groups. The Kasihtas (or Cusitawhatchees), visited by De Soto, were probably a Muskogean people, who at least at one time lived east of the Savannah River. By 1738 they were down to some 111 warriors. Among the fiercest and most warlike of Carolina tribes were the Westos of Westabou, probably Rechaheerians, who came in colonial times from Virginia and may have been of Uchean (Yuchi) linguistic stock. They appear in Dr. Henry Woodward's early account, and in 1660 they attained some prominence because of what was called the Westo War. Finally defeated and almost annihilated, the survivors were absorbed into the Creek confederacy and moved out of the province. The restless and wandering Savannahs, relentless slave traders, were a Shawnee tribe remaining long enough in one place to give their name to a river; from Pennsylvania and Maryland parties of them made raids into South Carolina until just before the Revolution. The Notawegas (probably the same people as the Iroquoian Nottoways of Virginia) also harassed South Carolina for eight years during the governorship of James Glen.

The most famous Indians in South Carolina history and literature were the Yamassees, of Muskogean affiliation, a proud people who fought a great war against the whites and gave a title to the best-known of South Carolina novels. For a time they fought as allies of the English against the Tuscaroras, but in 1715, goaded beyond endurance by the outrageous behavior of unscrupulous traders, they rose in an insurrection against the colonists. After their defeat they fled to Florida and apparently were eventually absorbed into the Seminole nation. The census of 1715 shows them with 413 warriors and a total population of 1,215. Slightly earlier, in 1711, both the Carolinas were involved in the Tuscarora War, best remembered for the torture and execution of John Lawson by his former Indian friends. The Yamassees aided the Carolinians in defeating the Tuscaroras and causing one segment of that nation to move north and join their Iroquoian brethren of the Five Nations.

Other tribes of the Savannah River basin survive only in place names and in the records of Indian traders and agents. Usually Siouan were the small South Carolina River tribes such as the Sewees, Santees, Congarees, Waterees, Winyahs, and others, some of semi-nomadic habits. The Catawbas, who possessed some remarkably able leaders, will appear a number of times in this chapter. The already-mentioned mountain Cherokees were

of great importance to South Carolina, primarily for the lucrative fur trade they engaged in. Though usually friendly to the English, occasionally they were impelled to retaliation by frequent abuses and constant encroachment upon their land. Peace was not declared until 1791. They were an intelligent and progressive people; their eventual removal and "the Trail of Tears" is one of the tragic stories of American history, though it occurred long after the colonial period.⁷

From the time of the inception of Georgia and its first settlement in the 1730s the problem of reconciling the Indians to English intrusion had been recognized. By 1733 Oglethorpe had made a treaty with "representatives" of the Creeks (Muskogean in linguistic affiliation) though the credentials of the Indian "representatives" were somewhat suspect. Then in 1739 Oglethorpe had a friendly conference with the Lower Creeks situated on the Chattahoochee, and negotiated with the Creek, Cherokee, and Chickasaw nations. Georgia and South Carolina soon found themselves as rivals for the trade of these and other tribes, and much of the Indian diplomatic-economic history of the two decades before 1763 concerns these inter-colonial differences and attempts to solve them, either by bold aggression or by conciliation. Royal Governor Henry Ellis of Georgia, who took over in 1756, signed agreements with the Upper and Lower Creeks in Savannah in 1757. During the English-Cherokee War Georgia was little scathed. And the Indian power in the old southeast was immensely curtailed by the treaty signed in Augusta in 1763 between the governors of Georgia, Virginia, and the two Carolinas and representatives of the more important southern tribes. The boundaries established at the moment seemed to the whites at least fair enough in guaranteeing certain Indian lands. But the articles also guaranteed white safety in certain areas of the trans-Appalachian region, and almost immediately hordes of whites poured into Kentucky and Tennessee.⁸ In the coastal southern colonies the Indian remained only a tributary nation, on pitifully small and wretched reservations. If one excepts the inland and mountain Cherokees, the Indian was no longer a serious martial or economic threat to the advance of European civilization and the British empire, for he had vanished. But though he disappeared physically, his culture left its imprint on his conquerors and on the land. The English-language expression and explanation of what the red man was, especially the elaborate and entertaining accounts of the features of his character and his culture which fascinated his destroyers, do much to explain the mind of the southern colonial Caucasian. They demonstrate the settler's scientific curiosity, his assumption of Anglo-European civilization as superior, his moral and ethical nature, and usually his greed.

SOUTHERN ANGLO-AMERICAN LITERARY AND
PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTS OF THE RED MAN

To understand the southeastern colonial mind, the modern reader must remember that the settler from Europe had brought with him certain broad, general and occasionally specific conceptions regarding the American aboriginal and that throughout the period before 1763 he was constantly being reminded of them and of new ones in the literature he read. The concept of savagism he brought in essence with him, though his experience with the natives confirmed and enlarged its scope. It was essentially harshly realistic.

The settler also brought with him the contradictory or complementary idea or ideal of the noble savage, a concept going back at least to Ovid in classical antiquity and reaching its apex of popularity in western imagination and civilization well after 1763. Through Boethius and the *Romance of the Rose*, through the Renaissance and Montaigne to Rousseau and his followers for at least a full century, the vision of a golden age in which the simple barbarian is happy and noble persisted for a variety of reasons, of course partially as a reaction from the corruptions of sophisticated society and increasingly complex technology. The American Indian became one of its favorite symbols and his idealized way of life a model or pattern for living. A belief in what he was supposed to stand for lingers in Thomas Jefferson's portrait of the chief Logan and in Thoreau's wistful depiction of what he experienced at Walden.

Even before Roanoke and Jamestown, and then contemporaneous with them, scores of examples of the noble savage appeared in London at the royal court, in the theater, and among literary circles. In *The Faerie Queene* Spenser notes more than once (e.g., II, xi, 21; III, xii, 8) the picturesque grandeur of the American aborigine, and in *Paradise Lost* (IX, 1115-1118) Milton specifically relates him to the noble savage:

... that first naked glorie. Such of late
Columbus found th' American so girt
With feathered cincture, naked else and wilde
Among the trees on iles and woodie shores.⁹

The early Jesuit fathers in Europe, Maryland, and French Canada, with some exceptions, praised the Indians as uncontaminated by the vices of European society, as possessed of those natural virtues the exponents of "savagism" also believed they possessed, a "fact" which might lead different men to opposite conclusions. Some among the Spanish conquista-

dors viewed them with sympathy and a little envy as children of nature. James I saw them in a lavish court masque as a chorus of weird but exotic and presumably harmless savages. Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, which certainly touches upon the theme of the noble savage, depicts him not in the native Caliban but in the European-born innocent Miranda.

As Gary Nash has observed, the changing image of these original inhabitants of North America provides "a penetrating glimpse into the fears, desires, and intentions of Englishmen in colonial America." Nash begins one of his useful studies of this subject with a survey of pre-Jamestown and even pre-Roanoke writing in English and Spanish. Understanding the English image reveals especially the workings of the Anglo-American mind and helps to underline the significance of English relations and policies aimed toward controlling and civilizing and exterminating and converting the American native.

Loathsome halfmen and noble savages, the cruel beastlike hostile and the amiable friend, are sometimes pictured in the same account before 1585, as they are later. The conflicting images were perhaps struggling with each other for ascendance as Roanoke was settled, according to Lane and Hariot, and more clearly at Jamestown as the "histories" of Smith and Strachey suggest. Involved or fused in both images was the question of the English right to take or occupy land, a problem of law and morality or a rationalization away from both. There were several ways of solving the problem, some suggested in these southern accounts. One was to "buy" with more or less worthless objects, and another was simply to deny the humanity of the red men.

At Roanoke and Jamestown and later at Charleston qualities were read into Indian character which would enable the conqueror or exterminator or trader to do as he desired. Some were conscious and some unconscious misconceptions, some fairly perceptive insights. Events at Jamestown, such as the 1622 massacre, are more important in certain ways for their effect on the estimate of Indian character than for the near-extermination of the white settlement or their representing the final blows in producing the bankruptcy of the Virginia Company of London. As undoubtedly they did farther north, attitudes in the next century and a half changed from Maryland to Georgia as the Indian "threat" subsided. They became more favorable generally, though the great dispossession of the southern Indian is part of a later story of dispossessing all the eastern aborigines.

As the image held by the southern white of his native neighbor improved, the native himself, decimated by disease and deteriorated by alcohol, did anything but improve. And in the southeast long before 1763 he had slipped into a state of relative dependency on his white neighbor. In the eighteenth century Jefferson and many another discovered the in-

tegrity of aboriginal culture, but the farmer and frontiersman found less and less to admire in Indian life. The image of the native would continue to reflect the impelling needs and desires of materialistic, driving Europeans.¹⁰

But the white settler did more than reflect his own image and his distorted concept of the Indian in what he wrote. The reporters from Harriot to Jefferson in their accounts include all sorts of ethnological, anthropological, sociological, political, tribal, religious, and other qualities, with varying degrees of objectivity. To some extent they differentiate between cultural groups—Iroquois and Natchez, Algonkian and Creek—though there is relatively little in southern colonial literature which shows a white consciousness of distinct racial and cultural character, and perhaps even less of political differentiation. To be sure, Chesapeake settlers by the time of Bacon's Rebellion labeled some tribes friends and others foes or doubtful, but these whites were unable to distinguish sufficiently—or perhaps they did not want to because of their land hunger—to avoid exterminating friendly tribes and triggering the Rebellion in which the Susquehannocks fought against overwhelming odds in 1675-1676. Indeed, one must read into the whites' writing the fact that even the highest colonial authorities could not prevent genocidal attacks on red neighbors. Through much of the literature on the southeastern Indian during the colonial period, landhunger colors or indeed fixes the picture. But greed did not prevent, in fact it may have helped to produce, the detailed and often fascinating depiction of a native culture by interlopers who were often only dimly aware that it was a culture and who even more rarely considered the possibility that there were ethical and even social reasons why the native society should be allowed to survive.

Thus in the early South the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Englishman saw the Indians as European propagandists or philosophers believed them to be. Harriot noted some of their finer qualities, and Smith and others in some moods might describe them as "the most gentle loving faithful people . . . such as live after the manner of the golden age."¹¹ Sporadically for two centuries occasional visitors to certain tribes described the American native in just such terms. Others had sympathy for "these poor souls" but were wary of trusting or admiring them. And most often those who knew them best depicted them realistically, sometimes in the ironic terms of a William Byrd, but perhaps as often with a greater element of sympathy, a belief in their potential usefulness, and an enormous curiosity as to their character, government, and manner of life. There is indeed more than a suggestion of the previously mentioned wistfulness for a golden age in the display of interest in every phase of the red primitive's mode of life, even though there are equal or more emphatic sug-

gestions that the white colonial wanted the information so that he might cope with or conquer his Indian neighbor, or simply because of his steadily developing Renaissance-Enlightenment scientific curiosity.

Granting with Fairchild that the noble savage is a mental construct, one still finds the basically realistic and often articulate white fur traders of the colonial period and later occasionally employing the idea for their own purposes and even finding it so attractive that they sought and cited examples. Among these traders James Adair is within the colonial era the classic champion of this kind of primitivism.¹² Preceding Adair were all those Europeans at home and in America who wished to believe in an American Eden, with or without the red man.

The majority of southern white writers saw at least enough nobility inherent in the American savage to believe that he might be "improved." Philosophically they contrast with those who believed the Indian's simple state was innately good, for they proceeded from an assumption that he was innately good enough to be educated. John Smith sees the natives as a potential means to the ends of imperial policy, but as he describes the compass and the roundness of the earth to the poor souls he explicitly and implicitly acknowledges their ability to learn.¹³ Ralph Hamor asks, "What more praiseworthy and charitable, then to bring a *savage* people from barbarisme to civillitie[?]"¹⁴

As harsh as this realistic concept of savagism is, there is the more myopic view, often present in the Spanish-Portuguese accounts and in Frobisher and Barlowe and Amadas before the settlement at Roanoke, and then a thousand times after, that the "brutish" native was fit only to be destroyed, like the more ferocious and predatory wild animals the white man found in the New World, or that he was only a devil in human form, a practitioner of the black arts, who must be exterminated—all this, of course, bound up with the conscious "need" to take the Indian's land. Although in the period just before 1763 this view of the Indian as Satan was no longer a popular image, other basically unregenerate qualities in him were still regarded by some as innate.

Obviously the civilized southern colonial never fully understood, or "got at," the neighboring representative of an alien and contrasting society. The whites' portraits, literary or graphic, of the sixteenth and seventeenth and even eighteenth centuries do not in general, however, depict the Indian as the squalid or vengeful savage the nineteenth- or twentieth-century reader may assume him to have been. Cruel and treacherous the colonial often found him to be, certainly often because he so wished to find him. Some white men seemed to believe or understand that physical cruelty was natural in the barbaric state, and that treachery was the principal or primary weapon of desperation in combating a better-equipped foe.

And sometimes the white who wrote, the literate settler, showed a sympathy for the native whose life and land were being taken from him by strategy or force, and an admiration for his stoicism, bravery, and majestic oratory.

THE RED MAN AS HIS WHITE NEIGHBOR SAW HIM

INDIAN PERSONAL CHARACTER IN GENERAL

Thus certain of the preconceptions of aboriginal character the southern settler brought with him were enlarged or expanded fairly rapidly. Yet curiously enough, though it is difficult to tell by reading between the lines, most preconceptions seem to have been only a minor determining factor in the estimate he came to form of the red man's traits as individual or as race, whether he saw the Indian as savage fiend, exploited innocent, or object of scientific curiosity.

The assessment of southern Indian traits begins with Sir Ralph Lane, Thomas Hariot, and John White on Roanoke Island in the 1580's. Among them they represent in varying combinations about all the points of view just suggested. There can be little doubt that they expected to occupy land "inhabited" by Indians. Lane, governor of the little colony, was wary, suspicious, and perhaps imperceptive. Savage apparent inconstancy, or inconsistency, a trait usually acknowledged of all primitive peoples, he found in plenty, as did his administrative successors in the southeast. A shower of arrows, after warning by a war chant, was hardly treachery but a defense of lands, as were Wingina's (Pemispan's) actions, called by Lane his "conspiracie" and his "treason" though elsewhere he also records the same chief's friendliness and assistance.¹⁵ At any rate, he took a frightful vengeance for the supposed Indian plot, the described episode ending with the head of Pemispan in the hand of one of Lane's soldiers as he emerged from the woods.

Other attitudes toward the same chief, who became a sort of epitome of Indian character for all the early colonials, are displayed by two men of different calibre in that pioneer settlement. These were Oxonian scientist friend of Raleigh, Thomas Hariot, and artist-naturalist-cartographer and later governor John White.¹⁶ Each attains what appears to be a remarkable degree of objectivity and detailed accuracy derived from careful observation. As Quinn points out, Hariot makes Pemispan live as a credible human being, makes him live by recording his conversations and depicting him as he participates in Christian worship and begs help of the Christian God when he is ill or his tribe's crops fail. John White paints or draws

his portrait more than once, illustrating the half-ludicrous savage dignity of his attire, even the credulity Hariot has ascribed to him. *A briefe and true report* has an elaborate section "Of the nature and manners of the people," in which Hariot describes community life, personal appearance, has a little on language and government and war and a good deal on religion, and concludes with optimistic hope regarding future red-white relations. Complementing this text of Hariot are other paintings and drawings by White of Carolina Algonkians in varied postures, dress, occupations, and recreations. The two together depict a mild-expressed, dramatic, religiously credulous, and dignified people. The motivations behind the divergent Lane and Hariot-White pictures of the red men have been discussed at some length in Chapter I. Only obliquely, however, does the reader get from them some idea of the personal character of the Indian of earliest Carolina.

The Jamestown colonists were more specific. Chronologically first among the Virginia observers was George Percy, brother of an earl and a fairly well-educated man. His comments on many phases of Indian life and character are usually accurate. In matters of policy he and John Smith often did not agree, but he saw the red man much as the captain did. In "Observations gathered out of a Discourse of the Plantation of the Southern Colonie in Virginia, . . . 1606,"¹⁷ Percy gives a most detailed account of the voyage over, including comments on the cannibalism of West Indians and on the settlers' own first kindly Virginia reception at Kecoughtan. Only toward the conclusion of his narrative are there implications or statements that he distrusted the savages. He found them thievish, calling them "vild and cruell Pagans" and "our mortall enemies," yet admitting that the Indians saved their lives when the colonists were ill and starving. In his later "A Trewe Relation,"¹⁸ written when he was back in England, Percy is more hostile to the natives, seeing every red man who visited the Jamestown fort as a spy, charging them with attempting to surprise the blockhouse, declaring that the English had always to be on guard against "ould Powhatans subtell Trecherie," and referring to the colonists' long-time friend Kemps as "that subtle savage." Though Percy also had an eye for interesting details of life and customs, he considered the dominant native trait to be treachery.

John Smith, less well-educated, a soldier, and a "new gentleman," left a series of complex and at times slightly conflicting accounts or descriptions of character.¹⁹ One writer, using the statistical method, says that Smith had about as much to say in favor of Indian character as against it, naturally not a very specific or informative conclusion. The same writer and others point out that between the 1608 *A True Relation* and the 1624 *Generall Historie* Smith's estimate of the Indian character altered. One had better

say that it mellowed, that in the interval of fifteen years between his on-the-scene observations and his collected meditations Smith weighed things anew. That he came out with new solutions for old problems is questionable. As will be shown below, he saw the Indians' rulers as despots never to be trusted, though in a grudging way he admired their aplomb, their shrewdness, and above all their maneuvers in attempting to drive or discourage the English invader from their shores.

But like many other civilized men, Smith held them in a certain scorn. He disagreed with Newport as to the treatment of the Indian, preferring to conquer by force of arms as the quicker, cheaper, and safer means of occupying the country, while Newport proposed diplomacy and conciliation. After the 1622 massacre Smith could and did say, "I told you so," for he declared that the unmartial or nonmartial character of colonial administration or government or policy had invited the Indian to attempt annihilation, and he offered to take a few companies of soldiers and in a short time put the country in order, a boast which naturally included controlling all Indian-occupied lands the colonists thought they needed. Although he was capable of appreciating the Indian's dramatic or histrionic qualities as well as his sense of tragic destiny in the wake of the white invasion, by 1624 Smith still saw most red men as he had seen them in 1608, as treacherous, wily, cruel savages—devious devils—one exception being Pocahontas, whom by then he had made into an angel of mercy. And so he blamed the English for not disciplining this "idle, improvident, scattered people," for not making them "tractable, civill and industrious."

Another estimate comes from Henry Spelman, who had left home as a young boy to undertake the Virginia venture and had spent so many years with Powhatan and with the King of the Potomacs that in Virginia's first generation he became one of the ablest interpreters of the Indian language. In ungrammatical, almost illiterate English he wrote his own account of daily life in a village chief's household and of the personal kindness he experienced, even though it may have been mercenary in motivation. He contents himself with giving a vivid picture of the domestic, martial, and recreational life he himself had lived, incidentally bearing out and often expanding other accounts of burial and government and modes of justice.

William Strachey, secretary of the colony soon after John Smith's departure, wrote his *Historie* in 1612, drawing on Smith as well as his own observations. Though much of his characterization of the treacherous quality in the red man may come from Smith, his own eye notes the modesty of the women, the mixture of craftiness and temerity in the men, the quickness of apprehension and ingenuity in crude contrivances for fishing and hunting among all these people. And he observes individual differences, some men being fearful, some bold, some covetous, some malicious,

some fiery in temper, some thievish. Save for their universal inconstancy and treachery, he finds them as individually different as any Europeans. Perhaps he did not make the comment first, but he does observe that "they seldom forgett an Injury."²⁰

Throughout the rest of the seventeenth century and most of the eighteenth the trait the southern colonist usually considered congenital in the Indian was that already-mentioned, treachery. In the reports of the 1622 Virginia massacre *treachery* is the key word, sometimes expanded into such expressions as "that perfidious and inhumane people."²¹ In a 1648 act the Virginia General Assembly sought to protect the governor from "some treacherous attempts threatened by the savages," and in 1650 Edward Williams observed that the "Devil tutors them to be treacherous." In 1655/6 the Assembly again sought to make sure that no migrating "perfidious and treacherous Indians" came to settle in their neighborhood, and in the next year the Council and General Court used almost the same words in describing the red men.²² Well-educated puritan Colonel John Catlett, writing in 1665 to a relative in England, was alarmed by the "clandestine workings" and the "treachery of the heathen" tribes along the Potomac to such a degree that he tried to convince Governor Berkeley of the danger.²³

Settlers in the other southern colonies wrote in the same vein. Anti-proprietary Marylanders accused Lord Baltimore of inciting treacherous attacks by the Piscataways against Protestants in northern Virginia,²⁴ though the Jesuit fathers of St. Mary's naturally saw wonderful Christian potential in people of the same tribe.²⁵ As early as 1664 William Hilton, writing of North Carolina, was in mortal fear of "the Indians treachery"; and in 1709 John Lawson, in what is generally a detached or even too favorable discourse on the red men, reminds his readers that they "are very revengeful, and never forget injury done,"²⁶ repeating Strachey's observation. So one may wander on through history, correspondence, or special report. For example, in South Carolina in 1749 a legislative committee appointed to take Governor Glen's answers to the queries of the Board of Trade and Plantation made a pointed comment:

In the sixth Page of his Excellency's letter, when he calls the Cherokee Indians our strict allies, your Committee recommend that his Excellency leave out the Word strict. For that all Indians are of a Nature so inconstant and slippery, their Adherence is no longer to be depended upon than while they are awed by fear or moved by Interest.²⁷

In other accounts, from *Purchas His Pilgrimes* of 1625 to the threshold of the Revolution, the aborigines are vacillating, fickle, and uncertain; cruel, cowardly, and quarrelsome. But some of the same writers who em-

ploy these pejorative terms balance them with others quite different; and, as already noted, a modest number see their character, as well as their plight, most sympathetically. Frequently is noted their sense of humor, sometimes with a touch of the sort of sadism in it that southern literary backwoods white humor was to develop, or again sometimes a genuine and almost sophisticated sense of the comic or ridiculous in life. John Smith records a great deal of laughter in Powhatan's household and seems to see nothing cruel or ominous or insidious in it. Virginia colonist William Powell, writing to Sir Edwin Sandys on April 12, 1621, tells an excellent story of a boasting contest among the warriors at Powhatan's court, a situation turned into the ridiculous by the last boaster's statement that his own mighty deed of the day was the killing of six muskrats (normally a young boy's feat), and that at least his story was true, as were none of those of the braggarts who preceded him. Powell says: "This moved the whole assemblye to laughter, nor was the truth of his meane action either blaymed or shamed, for the Jest so tooke the Kinge that this fellowes poore indeavours were most regarded and best rewarded fabula narratur."²⁸

Other observers note a variety of traits they approve. In daily routine or peaceful intercourse the aborigines' dominant trait is mildness, Lawson points out, as he also comments upon the docility of their children. Years earlier, perhaps a bit from wishful thinking, Father Andrew White in Maryland had declared that upon the whole "they cultivate generous minds." The Cherokee empress' distress at what she took to be actual homicide on the Williamsburg theatrical stage and her attempt to stop it show us a great deal about Indian feminine nature, at least. Henry Norwood, shipwrecked in 1649 on the Eastern Shore of Maryland-Virginia, attests without reservation to the genuine hospitality, kindness, and even personal affection those gentle Algonkians held for their white visitors. The Reverend Giles Rainsford, S.P.G. missionary in North Carolina, felt that he was "extremely beloved" by the Indians around him, as was Mr. Mashburn, who conducted the Indian-attended school at Sarum. And the author-editor of the Williamsburg or Virginia edition preface to the Six Nations Treaty of 1744 with Virginia-Maryland-Pennsylvania at Lancaster testifies to the genuine tenderness and affection held by these native people for the whites they felt had befriended them. Lieutenant Henry Timberlake, intimately associated with the Cherokees in 1756-1765, declares them "very gentle and amicable to those they think their friends." In other words, even without Pocahontas as the showcase example, the southern colonist knew that some of these uncivilized people possessed the best of human traits, love and kindness. In addition, the late colonial traveler Andrew Burnaby witnesses to the Indians' strong sense of obli-

gation, a kind of ethic, when a promise was given. Burnaby tells of how Captain Charles, a Nottoway Indian who had promised him a remembrance, had forgotten it when he came to Williamsburg, and then without Burnaby's knowledge traveled all the long and painful way home and back again to present it. And Edmond Atkin, the Indian agent for the southern colonies (from South Carolina), sums up the case *for* Indian character in his famous report which also emphasizes the red man's value as a barrier against the French and Spanish: "No people in the World understand and pursue their true National Interest, better than the Indians. However sanguinary they are towards their Enemies, from a misguided Passion of Heroism, and a love of their Country; yet they are otherways truly humane, hospitable, and equitable."²⁹

John Oldmixon, who had never seen the New World and got his information for the Virginia section of *The British Empire in America* (London, 1708, 1741) firsthand from William Byrd II and secondhand from John Smith, Robert Beverley, and John Banister, summed up Indian character and indicted his fellow Englishmen at the same time. In his chapter on the Virginia aborigines he concludes: "And thus much of the *Indians*, who, from a State of Nature and Innocence, in which the *English* found them, are now infected with the *European* Vices of Drunkenness, Avarice and Fraud, having learned nothing of the new Comers but what has served to render their ignorance the more detestable."³⁰

PORTRAITS OF INDIVIDUAL INDIANS

One way of assessing the red man's character in general was to examine it through individual instances. This sort of examination useful to imperial organizers also afforded satisfaction to the scientifically and generally curious, for it presented savage potentates, one famous princess and a few other interesting women, and a number of chief warriors and interpreter friends of native blood. Already have been noted the first pictures, verbal and graphic, from the earliest colony of 1584-1587. Even Ralph Lane's description of the crippled Menatonon, King of the Chawanoac tribe, is uniformly quite favorable, though his vacillating and treacherous Wingina is quite different from Hariot-White's delineation of the same Indian. White's watercolor or pencil conceptions of Wingina and his fellow Algonkians are individual portraits of a man or woman playing a part or pursuing an occupation, such as the priest, the famous conjurer, the wife of the werowance (chief) of Pomeoc, and a chief of Roanoke (probably Wingina himself) and his wife.³¹

But most familiar in verbal portraits are the great chief or emperor

encountered by the Jamestown settlers, his even more famous daughter, and his more or less infamous "brother" and successor, Opechancanough. Powhatan was a name before he was a personage, for he is mentioned early in the relation of Captain Gabriel Archer in May-June 1607. A short time later Archer recorded the first glimpse of the old monarch. Seated upon a mat, as the reader sees him dozens of times thereafter, he is attended by subordinate chiefs, innumerable women, and warriors. In *A True Relation* Smith devotes two pages to his first major meeting with Powhatan, beginning with a verbal sketch resembling some of White's drawings as well as a Renaissance title-page tableau or proscenium: low bedstead as throne, wreaths of pearls, postured women, ranks of warriors. Comely young women in chains of white beads, great platters of food, and a lively give-and-take conversation complete the picture.³² From this initial encounter and the questions asked by the Indians and the evasive answers returned, it is evident that the white men pretended the settlement was but a temporary affair, that the red men saw at once that the aggressive inland voyages of exploration in several directions pointed to a search for a permanent abode, and that from the first the emperor was rightly in dread that these civilized men would wrest his land, and perhaps his and his people's lives, from them if it were possible. But for the moment this cautious aborigine treated his guests courteously, describing the James River region even above the falls, and the tribes and topography of the Potomac and Susquehannah. In a second dramatic meeting the Queen of Apamatic, "a comely young Salvage," waited upon or served Smith, the emperor and the captain bargained for corn, and in stentorian tones Powhatan made the announcement that Smith was a werowance or prince of his tribe. On the captain's departure, the chief courteously rose from his seat to conduct him to his barge.³³ Constantly Powhatan tried to get Smith and Newport to visit him without arms, but they prudently avoided doing so. The old chieftain and the two captains sparred during the rest of Smith's *A True Relation*, exchanging gifts, meeting wile with wile, using Pocahontas and Rawhunt (Powhatan's "trustie messenger") as go-betweens, the savage looking for an opening to attack or means to persuade away, the Englishmen apparently trying to hold the red men in check at least until they had secured a firm footing. Smith's picture of Powhatan should convince every reader that foreigners of any kind were not welcomed to Algonkian Virginia shores and that the frequent allegation by historians that the white man felt kindly toward the red until the latter attacked is simply not true, if for no other reason than that there was skirmishing or the threat or fear of it from the first landing.

In the 1612 *A Map of Virginia* Smith enlarges and continues his delin-

eation of Powhatan. He describes him as "a tall well proportioned man, with a sower look, his head somewhat gray, his beard so thinne that it seemeth none at all, his age near 60; of a very hardy and durable body." He expatiates further on the emperor's domestic situation, his conduct of his government, his sharp dealing for corn, his continued use of Pocahontas to excuse his perfidies, and his (to us) seriocomic conversations with Captain Newport.³⁴ After Smith himself became president of the colony, he dealt more bluntly and harshly with the "avaricious" chief, and according to his own account he usually got the better of the bargain. Between the little soldier and the tall savage there were many days of long conversations (parleys), among them Powhatan's "discourse of peace and warre," a "subtil discourse," which was answered flatly by the blunt Englishman. In passing, Smith notes Powhatan's attempt to murder him, the chain of pearl sent as a peace offering, and the chief's excuse. *A Map of Virginia* represents the native ruler as growing more and more crafty and treacherous. This he probably was, for he was desperately trying to save his country.³⁵

Ralph Hamor, whose *True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia* (London, 1615) is better known for what it has to say about Pocahontas than about her father, nevertheless gives us a good deal about Powhatan. The old man's reaction to the news of his daughter's capture or kidnapping by the British, his offers to trade prisoners and stolen weapons for his daughter, and his consent to her marriage, are among the details. More significant is Hamor's own visit to Powhatan, with young Thomas Savage, who had lived three years with the old man and spoke his language fluently. Hamor tells the story well, beginning with Powhatan's kindly greeting to the boy who had been his adopted son, his fumbling search for the talisman of pearl about Hamor's neck which had been agreed upon by Sir Thomas Dale as the valid proof of embassy, the "drinking" from the peace pipe, and the rudimentary treaty-trade ritual which was for a century and a half later to be the red man's most dramatic way of presenting his strategy as policy. Hamor gives his own and Powhatan's speeches, the last of the latter rather pathetic: "I am now olde, and would gladly end my daies in peace, so as if the English offer me injury, my country is large enough, I will remove my selfe farther from you."³⁶ With these fateful words and further exchange of gifts and messages, the white and the red parted, on apparently good terms. Four years longer the old emperor lived, and he kept the peace the rest of his time. He had indeed grown weary in defense of his land and race.

The most careful and detailed delineation of the famous emperor which has survived in southern colonial literature is that of William Strachey, who devotes several pages to this most interesting and august male native

that he or his governor, Lord de la Warr, was to meet. He combines Smith's personal observations with his own in conclusion:

He is a goodly old-man, not yet [1610] shrincking, though well beaten with many cold and stormy wynters, in which he hath bene patient of many necessityes and attempts of his fortune, to make his name and famely great, he is supposed to be little lesse than 80 yeares old, (I dare not say how much more, others say he is). Of a tall stature, and clean lymbes, of a sad aspect, rownd fat visag'd with gray haire, but playne and thyn hanging upon his broad showlders, some few haire upon his Chynne, and so on his upper lippe. He hath bene a strong and able salvadge, synowie, active, and of a daring spirit, vigilant, ambitious, subtile to enlarge his dominions. . . . Cruell he hath bene, and quarrellous, as well with his owne Werowances for trifles, and that to stryke a terrour and awe into them of his power and condicion, as also with his neighbours in his younger dayes, though now delighted in security, and pleasure, and therefore standes upon reasonable condicions of peace. . . .

Watchfull he is over us, and keeps good espiall upon our proceedings . . . more fearing, then harmed at any tyme, with the danger and mischief, which he saith wee intend unto him by taking away his land from him, and conspiring to surprize him, which we never yet imagined nor attempted. . . . he doth often send unto us to temporize with us, awayting perhapps but a fitt opportunity (inflamed by his bloudy and furious priests) to offer us a tast of the same Cuppe which he made our poor COUNTRYMEN drinck off at *Roanoak*. . . .

It is straung to see with what great feare and adoration all these people doe obey this Powhatan, for at his feet they present whatsoever he commaundeth, and at the least frowne of the brow, the greatest will tremble.³⁷

This is a remarkable analysis, penetrating up to a certain point, sincere in the conviction that the English never intended to take *all* of the savages' land, and yet supremely indicative of the primitive leader's anticipation of what did happen to his race. The primitivism inherent in the delineation here is mixed, with nobility and strength as components of a nature also subtle, ingenious, and devious. The colonial writer saw Powhatan not as a noble savage, but as a great one.

Later characterizations of the chief, based primarily upon Smith, are indicative throughout the colonial period of the southern settler's continuing attitude. Robert Beverley mentions him primarily only in connection with Pocahontas. Hugh Jones refers to him rather casually only twice, as though his reader would be already thoroughly familiar with him. John Oldmixon gives him frequent attention, and includes (in 1708) a census of the pitiful remnants of the Algonkian empire still left in Virginia. In his 1747 *History of the First Discovery*, again employing Smith, Stith uses some two hundred allusions to or descriptions of the old man. Like

Smith more than Strachey, Stith paints a hostile portrait. This is probably the southern colonial's last word on the very human being who is the blood-ancestor of thousands of white Americans:

This year 1618 is memorable, for the Death . . . of Powhatan, Emperor of the Indians, a Prince of excellent Sense and Parts, and a great Master of all the Savage Arts of Government and Policy. He was penetrating, crafty, insidious, and cruel; and as hard to be deceived by others, as to be avoided in his own Strategems and Snares. But as to the great and moral Arts of Policy, such as Truth, Faith, Uprightness, and Magnanimity, they seem to have been but little heeded or regarded by him.³⁸

Powhatan's brother (perhaps adopted) and his usurping successor, Opechancanough, King of the Pamunkeys, was not a major figure until after Smith's time, but he does receive more than a verbal glance early. He was the instigator of the two major massacres, those of 1622 and 1644, and was needlessly killed after capture. According to his English contemporaries, all the cruelty and treachery and wily strategy present in Powhatan were exaggerated in Opechancanough. Smith speaks of him in *A True Relation* in 1608, and he continues to appear at least through Stith's history. The settlers could hardly forget him, for he put terror and distrust permanently into the hearts of Virginia frontiersmen.

We see Opechancanough first as he admires a compass Smith presents and explains to him. Later in the same year, he and his wife, women, and children come to meet Smith apparently with great affection. Later, still in *A Map of Virginia*, Smith records his "trading speeches" to Opechancanough and tells of the chief's alleged plot to murder the Englishman, a plot that ends with the dramatic tale of Smith's seizing the larger red chief by his scalp lock.³⁹ Strachey names this brother of the emperor Powhatan but gives no evidence of having met him in person. Hamor mentions his presence at Pocahontas' marriage. Though Smith notices him frequently in his *Generall Historie*, little or nothing new appears about the man.

John Oldmixon in 1708 and 1741, perhaps relying upon Beverley's similar description of 1705, presents a vivid and dramatic death scene for this last native challenger of British demands in Virginia:

Before his Death [after his capture in 1644] he carried himself with a Magnanimity truly royal. He was very old, worn out with Age, and the hardships of War. His Eyelids were so heavy, he could not see without the Help of his Servants to lift them up. When he was a Prisoner, hearing a Noise of a Rabble that were come to him, he reflected with Indignation on the ungenerous Treatment of the English, in making a sight of him, and exposing him to the Insolence of the Multitude; and calling for the

Governor Sir *William Berkley*, he said, *Had it been my Fortune to have taken you, I would not basely have exposed you as a shew to the People.*

Beverley, whose words seem paraphrased here, adds that the ancient warrior was shot in the back by an English guard who resented Opechan-canough's cruel attacks, though Governor Berkeley had wanted to send this "royal captive" alive to England, partly as an instance of the healthfulness and longevity of the natives.⁴⁰

The third and most renowned of this primitive royal family was of course Powhatan's daughter Pocahontas. This savage maiden, also known as Matoaka or Rebecca, has evolved from history to romance to myth, and perhaps back to history, from Smith's and Strachey's factual and/or dramatic accounts to the King's "darling daughter" of Stith, to the sentimental heroine in John Davis' 1805-1806 romances and in dozens of other novels, to savior-heroine roles in scores of nineteenth-century poems and biographies (almost always associating her with Smith), to the more deific being in the twentieth-century poems of Carl Sandburg, Vachel Lindsay, and Hart Crane and the mytho-criticism of Philip Young in "The Mother of Us All: Pocahontas Reconsidered," and finally to "the real woman" of Philip Barbour's beautifully reasoned, researched, and written *Pocahontas and Her World*.⁴¹ Young sees analogies to the tale of a dark maiden saving a white or blond warrior in the folklore of half the world and, like Hart Crane and Vachel Lindsay, sees her as the fertile red earth-mother, symbol of American red clay and figuratively and literally ancestress of thousands if not millions of white Americans, a facet of their idealism and of the American dream.

Captain John Smith and his contemporaries did not see all this in the youthful daughter of Powhatan, but they did see in her their salvation. At first she appears in mere glimpses. In his 1608 *A True Relation* Smith tells of the visit of the ten-year-old "only Nonpareil of [Powhatan's] Country" to intercede for the release of red prisoners, and he repeats the same sort of story of "his dearest Daughter Pocahuntas" in *A Map of Virginia* in 1612. In the latter he "corrects" her age to thirteen or fourteen, and passes on to his reader (with a denial) the suggestion made by some that he planned to marry her to cement friendship between red and white. And he tells how on a murky night she came by stealth through the dark woods to warn of her father's plans for ambush or attack. In the *Generall Historie*, as noted in Chapter I, Smith rephrases and adds stories of her rescuing others than himself, the tale of her perfidious capture, and of course the saving of Smith himself (though in the 1622 *New England's Trials* he had touched on the matter). This last most famous episode may be an afterthought or a restoration of material from the original story of

the first Smith-Powhatan confrontation (referred to above). In the late (or is it early?) version two stones are placed before Powhatan, Smith is forcibly seized and his head placed upon them, and two warriors with clubs appear about to beat out his brains. The young girl rushes in and throws her arms about him to protect his life, and the good omen apparently persuades her father to spare the Englishman. Of such stuff has the great myth been woven, and from it has sprung the bitter controversy regarding Smith's veracity. Philip Barbour believes it was either the sincere and noble-hearted gesture Smith makes it out to be or an example of a sort of initiation into the tribe (a ceremony taking place then and there, as announced by Powhatan), and perhaps related to the initiation rites of huskanawing to be discussed below. Barbour has established beyond question that Smith was a veracious chronicler: thus the question of what the captain thought he saw or endured remains.⁴² And whatever it was, as he tells it, Pocahontas becomes one of the great and gracious women of world history and fable.

Before her apotheosis in Smith's 1624 *Generall Historie* she was already a personage of the New World scene. Though he does not give her the attention he gives her father—perhaps he never saw her—Strachey does refer to her visits to the fort before his time, and states that when he was writing (in 1610–1612) she was already married to “a pryvate Captayne called Kocoum some 2. years since.”⁴³ Perhaps he confused her with another of Powhatan's several daughters. Perhaps she was actually married to the “private captain”; at any rate, no more is heard of him. Divorces were common enough among the Algonkians. Certainly Powhatan gave his prompt consent to her proposed marriage to John Rolfe. Strachey also tells the story, evidently from hearsay, of a “wanton” young “Pochahuntas,” of eleven or twelve years of age, who used to visit the fort clad only in her naked innocence, leading a group of the white boys in turning cartwheels.⁴⁴ But the story is not incompatible with the “facts” we do have of her habits, and Strachey adds the information that the name “Pochahuntas” means “little wanton,” this child's proper name being Amonute. The nickname, for so it was, the Indians dropped when the owner attained maturity. Smith and Stith give other reasons for her several names. But even here these names seem to have had no pejorative connotation.

Hamor's *True Discourse* tells of Pocahontas' capture, falling in love with Rolfe, and baptism, marriage, and voyage to England. Beverley uses the marriage story to support his own proposal of interracial marriage as a means to peace, prosperity, and population for both white and red. And Stith, as noted in the preceding chapter, sentimentalizes and romanticizes her in unconscious preparation for the nineteenth-century fictional treatments.⁴⁵

There is one final great scene of Pocahontas in the 1624 *Generall Historie*. This occurs when the now-impoverished and somewhat bitter founder of British America meets her in London in 1616-1617, whither she has been taken by her husband and his friends and has been received at the royal court. Smith quotes, apparently in full, a letter he wrote to Queen Anne of the story of the Indian princess as he had known her in Virginia. He more than hints that there are more reasons than courtesy that she be unreservedly welcomed, "being of so great a spirit . . . if she should not be well received, seeing this Kingdome may rightly have a Kingdome by her meanes; her present love to us and Christianitie might turne to such scorne and furie, as to divert all this good to the worst of evill." Smith need not have worried, as he himself admits, for she became most popular in London in court and with the populace. But the great final scene in London between the famous captain and the aboriginal American with whom his name is forever linked is of a rather sombre dialogue in which Pocahontas reproaches him for seeing so little of her and not acting as her "father," as Powhatan had acted for him in Virginia. He excuses himself on the ground, justifiable enough in the London of a monarch highly jealous of royal prerogative, that he could not presume to sponsor a king's daughter. And she shows her warm personal regard in telling him that she had heard he was dead, that she did not know otherwise until she came to Plymouth, "yet *Powhatan* did command Uttamatomakkin [his councillor] to seeke you, and to know the truth, because your Counciemen will lie much."⁴⁶

Thus in one sentence John Smith's adopted Indian sister, for so indeed she was, displayed her constancy and her spirit and with a disillusioned and devastating final comment summarized the southern English colonial's enduring mendacity in his relations with his red neighbors. The portrait of Pocahontas, drawn by Smith and touched up by others, and including only one physical detail—that she was not tall—is of a very real and intensely human being who was also a noble savage. Few if any more impressive verbal portrayals survive in the literature of early America.

The vignettes of other Indian men and women are naturally as revealing of their creators as of their subjects. The reader catches glimpses of the friendly Manteo and the crippled grave and wise Menatonon of Roanoke Island in Hariot and others, the Werowance of Rapahana playing upon his reed flute and crowned with red-dyed deer hair in Percy, or Oholase, Queen of the Tapanhocks, in all her finery and pride as depicted by Strachey (one of the most detailed descriptions of Virginia Algonkians). Among others are described the 1634 Maryland regent of the Piscataway, "a grave man and prudent"; a Carolina cassique, "an old man of large stature and bone"; and the Cassique of Kayawah (Kiawah) and

his three daughters in new robes of moss and adorned with multicolored beads. In the next century came the vivid depictions of Carolina, Georgia, and Cherokee Indians: the Creek Gogell Ey[e]s, the aged mico (town chief) of the Yamacraws, Tomochichi, and Oueekachumpa of the Oconas, the numerous and colorful Cherokee leaders such as Old Hop, Little Carpenter, the Raven of Hywassee, King Haigler, and other chiefs who visited Williamsburg, Charleston, and London.⁴⁷ Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and minor tribesmen are named, briefly characterized, and then allowed to represent themselves through their oratory, to be discussed below. Though southern colonists did not describe in detail the six Cherokees Sir Alexander Cuming took to London in 1730, the London and provincial English papers did, and the American gazettes often copied them. Twice near the very end of this colonial period Lieutenant Henry Timberlake escorted other groups to England, much to his financial embarrassment, but in his *Memoirs* he reveals a great deal about their reaction to the great city and its reaction to them. London painters limned the seven Cherokees of 1730 together, and a portrait of 1736 presents together Tomochichi and his "nephew," the boy Tooahowi. Sir Joshua Reynolds himself painted Ostenaco, leader of the first party conducted by Timberlake. Goldsmith described the Ostenaco group in his *Animated Nature*.⁴⁸ In later years southern and western Indians visiting the new national capital of Washington likewise sat for portraits. But what the southern colonial saw in his red neighbor he seems (except for John White) to have described in words which demonstrate that he maintained continuously a kind of respect for the dignity and eloquence of at least their leaders, from Powhatan to Tomochichi. For it was usually these Indians that the literate white observed most closely as he listened to their subtle or diplomatic and rhetorical pleas for their people. Yet from his scrutiny of them and their households he was able to draw his general conclusions as to Indian character discussed above. All these descriptions from that of Pemispan to the Revolution follow the various stereotypic conceptions suggested above, however individualized and based on personal observation they may be. The white observer saw Powhatan or Old Hop or Tomochichi or Logan through the colored spectacles of his preconceptions and prejudices, of his rapacious land hunger, and even of his religious zeal. And what he saw could be noble savage or crafty only half-human animal.

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS OF INDIAN LIFE: THE BODY OF LITERATURE

Alongside his observations of aboriginal personal appearance, including the portraits of individuals, the southern colonial recorded an enormous

amount in both general and specific detail of the Indian way of life. As with the delineations of character and person, various of the abovementioned preconceptions affected these impressions. Thus throughout the period a Cherokee custom or an Algonkian community arrangement might be compared with one or another usually farther south, certainly earlier, as described by Garcilaso de la Vega, Verrazano, Martyr, Laudonnière, Ribaut, or the daring English sailor-explorers included in Hakluyt and even in Purchas.⁴⁹

The list of southerners who wrote about Indians is long, especially for the colonies founded in the seventeenth century, and their subjects and materials are varied and often astonishingly comprehensive. Thus it may be well to pause here and survey this contemporary writing. Those authors composing after 1625 wrote, with very few exceptions, partially or almost wholly from personal observation; but to buttress their own experience, and with or without acknowledgment, they were likely to quote or paraphrase Hakluyt and Purchas, and especially Hariot and Smith. As already suggested, if their work is illustrated they are likely to have borrowed from John White's drawings as engraved by deBry, though between 1612 and 1624 there were some new pictures of Indians.⁵⁰

Hariot's *A briefe and true report* introduces the Indians in its discussions of fauna and flora, but the section "Of the nature and manners of the people" summarizes fairly succinctly all Hariot has learned from clothing and government to martial habits, religious beliefs, medicines, and attitudes toward the whites. His contemporary Ralph Lane gives sundry comments on the natives in letters and reports and in his 1586 account of the colony sent to Sir Walter Raleigh. In the last he passes on much he has gathered straight from the Indians about tribes and towns and regions, some truth and some legend, with an account of Indian agriculture and sustenance from shellfish.⁵¹ All the 1586 account, such as Hariot's truncated report, was included in both editions of Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations* (1589 and 1598-1600) and thus was easily available to later commentators, though there is little either general or specific in Lane that they could or did use except the charge of Indian treachery and malignity.

In the later Virginia of Jamestown the commentators become more frequent. George Percy's "Discourse" in *Purchas His Pilgrimes* and his recently published "Trew Relacyon"⁵² include portraits and generalizations on personal appearance, narratives of ambushes, negotiations, comments on longevity and religion, and occasional rhapsodies on the beauties of trees and wildflowers. In his "Relation of Virginia," fluent Algonkian linguist and sometime adopted Indian, Henry Spelman, provides a brief compendium primarily on religion, towns and buildings, marriage

customs, medicine, burial, government and law, agriculture, manner of eating, armor and martial discipline, and pastimes. But while basically sympathetic, it is not without the matter-of-fact assumption that Powhatan continually planned various treacheries. Though in his sermon pamphlet the good Reverend Alexander Whitaker is intent on conversion of the Indian, he depicts the aboriginal manner of living, with emphasis on the black magic and devil worship which must be stamped out. Strachey's *Historie of Travell*, besides its Indian portraits, is most original in describing the native in general, giving an extensive list of his words and phrases and including much on religion.⁵³

Ralph Hamor's *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia* (1615) adds further firsthand experience of life in a Virginia Algonkian village. But John Smith's observations of phases of aboriginal life are the most complete firsthand materials extant on the North American Indians of this southeast coast. Honest and direct if realistically harsh, as already noted, his books of 1608, 1612, and 1624 show his firm and fixed policy as to how to handle the red men. It is well to remember that, however Powhatan may have feared Smith, he and his daughter appear to have believed in his words and in his integrity.

Henry Fleet's *A Briefe Journall* (1631) of his visit made to the Potomacks on a fur trading expedition gives many details of the people who lived in the vicinity of our present national capital. Henry Norwood's *A Voyage to Virginia* (1649) contains much on the food and shelter and general living conditions of the Eastern Shore Indians. *The Discovery of New Brittain* (1651), by Edward Bland et al., primarily an account of a southwestern trade exploration, contains bits of aboriginal history recorded from their guides, stories of tribes, and men. Francis Yeardley's 1654 letter to John Ferrar adds more about the extreme southeastern Virginia and northeastern North Carolina Indians, including their alleged inclination toward Christianization. *The Discoveries of John Lederer* (1672), really three accounts in one book, adds a considerable amount about southern and western tribes, including Virginia-Carolina Algonkian, Siouan, and Iroquois, and describing a variety of matters, from Indian arithmetic to burials, though Lederer is not entirely reliable. Batts, Woods, and Fallam, "Journal of a relation," an exploration account, is complementary to the Lederer *Discoveries*.⁵⁴

Varied though usually brief communications were sent to the Royal Society in the late seventeenth century and often read before and published by that august body. Its *Philosophical Transactions* included Thomas Glover's "An Account of Virginia" (1676) and the Reverend John Clayton's "A Letter" (1687), the second devoted primarily to Indian medicine.

Recently published from manuscript has been the Reverend John Banister's "Of the Natives," a sourcebook directly or indirectly for Robert Beverley, William Byrd, and John Oldmixon. Like Clayton, Banister was a trained scientific observer. An unknown clergyman's "An Account of the Indians in Virginia" (1689) has also recently been published. And the French exile Durand, looking for a place to settle himself and his countrymen in Virginia, in his report-journal devotes several pages to describing Tidewater Indian villages and something of native family life.⁵⁵

Though for details of description and attitudes the eighteenth-century Virginia commentators leaned heavily on their predecessors in their disquisitions, they usually contributed a great deal themselves. Beverley's 1705 *History*, discussed in Chapter I, is one of our best-balanced and original sources on the Indian and displays a matured philosophical attitude toward the aborigine not discernible in earlier work. Though the author frequently uses Smith and, as we now know, Banister, his attitude is his own and much of his material is from direct observation. His is the first attempt in English America to give a "complete" account of these natural men, for so he considered them, men whose state was in many respects to be preferred to that of European civilized man. English-educated though avowedly American-bred, Beverley identified himself much more firmly with the New World than did his brother-in-law William Byrd II. He declared himself "an Indian" in style of writing, which has more implications than roughness. His comments on native religion mentioned in Chapter I will be considered later here. He believes that Christianization and civilization may be ultimately a means of saving the red men, but meanwhile he devotes Book III of his work to thirteen chapters on as many aspects of Indian life, beginning with personal appearance and ending with something on handicrafts; he includes marriage customs, towns and fortifications, food and cookery, traveling and hospitality, learning and languages, war and peace, medicine and disease, sports and pastimes, and laws. DeBry, Smith, Hariot, Purchas, and other classic predecessors he employs for purposes of comparison and contrast as well as well as filling out, but he is at his best when writing from experience. He draws some pleasing parallels between savage and classical golden-age life. And he concludes with a balanced, realistic comment which Oldmixon apparently paraphrased, at least in part, in the selection quoted above:

Thus I have given a succinct account of the *Indians*; happy, I think, in their simple State of Nature, and in their enjoyment of Plenty, without the Curse of Labour. They have on several accounts reason to lament the arrival of the *Europeans*, by whose means they seem to have lost their Felicity, as well as their Innocence. The *English* have taken away great

part of their Country, and consequently made every thing less plenty amongst them, which have multiply'd their Wants, and put them upon desiring a thousand things, they never dreamt of before.⁵⁶

Oldmixon's *The British Empire in America* (London, 1708, 1741), though it devotes much space to the southern colonies, says little about the Indian except in one of the chapters on Virginia, where it draws on Beverley and Banister and Byrd for a mass of information which is put in a section called "Government, Religion, Manners, and Customs" of the red men. Other depictions of the Virginia Indian include those of John Fontaine in his "Journal" of 1715, the first part of Hugh Jones' 1724 work on Virginia, Byrd's two histories of the dividing line (written c. 1730-1740), Stith's *History* (1747), and Henry Timberlake's *Memoirs* (1765).⁵⁷ Fontaine gives interesting detail on the Saponi and Meherrin and the Indian school at Fort Christanna, as well as some glimpses of native poverty and the Saponi town. Parson Jones is naturally much interested in Christianization and its practice in the school at Christanna, but he includes consideration of possible aboriginal origins, tribal organization, and personal appearance and mode of living. Byrd, whose *Histories* were not published in any form before the 1820s and not completely until much more recently, is only incidentally considering the Indians as he goes about the business at hand. Nevertheless, his incidental remarks interspersed with a few considered opinions such as that on intermarriage (here he agrees with Beverley and Lawson) and a long interview with his Indian guide on religion are of considerable value. His diaries and minor travel journals also contain some pertinent material. He leaves the impression, nowhere precisely stated, that he feels for the red men much the same sort of paternalism he has for his black and white servants.

Stith's attitudes have been suggested in the consideration of his work as a historian, especially in his use of Smith on Pocahontas. As Darrett B. Rutman has pointed out, Stith, true to his Whig philosophy of history, finds that the Indian tribes made treaties with the English to rid themselves of the tyranny of the Powhatan confederation and "to assert their liberty." Vignettes are usually skillful rephrasing. Actually he seems most valuable as representative of how the Whig historian of eighteenth-century British heritage could apply his principles and perspectives to the aboriginals. Finally, Henry Timberlake's *Memoirs* form one of the last major representations of the Indians on the threshold of the Revolution. One sees his native at home in the mountains, on the march, in formal and informal conference, and in London. Why the Indian has not made progress in the arts, his mixed form of government, his propensities for effective oral discourse are among the matters Timberlake ponders.

Although the *Archives of Maryland* contain many allusions to tribes,

treaties, and individuals, they tell us little specifically about these primarily Algonkian peoples. Early Maryland come-hither pamphlets give some details of living and trade which show how closely these Indians resemble those described by Hariot, Smith, and Strachey. George Alsop's little masterpiece, *A Character of the Province of Maryland*, does contain an entertaining disquisition on the Susquehannocks, a tongue-in-cheek account paralleling earlier sources in facts but describing even their religion in mocking tones. His penultimate paragraph begins, "I never observed all the while I was amongst these naked *Indians*, that the Women wore the Breeches, or dared either in look or action predominate over the men." And he concludes with ribald observations on their postures when answering the calls of nature.⁵⁸

North Carolina observations of the aborigines as far as the period of permanent settlement is concerned may be said to commence with Bland in 1651 and Yeardley in 1654. The promotional pamphlets by William Hilton (1664), Robert Sandford (1666), Nicholas Carteret (1670), Henry Woodward (1670 and 1674), Thomas Ashe (?) (1682), and Samuel Wilson (1682), among those included in Salley's anthology or Saunders' *Colonial Records of North Carolina*, tell us something of such tribes as the Chowanoaks, Tuscaroras, Westos, Chickasaws, Cherokees, and a dozen others as far south as the Savannah River and west to the foothills. Quaker governor John Archdale has much to add, including his famous comment that "the Hand of God was eminently seen in thinning the Indians, to make room for the English."

Only John Lawson among the colonial North Carolinians produced a great book on the Indians. *A New Voyage to Carolina* (London, 1709) is a major work in several areas, most of them considered in Chapter I. Something remains to be said of the final section (before appendices), "Account of the Indians of North Carolina." Beginning with the matter of origins, he proceeds to their food, appearance and health, war and poetry, games and feasts, charity and respect for the dead, traditions, songs, religion, trade, children, government, and several other matters. He presents a census of tribes of fighting men, women, and children. He inserts a brief dictionary of common words in English and their parallels in three Indian tongues. Anecdotes and personal attitudes are individual. In the latter Lawson seems in certain ways a sort of primitivist, for he believes the natives were happier and healthier before the white man came. He outlines some of the problems in converting them to Christianity, a conversion he feels must go hand in hand with training in the useful arts and giving them evidence that the white man practices the Golden Rule. Inter-marriage would be an additional means of Christianizing, he suggests, and he seems to indicate that there was more mating between white men and Indian

women than Beverley and Byrd admit. The English must not convert as have the Spaniards by setting up "our Christian Banner in a Field of Blood." His considered estimate is that "they are really better to us, than we are to them," but that they "are very revengeful, and never forget an Injury done till they have received Satisfaction." His own death by torture at their hands is thus as ironic as it was tragic, for he had befriended them.

Lawson's traveling companion at the time he was captured and executed, the Swiss Baron de Graffenreid, in his letters and other accounts declares his compassion for the maltreated Indian, with perhaps too insidious or hypocritical an explanation of his own escape and of Lawson's death. Some account of the Indian tribes also appears in Hugh Meredith's "An Account of the Cape Fear Country" (1731), published originally in Franklin's *Pennsylvania Gazette* (April 29-May 6, May 6-May 13, 1731). Dr. John Brickell's *Natural History* is essentially a blown-up version of Lawson, even in its Indian portion.⁵⁹

For the South Carolina Indians in the seventeenth century the sources are almost exactly the same as those for North Carolina, but beginning in 1706 a number of well-educated and intelligent observers began recording their comments on the red men of the low country around Charleston and then in a series of letters, journals, and reports, of the southern and western tribes with whom the colony's traders came in contact. Among these observers were two S.P.G. missionaries, the Reverend Francis LeJau, D.D., and Commissary Gideon Johnston. Huguenot LeJau was as interested as a modern ethnologist in the languages and dialects of the natives, and their habits and customs. He had the Lord's Prayer written in the Savannah tongue, which he considered the international language among the southern Indians as Latin was among Europeans. He collected origin and creation myths and all he could learn of rites and tenets of aboriginal religion; he showed an omnivorous interest in the neighboring Yamassees. He describes treaty ceremonies, corn feasts, festivals, Itiwans in a ritual dance, Apalachees who request missionaries to live among them, the beginning of the Yamassee War, the Cherokee alliance, and other features or incidents of savage life or contact.

He touches upon a matter only lightly mentioned by the writers looked at heretofore, the enslavement of the Indian. Though there had been Indian servants and perhaps slaves from 1585, including some in the Chesapeake country, apparently they were not in sufficient numbers to create a great problem. In the Carolinas a much more serious situation gradually arose. Warring tribes had perhaps for centuries held captives taken in war as slaves, but now (probably about 1700) they found it a profitable business, at least for a time, to sell captives to white traders who usually shipped them to the Barbadoes to work on the plantations,

which required an enormous amount of manual labor. The traders began to find the traffic so lucrative that they began to kidnap friendly tribesmen and thus created a major reason for border conflict. Eventually it was discovered that the Negro endured captivity and labor in the hot sun better than the red man (who frequently died after a short time in captivity), and West Indian planters, or local ones for that matter, were no longer in the market for red slaves. But for at least the first third of the eighteenth century the enslavement of the primitive red man which had begun long before became a major economic and political problem, as it was already an ethical or Christian one. That the matter apparently first became critical in the southern colonies in these first decades of the century is worth noting, for it is another shameful episode in the history of the southern white trader's long series of abuses of his customer and his victim.⁶⁰

Commissary Gideon Johnston, perhaps because of his onerous duties as rector of a parish and the Bishop of London's representative in South Carolina, never showed the wide-ranging curiosity regarding many phases of Indian life displayed by LeJau, but the two shared a genuine desire to convert the aboriginals to Christianity. He remonstrated against the examples of scandalous living set by the white traders who resided among the Indians and tried to get himself appointed to the office of Commissioner of the Indian Trade in order to look into the situation firsthand, but Charleston merchants allied with backcountry traders blocked his appointment or election.⁶¹

At the same time that the two clergymen were concerned with the natives, a number of Carolina planters acting as agents or emissaries to the scattered tribes recorded their impressions. Captain John Evans left a brief account, "Journey from South Carolina to the Indian Country, 1708," in which he tells of meeting Nottoways, Meherrins, and Saponis from Virginia and North Carolina as well as western South Carolina and Appalachian tribes. Thomas Nairne, one-time Indian agent, policy-maker of western expansion, and one of the great figures of early South Carolina history, is the supposed author of *A Letter from South Carolina* (London, 1710), a promotion tract attempting to bring settlers to the Beaufort region with accessibility to the Indian trade as its chief attraction. Nairne, who had explored most of the country from Virginia to the Mississippi, was to be burned at the stake by the Yamassees in 1715, like Lawson a victim of the struggle between the two peoples in whom he was vitally interested. Another writer, George Chicken, militia officer and Indian agent or Commissioner, kept journals of his embassy journeys to the Cherokees in 1715 and 1725. He comments on at least half a dozen red peoples, on tribal conjurors, and on a great Indian ball game. While

Chicken visited the Cherokees in 1725, Captain Tobias Fitch, who was to succeed Chicken as Indian Commissioner, undertook a similar mission to the Creeks and kept a fascinating journal-report on conferences and Indian rhetoric in their dialogues. In 1727/28 Colonial John Herbert, then Commissioner of South Carolina Indian Affairs, wrote of his residence in the Cherokee nation from October 17, 1727, to March 19, 1727/28, a story of marches and especially of dialogues and something of the traders' abuses.⁶²

One of the most unusual of writings on the Indian frontier is Sir Alexander Cuming's "Journal" of his self-appointed mission to the Cherokees, the story of a utopian scheme almost brought to success by a quixotic, probably slightly unbalanced Scottish baronet who managed to win the undying affection of this great mountain nation. Other aspects of the story will be discussed later. Here the writing should be noted as a vivid if not entirely accurate account of the Cherokees.⁶³ Mark Catesby came to know and describe the Pamunkeys of Virginia through visits to relatives in that colony and to report on the friendly South Carolina and Georgia red men after travels among them. All the accounts were given in letters to friends in Britain or in his *Natural History*. In two sections of his great work, "Of the Aborigines of America" and "Of the Indians of Carolina and Florida," Catesby makes his contributions to anthropology. He admits his use of Lawson but asserts that he has personally checked all his facts. He saw the Indian war policy as essentially irrational, for in his opinion the natives fought not from real self-interest as did the Europeans but from imagined wrongs or for honor. He remained skeptical of the intellectual potentiality of aborigines and of their susceptibility to civilizing influences. If he had been pressed, he would probably have admitted that he believed in savagism, that as natural men were incapable of being assimilated they must in the end be destroyed. But for the time he was much interested in their materia medica, the plants they used in healing and the usefulness of these plants to the European.⁶⁴

Two late Carolina descriptions add a little more to our knowledge. John W. Gerard De Brahm, engineer and fortification architect, left a rather long and readable account containing specific Indian information in a "History of the Three Provinces, South Carolina, Georgia, and East Florida." Perhaps more useful for facts and for the philosophical perspective of the author is Dr. George Milligen-Johnston's *Description of the Province of South-Carolina* (London, 1770, written c. 1763), with a chapter on Indian tribes, including origins, appearance, language (especially the limitations of the Creek language as a vehicle for the expression of abstract and general ideas), condemnation of the traders' behavior as

an impediment to conversion, and a defense of the Indian resentment of unfair business dealings with the whites. The author describes briefly the regions inhabited by Catawbas, Cherokees, Creeks, and Chickasaws. He then relates and condemns as bungling certain recent South Carolina diplomatic moves to conciliate or appease. His graphic accounts of the massacres at Fort Prince George and Fort Loudoun by no means place all the blame on the Cherokees. The Loyalist physician's perception of the Indian-white situation is clear: avarice rather than progress with justice has resulted in a shameful treatment of a brave and dignified people.⁶⁵

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries a number of revealing records have been printed for the first time. Among these are the *South Carolina Documents* edited by McDowell,⁶⁶ including journals of the Commissioners; communications authored by Governors James Glen and Charles Craven, the trader-interpreters Eleazar Wiggan and the Reverend Thomas Bosomworth, and the early agents (some already mentioned); and several fairly faithful translations or paraphrases of "talks" between white and Indian representatives. These Carolina documents alone complement previously known materials and add some completely new ones, including a few gems for the ethnologist and much for the student of that first American frontier, its fur trade, and the too frequently nefarious traders. Virginia governors too enter the picture, and they join with the Carolina administrators in implementing the British drive for territory in North America as well as looking out for their individual colonies' special trade interests. Writers of these documents do have an eye for Indian virtues, especially their rhetorical gifts. They recognize the knavery of most traders, but they also know that the probity and diplomatic skill of certain leading resident merchants have prevented breaks with the savages which would be disastrous to the colony's economy or might provoke a massacre or a war. Implicit perhaps in the background is the continued or developing belief in savagism, including the probable necessity of eventual extermination. But for the moment (1710-1763) they are coping, whether at the treaty table in Albany with the Six Nations or in conference with the Cherokee emperor and kings in "Charles-Town," with a people they must meet with at least outward respect and treat with on apparently equal terms. Up to the 1763 southern congress at Augusta, the southern white had held himself and his land hunger to some degree in check. The treaties there agreed upon opened the floodgates for a full display of white greed and contempt or disregard for red rights.

The one-generation history of Georgia for the colonial period contains a number of observations on the Creeks, Chickasaws, and Cherokees, as well as a number of lesser tribes. By 1733 Oglethorpe was meeting tribal representatives at Savannah, including the famous Tomochichi and

Oueekachumpa, and he had the reports of these conference treaties published in London. In them, however, there is relatively little discussion of the native's way of life, except for his oratory and his ability to sign a document transferring land and water rights to the white settler. Oglethorpe, Von Reck and Bolzius, and Francis Moore all add comments to their observations, as do the clergy such as the Wesleys and Whitefield. Bolzius, as well as the Wesleys and Whitefield, was genuinely concerned that the natives be converted but found a series of obstacles in the way. Francis Moore, a visitor in 1735, published in London in 1744 his impressions of the four major red nations, as well as of notables such as Tomochichi, and added some fairly unusual information about Spanish-English-Indian relations. Thus the red man in colonial Georgia literature remains an undependable, picturesque, unpredictable, yet not very prominent part of the changing scene, except for the lands to be acquired from him with his "consent" and advantage to be taken of him in trade. In other words, although the founders of this refuge for the oppressed, of this potential utopia, meant well to the Indian, they soon came to regard him as did their British neighbors of the other southern colonies.⁶⁷

The observations of James Adair come chronologically last and may be said to be a part of South Carolina or Georgia or Tennessee pioneer literature, though the title of his long book implies inclusion of much more than these three. In his *History* below his name as author he gives his credentials: "A Trader with the Indians, and Resident in their Country for Forty Years." The subtitle indicates the topics included, such as "Origins, Language, Manners, Religious . . . Customs, . . . Government, . . . Agriculture, Manufactures, . . . and other Particulars, sufficient to render it a Complete Indian System, with observations on former Historians, the Conduct of our Colony Governors, Superintendents, Missionaries &c." An appendix describes Florida and Mississippi lands and products and includes a new map and other material. The book had been written over a number of years, probably begun in 1761. Adair makes no attempt to include all North American Indians in his study, though by implication the southeastern tribes may be representative of all American Indians.⁶⁸

Adair, apparently of Scotch-Irish ancestry, born in Ireland and educated in Scotland, was a man of considerable education, as his knowledge of literature and history and the classics would indicate. All we know about him is derived from his book and a few letters, including several recently printed in McDowell's volumes. All together give only glimpses of his life among various tribes after he began his career of trader about 1735. He was among the Catawbas in 1743, and from 1744 he resided for some years among the Chickasaws, his favorite people, in what is now northern Mississippi. In 1746, with the support of Governor Glen, he was among

the Choctaws, seeking to win them over to the English from the French. Successful in his mission but never rewarded as he thought he should have been, Adair came to hate James Glen, who comes off badly in the book. He accused the governor of taking for himself the Choctaw trade he had promised Adair. In the *South Carolina Gazette* of April 9, 1750, Adair advertised a proposed treatise on the importance of winning the Choctaws to the English interest; it was to be supported by documents undoubtedly referring to Glen's allegedly inept policy and the false claims of certain traders other than the author.⁶⁹ In 1751 he was among the Overhill Cherokees, in 1756 saw Governor Glen at Ninety-Six, in 1761 presented a violently phrased petition to the Carolina House of Assembly, and in 1768 went north to confer with Sir William Johnson. He was in London for some years, possibly from 1768, but probably spent his last years in North Carolina.

By late 1769 in the *Gazettes* of both South Carolina and Georgia prospectuses for his great book appeared, which he hoped to publish by subscription, though there is now no evidence of an American edition.⁷⁰ The 1775 London edition is clearly an updated and revised version of whatever he had ready in 1768-1769. The volume is not a comprehensive treatise devoted to all North American Indians. It is a disproportioned work even as a history of the southeastern tribes. For example, almost all the first half is concerned with a series of twenty-three chapter-long arguments that the Indians are descended from the Jews. Although this idea was by no means original, here Adair offers pertinent examples from his personal observations among the red nations, bits of fact found nowhere else, for he presents marital customs, purification ceremonies, modes of burial, and dozens of other matters vitally informative and valuable for themselves. In the second half of the book he devotes sections to the Catawba, Cherokee, Muskogean (or Creek), Choctaw, and Chickasaw (variably spelled) tribes or nations. He gives as he saw them the specific characteristics of each Indian nation as it was when he knew it from intimate association. He even contradicts some generally held conceptions, as that the Indian enjoyed internecine warfare or indeed any warfare for its own sake. Pearce and perhaps others have seen in one of Adair's statements his firm belief in native primitive nobility: for example, when he points out that the Indians are governed by the "plain and honest law of nature," that "their whole constitution breathes nothing but liberty," and that the sense and practice of equality in every red nation is a desideratum in civilized life. These statements can be contrasted with those in Bernard Romans' *Concise History of East and West Florida*, also 1775, in which the author sees the Indians as rude and uncultivated and incapable of civilization, an extreme view Pearce feels is exactly the opposite of

Adair's and anticipatory of the *later* theory of savagism, that because of innate incapability of adjustment the red man must be destroyed. Actually, however, Adair is not such a primitivistic idealist as these quotations taken out of context make him appear. In his introductory chapter, he calls the Indians "ingenious, witty, cunning, and deceitful; very faithful indeed to their own tribes, but privately dishonest, and mischievous to the Europeans and Christians. . . . They are timorous, and, consequently cautious . . . likewise, content with freedom, in every turn of fortune." Crafty, slow, crazed by liquor, possessed of "wild and cruel tempers," and expert with weapons are these children of the wilderness. In his presentation Adair is close to what a twentieth-century sociologist or ethnologist such as John R. Swanton would say or ask about the Indian, for the latter's definitive work *Indians of the Southeastern U.S.* is perhaps not by accident organized much as is Adair's. Not only is Adair's book the major colonial ethnohistorical source for the tribes with which it specifically deals (and this would include Colden's *History of the Five Nations*), but for every modern ethnohistory of the American Indian.

In perception and in avowed and applied ethics in the treatment of the Indians, this last southern colonial commentator is undoubtedly superior to his predecessors in North America. He wrote at a time when these primitive people were undergoing rapid change in their way of living and, as in the case of the Cherokees at least, in their form of government. He was aware of some of these changes and certainly realized that to understand the Indian of his time one had to understand the red man's past. Like his contemporary Romans and to a lesser extent some earlier writers, he understood that the major problem was the relation of the savage to civilized life. Directly and indirectly Adair's book is an appeal for tolerance and acceptance of these natural men into the new American society. In making this appeal he wrote with verve from inexhaustible anecdote and stored fact. If the character of the Indian trader could be redeemed in southern history, it would be in the person and through the writing of James Adair, the white man among aboriginal red men who taught himself Hebrew in order to prove that they were descendants of the tribes of Israel, and who had a real passion for wilderness life. Perhaps he represents scores of less articulate men, though a minority among Indian traders, who did win the trust and affection and the business of the Indians among whom they resided.

DANCING AND MUSIC

In addition to his general survey of savage appearance and modes of sustaining life and political organization, the southern colonial writer

from Hariot to Adair shows a considerable interest in peculiar or special features of aboriginal activities. Particularly was the observer careful to explain what one would call today the Indian's contributions to the performing arts, first of all dancing and music. The writer knew that his potential European reader's curiosity about the exotic in New World human or natural history transcended his interest in the merely practical of politics or economics. And since he himself shared this European curiosity, he devoted time and space to depicting performance and even occasionally analyzing method.

At first he thought both dancing and music were primarily designed for entertainment. He soon learned that, though amusement was almost always an essential element of these arts, they were also a part of ritual and religion and war and peace. Though dancing and music were in some sense inseparable, the colonial commentator stressed the rhythm, movement, and occasion for dances. Instrumental and vocal music, as accompaniment or distinct art, were also frequently considered in varying contexts.

Dances were primarily a vital element of religious or fertility festivals. One of these was the famous green-corn celebration in early August described in 1585 by Ralph Lane in a letter to Sir Francis Walsingham. This affair, which opened the Indian New Year, was frequently preceded by three minor feasts, or "stomp dances," a month apart. Seven hundred people were declared present, "younge and [olde to] gether on a playene," in Lane's first English observation of the ceremony. In the same period John White painted and Theodor deBry engraved two groups of dancers "att their high feastes," one picture a detail of the town of Secota, the other concerned only with the dance and dancers, men and women in grotesque garb with unusual rattles in their hands moving rhythmically about and between carved posts set in a circle, with three women embracing in the center. Hariot's 1588 *A briefe and true report* describes a tobacco-festival dance, "all done with strange gestures, stamping, sometimes dauncing, clapping of hands, holding up of hands, & staring up into the heavens, uttering therewithal and chattering strange words and noises."⁷¹

In early Jamestown the kinsmen of the Carolina coastal tribes continued thus to entertain the English, though it is clear that by 1607 most of the dancing described is purely for entertainment of the white visitors, whatever its ritualistic origins may have been. Gabriel Archer sits on a mat smoking tobacco and "seeing their Daunces" provided for him. A little later, at the house of the King of the Pamunks, the visitors "were entertayned with great joy and gladness, the people falling to Daunce." George Percy goes into greater detail, paralleling in his words very closely the pictures made by John White of a circle of howling, stamping mimes

"with Anticke tricks and faces, making noise like so many Wolves or Devils." A leader stood singing and clapping in the center of the circle, and Percy noticed that they kept in time with one another with their feet, while each made individual gestures with his hands, head, and face. Strachey notes that, when the English first arrived, the natives "would not think they had expressed their welcome . . . sufficiently enough untill they shewed them a daunce," which he proceeds to describe.

In this first year too was observed the huskanawing or initiation rite beginning with two days of dancing in a circle a quarter of a mile in circumference. A rite for adolescent boys, it was described by a William White as a sacrifice and labelled by Smith and others as one of the most abominable forms of savagery, none of them believing the whole ritual anything but black magic and the pledging of the native youth to the Devil. White, Smith, Percy, Strachey (who names Percy as his source)—none of these, all of whom tell the same story, seems to have understood its significance. Some later colonists speculated about it rather intelligently, and modern ethnologists have categorized it as an exercise common to many North American tribes, one that probably resulted in few if any of the deaths of children reported by these first narrators. Lawson, for example, calls it an abominable practice, but acknowledges that the candidates for initiation were those deemed most able to endure the ordeal. He sees it, however, as a school for teaching polite manners and other necessary aspects of Indian education. It was a sort of endurance contest, in which the selected children were shut in a dark house in the woods, made to drink strong herbal purgatives, half-starved, and perhaps beaten. Finally they emerged, according to some interpretations, with their minds completely cleared of childhood memories and ready to face adult life. The initiation had religious implications now obscure (other than Devil-worship), as in the opening dancing led by the werowance, the march accompanied by rhythmic stamping of feet, and furious gestures. The uncomprehending first observers recorded it because of its strangeness.

A True Relation mentions at least three other more attractive dances performed for the entertainment of Smith and Newport and their followers, and *A Map of Virginia* describes a ritual of singing and dancing about a great fire, with rattles and clapping of hands, concluding with a great feast. The latter also describes three or four days of trading with Powhatan spent in feasting and dancing; the Eastern Shore Wicomicos and their laughter, singing, and dancing; and, most amusing of all, the masquerade of Pocahontas and twenty-nine other "naked" maidens who rushed from the woods clad only in a few green leaves and some paint and grotesque headdresses, shouting and singing and dancing for an hour

to while away the time for Captain Smith, who was waiting at a village for Powhatan's return.⁷²

Feeling their inadequacy to explain the strange Indian practices to Europeans who had never seen them, at least two observers compare them with English folk dances. Henry Spelman (the young man who, though he lived many years as an Indian, had spent his earliest life in England and returned to his native country after his sojourn with the savages) describes their "daunsinge" as "like our darbysher Hornepipe a man first and then a woman, and so through them all, hanging all in a round, ther is one which stand in the midst with a pipe and a rattell with which he beginns to make a noyes all the rest Gigetts about wriinge ther neckes and stampeinge on y^e ground." The Reverend Alexander Whitaker gives a scene witnessed on the Nansemond River, when there issued forth from a native village "a mad crewe dauncinge like Anticks, or our Morris dancers." Over a century later (1744) an observer at a treaty conference at Lancaster in Pennsylvania, a young Marylander, watched Mr. Andrew Hamilton dance "a jig . . . in a most surprising manner with a young Indian," after which the young white persons "raised their jollity by dancing in the Indian dress, and after their manner." Whether the jig was modified red or white man's dance the deponent sayeth not.

More often the observer is content merely to note the savage gyrations, although he might include a hint that their original purpose was more than entertainment. In the 1650 trading exploration of Edward Bland, he and his group saw in southern Virginia "the great men and Inhabitants" of "Maharineck" in "divers Ceremonies, and Dancings before us, as they use[d] to doe to their great Emperour *Apachancano*, when they entertain[ed] him in most solemne maner and friendship." In 1659 Briton John Gibbon, visiting Richard Lee in Virginia, found great pleasure in witnessing "a war dance of the native Indians," especially since their shields of bark and naked bodies were painted in colors and singular devices suggestive of his own favorite science of heraldry. The Reverend John Clayton in 1687 declared that "their Sports are dancing," as though he saw or knew no other savage athletic pastimes. In 1701 the Swiss Francis Louis Michel was more appreciative: "The most wonderful is their dancing. . . . They make such wonderful movements with body, eyes and mouth, as if they were [with?] the evil one. At one time they rave as if they were angry, then they bite their arms or other parts with their teeth, or they are entirely quiet."⁷³

On women's dances Parson LeJau reports "wild Ceremonyes of a Grave dancing" and Itiwan festival dancing. The last he witnessed in October 1711, an elaborate serpentine procession with "pritty motion, steps and

figures," rattles for music, and the singing of four notes, the whole ending at a painted hut which reminded him for some reason of Noah's ark and made him suspect they had some tradition of the Deluge. At about this same time Lawson published in *A New Voyage* two of the best extant depictions of the terpsichorean art as he had himself seen it. The first exhibition was in the King's house among the Waxsaws. After feasting and chasing out the dogs, the "Company was summoned by Beat of Drum." Then followed a masquerade by men dressed in feathers, with faces covered by "Vizards made of Gourds" and ankles and knees hung with bells, and brandishing wooden weapons. After an hour of mimicry and a few "high Capers," they were succeeded by some thirty women and girls, who also were covered with bells and danced in a circle. These had musical accompaniment of gourd rattles and drums, and they sang "a mournful Ditty" about the famous exploits of their ancestors. In other words, at such festivals oral tradition was presented to the younger generation, to be treasured up for still later descendants to hear.

In his general chapter on North Carolina Indians, Lawson turns again to dances. Feasts followed by masquerades always begin at night, he tells his reader. Here he gives a more exact description of the accompanying musical instruments and the "Equality and Exactness" of the cadences which, despite the unevenness of the instruments, the savages were able to keep in their songs. He declares that the dances are led by masters "of that Profession," who clearly earn their gratuities, for sweat pours down their backs as they perform. The professionals go into training to develop their wind, as do other red athletes. Any religious significance in the masquerade Lawson simply ignores. He writes as an eighteenth-century scientist concerned merely with presenting the "naturals" as they actually are.

John Fontaine, the young Huguenot British officer who in 1715 accompanied Governor Spotswood of Virginia to Christanna and the neighboring Saponi town, describes a mimic war dance performed by the young men and boys of the village at the governor's request. Here a musician seated himself in the middle of a circle, his only instrument a lapboard and two small sticks, which he employed as an accompaniment for his own "doleful tune," interrupting himself with hideous shrieks which were answered by the boys. It was all rather repulsive, Fontaine avers. Later in the Council Chamber of the Capitol at Williamsburg, Spotswood and his advisors were astounded when a band of Chickasaws entered, swaying and chanting, and carrying a smoking calumet and a bundle of hides as gifts.⁷⁴

Even before Georgia was settled, Cherokees of its northwestern corner were singing and dancing for Sir Alexander Cuming, stroking his head and body with the eagles' tails symbolic of friendship. By this time southern Indians were accustomed to performing mimic war dances, and in 1735 at

Frederica in Georgia a group of them entertained General Oglethorpe and his companions with an elaborate presentation. Francis Moore, who preserved the scene in his *Voyage*, decided that in their "antic postures [they looked] much like the figures of the satyrs." He points out the choral function of some of their songs and the epic or traditional function of others which described past wars and the glories of their people. "A Ranger's Report of Travels with General Oglethorpe, 1739-1742," tells of savage postures and twisting bodies in a gathering in a town square in which white and red danced together, "which pleased them very well."⁷⁵

There were entertaining and ceremonial dances connected with a number of treaties, including those of 1744, 1751, 1754, and 1758. In 1744 Cannasateego, chief of the Onondaga delegation, commanded the young Indian men to execute a traditional dance before the governor of Pennsylvania and the Virginia and Maryland commissioners. It was clearly a mimic war dance, with paint, feathered headdresses, arrows and tomahawks, and much whooping, dancing in a ring about the governor, and simulating an attack upon a fort of their enemies. The whites were much edified and impressed. At the Albany treaty of 1751 the allusions to dances are grimmer, the attendant southern Catawbias fearing their more numerous ancient enemies of the Six Nations would make "them dance the Death-Dance" and then put them to death, as the Iroquois had threatened in the presence of several persons. William Ball, reporting to Governor James Glen of the negotiations, was afraid French partisans might entice some young men to their side by coming to the Six Nations and singing the war dance, evidently in this context a recruiting and diplomatic instrument. Peter Timothy, *South Carolina Gazette* editor, in the same year sent South Carolina Governor Glen clippings from the *Virginia Gazette* concerning the latter colony's negotiations for peace treaties between the Nottoways and Cherokees. After much ceremonial, including singing the song of peace and smoking the pipe, the two nations danced together in the evening around a large fire. And in 1757 Lieutenant Wall, reporting to Captain Demere, the commandant at ill-fated Fort Loudoun, described a Cherokee peace dance and masquerade at Great Tellico, in which the chief Mankiller himself led the procession: "He gave several Hoops which was answered by a Number of different Voices and seconded by a kind of a yelling Howl from evry Indian in the Town House." Painted grotesquely, the chief and fifty-seven of his warriors danced to the drumbeat, soon being joined by the remainder of the men in town, all together about three hours without intermission. Then the young women, later joined by the older females, took their turn. At two in the morning the wan, youthful officer told Mankiller that he must retire to his lodging. After much oratory Wall was allowed to do so, though "they continued danceing and rejoicing all that

night." This ceremonial masquerade of peace and friendship, as seen through the eyes of the young South Carolina officer, is one of the ethnological and literary gems among recently edited documents.⁷⁶

The two most intelligent observers at the end of the colonial period, Adair and Timberlake, both indicate that dances were a familiar aspect of Indian life and perhaps by then of most white-red contacts. Timberlake gives something of the details of the green-corn dance which Ralph Lane had noted rather vaguely almost two centuries earlier. Later he describes a physic dance, which like the corn dance he regarded as a religious ceremony: "I was almost every night at some dance, or diversion; the war dance, however, gave me the greatest satisfaction, as in that I had the opportunity of learning their methods of war, and a history of their warlike actions, many of which are both amusing and instructive." He also enjoyed the frequent pantomimic dances, and describes one in which two men dressed in bearskins stalk and paw about with animal-like motions. Two hunters follow them in the dumb show, "killing" one and "wounding" the other, the second rising up and scuffling with the hunter to the amusement of the audience. Once Timberlake was about to see "a grand eagle tail dance," usually the most spectacular and graceful of the exhibitions, but sudden news of the murder of one of their great men caused it to be cancelled.

Adair, who had a dozen times as many years among the red men as had Timberlake, comments upon a number of dances. The old trader sees in the green-corn dance the Hebrew Passover, drawing a number of parallels. Later he points out the various preparatory rites, including decorations of the altar and fasting. Adair's is probably the most elaborate colonial account of this festival in existence, surpassed only in the national period by that of John Howard Payne, the actor and poet, who was among the Cherokees in 1835. A brief excerpt is indicative of style and content as well as of the supposed Hebrew parallel:

During the rejoicing time, the warriors are drest in their wild martial array, with their heads covered with white down: they carry feathers of the same colour, either in their hands, or fastened to white scraped canes, as emblems of purity, and scepters of power, while they are dancing in three circles, and singing their religious praises around the sacred arbour, in which stands the holy fire. Their music consists of two clay-pot drums, covered on the top with thin wet deer-skins, drawn very tight, on which each of the noisy musicians beats with a stick, accompanying the noise with their voices; at the same time, their dancers prance it away, with wild and quick sliding steps, and variegated postures of body, to keep time with the drums, and the rattling calabashes shaken by some of their religious heroes, each of them singing their old religious songs, and strik-

ing notes in *tympano et choro*. Such is the graceful dancing, as well as vocal and instrumental music of the red Hebrews on religious and martial occasions, which they must have derived from early antiquity.

Adair also had seen the West Florida seasonal spring love feasts, when the Indians dance "as [if] twined together," the men in gourd masks and hieroglyphic painting, some with buffalo horns on their heads, all, men and women, dancing in great circles from dusk to dawn. Later he describes a victory dance (with its musical accompaniment) about the red-painted war pole, a description which he follows immediately with a detailed exposition of a peace ceremony, including the eagles'-tails dancing mentioned by other writers. Then he notes the physic or healing dance, a Natchez religious dance to the accompaniment of a stringed instrument (the dance, not elsewhere recorded, called the Keetla Iohto Hoollo, "a dance to or before the great holy one"), and even a woman's dance the night before a great ball game suggestive of a rooters' or fans' rally preceding a modern football game. With the woman's dance went considerable body movement and shrill tribal yells, also suggestive of modern spectator participation in athletic contests. In every possible instance the old trader connects these dances with Hebrew tradition, for he never forgets his favorite theory of the origin of these people. What springs from the page, however, is a remarkably objective survey of the nature and purpose of the Indian pantomimic rhythms, no small contribution in itself to ethnohistory.⁷⁷

Though much of Indian music, instrumental and vocal, was integrated with their festival and other dances, not all of it was. Both dance music and other varieties received the interested attention of the colonial southern Englishman, who first came to America straight out of one of Britain's great musical periods, the Renaissance, and continued to emigrate throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from a homeland background of lively folk and stage music, varying from that of the composers Campion and Lawes, Purcell and Handel, to the whining street balladeers. Inventories of the settler's meager possessions, as we shall see in a later chapter, often include fiddle, harp, recorder, or flute and some simpler and some more elaborate instruments, as well as sheet music. Perhaps our earliest reference to colonial music, white or red, is to be found in a Spanish "relation" of June 1585 of the English expedition aiming to settle in Virginia. Hernando de Altamiro mentions in this intelligence report that the English fleet contained two tall Indians (Manteo and Wanchese) and "many musical instruments, 'chirimias' [shawms, early oboes], organs and others, because they said, the Indians liked music." Though there is no record of a concert for the red man at either Roanoke or Jamestown,

in the later Williamsburg and Charleston he did attend the theater and undoubtedly heard the white man's music. As just noted, the white man had certainly heard the red man's.

About the same time the Spaniard was noting English musical instruments in the early expedition, Arthur Barlowe, in his "Discourse of the First Voyage," comments regarding the native Americans that "they sing songs as they march to wardes the battell, in steede of drummes, and trumpets," an observation appearing dozens of times later. Within a few months Ralph Lane in his own "Discourse on the First Colony" confessed that he mistook a marching war song for a gesture of peace and, but for Manteo, who warned him, might have walked into the flight of arrows he managed to avoid. Hariot tells of natives' singing and of their praying to idols, and John White-deBry depict their "manner of prainge with Rattels about te fyer." The gourd rattle, one of their principal music or noise-making instruments, appears in several of the White-deBry watercolors and engravings, always in the dance scenes.⁷⁸

The principal Jamestown observers also quickly noted native music. George Percy describes a savage standing in the midst of a dancing circle singing as the others keep stroke. On a voyage of exploration his party was greeted at the river's bank by "the Werowance of Rapahanna, [who] came down to the water side with all his traine . . . , the Werowance coming before them playing on a Flute made of a Reed, with a Crown of Deares hair colloured red, in fashion of a Rose fastened about his knot of haire." And Percy is quoted by Purchas as saying that six of these natives with arms linked, and singing, go in search of their medicinal root, "and when they have found it, sit downe singing." William White and John Smith add more of singing at huskanawings or masquerades designed to entertain. Smith saw the circle of singers about a fire and heard their battle songs. Strachey observes their "*errotica carmina*, or amorous ditties . . . , they sing tunable enough," and he gives four unintelligible units, perhaps stanzas, of a scornful song composed against the English.

Swanton notices only drums, rattles, flageolets (flutes), and rasps as southeastern Indian musical instruments. Though the rasp may be among the sticks used by savage musicians described by these early chroniclers, the other three sorts of instruments were much more in evidence. Among the Powhatan Algonkians both Smith and Strachey saw drums made with skins stretched across wooden platters, though a century later Beverley and Lawson describe drums made with skins stretched across earthen pots, as does Adair. Smith mentions the thick cane "on which they play as on a Recorder." But he considers their chief instruments to be rattles made of small gourd or pumpkin shells: "Of these they have Base, Tenor, Counter-tenor, Meane and Tribble. These mingled with their voices some 20 or 30

together, make such a terrible noise as would affright any man." Strachey declares the cane recorder is "like the Greek Pips which they called *Bombices*, being hardly to be sounded without great straying of the breath, upon which they observe certain rude tunes."

Beverley in 1705 is content to tell how the rattles and drums are made. Lawson four years later adds horse and hawk bells to the savage musical instruments, articles surely obtained in trade with the English. LeJau's account of the Itiwan festival observes that the natives had only rattles for music, "and sung after a Pause onely four Notes saying the same again." Brickell denies that they had any real musical instruments, such as pipe or fiddle. John Fontaine in 1715, Philip George Frederick Von Reck and John Martin Bolzius in 1734, and chroniclers or reporters of the treaties comment principally upon singing that accompanies dancing, often doleful ditties or chants about ancient heroes. Actually the treaty songs, with their rising and falling cadences, largely in the 1744-1763 period, are the most interesting.⁷⁹ In the last decade of the period, Timberlake describes an Indian orchestra made up of drums and "several other instruments, uncouth beyond description," which accompanied the eagles' tail dances. The same white officer mentions Ostenaco's frightful dirge of thanksgiving for a safe voyage as his party arrived at Plymouth, the loudness and uncouthness of the singing attracting great crowds.

By this period the British public had become interested in Indian songs, or quasi-Indian songs. Timberlake includes "A Translation of the War-Song," probably gathered in substance from his interpreters but printed in the *Memoirs* in couplets, with elaborate notes. About 1760 appeared in London a folio broadside, "The Other Thing, A Song, or the American Rabbit. Said to be lately presented to the Q. by a Chief of the Catawbias." In 1762 was printed in the English capital the "Death Song of the Cherokee Indians. An original air, brought from America, by a gentleman, long conversant with the Indian Tribes, particularly with the Cherokees. The words adapted to the air by a lady." All three of these were probably British-arranged, even British-composed, from more or less authentic substance supplied by such men as Timberlake or the visiting Indians he twice conducted to London.⁸⁰

Curiously, instruments unnoticed by Swanton and other authorities are also referred to. One is the board and two sticks mentioned by Fontaine. More interesting is the stringed object seen by Adair in 1746 among the Natchez. It was a

Negroe-Banger in shape, but far exceeded it in dimensions; for it was about five feet long, with eight strings made out of the sinews of a large buffalo. But they were so unskilful in acting the part of the Lyrick, that the *Loache*, or prophet who held the instrument between his feet, and

along side of his chin, took one end of the bow, whilst a lusty fellow held the other; by sweating labour they scraped out such harsh jarring sounds . . . as might have been sufficient to drive out the devil if he lay any where hid in the house.

Perhaps most intriguing is the Indian fondness for the jew's-harp. As early as October 7, 1672, a ship seized in Maryland had in its inventory "Ten Jewes Harpes" for trade with the red men. And in 1709 John Lawson in his Indian vocabulary lists the word in two native tongues as meaning "A Jew's Harp." Apparently the Indians enjoyed the simple instrument, perhaps resembling something they themselves already employed.⁸¹ Under what conditions, or how they played this instrument, might well be investigated.

As most other Indian arts except oratory, dancing and music the white southern colonial saw as only barbarism or savagism, though he often was impressed by the complexity of native rhythms and musical festivals. He might see in them parallels of ancient Hebrew or Greek ritual, as Adair and Lawson and a few others did; but he was more likely to designate these native arts as peculiarly New World idiosyncrasies. Their impact or influence on his own culture was to come a little later, in the national period, or at least the southern white was not to notice its adaptation until then.

SPORTS AND GAMES

Though pastimes may frequently not be considered as a part of intellectual life, as the white observer in the colonial South looked at his red neighbor, he certainly saw native sports and games as indicative of the way the Indian mind worked, and of the nature and degree of Indian barbarism. The Spanish had already seen and described certain games, perhaps not exactly those witnessed by the English but bearing enough resemblance to indicate a common origin. Anglo-American accounts of aboriginal games go back at least to John Davis' story of his English sailors in 1586 playing football against the Eskimos, who repeatedly invited the crew to come ashore and participate. This seems to have been the first and last time during the colonial period that Englishmen participated as a group against natives, and then it was not in the South Atlantic area. Davis' account indicates no surprise or excitement that the North American natives played a kind of football, and our southern accounts beginning at Jamestown seem to proceed from the assumption that their readers already knew of Indian games but probably not their details.

Henry Spelman (1609-1610) distinguishes between football games played by women and young boys and those played by men. Of the former, he says they make their goals "as ours only they never fight nor pull one

another doune," at least one evidence that the English game was a little rough. But the "men play with a litel balle letting it fall out of their hand and striketh it with the tope of his foot, and he that can strike the ball farthest winns that they play for," incidentally the first of many subsequent suggestions or declarations that the Indians gambled on their own games. William Strachey describes something a bit different, "much like that which boyes call Bandy [an old form of tennis and a kind of field hockey] in English and may be an auntyent game . . . yt is said the Trojans taught the Latins skipping and frisking at the Ball." Likewise, Strachey has seen their football, "in which yet they only forceably encounter with the foote to carry the Ball the one from the other, and spurne yt to the goale with a kynd of dexterity and swift footmanship, which is the honour of yt, but they never strike up one anothers heeles as we doe, not accompting that praiseworthy to purchase a goale by such advantage." These are our most specific references to a kind of football, though the bandy-type game may be more nearly like lacrosse. Football, as Swanton says, was much in evidence in the Powhatan country, but apparently in some form it was played clear across North America.⁸²

More popular than football among southeastern Indians as a whole, and perhaps as well in the north and west, were two other games. They were of considerable importance in the ceremonial life of the natives, as the English became aware. The first was lacrosse, the southern type described by Adair and the Reverend George White. It was played with a ball of squirrel or deerskin or Indian hemp and two short sticks having rawhide netting at an end of each. White describes a laid-off playing field about one hundred by thirty-three feet, with goal posts at either end, the field being divided into segments by two parallel lines of poles. Mooney says there were nine or ten players on a side, but White says fifty. A goal counted when the ball was driven between the goal posts. The Cherokee game was preceded by several days of ceremonial with a night-before ball or feast. William Bartram, a little after the colonial period, gave a careful description of a postgame dance and party. Other tribes played one whole town against another, beginning and concluding with elaborate rites. On the game itself, Timberlake observed, the Cherokees (and Adair asserts the same for others) would literally bet the shirts off their backs, sometimes blithely losing all their possessions; others, as Lawson testifies, bet themselves and became slaves of their opponents. Variants of the game itself include single-pole goals, single longer sticks (as in today's lacrosse) and different sizes and kinds of balls.

Even more prevalent among southeastern Indians was the game called chunky or chungke, again in several varieties. All made use of a smooth stone roller and two long, slender poles, and usually there were only two

active participants; but the spectators betting avidly on the sidelines managed to get themselves involved in more ways than one. Both Lederer and Lawson saw Eno Siouans in North Carolina playing this game. Lawson says it resembled English "Trap-ball" and was "managed with a Batoon and a Ball." The Cusabo form is noted by Lawson, the Choctaw by Romans, the Cherokee by Bartram and Adair (who describes it as "Running hard labour"), and there are numerous later descriptions.

If ingenuity and strenuous exercise were the qualities most stressed in accounts of ball games, ingenuity and an exaggerated gambling instinct appear as the characteristics or concomitants of other games. Beverley says that the one great diversion of the red men was a game played with handfuls of sticks or hard straws they could count faster than we can cards. This is probably the "game upon rushes" described by Strachey a century earlier, "wherein they discard and lay a stake too," which may be all their worldly possessions, including bows and arrows and leather coats. Lawson in Beverley's time gives even more detail, saying that the game is played with fifty-one split reeds seven inches in length and that, "when they play, they throw part of them to their antagonist. The art is, to discover upon sight, how many you have, and what you throw to him that plays with you. Some players are so expert they judge correctly ten times out of ten. A set of these reeds may be bought for a dressed doe skin."

Lawson also observed a game employing persimmon stones as dice, winning or losing depending upon which side fell face up, and another the score of which was kept with a heap of Indian grain, the latter played by Congaree women. Adair describes Indians as inveterate gamblers, but he goes into detail on none of their games of chance, rather emphasizing their betting on athletic contests, and their taking of losses with apparent stoical indifference.

Though the colonial drew parallels between the games and pastimes of the aborigines and those of his own culture, he was quick to imply or to state great differences. Occasionally he saw a Roman or Greek parallel which had more primitivistic than civilized connotation. The Indian recklessness in physical-exercise games or in betting he viewed more as an indication of savagism and barbarism than as gallantry or bravery. That the Indian game of lacrosse and betting habits have been taken over in our time by the white recorders' descendants is but one irony of these colonial observations.⁸³

MEDICINE

Indian illness and cure were from the first a real concern of the colonist. He might learn of a contagious disease from which he could protect him-

self or for which he might find the cure. He soon discovered that native illness was combated by medical practices combining magic and empiricism in varying degrees. Whether the colonist was untrained or inexperienced even in home remedies or was a university-educated botanist or doctor of physic, he was usually eager to find out something of the native's practice, since from the great periods of the Spanish conquest plants such as the quinine bark had been carried back to Europe as well as used by the white settler with some success. Therefore from Raleigh's settlement into the national period observers noted native medical practice and pharmacopeia with the usual mixture of curiosity and search for practical curative materials. Recent investigation has convinced medical historians that most of the really useful curative plants came from Latin America. But in some instances the same plant or a kindred one grew in the southeastern English colonies. Then rattlesnakes and poisonous insects such as spiders were in greater abundance in the South than along the northern coasts, and by his far more active outdoor life the southern settler was exposed to such dangers much more frequently than the New Englander was. Mosquitoes also and other flying insects were more abundant along the low-lying, swampy, southern coastal region. The really remarkable contributions to *materia medica* made by southern colonists will be discussed in Chapter VII, but here in rounding out as fully as possible the picture of the Indian as the colonist saw him, one must glance at the native medicines and medical practices.

Many of the plants which the Indians believed were specifics against various illnesses have since turned out to have been principally psychologically useful, at least as far as the white man is concerned. Sassafras, still used as a mild and healthful but not curative "tea," had been recommended by the French and Spanish as a cure for syphilis and malaria. Naturally, as the sassafras shrub grows in abundance in the Carolinas and Virginia, it was the first of the "physick" plants noted by Thomas Hariot.

Most unconsciously tragic among his observations is the naive remark that nearly always after a party of English visitors had left a native village, its people began to die very rapidly. For more than a century the Indian, with no immunity to European diseases, was to be decimated not only by smallpox and typhoid, but by what were for the Europeans the relatively mild diseases of whooping cough, measles, and malaria.

The explanation with the White-deBry drawings describes the milkweed (also known as the pleurisy root) as the herb used by the savages to cure wounds from poisoned arrows. Probably White-deBry's most famous figure is that of the medicine man, or conjurer, who used magic more than drugs and was most revered for his prophecies of relief from pain or disease.⁸⁴

From early Jamestown medicinal plants such as sassafras were a frequent part of the return cargo. Sassafras especially became in a double sense a drug on the European market. But Smith as early as 1608 in *A True Relation* was describing the methods rather than the matter of Indian medicine in his depiction of the howling, gourd-rattling attempted cure by the Quiyoughquosicke, or conjurer, and his probably more effective sucking of "bloud and flegme" from a diseased or infected place. The "antick" conjurer-physician becomes most familiar among observations throughout the rest of the colonial period. Smith also is interested in the physic, and in *A Map of Virginia* describes the annual spring dosage of strong purgative made from a root also used to cure green wounds. As for surgery, the natives made incisions with "splinted stone." And for swellings, aches, and dropsies they used a sweating-house resembling the Finnish steam bath. Henry Spelman adds more on the priest-conjurer's methods. Strachey says juice rather than powder was applied to open wounds caused by any sharp thing, and notes that they seemed not to know anything to do for a broken bone or "old ulcers." He describes the pox (syphilis) as "their own country-disease," for which they have several herbal cures.

John Lederer testifies to the efficacy of the treatment involving sucking the venom from the wound, applied to him when he had been bitten in the finger by a mountain spider, a procedure which was accompanied by a small dose of snakeroot powder. In early Carolina there are frequent testimonies as to the efficacy of Indian medicine. In 1680 in a letter to Scotland N. Matthews admires Indian knowledge of the curative powers inherent in many plants. His is one of the earliest of many urgent requests from colonists that some gentleman knowledgeable in *materia medica* be sent over to assess the value of what he and others had learned from the Indians. Matthews, evidently a trader, avers his intimate knowledge of the language and customs and religion of the neighboring natives. Published two years later, Thomas Ashe's *Carolina* contains further information on the "Nature of Simples, [of which] some [of the Indians] have an exquisite knowledge; and in the Cure of Scorbutick, Venereal, and Malignant Distempers are admirable." He adds something on their sucking of infected wounds, and of their skill in aphrodisiacs.⁸⁵

About this same time, in the 1680s, Virginia had acquired at least three "knowledgeable gentlemen" who, with varying degrees of attention, judged the native *materia medica*. The Reverend John Banister, chaplain at Magdalen College, Oxford, had by 1679 emigrated to Virginia almost surely for the purpose of writing a natural history of that colony. He was a remarkably able scientist and but for his early death by accident would have produced such a work. As it is, his rough drafts and completed shorter pieces, recently gathered and admirably edited by the Ewans, reveal much

of the natives as well as of fauna and flora. In his "Of the Natives" Banister more perceptively than earlier writers notes that any physic is called *Wisoccan*, and that it is not the name of any specific herbally derived drug, also observing that Indian medicines are usually roots, very rarely leaves. Poultices and plasters they do use on wounds but leave the "sore place" bare, and frequently employ sucking and scarifying. He compares Indian cures for gout with Japanese, and the sweating houses with Turkish, Russian, or Finnish baths. Ointments, not recorded by previous observers, he notes in some detail, with the varying uses the Indians made of them.

The Reverend John Clayton, who arrived in Virginia in 1684, probably went there with the double motive of religious duties, perhaps as a missionary, and scientific observation. Certainly he was a well-trained scientist whose later reports to the Royal Society indicate that he made meticulous records of what he saw or heard. In his surviving writings he notes his conferences with the Indians concerning remedies, for he like others was interested in practical uses of aboriginal materia medica. Most of his letter to Dr. Nehemiah Grew of 1687, a series of answers to questions, is devoted to Indian medicine, with a statement that their *Wiobhist*, or priest, is in general their physician and second in importance and prestige only to the tribal king or war captain. "Nature is their great apothecary," he next observes, pointing out that up to a certain point every man is his own physician and each gathers his own herbs. The official physician, the priest, is paid in skins or rum or something else according to the nature of the cure: "They have no consultations, their practice being merely Empirical. They know little of the nature or reason of things."

Clayton goes on to describe the curing of wounds by sucking and spitting out, marvelous secret cures such as are frequently recorded in colonial legislative records (including an Indian's restoration of sight to a black slave belonging to Colonel Spencer after white physicians had given up), and a list of diseases, most of which he admits he knows only by hearsay. Snakeroot, the universal panacea, and emetics and purgatives are among the observables, though not all has he personally seen nor can he vouch for. Clayton wrote with verve, expressing in archaic English idiom many facts which he was the first to record.

The third of the knowledgeable Virginia gentlemen was also a clergyman, but he has left us neither his name nor a great deal of detail. His manuscript of 1689, "The Indians of Virginia," discusses the conjurers as priests rather than as physicians, but he does devote three paragraphs to Indian diseases and cures. Like others, he has never seen bloodletting as a native remedy, but he has seen sucking to relieve infection, the sweating or steam baths, and different sorts of distemper from which the Indians suffer. Evidently he was not the natural historian, especially not the

botanist, that Banister and Clayton were, but he seems to have known something about many aspects of native life.⁸⁶

As time went on, colonists came to believe more and more in the potential benefits of Indian medicine, especially in its use of native plants. In 1697 the Reverend Nicholas Moreau wrote to the Bishop of Lichfield from Virginia that the "Indians tho illiterate and ignorant have the best secrets any Physicians in Europe do not have. . . . They have taught me how to cure any intermittent fever in three days' time." In 1706 from South Carolina, Boston-born and Harvard-educated Daniel Henchman, an Indian trader, informed the British naturalist James Petiver of the many curiosities he had come upon in his wide travels along the Indian frontiers, lamenting the indifference and ignorance of the average trader regarding "Remarkables." Henchman declared he was preparing a "*Medicus Occidental*." But he died in 1710 and his manuscripts other than the letter have disappeared.⁸⁷

In the first decade of the eighteenth century careful historians such as Beverley and Lawson give much on Indian medicine. Beverley devotes several pages to an amusing tale of a conjurer-priest-physician employed to bring rain to some of the parched crops of William Byrd I. But most of his medicinal lore is incorporated in a chapter "Of the Diseases, and Cures of the Indians," in which as usual Beverley has employed a few older Latin and English sources with his own experience to describe barks and roots, sweating houses, and ointments. The order and detail is much that of John Banister's recently printed manuscript, and we now have good reason to believe that both Beverley and William Byrd II had seen that document on the Indians. Lawson is more original. Like the learned Virginia clergymen, he had come to America to gather scientific material, including *materia medica*. He did send collections of Carolina plants, not all medicinal, to friends and patrons in England. Among his dozens of references to native priest-physicians is his story of the cure by Indian Jack of a white friend given up for dead by an English physician. It is a genuine tall tale of a large rattlesnake put to bed with the sufferer to cure the distemper. The snake died and the white man got well.

After this incredible story Lawson discusses aboriginal modes of curing the spleen and toothache, methods of amputation, and emetics and purgatives. Sassafras, smallpox, epidemics, rheumatism, poisoning, and the health-destroyer rum receive his attention. He is disgusted with Christian disregard for savage health. Like most of his white contemporaries, he may have overestimated the value of Indian therapeutics in civilized medicine, but very recent historians are returning to the belief that there were many medicinally valuable plants employed in native cures. John Brickell by borrowing emphasized Lawson's theories of Indian medicine.⁸⁸

Between 1724 and 1740 at least three other educated colonists commented on Indian medicine. The Reverend Hugh Jones (c. 1690–1760) has in *The Present State of Virginia* a succinct chapter on sweating houses, priests' cures of the wounded, and the medicinal value of native plants. William Byrd II in his major histories, his diaries, and his letters demonstrates a continuing interest in Indian drugs and methods. He was a great believer in the powers of snakeroot and bear oil, in the emetic usefulness of ipecacuanha, and in favorite prescriptions based on Indian medical practice and plants. In *A Discourse Concerning the Plague* he points out how the use of American tobacco has immunized Englishmen, and he advocates the use of snakeroot in wine as a preventive. Ginseng and other plants he had located with Indian aid. He knew a great deal about Old World medicine and had a considerable library on the subject, but in practice he seems to have relied on his own experience and experiment, based on Indian lore. To Sir Hans Sloane and other British scientists he poured forth the "discourses" of the therapeutic value of American plants, much of it derived from his native friends. He recorded the Indian belief in a diet of bear's meat as an aphrodisiac and even a means of conception, and in the histories a favorite jibe at his companions refers to their increased sexual appetite from the great amount of bear's flesh they were consuming.

The great naturalist Mark Catesby, Byrd's personal friend, observed in all the southern American colonies from Maryland to Florida. In his letters and in his *Natural History*, he comments frequently on Indian medicine and his posthumously published *Hortus Brianno-Americanus* (London, 1763) is entirely devoted to American plants including the medicinal. In the *Natural History* he shows his skepticism regarding the powers of the snakeroot. He has seen many bites when traveling among Indians, but the recoveries depended more on where the person was bitten and how well the poison was sucked or drawn out than on herbs. Thus he declares that in general scarifying and sucking are more efficacious among the Indians than plant medicine. Ipecacuanha and the "Tooth-ache Tree" are useful within limits. Altogether he finds the Indians totally ignorant of anatomy and possessing only the most superficial knowledge of surgery.⁸⁹

Even busy Georgia administrator James Oglethorpe in 1734 took time to write to Sir Hans Sloane and send the bark of a tree which is "a specific against all kind of Defluxions. . . . [It was] discovered to me by the Indians who call it Itookacippe [?] & by chewing raise a kind of Flux." Nearby a little later was Dr. Alexander Garden (1725–1791), called the most important resident scientific figure of colonial Carolina. He learned all he could about plant life in several excursions to the Indian country with Governor Glen and in extensive rambles on his own in the Charleston area. He wrote to the Edinburgh Philosophical Society on the Indian

pink, a popular worm medicine still in use today. Garden never devoted himself to describing Indian medicine, but undoubtedly he employed the red man's lore in his own description, location, and use of Cherokee-country plants. And Dutch architect-engineer in South Carolina, John Gerard De Brahm, remarks on Indian ignorance of epidemic disorders (by no means an original observation) but testifies to their skill in dressing and curing wounds, venereal disease, and snake bites. He believed they had few fevers and rheumatic disorders because of their way of life—moderate diet, bodily exercise, and bathing or swimming all year round.⁹⁰

A second John Clayton (c. 1694–1774), a Virginia county official, is even more distinguished than the earlier one as a botanist, for his *Flora Virginica*, edited by Gronovius and published in two European Latin editions of 1739–1743 and 1762, made him known throughout the western world. He does not deliberately describe Indian medicine, but the *Flora Virginica* contains many references to Indian medicinal uses of the plants he describes, and certainly more of those to which he ascribes curative properties have Indian backgrounds, perhaps the natives' suggestions as to uses. "Indian Physick" and the May apple are here given as different plants, both possessed of emetic qualities. For example, *Aletris* or "Star-grass," still collected in Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Indiana, and Tennessee, and useful as a gentle cathartic and for insect stings, almost surely became known to him through the Indians. In both editions of the *Flora Virginica*, for example, is the description of *Sanguinaria* observed by Clayton, as "quem Indi *Puccoon* vocant," and we are back with John Smith or Strachey.⁹¹

Though the old trader Adair frequently refers to Indian medicine in his *History* of the Indians, actually he tells us little about it. He repeats at least twice Indian expressions of horror at amputation, which they considered unnecessary mutilation, for if herbs could not cure, any man had rather die than be so disfigured. He is inclined to believe in the efficacy of Indian concoctions for fevers or even for smallpox, and he declares that he prefers Indian herb drink or poultice for a green wound to any treatment by the best-trained English surgeon. Men like Catesby would probably have been skeptical of his assertion that, in his forty years with them, he never knew an Indian to die of snakebite. An educated man Adair was, but hardly in the new science of his time, especially not in botany. He names a few useful herbs, such as "Cuseena," sassafras, and ginseng, but he seems to know little and care less about the wide variety of medicinal plants growing everywhere around him.⁹²

Indian medicine in itself seems to have progressed little or hardly at all in the two centuries between Hariot's and Adair's observations, though some recent observers say it improved by borrowing from the white man.

Engraved by John Smith's Map of Virginia, reproduced from an engraving in the Library of Congress.

Special Collections, University of Tennessee Library

Early map of Virginia from Smith's *Generall Historie*

Copyright by the Trustees of the British Museum

"An Indian in Body-Paint," the John White drawing of the 1580s
adapted by Theodor deBry for *Historia Americae*

The same uses of suction for open wounds, herbs for emetics or purgatives, some scarifying as well as suction for infections, seem to have been usages common alike to late seventeenth-century coastal Algonkians and late eighteenth-century mountain Cherokees. The imaginative or psychological effect of the songs and rattles and incantations of the priests are suggested but never really discussed by the colonial white observer, and they yet remain for serious scholarly investigation. On the positive side, the white southern settler began almost immediately to use certain plant remedies, perhaps because the Spanish had already testified to the therapeutic powers of some plants found in Latin America. Despite their sense of superiority, the English venturers as true sons of the Renaissance held open minds about Indian medicine. More than fifty items from the native's herbs are said to have found their way into European pharmacopeia. Of these wild cherry, wintergreen, beech, sassafras, bloodroot, aralia, and a number of others have been found to be ineffective, though the United States Pharmacopeia recognizes oil of sweet birch and oil of wintergreen, among others, and the National Formulary still lists aralia, sanguinaria, sassafras, and two others. The drugs persisting in use today, if one does not count tobacco, are principally veratrum, stramonium, and podophyllum. The white observer marveled at Indian cures, but he could no more evaluate them than he could his own, which included the use of magic stones for treating the bite of a mad dog. So intelligent and educated a man as William Byrd II did adopt and use "Indian physick," both the herb so called and many other plants the Indians considered efficacious in sickness. Undoubtedly the southern colonial did at least as much harm medicinally as he was able to do good, for he brought diseases which were as powerful as his rifle in destroying the Indian race. In the one matter of epidemics the late colonial seems to have come to realize what smallpox and other diseases relatively mild to Europeans meant among the red men, and a few like Adair and certain physicians tried to prevent their occurrence or spread. Winthrop the younger, James Logan, the Mathers, and Cadwallader Colden were northern and middle-colonies men in touch with the European scientific world throughout their lives, but as for knowledge of Indian medicine being communicated to the old world, half a dozen eighteenth-century southern colonials seem to have done as much as their northern brethren were able to do.⁹³

MARRIAGE AND BURIAL

Though marriage and burial were certainly highly significant events of Indian culture or society, they were not more or less equally sacramental as they were in European Christendom. Marriage was a social contract with little or no religious significance. Burial, especially for leading men of the

tribe, was very much a ceremonial and religious matter, usually with an elaborate ritual, as the Jamestown settlers soon recognized.

Curiously, for they were quite detailed about other social institutions, Hariot and Smith seem to have been little concerned with the method and meaning of aboriginal marriage. Smith frequently mentions Powhatan's many wives and women and children, and also refers to the families of various minor kings and queens. He does not appear to have been very much concerned with either the connubial bargain or its degree of permanency. The relation of Pocahontas, himself, and John Rolfe in the matter of the girl's marriage is his principal oblique comment on the institution, and then it is not an Indian but a white contract he is speaking of. One should recall that he was a bachelor. The little known of early coastal Algonkian marital habits comes chiefly from the youthful Henry Spelman, half-Indian himself in his rearing, and from William Strachey.

Spelman's short "Relation of Virginia" devotes several paragraphs to "Ther maner of mariing." The custom of the country is to have as many wives as one can afford to buy from their parents; and the ceremony consists in the bride's relatives bringing her to the groom's abode, their hands being joined, and a long string of beads broken over them at the moment of clasping. After this there is great feasting. Kings, Spelman declares, have their choice wherever they wish to take a maiden. After having one child by her, the king puts her away and takes another in her place. Spelman concludes the discussion with a seriocomic tale of an experience of his own when he resided with the King of Pasptanse (Passapatanzy). He was beaten by two of the chief's wives for his refusal to carry a child, but a surprising turn of events came when the husband, coming back from a journey, took the white boy's side and half killed one of the women with an iron bar. And Spelman adds as a sort of appendix an explanation as to how a child is named at a baptismal feast and dance after the father has held the infant in his arms and declared what it shall be called.

Strachey devotes a whole chapter of his *Historie of Travell* to the Indian household, beginning with the matter of the marriage contract. The lover brings presents of game or fruits to his chosen one by way of courtship, promises her parents she shall not want for the necessities of life (deer-skins, beads, pearl, and copper), and pays some "earnest money" to ratify the betrothal. As soon as they become well acquainted and he builds her a house, the husband takes her home. The chiefs or werowances naturally have numerous wives acquired in this manner. After the first wife, Strachey avers, the rest are simply hired for a year or two, being put away at the end of the appointed time. If the separation should fail to occur at the time agreed the chief must keep the woman all his life, diseased or deformed or shrewish as she may be. Strachey, unlike many later commentators, con-

siders the Indians very voluptuous and in practice incontinent from childhood, a principal reason for the great proportion having the pox, or syphilis. He gives evidences of family or household affection. As for names, the child may begin with a simple family pet-name, as Pocahontas (or Little Wanton), which will be renounced for a more dignified permanent name as the young one matures.⁹⁴

The Frenchman Durand, who was in Virginia in 1686, declares that the red men "have no other marriage ceremony than to have the village assemble & the young man after choosing her he wishes for his wife gives her a hind or hart foot, while she offers him an ear of Indian corn, signifying the husband will provide the house with meat & the wife with corn." Robert Beverley does not describe a marriage ceremony, but he observes that "The Indians have their solemnities of Marriage, and esteem the Vows made at that time, as most sacred and inviolable." There is such a thing as divorce, however, though it brings such shameful reputation to a couple that they rarely let their quarrels proceed to final separation. If divorced, they may remarry, but infidelity during marriage is accounted one of their unpardonable crimes. Beverley's brother-in-law William Byrd II says little of Indian marriage beyond the fact that the women are made to do all the drudgery. John Lawson, who like Byrd and Beverley advocated intermarriage with the natives as a means of solving many colonial problems, devotes more space than either of the Virginians to the aboriginal connubial contract, perhaps because he had seen a great deal more of it. He notes that the Carolina Indian girls marry as young as twelve or fourteen, that the prettiest girls are given to the best hunters of any tribe, that married women often bestow their favors elsewhere in their husband's absence, that the wives differ in their hairdress from the trading girls, or prostitutes, and finally that after an Indian divorce children of the marriage go with the mother and never with the father. He also observes that, though he has often read and heard of the ceremony and form of an Indian marriage, he has never seen one. But he does trace the steps of courtship—offers of a match, the reply of the relatives, a second meeting in the form of a debate between the prospective in-laws of an older generation, and the consent of the young woman herself, which must be obtained. The price paid for her depends on how handsome she is, and though if he be a good hunter he may take her home at once, the marriage is not to be consummated until he has been able to pay the full amount agreed upon. Lawson notes that Europeans would probably not abide such a custom, but that "the *Indian* Men are not so vigerous and impatient in their love as we are"; yet he has heard that the women are quite the contrary. Some men sell their wives "as Men do horses in a Fair," and often old men have three or four young wives, apparently as a sort of investment. A woman

is not punished for adultery, but the man makes satisfaction to the injured person. And he reports that the trading girls all know various means of contraception.⁹⁵

It should be noted that the contradictory assertions as to the inviolability or sacredness of Indian marriage may be because each observer was writing of a particular tribe or linguistic stock. It is more probable that his assertions depend upon what had been related to him by the traders and explorers who had been among the Indians. Of the three early eighteenth-century commentators, Beverley and Lawson had certainly been in Indian villages and seen a good deal of native domestic life. Byrd also had visited a few villages and had the Indians visit him at Westover. He had the fewest illusions among all southern commentators as to the charms of Indian maidens, all of them to him dirty, grease-smeared, and ill-smelling. His comments regarding them are almost always ironic, sardonic, and disparaging despite his advocacy of intermarriage (he implies for the lower-class white man and the red maiden).

James Adair, as one might expect, had considerable knowledge of the marital customs of the southernmost and mountain tribes of South Carolina and Georgia. Almost surely, as his editor, Judge Williams, notes, he left his blood lines among them himself. He spends some time on purification rites after childbirth, which of course he compares with Hebrew observances. Then he tells a hilarious tale of the Christian marriage of a white with the charming Indian maid Dark-lantern, her misunderstanding of all the doctrinal questions put to her by the priest through a stumbling interpreter, and her being transformed by her "conversion" from a Dark-lantern into a lamp of Christian "light." Sadly enough, her name soon had to be erased from the parish role of future saints because of her many adulteries.

Adair devotes the whole of "Argument XIII" for Jewish origins for the Indians, to "Marriages, Divorces, and Punishments for adultery," which not surprisingly he finds quite Hebraic. He tells of the deer-foot and ear-of-corn exchange in marriage noted by Durand and adds further elements. Protections and bribes against adultery are customs among the Creeks, though he admits that at the time of his writing they are fast disappearing. Adair thinks he sees more resentment of and revenge for adultery than earlier observers had noted, though he admits there were gradations of punishment to fit the flagrancy of the crime. He also sees the Cherokees as exceptions, for they have no law against adultery. This he attributes to the matriarchal government frequent in many of their tribes. On the last page of his *History* he records a dialogue with an Indian friend regarding the relative virtue or sin in a divorce between persons who found it impossible to get along in marriage. They should be divorced, argued the friend, and

the wife's property restored to her so that she might make a happier choice. It was a matter of law-and-equity, not of religion, observed the Indian. Evidently Adair agreed.⁹⁶

Very little is said of the moment of death itself, of priestly attendance on the dying, even of the nature of death except that it was from wound, disease, or age. The matter of an afterlife will be considered below with the religious beliefs, though certainly much concerning it is implied in the modes of burial. Of burial itself there is a great deal recorded, almost entirely of chiefs or great men. John Smith notes in *A Map of Virginia* that "for their ordinary burials they dig a deep hole in the earth with sharp stakes and the corpse being lapped in skins and mats with their jewels, they lay them upon sticks in the ground, and so cover them with earth." Afterward the women paint their faces with black and wait for twenty-four hours. This was probably the usual method for all southern tribes, of course subject to variation. Earlier in *A True Relation* Smith noted that "their Kings they burie betwixt two mattes within their houses, with all his beads, jewels, hatchets, and copper." "Within their houses" must refer to the sepulchre temples, which Smith describes on the same page on which he mentions ordinary burials. At Powhatan's Pamunkey capital, for example, "there are 3 great houses filled with images of their kings and Divels and Tombes of their Predecessors. Those houses are neare 60 foot in length built arbor wise. . . . In this place commonly is resident 7 priests."

These ossuary temples had been depicted by White and deBry before 1590, with descriptions of the methods of embalming (removing flesh from bones, drying it, and covering bones with deer skins) and drawings of the scaffolds upon which the werowances and chief lords are laid nine or ten feet off the ground, in long rows, with a priest attending a sacred fire in the foreground. Spelman implies that this scaffold burial place is for any man, though he does not say so outright. He describes how kinsfolk of the eminent deceased fling beads to the poor at the time of the burial, and the feast afterward. He also tells of the ultimate disposition of the corpse. If and when the body on the scaffold is totally "consumed" [flesh disintegrated?], then the remains are removed in new mats to the houses or house of the surviving relatives, where they remain until the building itself has rotted away and they are left to be buried among the ruins.

Strachey in his *Historie of Travell* probably follows Smith's or Hariot's account, adding that the favorite "toys" used in life (such as pipes) are laid by the corpse, and that the skin and bone "inwards" are stuffed with pearl, copper, and beads. He declares that "these are all the Ceremonies we yet can learne, that they give unto their dead." In 1670 John Lederer,

in his observation of Piedmont non-Algonkian tribes, notes that they divide their burial places, "assigning to every tribe one, for to mingle their bodies, they esteem wicked and ominous." "They commonly wrap the corpse in beasts skins" and bury with it the household provision useful in this world. When great men die, prisoners are slain to attend them in the future state, and they believe in the transmigration of souls into animals characteristic or representative of a dominant trait, as an "angry man" into a serpent. No scaffolds for the dead great men are mentioned.⁹⁷

As for Tidewater Virginia Algonkians, the anonymous clergyman of the 1689 manuscript adds an interesting note that formerly their dead (presumably the ordinary people) were buried standing upright with their faces toward the setting sun but that now they are commonly laid along the ground as is the English custom. In 1705 Beverley presents exactly the portrayal of royal Indian burial in deBry's engraving and Hariot's description. But earlier he gives a most detailed account of an Indian sepulchre temple he and hunting companions stumbled upon deep in the woods. In rolled-up mats they found human bones, tomahawks, colored feathers, and other articles which would indicate that the Hariot-White description of more than a century before still held in general for the burial place of chiefs and great men.

Dr. Francis LeJau, already commented upon as an early incipient ethnologist, notes that the Itiwan people have their women anoint the recently dead with oil "either of Bear or Ikkey nuts for they have no other." About the same time in Carolina John Lawson was observing the sepulchre of the late king of the Santees. The embalming-burial-tomb ritual he describes is somewhat different from that of the coastal Carolina-Virginia Algonkians to the north or at least is described in more detail. These Indians first erect a mound or pyramid of earth, top it with "an Umbrella, made Ridge-ways, like the Roof of an House," support this with nine stakes or posts, and presumably have the resting place in the midst beneath the roof. Embalming with spices and powdered root, laying the body on "crotches" (perhaps the Algonkian scaffolding), and placing the deceased's earthly possessions around him follow next. Then a chief mourner chants for three or four days, the mellow flesh is removed from the bones and burned, and the bones are wrapped in opossum's hair cloth, placed in a wooden box, and oiled each year. These remains often survive for three or four generations. There is also another sort of tomb, a great heap of stones or sticks marking the burial place of one slain in battle.

Lawson frequently returns to the subject of tombs and burials. In "An Account of the Indians of North Carolina" he gives another elaborate description of mourners and embalming processes, these fitting quite closely the Hariot-White Algonkian accounts. The chief mourner here delivers

an oration or sermon, telling the survivors to emulate the deeds of the deceased and describing the "Country of Souls" or Happy Hunting Ground where there will be handsome young women and no hunger, cold, or fatigue. The lazy and sinful go to a very different sort of place. Perhaps most interesting to the ethnologist are the parcels of reeds used by the chief mourners or kinsmen, which by their length and marks tell of "accidents" which happened years before. Lawson vouches for their accuracy after checking three different bundles in three distinct regions. All agreed, for example, that 105 years earlier there had been such a terrible winter that the great sound was frozen over and the wild geese came to eat acorns and could be killed with clubs.

This first story or tale of the heroic past is followed by further recitals by other near kinsmen. Next the thoroughly prepared corpse is lowered into a bark-lined coffin or vault, covered for many days with stamped earth, disinterred and the bones scraped and wrapped and laid in the scaffolding loft (of the White-deBry engravings), the mummified skeletons now covered or attired in deerskins. This is the method for great men. Other men are buried in standing or in various other positions, but always kinsmen with blackened faces lament night and day at the grave. Lawson was never able to ascertain what happened to deceased females. His book affords abundant evidence that burial customs had changed no more than aboriginal medicine in the 125 years since Hariot, and that other southern tribes followed much the same burial procedures as the Algonkians, for some of the people he described were Santees (Siouan) and others Tuscaroras (Iroquois).

The clergy were naturally much interested in burial customs. In 1723/4 F. Varnod in Dorchester, South Carolina, sent the Secretary of the S.P.G. certain details, and Hugh Jones in Virginia recounts at length a burial of those slain in battle. The soldier Timberlake claims that the Cherokees seldom buried their dead but usually threw them into a river, an extremely inaccurate observation probably based on a mistaken idea of the nature of the river ceremonials peculiar to this nation. Adair tells how a warrior dying a natural death was honored by the tribe or town's abstinence from war drums and diversions for three days and nights. Of course Adair sees Chickasaw and Choctaw mourning as almost identical with Hebrew ritual. The Choctaw burial and embalming ceremony he describes is much like the ceremonies described by Hariot and Beverley and others. He calls the ossuary temple the family bone house, to which the corpse is finally borne the fourth moon after death. All the Indians he knew, except the Cherokees, once buried movable riches with the corpse, though of late years the nearest of kin are beginning to inherit them. He claims that whenever possible even the bones of those killed in distant

wars are brought home, but only after they have been allowed to "cure" on a scaffold before being brought back for interment. He describes rather dramatically the last rites for a chieftain, who was in a sepulchre much like those described above. Dressed in his finest apparel with his face painted red, the chief is first buried in a sitting posture. After a period in an airtight log-and-clay vault, his remains are carried on to the mummified skeleton burial pictured by deBry. Many details not found elsewhere are here recorded, though one may be skeptical of the story that every Indian traveler, whenever he passes by, adds a stone, or throws a stone, at the place where a warrior was killed in battle, which fits too well with ancient Hebrew customs. Loaded statements by Adair may be partial to his favorite Hebrew-origin thesis, but the facts that emerge from his "Arguments" on burial are not at all incompatible with those of earlier observers in the Chesapeake area or along the Carolina coast. Like those earlier accounts, Adair's add to the impression that southern Indian "life in death" was strongly marked, as it was elsewhere, with barbaric dignity and elaborate ceremony.⁹⁸

UTOPIAS

As indicated earlier in this chapter and more fully in Chapter I, the Englishmen who settled North America believed that they could establish a utopia in this natural paradise of noble savages or that the anti-utopian characteristics of the howling wilderness could be transformed or redeemed. As demonstrated in Chapter I, the southern colonist was much more likely than the northern *to begin* with the former attitude, and for almost two centuries he saw his land as more of a natural paradise than as a terrifying wilderness, however harsh conditions might occasionally be.

Indian government was usually "monarchical," Adair among others liked to inform the royal government back in Great Britain. Since the colonial period was partially in the reigns of Elizabeth, Mary II, and Anne, it was worthwhile to note the many "queens" who ruled certain coastal and occasionally inland tribes. Later, in the national period, political economists or scientists spent many pages of books and periodicals analyzing southern Indian government and society. But during the colonial period the observer, even a veteran like Adair, was much more interested in traits other than political. The result is a great deal of information about town, subtribal, tribal, and confederacy organization but little or no real analysis of their nature or cumulative significance. From Harriot and Lane one learns of werowances and chiefs, of towns or villages or groups of villages, or from John Smith of the Powhatan confed-

eracy increased by the "emperor" from six inherited towns into the two hundred inherited by his brother. From others later in the century one learns of the less numerous Carolina and inland Virginia peoples of several racial or linguistic stocks, and last of all from the Virginia-Carolina traders of the mighty mountain Cherokees, a loosely organized confederation which sometimes had an emperor and was in a sense an empire, or perhaps three empires. Today historians occasionally read strong democratic qualities into the southern tribes; actually their political qualities were more nearly communal. For most possessions, especially land, were held in common by members of town or tribe, and policy in war or trade was determined by a council of elders meeting around a campfire. Occasionally younger warriors joined them.

Adair's is by no means the first consideration of tribal organization in southern writing, for there are direct and oblique comments on the subject from the time of Hariot and Smith and Strachey, as already noted. From the earliest accounts the concept of an Indian "nation" seems to be related to possession of lands and number of warriors. Leadership was evident to the observers at every level of authority, leadership comparable in function to that evident in European society. The contemporary evidence suggests that it was sometimes female and sometimes male, and perhaps that the succession was through the female line, at a time before Queens Mary and Anne in Britain though of course after Elizabeth. Even a relatively powerful chief such as Powhatan had among his subchieftains at least two women, and there are descriptions of others. But political organization was a complex affair, and during the colonial period among the natives the organization changed with the changing relations to the whites and among the Indians themselves. There are many suggestions in the early accounts of the relationships and forms of authority among the Chesapeake Algonkians. The early Georgia settlers found outlaw chief Tomochichi in a peculiar relationship to his "tribe" of outcast-exiles and the other tribes of the area. Cherokee history recorded by Adair and the others mentioned in this chapter is a story of adaptability to conditions, of confederacies, of organized groups of villages and autonomous villages, all developing or shifting.

The relationship of each member of a group to his village, his responsibilities and degree of allegiance and independence, is another recorded characteristic of the Cherokees as it is of other tribes. Of the seven Cherokee clans, all were matrilineal, and each village had seven representatives. Allocation of garden plots, regulation of marriage, revenge for injury were responsibilities of the clan sections, and as Adair and Timberlake among others inform us there were houses built and set aside for village council

or clan discussions. Other tribes were perhaps not so "democratic," but in the writing on the Indian there is frequent reference to the warrior's individual independence.

The Iroquois and other tribes which were partially southeastern in location appear to have had somewhat different organization, as their representation at treaty conferences and relationships to white governors suggest. But there is a general lack of agreement on the extent of political coherence of any Indian "nation," a single village or a large group of towns, as historians and anthropologists and even jurists note. The observer in the colonial period, for his individual reader or for his home government, usually interpreted native government as monarchical, as just noted above, though he showed distinctly that decisions among the Indians were made in conference or council. Again he was reflecting his preconceptions and what he thought his readers would understand or wanted to hear. And he may not have said more because he did not sufficiently comprehend.

Lane and Hariot, Smith and Strachey, saw the potentialities of the sweet new land, but essentially as an adjunct to or element in the budding British empire. Henry Woodward in 1670 called it a possible second paradise, and Lawson and others in the early eighteenth century dreamed of another great British state. In one sense James Adair's long series of arguments for the Jewish origins of the Indians implies that he regarded the aboriginal world of Creeks, Chickasaws, Choctaws, and Cherokees as a somewhat degenerated biblical Canaan or utopia, but nevertheless a utopia, despite his own earthy realistic view of many of its aspects.

The utopia visualized by the Georgia Trustees had very little to do with the native Indian, nor did the Azilia Sir Robert Montgomery planned in 1717 to be located in what is now Georgia include the native population, except perhaps as serfs or slaves. But at least twice in the eighteenth century white Europeans attempted to set up among the Indians and/or for the Indians, ideal states or societies.

The first was the brainchild of Sir Alexander Cuming, Bart. (1692-1775), a Scottish gentleman somewhat eccentric but of great energy and personal magnetism. His journal, originally printed in the London *Historical Register* of 1731, edited in this century with a good introduction by S.C. Williams in *Early Travels in the Tennessee Country*, tells the story of his visit to the Cherokees in 1730. His proposal was a wild scheme to settle 300,000 Jewish families in the Cherokee Mountains and thus pay off the British debt! Strangely enough (for their reasons are now obscure) the Cherokees welcomed him warmly, and so popular was he among them that they proposed making him their permanent "Emperor." His was actually an entirely unofficial embassy, though he managed to secure the best interpreter-traders of the South Carolina colony to accom-

pany him, among them Eleazer Wiggan and Ludovick Grant, and eminent local men like Colonel George Chicken. Though he knew of the hostile disposition of the Cherokees at the time, he pushed on until one day he boldly entered their council house, where more than three hundred were assembled. The surprised Indians found themselves submitting to his demand that they at once acknowledge the sovereignty of the king of England, a submission and a promise they made upon their knees. The amazed interpreters certified the actuality of this audacious accomplishment. Then he proceeded from one Cherokee town to another, in a series of triumphant acknowledgments of the English king's sovereignty and Sir Alexander's personal popularity. Finally he returned to Charleston with six "chiefs" who were to accompany him back to England, presumably to confirm their allegiance and to be impressed by British power, as well as to document their consent to Cuming's proposed scheme of settlement. Returning to Britain aboard the man-of-war *Fox*, Sir Alexander and his Indians were given an audience by the King on June 18, when the baronet laid the crown of the Cherokee nation at his majesty's feet. The treaty that resulted had nothing to do with the proposed establishment by Cuming.

Unhappily for Sir Alexander and perhaps for British southern-area settlement, after the court presentation there is no evidence that he received further attention from the home government. The Indians continued their affection for him and expressed concern and resentment at his absence from the treaty talks. Actually he was soon in prison for debt. His cloud-capped Hebraic towers vanished into nothingness, and his became a neglected or forgotten name in the footnotes of colonial history. Diplomatically his service to his nation was most valuable, though the resulting signed treaty was actually illegal, for the six Indians were not official delegates. What he would have done for Indian and white had even a modicum of his proposed Jewish colonists reached the Cherokee country for settlement is an interesting question, but that is all. Yet his "embassage" is perhaps the most singular event in southern frontier history.⁹⁹

Six years after Cuming's visit there arrived in the lower southern colonies the German communist Christian Gottlieb Priber, as picturesque a figure as Sir Alexander, and in his activities much more alarming to Georgia and South Carolina authorities. Though described as a Jesuit agent of the French government, he was probably, as C.J. Milling observes, an agnostic who preferred French Indian policy to British. A utopian mystic, Priber hoped to found a republic based partly on Plato's ideal and partly on general and specific principles of equality and liberty. Few if any British colonials understood this man who reached Tellico in 1736 and preached his novel doctrine among the Indians for several years. Fearful that Priber

might further alienate the already pro-French Choctaws from the English and infect the Cherokees, the governors of Georgia and South Carolina offered a reward for his capture. But to take him was difficult, for he had adopted native costume and way of living and was protected by the Cherokees for several years. Adair asserts that Priber actually set up and put into operation his "republic," inventing a number of high-sounding titles for native leaders and designating himself in his openly defiant letters to British authorities as "his imperial majesty's principal secretary of state." Perhaps considering "emperor" in the Indian sense and "republic" in a vaguely Roman one, Adair apparently saw no inconsistency in having an emperor as chief executive of this red democracy, and was indeed blind to what Priber now appears to have been attempting.

Priber was finally captured some time before 1743 by Georgia authorities as he went outside the mountains in search of more converts, or potential republics. At the time he had with him a great bundle of manuscripts which have since disappeared. Today they would be of great interest as the documents of a strange early American experiment in politics and living. Among these documents was one of a book, with the title of *Paradise*, described in the *South Carolina Gazette* of August 15, 1743, as by a Georgian, and then ready for the press: "The Book is drawn up very methodically, and full of learned Quotations; it is extraordinarily wicked, yet has several Flights full of Invention; and it is a Pity so much Wit is applied to so bad Purpose." About this time Priber died in prison at Frederica. As the modern historian looks back at the scanty evidence, he sees Priber's idea as an attempt to develop an independent confederacy of southern Indians with a communal or communistic establishment which, as V.W. Crane observes, might later have served as a model for a French republic. For a few years, then, in the mountain fastnesses of the colonial South, there existed among the Indians the first of many unusual American experiments in social idealism. Behind the social venture was the vision of a white European, but his body politic was red aboriginal.¹⁰⁰

WHITE IDEAS OF RED ORIGINS

From the moment the West European realized that America was not Asia and that the Indians were not Mongols or East Indians, he must have begun to speculate about their origin. As a Christian he was forced to believe them to be descendants of one or more of the sons of Noah. But which son, and how they had reached the newly discovered western continents, was to become a widely discussed and never fully decided question. As this is being written, the newspapers report a serious lecture at Brandeis University declaring newly discovered support for the theory that Indians

are descendants of the ten Lost Tribes of Israel. More convincing is Samuel Eliot Morison's succinct yet penetrating, commonsense, and scientifically based conclusion, that all Indians are of Mongoloid stock of several varieties, men whose ancestors crossed the Bering Strait or isthmus over a period of several thousand years and began that migration many more thousands of years earlier than was ever conceived until the discoveries of the last decade or two. There are dozens of fascinating books on the subject or touching upon it, from Don Cameron Allen's literary study of the legend of Noah in its relation to Renaissance rationalism, through ethnological and anthropological treatises and the synthesized histories to Lee E. Huddleston's *Origins of the American Indians* and Robert Wauchope's *Lost Tribes and Sunken Continents*.

The Jamestown colonists probably knew the question before they ever set sail for the New World, for some of them had read the answers proposed and the methods followed by José de Acosta and Gregorio Garcia (published respectively 1589/90 and 1607), who represented the two principal schools of thought on and approaches to the problem. De Acosta's tradition is marked by skepticism with regard to cultural comparisons, considerable restraint in constructing theories, and a great reliance on geographical and faunal considerations; the Garcia tradition, by strong adherence to ethnological comparison, a tendency to accept transatlantic migrations, and an acceptance of possible or probable origins.¹⁰¹ Throughout the British-American colonial period discussion in England or the colonies was likely to center in or be related to one of these major approaches. In all cases, unless one accepts Isaac de la Peyrère's postulate of the existence of man before Adam, the theory was formulated within the boundaries of biblical and classical tradition.

A John Rastell has been given credit for being the first Englishman to ask in print the question as to origins, though several Continental writers probably preceded him. This appears in his (c. 1520) *A New Interlude and a mery, of the nature of the iiij Elements* (ll. 29-31):

But how the people furst began
In that countrey or whens they cam
For clerkes it is a question¹⁰²

Throughout the period from 1585 to 1763 English at home or in America read Spanish, German, Dutch, and French theories; but they were probably most interested in those suggested by their own countrymen. Influencing theory, British or Continental, were of course national pride, belief in a Northwest Passage, and a multitude of ancient legends of northern European voyages to America centuries before Columbus, most of the last containing no claims that such explorations marked first settlement.

Among the earliest and most persistent of British traditions is that of Madoc, Prince of Wales, who was said to have reached the West Indies, a story republished when Hakluyt incorporated it into his 1589 *Principall Navigations*. Madoc was supposed to have left most of his people there, perhaps in some part of Mexico, if one may judge by comparison of names and other words. A few years later a Jamestown settler with a Welsh name, Wynne, stated his belief that the Monacan Indians spoke a Welsh dialect. Hakluyt also included Sir Humphrey Gilbert's "discourse" to prove the existence of a Northwest Passage to Cathay and the East Indies. Gilbert held the theory, now assumed as fact, that the first men came from Asia via Bering Strait, and that they had not come from Africa or Europe or the islands of the Pacific.¹⁰³

Samuel Purchas in *His Pilgrimage* (1613 etc.) and *His Pilgrimes* (1625) summarized certain theories, including the story of a Carthaginian origin perhaps akin to that Egyptian-origin tradition behind the recent attempts to prove north African navigation of the Atlantic possible. Purchas accepted no theory of Mediterranean origins nor did other northern Europeans believe in such theories, which were entangled with the tradition of the lost mythical continent of Atlantis. Smith in his *Generall Historie* mentions and dismisses without more ado both the Madoc and the Carthaginian myths. There was some talk of Phoenician and Trojan origins, but the English paid little attention to it. Thomas Morton, author of the 1637 *New English Canaan*, played with the idea that the red natives of New England had many words from Latin and Greek perhaps derived from the Trojans. Various later more pious New Englanders entertained variously the Tartar (variation of Bering Strait) and Welsh myths. In the southern colonies Strachey gave most attention to origins in the chapter in his *Historie*, "De Origine, Populi." Bringing in the Deluge as the means of scattering the human race, he is inclined to believe that the descendants of "Cham," the most barbarous and idolatrous of peoples, may have settled America. As to the stocking of the New World with animals and the means by which the vagabond descendants of Cham reached it, he refers his readers to de Acosta's *Historie natural y moral de las Indias* in its 1604 English translation by Edward Grimestone.

Lawson begins his "Account of the Indians of North Carolina" by commenting upon the obvious marks of the Deluge there. He offers "proofs" that the present Indian inhabitants of the land were not its first human possessors, for he finds artifacts resembling Roman urns far below ground and other products of an iron-age culture. Anthropologists today, along with archaeologists and ethnologists, are still finding remains of cultures quite different, some more primitive and some more advanced, than those of the Indians of history. Lawson's was an intelligent speculation, but

really nothing more. Hugh Jones, working within a biblical framework, saw the Indians as possibly Asiatic descendants of Shem (Chem) who may have arrived by a possible northern land bridge between Asia and America. He unites the Canaanitish, Tartarian, and Bering Strait theories into one. Like the Canaanites, the Indians "afford living examples of the primitive savages, and idolaters." He concludes with an imaginative Indian genealogy showing them as descendants of Joktan, second son of Eber, sprung from Shem, Noah's eldest son.

The *South-Carolina Gazette* for October 6, 1758, carried on page one the first installment of "A Conjectural Essay concerning the First Peopling of America." It begins with mention of the Welsh, Egyptian, Ophir-Phoenician, and Chinese origin theories, and then asserts that there are so many differences among the Indians themselves, from nation to nation, that the author is convinced that they are descendants of several distinct peoples. He begins his proof with some discussion of the Carthaginians and the way in which they may have reached America, probably Mexico. He feels that Central America was settled by accident, else cows and horses would have accompanied the emigrants. Presumably this well-written essay was to take up other sources for red peoples, but no other installment appeared.

In 1760 Dr. George Milligen-Johnston wrote in the manuscript of his 1770 *Description of South Carolina* that he believed the red men to be descendants of the Scythians, ancestors of the Tartars, and that they reached America by way of northern Asia and Europe. This was a not unintelligent surmise: for the northern European was perhaps thinking that Mongoloid peoples such as the Lapps may have reached Greenland and Newfoundland across the Atlantic while other Mongoloid Asiatic peoples traveled the way most of us believe today they did. As a scientist of the later eighteenth century Milligen-Johnston might naturally have drawn such a conclusion. But his learned contemporary James Adair, experienced in Indian affairs, was no scientist, as we have seen, and was convinced (perhaps suggested by some reading) that the red men were directly descendants of the Lost Tribes of Israel, naturally a people he knew only through the scriptures. As already noted, he employs almost half the space of his long *History of the American Indians* presenting a series of numbered "Arguments" which at least for him prove that the Indians were of Hebraic descent. He sees the kinship everywhere—physical appearance, food, language, ceremonials, modes of warfare, religion, even tribal organization. He taught himself Hebrew and translated the Old Testament, probably tailoring his translations to fit his thesis. Yet the opening section of his book is just as valuable to the student of the Indians as the principal section of history, for it is replete with anecdotes and other observations which tell much of the aborigine as Adair knew him. It may even be argued that with-

out Adair's interest in Indian origins he might have given us a book only half as valuable as we now have.

All this discussion has considered only the matter of *racial* origins. As to linguistic and tribal origins and migrations, only a few vague traditions passed on by the Indians to the white men have been recorded. They tell us little beyond that already noted in the brief discussion of linguistic stocks, tribes, and nations. Swanton, Mooney, and other ethnohistorians have ferreted out and speculated concerning aboriginal movements prehistoric and historic, but their work does not belong to the literature nor to the mind of the southern colonials who left us the contemporary records of the Indians they knew.¹⁰⁴

NATIVE RELIGION AND CHRISTIAN CONVERSION AND EDUCATION

The promotion pamphlets and colonial charters considered in Chapter I of this book indicate that conversion of the natives to the Christian religion was one of the three major avowed motives behind the enterprise. Almost every southern writer for at least a century gives it lip service, and down into the national period organized religion, from the Roman and Anglican to the simplest of evangelical sects, urged missionary activity, and to some extent undertook it, among the continually dwindling red men. Individuals, including governors and prominent planters and traders, occasionally voiced open opposition to it, sometimes on the same grounds they employed in opposing Negro Christianization. They were a minority, however, for the majority of southern colonials believed that for the sake of the natives' souls and Englishmen's safety, the Indians should become Christians. Unfortunately, they seem to have found no effective means of making them so, though they realized that a first step must be to have their clergy learn native tongues and the natives learn English. There were missions to the Indians and translations of the Bible and Prayer Books into the languages the Indians understood, though none of this was as systematic or as temporarily successful as the work of John Eliot and David Brainerd and the elder Mayhew in New England. By the time of the Revolution the Pennsylvania Quaker and the New England Puritan and southern Anglican or Presbyterian found that he had failed to reach the whole of a primitive people, or indeed a large segment of them, in such a way as to make Christianity the religion they were as yet ready to observe or profess.

Having the natives learn English so that they might understand the required education in the Bible and Prayer Book or Catechism, and the idea for and actual foundation of an Indian school came in the Chesapeake area before the Pilgrims first landed. Schools for Indians, colleges and universities admitting Indians, tutoring of Indian children in white families are

written into southern legal and legislative records, as are donations for implementing red education.

Sometimes intermingled with conversion and education as a means to them is southern interest in the native pagan observances, though perhaps just as often this interest is merely avid intellectual curiosity about the strange and marvelous, and the knowledge that Europeans back home would find descriptions of the barbaric idolatry fascinating. Whatever the reason, Indian pre-Christian religious observances are described from Hariot to Adair, by clergy and by laity. Alexander Whitaker in Virginia, Francis LeJau in South Carolina, and John Wesley and John Martin Bolzius in Georgia all had white flocks of their own to shepherd, but in each of their cases they would have liked to train the red foxes (to some extent Whitaker and LeJau did), and usually they became most interested in the nature of the idolatry or worship they had to combat, or to wean the Indians from.

As usual, the story of the two religions begins at Roanoke Island, where in 1587 Manteo the red man and Virginia Dare the first white child born in English America were christened, probably by a ship's chaplain, for these colonists had no minister of their own. This christening of Manteo is the only recorded fruitful result of missionary activity in this colony, though most of the chroniclers of the settlement wrote home that they spoke to the natives of the true god whenever they had opportunity. These same chroniclers have left far more on the native religion in practice than on the reception accorded their own faith. The only precedents they had for their religious discourses were the Spanish-Portuguese histories of conquest, which did emphasize the Christianity they bestowed upon the fortunate central Americans by fire and torture. Anglo-American chroniclers frequently express their distaste for the Spanish bloodbath in the name of religion, perhaps one reason why their campaign of conversion was generally unsuccessful and always slow.

At any rate, the 1584-1585 "Discourse" of Arthur Barlowe's first voyage, when it is directly concerned with religion at all, describes that of the natives. Barlowe notes that the Indians carry their idol to war with them, and ask his counsel as the Romans did the Oracle of Apollo. And Barlowe relates the treachery and revenge of one tribe, who slew all their enemies who accepted their invitation to pray with them before their idol. Ralph Lane tells among other things of the monthly masses the aboriginals had for the souls of their dead. Naval officer Primrose, describing Drake's excursions in Virginia, observes that "the[y] have a churche with 3 Images in hit, And the[y] speake with the Divell once everie yeare uppon an high Mowntaine."

Naturally the perceptive Hariot, whose task was to describe the new

land and its people, gives their mode of worship much more attention. In *A briefe and true report* Hariot begins by declaring that the Indians think so highly of tobacco that it is used in fire or water as a sacrifice to pacify angry gods, and as a thank offering for escape from great dangers. Some pages later he gives a fairly succinct discourse on the principal elements of their religion. They believe in many gods, including the great and all-powerful *Móntoac*, the creator. They believe in the Iroquoian myth that woman was made before man. The images of their anthropomorphic gods they place in temples so that the people may sing and pray and sacrifice before them. They believe in immortality, in a heaven and a hell (called *Popogusso*) and a system of rewards and punishments. Fear of eternal torment and other teachings of their priests cause them to be orderly and law-abiding. This summary of their religion, Hariot declares, he learned from long conversations with their priests, the latter confessing to the English interrogator that they considered Hariot's religion superior to theirs. The reader will note that certain elements of coastal Algonkian belief may have been modified by contacts with Spanish Christianity. Of this contact direct and indirect, there are more striking later evidences.

In the White-deBry engravings and Hariot's comments are villages with temples, a dancing priest or conjurer, other more isolated ossuary sepulchre temples, the idol *Kiwase*, and dancers praying with rattles around a fire. These watercolors and engravings illustrate almost every phase of Hariot's discourse on religion and a few matters he did not touch upon. Dozens of later writers here as elsewhere testify to the general accuracy of the drawings.¹⁰⁵

Though most of them had read Hariot in Hakluyt and many had seen the deBry illustrations, the Jamestown settlers add quite interesting further details. Percy, perhaps through inadequate linguistic understanding, states that the Algonkians of the Chesapeake were sun worshipers, sacrificing to this god with circles of dried tobacco and attendant dancing. John Smith in *A True Relation* is more interested in religious ceremony, for at least at the time he believed the first such ceremony he saw was marking his own sacrifice. He describes the rattle prayer dance about a circle made with meal, with a fire in the middle, and the offerings to the *Quiyoughquosicke*, or power represented in the image they worship, and "a more uglier thing cannot be described." Later, in *A Map of Virginia*, Smith describes also temples, priests, idols, the architecture of the sixty-foot-long arbor-shaped sepulchre temples, the degrees and ornaments of the priests, the song-and-dance seasonal ceremonials, altars, sacrifices of tobacco and children (*huskanawing*), and their belief in the resurrection of their werowances and priests, not of the common people. Then he continues,

To divert them from this blind idolatrie, many used their best indeavours, chiefly with the Werowances of Quiyoughcohanock, whose devotion, apprehension, and good disposition much exceeded any in those Countries, who though we could not as yet prevaile with all to forsake his false Gods, yet he did beleieve that Our God much exceeded theirs, as our Gunnes did their Bowes & Arrows and many times did send to the President, at James towne, men with presents, intreating him to pray to his God, for raine, for his Gods would not send him any. And in this lamentable ignorance doe these poore soules sacrifice themselves to the Divell, not knowing their Creator.¹⁰⁶

In his "Relation of Virginia" Henry Spelman locates Powhatan's chief temples, including an idol called Cakeres, as being at Orapax or Yaughtawnoone, and differentiates between this idol and that of the Potomacs, which was called Quiquasacke. He claims he witnessed fire circles, conjurations, prayer, and the sacrifice of two or three children by burning. Master Alexander Whitaker, who had left a comfortable parish in England to become a missionary to the heathen, contributes principally from hearsay the story of the tight grip the Indian priests hold on their people and describes the hermit-like living of these native holy men. In a letter of August 9, 1611, to Crashaw, Whitaker describes one primitive ecclesiast "who tossed smoke and flame out of a thinge like a censer." He adds that the priest-conjurer brought rain by his antics, further proof of his alliance with his Satanic Majesty.

William Strachey in 1612 devoted a whole chapter of the *Historie of Travell* to native religion, motivated in his desire to understand Indian beliefs and explain them to his countrymen by a personal conviction that through their own primitive ideas of creation and immortality they might be led to Christianity. His description of the ossuary sepulchre temples agrees exactly with Hariot's and Smith's, though he seems to have seen even larger buildings than they had. He explains native worship of Satan by the Indians' theory that the beneficent Ahone who created the earth, fruits, and seasons, requires no homage from men, but that the diabolical Okeus, examining men's actions, punishes them with a severe justice. Okeus, or Okee (and there are other spellings) therefore must be appeased, and to him they bring offerings and through the priests they try to obey his will. Strachey may be the source for the London Virginia Company's assertion that the priests are the evil element in Indian society, and also for the instructions to the colonists that they destroy the priests so that they may obtain Indian children to be educated and brought up in "Christian manner of life." Intermingled in all his discussion of native paganism and conversion is the theme that Britain may establish an empire by converting

them from "their barbarous natures," not by destroying them as the Spanish have done. This benevolent concept of imperialism was always an ideal among a considerable proportion of English colonists. Yet there was a less deliberately bloody but actually more complete obliteration of savage peoples than the Spanish ever accomplished, probably the result of the comparative sizes of the European immigrant and native populations in English America, especially among the coastal Algonkian peoples.

Strachey repeats the accusation that Powhatan was responsible for the extermination of the Roanoke Island colonists of 1585-1587 and that merely convincing the natives that they would have greater freedom under the English might persuade them to throw off Powhatan's yoke. Then he turns back to religion, describing native burials, temples, fast days, huskanawing, and belief in immortality for priests and chiefs. He concludes with a story of young Henry Spelman explaining to the Potomac Indians, with the aid of a large illustrated Bible, the Christian story of creation and immortality, and a summary of the Indian parallels. The happy hunting ground is a great and pleasant field "where they doe nothing but daunce and sing, and feed on delicious fruicts with the great Hare" (the Creator, discussed below) until as very old men they again die and are born into the world again.

A curious religious or ritualistic element is introduced by the Council of Virginia in 1619 and January 20, 1622/23 letters to the Company in London commenting upon one red man and his possible connection with the 1622 massacre. Called Nenemettanan or Nenemachanow or Nematatanow, or by the English settlers usually known as English Jack or Jack of the Feather(s), certainly in 1619 this man was the trusted aide of Opechancanough and as subsequently evident an agent and symbol of magical or religious powers. By 1622/23 the colonists were assuring their administration at home that the man's death just before the massacre had not been one of its causes, for Opechancanough himself had assured them that there would be no breach of the peace because of the death of this one man. Yet in this whole passage lies the suggestion that Jack of the Feather was no ordinary Indian. Captain John Smith soon after begins his relation of the dreadful catastrophe by presenting as "The Prologue to this Tragedy" an event which may have caused it. He describes "Nemattunow" or "Jack of the Feather" as strangely adorned, a chief captain among the red men and a man they believed "immortal from any hurt [which] could be done him by the English." Shot by two youths who had good reason to believe he had murdered a man called Morgan, Jack died in a boat on the way to being interviewed by Captain Thorpe. The significant point seems to be that he begged of his executioners two things: first, that they not let it

be known that he was slain by a bullet, and second, that they bury him among the English.

Here the seventeenth-century recorders are on the verge of revealing, even though they may not have fully recognized it, the ritual folklore and symbolism of Algonkian religion, with time-honored elements of primitive belief implicit everywhere. For here the southern settler of the first generation was noting two elements of folk superstition, or religion, which may be significant keys to an understanding of Indian strategy and aboriginal belief: that a bullet (or some other designated lethal weapon) cannot hurt charmed individuals and that these or other individuals are immune to ordinary injury resulting in death. These beliefs, as old as humanity but most familiar to Europeans, are found in the New World. The two documents and Smith's laconic paragraph on Nemattanow's peculiar request are intriguing evidence of early English colonial concern for or at best interest in the red man's religious and kindred concepts.¹⁰⁷

In 1634 Father Andrew White in Maryland observed that the Indians acknowledge a God as the giver of all good things, that an old man (priest) speaks and makes sacrifices to Him, and that the people eat only after the sacrifices are performed. A generation later Dr. John Lederer describes Okaeë or Mannith as the Indian Creator, and lesser good and evil spirits. In 1682 Thomas Ashe reported Indian religion in Carolina as chiefly a worship of sun and moon. All these perhaps derived from first- or close secondhand observation but representing long-familiar stereotypes just the same. In the 1680s the Frenchman Durand and the Reverend John Clayton reported a little on native beliefs and ceremonies. The latter's anonymous brother clergyman of 1689 describes the burnt offerings, prayers, and images of gods and animals in the temples. He adds that the god often appears to them after they become adults, never as boys, perhaps as a result of the huskanawing ceremony in which they drink in the brews taken in the ritual of adolescence to maturity, which cause them to forget all the past. They think our god more powerful than theirs, but that nevertheless they must propitiate their own. The writer denies that any worship the moon or sun, "as the negro's doe." So went the observations of the first century, remarkably consistent except as to whether the natives worshipped the sun or moon.¹⁰⁸

In 1705 Robert Beverley, like Strachey a century earlier, devotes a whole chapter to Indian religion. Beverley uses Smith and Hariot and to some extent the manuscript of John Banister. The last devotes little space to native religion, but remarks on sacrifices, pyramidal stones or altars, and the resemblance of the incantations at a sacrifice to those of a Roman Catholic mass. Beverley disclaims any ability to explain Indian superstition

and ecclesiastical practice, but besides the fascinating description of the idol and other remains in the temple in the woods (see "burial" above) he presents the summary of a conversation he has with an Indian on the subject of religion. He says he managed to get his red man under the influence of strong cider to remove his inhibitions. Through questioning, as noted earlier, he got the usual story of good and evil deities and the necessity for propitiation of the latter to prevent pestilence, war, and famine. Upon Beverley's own declaration that the idol the Indian feared was but a dead, insensible dressed-up log, the Indian answered hesitantly and perhaps unwillingly that it was the priests who made the people believe. Beverley continues with a discussion of conjuring, ritual dances, huskanawing, and black magic in connection with the last. He doubts that the boys undergoing the ceremony died. He had actually witnessed a huskanawing ceremony among the Pamunkeys in 1694. He adds remarks also on carved posts and sepulchres and rituals.¹⁰⁹

John Oldmixon summarizes much from Byrd and Beverley and Banister on Indian religion, but John Lawson is much more original. He begins, "To pretend to give a true description of the religion . . . is impossible." He writes largely from his experience with North Carolina tribes, summarizing their creeds, describing the sacerdotal functions of the priests at some length, and exhorting his readers to bring salvation to the red man. In order to accomplish the last, the white must show tenderness and understanding, set examples in good behavior, and where possible intermarry with the red people. Indian children now living with the whites to learn trades (see references below) should be allowed in the hands of men of only the best lives, character, and piety.

The Reverend Francis LeJau naturally was anxious to learn the primitive beliefs as a means of knowing how to prepare the Indians for Christianity. He writes a great deal about circumcised Indians, evidently with his Hebraic-origin theory in mind. Either some of those with whom he talked almost certainly told the good man what he wanted to hear, or had been influenced by Spanish Christianity, for he reports that they believed man was created first and his wife from his rib. Varnod's already-mentioned letter from Dorchester in South Carolina to the Secretary of the S.P.G. refers to Indians' belief in a future state. In Georgia in 1734 Commissary Von Reck and the Reverend Martin Bolzius summarize in their journals what must be Creek religious tenets and practice. "The[y] have some Religion, believing a Supreme Being, which they call *Sotolycate*, who is in all Places." From him comes all knowledge. They worship him in a festival once a year, and though they have no idols, they sing on such occasions of their ancient heroes or demigods. Generally, like other Indians, they are reluctant to talk about their beliefs. Superficial as this Georgia observation may

have been, and perhaps even recorded secondhand, it seems to illustrate absence of the idols which the Algonkians and other Virginia-Carolina natives worshiped, though the wording does not make this certain; for they may have considered, as several other observers did, that the Okee stuffed figures were but symbols of invisible gods.¹¹⁰

Two of the discursive observers of primitive religion were those masters of eighteenth-century prose, William Byrd II and James Adair. Most of Byrd's significant comment is to be found in his two histories of the Dividing Line. He notes the superstitions of the natives—for example, the belief that cooking venison and turkey together would bring down the vengeance of the tutelary spirit who presided over the woods. He found that the Indians had no Sabbath and prayed only when they felt like it, perhaps when hungry. But from a literary point of view a masterpiece among colonial accounts of primitive religion is the two-stage rendering of the discourse by the Saponi, Bearskin, concerning his religion, first and more briefly in the *Secret History* and then in full, with Byrd's philosophical observations, in *The History of the Dividing Line*. The Indian's explanation is close to the form of a credo, but including descriptions of the universe, a benevolent deity, the forked road after death leading to the regions assigned to the good and the evil, and a harrowing account of hunger pangs and "haggard old furies" in the hell of the wicked. In the *History* Byrd characterizes Bearskin's recital as a good example of the three great articles of all natural religion, the belief in a god, the moral distinction between good and evil, and the expectation of rewards and punishments in another world. The Indian notion is a little gross and sensual, like Mahomet's paradise. But how can it be otherwise, Byrd asks, in a people that are contented with nature as they find her and have "no other Lights but what they receive from purblind Tradition." Though there could have been more on idols, festivals, and customs, what has survived in the two histories is a presentation of aboriginal mental or imaginative conclusions regarding the nature of the relation between God and Man, or at least a presentation of the relationship as seen by one Indian, member of a tribe which had been for some time under white instruction and protection.¹¹¹

Two decades after Byrd wrote, Timberlake and Adair composed their firsthand impressions of Indian religion, those of the relatively isolated mountain Cherokees and of the free-roaming southern and southwestern Creeks, Choctaws, and Chickasaws. All these people had felt European influences, including Christianity itself, from Spanish explorations two centuries before to their own time. But when Timberlake or Adair speaks of native religion, he is clearly trying to present its indigenous elements, sifted out of the possible quasi-Christian-pagan mixture. Timberlake declares that each individual among the Cherokees has the right to

think as he pleases on religious matters but that few go to so much trouble. Then he points out that generally these people believe in the idea of rewards and punishments, though he gives no details. He does recognize the green-corn dance as a religious rite.

Old James Adair, with his Hebraic-origin ax to grind, is the last and most expansive explicator of aboriginal beliefs. Rites he describes *in extenso*, usually as proofs of kinship with the Jews. Idols, war-gods, temples of Dagon, and scores of other biblically described counterparts he finds everywhere. The Indian priesthood he sees as Levitical; government as basically a Hebrew theocracy; the black and evil spirits as related to the witch of Endor; the incantations, the word for God or Jehovah, and even common words, as Hebraic derivatives; the Passover as the green-corn dance or vice versa. Thus the veteran trader marches through a bewilderingly knowledgeable and detailed series of Indian religious customs and beliefs and finds them basically Jewish. All this, in a series of numbered "Arguments," forms the first half of his *History*. The second half, the history of the southern tribes, considers religion mainly in the relationships of missionaries and Christianity to the natives, and how the Indians should be approached for conversion. His long documented observations show that from the Chesapeake Tidewater to the valleys of the Appalachians and southwest to the Mississippi, from 1585 to 1770, southern Indians of many dialects and variant physiques and history held very much the same religious tenets and ritual. Beverley wrote as an *American* historian preserving what should be known of the Indian past and present, Byrd wrote as a literary entertainer, sardonic and yet philosophical, of what may be archetypal Indian religious thought, but Adair used an enormous and hard-won personal knowledge to advance a thesis regarding the red man's belief.

Two particular myths (in the older sense of this word), basically religious, persisted throughout the colonial period, the tradition of a universal Deluge and of the Creation of human and animal species. Some of the Creation myths are suggested perhaps in the discussion of what the white man believed to be the Indian's origins. In British America both Creation and Deluge accounts were recorded from Indians who had an opportunity to be influenced by early Spanish-Christian concepts and contacts. On the other hand, as Don Cameron Allen and others¹¹² have demonstrated, such explanations of human origins were common to most of mankind. James Mooney in *Myths of the Cherokee* records a form of Deluge story "surviving" into the nineteenth century in a version quite different from the biblical and perhaps borrowed from other Indian tribes before European contact. Mooney believes that, in general, Christianity had actually little effect on Cherokee mythology. Most Cherokee cosmogonic myths, as he gives them, show few similarities to the story as told in Genesis.¹¹³

As noted, Hariot before 1588 recorded the Indian Creation story: "First they say were made waters, out of which by the gods were made all diversitie of creatures that are visible or invisible," adding that woman was made before man. Purchas used Henry Spelman's Virginia Algonkian account of the Creation, improving Spelman's grammar and style. Strachey also probably drew from Spelman, though with more detail than Purchas, and describes the great Hare and the four invisible gods (winds) who keep the four corners of the earth. The great Hare conceived the idea of peopling the world, and kept the men and women he made in a large bag until certain cannibal spirits demanded them as food. Afterward the four wind gods came and killed and ate a great deer created by the Hare, but the Hare made of each hair of the deer a living animal. These animals and the men and women from the bag he released upon earth, a couple in each country, who thus populated every continent.¹¹⁴

This is much more imaginative than LeJau's Itiwan account of the woman being made from man's rib. But more dramatic among the lower South legends is the Creek story of Creation recorded at Savannah on June 11, 1735. As one chief told the tale, toward the setting sun the ground opened, and the Cussetaws came out of it and settled nearby. But the angry Ground began to eat up their children, and they divided, some going farther west and some settling near the mouth of the Ground. After many vicissitudes the latter group moved on to a great waterfall and mountain belching fire and smoke. They saved fire from the mountain, and at that place learned the use of herbs. They chose to use red and yellow among many colors of fire. The story of the four principal tribes of Cussetaws, Chickasaws, Alibamas, and Obakaws and a string of anecdotes regarding their wanderings concludes with their settlement where they were in 1735. The Cussetaws were actually the lower and upper Creeks. This long narrative recited by a chief in council with Georgia officials is of course suggestive of Creek origins as well as being a concept of Creation.¹¹⁵ It is perhaps significant that it bears no signs of Christian influence.

The tradition of the Deluge occurs most frequently in medieval and Renaissance literature from mystery plays to sophisticated metaphysical verse. Europeans who recorded the story as found in America compared it with already familiar versions which had been used to explain the migrations of Eurasian and north African people probably at least as far back as the first century, A.D. It was employed in various other ways as theme or explanation from historian Josephus and Church Father St. Augustine through Lydgate and Gower. Renaissance writing shows the story in every living language of western Europe as well as in Latin. As the English began peopling their part of America, they had access to recent Latin

American versions by de Acosta, Herrera, Garcia, and a number of others. It was to appear as part of the explanation of origins both in the imaginative and in the scientific literature of the Britisher who wrote at home throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in works read by the southern colonial. The poet George Sandys, who translated and shaped most of his English Ovid at Jamestown, was one of the many Anglo-Americans who saw marine fossils on mountaintops or deep below the ground as evidence to support Moses' story. And Thomas Burnet's *The Theory of the Earth* (1684), a popular English version of an originally Latin text, held what the author considered a rational theory as to why the Flood was worldwide. The details of his theory were known to many educated southern colonials, for his book was present in scores if not hundreds of their libraries.

But long before Burnet, as George Sandys composed the Philosophical Commentaries for a new revised and elaborately illustrated edition of his Ovid's *Metamorphosis* and mentioned Deucalion's Flood, he declared, "There is no nation so barbarous, no not the salvage *Virginians*, but have some notion of so great a raine." The poet notes that Ovid agrees with Moses, but points out the "natural causes" the pagan author gives for the occurrence. Sandys' translation was also present in many Virginia libraries, William Byrd's being only one. Another resident of Virginia, the unknown clergyman who wrote on the Indians in 1689, had only one sentence on "their Tradition about the Deluge: They have a tradition of the floud, that all the world was once drowned, except a few that were saved, to wit, about seven or eight in a great canoro." John Lawson's 1709 book notices Indian ideas of a Deluge twice. The first is a bardic incantation, of "a very curious Description of the great Deluge." The second is more specific, beginning: "In *Carolina* (The Part I now treat of) are the fairest Marks of a Deluge (that at some time has probably made strange alterations, as to the Station that Country was then in) that ever I saw, or, I think, read of, in any History." He, like Sandys, wrote of seashells upon mountaintops or buried far beneath the earth as among the proofs.¹¹⁶

In 1712 a North Carolina S.P.G. parson noted some Indian "notions of Noah's flood." In the same year in South Carolina Dr. LeJau wrote of the Itiwan pantomimic festivals as representing the Noah story, and LeJau promised further investigation. Though garrulous on almost all other matters even remotely connected with the Indian, on the red man's relation to the great Deluge, Adair is almost entirely silent. The explanation is simple enough: his Hebraic-origin thesis that the Indians were descendants from a *later* period than the Flood might not fit too well with traditional flood theories, though many other Europeans and Americans held theories close to Adair's. A totalling up reveals that few major colonial

writers dwelt upon the subject of the Flood, perhaps because they found no evidence of its presence in Indian religious tradition, possibly because it was so well known they took it for granted, and most probably because they had already discarded it in their own minds as a historical fact and were not yet sufficiently folklorists to record it for other reasons.¹¹⁷

William Strachey introduces in the spirit of his age the matter of conversion in the epigraph beginning "Wild as they are, accept them, so were we, / To make them civill, will our honour bee" and concluding "No better work can Church or statesman doe." Naturally "to make them civill" included religion as well as manners and secular learning. The Englishman in North America from the Chesapeake southward held conversion to be a matter of bringing the red man to Christianity in Church of England forms. Only a few Quakers and late in the colonial period a few Presbyterians attempted Christianization in any other version. As noted above, bringing the heathen to God was a major avowed purpose for settlement from at least the time of Sir Walter Raleigh. It has usually been declared an almost complete failure, the result, most historians have decided, of a combination of poorly organized effort and lack of real interest in the matter. The effort was for the first century indeed poorly organized, but with the formation about 1700 of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts and its affiliated organizations, there was plenty of organization but scarcity of funds. As for interest, the writing of the southern colonial proves that at least among the clergy and some laymen there was sustained interest in conversion of the Indian throughout the period. Usually it was the red man who was indifferent or hostile.¹¹⁸

Manteo's baptism in 1587 at Roanoke "by the commandment of Sir Walter Raleigh" may have been primarily a political-economic matter, as Quinn suggests, for at the same time the Indian friend of the first settlers was created Lord of Roanoke and thus was feudal subtenant under Raleigh of the English-claimed land of Virginia. But it was undoubtedly also acknowledgment by the English of their plans for religious conversion. That evangelizing had been undertaken earlier is borne out by Ralph Lane's charge against Pemispan (Wingina) that he and his tribe recanted their professed belief in Jesus Christ when they thought the British had been slain or starved. Hariot, on the other hand, following English visits to their villages, took advantage of the epidemics among the natives to preach to them of the nature of the only true God. Since the English in no instance were afflicted by the fatal maladies, whatever they were, the Indians were much inclined to believe the Christian deity the all-powerful one, or so Hariot thought. This rational observer also testifies that whenever he visited

a native village, he "made declaration of the contents of the Bible" and the principal tenets of religion, interesting evidence of the Anglican orthodoxy of a scientist who with his employer Sir Walter Raleigh has been often declared an atheist. Hariot prayed and sang psalms with Wingina, who when ill had Hariot intercede with his God for him. Altogether Hariot's report is a sincere account of missionary endeavor, the first recorded for British North America. Considering all the difficulties these first settlers had to face to survive as long as they did, this attempt at conversion is genuinely remarkable.¹¹⁹

The 1606 First Charter of the Virginia Company includes King James' declaration that a principal purpose is propagating the gospel to those who live in darkness and ignorance. In the "Instructions" to Sir Thomas Gates as governor of Virginia, May 1609, an item characteristic of all the early directions to Jamestown administrators (some of it perhaps inspired by information Smith and others had sent back to the Council for Virginia) is quoted in Chapter V below. It is a direction to employ all means to convert the natives "as the most pious and noble end of this plantation," it urges the administrators to train Indian children in the English language so that they can understand Christian tenets, and it even recommends that all the priests be imprisoned who are the principal cause of their superstition. And the governor should if necessary deal even more sharply with these murderers of souls and sacrificers of "gods images" to the Devil.¹²⁰

This was but the beginning of a program of education and conversion. Before it was well under way there were other indications of missionary effort. Francis Maguel, Irish spy for the Catholic powers, wrote in 1610 from Jamestown in his "Relation of the First Voyage" that the Emperor (Powhatan) and his sons promised the English that they would abandon their own religion and believe in the God of the English. Maguel was deceived into thinking that "it seems easy to convert them because they are so friendly." And John Smith in *A Map of Virginia* avers that the natives were so impressed by his and Captain Newport's "power" and knowledge that they acknowledged the true God as the creator of all things. In the same year Strachey, in writing of the natives' pagan idolatry, looked forward to their being instructed in and converted to Christianity, and declared that one werowance, who sent to them to pray for rain, had already been partially converted. Strachey was one of those who believed the Indian priests should be destroyed to the last man. Alexander Whitaker assured his English readers that, if the natives would lay aside their priests, the way would be open for their salvation. Ralph Hamor in 1615 reiterated the missionary function: "What more praiseworthy than to bring a *savage* people from barbarisme to civillitie?" In Hamor's volume Sir Thomas Dale refers to his work in Virginia as "this religious warfare,"

and tells how he placed Pocahontas under careful religious instruction. And Hamor's volume concludes with John Rolfe's famous letter to Dale giving his religious reasons for wishing to marry Pocahontas.¹²¹

Rolfe in his 1616 *True Relation* and in a 1617 letter to Sir Edwin Sandys gives further evidence of his intense concern with bringing his red in-laws to Christianity. The fragmentary surviving records of the Virginia Company of London covering roughly the years 1619 to 1624 and John Pory's *Proceedings of the First General Assembly of Virginia* in 1619 contain dozens of references to conversion and education of the heathen.¹²²

By 1619 plans for a college or university at Henrico were well along, and fifty men were sent for the purpose of raising crops on the college land which would pay for the "bringing up of Thirty of the *Infidels* children in true Religion and civility." In the same year £500 was given to the Company treasurer for educating Indian children, and plans were made by the Company in London for bringing up some children in the trades by having them reside with white families, while those capable of "learning" were to be put at the college. What the intelligence or proficiency test was to be is not specified. A year or two later the Company Court Minutes contain much on the plans for a free school supported by East India Company funds, though it is not clear whether native students were to be admitted. But there are also plans for another kind of grammar school, perhaps connected with the college, which would be primarily or entirely for Indian children. Both schools would be preparing youth for the college, and the King himself ordered the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to undertake a fund-raising campaign for college and schools.

The Court records also note gifts of altar cloths, communion silver, and religious books for the use of the college in the religious education of the Indians. The early letters of 1621-1622 of George Thorpe, who arrived at that time to take charge of the college activities, are full of optimism. But he and many of the college tenants were killed in the 1622/23 massacre, and by 1624 the Company was in bankruptcy and the colony came under royal control. For two full generations the college for Indians was dead.

But Indian education was not. In the last two years of its existence the Company continued its practice of educating Indian children in private families. The college estate as a revenue-producing foundation for education of the heathen continued for a time, as one letter of May 7, 1623, asserts. The same epistle declares that under the Company "sundry of these Infidles and some of eminent note were converted to Christian Religion" and that sixty tenants still support the College, which in due time will again proceed.

At least until the massacre the real operators of the Virginia Company

of London—Sir Edwin Sandys, Nicholas and John Ferrar, and the Earl of Southampton—were ardent supporters of evangelization. Though they recommended the stern measures of retaliation after the 1622 massacre, there is no evidence that they felt that the Indians were then beyond redemption. Perhaps the average settler did, and certainly the surprise attack was used as a justification for appropriating lands and subjugating neighboring tribes. But for the next century and a half, in legislative journals and court proceedings and especially in the *Statutes at Large of Virginia*, there are occasional references to the continuing program of educating young Indians in white households or in the grammar schools at Christanna and the College of William and Mary. Thus in the Virginia colony alone—and there are certain parallel instances from Maryland to Georgia—leading men of the colony encouraged Indian education as a means to conversion, and lesser planters or craftsmen took them into their homes and businesses and gave them occupational training at the same time they instructed the young aborigines in the tenets of the Church of England. For example, in 1641 George Menefie presented to the General Court a Christianized Indian boy brought up by the deceased Captain William Perry, claiming a maintenance allowance of £8 per year from the Nicholas Ferrar bequest. Upon examination, the Court found the boy well instructed in Christian doctrine and in reading and writing, and the claim was paid.

During the Commonwealth period, in March 1655/56, a legislative act encouraged the Indians to bring their children as pledges of their good intentions, and they were guaranteed that the parents might make their own choices of white households for their offspring. The youths were to be trained in trades and "civility" as well as Christianity, and they were not to be considered or treated as slaves, a tacit admission that some Indian slavery existed in that colony. At least in theory the young Indians went through the sort of trade apprenticeship then prevalent in England, with religion added or emphasized. One merchant got permission—provided the child's parents consented—to carry a boy to Great Britain. A Powhatan Indian who had been sold by another tribe as a slave was freed when he demonstrated fluent English and professed a desire for baptism.¹²³

In 1629, in the original patent to Sir Robert Heath for most of the land later chartered as North Carolina, the grantee was charged with "enlarging the Christian religion as our Empire & encreasing the Trade & Commerce of this our kingdom." From the 1630s to the 1680s in Maryland the letters of Father White and other Jesuits testify to their effort to Christianize (Romanize) the neighboring Indians. The Jesuit fathers were naturally distrustful of their interpreter, a Virginia Protestant; but they argued that it was prudent and charitable to civilize and Christianize these primitive people rather than to kill, rob, and hunt them to extermination. The letters

include tales of remarkable conversions and regeneration of pagan chiefs and their whole families, including some dramatic sickbed restorations through sacred relics and preachings. By 1681 the fathers had opened "a school of humane letters," in which their pupils were making good progress. Two students from thence were sent to St. Omer's in France, where they equalled any Europeans in intelligence and perseverance.

At the opposite extreme, liturgically at least, were the Maryland Quakers under George Fox and others, who carried their form of the gospel to Indian kings and emperors and declared their considerable success, though no Indian Quakers from this colony survive by name in history. Fox himself through an interpreter described Creation, Christ, and eternal punishment to a young North Carolina Indian king. Among his auditors the Quaker noted some eminent red men, including a war captain and one of their priests.

In 1654 Virginian Francis Yeardley, who had explored northeastern North Carolina, wrote of Christianizing certain Indians who returned home with him. One chief accompanied Yeardley's wife to church and begged to be allowed to bring his child for Christian rearing. Yeardley describes the christening of the child of a Roanoke chieftain, with a Tuscarora prince in attendance.¹²⁴

Though Morgan Godwyn's 1680 and 1681 books, *The Negro's & Indians Advocate, Sueing for their Admission into the Church* (London), and its supplement, are significant landmarks of missionary literature, they say little specifically about the Indian. The emphasis is on the indifference of the whites of Virginia and Maryland to the conversion of heathen, with the additional inference that the Indian, instead of being a respected or feared friend or enemy, has in his subjugated state sunk to the social level of the black slave, at least within the settled portions of the Chesapeake Bay region. But Godwyn was prejudiced against the planters, and there is continued evidence that Governor Nicholson, for one, in both his Virginia and Maryland tenures of office, gave support to the "breeding up of Indian Youths in schools and fitting them for the university in Virginia [William and Mary] as a means to their conversion." He begged the Board of Trade for assistance in establishing free schools for the red men in Maryland.

Meanwhile on February 8, 1693, the College of William and Mary was chartered, and the southern colonies had their first permanent institution of higher learning. By no means perfunctory in the charter is a declaration of the intention of educating "Western Indians." Endowments soon came for Indian children's tuition and for an Indian grammar school in connection with the college. Though in his part of *The Present State of Virginia, and the College* (written 1697; published London, 1727), James Blair had said little of educating the aborigines, in a 1699 individual report to

colonial Revisors of the Laws, he included "A Proposition for encouraging the Christian education of Indian, Negroe and Mulatto Children." Financial inducements are offered families which will educate young Indians in Christian fundamentals and have them baptized before the age of fourteen. Apparently this applied to children in perpetual servitude and is another evidence or suggestion of Indian slavery in Virginia. By 1700 Boyle's legacy to the college *required* that Indians be educated, and in May of that year Blair was trying to persuade red parents to send their children to the College as soon as the Indian building was ready. In 1708 Oldmixon mentions the lotteries authorized in Britain partially for missionary endeavor among the Indians and the great numbers of Indians who attended the first [graduating] "Academical Exercises" at the college.¹²⁵

From 1706 to 1717 Francis LeJau strove to get the Lord's Prayer translated into the Savannah tongue and then not only tried to get clergy to live among the Indians and thus learn their languages but hoped to persuade an imported English schoolteacher to include young Indians with his other pupils. Benjamin Dennis, the schoolmaster, proved to be able and useful for five years before the Yamassee War put a stop to his work. Even stern Quaker Governor Archdale urged that surviving Indians be civilized as a preparation for the gospel state. Chief Justice Nicholas Trott and Commissary Gideon Johnston were among dozens in South Carolina who encouraged Christian education in a variety of ways.¹²⁶

John Lawson appears to have been as concerned as any man of the cloth in winning the Indians to Christianity. He tells of his delight in instructing an Indian king in the attributes of a model sovereign by showing a picture of King David and expatiating upon his character. Lawson's work is perceptive in suggesting that a mixture of carnal and spiritual rewards be dangled before the Indian in attracting him to the true religion, "thus dispens[ing] the Precepts of our faith according to the Pupil's Capacity." He admits that a New England minister considers this method Jesuitical and against true Christian practice. In another place he shows how the 1661 Cape Fear settlement was destroyed by the natives because the settlers, under pretense of educating Indian children, sold them into slavery. Lawson concludes that whatever reasons there may be for the Indians' aversion to Christianity, their objections or prejudices may be overcome by good example and kind treatment, education in useful trades, and intermarriage, not by the harsh treatment and forced rote-learning of creeds as practiced by the Spaniards.

A great exponent of evangelization combined with education was one of the ablest of southern colonial governors, Alexander Spotswood. William Byrd II, although antagonistic to Spotswood during the governor's tenure in office, in his *History of the Dividing Line* pays poetic tribute to the vice-

South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina

Cherokee Indian Embassy, 1730, from the engraving by Isaac Basire

THE
H I S T O R Y
OF THE
AMERICAN INDIANS;
PARTICULARLY
Those NATIONS adjoining to the MISSISSIPPI, EAST AND
WEST FLORIDA, GEORGIA, SOUTH AND
NORTH CAROLINA, AND VIRGINIA:

CONTAINING
An ACCOUNT of their ORIGIN, LANGUAGE, MANNERS, RELIGIOUS and
CIVIL CUSTOMS, LAWS, FORM of GOVERNMENT, PUNISHMENTS, CONDUCT in
WAR and DOMESTIC LIFE, their HABITS, DIET, AGRICULTURE, MANU-
FACTURES, DISEASES and METHOD of CURE, and other Particulars, suffi-
cient to render it

A
COMPLETE INDIAN SYSTEM.
WITH
OBSERVATIONS on former HISTORIANS, the Conduct of our Colony
GOVERNORS, SUPERINTENDENTS, MISSIONARIES, &c.

ALSO
AN APPENDIX,
CONTAINING
A Description of the FLORIDAS, and the MISSISSIPPI LANDS, with their PRODUC-
TIONS—The Benefits of colonizing GEORGIANA, and civilizing the INDIANS—
And the way to make all the Colonies more valuable to the Mother Country.

With a new MAP of the Country referred to in the History.

By JAMES ADAIR, Esquire,
A TRADER with the INDIANS, and Resident in their Country for Forty Years.

L O N D O N:
Printed for EDWARD and CHARLES DILLY, in the Poultry.
MDCCLXXV.

Special Collections, University of Tennessee Library

Title page of James Adair's major work on the Indians of the Southeast

roy's great work in bringing whole tribes to Christianity. Spotswood's eloquent appeals for assistance were directed to the S.P.G., the Bishop of London, the Virginia General Assembly, and the Board of Trade for material aid. Especially between 1711 and 1714 he attempted to reach the aborigines through their children, and he begged the provincial legislature and British bishops and archbishops to assist him with teachers and funds.

Spotswood's speech to the colonial Assembly in November 1711 stresses the combination of soul-saving and peaceful security for the colonist by changing "the Savage nature of their youth." When he negotiated a peace treaty with the Tuscaroras in that year, one stipulation was that two of the chief men's sons as "hostages" be educated in a school conducted by whites. Tribes such as the Pamunkeys, Nansemonds, Nottoways, and Meherrins also eventually agreed to do the same. His first school was erected at Fort Christanna near the Saponi town, with the magnetic Charles Griffin as schoolmaster. At one time Griffin had as many as seventy children learning to read, write, and say prayers, all this being at the expense of the governor. John Fontaine, a year later one of Spotswood's Knights of the Golden Horseshoe, in 1715 accompanied the governor to Christanna and gives a glowing account of the school and how beloved Griffin was. Hugh Jones, another visitor, gives similar testimony.

All the while Spotswood was trying to get the Virginia Assembly to settle funds on the Indian secondary school at William and Mary so that it might do a similar sort of work. In 1712 he informed the Bishop of London that he had failed to persuade the planters; and within a few years, perhaps because Spotswood could simply not afford to support the Christanna project indefinitely out of his own pocket after the Board of Trade killed the Indian Act which supported the fort and instruction, that school was dissolved and Griffin was placed in charge of the Indian school at Williamsburg, where he seems to have been equally successful in 1718-1720.

In 1712 there was also a promising school at Sarum, just below the Virginia border in North Carolina. The Reverend Giles Rainsford had persuaded Mr. Mashburn, the master, to include Indian children gratis with his white pupils provided he was granted a small income. Despite this attempt, Hugh Jones a few years later reported that North Carolina had done little or nothing for the conversion of the Indian, though he admitted he did not know the province well.¹²⁷ Byrd was always skeptical of the possible success of schools for Indians located at some distance from their homes. He believed that most of those trained at Williamsburg reverted to savagery as soon as they returned to their people. He felt that, so long as they went back to their tribes, conversion would not be permanent, another way of looking at the problem. Thomas Jefferson, who attended William and Mary while the Indian school was still in operation, also felt that it did

not accomplish its purpose and that missionary teachers actually living with the tribes could do more: incidentally, in his opinion, they could also collect a great deal of Indian lore for future scholars of aboriginal history. In surveying the whole history of Indian education and missions in colonial Virginia, W. Stitt Robinson concludes that Christian education was throughout the colonial period far more than a pious intention in that province. But that it was in any way really successful is doubtful.¹²⁸

Indian education continued to be considered or attempted in the southern colonies by the Church of England and by a few dissenting or Continental Protestants from the 1730s to the 1750s. At Irene, on an island about five miles above Savannah, the Moravians trained Indian children from 1735 to 1740. Here taught for two years the Reverend Benjamin Ingham, evidently an Anglican, who acquired enough of at least one Indian language to begin writing a Creek grammar. In a letter of September 15, 1736, Ingham describes the school house, a three-room affair, then being built near Tomochichi's town, the Moravian brethren constructing the edifice very reasonably out of their zeal for the mission work. The same letter also praises Oglethorpe for his personal efforts in evangelization and education of the red men. Another worker, the "Honorable Person" writing "A Curious Account of the Indians" in *A New Voyage to Georgia* in 1737 was as optimistic as Ingham that the door was open for the Indians' conversion.

In 1742 Carolina S.P.G. missionary clergy received a new book written by the Bishop of Sodor and Man to aid as instruction for the red men. It was distributed to various parishes by Commissary Garden. In 1748 appeared in London a curious work, an account of the author's supposed experience in South Carolina, James Walcot's *The New Pilgrim's Progress: or the Pious Indian Convert*, containing the alleged journal of George James, a converted Indian, on a pilgrimage to tribes in the Carolinas and Georgia. The whole thing may be spurious, and historians contemporary and since have doubted the author's veracity. The title is for the modern reader the most interesting thing about this work, which went through at least three editions.¹²⁹

Samuel Davies, the great Presbyterian poet and pulpit orator of Hanover County in Virginia, sponsored a mission to the Cherokees about 1758, and proposed sending the Reverend William Richardson to preach to the Indians along the Virginia and Carolina frontiers. In some respects he was replacing a Davies-trained man, the Reverend John Martin, who had worked for a time among the Overhill Cherokees. Actually the colonial Presbyterian society for missions and schools among the Indians had, with the backing of societies in Edinburgh and London, gotten support for two missionaries and two English schools for the Cherokees. The Tennessee his-

torian Judge Williams thought Martin was the first Protestant minister to preach in the Tennessee country or in the southern Trans-Alleghenies. It is Richardson's rather than Martin's record which survives, however, and the manuscript journal of the former from October 2, 1758, gives the details of the disappointing attempt to convert these red tribes. Dialogues with the famous chief Old Hop concerning God, discouragement for lack of an interpreter who would aid in reaching the Indian people as a whole, fear of drunken Indians, and other frustrations, many of them perhaps the result of traders' ill behavior among the red men, convinced him finally that the time was not yet ripe for effective conversion of the hill-country tribes.¹³⁰

Perhaps the most effective and unorthodox sermon among border tribes, partially because they could understand the language—their own—was that preached by James Adair to an "attentive red congregation" upon their urgent request that the trader explain the character of the Christian clergy and what they believed and taught. Though Adair protested that he knew too little of "the beloved men" of the English to attempt such a thing, he finally yielded to their importunities and his own prejudices. In his *History* he gives at least the gist of what he said, which he seems to have couched in the natural terms they would understand—of sun, moon, stars, fauna, flora. His outline history of the church represents ancient "beloved men" (clergy) as having forgotten the old beloved speech, the divine law. The Ark of the Covenant and the great Jehovah, both of which of course Adair saw still represented among the Indians as Hebraic in origin by their own ark and "master of breath," helped to recall the priests to holiness. Then Adair goes on to paraphrase Jewish custom and ritual in aboriginal terms quite effectively—for the English reader—including also the death and resurrection of Christ, the twelve disciples, the early history of the Christian church, the tyrannical black-robed apostates (French Catholics) who worshipped images of dead people instead of the true Spirit, and genuinely humble clerics who called themselves the "Servants of God." These last wandered through all countries instructing young people to invoke Jehovah (or Yo-He-Wah). Most significant is his strong hortatory conclusion against those who would introduce American Anglican bishops, "for we strongly suspect a dangerous snake in the grass; and esteeming them dead to the true interests of religion and liberty, we think they ought to keep them at home, and even recall their present troublesome missionaries from our settlements, and allow us to enjoy our former peace and quiet." Thus Adair was one of the rather rare southern voices (almost all in this later period) against American bishoprics. He is also sharply critical of the aims of the S.P.G. and the Church of England, probably from mixed motives. He was probably Presbyterian or Quaker in rearing and had enjoyed the happy, carefree, priestless life of his long years among the red

men, a life which was in sharp contrast with the formal church-and-morality mores of the Charleston he occasionally visited. That his convictions were expressed in addressing the Indians on religion is interesting and ironic. But even an avowed missionary such as Wesley gave up on the Indians because they were too much like "animals." It is also significant as a final colonial evidence that the average southern borderer was anything but interested in converting the Indians, an attitude to persist in America for a long time into the national period. What impetus did come for missionary work was usually from the older coastal settlements or from the mother country.¹³¹

THE FRONTIER: ITS EFFECTS ON RED MAN AND WHITE

In the southern colonies there was always a frontier, one difference between them and the New England group. And however physically far away the border or boundary land may have been for most of them, even the Tidewater planters in the older colonies had it constantly on their minds up to the very threshold of the Revolution. Frontier native chiefs and warriors frequently journeyed to the oceanside capital cities, frontier plants and especially animals were an important part of trade, and above all the frontier offered, or seemed to offer, boundless tracts of land for younger sons or their fathers with wornout farms or for the steady stream of newcomers from the Old World or for economic speculation. In one way or another, every southern colonial faced the problems which the existence of the frontier created.

The individual colony's policy toward the Indian was formulated with regard to conditions on this frontier. Great Britain in the main had to permit the colonials to determine their own policies. Conditions of that frontier, including the aggressive fur trader and land hunter, also determined Indian attitudes and policies toward the whites and toward European culture. It was from the frontier, from Powhatan's day to the Cherokee mid-eighteenth century, that Indians were selected to be sent to England so that they might be impressed by British civilization and, it was hoped, would obey white dictates when they returned home. They were impressed, but not very favorably, and they usually continued to live as they always had. Their comments on London and English culture when they were in Great Britain or after returning to America afford one of our few direct insights into what they actually thought of the white man and his way of life. And it was in frontier country that the captivities and tortures of white prisoners occurred, affording to the person who survived material for one of the kinds of tales which are peculiarly American and incidentally

offer evidence or excuse for further exploitation of the aboriginals.

Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier thesis involves much more than Indian-white relations, which are in fact only minor points to assist in proving or refuting it, and the thesis applies principally to a later America. Here is to be considered only briefly what the southern colonial in his writings has to say about the frontier's effect on him and on its Indian inhabitant when from and through it the latter came into direct contact with the white man's world. Discussion of these matters has been implicit in all earlier portions of this chapter. The volumes listed in the bibliography below present a great mass of fact and varied and often provocative interpretations of the southern frontier; and taken together, they show how complex were the problems arising from its continued existence. The printed documents of the various colonies and older studies such as those of Charles M. Andrews and Wesley F. Craven are also vital to any understanding of that vaguely defined region and its atmosphere and inhabitants.

POLICY: WHITE WITH SOME RED

Philosophically behind all British colonial policy were the oft-avowed aims of conversion, patriotism and empire, and individual material achievement. From Raleigh and Lane in 1584-1585 to the Augusta Treaty of 1763, immediate or ad hoc English policy concerning the Indian was usually determined by conditions of time and place, though it might be formalized and made legal and imperative by the Virginia Company or the Board of Trade back in London. The Indians played it even more by ear in determining how or why they should receive the invaders. But in both instances the colonists' reports indicate a complex and frequently contradictory activated policy.

To begin with, the coastline was the frontier, and it remained so in the Chesapeake colonies and upper Carolina until the late seventeenth century and in Georgia and lower South Carolina until well into the eighteenth century. Earlier in this chapter somewhat indirectly has been pointed out what Barlowe and Lane and Hariot recommended as treatment of the Indians, though they and others were often perplexed or confused by the Indians' alternate hostility and friendliness. There is evidence in documents of the Roanoke voyages that the red man had already come into contact with Europeans, probably Spanish, and had been handled roughly. The Indians seem to have realized that these Englishmen were different, and today as one reads between the lines—or straight from an outright assertion such as one made by John Lawson—the aborigines seem to have been a mild and gentle people who were inclined to hospitality. But some of them feared for their lives and above all for their land and therefore in

desperation on occasion attempted to eliminate the intruder. Thus one may understand Lane's and Hariot's differing attitudes toward Wingina and his tribe, and the treachery (surprise attack) experienced by one leader and kindness by the other. What the southern white from this time on, especially what Smith and Sandys and others connected with Jamestown, called the innately perfidious or treacherous character of the natives, was actually, as one looks at it today, an intelligent but outarmed people's desperate realization that surprise and dissembling appearance were their only possible means of survival. When the Virginia Indians' 1622 and 1644 massacres failed to accomplish their purpose, these people, unwisely perhaps, through their intense affection for their own region, declined to remove beyond the mountains and became tributaries ultimately reduced to pitiful remnants on tiny reservations. The more powerful Cherokees a century and more later, feeling strength in their numbers and mountain fastnesses, for many years maintained a policy of trade and of playing off English against French. During the Revolution they remained loyal to their English allies. Though they backed the wrong horse, this allegiance does not seem to have been responsible for their removal to Oklahoma in 1838. All of the large southeastern tribes were removed regardless of the part they played during the Revolution.

Percy and Smith and others were perplexed by the shower of arrows greeting them at Cape Henry, and by the alternate friendliness, hostility, and double-dealing of Powhatan's people. Now one reads through the Englishmen's own words that the old emperor's loosely confederated dominion, with hostile elements within it, combined with what was probably experience with a Spanish mission and with the Roanoke colonists, caused Powhatan to develop a complex strategy. The English could aid him against rebels among his own people and against hostile tribes to the north, west, and south. On the other hand he believed he must keep these whites pinned down to a few precarious shoreline spots. Thus the first recognizable Indian frontier policy for survival. Smith's rescue by Pocahontas and her father's consent to her English marriage may have been parts of that policy. In later years, when the old man's "brother" Opechancanough had succeeded Powhatan and it was obvious the English were absorbing the Indians' best hunting and planting grounds, ambush and massacre had to be attempted.

John Smith's stern and martial Indian policy has been noticed in this and the preceding chapter. In this land "as God made it" the duty of the English was to explore the country, *subdue* the natives and teach them trades, and aid them in becoming civil and industrious. In 1610 Smith thought these matters were well along. In revising *A True Relation* and *A Map of Virginia* for incorporation into the 1624 *Generall Historie*, along

with a chronicle of later events including the 1622 massacre, he emphasized that pursuit of his personal policy of ever-alert suspicion and stern measures with the Indians—including seizing corn when needed and taking hostages—would have prevented the misfortunes which had overtaken the colony. Another original settler, the cantankerous Captain John Martin, made his own proposal in 1622, probably at the suggestion of the Virginia Company, as to “the manner howe to bringe in the Indians into subjection without makeinge an utter extirpation of them together with the reasons.” His policy sounds much like Smith’s, in some respects more severe, for he would have prevented the natives’ planting corn or fishing, a prohibition to be enforced with a standing army of two hundred soldiers on foot constantly harassing towns and destroying their “weares.” He based his proposal on his own experience and on holy writ, in which God told the Children of Israel not to exterminate utterly the heathen because the idolators would be useful in keeping down ferocious wild animals, as the Indians do by hunting wolves and bears. Martin seems not to have understood that his methods would have resulted in total annihilation. His attitude of apparently utter indifference to conversion or to recognition of the aborigines as men is matched only by that of certain New England and middle-colony people who had suffered directly from the Indians.¹³²

Provincial legislative records and statutes include debates and enactments regarding the Indian, most of them referred to in other contexts above. In the March 1755 *Maryland Gazette*, “Americanus” comments on measures to be taken against the French and Indians, and in various issues of the *Virginia Gazette* in 1756–1757, “The Virginia Centinel” wrote a number of essays touching on the Indians, notably on how to keep the Cherokees on the English side. Trade is a major factor in the Centinel’s arguments and in those of Governor James Glen of South Carolina, also of this period.¹³³

The South Carolinians, most concerned economically with the inhabitants of their own Indian frontier down to 1763, certainly followed policies largely determined by what they considered the peculiar interests of the colony. Yet Edmond Atkin of that province, appointed southern Indian Commissioner soon after his presentation of his own plan and policy to the British authorities, has left us the most comprehensive and perceptive study of mid-eighteenth-century frontier problems generally produced in the colonies or by a colonial. He analyzed French methods with the Indians, discussed critically Indian management and commerce throughout the British continental colonies, portrayed the native in “Character of the Indian,” a valuable summary, and proposed a most elaborate plan for Indian administration. This plan included separate northern and southern Indian superintendencies well supported by parliamentary authority, the

construction of a string of forts and blockhouses by British army engineers, and the use whenever possible of S.P.G. missionaries, forest rangers, interpreters, and gunsmiths, among others, to advance British interests. In spite of having been written as a report rather than as a book, Atkin's work has an eloquence and persuasiveness unusual in documentary treatises or business proposals. Though when he was appointed southern superintendent, he was not very successful, he did know the southern red man: "No people in the World understand and pursue their true National Interest, better than the Indians," begins his characterization. Also in South Carolina at the same time, Glen included some discussion of Indian affairs in his *Description of South Carolina* (1760), while Christopher Gadsden and Henry Laurens wrote a number of essays on opposite sides of the policy pursued in the Cherokee War, one sharply critical of the two campaigns of 1760 and 1761.¹³⁴

Though most of the elements of policy just noted are economic and political, the white settler never entirely forsook his conscience and religion, even though they were almost always combined with realism, except in the notable dream plans of Montgomery and Cuming and Priber. But in Virginia, for example, valiant legislative attempts were made to safeguard the Indian in possession of his own land, as Hening's *Statutes* frequently indicate. Georgia began with the best of intentions toward the Indian and appears to have wished to live with him rather than in his place. Constant pressure from land-hungry immigrants first under the Trustees and then under the royal governors changed much of this, though royal Governor Ellis handled the Cherokee situation with such sensitivity and sense that the colony was little hurt by the 1759-1760 War, even though almost no assistance came from Great Britain. The Augusta Treaty of 1763 has been variously interpreted as a catastrophe or as full justice for the Indians. Actually it opened the floodgates of western expansion. But Georgia's thirty years before 1763 show the same mixture of policies present more than a century earlier in the Chesapeake Bay area. There is some paternalism, a good deal of Christian zeal, and a growing realization that friendly Indians formed the most effective barrier against strange and hostile Indians as well as rival European powers. This last was recognized to some extent by John Smith long before, more clearly by Maryland officials a little later, and even occasionally by Carolina governors. That various South Carolinians, including Church of England commissaries, governors, Charleston merchants, and Indian traders, acted upon policies differing enormously in idealism and realism, justice and unscrupulousness, was perhaps natural, but from the Indian's point of view it was confusing, bewildering, and hypocritical. James Adair is probably a good example, as in his sermon-lecture and *History* noted above, of the decent and intelligent

trader's policy toward the Indians among whom he lived and from whom he made a living. From today's point of view, Adair is far from being an idealist or even entirely a fair trader in his dealings with the natives. But there is no doubt that Charleston merchants, the better sort of traders, and even governors such as Lyttleton agreed as to the effectiveness of his policy in operation and seemed to think it honest.¹³⁵

The Special Problem of the Trader

The adventuresome white who attempted to carry on a lucrative trade with the frontier Indian, usually for furs, was of a peculiar breed and a peculiar philosophy of life and business. As a person he may have varied a great deal. In rude or embryonic form he existed at Jamestown, though not as a professional. Captain Henry Fleet was trading for furs in the Potomac by the mid-seventeenth century. About the same time, with Fort Henry at Petersburg as a base, Abraham Wood engaged in extensive back-country Indian trade. And before that the Maryland Jesuits mention the rich trade in beaver skins. By 1667 Henry Norwood wrote that the Virginia governor was licensing certain men to trade with the Indians, all in rather unscrupulous fashion. The first real traders for appreciable inland profit were also explorers, men of daring, imagination, and enterprise. The 1670 Batts, Woods, and Fallam and the Lederer expeditions, the jingling-bell mule trains of William Byrd I, and of others whose names have not survived, penetrated deep into the frontier, perhaps beyond it into pure Indian country. And Byrd at least made sizable profits. How much Berkeley's personal avarice in Indian trade helped to precipitate the events leading to Bacon's Rebellion is still a moot question. But the governor did have an Indian policy, and Bacon and his followers wanted another in place of it.¹³⁶

By the 1690s the trader was a familiar element of colonial business and already becoming a consideration in policy regarding the Indians. There was no pattern or stereotype for these first Virginia and Carolina wandering merchants. The first Byrd was a well-educated man who was a leader in the social and political life of the colony. In South Carolina John Stewart was an even more polished and cultivated man, a trader who was an imperial expansionist whose letters show his learning, in regard not only to the New World and its history but also to a host of Renaissance European writers such as Machiavelli, Rushworth, and Buchanan. Part of the policy he advocated was conversion, on which he quotes or misquotes George Herbert's lines: "Religion does upon its tiptoes stand, ready to flie to the American strand." He understood and spoke at least three Indian languages and at various times lived and traded among the Cushedoes, the Yamassees, the Chickasaws, and other southern and mountain tribes. He

boasted that he had traveled farther west than Dr. Woodward ever did and that he had never indulged in the weakness of most traders, that is, consorting with Indian women. A sophisticated practitioner of the golden mean who believed in treating the Indian fairly, he was the wandering merchant at his best.

That Stewart was unusual is evident in a memorandum intended for Governor Sir Nathaniel Johnson of 1695/96 suggesting that "the first step towards advancement of this Collonie as I conceive (and submit to better Judges) is the imprisonment of the Indian Trader—which might produce better Commodities for Exportation & consequently bring more inhabitants to it." It goes on to suggest further that for the time being all traffic with the Indians should be forbidden. To such drastic devices one thoughtful observer before 1700 suggested that the Carolina colony should resort in order to curb avaricious and unscrupulous traders.¹³⁷ His opinion is confirmed by Daniel Henchman in a letter to natural historian James Petiver in 1706, who also notes that "our Indian factors being generally very ignorant and wholly devoted to Interest" are useless as sources or means of gathering plants or animals. Zealous Commissary Gideon Johnston found his appointment to the Carolina Indian Commission blocked because he denounced the "scandalous Lives of those . . . Traders, who are a wretched sort of Men." In the same colony's instructions to Indian agents in 1712 they were urged, "Use your utmost Endeavour to regulate the Lives of the Traders so that they give not the Indians Offence and Scandal against the Christian Religion, and bring them within the Bounds of Morality att least; to that end rebuke all Actions that tend to the Contrary, and if any Persons soe rebuked persist Lett us know them."¹³⁸

Chapman Milling gives a somewhat different picture of the traders, including Robert Bunning (perhaps the first to live permanently among the Cherokees), Cornelius Dougherty, Eleazar Wiggan, Ludovick Grant, and some others, all of whom had by 1751 lived from twenty-six to thirty-seven years among the Indians. Milling sees them as farsighted and patriotic, and wise in suggestions on how to prevent war. Bunning, Dougherty, Beamer, Grant, and Adair were probably the ablest and most honest of the traders of the mid-eighteenth century. Contemporary documents suggest generally, however, that the average trader was as rough and unscrupulous as those who were characterized a generation earlier. In the first third of the century the Yamassee War seems to have been the direct result of traders' abuse of the Indians. Yet the missions of George Chicken, Tobias Fitch, and John Herbert (all represented in now-printed journals) indicate that the Carolina government tried to be fair to the Indians and to maintain the peace. These men were not able to settle anything, but they

did a good deal to postpone Indian retaliation, especially in the years after the Yemassee War.¹³⁹

In his *History of the Dividing Line* William Byrd II makes several observations on the conduct of the Carolina Cherokee trade by Virginians. From his diaries it would appear that he kept up some interest in the business which had been in considerable part the foundation of his father's fortune, for he notes that he entertained various Indians making the journey from the frontier to Williamsburg. The *History* suggests that a shorter trading path be found to the Cherokees, the existing route being so circuitous that the traders made little profit because of the expense of transportation. Later he pauses to describe the trading path to the Catawbas, the goods traded, and the method of transportation, and to note that in recent years the Virginia trade had much declined. He does not neglect the opportunity to accuse the Carolina traders dwelling among the Catawbas of cheating and other abuses, with the flat statement that Virginia caravans were always more welcome than those from Charleston because the former gave better and fairer exchanges. Certainly Byrd had his prejudices, but the actual fact is that Virginia never had the complaints from the Catawbas or Cherokees that the South Carolina government received. The Virginia trade was never a major element of the colony's economy as it was in Carolina, and the Virginia trader, in order to compete, probably gave better bargains. The Virginia Indian trader endured, however, to the end of the colonial period, at least to 1763; he seems to have been perhaps as much an intelligence agent and ambassador as he was a businessman. George Washington found such traders as Christopher Gist useful as guides, interpreters, and emissaries when the Colonel visited the French command post on the Ohio.¹⁴⁰

In the 1750s in Carolina the traders were major factors in furthering or hindering provincial policy. Shrewd James Adair was outraged when his successful efforts with the Choctaws met with no proper reward from Governor Glen. Glen found he had to employ lesser men in implementing his policies of fixed prices in trade, prohibition of Negro slaves in the Indian country, and licensing merchants before they could do business. But he tried these policies and agreed with the honest traders who petitioned that inspectors and interpreters must reside constantly in the Cherokee nation to see that the laws were obeyed.

The Atkin Report of 1755 included in its comprehensive analysis a great deal about the "Vagabond Horse Pedlars" and their avid search for profits even among the remote tribes of the lower Mississippi. Atkin's vivid description of the Indian trader, with painted war sticks and fluttering pennons, affords one of the few direct lights existing today upon this confused and

confusing epoch in Indian-white relations. He is realist enough, or reckless enough, to accuse Adair, McNaire, and Glen all together of promoting a civil war among the Choctaws and yet giving them nothing but glass beads to be used as bullets. He advocated maintenance of order by troops of rangers and periodic inspections. His entirely imperialistic policy was aimed at securing a vast territory from the French, or saving it from them; but he believed firmly that the continued survival and friendship of the Indian was necessary to accomplish either. The *regulation* in his report was directed for the moment straight at the trader.¹⁴¹

In his *History* Adair has more to say than anyone else about the traders and the policy or policies they have furthered, provoked, or abused. As elsewhere, Adair is here a lively and perceptive raconteur. He records a dialogue between him and a Cherokee priest who cheated and exploited his fellow tribesmen. When Adair asks him how he can condemn the chicanery of the white trader when he himself does exactly the same thing, the Indian gives an entirely adequate reply. Dozens of times Adair refers to white traders as integral parts of the Indian community. He urges admittance into all Indian countries of "a sufficient number of discreet orderly traders," whose presence might prevent wars. Bitterly he comments in an aside, "Before the Indian trade was ruined by our left-handed policy, and the natives corrupted by the liberality of our dim-sighted politicians, the Cheerake were frank, sincere, and industrious," the beginning of a diatribe against what he considers indiscriminate granting of trading licenses. Later he refers to the skulking "Arab-like pedlars" who now reside in every Indian town. Near the end he looks back on the halcyon days of Indian trade before the "mercenary empirics" had corrupted the Indians, and he recalls the idyllic life he and all other traders had then lived—in plenty and in safety. His appendix, "Advice to Statesmen," is a direct appeal to British colonial administrators to use the trader in a great expansion in the west.¹⁴²

Regarding Acquisition of Indian Land

The seventeenth- or eighteenth-century Briton or Continental European who settled in America, north or south, Charles M. Andrews argues, usually came to the New World out of a desire for land. Land was a gateway to freedom for small landowners, younger sons, and city artisans and tradesmen. Especially in the southeast, as graphically indicated by the books and promotion pamphlets discussed in Chapter I, the fertile land and lush vegetation were particularly attractive. Formulation of a land policy was one of the first problems to confront the officials of every colony, and its nature often determined the economic, political, and social life of its settlers. The presence of the Indians already in North America, and in the southeast, was the complicating factor. A thorough study of this one phase

of southern Indian-white relations could occupy a whole book, and has already occasioned several volumes. But something of what the southern colonists themselves said and thought about the problem can be indicated.¹⁴³

In the southeast, as elsewhere in British North America and actually in the European settlements of Central and South America, the home government did not recognize the sovereign right of the heathen native but claimed a general title to the area by right of discovery and later by right of continued or effective occupation. Hakluyt and Purchas and the other clerical promoters of the enterprises took this for granted. A few land cessions were actually made by the natives in early Virginia and the Virginia Company confirmed them, but the home government made no admission of superior Indian claim to the land. Disregard of aboriginal occupants increased, of course, with more colonists and greater need for expansion. Yet southern provincial governments had some conscience, or perhaps an imperial policy, which impelled them to recognize at times Indian rights to land, to warn Europeans away from these areas, and to establish boundaries beyond which Europeans might not go. The Virginia *Statutes* contain many acts relating to the matter, and the legislative and judicial records show many petitions, decisions, and fines and other punishments for infractions. So with the other southern colonies. Thomas Jefferson was of the opinion that most of the land had been acquired by purchase from the Indian, though he grossly overestimates the proportion so secured.¹⁴⁴

What is not so generally understood—and it is never clearly “got at” in southern colonial writing, though it is often suggested—is the Indian’s own attitude toward ownership of land. It is represented and involved in the treaty-making and gift-bestowing treaty sessions to be discussed below. Modern students point out that, when red chiefs spoke of the transfer of land from one people to another, they apparently referred to Indians alone. All Algonkian and Iroquois tribes of the north and northeast, for example, felt that whites could not acquire any land except that “given” them by Indians, and that the presents accepted for such gifts for territory were reciprocity, and not compensation. Thus lands were considered gifts not to be bought with money, and therefore there were no sales of land as we understand them. Whites were intruders who could only receive “gifts” of land which had been supernaturally bestowed upon the red men. Land, as fauna and flora, was part of the bounty of mother earth. Though tribes controlled village garden plots and hunting grounds, they had no real understanding of the full meaning of individual land ownership.

The subsequent actions of the whites regarding real estate show that these newcomers took a very different view, sometimes blindly and sometimes simply avariciously in defiance or utter disregard of Indian “legal” claims and concepts. Authorities such as Wilbur Jacobs assert that the whites mis-

understood the woodland Indians' "almost astonishing awareness of the ecological relationships between plants and animals" and the vital relation of both to the land.

British land policy in North America evolved, in the south varying from decade to decade, colony to colony, and from low country to mountains. It was based on some of the reasoning and the European legal concepts, mentioned in this chapter and in Chapter X, by which land might be totally alienated from Indian control by "purchase" or "exchange" or "agreement," even by occupation. The white concept was bolstered by the European theories of savagism and the civilized man's right, even duty, to make cultivated gardens out of fruitful territories occupied only by "unhumans." The white's often terrible and complex avarice, his determination to own his own lands as he may not have done at home, were other reasons for the European's seizures. Much of this is to be seen in the promotion pamphlets, including John Smith's, and in the instructions to colonial executives from authorities in Britain. The last as motive naturally was to some extent spurred by the representations of the southeastern settlers themselves.

The result of two such differing concepts was of course conflict. The Indians were accused of "conspiracy," certainly when there existed some specific desperate plan by a weaker people to retain or regain what was theirs. In Virginia alone the massacres of 1622 and 1644 and the uprisings of 1675-1676 are examples, as are the Yamassee and Tuscarora wars in the Carolinas, among many others, in the eighteenth century. Legislative records of the southern colonies' Indian affairs (especially full or complete for South Carolina) indicate the steadily developing or evolving policies and laws allowing appropriation of Indian land, in small plots or huge territories, sometimes with the full approval of authorities in London, sometimes despite the disapproval of imperial boards of trade. Reports of Indian commissioners, of the dialogues or colloquies between white and red authorities, and the more formal treaties, all here noted, are in one way or another outgrowths of the basic conflicts of conceptions and policy regarding lands. Indian culture saw land as communal. European culture saw it as individual or imperial or national.

But the concepts had wider and deeper implications. For as the colonies developed, so did the British dreams of empire and the realization that they had to control territories as close to their French rivals to the west and north as was possible. The great southern speculative land companies came late upon the colonial scene, condoned and even approved by the Board of Trade. And funds to support militia were as much to aid in accretion of territory to a colony as for "defense" against French and above all Indians. In other words, British land policy, recorded or suggested in southern writing, is one of the largest single reflections of the nature and quality of

the colonial southern mind. So it was in other colonies, though they produced somewhat different reflections. Examples of varied approaches to or means of land acquisition are worth noting.

The natives from the beginning were in great fear that the British had come to stay and would take their land from them. There are suggestions of this fear in the records of the Roanoke voyages and more explicitly in George Percy in 1606/7. Smith gives the classic justification in the first epigraph to this chapter: "But we chanced in a lande, even as God made it. Where we found only an idle, improvident, scattered people," who, he might have added, have no sense of *individual* ownership of land. Between 1644 and 1664 the General Court records of Virginia indicate that land was granted to William Claiborne on the Pamunkey River "at the place he had first landed against," thus apparently his partially by right of discovery; that land deserted by the Wicomico Indians is to be Samuel Mathews'; that those lands of the Chiskiack Indians "when deserted" are to be used for glebes in Gloucester County; and that as many Indians as possible be brought together in one place and land laid out for them (perhaps the beginning of the reservation scheme). In the legislative acts are laws against invading Indians who want to settle in Virginia, and against tributary tribes conveying land to anyone whatsoever. Among other court and legislative decisions is one laconic entry: "Justice done to an Indian." As late as 1715 the Queen of the Pamunkeys was petitioning for recovery of lands fraudulently secured from her apparently by avaricious land hunters.¹⁴⁵

Pious South Carolina Quaker Governor Archdale's remark that God has providentially thinned out the Indians to make room for the English is one that bears repeating in this context. John Lawson, on the other hand, writes of the injustices done the "poor Heathen" whom the whites have driven from their land. As time went on, the once remote Cherokees complained through their Emperor Cukaaouskassatee in 1745 that the white man drew nearer and nearer, "yet it is the Indians' land." The Indian leader goes on to say that it is a pity the Indians cannot read, for when they see a letter of promise or command "it is like a Darkness to Us (putting his two Hands over his Face and Eyes) for we do not know the meaning of it." Perhaps the great coup of Glen's administration of South Carolina, at least in his opinion, was his getting the Cherokees to cede their entire country to the Crown, a symbolic act by Old Hop at Saluda Old Town about 1755. On this subject James Adair may have again spoken the final words, at least for colonial policy regarding Indian land. He notes one plan to have a mixed settlement or population of red and white in the Chickasaw nation, a scheme which by no means worked out; and he generalizes that in most instances the white man should observe the

Indian from a distance. In discussing the red nations one after the other, he concludes that the rich lands of the Choctaws are best fitted for civilized agriculture and settlement, though he refrains from suggesting occupation. He notes that the Chickasaws fought the French and their red allies "in defense of their liberties and lands, to the very last." Only in his final pages does Adair come out strongly as imperial expansionist, urging the occupation of lands in the huge territory Great Britain owns, which extends to the Mississippi. The Mississippi basin and the two Floridas, he assures his readers in the best tradition of promotional rhetoric, smile an invitation to colonists to make them the gardens of the world. He mentions aboriginal communities but clearly regards them as no obstacle to his proposed migrations, though for a time prospective settlers may have to skirt their borders. Thus he ends as the first English promoter-settler began, by believing that America was a relatively unoccupied potential paradise and that the few aborigines might possibly live on unmolested or at least amiably with the whites. What he did not consider seriously, or fully anticipate, was the voracious land hunger of his white fellow countrymen.

From Percy to Adair, the southern colonial was no better and no worse on the matter of land than his Quaker and Puritan kinsmen to the north. Like them, he took over lands when whole nations died out, or removed; like them, he often went through the motions of genuine purchase; like them, he never understood the Indians' feeling about the ownership of land, a communal but nevertheless a real ownership; and like them, when he felt pressures or greed enough, he pushed the Indian aside and occupied what he pleased. But through 1763, white legislative bodies and provincial governors in the south regularly, not sporadically, attempted to do some sort of justice by reserving or preserving lands for neighboring tribes, from coastal Algonkians to mountain Cherokees. They used treaties, maps, and ordinances to indicate the Indians' rights to vast territories in the west. But laws and fines proved ineffective as they did in other areas and periods of American history, and eventually men of otherwise great integrity, including several able royal governors and the future father of his country, became shareholders in the great speculative joint-stock companies which hoped to take over most of the "unoccupied" land east of the Mississippi. Treaties such as that at Albany in 1754 recognized at least some of the problem and were attempts in some measure to solve it, as will be shown below. But the Indians' claim finally, though not in the colonial era, lost out.¹⁴⁶

The Indian Agent

Though certain Indian traders sometimes acted as official agents for colony or Crown, the office of agent was a relatively late outgrowth of

eighteenth-century problems with the Indians. Occasionally in the seventeenth century a man, more often a gentleman planter or merchant than an Indian trader, was appointed as emissary on a particular mission and designated in the records as an agent in the original meaning of the word. Today, if one knows the term at all, he thinks of agents of the national period, or superintendents of Indian affairs such as Benjamin Hawkins, the most successful early representative of the central government among the southern tribes.

James Adair was in one sense an official agent for Governor Glen among the Choctaws and Chickasaws, for he was officially appointed to go and work for the British interest among them, probably because he was a man of education who also knew the Indian. There were other appointments like his among the traders. But more frequently planter militia officers like William Byrd III in Virginia or George Chicken and John Herbert in South Carolina, traders if at all only through rather indirect mercantile enterprises, represented governor and government in a particular nation on a limited mission for a short time. All those mentioned worked as agents between 1715 and 1763, the period that marks the real beginning of the Indian service in the southern colonies. In the middle and latter parts of this period the first agents were appointed to go and live among the Indians.

Their functions were manifold. First of all, in this period they were instruments of provincial or imperial policy, on-the-scene experts who would observe and act in governmental interest. But in most instances they were also a real attempt to do justice to the Indian, to protect him from unscrupulous traders, and to hear and funnel his complaints to the colonial capital or even to London. It was expected that these men would win the trust of the natives, and many of them did so.

The Indian agent is really visible earliest in South Carolina, where because of the extensive fur trade he was most needed. He was the representative of the Board of Commissioners for the Indian Trade. The first agent was Thomas Nairne (d. 1715), employed as early as 1702 by the Carolina Assembly to regulate the traders among his neighbors, the Yamassees. As a member of that Assembly in 1707 he successfully secured the passage of an Indian act which laid the basis for the southern regulative system brought to completion and use on a national scale almost half a century later by his fellow Carolinian Edmond Atkin. Under the 1707 act Nairne served as the first provincial agent, or "itinerary justice" and diplomat, with jurisdiction west to the Mississippi. In carrying out his office he developed an ambitious plan for extending British influence and driving the French from Louisiana. In all this he was at odds with the governor, who felt that in Nairne the Assembly was usurping Crown prerogative, an attitude which on the part of most governors was destined to alter drastically.

Thrown into prison on a trumped-up charge in 1708 and winning the favor of the Lords Proprietors in London in 1710, Nairne was reappointed agent in 1712. Ironically enough, when the southern Indian war broke out in 1715 he was captured, tortured, and died at the stake at the hands of the people he had tried to protect, a death closely parallel to John Lawson's in 1711.

Nairne was succeeded briefly in 1710 by John Wright. Then, under royal Governor Nicholson, the Carolina regulation of the Indian trade was much improved; by 1725 a single commissioner instead of the three-man board had charge of affairs. The first commissioner was the highly successful Colonel George Chicken, who traveled from tribe to tribe; and though he was not resident among them, he did appoint special resident subagents for the major tribes. Then Glen's governorship was marked by complex Indian problems which required special agents. William Bull was sent to Albany in 1751 to arrange a satisfactory settlement between the English-allied southern tribes such as the Catawbias and the northern Six Nations. Glen employed as his agent among the Creeks the Reverend Thomas Bosomworth, whose wife, a half-breed Indian princess, was most influential in Indian-white diplomacy. Mary Musgrove Bosomworth was really her husband's partner as agent for both Georgia and South Carolina.¹⁴⁷

Most significant among Carolina agents, however, was Edmond Atkin, merchant-planter and member of the governor's council, whose writings on the whole Indian question do much to illuminate the subject and indeed the whole period. His comments on the traders and his comprehensive and farseeing policy have already been mentioned. His recommendations are somewhat grandiose, however, and not without self-interest. Under his plan he and Sir William Johnson became the Indian superintendents for the south and north respectively. Historians differ in their assessments of the capabilities of the two men. Johnson had a less complex situation and firmer backing from England, and with an Indian wife was able to secure knowledge and friendships beyond Atkin's powers. Atkin's administration of the southern department, despite certain uncooperative governors and lack of support from London, was successful in its Choctaw and Creek relations, and the 1759 outbreak of Cherokee attacks appears to have been anything but his fault. As one reads his "Plan of a General Direction and Management of the Indian Affairs Throughout North America," one realizes that here was a workable and honest solution. Atkin's and the Indians' tragedy is that he was not firmly supported and perhaps that he was a better administrative planner than a man of action.¹⁴⁸

Soon after Atkin's appointment Christopher Gist, employed by the Ohio Company to explore the Ohio Valley in 1750 and 1751, became the Carolina superintendent's representative on the Virginia frontier. A former

Baltimore merchant and probably Indian trader, he had been Washington's guide to the French in 1754 and Braddock's guide in 1755. Then, after serving as captain of a scouting company of the Virginia regiment, he assumed office as deputy superintendent for Indian affairs in 1757 and proceeded to organize the Virginia Indian service. In spite of being troubled by inadequate funds, a treacherous rival named Pearis, and the notorious murder of Indians, Gist was so successful in his relations that after his death from smallpox in July 1759 he was mourned by the Indians, one group of Catawbias asserting that since "their Father Captain Gist was dead, it was better to return home." And he left his accounts in perfect order.¹⁴⁹

Georgia from the beginning had a secretary for Indian affairs, the only man of really high calibre to hold the office being the first, Charles Wesley. Wesley had come to Georgia as Oglethorpe's secretary and was appointed to the Indian office September 24, 1735, the same day Oglethorpe was appointed commissioner. So-called Indian agents, or special agents, were appointed by Oglethorpe, one serving with the Creeks, another with the Cherokees, etc. The policies of the Georgia Trustees for the Indians were as paternalistic as they were for the whites. Acts of 1735 tending to cut off Carolina from commerce with certain tribes were naturally much resented by Carolina traders. Mary Bosomworth was for several years, until his departure in 1743, Oglethorpe's principal agent and interpreter with the surrounding tribes and exerted considerable influence in his policy making. When the Crown took over Georgia a few years later, there were many changes, though not very marked for the Indians. Lack of sufficient presents for the Indians—the Cherokees always came from a Georgia conference grumbling—were a major hindrance to negotiations. On the other hand, the whole record of commerce (in the broad sense) between Georgians and Indians convinced the former that the latter had one marked trait—fickleness. But in the end, the Augusta convention of 1763, the British were successful, whatever the achievements of individual agents may have been, as the wave of migration swept westward. Actually it is a matter of record that agents of every kind and of every social and political level had their part in the final success.¹⁵⁰

THE FRONTIER INDIAN ABROAD: HIS VIEW OF THE WHITE MAN

Most of this chapter has been concerned with the white man's view or treatment of the Indian, but one should remember that occasionally in frontier history the Indian expressed his view of the European white and his civilization. The expression usually occurred after or during a frontier Indian's trip to Great Britain. Since such visits and comments were reported only by white men, the record may not be entirely accurate. But to say, as

at least one historian has done, that the southern Indians "were singularly inarticulate" and left their history only through the white man's commentary is at best noting only a partial truth.

Any beginning student of history knows that the southern red men had no written languages and that the incantatory tales of ancient tribal heroes were passed down orally, without the white man really knowing what was chanted. Yet as orators and treaty makers the Indians addressing the whites were anything but inarticulate, and occasionally in other situations they told the white what they thought of him.

The visiting frontier Indian in Europe found his hosts interested in what he thought of their civilization, and frequently the colonial chronicler or the London newspaper recorded what he said or tried to say. From Roanoke Island in the 1580s at least two Indians, Manteo and Wanchese, visited Great Britain; and though they left no statement of their impressions, their friendly activity in behalf of the settlers thereafter is probably indicative that they had been well received. Indeed, the English newspapers and newsletters for a century and a half and longer indicate that most Indian primitive guests were kindly and even cordially and sumptuously entertained. From Jamestown Namontack, Powhatan's trusted servant, accompanied Pocahontas and her English husband to London. He appears frequently in the discourses of the chroniclers of the first permanent settlement, especially in Smith's, as an active emissary and intelligence officer for the old chieftain. Evidently he was intended to perform a similar function in England, though he was slain by a fellow Indian, Machumps, on the voyage home. Strachey reports that Machumps was often at Sir Thomas Dale's table and that once or twice he said an Indian grace, though Strachey forgot to take it in writing. Evidently Namontack and Machumps could speak English, but they left us no statement of their impression of London and its people.

Smith has said a great deal of Pocahontas in Great Britain, her kindly reception by the Queen and other great ladies, and her unwillingness to return to Virginia. In the *Generall Historie* he gives his version of her affectionate and dignified speech, including her reproaches to him for not letting her know he remained alive. Throughout his account Smith makes her an eloquent pleader, a trait characteristic of her race, as many another Indian in later years was to show. Equally eloquent was her guardian intelligence officer Uttamatamakkin (or Tomocomo), who had been commanded by Powhatan, among other things, to count the Englishmen he saw so that the Algonkian emperor might gauge their strength. Tomocomo began notching a long stick when he landed at Plymouth but soon gave up in despair. He was also enjoined to ascertain whether Smith was alive and to see the King and Prince. Later, Smith assured him that he had indeed

been (with Pocahontas) received by His Majesty. This Tomocomo denied, adding sadly, "You gave Powhatan a white Dog, which Powhatan fed as himselfe; but your King gave me nothing, and I am better than your White Dog."

In Smith's eyes the Indian princess and her counselor were thus noble savages who judged England as one might expect from two sojourners from a primitive paradise. Samuel Purchas, however, shows another side of Tomocomo's primitivism, a quality which apparently horrified the clergyman-historian:

With this Savage I have often conversed at my good friends Master Doctor Goldstone where he was a frequent guest; and where I have both seen him sing and dance his diabolically measures, and heard him discourse of his Country and Religion . . . [and after several compliments to Pocahontas, who] carried her selfe as the Daughter of a King, and was accordingly respected. . . . Not such was Tomocomo, but a blasphemous of what he knew not, and preferring his God to ours . . . and beleeveth that this Okee or Devil had taught them husbandry, &c.¹⁵¹

Thus the two historians see in the same aboriginal Virginian opposite qualities, the one emphasizing natural dignity and the other insolent paganism. It would be interesting to know what other early seventeenth-century red Virginians thought of England, for example, the two Indian maidens who in 1621 had to be sent from London to Bermuda with doweries from the Virginia Company so that they might find husbands among the white settlers there, or the Indian boy carried to England by Captain Eppes in 1626.¹⁵²

In the eighteenth century the southern Indians who visited Great Britain usually came from Carolina or Georgia. As already mentioned, Sir Alexander Cuming took seven "chiefs" back with him in 1730, one the later famous Little Carpenter who in his prime recalled with pleasure his reception in London and the great King George's talk. British newspapers appear to have recorded every move of this famous group, reporting their behavior at or reaction to fairs, band concerts, schools, archery contests, church organs, museums, and parades, most of which delighted them. Though the treaty they signed was not legally binding, they returned home by way of Charleston well pleased. A group portrait of them survives in Great Britain, foreshadowing in its details the slightly later noble savage concept in romantic art.

The ancient semi-outlawed chief Tomochichi, romantic subject of verse from his own first contacts with Oglethorpe and his journey to England until long after the American Revolution, gave his Britannic Majesty perhaps his first face-to-face expression of Indian rhetoric. Hewatt reports:

When Tomochichi, struck with astonishment at the grandeur of the British court, addressed the King in the following words: "This day I see the majesty of your face, the greatness of your house, and the number of your people;—I am come in my old days, though I cannot expect to see any advantage to myself—I am come for the good of the children of all the nations of the Lower and Upper Creeks, that they may be instructed in the knowledge of the English.—These are feathers of the eagle, which is the swiftest of birds, and which flieth around our nations.—These feathers are a sign of peace in our land, and we have carried them from town to town there.—We have brought them over to leave thus with you, O great King, whatever words you shall say unto me, I will faithfully tell them to all the Kings of the Creek Nations."

As he boarded his vessel for America Tomochichi told Oglethorpe he was glad to be going home, but that parting from the General "was like the day of death." He too, with his nephew, left a joint portrait in Great Britain which gives him a benevolent, fine face. As a British poet expressed it,

His bold free Aspect speaks the inward Mind
Aw'd by no slavish fear, from no vile Passion blind.¹⁵³

About 1762 three Cherokee chiefs who visited London had their portraits painted by Sir Joshua Reynolds. Others in their group were limned by lesser artists. They were almost surely members of one of the two groups escorted to London and largely financed by Lieutenant Henry Timberlake, the young Virginia officer who visited the Cherokee country between 1756 and 1765. Apparently rivals of Attakullukulla (or Little Carpenter) wished also to see the King, and the Virginia government encouraged the journey. Timberlake records their behavior from first landing at Plymouth, when Ostenaco in a thundering voice returned thanks to God for a safe passage. Men and women of every rank flocked to see the strange and marvelous creatures. The visitors were terrified by a statue of Hercules at Wilton and vastly amused at Sadler's Wells and Vauxhall. Goldsmith wrote of them and gave Ostenaco a present, and that chieftain harangued the King as Tomochichi had done. Much of the rest of the story is of Timberlake's woes—mostly debts contracted—for which he was never reimbursed by either colonial or home government.

Undoubtedly Cuming's, Oglethorpe's, and Timberlake's Indians were deeply impressed by British grandeur and official friendliness, as other visitors from Africa or India were in later stages of the imperial development. But perhaps a natural reaction to it all is that observed by Edward Kimber, the young English journalist and poet who toured the southern colonies and published his *Itinerant Observations* in 1745-1746. He once asked the now-adult Toanahawi, apparently the companion who appeared

as a boy in the portrait with Tomochichi, how he liked England, where he had been so caressed by the royal family: "He told me, they were a good People, but it was a poor Country, and he could not live in it, because they had no Woods or Deer, but what were kept in some Gardens [Parks]." Though he may have seen a little English countryside, London was his principal conception of Great Britain, as it was for numerous other Indians who visited England. Toanahowi's answer is the natural one, all the more obviously sincere in that he lived and died (in battle against the Yamassees in 1743) a staunch ally of the British.¹⁵⁴

ACCOUNTS OF CAPTIVITY AND TORTURE

From Charles Brockden Brown about 1800 to Caroline Gordon of our day the Indian captivity narrative has been adapted and fused into American fiction, novel, or short story. Before Brown it was already a popular form of escape literature, appearing in cheap pamphlets and offering the vicarious thrills and horror paralleled in the British rogue narratives or biographies of the same time. Again it was an American book of martyrs, suggestive of Foxe's account. The captivity narrative may be considered too as an American saga, a tale or cluster of tales presenting the heroic deeds of our white frontier ancestors and at the same time offering to the ethno-historian remarkable insights into, and details of, aboriginal life. Roy Harvey Pearce argues that it was far more than this, or far other than this. for he sees the captivity narrative, from Mrs. Rowlandson's to the early nineteenth century, as a literary form varying according to the cultural milieu in which it was created: that is, it may be religious confessional (of God's providences and retributions), religious or political or economic propaganda, or simply pulp thriller, occasionally but by no means always combining these and other qualities. All commentators agree that in general it was not pure history, but historical fact adapted to a particular reading public.

The genre is best represented by the many versions of the Mary Rowlandson type of captivity, which includes removal, life with Indians in Canada or the wilderness, and deliverance or escape. Most examples, including the Rowlandson story, are New England in setting and origin, with Calvinist examples of providence, repentance, and resignation to the inscrutable will of God as primary features. These were indeed the most numerous and as a group the most popular, from the 1680s to 1800. But the first and ultimately the most popular captivity tale is that of Captain John Smith, imbedded in the larger *A True Relation* of 1608, an account of the narrator's capture and twenty-four-day stay among Powhatan's tribesmen on the James River in 1607. His rescue by Pocahontas does not, however,

appear in print until it is summarized in a paragraph of the 1624 *Generall Historie*, as noted above. This is but the first of a number of southern accounts, or accounts of southern capture, more frequently but not always imbedded in longer narratives or observations. These form another or variant source of information about both Indian and southern colonial, though much of the data incidental to them has already been considered in this chapter as representative of various phases of Indian character. But actually of the more than four hundred captivity narratives in the great Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, only a handful are concerned with southern incidents. And the libraries and newspapers of the eighteenth-century southern colonies, during the heyday of popularity in some quarters of this kind of tale, contain no evidence that the captivity-deliverance chapbook or pamphlet was by any means "the American equivalent of the Grub Street criminal biography" that Pearce claims it is. He should have called it the New England equivalent of the British rogue story.¹⁵⁵

The few southern captivity narratives which have survived (Were there ever more?) are for the most part after our period, the best of them, especially from the ethnological point of view, by Charles Johnston of Virginia, in the Jeffersonian period. But the few published before 1763 are worth considering for several reasons. The Virginia story begins with Smith's relatively short captivity and some longer "restraints" of a few other people which may have been voluntary as well as involuntary.

When all of the parts of Smith's narrative, revised in portions from 1608 to 1624, are fitted together, it is still difficult to tell exactly what happened. That he was not tortured is evident and that the natives ever intended to execute him by beating out his brains now seems extremely doubtful. As has been observed, they may have simply been initiating him as a werowance of their tribe, even if one grants the actuality of the Pocahontas "rescue" story or scene. There is no evidence that Smith or others were tortured or treated brutally during Smith's stay in America. Spelman, one recalls, was actually protected by a chief from the red man's spiteful wives. Obviously Smith's implication in all versions of his story is that white man and Indian may live together, each aiding the other, as in this instance Smith secured some needed supplies for the men at Jamestown.

The 1622 and 1644 massacres are noted for the attempted surprise, brutal slaughter, and occasional captivity of individual whites, but again there is no evidence of torture. Several attitudes were expressed by colonists and the Company at home as to the causes of the 1622 massacre, from George Sandys' attributing the attack to loosely strung-out settlements to the London Council's puritanic accusation of neglect of divine worship and too great interest in fine apparel. At least one captivity is recorded in connection with this massacre, for on March 30, 1624, one Jane Dickinson, widow,

petitioned the resident governor and Council for relief from an indenture Dr. John Pott[s] insisted she work out. For, she said, her late husband, who had come to Virginia four years earlier under a seven-year indenture, had been slain in the "bloody Masacre, & her selfe Caried away with the Cruel salvages, amongst them Enduring much misery for teen months. At the Expiration it pleased God so to dispose the hartes of the Indians, that for a small ransome your petitioner with divers others should be released." Dr. Potts, who had laid out two pounds for her release, now asserted she was doubly bound to serve him, for the ransom money and for her husband's incomplete term. The verdict is not recorded. The "Cruel salvages" may be a stock phrase. At any rate, Jane Dickinson goes into no particulars.

In the *Gentleman's Magazine* of 1740 appeared the story of Morgan Jones' 1685/6 captivity among Indians in South Carolina. Jones declares he is an inhabitant of Virginia and chaplain to Major General Bennet of Nansemond County. A real captivity pamphlet was published in Philadelphia in 1699 by Jonathan Dickenson, *Gods Protecting Providence . . . from the more cruallly devouring Jawes of the Inhumane Canibals of Florida, Faithfully Related by one of the Persons Concerned therein*. Under varying titles this popular work went through at least ten editions in English and one in Dutch by 1868. The emphasis in the preface is on Providence, and the text, as in many other such narratives, is in journal form. It includes accounts of insults from the Indians, ceremonial dances, harrowing vicissitudes, intercession of a chief's wife, and final escape to "Charles Town," South Carolina, ending with a prayer of thanks and admonitions to others. Despite its southern setting, this tale bears all the earmarks of Puritan or Quaker origins.¹⁵⁶

The Swiss Baron von Graffenreid, in letters, in his German-language manuscript of his adventures among the Indians, and in his treaties of peace with the Tuscaroras allows us to piece out the tragic and horrifying tale of the long-drawn-out torture and death at the stake of John Lawson. The burning splinters of lightwood, flaying, mutilating, and other barbarous torments modern historians tell us, were reserved for men of great renown and known bravery. But von Graffenreid presents Lawson's execution in no such light. He blames Lawson for arousing the Indians' anger (in some accounts by boasting or taunting or threatening retaliation, in others using his position as official surveyor to appropriate Indian lands). As the modern historian reads between the Swiss baron's lines, he sees a man defending or excusing himself, or at least trying to explain how he escaped and why his companion and his Negro servant were executed.¹⁵⁷

Further indications of the red men's "exquisiteness of torture & prolonging the Deaths" of their captives (not necessarily white) comes from

Commissary Gideon Johnston in 1715, who adds that "they seem to have nothing but the shape of Men to distinguish them from Wolves & Tygars," an opinion not always held by that good clergyman. And Dr. LeJau notes how barbarously the men taken prisoners by the Indians are burned and the women and children made slaves, apparently a reference to the Indians' treatment of other Indians, though he notes it soon after telling of the death of Lawson. As mentioned in passing, the long-drawn-out torture and execution of Thomas Nairne in 1715 by his former friends the Yamassees is as tragic and ironic as Lawson's. The early period also was marked by the 1720 publication in London of *The Voyages, Dangerous Adventures, and Imminent Escapes of Captain Richard Falconer . . . his being taken by the Indians in Virginia &c.*, a popular many-editioned work which may be fictitious.¹⁵⁸

During the French and Indian War, the Reverend Samuel Davies referred several times in his sermons to Indian atrocities and even published a poem on the "Barbarities of the French, and their savage allies . . . on the frontiers of Virginia," with especially lurid descriptions of scalping, dashing out of infants' brains, and slaughter of even the wounded. In one of the most historically valuable of the captivity accounts, James Smith, a captive at Fort Duquesne in 1755 who witnessed the Indians' preparation for and celebration after Braddock's defeat, shows himself as an adopted Indian until 1759, when he escaped. *An account of the Remarkable Occurrences in the Life and Travels of Col. James Smith* (Lexington, Kentucky) was not published until 1799, but it went through several nineteenth-century editions and at least one in the twentieth. Smith tells of running the gauntlet, of a forced "bath" in the river given by three maidens, and something of Indian customs and religion. Then there is what was to become the most popular of southern pre-1763 captivity narratives, though it was not printed for several years after the colonial period. This is the tale of Mrs. Mary Ingles, taken in 1756 by the Indians at Fort Vass (Vaux) in then Augusta County, Virginia. The story has been retold several times in histories of the region, and quite recently has appeared with color illustrations in *Virginia Cavalcade* and *American Heritage*. She gave birth to a daughter near the beginning of her march in captivity and was strong enough to travel the next morning—otherwise she and the infant would have been killed. The Indians permitted her to ride occasionally with her children and taught her how to poultice the arm of her wounded sister-in-law. She saw others run the gauntlet, learned to make salt, watched her children divided and sent away, made shirts for the Indians, and escaped with a Dutch or German woman who later tried to kill and eat Mrs. Ingles. Incredibly she found her way home. It is worth noting that

the Indians from whom she escaped thought the two women were lost in the woods and never knew what happened to them until a treaty meeting at Point Pleasant many years later. There is more to the story, including a sequel in which the husband goes in search of his children.¹⁵⁹

In the *Maryland Gazette* of April 1 and 8, 1756 (nos. 569, 570), is a "Narrative of the Sufferings and Surprising Deliverance of William and Elizabeth Fleming, who were taken Captive by Captain Jacob, Commander of the Indians . . . , as related by themselves," a tale of a Pennsylvania Indian-raid capture, divine providences, escapes, and murders. The final account chronologically (as far as the events are concerned) has a South Carolina setting of August 1760, *The Horrid Cruelty of the Indians Exemplified in the Life of Charles Saunders, late of Charlestown in South Carolina* . . . (Birmingham, Eng., 1763), no doubt tailored for a British public. This first-person narrative traces the author's life from Bristol apprenticeship to Charleston and the Indian trade and depicts a slow-torture execution, with the red man emerging as a purely ferocious tormentor and vicious savage. To balance this account, one should read Charles Johnston's later (1790, published 1827) dispassionate and compassionate appraisal of the Indian as he knew him during his own captivity when he was carried from Virginia. This *Narrative of the Incidents Attending the Capture, Detention, and Ransom . . . To Which Is Added Sketches of Indian Character and Manners and Illustrative Anecdotes* is hardly in the Grub Street tradition.

Clearly the southern Indians, like their kindred Iroquois to the north, derived a certain emotional satisfaction from prolonged tortures inflicted upon war captives. Various commentators have suggested that burning at the stake may have been introduced by Europeans, and it has been pointed out that John Smith and his men confessed to torturing the Indians. Later, however, colonial Marylanders were horrified by the story of prolonged tortures of a Christian New England tribe by the Puritans to obtain a confession of murder.

Thus it may be said that occasional indications of Indian tortures and captivities of whites occur in southern documents throughout the colonial period. But there are even more evidences of southern red men torturing fellow red men, as of the Cherokee cruelty to a Seneca chief. Despite the stories of John Smith, John Lawson, Thomas Nairne, and a few others here noted, however, it seems clear that the captivity narrative per se never became in the colonial period of the South a distinct literary genre as it did in the North. It remained imbedded in the histories and state documents of individual colonies as one element of the story of Indian life or of Indian-white relations.¹⁶⁰

COMMUNICATION: PRACTICAL AND ARTISTIC

Some consideration of the means and method, character and quality of communication between colonial white and red man may suggest the value one may place upon the contemporary discourses on the Indian already referred to in this chapter. Though much of what has been considered came presumably from direct observation of Indians and their way of life, even this *direct* quality has to be accepted with some reservations, for quite often the observer determined the significance of what he saw from the explanations of an on-the-spot interpreter. How well qualified that interpreter was for his task still remains a major question of Indian-white relations.

Closely connected with it is the most frequently met with, or certainly the most impressive, of Indian forms of art, the art of eloquence or rhetoric. Almost all the recorded speeches or dialogues, and there are many, are renditions, with a few exceptions, in the words of interpreters. The speeches, as would be expected, vary in style from Smith's time to Adair's, but certain qualities of Indian rhetoric, such as its peculiar imagery and phraseology, in at least their translated forms, remained much the same throughout the period. But how did the original speeches fare with the interpreter? A corollary consideration is the nature of the white man's side of the dialogue, or of governors' addresses to Indian delegates. Did the great white chief who addressed his General Assembly in the morning deliberately or unconsciously change his style when speaking to assembled red men in the afternoon, or did the interpreters twist his words to suit the different occasion and Indian understanding?

Again closely connected with interpreter and with rhetoric, but also a distinct art form with rites and rituals and other elements more or less distinctly its own, is the Indian treaty, often called our first American drama. The interpreter was a vital element of the treaty conference, and white men and red spoke in a formal rhetoric which they considered most appropriate for the extreme dignity of the occasion. But the mannered gestures of the treaty, the traditional and conventional idiom and act employed, the code of conduct rigidly adhered to, reveal much of Indian mind and character. Perhaps equally valuable are the sideshows away from the main big tent of the treaty, as one historian has called them—the tribal dances, the drinking bouts, the official white dinners and the less formal Indian barbecues, the outside hints or negotiations as to the amount, quality, and nature of the "gifts" to be bestowed upon the Indians. And the reader should not forget that these treaties implemented policy (usually

white unless the Indians adroitly maneuvered their way out of really committing themselves) and most frequently affected specifically the course of American history.

Many of the significant recorded treaties in which southern Indians and whites participated actually took place in the provinces of Pennsylvania and New York, in almost every instance involving the Six Nations of the Iroquois and one or more southern tribes allied to the governments of Virginia, Maryland, and South Carolina. The records of treaty conferences indicate that southern and northern colonial official problems with the aborigines were much alike, though certain subtle and not-so-subtle innuendoes of the chiefs of the Six Nations reveal differences even at the council fires. And then there are the great southern conferences such as those at Salisbury in North Carolina and Augusta in Georgia, as well as the scores of colloquies between governors and tribesmen—as Governor Glen's with the Cherokees—which sometimes evolved into genuine treaty-table negotiations, perhaps often as previously planned. The evolution of the treaty itself, from the simple forms (as far as record goes) employed in 1585 and 1607-1609 with Virginia Algonkians to the full-fledged treaty-dramas of the 1750s, is worth considering.

Thus the matter of communication had to be a major problem between a Stone Age people and a civilized Renaissance nation. Communication has always been a major problem in human history, but here in southeastern North America, with the great spaces and varied languages and fear of the invader on one side and the determination and motivations of the white on the other, it was unusually important.

THE INTERMEDIARY: THE INTERPRETER AND HIS ROLE

From the time of Columbus American aborigines were taken aboard ship and carried to Europe, quite frequently so that they might learn the language of the country in which they found themselves, and so that one or more Spanish or Portuguese might learn an Indian language or dialect. The English themselves sometimes followed the same practice, but they were more likely to attempt to learn the native language by frequent association with the savages in their natural habitat or by sending white boys or young men to spend months or years with the Indians. Or red hostages, mature or youthful, might become acquainted with the language of those who held them. There were advantages and disadvantages of depending upon either. A scholarly leader among the southern whites, or even simply an inquisitive or determined one, might acquire sufficient knowledge of a language to make his wants and those of his fellows known to the aborigines.

Some time before the Roanoke settlement, English explorer-sailors were occasionally carrying red men back to England, at least partially because they were representative curios of the New World. In 1584 the two Carolina Algonkians, Manteo and Wanchese, who spent some time in Great Britain, returned to the colony as guides and interpreters. Manteo especially was an important factor in exploration and communication with Ralph Lane and John White. Quinn suggests that Hariot, who went out in 1585 with special instructions to study the natives, had been the person who in Britain had been charged with teaching these two English and of learning from them their own language. Evidently they learned rapidly, but without even an ordinary European school training they could hardly have been able to understand or distinguish fine shades of meaning, or to render them to their countrymen. Hariot, on the other hand, a university-trained linguist as well as scientist, probably was able to handle the Algonkian language with some finesse. That the Carolina Algonkian dialect differed somewhat from the Powhatan Algonkian, or that Hariot's knowledge was very far from a mastery of the tongue, is borne out by a recent comparative study of Hariot, Smith, and Strachey. Hariot apparently did formulate "an alphabet" of Algonkian words in an English dictionary he took with him, and in *A briefe and true report* he used several dozen Algonkian words, though whether his suffixes and certain other forms are exact may be a matter of what he thought he heard, as it has always been with recorders of primitive tongues. For purposes of trade and settlement the two Indians and the Englishmen were probably effective interpreters. Wingina (or Pemispan), the chief of the Roanoke tribe pictured with hostility by Lane and with sympathy by Hariot, also may have acquired sufficient English to act occasionally as interpreter, for Lane says, "as Pemispan told me," though the telling here may have been largely through someone like Manteo or Wanchese. But Wingina and his retinue also often prayed and sang psalms with Hariot, a probable further indication of some knowledge of English. Whatever skill Wingina attained, his speeches did not allay the distrust of Lane, who surprised and almost wiped out the tribe.¹⁶¹

In the era of the Jamestown voyages more savages visited Great Britain. Probably Namontack, Machumps, and Tomocomo (or Uttamutomakkin, Purchas' blasphemer), all of whom visited London, learned English and used it fairly effectively. Pocahontas' use of the language, at least as Smith represents it when she was in London, was perfect, though the reader is entitled to his doubts. Another Indian, Kemps, who was long a prisoner of the settlers and learned English, was of considerable use, though perhaps never fully trusted. No one of these probably was as effective in communication between the two races as Captain Smith himself, who left a con-

siderable Indian vocabulary and idiom list and, at least occasionally, by his own admission acted as interpreter between Captain Newport and Powhatan. As a soldier who had been compelled to use at least half a dozen European languages, including Hungarian and Turkish, he had probably developed a skill beginning with a natural linguistic ability.¹⁶² Several times Smith's ability to understand and to make himself understood may have saved his and his colony's lives. And presumably the "discourses" or speeches he attributes to Powhatan and other chiefs are polished paraphrases of what he heard in person.

William Strachey was better educated than Smith and clearly had a flair for languages also. Upon his arrival at Jamestown he probably found at least two persons who could help him with Algonkian—Kemps the Indian and young Henry Spelman, the English boy already mentioned a number of times. Strachey's Indian vocabulary, six or more times as extensive as Smith's, forms a valuable adjunct to it. Though as secretary to the governor Strachey may have had to interpret Indian parleys for the record, there is no evidence that he acted as interpreter even in the way Smith did. Strachey does mention that Hariot had learned to speak the Indian language, and it seems possible that Hariot may personally have given him some training before he came to America and some help with his "dictionary" after his return.

The first more or less professional interpreters were two young English boys sent by Smith to live with the Indian tribes and learn the language, Thomas Savage and Henry Spelman. In 1609 Savage at thirteen was given by Captain Newport to old Powhatan under the guise of being Newport's son, with the tacit understanding that here was a hostage for the good faith of the English. Later when the boy returned to the English Powhatan sent his ten-year-old (?) daughter Pocahontas to intercede and have the beloved boy returned. In *A Map of Virginia* Smith says that Savage was given to Pocahontas in exchange for the latter's trusty servant Namontack, Savage still appearing as Newport's son. In after years the adult Savage was long an interpreter for the colony, living after 1625 on the Eastern Shore with his wife and two children and having the military title of ensign. The Indians called him Thomas Newport and he appears to have been a favorite with all of them, including Powhatan and the Laughing King of the Eastern Shore, both of whom called him son. This boy who arrived in Virginia in 1608 was to be a vital means of communication for at least a generation.

Perhaps even more interesting, and useful for a shorter period, was Henry Spelman, nephew of a noted English scholar and antiquary; he was about the same age as Savage had been when he arrived in America. Spelman's *Relation of Virginia*, already frequently quoted, begins "Beinge in

displeasuer of my frendes, and desirous to see other cuntreyes." He says himself that he was sold to the Indians in exchange for a town, or town site, and that he lived with them, of his own accord, until December 1610, returning to England with Lord de la Warr in 1611. Afterward he went back to Virginia and like Savage was employed as an interpreter for the colony in 1616 and made another round trip to England in 1618. Having spoken disparagingly of Governor Yeardley in 1619, he was tried before the Assembly, stripped of his rank of captain and of his salary as interpreter, and required to serve the colony without pay for several years. In 1623 he was killed by Anacostan Indians on the Potomac as revenge for the treachery of certain whites—like others later, a victim of the people he understood and loved. Smith refers to him after his death as "one of the best Interpreters in the Land." His "Relation" is in crude English, evidence that years ordinarily devoted to study, including grammar, had been employed among primitive people. As a man of gentle blood and an able emissary as well as interpreter with the Indians he was held in great respect. Smith's *Generall Historie*, especially in its information regarding events after the Captain's return to England, may have owed a good deal to him.

The practice of employing specially experienced or trained interpreters officially continued in Virginia. Hamor mentions sending his servant Brown to live among a neighboring tribe and learn their language, and there is evidence that Hamor himself understood Powhatan Algonkian. The pattern thus being set continued throughout America into the national period. Hodge sees the interpreters of the later era as mixed-bloods who picked up English from trappers and traders and other adventurers in the Indian country, but the colonial situation almost to its last decade was quite different. Southern colonies for several generations employed official interpreters. Though before the end of the seventeenth century Virginians felt that their tributary tribes knew English so well that it was unnecessary to employ interpreters to deal with them, nearly to the Revolution southern colonies including Virginia had, like New York and Pennsylvania, official interpreters to act in diplomatic and trade matters with independent tribes. Until almost the end they were white men, and in the last few years both white and half-breeds, the latter at least partially educated among whites.¹⁶³

In the 1620s Virginians used, besides Savage and Spelman, Robert Poole and Thomas Hobson, among those designated by name. Poole, perhaps treacherous, was an official interpreter. By 1634 a Captain John Floud (or Flood) was interpreter for the colony with a fixed salary, being succeeded in the post in 1658/9 by his son Thomas. The records indicate that they frequently used assistants. By 1670 the General Court swore in four interpreters to act in a case between certain Indians and Colonel Scar-

borough. No interpreter is mentioned, though there must have been at least one, to render the speeches of Governor Lord Effingham, William Byrd I, and Edmund Jennings when they met the Five Nations at Albany in September 1685. The English text of the governor's address indicates he was quite eloquent; one hopes the red auditors got something of its spirit and letter from an able interpreter.¹⁶⁴

In Maryland the Jesuit fathers soon remedied the situation of having to employ Protestant interpreters by learning the language themselves and training young converts in English. In a 1666 Maryland secular official treaty the interpreter Mathews rendered the "Heads" of the Indians' discourse in English and probably performed the function in reverse for the red men. Apparently the three Indian speakers represented different tribes with similar languages or dialects of the same tongue. A Colonel Evans was ordered to "deliver the Indian Speech to the Lower House" as soon as it sat. Two years later Lord Baltimore and the Emperor of the Nanticokes held a treaty conference, but no interpreter is named in the record. On the Eastern Shore in Somerset County Christopher Nutter was the interpreter and John Mallet his assistant at a conference of Nanticokes and provincial officials, and in 1693 Nutter again acted between the governor and the Choptank Indians. Nutter also appears many other times in the records.¹⁶⁵

The Carolinians, who had several dialects and even disparate languages to deal with, used interpreters frequently. Mr. Carteret mentions that in the planting on Ashley River in 1670 the English carried about with them the Cassique of Kayawah, "a very great linguist in this maine," presumably because he knew all the Indian tongues. He may or may not have known English. Two years later Quaker George Fox was attempting to convert Indians through an unnamed interpreter. His religious exhortation must have been most difficult if not impossible to convey. Much more successful must have been the commercial parleys in various native tongues by such educated men as John Stewart, who modestly observed that he could understand and speak the Yamassee tongue and knew a great deal of several others.¹⁶⁶

By 1700 the religious interpreter or translator was in great demand. In Maryland Commissary Bray (see Chapters V and VI) was preparing an all-out missionary effort. From Virginia the Reverend William Andrews had been persuaded by the S.P.G. to serve as a missionary to the Mohawks in the province of New York. There, with the assistance of professional translator Lawrence Clæsse (or Clausen, etc.) he translated the Church of England's *Morning and Evening Prayer* (New York, 1715) and had it printed. In this instance translation seemed to do little toward conversion, for Andrews was back in his Virginia parish by 1724.

Lawson explained in *A New Voyage* how the traders of the first decade of the eighteenth century learned Indian languages—by marrying or taking mistresses from among the Indians. The well-educated Lawson himself became a comparative linguist, giving in his book equivalents in two or three different Indian languages of several hundred English words. His companion von Graffenreid on Lawson's fatal journey in 1701 appears to have talked freely with the red men. There is mention of "a merchant of Virginia as interpreter," but the baron admits the translator was not very effective, especially in getting the Indians to release them. By 1715 the South Carolina trader and later professional interpreter Eleazar Wiggan (Wigan, Wiggin, etc.) was on the scene, and was to remain there for a full generation, playing an important role in negotiations with Catawbas, Cherokees, Yuchis, and the more southern tribes. Pretty clearly he knew the Catawba and Cherokee languages well and could make himself understood in a dozen other dialects or tongues. The first sight of him is as a trader with the Catawbas and Yuchis, and then especially with the Cherokees. He was troubleshooter as well as interpreter for South Carolina in dozens of critical situations, especially in trying to keep red tribes from French alliances. In 1730, though Bunning appears to have been the official accompanying interpreter for Cuming's Cherokees in London, Wiggan, known to the Indians as "the Old Rabbit," seems to have been along in some official capacity. Perhaps because he gave too hasty an affirmative to the British sovereign's speech claiming all the unconquered neighboring nations and their lands as his property, the Cherokees in the dead of night threatened to kill him. But he did not lose their confidence permanently, for back in America he continued to act for a long period as one of South Carolina's foremost forest diplomats. Despite the 1730 Cherokee protest or accusation, his reputation is that of a man of integrity. In fact, since his life and livelihood depended upon the red men among whom he lived, he could hardly have done otherwise than treat them fairly, at least ostensibly.¹⁶⁷

Scattered through the South Carolina Indian records are the names and tasks of Joseph Cooper, James Welch, John Musgrove (earlier husband of Mary Bosomworth), as well as Wiggan and a few other named interpreters such as Bunning, and a number unnamed. Georgia employed several of the same men.¹⁶⁸

Virginia abolished the office of interpreter on salary fairly early because the tributary tribes understood English. John Fontaine noted in visiting Fort Christanna that Indians who understood English declined to use it and demanded an interpreter in official negotiations. At the great Albany Treaty of 1722 (of which more below) Governor Spotswood apparently used Lawrence Clæsse and Robert Livingston, the Dutch and

English interpreters supplied by New York. The Virginia text of this treaty conference published with other William Byrd II materials differs somewhat in form and content from the New York version, both printed in the nineteenth century. In 1726 Virginia still had at least three salaried interpreters, one for the Pamunkeys and Chickahominies; one for the Nottoways, Meherrins, and Nansemonds; and another for the Saponis, Occaneechees, Stuckanocks, and Toterós. Apparently each man was a specialist in the dialects of a distinct language.¹⁶⁹ It is easy to see why within a few years the positions were abolished.

Several questions remain about southern interpreters for the thirty years at the end of the period. Who, for example, interpreted or paraphrased or recorded Tomochichi's great address to the King in London in the 1732-1734 visit? Was it Thomas Christie the "Recorder" who took down on June 11, 1735, from Chekelli Mico and other chiefs or kings their story of the Creation? Who translated for Oglethorpe and the Creeks in 1739 and 1750? Who was the Captain Taylor, interpreter at a Catawba-South Carolina conference at Charleston in 1746? a Catawba? Beginning with the Treaty of Lancaster in 1744 in which Virginia and Maryland participated and continuing through the 1763 Augusta congress, there are only partial answers to questions of communication, including some names of interpreters and translators. And what part secretaries of individual delegations, such as Black for Virginia and Marshe for Maryland, had in the 1744 negotiations is not clear.

Treaties or treaty conferences within the southeast usually do list names of local or personal "linguists," many of them already mentioned above. To names like Bunning and Wiggan should be added in the 1750s Ambrose Davis, John Buckles (?), one of the McGillivrays, Matthew Toole, and others to be mentioned below. Toole even conducted one treaty conference in 1754 at his house near Salisbury, and he accompanied the Catawbas to Albany in 1751. In the latter instance he translated *each sentence* distinctly. Sometimes the interpreter had only to render paragraph by paragraph, but in 1753 Mr. Gillivray was sworn to word-for-word rendition "without answer and alteration." Bosomworth's accuracy in translation is doubtful, not because he lacked ability but because he was often suspected of advancing personal ends. Virginia, which had printed separately its 1756 treaty with the Catawbas and Cherokees, had employed William Giles, Richard Smith, Abraham Smith, and David Carrol as interpreters for the colony. Unfortunately we know little or nothing about the qualifications of the men named in this paragraph, but we may be sure most of them were or had been traders.

The best-known of colonial interpreters was born in Germany and spent most of his adult life in New York and Pennsylvania, but he did perhaps

as much as any single white individual to shape the pre-Revolutionary Indian policy of the southern colonies. For Conrad Weiser (1696-1760) acted as interpreter and frequently as official or unofficial agent for Virginia, Maryland, and South Carolina in their negotiations with the Iroquois. The most powerful confederation of the northeast and middle colonies, these Indians, who frequently crossed western Maryland and Virginia to get at and fight Carolina Catawbas and other southern groups, were wooed by both French and English in the struggle for North America. Weiser worked with the Iroquois themselves in keeping them either neutral or on the British side through a series of missions and other adroit maneuvers culminating in the 1744 Treaty of Lancaster (in which Virginia and Maryland were particularly concerned), the Treaty of Albany in 1751 (with South Carolina the principal southern province represented), the Treaty of Logg's Town on the Ohio in 1752 (Virginia and the Ohio Company with Pennsylvania present), and another Albany Treaty of 1754 (with Virginia not present but much concerned), among others. Actually the skillful diplomacy of the Iroquois was, according to recent investigators, more important in keeping the tribes neutral than any of the maneuvers of Weiser. But he is an interesting figure in the southern Indian-white relationship of the eighteenth century.

Having learned Mohawk and the variant dialects of the Six Nations from living with the Indians during his first years in America, he was official interpreter for New York for the decade 1719-1729. Moving to Pennsylvania, he became the close friend of Shikellamy, the agent of the Iroquois in that province, and the two worked together until the Indian's death in 1748. Weiser's belief in an imperial as opposed to a provincial frontier policy brought him into contact with southern governors and other representatives and was to aid them in securing from the Iroquois lasting peace and clearly defined boundaries.

Writer of hymns and other music for the organ, whilom brother of the Ephrata cloister, storekeeper and merchant, colonel in the French and Indian War, almost a religious mystic, the Indians called him Tarachia-wagon, "who had held up the sky while he lived." According to many red men and white, men perhaps inclined to eulogize or sentimentalize, he carried with him to his grave the last hope of understanding between the two races. During more than forty years this agile-minded man assisted in keeping the most powerful of Indian entities peaceful and to some extent satisfied and thus allowed the time necessary for the colonial governments from New York to South Carolina to consolidate their positions, make firm their borders, and prepare for movement into the west. He corresponded and worked with Thomas Lee of Virginia and other southerners such as William Bull of South Carolina, giving advice, suggesting

procedures, and setting up conferences. As an interpreter he seems to have been fully trusted by red men and white, though in view of his long-range policies one wonders whether either party received word-for-word renditions. Possibly they did, for by the mid-eighteenth century there were enough people at every parley who knew the language of the other side to make checking relatively easy. Perhaps the flowing rhetoric of the Indian speeches reported by Weiser owes something to the white man's own poetic talents and interests—but of this more in a moment. A professional interpreter, Weiser must be rated as the one of that calling who rose highest and accomplished most, a statesman of the frontier.¹⁷⁰

Less important, but serving the southern colonies occasionally before 1763 was Andrew Montour, a mixed-blood son of the more famous Madame Montour and an Oneida chief whose English name was Robert Hunter. Weiser, who on occasion had to work with Montour, thought him stupid and illiterate. Actually he proved quite useful to Virginia and Pennsylvania governors, however, for, illiterate or not, he was fluent orally in Indian dialects and in English and French and, one may add, far from stupid. Dinwiddie hoped to persuade him to live in Virginia, for by 1751 a man of such gifts was much needed. This hope was never fulfilled, but Montour was a captain or major in the English service against the French and their red allies. In blood and in ability and degree of education Montour somewhat anticipated the interpreters used in the early national period. Never the policy maker Weiser was, his style in translation from the Iroquoian dialects, if at all accurately reported, is worth comparing with Weiser's. The two together seem to offer abundant evidence of the metaphorical, elaborate, and dignified qualities of Indian speech.¹⁷¹

The Augusta Treaty conference of 1763, in which southern governors from Virginia through Georgia met with several hundred Indians from the Five Civilized Tribes (by then so-called), was conducted with the aid of at least six professional or semiprofessional southern interpreters, presumably specialists in one or more of the languages employed. Some were veterans, others younger but perhaps thoroughly prepared through living with the tribes. John Butler, James Beamer, John Watts, James Colbert, Stephen Forrest, and John Proctor, from their names, sound like pure-blooded whites probably engaged at least part time in the Indian trade. Problems were many and complex, but after a long series of speeches by governors and Indian superintendent John Stuart, a treaty was signed, really a tentative document on boundaries. It scotched whatever plans certain chiefs had for forming a southern confederacy to work in collaboration with Pontiac. The immediately visible result was a rush by white settlers into what are now Kentucky and Tennessee. Exactly what part the interpreters had in policy making, if any at all, cannot now even

be guessed at. But they were present and necessary, and they handled a great range of topics.¹⁷²

Thus the interpreter, though he had at least in the Chesapeake colonies ceased to be a permanent official a generation before, was in 1763 still highly useful at top-level conferences, in trading, and in local land disputes as the whites moved farther west. He was also still the agency through which were preserved, however adulterated or altered the forms may be in translation, what everyone recognizes today as the natural rhythms and picturesque metaphors of a primitive people negotiating with a civilized invader for their very existence. The interpreter varied in education from the English or Scottish university graduate to the illiterate or semiliterate white or half-breed son of the frontier. That the former have preserved for us an indigenous American literary style and form is not surprising, but that the less well-educated also frequently managed to catch and render its cadences and its beautiful figures of speech indicates not only that they were faithful to their tasks but that they possessed sufficient command of English and sufficient imagination to contribute significantly to the expression in English of Indian verbal art. That expression, and the rejoinders in English, is the next consideration.

WHITE-INDIAN ORATORY: FORMAL AND INFORMAL

Two of eighteenth-century America's best minds, Cadwallader Colden of New York and Thomas Jefferson of Virginia, studied the nature and function of Indian eloquence and arrived at much the same conclusions. Colden studied the Five (later Six) Nations of the Iroquois and decided that they were an extremely democratic people who showed individual superiority and gained approbation through development of the arts of persuasion. In his study of these people he avers that they attained a certain urbanity and elegance in oral expression perhaps unsurpassed in human history. Jefferson argued that since the principles of Indian society forbade all compulsion, they had to be led to duty and to enterprise by personal influence or persuasion. Therefore eloquence in council became of major importance to them. He was thinking in terms of the southern Indians he knew. Colden, born a generation before Jefferson, saw in red oratory a classical, even neoclassical, quality; and Jefferson, though he compared Logan's speech to the best of Demosthenes and Cicero, was in his comparison more nearly in the pre-Romantic gentle-savage tradition.¹⁷³

Today some specialists in Indian culture suggest that the red man's discourse was as capable of expressing fine shades of meaning, with as adequate vocabulary for everything within his experience, as any language

ever known, including the English and French.¹⁷⁴ Others are more cautious, putting their fingers on a difficulty in arriving at a definite opinion concerning red oratory which Colden noted two and a half centuries ago. With over fifty fairly distinct Indian languages and a multiplicity of dialects and an entirely different system of prefixes, suffixes, and inflections from those of the European languages, they find making positive or exact assertions difficult, or at least questionable. Certainly the precise rendition was impossible, or nearly so, in the colonial period, as was the ability to gauge the adequacy of vocabulary. Colden complains of what any student of the Indian north or south noted, that he could find no person "who understands their Language, and also knows any Thing of Grammar, or the learned languages," and therefore could make an intelligent and entirely intelligible comparison. Those translators who did fairly well in varying degrees have just been noted, as has the fact that their renditions varied from sworn word-for-word to paragraph-by-paragraph and finally to simple digest or summary.

To match their speeches governors and other white representatives who replied to them or welcomed them consciously heightened their rhetoric. Since the colonials' speeches were quoted in newspapers and magazines even more widely than the Indians', and the white officials had plenty of opportunity to amend or correct them, it may be assumed that they are fairly accurate, though if taken down by a stenographer from spontaneous oral dialogue (done quite infrequently) perhaps likely to be somewhat garbled in the printed record. As far as the southern colonists' addresses are concerned, especially in the eighteenth century, an interesting matter psychologically and artistically is the change of pace, or of idiom and metaphor, from a governor's morning address before the provincial assembly to his afternoon harangue to red chiefs.

At the end of the colonial period Britishers like Horace Walpole, Bishop Hurd, and James Macpherson were cultivating the interest in primitivism which is a major aspect of the pre-Romantic and Romantic mind. Thus in 1775 Bishop Percy, indefatigable collector of British primitive or folk verse, profusely thanked Professor Samuel Henley of the College of William and Mary for his "specimen of Indian oratory . . . a masterpiece of its kind . . . exceedingly admired by all who have seen it. It is the eloquence of *sentiment*, and penetrates through the soul,—infinitely more forcible than the eloquence of language."¹⁷⁵ Earlier Englishmen of the court and times of James I would not have called the appeal of Indian discourse *sentiment*, but they were impressed by that discourse and by their own in reply. Smith, Strachey, and Hamor took the trouble to record, perhaps in quite free translation at this early stage of white-red relationship, what

chiefs and official orators or emissaries or Pocahontas said, as good "verbal entertainment," and Smith especially set opposite their utterances his own or some other British official's reply.

George Percy's first encounters and communications with the Indians were by means of gestures and signs, but Smith very soon found ways of speaking to Emperor Powhatan in deliberately blunt soldierlike language. "With many discourses they spent the day," add Russell and Todkill, here Smith's chroniclers. Then came Powhatan's long speech on peace and war, in which the probably original eloquence glows through the paraphrase, reflecting the whole innate tragedy of essentially helpless savages facing a stronger power. Powhatan frankly says he wants to be Smith's friend, for otherwise he knows he will be hunted to extermination or exile. Smith's adroit disavowal of intent to appropriate land and property is followed by a series of verbal exchanges. The modern reader is merely tantalized by such remarks as "the kings Orators presently entertained us with a kinde Oration"; or by Powhatan's semi-obsequious addresses to Captain Newport, who to Smith's chagrin was taken in by them; or by the dignity of "If your king have sent me presents, I also am a King, and this is my land." And Smith's recorded defiant rhetoric, undoubtedly very close to what he said, when Opechancanough's Pamunkeys threaten treachery: "here I stand, shoot he that dare. You promised to fraught my ship ere I departed, and so you shall, or I meane to load her with your dead carkases; yet if as friends you will come and trade, I once more promise not to trouble you, except you give me first occasion." And finally there is the effective plea of Ocanindge, "their Orator . . . a stout young man . . . whose worthie discourse deserveth to be remembered, and this it was." A part of one sentence marks the beginning of recorded majestic Indian oratory:

. . . the fishes swim, the fowles flie, and the very beastes strive to escape the snare and live; then blame not him [Powhatan?] being a man, hee would entreat you remember, your being a prisoner, what paines he took to save your life; if since he hath injured you he was compelled to it, but howsoever you have revenged it with our too great losse, . . . if you promise us peace we will believe you, if you proceed to revenge, we will abandon the Countrie.¹⁷⁶

Strachey's version of Henry Spelman's Indian Creation story, of the Hare, has something of the animal imagery of Ocanindge's worthy discourse. A few sentences from Opechancanough to Sir Thomas Dale, Pocahontas to Smith in London, Tomocomo's reproach to Smith, and Purchase on Tomocomo afford further glimpses of early Virginia Indian speech, though little or none of it seems an attempt to reproduce sentence by sentence the original expression. The humor which crops up frequently in later Indian

oratory is present in 1621 in William Powell's story of the mock-heroic boaster. Though Powell renders direct discourse, he is surely paraphrasing when he uses Elizabethan terms such as "my Lorde" and "my Leige" and "fables." But the recorded Indian laughter is certainly genuine. In an entirely different mood, and perhaps with the original imagery, is the declaration of the emperor succeeding Opechancanough in 1648 to Sir William Berkeley, at the end of a long oration, "That the Sunne and Moon should first lose their glorious lights and shining, before he, or his People should evermore hereafter wrong the English in any kind."¹⁷⁷

The comprehensive *Archives of Maryland* contain many records of Indian speeches, usually in brief paraphrase or summary. In 1666, 1668, and 1687, for example, there were treaty conferences on both shores of the Chesapeake, but only an occasional phrase in the official accounts seems directly from either governor or red chief. The Maryland executives followed the now-familiar phrase patterns such as "Great White Father" and "Supreme King Over the Seas" and brotherhood with the Indians which Smith and others had earlier employed. During the last decades of the century, 1670-1700, the oratory was much the same. In 1674 Henry Woodward in South Carolina notes speeches in his tour among the Westoes. In 1670 Dr. John Lederer, the explorer from Virginia west and south, declared, "I have been present at several of their Consultations and Debates and to my admiration have heard some of their Seniors deliver themselves with as much Judgment and Eloquence as I should have expected from men of Civil education and literature." In 1684 Governor Lord Effingham, at the first northern treaty in which Virginia participated, made effective presentations in the usual treaty metaphors (to be discussed below) of covenant chain, burial of war hatchets, planting of the tree of peace, and presenting of wampum and skins between speeches. The Five Nations' response is in the same terms. Though not recorded earlier than this date in southern parleys, this sort of phraseology does occur henceforth frequently in the documents from Maryland to Georgia. That is, this treaty imagery does not appear to have been by any means peculiar to the Six Nations. At least it seems to have been used by all Indians east of the Mississippi.¹⁷⁸

The eighteenth century saw many more recorded southern Indian orations, for the red men were desperately employing what they considered one of their most effective weapons, persuasion, to stave off, or stop if possible, the relentless western march of the white man. The renewal of European interest in the Happy Man, the forerunner of the Noble Savage, the growing scientific approach encouraged by the Royal Society, and the anti-quarianism allied to both art and science undoubtedly lay behind the relation and transmission of individual orations to Great Britain, or the frequent mention of them. With the rise of colonial newspapers and the *Gentleman's*

and *Scot's Magazines* especially, there were new popular media in which such materials might be presented. Thus there might be for treaty eloquence the official record of the various colonies participating, frequently varying in detail and sometimes in language from one provincial text to another; personal observations by interested spectators or participants; and periodical transcriptions sometimes but not always derived from official sources.

In 1706 from South Carolina Daniel Henchman sent the botanist Petiver the text of a speech by an Indian king in council. About the same time John Lawson describes a Carolina red funeral sermon, though only in general terms, and then later gives something close to the actual text of another, which he calls "a ridiculous parcel of lies." LeJau tells of an ill old Indian professional orator scheduled to speak for the Itiwans, and Colonel Chicken in his journal of 1715, without giving any details, merely notes various discourses with red chiefs. On the other hand, Governor Nicholson's talks with the Creeks are spread on the official records and indicate the executive's use of "Great King on the Other Side of the Water" and other phrases and idioms adapted from aboriginal oratory. Tobias Fitch and John Herbert in their embassies to the Creeks and Cherokees likewise have left in their official journals some idea of their conversations with tribal leaders. Sir Alexander Cuming's journal and the newspaper and other accounts of his American venture and of his return with the Cherokees to London report speeches of various kinds, by governor, chiefs, and warriors, including a most characteristic "talk" at the treaty table by Ketagustah, including: "We are come hither from a dark mountainous place where nothing but darkness is to be found but are now in a place where there is light." On the Cherokees' return to Carolina they were entertained in Charleston; and one chief, after moving forward to take a fashionably dressed lady's hand, drew back, saying that "he was sensible he was not made to touch such Things as those."¹⁷⁹

In Virginia William Byrd II preserved in his Westover Manuscripts the transcript of the 1722 treaty rituals with the Five Nations, including speeches by the New York commissioners for Indian Affairs, Governor Spotswood of Virginia, and of course the Indian representatives. Curiously, Byrd's manuscript differs in some details as well as form from the official New York transcript. The two versions share the metaphorical imagery and picturesque phrase as translated from the Indians by New Yorkers Clæsse and Livingston. Morton feels that Spotswood's "commanding presence and straightforward talk" as well as his long record of fair dealing with the Indians made a wholesome impression on the Five Nations. In his oral communication Spotswood was perhaps unconsciously or half consciously following a policy and a style adopted by John Smith more than a century before.¹⁸⁰

In Georgia in 1732–1733, soon after his arrival, Oglethorpe at Savannah heard from Oueekachumpa, a very tall old man, an oration which in paraphrase (translated by Wiggan and Musgrove) is fully spread-eagle rhetoric. Another chief may have been quoted directly in “You have comforted the banished [Tomochichi]; and have gathered them that were scattered, like little birds before the Eagle.” In 1735 the Creek Chekelli Mico gave his eloquent story of the origin of the Cussetaws. In 1745 the Cherokee emperor Cukaaouskassette made in Charleston his complaint against steady encroachment with his gesture of putting two hands over his face and eyes to indicate that the illiterate red man was left in ignorance and darkness. The talks and visits of Glen went on and on in South Carolina. Sitting under a canopy at Ninety-Six, he gave a long speech. Four years later he spoke more harshly to the same Cherokees, cogently and yet eloquently, omitting the imagery but retaining the conventional courtesy, except in his peroration, where he launched into figurative language involving stones, birds, and trees. The 1750s were marked in the southernmost colonies by even more speeches, as the problems of the French and Indian War were considered, though the Indians never neglected an opportunity to plead for their land, or natural borders.

In 1751 William Bull, representing Governor Glen at an Albany conference, wrote detailed and vivid accounts of his adventures with his Catawba delegation. Though this was a formal treaty meeting and followed the rituals discussed below, there was plenty of good talk in which the figures flowed freely. At home Glen was engaged in fairly well recorded dialogue in conferences with the Warrior of Keowee, the Raven of Hywassee, Ski-agusta, and a dozen others. In 1752 the Cherokees and in 1753 the Creeks engaged in long conference harangues with the Carolinians, in which there was much rhetoric and little wampum-giving, and therefore these were not treaties. By 1755 Glen’s policy had paid off, and the reader may find accounts from many sources of the climax, the scene in which Old Hop, emperor of the Cherokees, “in a very solemn manner ceded to him in behalf of the Crown all the Cherokee Lands . . . as fine Lands as any in the Universe.” Henry Laurens, the author of this statement, declares that the cession was a total surprise, but evidence he did not have shows that Glen had been aware of this possible event and planning for it for a long time. The *South Carolina Gazette* gives details about a symbolic leather bag of earth, another of parched corn, and bows and arrows presented by the red spokesman with the “dignity and graceful action of a Roman or a Grecian Orator, and with all their ease and eloquence.” Despite all this, the governors of Virginia and North Carolina considered the cession a mere gesture, one of them complaining that it prevented Cherokees from serving in Virginia against the French.¹⁸¹

Meanwhile royal Governor Ellis of Georgia was trying to calm Creek fears of further land encroachment. In North Carolina, provincial authorities parleyed with Catawbias in exchanges marked especially by King Haigler's strong speech against the traders' selling liquor to the Indians, which he rightly thought was a principal cause of friction between the two races. As recorded, these Indian speeches are in simple and unadorned English translation.

Lieutenant Wall, traveling on diplomatic missions among the Cherokees in 1757, reports some most effective discourse he heard or participated in at conferences in Tellico and other places: "Nothing but the greatest Decorum and Attention was observed, the Headmen giving their usual Word of Assent and Approbation to every sentence." The imagery is bountiful: "before he saw me the very Breath that came out of their Mouths was infected and bad, but now it was quite altered . . ." Most of the rest is in the treaty tradition to be noted below.

Meanwhile the Chesapeake colonies were deep in their own negotiations along a wide border from the Cherokees to the Six Nations. In August 1751 the Virginians entertained in Williamsburg a large delegation of Cherokee chiefs with a retinue of ninety. Lewis Burwell, acting governor and president of the Council, welcomed them in a long "Friends and Brethren" speech which was reported with the Cherokee replies in various provincial newspapers. Typical English-recorded oratory is that of a chief's reply to the president: "Brother, We have traveled through Bushes and Briers to see our Friends of Virginea. We have no Cause to represent [repent?] of our long and tedious Journey; the Pain and Fatigue we have undergone are compensated by the kind and generous Reception we have met and we are much pleased."¹⁸² The 1752 Logg's Town conference and treaty on the Ohio is well recorded, but Montour as chief interpreter does not render the picturesque language usually found in the conferences at which Weiser or Clæsse was a translator, perhaps of course because it was not picturesque, but more probably because the nuances and the artistic phraseology of red speech escaped the interpreter—or simply that his English was not firm enough to allow him to render what he understood in red dialects. In 1755 Dinwiddie of Virginia sent commissioners to the Catawbias with a letter couched in the conventional phrases about chains of friendship and buried hatchets and belts of wampum. In 1755 and 1757 the *Maryland Gazette* printed a number of chiefs' speeches to the governor, nothing unusual but indicative of Maryland's continued interest in the red man.¹⁸³

For the early 1760s Cherokee oratory is most of that which is preserved or mentioned. The rhetoric appears even in written communication. For example, a letter from the emperor, Conockotoka, to Colonel William

Byrd III reports on the delegation sent to Charleston. Even in the epistle the path is straight and the chain so long that black is now bright, and thus the sky is clear. The emperor may actually be giving Virginia a tactful notice that future alliances and trade will be through South Carolina, but in any event the idiom is conventionally metaphorical. Timberlake, so intimately associated with this nation at the time, presents some of the most useful details in his observations:

They have many of them a good uncultivated genius, are fond of speaking well, as that paves the way to power in their councils; and I doubt not but the reader will find some beauties in the harangues I have given him, which I assure him are entirely genuine. Their language is not unpleasant, but vastly aspirated, and the accents so many and various, you would often imagine them singing in their common discourse. As the ideas of the Cherokees are so few, I cannot say much for the copiousness of their language.

They seldom turn their eyes on the person they speak of, or address themselves to, and are always suspicious when people's eyes are fixed upon them. They speak so low, except in council, that they are often obliged to repeat what they are saying; yet should a person talk to any of them above their common pitch, they would immediately ask him, if he thought they were deaf?

Among the examples of harangues, Timberlake gives Ostenaco's speech, after smoking the peace pipe with the young officer and his mission, concerning burying the tomahawk. And without quoting he notes a number of other speeches addressed to him.¹⁸⁴

Though the Augusta conference of 1763 affords the last examples of Indian eloquence in the colonial period, this was a treaty ritual, and its expression belongs in the discussion of that form to be considered next. But James Adair has the final word on the oratory of the colonial southern Indian, as he concludes so many other discussions of facets of Indian-white relations. He corroborates much of what Colden and Timberlake say and Jefferson was to say, but he adds much more. He does not confine his analysis to any one section, but scatters it through his long book. Though he had visited the Six Nations, his observations are largely of the southern Indians whom he had known so well.

Adair begins with a descriptive analysis of an Indian funeral sermon on the noted Choctaw chief Red Shoes:

The orator compared him to the sun, that enlightens and enlivens the whole system of created things: and having carried the metaphor to a considerable length, he expatiated on the variety of evils, that necessarily result from the disappearance and absence of the sun; and, with a great deal of judgment, and propriety of expression, he concluded his oration

with the same trope, with which he had begun. . . . [T]heir orations are concise, strong, and full of fire.

Some pages later he describes their priests' harangues to incite religious frenzy or undertake a holy war. Later he discusses red speech generally: the vehemence in expression of even set orations, and the low key maintained in ordinary discourse, even when the speakers are being ironic or satiric:

I have heard one of their captains at the end of his oration for war, tell the warriors that stood outermost, he feelingly knew their guns were burning in their hands; their tomahawks thirsty to drink the blood of the enemy; and their twenty arrows impatient to be on the wing; and, lest delay should burn their hearts any longer, he gave them the cool refreshing word, "Join the holy ark, and away to cut off the devoted enemy."

Of special interest is his attention to what he calls "a skillful Pantomime, as ever were those of ancient Greece and Rome, or the modern Turkish mutes, who describe the meanest things spoken, by gesture, action, and the passions of the face." He refers of course to sign language, by means of which two separated Indian nations of different linguistic stock could communicate, even converse at length.

Most significant, however, especially as it relates to the observation of Colden and Jefferson, is what Adair has to say about the relative theocratic and democratic elements in Indian society, as he sees them represented in their speech making:

The power of their chiefs, is an empty sound. They can only persuade or dissuade the people, either by force of good-nature and clear reasoning, or coloring things, so as to suit their prevailing passions. . . . When any national affair is in debate, you may hear every father of a family speaking in his house on the subject, with rapid, bold language, and the utmost freedom that a people can use. Their voices, to a man, have due weight in every public affair, as it concerns their welfare alike.

The speaking is very orderly in their councils, he continues, conducted with coolness and respect, the speaker always standing, each head man in turn. Then they sit down and decide what they will do. "In all their stated orations they have a beautiful modest way of expressing their dislike of ill things. They only say, 'It is not good, goodly, or commendable.' And their whole behaviour, on public occasions, is highly worthy of imitation by some of our British senators and lawyers."¹⁸⁵

So the last and greatest colonial trader saw the true forest-born Demosthenes at the very moment Patrick Henry was doing his part in creating a new American oratory which was itself to become traditional. All the southern Anglo-Americans, an Adair or a Jefferson or a William Wirt, saw the art of eloquence at least partially in classical terms—Quintilian, Demos-

thenes, Cicero. But they also saw the greatest eloquence as *natural*. The Happy Man or Ossian or the Noble Savage, concepts of their day, were terms or names which could be applied to the persuader. Adair's red orator is a noble savage, as was Jefferson's Logan. Whatever their immediate antecedents, among which the pulpit orator of the Great Awakening was one, Patrick Henry and the spread-eagle Fourth of July speaker of the early republic were at least in part his spiritual descendants. Their white ancestors had for two centuries before been adapting their own forensic eloquence to aboriginal modes of expression.

THE WHITE-INDIAN TREATY: POLITICS AND ART

Out of the desires and needs of both races, in the very tensions between them, rose the one great art form which is the joint product of the minds of red men and white. From the Roanoke Island period the Indians' fear of extinction grew, and with the desire to live was the concomitant urge to keep what land and property they had. At the same time the white southern colonials, at first in communal and then in individual, provincial, and imperial terms, were developing the passion to acquire and cultivate the land they saw as theirs by right of discovery and conquest and Christian duty. The conflict of interest resulted in a variety of documented promises from both sides. The first of them were mere phrases in the early chronicles, then official itemized articles of "peace treaties" which were almost always land purchases, followed by legal acts of provincial assemblies. That the ownership of territories was an all-colonial rather than single-province matter began gradually to dawn upon both sides, and, as already noted, long before the end of the seventeenth century a Virginia governor, with his colleague of New York, was meeting certain red nations in Albany to establish a peace which would guarantee, they hoped, the right of both to live as they pleased. In the eighteenth century, in traditional ritual forms of the Six Nations adapted by the astute and poetic Conrad Weiser to the needs of the situation, there were drawn up and signed in the middle colonies a series of treaties which both incidentally and deliberately are genuine dramas, full of suspense, eloquent phrase, dry humor, musical rhythms, picturesque costumes and settings, and often genuine climaxes. Of these a number were participated in by representatives of Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, and those colonies had a very definite part in creating the semi-conscious art forms, particularly one of the greatest of them, the Lancaster treaty of 1744, when the secretaries of the Chesapeake colonies' delegations recorded the whole procedure and attendant circumstances. In 1751 a South Carolinian was eloquent and effective in a somewhat similar situation in Albany. Undoubtedly the presence of Conrad Weiser as interpreter and

in reality impressario for several of the most effective of these forensic confrontations did much to give them literary quality. Many of them were published by Benjamin Franklin, who printed three hundred extra copies of the 1744 Lancaster treaty for transatlantic consumption, almost surely with its artistic appeal in mind. Though Franklin's treaties were probably edited by someone like Franklin or Weiser, in the instance of the 1744 agreement the variant text printed at Williamsburg is a more interesting literary and historical document than Franklin's. And it seems evident that the Maryland and/or Virginia secretaries of the two delegations had something to do with the form, style, and other features of the Williamsburg edition.

Lawrence Wroth states that New England treaties of the same period lack any artistic quality, for they "are as bare of adornment as a pure plank."¹⁸⁶ He does not know whether to blame Puritan lack of imagination or inability in translating and staging or some deficiency in the metaphorical quality of northeastern Algonkian. As far as he seems to know, there were no southern treaty forms to compare. If he had looked hard enough, however, he would have seen that the southern coastal Algonkians, the Muskogean tribes of the lower South, and the mountain Cherokees all possessed in their languages the metaphorical elegance, and in their treaties and conferences many of the same terms and rituals, as did the Six Nations in the North. Perhaps the southern area had no white artistic genius comparable to Weiser who could organize the region's treaty powwows so dramatically. Few if any treaty conferences south of the Susquehannah survive as did the elaborate histrionic dialogues one sees in the Franklin pieces, but this condition is probably as much the result of poor incentive (the need to publicize did not seem as pressing) as lack of a gifted interpreter-composer. But gesture, ritual, language, presentations, and other characteristic features of the form are glimpsed at least in part in the records which do survive for the southern conferences. By 1763 the treaty conference was definitely a forensic art form among southern red and white peoples. Even the mostly fragmentary extant documents show them rarely as bare as a plank, certainly not in this period. The generous selections from transcriptions of such occurrences printed in the provincial gazettes and British magazines appear to suggest that the reader, though he probably never thought of these texts as drama, did see them as history made colorful by rhetoric and gesture and staged scene.

Tracing the evolution of the southern peace treaty as diplomatic and literary document suggests that it developed in somewhat the same way as in the middle colonies. When northern Indians politely refused to hold a conference at Williamsburg, they gave as one excuse the alleged fact

that there was no ritual council fire kept burning for them as there was at Albany or Philadelphia or Lancaster. They may have been speaking metaphorically, for there is no evidence of an eternal flame tended by provincial authorities in these northern towns. Another excuse was that there was no road to Williamsburg. Fire, road, and covenant chain (a third favorite figure) may be traced as far back in southern as in northern Indian history to the first English contacts in which council fire, old buffalo or deer tracks made into red war or trade paths, and chain dancing at ceremonials were recorded elements of Indian life. The chain of friendship, a term used familiarly by Cherokee as well as northern Iroquois in the eighteenth century, may have had its origins in shell ceremonial necklaces, or copper ceremonial linked necklaces used in the first known Indian ceremonies on Roanoke Island. But more of this in a moment.

Wilbur Jacobs and others have analyzed the protocol of treaty making, the symbolism and significance of wampum, the silver covenant chain of friendship, the gift giving with attendant appropriate speeches. Wampum itself, a common medium of exchange, may have had certain mystic qualities never fully understood by Europeans. Beads used in its composition or separately had definite value in furs and even English coin. Most important, wampum had for centuries been an effective mode of communication between tribes. Learned chiefs could read wampum belts.

War hatchets and war belts, flung upon the ground or (if peace was intended) buried or bestowed, also entered into the symbolism of the treaties. Designs on belts carried special meanings, and these were sometimes referred to in the dialogues. Jacobs states that the "chain of friendship" figure and object met with so frequently in the conferences was based on a legend concerning the Six Nations and the British of chaining a British ship to a mountain so that the alliance would be permanent. If Iroquoian in origin, the term made its way into southern treaties. It may have had the earlier origin mentioned just above. That the chain might grow rusty and require polishing, that its links might be broken or need repair, was referred to in almost every treaty. Brightening the chain of friendship strengthened or renewed an alliance. The chain usually appears, like the hatchet, as an image.

But the strings and belts of wampum were histories and promises, and were exchanged or bestowed or presented as evidence with appropriate words or speeches. After the presentation, the Indians gave a great shout, written down by various interpreters differently but surely representing the same or similar sounds. Both by implication and expression these actions and objects are symbol-metaphors, part of the ritual or ceremony between equals engaged, as noted above, at least as far as the Indians conceived, in an act or series of acts of reciprocity.

Wampum was a principal symbol at the 1752 Logg's Town treaty, for example. It appears in the records of the other treaties in which southern colonists were engaged if these records survive in any detail. Gifts varied from colony to colony, but frequently the Indian bestowed tobacco and sometimes pipes, and the whites a variety of blankets, bracelets, medals, gorgets (note Governor Spotswood's gift at Albany), food, above all liquor, and sometimes English coins. French gifts apparently were somewhat similar and were certainly used for the same purposes.¹⁸⁷

In their journeys from village to village Lane and Hariot pretty clearly had peace talks or agreements with their hosts. A little later John Smith records the speeches mentioned in the section above, almost all concerned with fear of extermination or exile and the possible making of a red-white agreement. Ocanindge's oration is a good example. Here already is the crucial or basic land element still alive today in the American government's dealings with its Indian wards. Negotiations, with a mailed fist or a handful of beads, were always Smith's way of getting what he wanted, first food to survive and then good land to till. Letters home through the period of the Virginia Company and long thereafter mention agreements with the red men, almost always over food or land, though sometimes over education of Indian children.

The earliest surviving legislative act confirming articles of peace with the Indians came in April 1642, though its very form shows it was already a familiar procedure in dealing with "the naturals." In 1646 King Nectowance acknowledged he held his kingdom in his British Majesty's name, and in return the Assembly on behalf of the colony undertook "to protect him or them against any rebels or other enemies whatsoever." In acknowledgment and tribute the chief was to pay the governor of Virginia twenty beaver skins every year at the going away of the geese. Land boundaries and hunting privileges were also involved, with attempted guarantee of Indian property lines. The Virginia *Statutes* contain many other such agreements, with of course the gradual diminution of Indian rights and properties as the years pass.¹⁸⁸ Since these were tributary Indians, the ceremonies of the treaties were probably very simple.

The *Archives of Maryland* include many parallel enactments, of allegiance in exchange for protection, for the few Indians originally found in Maryland rapidly became tributary. They were guaranteed fishing and hunting privileges forever, which in practice was but for a few years. In 1668 Lord Baltimore and the Nanticoke emperor established a simple eight-point treaty with no recorded attendant ceremony. In 1687, at the home of Captain Winder in Somerset County of the Eastern Shore, a dignified treaty conference was held with two official interpreters, a brother of

the late Nanticoke emperor and six other Great Men, and Colonel William Stevens with other whites representing the Proprietor. Perhaps this was preliminary to the Articles of Peace agreed upon with the Nanticoke by the Provincial Council at St. Mary's a month later. In 1693 the 1687 interpreter Nutter served at a treaty conference between the governor and the Choptank tribe. Gifts but no dialogue are recorded. And in 1700, as a kind of end to their first period of settlement, the Marylanders concluded a treaty of peace and amity, itemizing portions of the act but giving no details of the ceremony preceding it.¹⁸⁹

One of the most interesting of seventeenth-century treaties extant as a document is usually referred to as a land purchase, which of course it was. This was signed in South Carolina on March 10, 1675, by four red cassiques (chiefs or kings), eleven war captains, and fourteen women captains and by seven whites, three of whom made their marks as the Indian captains did. The whites may or may not have been able to write. This first recorded purchase of Indian lands in that colony was made by Andrew Percival, a colonist quite active in Indian affairs, for the Earl of Shaftesbury and the other Proprietors. It is the end result, without the ceremony, of a series of negotiations. The large single sheet, describing an immense tract of land, and the cloth, hatchets, beads, and some other goods exchanged for it, carries interesting semi-hieroglyphic or symbolic marks by the Indians as their signatures. The queens or chieftainesses, frequently mentioned in Virginia and Carolina treaty records but not in those of the middle colonies, must have added color and more to the proceedings.¹⁹⁰ A 1684 South Carolina treaty (mentioned by Mooney) with the Cherokees, including the hieroglyphics of eight named chiefs of the Lower Towns has never been located. It would be, of course, the oldest Cherokee treaty on record. There is enough detail given in the nineteenth-century Indian newspaper to permit reasonable certainty that it existed at some period. This brief suggestion of its content is tantalizing.¹⁹¹

Perhaps the first southern treaty published in Great Britain is that of 1677 of Virginia, which Mooney says marked the end of the Indian period in Virginia in that from that time the shattered remnants of area tribes were tributary or dependent. The document was drawn up at Middle Plantation, later Williamsburg, on May 29, and was signed by the Queen of the Pamunkeys, the Queen of the Waonokes (Weyanokes), the King of the Nansemonds, the King of the Nottoways, Captain John West, apparently the son of the Queen of the Pamunkeys (the phraseology here is ambiguous), and several other red men, and certified by the president of the Council and Royal Commissioners Berry and Moryson. The meeting had been arranged by the British king's representatives appointed to investigate Bacon's Rebellion, and it was held on the King's birthday with appro-

priate dignity and undoubtedly considerable display. The twenty-one articles acknowledging subjection and guaranteeing protection contain no details of the procedural steps in the negotiation. But the reader gets some hint of the tone of the conference when he sees the articles followed by petitions to His Majesty from the red kings and queens for small crowns of silver gilt to be adorned with semiprecious stones and accompanied by purple robes for each native sovereign. There is also a list of names of the kings and queens and the presents to be given, the whole cost nor to exceed £120.¹⁹²

More significant for a trend toward pancolonialism is the Albany Treaty of 1684. Perhaps Virginia Governor Lord Howard of Effingham merely took advantage of a visit to New York for his health to approach the Five Nations, who were causing trouble by attacking Virginia tributary Indians as they journeyed south on marauding expeditions and by massacring isolated white settlers at the foot of the mountains. For it was along the old path just east of the Blue Ridge that northern Indians had traveled for generations to attack their old enemies the Catawbias. Effingham spoke to representatives of the Mohawks, Onondagas, Oneidas, and Cayugas, the Senecas not having arrived. He gave a sharp but courteous reproach for their not having lived up to their word given seven or more years before: they had been molesting Maryland and Virginia tribes and murdering whites or carrying them into captivity. He may have been referring to their word given not seven years before but twelve, for in 1672 two Virginia representatives had participated in an Albany conference and agreement. This pattern or reprimand was repeated many times from New York through Georgia as the years passed. The conclusion was firm: the red men must live up to their agreements.

And here, as far as surviving southern documents are concerned, begins the use of the ritualistic metaphors appearing so often later. Effingham is willing to make a new Covenant chain on behalf of the Chesapeake colonies and their Indians "that will be more strong and lasting, even to the Wor[l]d's End; so that we may be Brethren, and great King Charles's children." Then follow his propositions for security, to be marked by the burial of two hatchets as a final declaration of eternal peace between the Five Nations and his own people. The Indian reply was addressed first to Governor Dongan of New York, who was host and master of ceremonies. It consisted of eloquent speeches by the Indian leaders; then there were more to Brother Assarigoa (Governor of Virginia), and much talk of the chain, planting the tree of peace, and burying the hatchets. They even proposed including the Catawbias, their hereditary enemies, in the peace agreement. The chain was to be kept as bright as silver, the covenant fire to be replenished, wampum belts of confirmation to be bestowed, and a hole

to be dug for burying the axes. Beaver-skin pledges were presented by the Oneidas, earth was flung on the hatchets, and lastly, the Oneidas, Onondagas, and Cayugas joined in the peace song.¹⁹³ The follow-up meeting the next year attended by Virginia representatives William Byrd I and Edmund Jen(n)ings revealed that as usual the natives had not honored all their promises, a fact that does not detract from the histrionic quality of the 1684 occasion.

In 1711 came the Tuscarora War in Virginia and North Carolina, during which that Iroquois people murdered John Lawson. De Graffenreid managed a six-point treaty with them, but as it survives it contains no evidence of ritual gestures or elaborate metaphorical language, possibly because it is a list of legal acts, not conference procedures. At the same time Governor Spotswood in Virginia made a treaty with at least a remnant of the Tuscaroras, one requirement of which was that two of the chief men's sons be sent as "hostages" to be educated in schools operated by the whites. The principal Virginia tributary tribes such as the Saponis and Pamunkeys were already doing this. After their crushing defeat in South Carolina in 1713, some fifteen hundred Tuscaroras went to Virginia and in February 1714 met at Williamsburg with provincial officers, where they concluded treaties with whites and the Nottoways and Saponis.¹⁹⁴

In 1722 Spotswood's anxiety to settle Indian affairs is evident in his journey to Albany, where, apparently without the presence of the governor of New York as a sort of intermediary master of ceremonies, he and his two Virginia delegates, with the aid of Lawrence Clæsse and Robert Livingston, the Dutch and English interpreters, carried through a treaty conference with the Five Nations in the best dramatic tradition. The double translation may have altered the original intention, or phraseology, somewhat, but one finds in the colonial archives of New York and among the papers of William Byrd II only slightly differing versions of a poetic and rhetorical dialogue. The texts show, incidentally, that Conrad Weiser may later have perfected the procedure, but that he did not inaugurate or formulate its principal features.

Spotswood begins with the conventional observation that the covenant chain with Virginia has grown rusty and that he now comes with the hope that it may be polished and grow bright again. Here are indicated a pause and presentation of belts of wampum, one for the Virginia government and one for its tributary tribes, the latter indicating that Virginia Indians entered the consideration. Spotswood asked for promises of peace and observation of boundaries from the Five Nations and promised both from Virginia. Then he held up "a fine Coronet" to be bestowed upon the representative of the Five Nations when they had agreed to remain within the prescribed boundaries and regulations. After many sonorous speeches by

Brother Assarigoa (a note tells us this Indian name for the governor of Virginia came from a Dutch word for cutlass or scimitar, a weapon presented to Effingham in 1684), the Indians gave the agreed-upon six shouts or Yo-hahs of approval for the Five Nations and for the Tuscaroras lately joined to them. Twelve days later, after many speeches and wampum-bestowings, the treaty stipulations were signed and the penalties for transgression defined. Spotswood's final gesture is perhaps the most dramatic in all the records of Indian treaties. Moved by what he deemed the spirit and accomplishment of the occasion, he took from his own breast, probably impulsively, the cherished insignia of the Transmontane Order he had himself founded, a golden horseshoe, and presented it to the chief spokesman for the Iroquois, bidding the interpreter to "tell him there was an inscription upon [it] which signified it would help to pass over mountains & that when any of their People should come to Virginia with a Pass they should bring it with them." Then he distributed the expected presents, which the Virginia-Byrd version adds were worth about £350 New York money. This presentation of the horseshoe was the final official gesture of one of the ablest of colonial governors, for he returned to Virginia to find himself superseded. But as an example of the southern colonial's consciousness of the histrionic and artistic elements of his relation to the red man the presentation deserves a place close to Pocahontas' cradling of Smith's head in her arms to save his life.¹⁹⁵

The setting for the next significant southern treaty negotiations is the royal court in London in 1730. Most of the dramatic gestures of Sir Alexander Cuming's Cherokees before the King have already been noticed, as Ski-agusta's (spelled a dozen ways) eloquence and Chief Moytoy's (of Tellico) eagles' feathers. But they also mentioned the chain of friendship, the keeping of the trading path (road) open, and the symbols of peace. The treaty signing came a little later in their lodgings, but these red men always remembered the splendor of their meeting with the great king and may well have been proud of their own dignity or decorum on the occasion. Bunning and probably Wiggan interpreted, and Sir William Keith, governor of Pennsylvania then in England, phrased the major treaty rituals in terms the Indians understood and approved. Land is mentioned only once but quite significantly: "As the King has given his Land on both sides of the Great Mountains to his own Children the English, so he now gives the Cherokee Indians the Privilege of living where they please." This was not exactly a privilege the red men coveted.¹⁹⁶

As Georgia was being founded in the 1730s, several treaties were drawn up by Oglethorpe and others, first with the semi-outcast or semi-exile Tomochichi, who could not and did not represent the tribes who felt they owned

the land, a fact the English took some years to understand. The General's first major conferences with chiefs or *micos* from major and subordinate tribes occurred on May 18, 1732. Wiggan and Musgrove interpreted, and there is the notice of the long and graceful discourse by "a very tall old man," who thanked the English for a number of things, including the care of Tomochichi. Tomochichi himself spoke in soaring imagery and was followed by the *mico* of Coweeta. When the treaty was signed on the twenty-first, each chief received a laced coat and hat and a shirt and a gun, with lesser presents for all others who attended. The Indians in turn presented buckskins. Two years later Tomochichi stood before the King at Whitehall and made a great treaty oration, with presentation of eagles' feathers as symbols of peace. The King's reply in straightforward English is also recorded. That Tomochichi had no legal right to make a treaty, as Cuming's Cherokees had not, does not detract from a spectacular scene or prevent the aged exile from being one of the rages of London even though no one understood the situation and may not have cared if he had. In 1735/6 Oglethorpe set up an act for keeping peace with the Indians, and then and later, at least through 1751, there are documented treaty procedures employing gifts, songs, and shouts of approbation, mentioned more or less incidentally as matters of course.¹⁹⁷

Though for some years Conrad Weiser had been advising both his white and adopted Indian brothers on how to conduct a treaty, it was about 1740 that he came into real prominence as *impresario-interpreter par excellence*.¹⁹⁸ Though the Chesapeake colonies were not yet represented in Six Nations' treaties, or had not been since Spotswood's time, they were very much in the consciousness of both red and white Pennsylvanian participants at a 1742 Lancaster treaty. By the time of the great "Treaty . . . at Lancaster" in June 1744 Maryland and Virginia shared responsibility with Pennsylvania. Border conditions in the west had grown worse and worse. Maryland suggested the conference and invited the Six Nations; but Virginia was an equal partner, though the Indians insisted that Maryland be allowed to talk first, as it had requested the meeting. The host colony provided the master of ceremonies, this time Governor George Thomas of Pennsylvania, whose own province was vitally concerned in the matter of boundaries, marauding expeditions by backcountry Indians, and of course trade. Weiser had advised that the governor be present in person, for the Chesapeake representatives knew too little of Indian customs and were supercilious regarding the red men anyway, an accusation of dubious accuracy but nevertheless effective in persuading the governor. Virginia had present Commissioners Thomas Lee and William Beverley and secretary-recorder William Black; Maryland had Edmund Jennings, Philip Thomas, Robert King, Thomas Colville, and secretary-recorder Witham Marshe.

Each colony had other semiofficial representatives. Weiser was *the* official interpreter and consultant for both parties. As noted, there are two considerably varying printed texts of the treaty, one by Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia for middle-colony and English distribution,¹⁹⁹ and the other by William Parks in Williamsburg. Since in the heading for almost every colloquy held privately with the Indians by Virginia or Maryland, the Virginia version gives not only the names of the commissioners but of Black or Marshe respectively as "Secretary to the Treaty," it seems that one or both of the secretaries probably, with the commissioners, edited the Williamsburg text to fit the interests of the Chesapeake colonists.²⁰⁰ There are not only the two distinct texts, but also Black's diary of his journey to Lancaster as well as Marshe's detailed journal of what went on behind the scenes. French pressures, backcountry English land greed and concomitant boundary disputes, Indian ambushes and massacres, and trading paths are mentioned directly or obliquely throughout and naturally determine the treaty points. The facts tell us much of politics and forest diplomacy, but the two great publishers seem to have realized that they were appealing to reading publics which might appreciate the literary qualities of the documents as well as their current-history interest. They may or may not have been partially conscious that this was the "turning point in our colonial history" which was to make English influence supreme from the Lakes through Virginia.²⁰¹

Perhaps more than any previous treaty, that of Lancaster in 1744 employs all the dramatic devices practicable, including Indian techniques and elaborations of them and some additions occasioned by the several colonies represented. The participants were much as in earlier conferences, official individual colonies' representatives, interpreters and recorders, a variety of famous chiefs and orators and their attendant retinues, in some instances including even children. Among the red men was the renowned Onondaga orator Conasatego (Cannasatego, etc.), veteran of previous meetings, and among the whites the astute Thomas Lee, the able governor of Pennsylvania and the two remarkably observant secretaries Black and Marshe. The Maryland as well as Virginia aristocracy were present, the former notably in Benedict Calvert.

Black's pre-treaty diary is of only moderate interest, but Marshe's daily record of actions outside the conference room is fascinating and throws considerable light on what actually happened officially. One learns from Marshe that the Reverend Thomas Cradock, noted pulpit orator and scholar, accompanied the Marylanders as chaplain, preached at the court house before the motley assemblage during the negotiations, and actually signed the treaty as a witness.²⁰² Marshe describes the Indian traders present, men as wild as the most savage Indian; explains the cadences or music of the

cry of approbation, the Yo-hah; and the presentation of the wampum. In visiting the Indian camp with other young men he was an interested on-looker at a ritual dance performed at Cannasteego's command. He describes official and unofficial dinners, the drinking of healths, the local female Jewish-German-Scotch-Irish dancers (none to his taste), the examination of the offered purchase goods of Virginia and Maryland by the Indians (who complained of their quality), and—perhaps most valuable—the actual physical appearance of the leading sachems. Throughout, he notes Weiser's cautions as to behavior or suggestions as to strategy.

Marshe's account is thus background material such as we have for no other treaty conference. But it is the treaty and the conference which most interest us, for its political is matched by its artistic significance. The remarkable *dramatis personae* mentioned above, an adept employment of all the rituals of previous Indian treaties, unusually effective oratory on both sides, some adroit humor intentional and unintentional (as in the Indians' request to cut off Weiser's beard because it frightened their children, and the governor's reply), are among its literary or dramatic qualities. It was not a debate, but a series of set speeches interwoven with movement and tableaux. The Virginia text begins with a preface quoting Weiser on the character and history of the Six Nations, with some additional material on Indian religion and government, which traces the story of Pennsylvania's previous dealings with these people and emphasizes the integrity of the interpreter and the confidence placed in him in the present dangerous situation. This preface and certain textual interpolations not in the Pennsylvania text show that this version was clearly intended for Chesapeake Bay reading. It may have been written, as just observed, by any combination of Thomas Lee, Black, and Marshe, or perhaps two of them. An appendix to the Virginia text defines the north-south road from the Six Nations to the Valley of Virginia and gives an outline of the pass or passport to be used by the red men of regulations regarding the honoring of property, along with a few other specifically Virginia documents or problems regarding the new road to the Catawbias. The Williamsburg text also contains tidbits of the Indians' asking for and obtaining wine and punch under any and every excuse. The speeches of the governor, commissioners, and chiefs is substantially the same in both texts. The two vary in noting the "Yoh-hah" or usual cry of approbation, probably the result of a copyist's whim, for there is no consistency in either text.

The quality of the oratory is high, even in an age of effective rhetoric. First Governor Thomas employs the conventional metaphor of council fire almost burnt out and chain of friendship now rusted, belts of wampum, and warnings to the Indians that they must expedite affairs (they did not). The same afternoon Canasateego replied for the Six Nations, and a message

from the governor of Maryland was read. After further verbal skirmishing, they got down to business. Maryland based its claim to certain territories on a treaty with the Susquehannahs dating back more than a hundred years and another of seventy years before in which the Six Nations had participated. Canasatego's reply is characteristic of Indian rhetoric and directly concerned with theory of land ownership:

Yesterday you went back to the old Times, and told us you had been in Possession of the Province of Maryland above One Hundred Years; but what is a Hundred Years, in Comparison of the Length of Time since our Claim began? Since we came out of the Ground? For we must tell you, that long before a Hundred Years, our Ancestors came out of this very Ground, and their Children have remained here ever since.

You came out of the Ground in a Country that lies beyond the Seas; there you may have a just Claim, but here you must allow us to be your elder Brethren, and the Lands to belong to us long before you knew any Thing of them.

In referring to the English who declare the red men would have perished but for European goods, Canasatego denies the truth of what they say: "We had then Room enough, and Plenty of Deer. . . we had Knives of Stone, and Hatchets of Stone, and Bows and Arrows, and these serv'd our Uses, as well then, as the English ones do now." The speech goes on, of ships anchored to mountains and chains of silver. And the austere Canasatego displays a sly, dry humor when he chooses, as in explaining Weiser's double affiliation, or why the English should supply rum to the red man.²⁰³

A day or so later the Virginia commissioners spoke, mentioning their treaties of at least 160 years and asking what red people of Virginia the Six Nations had conquered and how long ago it was. Tachanoontia spoke for the Indians the same afternoon, declaring everything west of certain marks was and had been theirs by right of conquest, though they more or less conceded to the Virginians rights to the Great Valley. They emphasized the mountains as the true boundaries, and they fought verbally for their road south through the western border of the oldest province.

The next day the Maryland-Indian semiprivate colloquy occurred. The Virginia text, printed with Marshe's name in large letters at the head of it shows the two groups to have been occupied with chains, roads south, grumbling about trade goods, Indian references to the Creator's originally putting the ocean between the white and red peoples, and a review of Cherokee-Catawba relations with the Six Nations. Repeatedly emphasized, as in John Smith's time, was the unjust white appropriation of Indian lands. That afternoon the three colonial governments entertained officially, drinking healths, and the Indians bestowed upon the governor of Maryland the name *Tocarry-hogan* (denoting Precedency, Excellency, and Living in the

Middle, or Honourable Place, between Brothers *Assaroquoa* [Assagiroa] and *Onas* [governors of Virginia and Pennsylvania]). On July 2 the Six Nations signed a treaty or deed of release of their claim to some land in Maryland and on the same day agreed to certain Virginia land claims. They took trade goods in exchange and rum for the journey home, and some gold as actual payment. The red men, resigned to the loss of land, did squeeze out some addition to the agreed-upon compensation from the Chesapeake governments. A deed was produced, signed, marked, and sealed, and delivered by Canasatego to the commissioners of Virginia, for the King, a ceremony concluded with three shouts. After a few further acts of conclusion the Virginians did an unusual thing, perhaps reminiscent of Spotswood. Calling to the attention of the Indians the obvious fact that Conrad Weiser was getting old and would not always be available to reconcile white-red differences, the commissioners invited the Six Nations to send "three or four of your Boys to *Virginia*, where we have a fine House for them to live in, and a Man on purpose to teach the children of you, our Friends, the Religion, Language, and Customs of the white People." They promised the children would be well cared for. The Indians later declined with thanks, with the suggestion that *Tarauchia Waggon* had many more years and not for some time did they need to search for his successor. One amusing symbolic by-play was giving the Indians rum in small glasses deliberately, calling them French glasses. Then when the Indians complained, they were supplied with drink in somewhat larger receptacles, called English glasses. Canasatego departed resplendent in a scarlet Camblet coat presented by Virginia, while a fellow-chief left wearing a broad gold-laced hat from Maryland, each also having been given the first road passes through the western part of the Chesapeake colonies.

Despite the land confirmations, it was the Iroquois alliance which made this treaty at Lancaster historically important. However supercilious and unskilled in Indian diplomacy the complacent Weiser and other Pennsylvanians made them out to be, the Chesapeake representatives managed to get results, clearly as much because of the outright payments and historical reminders of past promises as from the maneuvering of the great Weiser. In this sophisticated example of forest diplomacy one sees white ideas expressed in an English colored and shaped by Indian rhetoric. This is a remarkable historical chronicle play, product of conflict and reconciliation of two cultures, one of the best examples of a dramatic art form uniquely American.²⁰⁴ In it, and in others later in the southern area, southern colonists had a principal part.

In 1751 the Catawbans of the Carolinas, who had been mentioned occasionally in the 1744 Lancaster treaty, were persuaded by Governor Glen of South Carolina to attend a conference at Albany in New York. Unfortu-

nately Franklin did not print this treaty or the conference minutes, though Weiser, who was present, left some vivid details of it in his journal. And in the South Carolina Archives, recently published, is the record of the negotiations beginning July 6. To compare with the old Pennsylvania German's version is that of the more urbane, perhaps equally perceptive Commissioner William Bull of Charleston. The Catawbas were quite apprehensive in meeting their hereditary enemies on the latter's home ground, as both Bull and Weiser attest. Bull reported the Catawbas fear that they might be compelled to dance the Death Dance instead of some ceremonial of peace, and Weiser reported the Catawba king's fears for the safety of his party. As usual Weiser gave advice freely, telling Bull he thought the Catawba chief "a little to Haughty in his mind," an attitude that might cause trouble. In genuine compliment Weiser did admit that Bull seemed a man well versed in Indian affairs. Gradually the conference got under way, with Governor Clinton of New York as presiding host.

All the extant documents indicate that this too was a dramatic event. It began with the elaborate Indian ceremony of condolences, in which the Six Nations gave skins and wampum to the governor "to dry up tears and cheer the heart" after the recent death of the Prince of Wales. Weiser, Aaron Stevens, and later Captain Callick, probably an Indian, did much of the interpreting, though Matthew Toole was the interpreter accompanying the Catawbas. The timid Catawba chief could not struggle through his speech, though Weiser managed to convey its purport to the Six Nations (especially the Mohawks), who were pleased with it. The Iroquois, though at first disturbed by Callick's interpretation of Bull's speech, seem to have been satisfied with Weiser's explanation of it. Individual scenes were quite dramatic, as when the Catawbas, under instruction, filed into the Council Chamber with their feathers horizontal instead of erect, and singing as soon as they entered the door. Their two choral leaders faced the central group of old sachems, shaking the musical "Calabashes" as they sang. The peace pipe went round, and feathers were fastened to a pole.

Peace was what the Catawbas and their southern sponsors wanted, and for various reasons first the Mohawks and then the others responded cordially. Speeches were translated paragraph by paragraph and carefully attested, wampum in strings and belts was laid down at the usual intervals, the tree of peace was planted, and the hatchet was buried. An exchange of prisoners was agreed upon, and New York and South Carolina bestowed the usual gifts. Bull's report includes stipulations for a follow-up conference the next year. Though Bull ends his epistolary report to his governor optimistically, Weiser's biographer, Wallace, considers the conference "another Clinton [of New York] fizzle" in which only Sir William Johnson, the Indian agent, profited, but this is a prejudiced judgment. There is plenty of

evidence that Weiser was not universally trusted or listened to, and perhaps Clinton and certainly Johnson were not his admirers. The negotiation did not have the significance of the Lancaster agreement of 1744, for fewer tribes and only incidental boundary and land matters were involved. But the Indian chief Hendrick's addresses, Bull and Weiser as leading figures, together with the dark comedy of the Catawba fear of their ancient foes, must have made it almost as spectacular as the drama of seven years before.²⁰⁵

Meanwhile both Virginia and South Carolina were having their troubles with the Cherokees. In the spring of 1751 Cherokee-Carolina relations broke down through Indian murder of a trader, traders' abuse of Indians including use of false weights and measures, and the eternal steady encroachment on Indian lands. In that year there was a Charleston conference at which 160 Cherokees were present and heard a stern lecture from Governor Glen and speeches by the Raven of Hywassee, the Slave-Catcher of Tellico, and other chiefs noted above. On November 26 a four-point stop-gap treaty was signed. In Virginia in August 1751 a treaty was drawn up under circumstances reminiscent of those in Pennsylvania and New York. In 1753 Glen and the Creeks drew up agreements, with Malatchi as principal speaker. The oratory of this last conference at least equals that of the northern negotiations. It and a later 1755 Carolina-Cherokee treaty were printed not only in South Carolina and Pennsylvania and other American provinces, but in the *Gentleman's Magazine* and Hewatt's almost contemporary history.²⁰⁶ In 1751 at Williamsburg in Virginia an impressive delegation of Cherokee kings with eight headmen and ninety attendants arrived from the Emperor of Choto to negotiate a "Treaty of Peace and Commerce." Acting Governor and Council President Lewis Burwell made the appropriate replies to Indian speeches, heard the song of peace, and smoked with his visitors the pipe of peace. Belts, trade gifts, and dancing about a large fire were official or incidental to both Carolina and Virginia visits.²⁰⁷

As the hostilities between French and British accelerated, there were more and more British-Indian conferences and treaties. In 1752 the Virginia government and the Ohio Company of Virginia, the great land corporation vitally interested in the northwest, met the Ohio Indians (presumably but not surely or legally including the Six Nations) in an attempt to secure a renewal of the Lancaster treaty so that the Ohio Company could bring settlers into the basin after winning cooperation of the Indians against the French. Virginia's able commissioners Joshua Fry and James Patton, with Christopher Gist as Ohio Company representative and Andrew Montour as interpreter, met with the red men for two weeks. The Indians accepted all the gifts but showed no enthusiasm for Ohio Valley settlers. They did agree to a fort at the forks of the Ohio and to establishing of English settle-

ments south and east of the river. George Croghan acted for Pennsylvania, and the Half King, a Seneca chief, made a series of speeches. Several follow-up conferences were only partially successful, including a second gathering at Logg's Town in 1754.²⁰⁸

In June of that year, at Albany, Maryland joined Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania in another treaty meeting with the Six Nations. Weiser was interpreter, and the governors of Massachusetts and New York gave the welcome. The usual rituals and gifts were observed or bestowed. Besides its having been an attempt to placate the Indians for land stealing and other abuses, this conference was remembered because Benjamin Franklin's plan of a union for the colonies was there proposed. Weiser again seems to have been the soul and sinews of the conference, writing speeches, interpreting, advising both sides. The signed resulting deed caused an empire to pass into the hands of Brother Onas (Pennsylvania) for £400 cash and £400 more when the trans-Appalachian lands should be settled. Four years later Pennsylvania gave back the lands, over the protests of Weiser. As for active southern participation, there is no evidence.

Most southern treaty conferences of the next few years were in the Carolinas and Georgia. The above-mentioned treaty of August 29, 1754, at Salisbury in North Carolina at the house of Matthew Toole, with King Haigler present, was marked by some good oratory, as was that of May 26, 1756, near the same spot with King Haigler of the Catawbas again present. Giles and Toole acted as interpreters at the latter, and Chief Justice Henley of North Carolina as presiding officer. The Catawbas for the time being managed to evade sending fighting men against the French in Virginia.²⁰⁹ More elaborate, and printed separately, was the Virginia and Catawba-Cherokee treaty of February and March 1756. Almost the sole object of the conference was to secure aid from the strong tribes against the French. Governor Dinwiddie sent addresses and gifts but could not attend himself.

Dinwiddie's message to the two nations points to the Six Nations' alliance with the English and his own hopes of brightening the chain of friendship between the English and these red men. The general form of this document is much that of the Lancaster 1744 conference, with the usual Yo-hahs, wampum, and metaphors. The "Treaty," as it was called, was signed on February 21.²¹⁰ A few days later at Broad River the same commissioners (Peter Randolph and William Byrd III), with three new interpreters, met Cherokee sachems and warriors and asked for Indian boys for the school at the College of William and Mary. There is much detail, some dramatic incident and scene, but no humor, for these were not the times for such display.²¹¹

Mentioned above is the 1757 letter of Lieutenant Wall of South Carolina concerning his negotiations in several Cherokee towns. That these negotiations conformed to treaty ritual is evident: "Nothing but the greatest Order, Decorum and Attention was observed, the Headmen giving their usual Word of Assent and Approbation in every sentence." After the usual giving of presents and much more talk, Wall found that what he had got was a definite promise from the Cherokees that they would at once "confirm a strong and lasting Peace" with the Creeks.²¹² The description of the peace dance is the most interesting part of the long letter. In 1760 further Carolina negotiations were noted and speeches excerpted in various newspapers.²¹³

It is peculiarly appropriate that the last great treaty of the southern pre-Revolutionary era should have occurred the year the colonial period proper concludes and that it was a real congress attended by four southern governors and by representatives of most of the independent or semi-independent red nations. The year 1763 was thus significant not only in general American history but also in the story of southern red-white relations. The conference was appropriately held in Augusta, Georgia, with the governors of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia on one side and headmen of the Chickasaws, Choctaws, Creeks, Cherokees, and Catawbas on the other. Fifty copies of the *Journal of the Congress of the Four Southern Governors and the Superintendent of that District with the Five Nations, at Augusta, 1763*, were printed in Charleston.²¹⁴ The great wilderness diplomat John Stuart was the Indian superintendent, and there was a staff of six interpreters. Over 800 Indians were present. The congress, opened formally on November 5, moved so rapidly that the treaty was signed on November 10. Everyone had complaints or suggestions, frequently about the problems of red reservation boundaries brought on by the accelerating pace of white encroachment west of the mountains from Virginia to Georgia. The signed articles "guaranteed" that whites be secure, that Indians be forgiven past offenses, that red and white were to live together as one people, that the traders were to be protected and murderers ferreted out, and that boundaries would be defined. Though some definite boundary lines for Georgia were drawn, the wording of the agreement was generally vague or permissive or ambiguous enough to cause hordes of whites from the upper South to pour into trans-Appalachian territory because they no longer feared Indian reprisals. Though the red sympathizers among the whites looked upon the agreement as a temporary stopgap of encroachment, the Indians were not deceived. They knew the all-devouring monster of English land rapacity was advancing steadily across their hunting grounds. And the road to the northwest was open.

So much for the historical importance of the Augusta meeting. As

dramatic art the 1763 treaty negotiation has real merit and continues the ritualistic tradition noted especially among the Six Nations. Yet despite able speeches, choral cries of approbation, unusually fine presents, and an unusually eminent assembly of notables, this treaty remains much more historically than artistically significant. A great man Stuart certainly was, but he was not a poetic Conrad Weiser, and Stuart seems to have managed the show. If dramatic effect had been accounted a genuine asset in the production, the Virginia governor, Fauquier, learned and urbane and musical and by then experienced in Indian affairs, might have been employed. He may have played a speaking part, but there is no evidence that he was an impresario. Nevertheless, the Augusta conference was a good show. The past had prepared the way for it, and it pointed toward the future, for good or bad.²¹⁵

Throughout the period of the treaties, from those of New York in the 1740s and before to the Augusta, the literature that records them makes obvious the fact that the southern white was still trying to educate and convert the Indian. In the treaties, as in the paintings of John White or in native music and dancing or in the speeches of Powhatan or of Catawba or Cherokee chiefs, he continued to see the red man in artistic terms, as subject for or element of art. The southern white also showed his interest in aboriginal religion, medicine, government, and almost every aspect of daily life. He coveted the Indian's land and sometimes his furs, but there is little real evidence even after 1750 that he consciously or deliberately intended to destroy him. Thoughtful men like Hariot or Adair and dozens of others, including the keen Robert Beverley and the urbane Byrd, saw in the red man much to consider and some things to imitate or borrow. And these were men who had come into close contact with the Indian, not far-off visionaries who romanticized at a distance. The Indian was throughout the colonial period more directly a part of life throughout the South than he was in the northeast, and perhaps even more than in the middle colonies. His was a familiar face from Annapolis to Savannah in the Tidewater capitals throughout the period, though his permanent abode may have been more distant. The southern colonial took him to London or entertained him as he journeyed past the frontiersman's cabin or the lowland planter's Georgian mansion. Occasionally he was a servant or an apprentice and at one period even a slave in a southern household. His total impression on the southern mind and way of life has not yet been fully measured.

CHAPTER THREE

Formal Education,
Institutional and Individual

CONTENTS

Introduction	259
European Backgrounds and First American Objectives	269
The Schools: Their Foundation, Curriculum, and Teachers	274
The Free, Grammar, and Charity Schools	276
Private, Parish, Old Field, and Tutorial Schools	299
Apprenticeship Training for the Crafts, Trades, and Professions	313
The Negro and the Indian Schools	320
The Teacher	327
The Southern Interest in Colleges and Universities	330
Virginia: Henrico, the Act of 1660, and the College of William and Mary	331
Maryland, South Carolina, and Georgia	349
Education Abroad, General and Professional	352
Schools	354
Universities and the Liberal Arts	359
Medical Training	362
The Inns of Court	366
Theories and Philosophies of Education	371
Lay and Clerical Expressions of the Seventeenth Century	373
Lay Expressions in the Eighteenth Century	375
The Eighteenth-Century Clergymen's Ideas	378
Bibliography	453
Notes	464

~ ~ ~ To this purpose God having ordained schooles of learning to be a principal meanes to reduce a barbarous people to civilitie, and thereby to prepare them the better to receive the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ; as also for the breeding and nourishing of such a holie Ministerie, with a wise and godlie Magistracie, and people to be perpetuallie preserved . . . gaining the verie savage among them, whether *Irish* or *Indian* . . .

a most speedie and sure foundation, may be layd for all future good learning, in their [Virginia] schooles, without any difference at all from our courses received here at home; and whereby both Maisters and Scholars, may proceed speedily, and cheerefully. . .

for the conversion of the heathen, and training them up in good learning, and the feare of the Lord . . . especially for drawing the poore natives in *Virginia* . . . from Sathan to God.

—JOHN BRINSLEY, *A Consolation for Our Grammar Schooles*, "Dedication" (1622)

~ ~ ~ As for education several [young colonists] are sent to England. . . . But indeed when they come to England, they are generally put to learn to persons that know little of their temper, who keep them drudging on in what is of least use to them, in pedantick methods, too tedious for their volatile genius.

—HUGH JONES, *The Present State of Virginia* [1724], ed. Morton

~ ~ ~ For, Sir, tho' the Knowledge of these ancient Tongues be valuable; may it not be bought too dear? . . .

For, in this, as in many other Cases, an Alteration of

Circumstances warrants, nay requires, an alteration of Conduct. And it is evident, since that Time, there have been very remarkable Changes & Revolutions in the Republic of Letters. . . .

—JAMES MAURY to ROBERT JACKSON, July 1762, in Bullock, ed. "A Dissertation on Education . . .," in *Papers of the Albemarle County Historical Society*

MUCH OR MOST of what is said in other chapters of this book refers to the education in its broader sense—that of the so-called revisionists of our time—of the southern colonist. But the properly proportioned picture of this southern colonist's mind must include a focus in at least one place on formal education in the generally accepted sense of the term. One can agree partially with Richard Hofstadter, Bernard Bailyn, and Lawrence A. Cremin, and even with such disciples of the last as Douglas Sloan and John Calam, in their definitions of the history of education and still be convinced that essential to any comprehension of the mind of the colonial South is a direct consideration of schools and colleges and schoolmasters and curricula, of the legislative measures formulating or controlling them, and of explicit and implicit group and individual philosophies regarding the nature and function of formal education, with something of their ancient and contemporary backgrounds.

Because every man has a right, within bounds, to his own terms, perfectly legitimate are Bailyn's insistence that one must consider education as "the entire process by which a culture transmits itself across the generations," and Cremin's that it must be viewed as "the deliberate, systematic, and sustained effort to evoke knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, and sensibilities," and that his own history of education considers all "agencies, formal and informal, [which] have shaped American thought." One merely observes that philosophically and etymologically their definitions have always been accepted, and indeed employed by some scholars for centuries, but that these definitions of educational history closely approximate what has generally more recently been called intellectual and cultural history, the latter terms for most of us being the clearer because of the limitations usually imposed on the meanings of *education* and the *history of education*. Owing much to Edward Eggleston's *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century* (1901), Cremin and Bailyn have exemplified their theories brilliantly in comprehensive studies based on enormous research and erudition, but their followers have shown in other writings the essential weaknesses of the revisionist concepts when applied in many situations.¹ But this is not the place for debate. One can only suggest that evol-

ing southern promotion literature and history and the progressing relationships with the red man traced in the two preceding chapters, together with the later chapters on libraries and reading, fine arts and belles lettres, religion, science-technology and law-politics-economics exemplify facets of education in the broadest sense. And indeed the present chapter, in its representation of European origins and influences and the social and political relationships of formal education, will be describing colonial institutionalized training in a context by no means wholly or narrowly American or pedagogical.

The beginnings of southern colonial education lie in the formal training the first venturers brought with them as well as the general lore of the medieval-Renaissance Europe from which they came. In Virginia or South Carolina or the later Georgia they were as direct heirs of all the centuries of the Old World as were their New England contemporaries. One must agree with Eggleston on many counts, among them the observation that one cannot assert that the congenial environment from which sprang the eighteenth-century Virginians who led in the Revolution has any traceable relationship to the presence of a considerable body of university-educated men at Jamestown any more than one can assert that the literary flowering of New England in the nineteenth century was produced by the great number of Cambridge-educated men in the Massachusetts Bay's first settlements. One continues to agree with Eggleston that the university ideals of the time did influence directly the course of thought in the new provinces, that the fact remained that logic (including disputation) was an essential element of all New as well as Old World university and upper secondary school curricula as a means of acquiring truth, and that the verbal sword-play thus mastered was employed in sermon and legislative argument or social conversation down to and through the first periods of our national life.² Furthermore, in the South, where from the mid-seventeenth century sons of the colonists were inured to the scholastic tradition in British schools and universities or by British-educated clerical or lay teachers in their home provinces, almost every facet of social, political, or intellectual life was influenced directly by this tradition from the mother country of the majority of settlers. One also must add that certain elements profoundly affected the direction and the matter of southern colonial formal education: Filmer and Locke and Newton; the changing complexions of the Church of England including its educational missionary endeavors; evolutionary processes in pedagogy and curriculum in British schools of every type; and new religious dissenting sects and racial entities.

Every twentieth-century scholar who has examined the evidence points out two omnipresent qualities or characteristics of formal education in the colonies below the Susquehannah. There was from the beginning a *persis-*

tent desire for schools and colleges, suggested by legislative acts in every colony, petitions and proposals of organizations and individuals, and bequests and donations designed to found or further. And there was concomitantly from the beginning the religious element, expressed in a dozen ways: it was part of the avowed original purpose of settlement—a means of converting the heathen; it was cited in bequests and legislative proposals as a major reason for building or aiding a school; it was of itself an institution—through the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, and Dr. Bray's Associates—a founder of schools (especially for the poor and for Negroes and Indians), a supplier of teachers, and a builder and disseminator of libraries. Incidentally, all three of the organizations just mentioned grew from the efforts of the zealous Dr. Thomas Bray, for a time the Bishop of London's commissary in Maryland. The societies originated in his plans for that and other colonies, and to some extent they were shaped by his experiences in the Chesapeake region. Though in certain colonies growing secularization of education is evident, especially in the eighteenth century to the very threshold of the Revolution, somewhat paradoxically, all institutions in any way resembling today's public schools are strongly tinged with religion or religious influences, while some of the strictly private schools, even when conducted by clergymen, seem relatively secular, though in both cases it may have been a matter of emphasis.

A primary official object of colonization explicitly stated in charters from those of the Virginia Company (and Raleigh's earlier) to those granted the Trustees of Georgia more than a century later was the conversion of the heathen. This was to be accomplished, all admitted, through education, first of all through developing an ability to read and write the English language. Directions from the Virginia Company of London for a decade reminded the colonists of this objective, as did other British home-based controlling bodies later. In Virginia, including the earlier Roanoke Island settlement, first efforts were at best makeshift, at worst fumbling. Indians from the Carolina coast had been taken to England to learn English, and on their return at least one was baptized. If those who administered the sacrament adhered to later practice, they made sure the christened aborigine could read something of the Bible, Prayer Book, and Ten Commandments, and perhaps be able to write. The Jamestown people also sent a few Indians to London; but, for purposes of improving communication (and clearly with the hope of later conversion), they sent two English boys and one or more indentured servants to live with the natives and thus learn their language and ways. Also during the first decade they persuaded certain chiefs to send children or young men to live in white families with the stipulated primary purpose of familiarizing them with

Christianity, accomplished if at all by some patient teaching. Whatever the general effect of this policy, in a particular case it had spectacular and gratifying results, for one such Anglo-domesticated red man warned the settlers of the impending 1622 massacre, a warning without which the colony might have been completely wiped out.

As already suggested, there was an impressive number of men among the Virginia Company settlers (that is, before 1624) who were for their time very well educated indeed. Despite glaring gaps in the records of many major and even more minor British schools and university colleges of the last decades of Elizabeth and the early years of the Stuarts, there survives impressive evidence of formal schooling among even the first generation of John Smith's time. Undoubtedly those disproportionately long lists of gentlemen (as compared with artisans and farmers and laborers) among the first venturers and "supplies"³ include scores of names of educated men other than those actually identified with particular educational institutions, though where and when they received formal training will probably never be known. Certainly the average "gentleman" had attended at least a grammar school or its equivalent. If he were a younger son or brother, as perhaps most of these colonists were, he was more likely to have had his parent or guardian insist on education than if he were to have inherited title, fortune, or estate; for he would have needed the training to sustain himself in the world. Putting it another way, probably almost every colonist who wrote "Gent." or "Gentleman" after his name was at least relatively as well educated as the young people of today who have had a year or two of college, though the intellectual attainments of the seventeenth and twentieth centuries have little in common. The earliest southern colonists, many even below the social order of gentry, could express themselves forcefully and colorfully in oral argument or written epistle, as the extant records bear witness. Though we know almost nothing of Captain John Smith's personal formal education, a good guess is that he attended an average Yorkshire grammar school, and in that county the average was very good indeed. He was a "new gentleman" who had risen from the yeomanry and received a coat of arms from a foreign prince for military service. At any rate, he handled classical languages with relative ease in reference and quotation, he understood and could make himself understood in a number of modern European languages, and his writing offers evidence that through his basic linguistic training he could formulate or record more or less phonetically an American Algonkian vocabulary. His work is vigorous, with a sense of style and of the picturesque, and with a strong feeling for and of history. Especially does he show a knowledge of scholastic disputation, the backbone of every school curriculum, and it is within its tradition that he is a cogent debater, a persuasive advocate, and a vehement protestor. Although

his experiences in the world certainly must have developed his abilities as writer and thinker, the sensitive linguist and forceful chronicler shows himself a product of the scholastic curriculum bequeathed by the medieval to the Renaissance educational program or methodology.⁴ Among the early colonists who probably had the sort of basic pedagogical training he had were his named collaborators in *A Map of Virginia* and the *Generall Historie*.

In the first three or four years of the colony from one-fourth to two-thirds of the colonists on incoming ships were listed as gentlemen. In the next forty years, despite strenuous efforts to change the proportion in favor of laborer or artisan, a steady stream of sons of the upper-middle or upper classes poured into Virginia. Maryland in its first years seems to have had much the same experience, saving that the majority of clergy-teachers among the gentry, and an influential element among the educated, were for a few decades Roman Catholic priests. The extant records indicate that by 1646 Virginia had attracted at least twenty-eight university-educated Church of England clergy, including able and forceful preacher-missionary-men such as Cambridge-bred Alexander Whitaker.⁵ Among physicians were two "doctors of physick" of British and/or continental universities such as Leyden and an M.A. physician from an English university. Among Jamestown officials were George Percy (Cambridge and the Middle Temple), William Strachey (Cambridge and Gray's Inn), Ralph Hamor (Oxford and the Inner Temple), Pierre Erondelle or Peter Arundel (French-educated scholar and linguist), and Gabriel Archer (Gray's Inn). On the Council 1621-1626, at the time when the Company was dissolving and Virginia becoming a royal colony, Governor Sir Francis Wyatt had attended Gray's Inn; Treasurer George Sandys, both Oxford and the Middle Temple; Secretary Christopher Davison, Gray's Inn, Secretary John Pory both universities; and Samuel Maycocke, Cambridge. Charming or trenchant or learned as writers were others with considerable education, from Edward Maria Wingfield to George Thorpe and John Rolfe. These, many of whom were among that first legislative General Assembly of 1619, joined with other representatives then and there to include among their first enactments ("instructions" from England turned into colonial laws) statutes regarding the education of "the natives children," with mention of "the Colledge intended for them" and a petition that the Company send over workmen of all sorts "towards the erecting of the University and College."⁶ Of this educational project more below. But what must be emphasized is the abundant surviving proof, both in Old World institutional records and by the erudition and craftsmanship employed in many forms of writing (and soon after in recorded oral presentation in legislative journals), of the very considerable body of educated men in Virginia from the very first

landing at Jamestown. During the whole of the seventeenth century in the Chesapeake Bay colonies there were scores, almost surely hundreds, of university-educated men, and more well trained in good secondary schools, who sometimes deliberately and sometimes inadvertently created an atmosphere in which, despite immense obstacles, there would be real attempts at organized and institutional education. For these men had their own British or continental training always in mind to a degree their New England neighbors after the founding of Harvard did not. Upper-South programs in education never achieved the success of similar programs in New England; yet the evidence seems to indicate that at least in the seventeenth century there were as many literate individuals in Virginia and Maryland as in rural England, or even New England. Various aspects of the European heritage in formal education will be considered as the development of formal training in and of southern colonials is traced. Here is emphasized primarily that those who had a say, and a stake, in government—and that included every freeholder—gave at least lip-allegiance to education for all who could absorb it, though in practice they supported *directly* training for the poor, the Indian, and the comfortably situated.

Thus in the seventeenth-century the colonies of the upper South included a large number of people who were as convinced of the value of formal education as they were accustomed to it. These colonies in turn influenced in institutional organizations the two Carolinas just beginning to show social consciousness in the last decades of the period. Most obvious was the influential presence of sons of Oxford and Cambridge, trained in a curriculum just emerging from the medieval, with emphasis on the classics and kindred scholastic disputation, mathematics and astronomy, and a new and avid interest in the natural world of plants and animals about them. And these interests were in most cases most obvious in those who came as clergymen. Throughout southern colonial history, for example, many of its major scientists were in holy orders. But some of the physicians had attended the same universities as the clergy before being apprenticed to surgeons or physicians in Great Britain, or had attended famous continental medical schools such as Leyden or Utrecht. Perhaps even more than the curious clergy, these men were fascinated by new plants, for they saw them as useful as well as exotic. And with or without previous experience in the two English universities, many had attended the great London legal training centers, the Inns of Court, which were schools of manners and general erudition as well as of jurisprudence. In Virginia's first generation, probably not a single alumnus of these professional schools was a lawyer by occupation. Sir Francis Wyatt and George Sandys certainly were not, nor were the clergy trained at the Inns. For government service, especially as administrative officials, the Inns were useful training grounds in civil law,

diplomacy, and social consciousness. For the next century and two-thirds Virginia and Maryland and South Carolina planters who sent their sons to these legal centers rarely expected the young men to become barristers. Though several such as William Byrd II were admitted to the English bar, even those who thus "graduated" were preparing themselves primarily for places in colonial government, or perhaps more frequently attempting simply to learn enough law to defend their vast landholdings and acquire more. Later they found other uses for their legal grounding, including vindication of the rights of Englishmen.

Even in the seventeenth century the Scottish universities were represented in and shaped some of the thinking on education in Virginia. Aberdeen, for example, was the alma mater of the Reverend Patrick Copland, the chief mover for what was to have been the first secondary school if it had materialized, and chosen to be chief administrator of the academic side of the planned college at Henrico. At the other end of the century, Commissary James Blair, trained at Aberdeen and Edinburgh, was to show apparent Scottish influence on several organizational aspects of the first permanent southern institution of higher learning.

But it was surely the British secondary school which supplied the largest number of early colonists with their education and with a sense of need for it. Though the secondary cathedral schools were almost as old as Christianity in Britain, it was in the age of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I and James I that a great host of grammar or free schools were founded, endowed classical academies which might become Etons or Harrows and rival Westminster and Winchester in prestige or might be simply grammar schools such as those endowed by Archbishop Sandys at Hawkeshead in North Lancashire, by Archbishop Holgate at York, or by Elizabeth herself at Heath or at Wakefield. Such schools a Shakespeare or a John Smith, as just mentioned, might have attended. And such schools the sons of southern planters attended up to and during the American Revolution—if their families could afford them.

In the first half century it was not Americans, however, who attended these schools and brought that solid erudition and forensic training they were later to use against the mother country, but Englishmen who came to the South Atlantic region with a thorough grounding in the three R's together with a sense of grammar and language derived from study of the classics, and in many instances a sense of history, derived partially from reading in Latin and Greek and partially from direct study of the subject.⁷ It was these men as early legislators, or as justices of the peace or parish vestrymen, who were at first sporadically, and in the end persistently, to insist on similar training for their own children. And as in Britain, many were to endow schools so that a certain number of children of the poor

might attend them. Also, for some had undergone such training at home, they insisted that colonial orphans and other poor children who were apprenticed for a number of years should be taught to read and write and sometimes to cipher, with strong penalties against the master or guardian for neglect of the stipulated training.

Without these educated colonists, there would never have been the persistent proposals for the chartering of schools by individual colonies, for the cooperation with the clergy in parish schools, or for the support of old field or tutorial schools by groups of neighbors. The British government and the Church of England had similar programs in mind for the colonies, and often together or with provincial assistance organized schools and systems of education. As already suggested, in some respects the Church was the single strongest factor in southern formal education (it certainly was for the Indian), but the records show that in the Chesapeake colonies and to a considerable extent in at least South Carolina, local persons trained in Great Britain made bequests for schools and scholarships, organized lay sponsoring groups or societies, or encouraged legislative assemblies to found schools. "Better never be born than ill bred" was the statement of a Chesapeake planter who apparently never attended a university but had a good grammar school education and who was determined that his children, brought up on the frontier in Virginia, should have training at least equal to his. Two of them learned Greek and Latin near home under a clerical Huguenot schoolmaster who spoke to his pupils only in French, and later one of the boys went on to England to school. This planter-parent and others almost certainly began the instruction at home, either by themselves or by an indentured tutor, as will be discussed below. There were many forms of educational institutions in the southern colonies, probably most of them much alike in content but varying greatly in modes of presentation of subjects. For variety came not so much from purpose as from New World conditions. Variety was more often than not adaptation, an adaptation to new and changing conditions which began when the first transplanted Englishman decided he would educate his children and his neighbor's "family," black, white, and sometimes red.

The transit of institutions from the Old World was a transit "in motion and under stress."⁸ Thus while the southern colonial struggled to retain forms and methods he knew and for most of the period used British-printed textbooks, he found himself constantly altering and developing at least slightly different theories of purpose and structure from those of the educational process he had himself experienced in Europe. Oxford- and Cambridge-educated men and others who had attended British schools were as conscious, and insistent, as was William-and-Mary-bred James Maury

that education for the future leaders of America must be different from what it was in Britain. The varied philosophies of education expressed in colonial legislative enactments, provincial histories, newspaper essays, or epistolary communications range from conscious conservatism to fairly radical innovation. But all these discussions imply or acknowledge that here in the colonial South was a new breed of men who must assess for themselves the imported educational practices and decide how much they could and should use of them. For there are recorded philosophies of education in whole or in part throughout southern colonial history.

Because of the continuous though not pervasive influence of the Church of England and the continuing education of a considerable number of its sons (and some of its daughters) in Great Britain, in its educational system the South perhaps never got as far away from British principles and methods as did New England. Its evolving methodology probably reflected British pedagogical development as much as it did changes necessitated by a new society. Especially did it resemble in theory and practice what went on in *rural* England.

Though the New England schoolboy or Harvard or Yale student used most of the same texts perused by his southern counterpart, at all levels the schools and colleges came into being under widely differing circumstances and nature of settlement. The New England of thickly settled towns and townships controlled by a Puritan theocracy would naturally develop schools and systems differing considerably from those springing from a widely and even dangerously scattered rural population usually nominally under the Church of England, but even in overwhelmingly Anglican Virginia controlled more by secular elements, including royal governors and commissions of the peace and even lay non-Anglican vestries. Despite the apparently obvious advantages of the New England situation for the development of a universal public school system, recent authorities and statisticians have pointed out several times that for the first full century at least there was as great a proportion of literacy in the Chesapeake Bay colonies as in the Dominion of New England. Though by the time of the Revolution the Northeast had a public school system of sorts and the Southeast was not to have one for another generation or two, even at that late date, when the rapidly expanding southern frontiers were making it impossible to extend decent educational facilities far enough westward, somehow some members of the younger generation even along the border learned to read and write. And, as Louis B. Wright has shown in several places, from these areas came some highly cultivated or educated men.⁹

For the red man, as the preceding chapter has indicated and as will be shown further in the present chapter, formal education in the Southeast

was no more successful than it was in the Northeast or middle colonies, though in all three areas valiant if somewhat sporadic attempts were made to get conversion-education under way. For the black man's education, a problem barely recognized in the North until the formation of Dr. Bray's Associates in the earlier eighteenth century, some efforts were made by an occasional southerner, including influential clergy of the established church and dissenting ministers, before the end of the seventeenth century (and later, with the aid of Dr. Bray's Associates). This also was a missionary-inspired effort, not an attempt to improve intellectually or socially, and even it met with frequent and strenuous opposition, especially from the planters who owned the slaves. But the existence of red and black training, both in segregated and integrated form, is part of the colonial picture.

British or European education has been said to be a series of experiences determined for the individual by the clergy, the printer, and the teacher, in that order, or sometimes the family, the printer, and the teacher, in the same order. The influence of the printer, through books and libraries, is the subject of the next chapter. The clergy's role in education in the South has to some extent already been considered, and will be touched on later through the books mentioned. But here in the present chapter both clergy and family as influences and as teachers, and other sorts of teachers and their methods and facilities and the sources of the two latter, are to be considered. Other considerations grow naturally from them.

EUROPEAN BACKGROUNDS AND FIRST AMERICAN OBJECTIVES

The first four fleets bringing colonists to Jamestown contained very few families. Thus education within the household was not a real consideration in America until in Virginia and New England married couples and their children did begin to arrive in the 1620s. The young people among these early settlers, with the exception of the orphanage-reared children or some half-grown apprentices, had family backgrounds which in certain ways more or less prepared them for life in a civilized community. For often within the family circle they had been taught reading and writing and the simpler elements of Christianity and thus had been prepared for further self-instruction. The small bundles of books among the inventories of many southern settlers had their educational significance. Though relatively little has been written on the subject, there is sufficient evidence that the family in England in 1607 was a hierarchical social institution offering

at almost every social rank some formal training in oral and written communication and religion.¹⁰ At the yeoman and artisan level, the family—including attached apprentices—was an elementary school as well as a centralized religious and industrial training institution. At the level of the large-familied gentry, it was again concerned with religion and carried basic literacy on even into Latin and Greek. The children of the poor, if they became apprentices in a lower middle-class family (usually of artisans or tradesmen) also received instruction. Some gifted orphans (one suspects often of impoverished gentry but certainly not always of that origin) were given scholarships at endowed institutions, but most of them received like others of "the poor" their formal education in an "industrial" family which was still actually a single household. All this was according to injunction and statute at least from the time of Henry VIII. Obviously the family-circle school did not include certain elements of society—thus the patent illiteracy in rural England, for public institutions and laws also made no provisions for many kinds of children. In a New World society much more scattered than even that of rural England the illiteracy rate might be expected to have been greater. Actually in the Chesapeake colonies it seems to have been smaller, for reasons suggested below, and even late in the eighteenth century in frontier South Carolina the literacy rates seem to have run between eighty and ninety per cent among male white settlers.¹¹ And most of the learning of the border Carolinians had to come from within families.

Under Elizabeth and James education outside the home might have been in a dame school, a lower elementary-level institution with a woman teacher, principally concerned with inculcating the three R's in boys and a few girls who for some reason did not receive such instruction at home. But much more numerous, or at least far more frequent in the records, were the classically-oriented grammar or free or public or endowed secondary schools noted above, the Westminster and Etons and Winchester and Shrewsburies, the less famous but probably equally effective schools such as those in Yorkshire at Leeds or Heath or Beverley or Wakefield (and there were scores of others in other counties), and the somewhat inferior parish or community schools. Any or all of these may at various times have been called endowed grammar schools, or some of them, somewhat later, *public* (in the British sense) schools.¹² In general in England "free grammar school" may be interpreted as meaning a school open to all who wished to avail themselves of the education offered, or one subject to no other authority than its own board of governors, or one free from tuition fees. A free school might be open only to boys of a particular locality or from all over the kingdom, or to the sons of descendants of founders or benefactors. The designation did not necessarily preclude payment of other fees and fines

and occasional expenses as well as board and lodging. There were a number of free schools in the seventeenth century which because of substantial endowments were able to continue to offer exemption from tuition fees to all or to some scholars. They seem to have been originally intended for all social classes (but rarely for girls) though through affluence and instructional fame and social prestige several of them evolved into the "public schools" of today, until very recently intended only for the upper levels of society. During the colonial period a southern parent whose son was attending a now forgotten English secondary school sometimes decided the boy should go next to Eton or Westminster or Winchester, which clearly the parent considered the best of the British schools in which to prepare for a university.¹³ In the southern colonies, as will be shown, the terms "free school" and "grammar school" might be used even more loosely than in Great Britain. But on both sides of the Atlantic they stood for much the same things in curriculum, daily routine, and type of instruction. In other words, secondary schools developing in the American Southeast in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries shared generally with their British counterparts the qualities and forms of instruction already in use in Britain in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. To begin with, there were only a few significant alterations or adjustments.

"Free" may indicate something of the financial and social aspects of these schools, but "Grammar" gets at the heart of what they attempted to do and be. After the three R's attained before entrance or in a special lowest form of the school, the concentration was on Latin grammar, and perhaps a little Greek and Hebrew. With and through and alongside the grammar came scholastic disputation, which after the separation from the Church of Rome might be called by another name. And with it all came prayers, Bible and Prayer Book study, and catechizing.¹⁴

Textbooks of 1607 were in many respects, especially for Latin and its grammar, much like those of the next two centuries. Until late in the colonial period they were intended almost entirely for the use of the schoolmaster and for classroom recitation or exercise. Roger Ascham's *The Scholemaster* (1570), a treatise on method, William Lily's and Erasmus' grammars, and John Brinsley's *Ludus Literarius: or, The Grammar Schoole* (1612), and *A Consolation for Our Grammar Schooles*, the latter written with the Virginia colony especially in mind, together with dozens of adapted versions of Lily's popular book and a number of "accidences" (inflexional textbooks or manuals to be used as supplements to or in place of grammars) were in use from their dates of publication in almost every one of these free grammar schools, supplemented by manuals for mathematics and rhetoric in English. Ciphering or arithmetic was important, for many pupils might later have to keep their own or others' accounts. And guides

for letter writing and for handwriting were necessities often taken for granted. Geography, navigation, history, and occasionally a modern language were probably primarily taught orally, and even the reading in history might be done aloud at this level, for it was well into the eighteenth century before there were school libraries to be used by students.¹⁵ Though schoolboys seem to have known something of the contents of the courtesy books such as Richard Brathwaite's *The English Gentleman* (1630) or Henry Peacham's *The Compleat Gentleman* (1622) and perhaps Castiglione's *The Courtier*, they probably knew only excerpts until they read them in the university or as adults in their own personal libraries. Every book here mentioned, with many more, is to be found in southern colonial as well as British personal book lists. They, and eighteenth-century newspaper advertising, give us a fairly good idea of the curriculum outline for these schools.¹⁶ But very little is known about teaching methods beyond evidence that mnemonic devices, including rote memorizing, were much used, and that schoolmasters constantly were warned to pursue a middle course in discipline, without too much corporal punishment or too "licentious" freedom.

Perhaps for a study of colonial southern education the most important "school book" of the seventeenth century was that written to explain the English grammar school system to potential teachers in less privileged regions such as Ireland, Wales, and Virginia, all three of which are mentioned in the dedication. This was John Brinsley's *A Consolation for Our Grammar Schooles*, printed in London in 1622 and written by a man called the foremost schoolmaster of his age.¹⁷ Apparently Brinsley, a Puritan, had been asked at least by certain members of the Virginia Company to prepare a guide which might be useful in organizing both the Indian and the white secondary schools being planned for the colony. By January 1622 the book was submitted to a special committee of the stockholders for consideration.¹⁸ Though no recorded official action as to approval or adoption of the book survives, it remains enormously useful and interesting to any student of early Anglo-American education; for the author outlines succinctly and clearly the organization, aims, curriculum, pedagogical method, and other elements of down-to-earth grammar school education not only as he had seen it practiced for years, but as he believed it could be adapted for youths without the intellectual background most English boys brought with them. It is indebted to Ascham, Ireton, and other noted pedagogues of earlier or contemporary England, but Brinsley suggests modes of learning Latin, of practicing disputation, and mastering composition and rhetoric growing from his own teaching experience. He kept in mind a potential grammar school boy who might be the son of a Welsh mountaineer or Irish cottager or English colonist or Indian chief, a boy who would start

from scratch perhaps even with the alphabet and with ideas of the Christian religion but who might in the end be developed "so [as] to be fitted for divinity, law, or what other calling or faculty soever they shall be after employed in."¹⁹ In other words, Brinsley spells out for the inexperienced or less well-trained teacher—who perhaps he assumes will be the schoolmaster in the less-privileged lands, including rural areas of England itself—what will prepare a youth for the university and thus for a profession. He also gives in conclusion a list of goals and an annotated bibliography of current pedagogical printed aids for the would-be teacher. Except possibly in his insistence that the hard work of learning may appear insofar as possible to be "playing" (i.e., made pleasant), his approach and his material were orthodox. Through the grammar school the Christian religion and the classical and scholastic heritage might prepare the wild children of primitive lands to learn to practice a Calvinist form of piety and to know and enjoy the boundless knowledge opening to the Renaissance mind. Thus *A Consolation* was an anticipation of the American Dream and later American educational methods even as it explained painfully and carefully an Old World pedagogy. For Brinsley felt that through his methods the underprivileged might rise to equal the privileged, and he implies that children of all backgrounds, if taught with patience and understanding, may be genuinely educated. Every historian of English Renaissance and American colonial education has been impressed by Brinsley's book for its modest yet aggressive and logical encouragement to his less experienced professional colleagues, and because the book did in intent and perhaps in fact have a very considerable success in improving English rural education and in encouraging the establishment of the secondary school in the American colonies.²⁰ Its contents, its dedication, and its very existence indicate that the first southern colony planned to bring up its inhabitants in the orthodox erudition of the western world. It is as significant as the charters and instructions granted or ordered by James or Charles stipulating the means of Christian conversion as a document of British intent that Britain's American colonies through organized education should become a respectable extension of its form of civilization. Virginia and Maryland were to be more than mere trading posts or land bases for preying on Spanish commerce.

Education per se was an incidental result, not a major purpose, of English colonization. It was a necessary means to conversion of red man or underprivileged southern colonial white. But as soon as there were children, plans for training them came into practice. The anticipation of need for education had come from the London Company itself, when certain members through the quarterly court began early to make fairly specific proposals for the establishment of schools for red youths and white and to

make anonymous but relatively munificent gifts of books, money for scholarships, and sacramental equipment for the Indian school; when funds were raised for establishing a grammar school for the offspring of British settlers; and finally when in 1616 the King himself ordered his archbishops to undertake the collection of monies for the establishment of a college at Henrico, near the falls of the James River, for the instruction of infidels and of resident Europeans.²¹ Thus a combination of missionary zeal and conviction of the necessity of learning for colonists brought activity on behalf of schooling. By 1617/1618, a decade after the first Jamestown settlers landed, the first objectives in education seemed about to be realized.

THE SCHOOLS: THEIR FOUNDATION, CURRICULUM, AND TEACHERS

The first southern colonists a decade after the founding of Jamestown were then a well-educated or at least decently-educated community who had brought with them normal or orthodox ideas of formal instruction, especially of the secondary school sort of training a substantial number of them possessed. These earliest Virginians and the founders of the later southeastern colonies were pretty certain themselves what a school and a schoolmaster should be like, including daily routine and curriculum and the qualifications of the teacher. In the beginning, and in some respects for the remainder of the colonial period, however, the usual colonial laymen had theoretically little to do with what secondary education might be among them. For until 1624 the officials of the Virginia Company in London did the planning, secured the funds, and recruited the personnel necessary for schooling both white and red youth. And under the Crown or Proprietary in each colony, the Bishop of London and the missionary societies noted above supplied and licensed and often financed teachers and schools throughout the colonial era. Especially did all of officialdom emphasize the Christian-conversion element of their planned educational program.

But remote control has always resulted in a degree of local independence. In the southern colonies the conditions of living which those who had not been to America never understood, the dozens or scores of legacies or bequests from *within* the colonies for the founding of provincial schools, the gradually increasing secularization of all governmental colonial institutions, the strategy and adaptation employed in what in the end were unsuccessful attempts to educate the Indian in a European way—all these were among the elements which produced schools (there was never in the

South a *school system* in the modern or even colonial New England sense) which were at once heirs of the Anglo-European tradition and yet in several respects quite original institutions. In justice to all concerned, it should be pointed out that Church of England officials or missionary organizations in England did listen to advice and to protest from on-the-spot educators or colonial officers and often attempted to adapt their plans in accordance with the latter's advice or instructions. And it should also be pointed out that English sponsors or provincial benefactors never had or never supplied enough money to establish schools firmly or to proliferate them throughout the area. And then there is the major and glaring evidence, never fully or satisfactorily explained, that though individuals and groups of provincial legislators for a century and a half rather regularly introduced bills for founding or endowing schools through some form of taxation, only occasionally were these bills enacted into law, and even when they were, implementation seems often not to have carried through, or to have done so only partially. For example, a South Carolina act of 1710 established a school in Charleston, but not until the act was completely reenacted in 1712 were steps actually taken to build the school. The American legislator, even though he has a decent education himself, is still hesitant to fund this most important of all branches of government. Then as now the southern assemblyman was slow to introduce new taxes: though the consequent failure of reelection should he do so seems a vital element in his hesitancy now, there seems little evidence that the colonial representative feared his constituency—or had need to—as his political descendant does today.

Perhaps the last sentences may suggest a public or governmental school system. As already suggested, this there never was in the colonial South, save only in the sense that the established Church of England—by 1763 it was established in every southern colony—founded or sponsored or encouraged many schools, including those founded by individual bequest; that in various colonies and at various times it tried to develop a system of parish schools (never in every parish of any province); and that emigrant schoolmasters had to be examined by the Bishop of London before they embarked if they wished to obtain a license or by the governor if they were already present in the colony. Again, as elsewhere suggested, secularization in education grew as it did even in the forms of church government. Though Thomas Jefferson was not able to get his Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge made into law for many years after he first introduced it, and never lived to see it fully implemented save on the university level, the growing secularization before 1763 certainly helped to prepare the way for the programs of state and—theoretically—universal education in the South long before it came

in Great Britain. Of course the New England theocracy, which had combined Church and State, had long before laid foundations for a system of public instruction not so much on different lines as from different backgrounds and philosophies.

Several types of secondary schools developed in the South, all of them except those for Negroes and Indians owing something to educational institutions of Great Britain. But old field schools, some evening schools, and a few others, with roughly parallel counterparts in the mother country, appear to have sprung really from peculiarly New World conditions. First should be considered the most prevalent and perhaps the most widely known sorts of institutions, all originally based on private or organizational endowments and all theoretically free of tuition and even board and lodging for certain pupils.

THE FREE, GRAMMAR, AND CHARITY SCHOOLS

Southern education thus began in the religious and political purposes of Company and then Crown. The articles and instructions accompanying the First Virginia Charter of 1606 granted by the King to the Company directed that all "good meanes [be used] to draw the salvages . . . to the true service of knowledge of God," and those to Sir Thomas Gates in 1609 ordered him to procure a number of Indian children and bring them up in his "language and manners," a direction repeated to Lord de la Warr in 1609/1610.²² In 1612 the *New Life of Virginea* (London) went into more detail as to how red children were to be taught and treated.²³ In 1616 when he returned to England, Dale took with him Pocahontas and her husband, a red counselor, as has been stated, and several Indian youths, presumably to be educated. In 1615/1616, in a letter to the archbishops of the realm, James I pointed out that the Virginia Company was planning churches and schools for the Indians which it had no revenues for financing, and that the prelates were authorized to urge or command all bishops to give orders to the clergy in their dioceses to encourage and gather contributions for so good a work. The funds were to be turned over to the treasurer of the Virginia Company. In the 1618 Instructions to Sir George Yeardley, mention is made specifically of contributions from all over the realm "for the building and planting of a college for the training of infidels . . . [and] that a convenient place be chosen and set out for the planting of a university at the said Henrico in time to come and that in the meantime preparation be made there for the building of the said college for the children of infidels . . . [and that land be allotted] for the endowing of the said university and college."²⁴ This is getting ahead of the story so far as Indian and higher education are concerned, but the college here

referred to is clearly meant as a grammar school, and was to be a college in somewhat the same sense that Winchester is today. Within a few months and years, both before and after the 1622 massacre, the plan for the college had been broadened so that children of white colonists might attend it as well as the projected higher university. Meanwhile there was an almost-successful project to establish a separate school (unmistakably a sort of free grammar school) for the children of the first settlers. At the same time that contributions were pouring in for the Henrico institution, the Reverend Patrick Copland, returning from the exotic subcontinent in an East India Company fleet, persuaded passengers and crews to contribute to a fund for the furtherance of the plantation of Virginia.

Copland, made a member of the Virginia Company, brought the collected £70 8s 6d to the Company quarter court and, acting with a newly appointed committee, decided that it would be best spent in building a "public free school," to be called the East India School.²⁵ The Company added lands and tenants (indentured servants, in a sense) on condition that it have governance and control of revenues of the school. Clearly it was intended to be a pay school, for potential profits therefrom are suggested (to be used by the Company for furthering other good causes), and just as clearly it was to have been an English grammar school, grounding its pupils in "the principles of religion, civility of life and humane learning." This first castle of erudition in the air reached firm foundations as far as the granting of a thousand acres to maintain a master and an usher, engage a Mr. Dike as master, and arrange for securing such books as Dike and his scholars would require. But Dike in the end declined the employment, and the funds were mismanaged by the Virginia Company. They were invested "temporarily" in projects which failed, and the Company went into bankruptcy and dissolution before it could make the proper restitution. Probably the 1622 massacre was the final blow to the school as it was to the Company. Incidentally, a separate £500 private donation made to educate and convert Indian children literally went up in smoke during the massacre in the destruction of an iron furnace in which the funds were invested to bring profits to support a missionary school.

Then there was the bequest of a Middle Templar, Edward Palmer, on November 22, 1624, which designated all his lands and tenements in Virginia and New England for "the foundinge or maintenance of a Universitie, and such schools in Virginia, as shall be there erected and shall be called *Academia Virginiensis et Oxoniensis*." Detailed stipulations include the ground plan for the location of buildings, the free admission of all Palmer's grandfather's legitimate descendants, and the hours for recreation and the employment thereof in learning to paint in watercolors and oils. Again the first step was to be a school, presumably a free grammar school,

whether called *college* or *school*, and ultimately an accompanying *university*. Palmer uses all three terms. His institution was to be located on a sheltered island granted probably by the Company in the Susquehannah River in what is today Maryland.²⁶ The institution with the imposing name never materialized, perhaps because of the Company's dissolution, perhaps because the proposed location would have been at that time on a dangerous frontier, or perhaps simply because the bequest or revenues therefrom were not large enough to get the project going. Fuller in his *Worthies*, however, mentions that before his death Palmer had already spent thousands of pounds in purchasing and preparing the island for the construction, but that his funds were embezzled "and in a manner lost" when they came into the hands of "such persons as understood them not."²⁷

So ended the attempts at secondary education under the joint-stock company which had founded and first settled the colony. Under the Crown after 1624 changes in administrative procedures were at first barely discernible, and colonists continued to pour in. Landholding policies had gradually changed under the Company and continued to develop in the direction being taken in 1624. Originally the Company's land-tenant policy had prevented all but a few officials and large stock investors from accumulating extensive lands and wealth;²⁸ but before the second half-century this policy had gradually changed, and several individuals possessed property enough to make generous bequests for educational use.

In the will of Benjamin Syms, dated February 12, 1634/5, the oldest extant record of a Virginia endowment for a "free school" appears. It is especially remarkable that the funds and lands, merged into the Hampton city branch of the state system in the nineteenth century, are still employed for educational purposes. In other words, the first southern school open to the public of a community has now been in continuous operation, with more recent buildings, for almost three hundred and fifty years.²⁹ Syms, from his property in Elizabeth City County, left land and milch cows for support of "a free school to Educate & teach the Children of the adjoining Parishes of Eliz^b City & Poquoton [Poquoson] from Mary's Mount downwards to the Poquoson River," and desired that the clergy and churchwardens of the said parishes see to it that his directions were carried out.³⁰ The bequest was to be used to erect a building and keep it in repair and support a schoolmaster. For some reason Syms' intention was not confirmed by provincial law until the General Assembly session of March 1642/3.³¹ The names of schoolmasters and trustees and accounts of recurrent problems regarding the institution survive in county and state records at least through 1944. There seems to be some confusion as to the extent, if any, to which this was a charity school: that is, to what extent it was a school free of tuition for some or all of the two parishes and to what extent scholar-

ships covering all expenses including subsistence may have been awarded to "poor children." Calvin Phippins, for example, speaks of the Syms school as offering "free tuition to those unable to afford it."³² J. L. Blair Buck thinks it was considered a charity school, though it certainly never was this in the sense or to the extent the Reverend Thomas Bacon's school in Talbot County, Maryland, was. Perhaps Syms intended it for children whose parents could not afford paying their way, and he and his trustees probably wished the institution to be a free school in the most literal sense. Confusion has probably risen, at least in part, from the clauses of the will which state that after school repairs and teachers are provided for, any other profits from the cattle which were part of the legacy shall go "to manteyne poor children, or decayed or maimed persons of the parish." The "poor children" so named did not necessarily have anything to do with the school nor is there indication that, if they did, any of them at any time were supported more completely than other students. There is no evidence of a nucleus of endowed scholars as there were in many of the endowed English free grammar schools noted above and such as were later founded in the southern colonies. In 1724, in the Bishop of London's questionnaire to the clergy in Virginia, one question concerned whether there was any endowed "public school" in each parish for the instruction of youth and if so who the master was. The minister for Elizabeth City names two schools and their teachers and adds that there is a private school also, where, besides reading, writing, and arithmetic, Latin and Greek are *very well taught*.³³ All this seems to imply that at least for many years, or several generations, the Syms school, though not fully under parish vestry control and thus not technically a parish school, was an elementary school aiming to raise into literacy any and all children of the two parishes who could not afford the private school or did not receive their education from family tutors or in Europe. It may imply that the Latin and Greek of the English grammar school were not taught at all, or that they were relatively poorly taught in the Syms academy.

The second significant bequest for a free school and maintenance of a master was also made for children of the county of Elizabeth City, this time by a Dr. Thomas Eaton³⁴ in 1659. In his bequest he spells out what he intends for his school to be as far as tuition is concerned: "no free education bee allowed but to such children as shalbe borne within the said county." Again through the years county record books and legislative acts give glimpses of the school, its teachers, and its problems.³⁵ Ebenezer Taylor, Robert Crook, and George Eland, for example, were among the schoolmasters in the 1690s. Eaton's school, which had suffered losses in income from trespassers who felled trees and stole the timber and from tenants who failed to pay rent, was given formal legislative sanction in 1730, and

by an act of 1759, was incorporated under "The Trustees and Governors of Eaton's Charity School." As late as 1753 an act had officially recognized the earlier institution as "The Trustees and Governors of Syms' Free School."³⁶ That the Eaton school had undoubtedly been intended for the underprivileged is borne out in testimony in the act of 1759, which notes that, in addition to the proper objects of charity, "a great number of children who could afford to pay for their education" had been admitted, an abuse of the original intent of the founder not to be tolerated. From now on, it is stipulated, only poor children shall enjoy the benefit of the school, though there is the loophole clause "without consent of the master,"³⁷ for others.

Probably most of the troubles of the schools, including the rapid turnover in teachers, sprang from inadequate endowment. Eventually, long after the colonial period (in 1805), the state legislature combined the two funds and the schools into an institution first known as Hampton Academy but later designated the Syms-Eaton Academy, or School, an elementary school in the Hampton city system.³⁸ Later petitions and other documents presented to the legislature in behalf of or opposing the merger suggest (1805 and 1830) that for several generations before the end of the colonial period all who could, paid, though free instruction was consistently given the poor. By the early nineteenth century, and probably before the Revolution, both schools appear to have been offering Latin along with metaphysics, mathematics, moral and natural philosophy, as well as "the ordinary branches of English education." That is, the free schools had become grammar schools in the British sense, or high schools (probably combined with elementary) in the present American sense.³⁹ To trace the history of these two privately endowed institutions of one early Virginia county is to see at least one of the ways in which universal public education would come into being in the South.

The records show by name and enactment that at least seven schools of the Syms and Eaton "endowed" and "free" varieties were founded in Virginia before 1724. There were surely by then many more even of this sort of school and many more of other sorts. The Northumberland County records show that in 1652 the Court approved "of Mr. Lee's petition for a free school to be set up."⁴⁰ In 1667 a Quaker of Lower Norfolk County, Richard Russell, left money for poor children's schooling, and in 1721 in nearby Princess Anne, Colonel Edward Moseley gave a lot for establishing a school which the local vestry also agreed to support.⁴¹ In 1675 Henry Peasley had left endowments "for the maintenance of a free school for ever," including a teacher, for the education of the children of the parishes of Abingdon and Ware in Gloucester County. His endowment included land and livestock, and various other persons added slaves to augment the

income of the institution. Again the school was not chartered by law until 1756, though the reports to the Bishop of London in 1724 indicate it was fully established and thriving at that date under a native Virginian named George Ransom. In 1756, with the formal incorporation, the trustees and governors (who in this instance were the vestry, churchwardens, and clergy of the two parishes) were empowered to relocate the school in a more convenient spot.⁴²

Other free schools were established by bequest, as by William Gordon in Christ Church Parish, Middlesex, in 1685 and operating at least until 1767; several early small ones in Isle of Wight County; and a more substantial one in the same county by Mrs. Elizabeth Smith in 1753, enduring until the 1780s. In 1659 William Whittington endowed a free school in Northampton County, and in 1697 Governor Francis Nicholson another in York-Hampton Parish of York County with lots and houses for a school which operated for about two decades. In 1702 John Farneffold, clergyman and son of a knight, of St. Stephen's Parish in Northumberland, endowed a free school to be called "Winchester school" for some four or five poor children who were to receive gratis board and lodging and tuition. After they had been taught to read the Bible and write a legible hand, they were to be dismissed and replaced by others. One of the interesting institutional endowments is that made in 1706 by Mrs. Mary Whaley for a school in Bruton Parish, Williamsburg, in honor of her little son Matthew, and called "Matty's School." In 1741/2, having died in Great Britain, she left the school a further considerable sum which was not realized until a century later when in 1867 the English courts handed over the money, then amounting to \$10,000, to the care of the College of William and Mary. The school was probably functioning from 1706 until after the Revolution.

When Norfolk borough was laid off in 1736, a Greek-Latin school was established and a master nominated by county authorities. It was certainly in operation before 1756, and is apparently the direct ancestor of the Norfolk Academy operating in the twentieth century (it did not become a public school). The will of John Yeates of Nansemond, Lower Parish, provided endowment for two free schools and books, the latter always to remain in the schoolhouse for the use of successive generations of pupils. The schools were flourishing in 1810 and still in existence in 1861. Lyon G. Tyler, who grew up in Tidewater Virginia and knew where to find records, located most of those mentioned and several dozen of other endowed free schools, many of which had lasted for only relatively short periods. But he pauses to point out again and again that no complete records, and indeed no records, exist for many counties and many parishes. What he and Edgar W. Knight and Guy F. Wells do indicate or demonstrate conclusively is that by 1724, at the threshold of Virginia's colonial golden age, there were in exis-

tence dozens of schools loosely denominated "free" or "charity" schools, clearly designed to ensure literacy for even the poorest children of parish or county. It is true that in the year many clergy reported no schools existing in their parishes and many more reported no free or endowed schools. But in the next few years numbers of such schools did come into existence, as the dates of founding given by Tyler and others testify.⁴³ One must keep in mind that Robert Beverley as early as 1705 perhaps somewhat too optimistically noted that

there are large tracts of Land, Houses, and other things granted to Free-Schools, for the Education of Children, in many parts of the Country, and some of these are so large, that of themselves they are a handsom Maintenance to a Master: But the additional Allowance, which Gentlemen give with their Sons, render them a comfortable Subsistence. These Schools have been founded by the Legacies of well inclin'd Gentlemen, and the Management of them, hath commonly been left to the Direction of the County-Court, or to the Vestry of the respective Parishes, and I have never heard, that any of those Pious Uses have been Miss-apply'd. In all other Places, where such Indowments have not been already made, the People joyn, and build Schools for their Children, where they may learn upon very easie terms.⁴⁴

One recalls that though Beverley may here in one sense have been writing promotion literature, he is not given to exaggeration, especially concerning the institutions of his native country. He is also saying that there are other kinds of schools in Virginia, notably community-sponsored (old field?) and perhaps private. Exactly who attended these last will be considered below, after a look at other endowed free schools in the remaining southern colonies.

Maryland's colonial free-school history is somewhat different from Virginia's, for the original proprietary colony founded in 1634 and open to persons of all Trinitarian faiths was to a great extent at the beginning ecclesiastically and educationally in the hands of Roman Catholics, especially the English Jesuits. The Jesuitical zeal was immense, and the few fathers and their lay assistants attempted to convert Indians, convert or proselytize Protestant settlers, and conduct schools for those of their own faith. The *Archives of Maryland* notes school endowments and teaching in the 1650s and 1660s, some of it Protestant and even Puritan. And one should recall in passing that the Palmer school planned at the mouth of the Susquehannah would have been in what became Maryland territory.

By the 1690s when Francis Nicholson became governor the province was largely Protestant, though of several sects or persuasions. In 1694, however, soon after the Church of England was established in the province, the General Assembly voted to support the establishment of a free school

at Annapolis. The first corporate school board was organized by Act of Assembly in 1696, and Andrew Geddes was the first official schoolmaster. The school did not open its doors, however, until five years after the enabling act, which had also provided for other such institutions in the province. It would probably never have gotten under way at all but for the encouragement and gifts of the governor, the same zealous Anglican churchman and Christian educator who had been a principal factor in founding the College of William and Mary.⁴⁵ But King William's School did open,⁴⁶ and was supported at least in part throughout the colonial era on revenues from duties imposed on certain exports and imports. Soon after independence it became St. John's College, and so survives today. But its history was not at all an easy one, for many times it had to struggle for income, decent instruction, and proper housing, and against political pressures of several kinds.

The enabling act of 1696 which legalized or authorized this and other grammar or free schools in Maryland provided for a governing body much like those in Virginia and English institutions, stipulated that they should endeavor to inculcate Christian doctrine in accordance with that of the Church of England and that each school should offer Latin, Greek, writing, and the like, and have one master, one usher, and one writing master. After the first, King William's, was built in Annapolis, a second should be erected and endowed with £120 per annum at Oxford in Talbot County, and so on, until each county had such a school with the same endowment or revenue. Real efforts were made to raise funds in Great Britain and Maryland and neighboring Virginia,⁴⁷ for it was never imagined that provincial-allocated revenues would support the units of such a system; indeed, for a long time they barely supported, with some outside help, the first of the schools organized under the act. One result of inadequate endowment was that an Annapolis rector often doubled as master of the school in order to augment his salary and at the same time keep down the cost of instruction.

Further acts were passed in the early eighteenth century, and replies to clerical questionnaires in 1714, 1717, and later indicate most inadequate public schooling. In 1720 and 1723 legislative acts were designed to tap new sources of revenue, and in the latter year "a good school in each county" was again authorized. In 1728 schoolmasters were required to take as many poor children gratis as the visitors believed they could handle. Thus during its first century Maryland had few if any endowed free schools equal to at least five or seven in Virginia. But there is legislative, vestry, and county record evidence that there were schools of some sort even in the seventeenth century in almost every if not every fairly well settled county of the colony, schools which attempted especially to instruct the poor and the prosperous.

By the 1720s there is evidence of a number of schools on the Eastern

Shore, perhaps some of them free endowed independent schools and certainly some of them the county schools authorized by the Assembly. By 1723/4 there was a good free school in Queen Anne's County, controlled by the leading men of the area, clerical and lay, and housed in a good brick building. The first teacher, David Davis, was obligated to instruct in grammar, good writing, and mathematics, as a minimum, and there were here to be ten "foundation scholars," presumably with full expenses paid. Girls were occasionally admitted. Records of eighteen masters include Charles Peale (who served 1740-1742), father of the famous group of artists. Records also exist of volumes of Greek and Latin classics bound and lettered "Queen Anne's County School," good indication that during at least the latter years the curriculum had become that of a genuine classical school. There was even mathematical and navigational apparatus.⁴⁸ There were too several schools in Somerset County, most of them private but including at least one "Free School." There is legislative evidence of a "Kent County Free School" some time before 1741, a school owning land it wished to lease.⁴⁹ There were bills and authorizations by 1745 for free schools in Dorchester and Worcester counties, among others.⁵⁰ On the western shore free schools were authorized in 1749 in frontier Frederick,⁵¹ and there are other accounts of similar schools in St. Mary's, Prince George, and Baltimore counties, among others.⁵² In 1730 there is the remarkable proposal for an academy of learning, probably by Richard Lewis, of which more later, and a fairly steady series of legislative bills establishing county or chartering other free schools or providing through taxes revenues for the support of at least one secondary school in each county. Though they were never fully implemented, either in adequate income or a school in every county, it is remarkable that some years before the Revolution Maryland had gradually developed its educational program into something akin to the state public school system still in existence.⁵³ In the last half-century before the Revolution mention of endowed free schools, private schools, charity schools, and other sorts appears frequently in Maryland often under well-equipped and even distinguished teachers, and the *Maryland Gazette* is full of advertising of schools and for instructors. Most of these schools of a public or semipublic nature taught religion according to the Church of England.

But non-Anglican and nonparish schools were another matter. There were Catholic classical schools such as that at Bohemia Manor (which was founded about 1744 and moved to Georgetown in 1788).⁵⁴ The Toleration Act of 1649 which had guaranteed religious freedom to members of all faiths had brought Lutherans, German Baptist Brethren, and Mennonites into Maryland, people who conducted their own fairly elementary schools, usually in the German language, quietly, without benefit

of endowment or provincial aid. Presbyterians had settled in several lower counties in the 1670s and 1680s and built meeting houses at several places such as Snow Hill even before the arrival of Francis Makemie. They planned a system of education from the elementary school to or through the university, and they organized secondary schools in each town. Probably their best known and most successful was the half-college, half-secondary school conducted by the Presbyterian minister at Nottingham in Maryland, Samuel Finley (later President of Princeton). It was modeled on the New Light "Log College" at Neshaminy in Pennsylvania. How the Nottingham school was financed one can only guess, but during his seventeen years there Finley turned out some of the best colonial classical scholars, among them Governor Martin of North Carolina, Dr. Benjamin Rush and his brother Jacob the jurist, Ebenezer Hazard of Philadelphia, Governor Henry of Maryland, the Reverend James Waddell of Virginia, and John Bayard, Speaker of the House of Representatives.⁵⁵ The Minutes of the Yearly Quaker Meetings in America and in London show the great Quaker sect's interest in Maryland education, particularly for its own people.⁵⁶ The evidence which exists indicates that in the later decades of the seventeenth and for at least half of the eighteenth century they conducted schools in which their own people were teachers. Their Maryland constituency, like their lower Virginia and especially Carolina people, were not themselves from the fully literate classes and usually could profit only from elementary training. Since most local Quaker records of such matters in the colonies themselves have disappeared, one must learn about what they planned and attempted from the records they kept elsewhere, or from the journals of the great itinerants such as Fox, Story, and Edmundson. None of these tell us a great deal. Despite Story's and Fox's declarations that they "convinced" many influential and prosperous people,⁵⁷ there is no specific evidence that any of these endowed a school on the advanced secondary level, though they almost certainly aided in organizing elementary schools. Their page in the printed educational historical record of colonial Maryland is so far almost blank. But there are evidences of some sort of Quaker school at Tuckahoe in Talbot in 1680s, apparently founded by Edmundson, and in at least for Talbot County some evidence that this and similar schools eventually came to train some of the prominent and prosperous, though they were aimed at making the poor literate.⁵⁸

One of the most interesting public educational projects undertaken in colonial Maryland was the charity working school in Talbot County, 1750-1754 sponsored by the learned and versatile Reverend Thomas Bacon⁵⁹ and other prominent persons in the county and in other sections of the province. Bacon was one of the original petitioners of July 14, 1750,

for setting up such an institution in his own parish of St. Peter's "for maintaining and teaching poor children to read, write, and account, and in instructing them in the knowledge and practice of the Christian religion, as taught in the Church of England." All this phraseology had been usual enough in both Chesapeake colonies for a century or more, but actually Bacon's ambitions went further than the conventional endowed grammar or free school. On October 14, 1750, he preached a sermon on the necessity for the school and the kind of education it would represent, a sermon printed the next year in Great Britain, along with a copy of the "Proposals, Rules, Subscription-Roll" and other features of the anticipated school.⁶⁰ The *Maryland Gazette* between 1750 and 1754 carried a number of notices, some as advertisements, of the proposal, together with lists of subscribers from Virginia as well as Maryland, and description of a concert given at Williamsburg for the benefit of the school. Not only did Bacon bombard Marylanders with propaganda, but he made more than one trip to northern Virginia and to Williamsburg soliciting donations. His published list of Virginia benefactors ranged from the Commissary and governor through most official and ecclesiastical persons of consequence. The June 11, 1752, issue of the Annapolis newspaper names among the donors Peyton Randolph, the president and several professors at the college, Dr. George Gilmer, Speaker John Robinson, Ralph Wormeley, John Randolph, Richard Lee, and George Wythe along with several clergymen and other notables. In the December 19, 1754, issue of the same journal are listed further benefactions from Governor Dinwiddie, Commissary Dawson, and some of the same persons previously noted with a few others. Letters from Bacon in the Dawson Papers of the Library of Congress express his appreciation of the material assistance from the sister colony and of his own personal pleasure in Williamsburg society, especially his enjoyment of its music. Part of the basis of his appeal was that, since Maryland "supported" the Virginia college, the Virginians should support this Maryland project which would in no way rival the college but might in the end supply it with some students, much the same basis for the plea made for the King William School years before, though in that case directed to the Lords of Trade.

The names of prominent Maryland contributors naturally include the six trustees and treasurer (several Goldsboroughs, a Tilghman, a Lloyd, and the Rev. Mr. Gordon, rector of a neighboring parish). On the longer general list are subscribers from at least half a dozen Maryland Eastern Shore counties and several persons from Annapolis, including the literary Dr. Alexander Hamilton, secretary of the Tuesday Club, the remarkable group of which Bacon himself was a member, and Bacon's close personal friend Henry Callister of Oxford. Daniel Dulany the younger and even one "Dissenting Teacher," Mr. John Hamilton, are among the donors. Each

subscriber of £5 or more was allowed to nominate a child who might live within the donation for a year.

The charity school, like others before it, was planned primarily to educate the "Orphans and Poor Children" mentioned in the sermon. But Bacon had also added to his proposal that "a Certain number of *Negro Children*, if thereunto required by the Trustees," be trained there. A fully qualified teacher was to be procured in England, and the number of poor children, "whether *Boys* or *Girls* [were to] be determined by the Trustees, according to the Produce of the Benefactions." The scholars should be taught the subjects mentioned above together with other matters useful in "their Condition and Capacity" and should be supplied with all the necessities of life (board, lodging, laundry, and clothing) during their stay at the school. The system was to be what would be called co-op today, for students were to labor part-time in the occupation they hoped to pursue in later life. This labor might include, if deemed wise and necessary by the trustees, a certain apprenticeship for some children. Also some "useful *Manufactures*" (perhaps such as flax spinning or other artisans' work) were to be set up at the school as soon as feasible so that the pupils might in part support themselves. Finally, the curriculum for Negro children would be reading and writing and Christian doctrine, and their expenses were to be paid by their respective owners.⁶¹

Though Lord and Lady Baltimore later became annual subscribers, the school flourished for a relatively brief period, perhaps partly because by 1758 Bacon had removed to another parish but almost surely largely for the old and most frequent reason, lack of sufficient income. The latter was Governor Sharpe's reason for the school's demise.⁶² But a brick building was erected as a schoolhouse, and 100 acres was purchased as the working plantation for masters and scholars. The school was never incorporated, and the real estate was held by Bacon in trust. In 1787, several years after the school had ceased operation, the legislature authorized the two surviving trustees to turn over the property to the supervisors of the poor of Talbot County.⁶³

In more recent times one might have called this a manual-labor or technical school. Though there were resemblances between it and certain schools in England (Bacon in his sermon points out that there were 1946 charity schools in Great Britain and Ireland and none in America), it was actually in total aim and purpose somewhat different from any of its predecessors on either side of the Atlantic. It hoped to make indigent whites literate and Christian by paying all their expenses, and blacks by having their owners pay the charges. Also, it was planned for both boys and girls. Bacon himself, one of the most learned colonials of the century, clearly believed that the humblest and poorest should be literate. In projecting

one school for them, he declared that he had in mind a series for the colony. His religion, his knowledge of history, his common sense, and his affection for his province were all factors in motivation. He simply wanted to make useful and pious citizens of that element which might otherwise succumb to "Ignorance, Idleness, Vice, Immorality, and Infidelity."⁶⁴ The school was to be a shining example.

There were a number of endowed schools of roughly parallel purpose and organization in the other colonies. Education again was closely related to religion. North Carolina, sparsely populated until after 1700, and never as completely under Anglican establishment as Virginia or South Carolina, seems to have had only a few scattered schools during the seventeenth century, and of these one learns only through incidental remarks in printed archives. North Carolina historians find no very specific evidence of schools before the S.P.G. began its labors in the province after 1700.⁶⁵ There were surely Quaker schools of some sort inspired by Fox and Edmundson in the later seventeenth century when North Carolina had almost no religious instruction other than that of the Friends, and apparently the settlers drifting down from Virginia into northeastern North Carolina had schoolmasters and perhaps schools. There is definite record that in 1695 at least apprentices and indentured servants were taught to read and write, and that there were well-educated persons in the colony, but no record is known of an endowment for any kind of school.⁶⁶

Even in the first decade or so of the eighteenth century instruction seems to have been in the hands of Quaker home teachers and Anglican S.P.G. clergy, the latter conducting schools anywhere they could, with somewhat haphazard support in the form of books and occasionally a qualified lay teacher who might also act as reader in the parish. Charles Griffin, who was later to conduct famous Indian schools at Christanna and Williamsburg in Virginia, seems to have begun his career by 1709 as a teacher in North Carolina, though little information has turned up as to the type of school he conducted. The Rev. Mr. Gordon as early as 1701 had introduced a schoolmaster and furnished pupils with books at Chowan and Perquomans.⁶⁷ Griffin had Quakers and probably other children of dissenting groups in his school at Pasquotank. From the letters of the Reverend Giles Rainsford, an S.P.G. missionary, one learns of an excellent school conducted near the Virginia boundary by a Mr. Mashburn, adjacent to two Indian towns, and including Indian pupils. These schools are mentioned here because even though they may have been parish or private or semiprivate, they bear recognizable characteristics common to free endowed grammar schools as well as those first mentioned. And indeed they may have been supported by some of the fairly numerous North Carolina well-educated, including Colonel Edward Moseley, of whom more in other connections.

Special Collections, University of Tennessee Library

The "Montanus Virginia 1671 Map," drawn by Arnoldus Montanus (1625–1683)

Courtesy of Miss Daisy Hardy of Robin Hood's Bay, Yorkshire

The grammar school at Leeds, Yorkshire, attended by
eighteenth-century southern colonials

Or they may have received both S.P.G. and private individual support.⁶⁸

Not until a full generation later, when North Carolina was a royal province and the Church of England had been established, was there legislation for "charitable Donation" towards the founding of an academy or seminary of learning in the province,⁶⁹ a proposal made by a Mr. George Vaughan, who would himself either raise the funds or make the donation personally. This was in January 1755. Before this date Governor Dobbs was already empowered to license schoolmasters, probably for private or community schools.⁷⁰ Later in 1755 Dobbs bluntly told the Assembly that legislation for county and parish schools was absolutely essential for the well-being of the province. In 1758 the Assembly addressed His Majesty on the desperate need for schools. As late as 1762 Dobbs wrote disgustedly to the S.P.G. secretary that there was not even a parish clerk in the province to serve as schoolmaster or reader, and there was dire need of clergymen.⁷¹ In the last year of the colonial period, 1763, Thomas Thomlinson arrived from England, with good recommendations, to establish in New Bern a public school for the children of the town's inhabitants. Though he arrived in December, in only a few weeks subscriptions had been raised for a school-house as well as for instruction. Governor Dobbs endorsed the town's appeal to the S.P.G. for further financial aid, and his successor, Governor Tryon, continued support of the school. The S.P.G. agreed to contribute £15 per annum and for a limited time revenues from a tax upon spiritous liquors imported by way of the Neuse River were to go toward the school's income. Out of all this Thomlinson was to employ an assistant and educate not more than ten poor children without charge. By 1766 the school-house was "enclosed," though not completed. In 1767 there were nearly eighty pupils. By 1770, principally because funds became constantly more difficult to procure, the school was in a perceptible decline, affected partially by a new rival establishment at Wilmington. Things went from bad to worse until in 1771/2 Thomlinson felt impelled to resign. In 1772 he was in Rhode Island and still owed money by the Trustees who had ousted him. Thus disappeared from history colonial North Carolina's ablest schoolmaster and the head of the only free grammar school of the period.⁷²

There were legacies for schooling the poor of a community. In 1710 John Bennett of Currituck decided that a portion of his estate be used for the schooling of two poor children each year, though not for the founding of a school. But in 1744 James Winwright of Carteret County left a substantial endowment for a schoolmaster for Beaufort Town, and in addition £50 sterling for a combined schoolhouse and dwelling for the teacher. Though there remains no evidence that this school ever came into existence, the bequest by James Innes of New Hanover in 1754 of slaves, livestock, books, and £100 sterling "For the Use of a Free School" for the

youth of North Carolina did become available for public educational purposes *after* the Revolution, when in 1783 the Assembly chartered the Innes Academy in Wilmington.⁷³

There were indeed good Moravian schools by the 1750s in the vicinity of present-day Winston-Salem, and both boys and girls were taught English in what may have been evening schools. But the church itself sponsored the elementary and perhaps classical schools at Wachovia and Bethania.⁷⁴ The Scotch-Irish arriving in considerable numbers in the 1730s and 1740s with a long tradition of education were joined by Highlanders after Cullo-den in 1746. To the Presbyterians among these last (actually almost all of them) belongs the distinction of founding North Carolina's first two colonial classical schools, though almost all the better-known academies were founded after 1763.⁷⁵ Princeton and the Virginia pulpit orator Samuel Davies were influences in many of these earliest foundations.⁷⁶ But one educator straight from Ireland, the Reverend James Tate, is said to have founded the first classical academy in Wilmington about 1760. In the same year Crowfield Academy, in some respects the germ from which grew Davidson College, was opened in Mecklenburg County. Princetonian David Caldwell was among the more prominent who established and operated excellent classical schools after 1763.⁷⁷ His former students became distinguished figures throughout the new nation and his church, and he himself was widely known for his strong support of the Revolution as well as of education and religion.

Obviously from the 1720s to 1763 a considerable number of legislators, clergy, lawyers, and governors were much concerned that there be decent educational facilities in the province. Scattered population, lack of a profitable "commodity" such as the tobacco Virginia and Maryland exported or the indigo and rice of South Carolina, absence of strong Anglican church support even through the S.P.G. were among the reasons why the backbone of public education, the free grammar and charity schools, was so infrequent in the area which has since become a leader in education. In North Carolina formal learning got off to a poor start, or hardly had a start at all, in the century of the colony's existence before 1763.

Though Bridenbaugh points out that there are no evidences of the existence of facilities for public education during South Carolina's "first decade" (i.e., before 1690), equally true is a southern historian's observation that no colony south of the Susquehannah showed more effort made by the wealthy to educate the poor during the more than one hundred years before the Revolution.⁷⁸ South Carolina came fairly late into the colonial picture, when the slavery system was in full swing and the lands of the province under the Proprietors were from the beginning more often than not allotted in huge tracts requiring Negro labor. Except in Charleston

and to a considerably lesser extent in smaller towns such as Georgetown and Beaufort (or Port Royal), there was little or no middle class until late in the period, and even in the towns large landowners were the dominant and even perhaps the majority of the free population. That is, at first glance there seems little incentive for the establishment of free grammar schools such as those described in Virginia and Maryland. Those who could afford education could get it from a family tutor or by studying abroad. But the simple fact of geography, that agricultural communities and counties were clustered about a real city, Charleston, caused the South Carolinian of the upper class to send his children to a private or public free school which flourished in the town at a time when Chesapeake colonists of this social class were largely dependent on plantation tutors. There were plenty of tutors in South Carolina, but not to the extent or in the proportion there were in Virginia.

South Carolina had in its coastal-fringe counties a number of schools endowed by local persons for the benefit of the poor and underprivileged and sometimes for the middle- or upper-class pupil, or for the Indian and/or Negro. The schools were frequently chartered or officially authorized by legislative act, and in a few instances the province aided in supporting them. The S.P.G., with local encouragement, also established and operated a number of what might be loosely or even strictly designated as grammar or classical or elementary schools. As noted elsewhere, the Church of England was established quite early in South Carolina, but along with the Anglican were Congregational, Huguenot, Presbyterian, and perhaps Quaker schools, though in the period before 1764 none of the institutions sponsored outside the established church seems to have been very strong or enduring. The schools teaching Anglican doctrine were usually but by no means always parish schools: they had free or grammar school characteristics just as strongly. It might be merely a matter of fund sources, originally and annually.

In 1694 the Assembly made its first move for schools with an act and in 1696 passed a second law creating five commissioners to receive gifts for educational purposes, both for potential pupils and for schoolmasters.⁷⁹ The first general act for the establishment of a free school in the province seems to have sprung not from an individual's legacy as such, but from the general recognition by responsible persons that at least one institution for the instruction of the youth of this province in grammar and other arts and sciences and useful learning, and also in the principles of the Christian religion, should be begun at once. This was in 1710. It was approved by Proprietors, governor, legislature, Council or upper house, and influential persons including Dr. Francis LeJau of Goose Creek and Justice Nicholas Trott of Charleston. A commission was named, to meet annually. It was to

have the power to dispose of any past or future legacies for founding schools or paying teachers and to supervise the building of schoolhouses on lands granted by the Proprietors, and immediately to choose and certify a master for the first of the schools. Naturally it was to be located in Charleston. The master was to be a member of the Church of England and be capable of teaching Latin and Greek and mathematics. He might be assisted by an usher and a writing master also appointed or approved by the commissioners. All this was rather vague, for it made no specific recommendation for immediate implementation. It took a second and similar act two years later to specify that a free school be erected as soon as possible in the provincial capital, for the use of the whole colony, to be funded at first by several recent legacies and personal donations. Governor Craven was named president of the now-reduced board of commissioners, and John Douglas was chosen as first master (by title Preceptor or Teacher of Grammar) in the school. Any person contributing as much as £20 current money of the province within seven years of the passage of the act might nominate one person to be taught free for the space of five years. There were to be not more than twelve free scholars on the foundation, and any scholar should be admitted at the rate of £4 per annum paid by parent or guardian. If conditions were carried out, here was to be a free school conforming in practically every way to contemporary British grammar schools.

This 1712 act did not conclude with the Charleston institution, but went on to urge the need, and provide partial support for a schoolmaster in each parish of the colony, and to direct the vestry of each parish to decide on a location where a schoolhouse should be built, which province funds would subsidize up to £12 current money.⁸⁰ So the Charleston Free School began. Though in 1711 William Guy arrived in the city as curate, schoolmaster, and catechist, the 1712 act placed Douglas and an usher in charge and paid their salary from government sources. Guy returned to England in 1713. In 1715 a new assistant to Commissary Gabriel Johnston as rector of St. Philip's appeared, a John Whitehead, who became master of the school. Perhaps the best-known head was the Reverend Thomas Morritt, concerning whom two extensive essays have been written within the last half century.⁸¹ Morritt was a veteran school man who had served in South Carolina before he returned to England and was ordained in 1718. In 1722 he was chosen by the S.P.G. for the schoolmaster's post and received the bounty for his return in 1723, though he had been back in the province at an earlier date than even 1722.

Morritt appears to have been a dedicated and zealous teacher plagued during his Charleston tenure by ill health, poverty, and an expensive and sickly family. In June 1723 he outlined his plan for a curriculum to Governor Nicholson, declaring that he would follow orthodox English

methods in teaching Latin and naming as some of his textbooks Lily's famous grammar and various modern editions of Ovid, Virgil, Horace, Justin, Erasmus' *Colloquies*, etc. Among Greek authors he would teach parts of Isocrates and Lucian, Hesiod, Homer, and Euripides. He went on to name his texts in geography and history, his method of using globes for teaching navigation, and the manner of religious instruction. He outlined a rigorous daily routine and advocated raising the prices of lodging and laundry. He concluded that he would like to receive a quarter's salary in advance.⁸²

Throughout his stay in Charleston Morritt was an effective teacher, but he steadily complained to London and to provincial authorities of his financial hardships. In 1724 he wrote the secretary of the S.P.G. that the school was flourishing, with twenty of the forty-five boys already in Latin and the prospect of sixty by Christmas. He was handicapped by lack of schoolbooks and money for a variety of purposes. In 1725, with fifty-two pupils, Morritt wrote of the son of a Creek chief who was expected soon to enroll. But by 1726 he asked leave to resign and take a parish. The financial difficulties of the school and his personal debts combined with family illnesses had proved too much for him. He went to a newly created country parish, Prince George's, Winyaw. There and in another parish he remained until 1738. The school he had got on its feet endured until the American Revolution in 1776, but the strenuous efforts of the high-strung and overworked educator put him in his grave within a decade of his resignation.⁸³

Legacies or donations for schools in South Carolina were often relatively munificent. They might be applied to what have been called free, grammar, parish, charity, or elementary schools, the institutions as in other colonies combining several functions once entirely distinct. The funds came from individuals or societies, and occasionally might be augmented by the S.P.G. Some of the schools were remarkably successful in educating a large number of charity and pay students over a long period.

As early as 1690 Philip Lee left a substantial sum for the schooling of the poor children of St. John's Parish.⁸⁴ In 1715 Richard Beresford (or Berresford) of Berkeley County left in a rather complicated bequest about one-third of his estate, said to amount at the time to £6,500 currency, for the maintenance and education of the poor children of the parish of St. Thomas, to be supervised by the vestry.⁸⁵ The fund was designed first of all to support one or more schoolmasters. If they had nowhere to teach, a building or buildings were to be erected. For a number of years the income was too small to produce really effective results, but it increased with the years. By the original stipulations, reading, writing, arithmetic, languages, mathematics, "and other liberal learning" were to be taught. In 1736, when the son of Beresford who had inherited the major part of the estate was past

twenty-one, the vestry of St. Thomas' was incorporated as the governing body for the school⁸⁶ to handle the large sum now fully and specifically theirs for educational purposes. Children of both sexes were instructed by a master, an usher, and a clerk (probably writing master), and a large schoolhouse was erected. For many years the parish rector was titular master of the school, though most of the instruction was done by the assistant rector, whose wife acted as matron. The school continued until after the Revolution, when the total assets were about £10,000 sterling, with a maximum of thirty students. Under a diminished income it continued to operate from 1783 to 1861, and even since the Civil War on an again greatly reduced budget. In 1889, when the state legislature had taken over the cost of housing, boarding, and clothing the children, instruction was still given in the schoolhouse at Cainhoy on the Wando River, the rector still being principal and the teacher still his assistant rector.⁸⁷

In 1718 James Child of Childsbury, on the western branch of the Cooper River in the parish of St. John's, a man who designated himself as "Yeoman," made a bequest of £600 for founding a school in the town and certain lots for a possible "College or University." His trustees were to secure a learned schoolmaster "to keep a Gramer School to teach the Latin Tongue to Boys & Children, until they are fitt for a University wth Learning, & to teach English to Children & to learn them to Write and Keep acct's by Arithmetick." Any child of the inhabitants of the western and eastern branches of the Cooper might attend, always provided parents sent firewood in winter and paid two shillings sixpence of current Carolina money per annum to the schoolmaster. Other parishioners realized that Child's sums were not sufficient for the combined grammar and elementary school he defined, and they quickly raised £2,200 additional.⁸⁸ The schoolhouse is described as located just adjacent to a romantic little church, with graveyard, live oaks, and gray moss around it.⁸⁹ By 1733 the trustees were men elected by those who had subscribed at least £50 for the use of the school. There is some evidence that the master was to have been a nonconformist minister⁹⁰ who should teach languages and mathematics. Though the town was gradually to dry up, here is another instance in South Carolina of an endowed grammar school explicitly training its pupils to go on to a university (if nonconformist, probably to Harvard or Scotland; if Anglican, perhaps to William and Mary or England) but also having a more immediately practical and elementary program for those who might proceed no further. It was open to any and all of the neighborhood who could pay the small annual stipend. It seems to have been in essence literally a free school.

Each endowment varied not only in amount but in purposes for which it was donated. In 1728 the Reverend Richard Ludlam, an S.P.G. mis-

sionary serving the St. James, Goose Creek, Parish left his estate of about £2,000 currency in part for establishing "a school for the instruction of poor children." The money was for a time put out at interest to increase the total capital, and additional contributions were solicited. The list of subscribers survives: it includes the names (in 1744-45-46) of many of the most prominent men of the colony from families still very active in the state.⁹¹ Exactly when the school or schools (there were two reported in 1843) were actually first in operation is difficult to determine, but apparently the legacy was the original impetus to the foundation of two schools with twenty-two pupils each as late as the mid-nineteenth century. Thus one charity-school endowment endured more than a hundred years.

There are evidences of other grammar and charity schools, such as that founded in St. Paul's parish by a Mr. Whitmarsh (a free school)⁹² and one at Beaufort (a grammar school) conducted by a Scot named Comming (a private school was also there under a clergyman's supervision). Comming's may have been the charity school endowed in 1743 by Lewis Jones of Beaufort, the latter's bequest intended originally at least for a more elementary sort of training.⁹³ Then there were the several free-grammar-charity schools endowed or supported by several of the patriotic and civic societies of the Low Country. The South Carolina Society fostered the oldest of these (1737-1808) and paid the salaries of schoolmaster and schoolmistress for children of both sexes. These children were boys from eight to fourteen and girls never beyond twelve. They were given a plain elementary education and numbered for many years seventy-two pupils, replaced steadily as they passed the age limit. Of the other such groups the Winyaw Indigo Society (incorporated in 1755), founded at Winyaw (Georgetown) conducted the best-known school. Its original charter allowed for sponsorship of schools for the indigent, a principal reason for its formal incorporation. For more than a century this was *the* school between Charleston and the North Carolina boundary—elementary, high, grammar, and collegiate⁹⁴—and the preamble to its charter notes the purpose of erecting "a Free School at Georgetown" and that classes were already being held. In this instance as well as others already noted this school continued until 1886, when it was incorporated into the state system of public instruction. Until 1861 it had annually about twenty-five pupils; after that, losses of property and library destroyed by Union troops and a drastically diminished income reduced the number of pupils, though the society did attempt to raise a new endowment. Thus grew out of a convivial club founded in 1740 one of the most useful philanthropic educational foundations of the colonial and early national South. It had among its students rich and poor of every branch or level of Low Country society. It was for many their only source of education; for others it was

a stepping stone to outside universities or to apprenticeships. More is known of the Society which founded the school than of the latter's teachers or curriculum. The more prosperous may have paid part of their own way and were probably given a Latin grammar school education, a course of study somewhat different from that for those destined for terminal education or artisanship.

The first act creating a free school in the Dorchester community was passed in 1724, but it took a second act, in this case ten years later in 1734, to get things organized. But it was not until 1756 that a third act insisted on putting into effect the provisions of that of 1734. In 1757 commissioners for the school, among them Henry Middleton, two Izards, three Warings, and Daniel Blake, met in the parish vestry room. A legacy of £500 currency left by Thomas Diston was paid to the commission, and the treasurer reported he had on hand £2,600 currency put out at interest. In 1758 two brick buildings were ordered to be constructed at once, one for a schoolroom and the other for a master's house. These were completed in a brief space, and the school was in active operation for a number of years. Donations continued to come in, one of £100 sterling from Samuel Wragg quite early in the program, and two other large ones in 1764. The two latter were invested and the income was devoted solely to poor children. Transferred to nearby Summerville in 1817, the endowment fund is still in the hands of the "commissioners of the free school" and is used for school purposes.⁹⁵

The instances cited are but the most prominent regarding free schools in South Carolina. As is here evident, the term was used perhaps even more loosely than in Virginia and Maryland, but probably it did usually imply some free or charitable education and some Latin or grammar school training as well as the elementary subjects. Undoubtedly most of the large number of wealthy Carolinians of the eighteenth century educated their children under private tutors or abroad or even in certain parish or private schools not yet mentioned. But that before 1737 some six free or charity schools existed, at least one for every twelve hundred inhabitants, indicates that this colony was caring quite well for the youth who could not or would not go elsewhere, for South Carolina never claimed, as Massachusetts did, that she educated one and all under a public or common school system.⁹⁶ These schools were followed by others, as has been pointed out. All together the activity in this form of school alone shows that South Carolina displayed a great and persistent desire to educate all her people. And from 1712 any white child of the colony could, if he and his parents so desired, secure a Latin and Greek or grammatical education.⁹⁷

Before moving on from the consideration of the free or grammar or

charity school in the southern colonies, one should look at what was being done in the youngest province, Georgia, during the thirty years of its existence before 1763. Any knowledge of that colony's founding and the purposes of the Trustees and of General Oglethorpe would lead one to expect considerable early effort in behalf of free school or charity education. Family-oriented settlements and plans of model towns would have demanded and included schools for entire communities, or so one might expect. The actual accomplishment was far less but nevertheless interesting.

The utopian experiment set in motion between 1730 and 1733 did theoretically have a tremendous interest in education. The Trustees in London may have been concerned, but they did little or nothing themselves in this first generation to bring education to the people they were persuading to settle in the territory. Largely they left up to the Georgians themselves the establishment of schools. Without active and substantial assistance from the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G., consisting principally of paying the salaries of schoolmasters and supplying books, there would have been practically no public instruction for a decade or two.⁹⁸

One of the first schools (in 1735) was at Irene, on an island five miles from Savannah, an institution in which the Moravians gave great assistance, conducting a school for Indian children there until in 1740 they moved to Pennsylvania. At Irene the Reverend Benjamin Ingham (Anglican) taught for two years and acquired enough of the Creek tongue to write a grammar for it. In Savannah a catechist began some Christian and grammatical instruction, and Charles Delamotte opened a school in which he taught elementary secular subjects and the catechism. In 1738 the so-called public school of Savannah had forty boys, and at Highgate and Hamstead there were a lesser number. Delamotte was succeeded by John Dobell, who managed to make the Savannah institution into a permanent free school. Other Savannah schoolmasters are not known except by name. The Trustees seem to have thought more or less only in terms of a charity or free school for all English-speaking children. They also often neglected other elements of the society they were creating.⁹⁹

Yet both Trustees and religious leaders realized that they must supply and encourage instruction in English for German-speaking Salzburgers and other continental peoples who settled Ebenezer and other small towns. George Whitefield arranged for an English-speaking schoolmaster for the French Protestant children at Highgate.¹⁰⁰ The Salzburgers themselves seem to have taken the initiative in educating their children, for they displayed the strong Lutheran zeal for education. Christopher Ortmann, Schoenmann Gruber, and Henry Hamilton were among their early teachers. They had schools, more or less parish institutions, at Ebenezer and Purysburgh. The story of their trials and triumphs is just now being

revealed as the translated journals and correspondence of the Salzburger leaders with Europeans are gradually being published.¹⁰¹

Oglethorpe's letters speak of the need for schoolmasters at Frederica and Darien and other places, eventually including Ebenezer, where Ortmann had trouble with students and the German pastor, Bolzius. Ortmann was transferred to Vernonburgh.¹⁰² By 1750 Schoolmaster Holt of Savannah had to be suspended also, though he was soon restored. The no-tuition Savannah school had at least for some of its pupils a Latin grammar school curriculum, though the surviving lists of hundreds of books presented for school use contain no titles of Latin or Greek authors or manuals for those languages.¹⁰³ It is probable that the German schools also gave some instruction in Latin.

At all odds the most interesting educational experiment of colonial Georgia was the Bethesda Orphan House, suggested by John Wesley and founded by George Whitefield with the aid of his friend James Habersham. By 1738/40 Whitefield had the land and was beginning to accumulate orphans, the first he mentions being German children, though he refers to poor orphans of Savannah. The main building was soon planned and construction begun and continued as Whitefield toured America preaching. Along with moving souls to God he moved considerable money into the coffers of this benevolent institution. Benjamin Franklin's rather wry account of his own contribution is as classic as it is probably typical.¹⁰⁴ Again and again on his trips to America Whitefield returned to Bethesda and as he traveled on both continents continued to gather funds for its endowment, enlisting in his cause such noble ladies as the Countess of Huntingdon. As interest and funds expanded, Whitefield resolved to develop Bethesda into a college. This would probably have been accomplished but for his death in 1770 and the fire which consumed the main building soon after.¹⁰⁵

The daily routine and curriculum of the Orphan House are outlined in a manuscript now at the University of Georgia,¹⁰⁶ dated June 4, 1740. Everyone rose at five and devoted himself first to private prayers, at six went to church, where a Psalm was sung and the Second Lesson expounded by Mr. Whitefield or a substitute. About seven all returned to the dormitory, sang a hymn and prayed again, and between seven and eight had breakfast. Singing, praying, and catechizing were interspersed between useful employments such as picking cotton, knitting, doing household chores, or learning a trade under a shoemaker or carpenter or other craftsman to whom some would later be bound or indentured. At ten school began, with two masters and one mistress. Since some were to be prepared for the ministry, there must have been for them at least instruction in grammar and the classics. It is specifically mentioned that no time was al-

lowed for idleness or play, Satan's favorite way of tempting children. So went the daily routine until ten in the evening, when all turned to rest or private devotion and meditation. On Sunday they attended church services four times.

Such was the rigorous and undoubted cruel regimen for children of a tender age. Except for the unusual amount of time spent in religious instruction and prayer, however, the diurnal program differs not too greatly from that followed in English grammar schools, *except* that in Britain the day usually ended at nine and there were at least short periods for recreation. Again Whitefield may have been following rather closely the daily program with which he was familiar in the charity schools he had often visited in old England. Especially would the pre-apprenticeship training have been a likely part of the work of these institutions. Thus in youthful, rough Georgia one of the great men of the eighteenth century western world tried his hand, heart, and head at practical philanthropy. The Bethesda Orphan House is the best-known charity school of colonial America.

PRIVATE, PARISH, OLD FIELD, AND TUTORIAL SCHOOLS

Just as free grammar and charity schools often performed similar functions and sprang from the same origins or endowments, the private, parish and old field schools frequently were closely related in origin and especially in function. The tutorial school shared reasons for existence with the later group, especially in individual instances. Most of the schools of both groups offered roughly similar instruction, varying from the elementary three R's to the full-fledged Latin-Greek scholastic curriculum. And almost all of them, save most rarely the tutorial, were likely to offer what today might be called technical or utilitarian training.

The private school was operated by an individual for profit, though his principal motivation may have been altruistic, and he may have gone into educational work at the insistence of an interested group of parents. The parish school, often conducted by the same sort of clergyman frequent in the private institution, perhaps with the assistance of his curate or a lay reader sent to America for the purpose, has already been mentioned in discussion of grammar and charity schools, for sometimes it is impossible to tell at this distance in time which description best fits a particular institution. Parish schools were endowed by an individual, or they were supported by revenues from import-export duties imposed by the provincial legislature, both as shown above, or they were supported in some other way by the parish through churchwardens and vestry, or most probably they were kept in operation by a combination of these financial resources.

The old field school took its name from the fact that originally wornout tobacco lands in the Chesapeake colonies might be turned over to an interested community group for educational purposes. An old tobacco shed might be improved to make a schoolhouse, or a new building might be constructed. The interested community might be a whole parish, and thus a few old field schools are also parish schools. The tutorial school usually grew up, or developed, on a plantation where the owner wished home instruction for his own children. It represented of course a form of family education such as that discussed above, though here the teacher was not a parent but an outsider employed for the purpose. Sometimes the only pupils, and there might be as many as twenty or thirty at that, were the planter's own children together with the offspring of a few of his "family," such as his overseers or tenants living close to the mansion. Or the tutorial school might include the children of neighboring planters. In the latter case, the children might ride over each day or board with the tutor or plantation household on weekdays. Teachers of all these latter sorts of schools were frequently clergymen and their clerical or lay assistants, any of them save in Virginia often sent over by the S.P.G. (of course not primarily as tutors), or they might be Scottish or northern American university graduates or persons of lesser qualifications, depending upon the purposes of the school, who were employed under contract by the year or who in many instances were indentured servants.

As already described, provincial legislation was introduced early in most of the southern colonies for the establishment of a school in every county *or* parish. In effect most of this legislation was persuasion or encouragement rather than enabling order. In addition, the Bishop of London through his periodic questionnaires to the colonial clergy was able to prod them into activity or at least find out the state of education in each parish, and their answers frequently imply that there should or must be parish schools, especially if there are no schools or only special-privilege schools, in a particular parish.¹⁰⁷ Similar questions and answers occurred at least in Maryland and South Carolina at this or different times. But even in England there was no precedent the colonists might follow in establishing systematic education, for in the eighteenth century there was none, and what was actually accomplished in the southern American provinces was perhaps most frequently locally inspired, often with the encouragement of the commissary, the Bishop of London, or the S.P.G., or all three.

Lay or clerical readers in Virginia parishes which had them were qualified to teach reading and writing along with Christianity, as Hugh Jones observed in 1724.¹⁰⁸ This historian also alleges that in that colony by that time there were little houses built for this kind of instruction "in most parishes," though judging by the answers sent to London this statement is

something of an exaggeration. In most parishes (though usually not in the larger and more affluent) the clergyman himself probably served as schoolmaster.¹⁰⁹ It is quite difficult at times to differentiate between a private school conducted by a clergyman for his own profit and one conducted for the parish and officially authorized by the vestry. In either case the teacher was paid: if the school was a parish school, he received a salary; if a private school, whatever profits might accrue.

Several of the public endowed free schools mentioned above, such as the Syms and Eaton schools in Virginia and several in Maryland and South Carolina, were endowed solely for the benefit of children of given parishes and thus represent another sort of parish school. In most instances the articles of incorporation or the terms of the bequest permitted as pupils only the children of residents of the parish and in some instances the children had to have been born within its boundaries. The latter was stipulated in the bequest for the Peasley school for Abingdon and Ware parishes of Gloucester County in Virginia.¹¹⁰ In 1724 only two parish institutions were designated as Latin schools, but there is other evidence that several followed the grammar curriculum. Virginia also had apprentice education, including elementary reading and writing, in the parish workhouses. Provision for education in such institutions came about in this colony in the form of legislative action allowing public taxation (parish levies) for general instruction.¹¹¹ This was in 1755-1757.

The *Archives of Maryland* and advertisements and other notices in the *Maryland Gazette* afford evidence very similar to that of Virginia, though perhaps more frequently in the younger colony the three sorts of parish schools were clearly affiliated in some way with a single vestry and its wardens. As already noted, Maryland official legislation, if it did not concern one school alone, was likely to be aimed at the proliferation of county as opposed to parish schools.¹¹² Of course Parson Bacon's charity school in Talbot was in several senses a parish school, for the official proposal states that it is to be established in St. Peter's Parish.

In North Carolina the early private and even endowed free schools operated by the clergy are again difficult to distinguish from parish schools. Generally perhaps those subsidized by the S.P.G. may be called parish schools, for their clergy were usually subsidized for ecclesiastical and educational duties. If genuine parish schools existed in North Carolina before 1763, they were certainly elementary schools only. But in spirit Moravian and Presbyterian educational institutions established after 1750 were almost parish schools and were serving congregations of their faiths, though of course these groups were not technically or legally recognized as parishes.

In South Carolina the same difficulty of distinguishing the free en-

dowed school, the private school, and the parish school often arises.¹¹³ The 1712 free school in Charleston was under the supervision of St. Philip's Parish, and the clergyman and his lay or clerical assistant were the teachers.¹¹⁴ The excellent school founded at St. James Goose Creek, by the Rev. Dr. Francis LeJau and conducted successfully by the Irish Benjamin Dennis with the aid of the S.P.G., is from its description a parish school partially designed to convert and catechize the local Negroes and Indians as well as the white children. Though it performed some unusual functions, LeJau's letters prove it was definitely a parish institution.¹¹⁵ The act of 1712 had encouraged each parish to set up a school for which £12 current money as subsidy would be provided from the provincial treasury. Many of the endowments by bequests mentioned above were placed in the care of a board of governors or visitors consisting of a clergyman and his vestry; and, as in the upper colonies, obviously the funded institution was designed to serve the inhabitants of a particular parish.

Georgia's few schools before 1763, though already considered as grammar or free schools, were variously for British, German, and French elements of the population and yet were more or less loosely affiliated with a Church of England parish, especially if the parish church was located in one of the several newly established towns. Bethesda Orphan House, despite its strong religious character, was not parish-affiliated in any usual sense.

The southern colonial private school also took many forms. The qualified lay schoolmaster who operated his independent school for his own profit is not hard to distinguish, nor is his school. Some of the best institutions seem to have lain somewhere between parish and private, however. What sort of school, if it was a school, did the French Huguenot clergyman John Bertrand operate in his own home, where at least two of William Fitzhugh's sons were trained in the 1680s? Was instruction individually tutorial, or did Bertrand have a number of pupils? Whatever the numbers, it is fairly evident that he did not conduct a parish school but augmented his income by some teaching.¹¹⁶

The small private school sprang up in the southern colonies wherever local persons interested in education felt the need for it, and the need seems to have been felt frequently. Wright and Knight point out that in the eighteenth century before 1775 four hundred advertisements of schools mostly private, appeared in the *South-Carolina Gazette* alone, a journal not founded until 1732.¹¹⁷ And as quoted from Robert Beverley above, in Virginia whenever and wherever there were not endowed free schools, other sorts of community private schools sprang up. Most of these schools had a relatively short life. As population expanded, other perhaps better

staffed institutions including the endowed and parochial, often took their places.

Along with the small private schools in Anglican-related communities or areas there existed especially in the eighteenth century private Presbyterian-church-sponsored schools anywhere and everywhere in the interior and even along the frontier where Scots or Scotch-Irish existed in appreciable numbers. Bigoted as the Lowland Scot may have been, he and his Ulster kinsman believed in education for all, and especially in an educated ministry.¹¹⁸ Princeton-educated youths, or young men from Aberdeen or Glasgow or Edinburgh or simply from good Scottish grammar schools, established small academies with the blessing of their church. Some of their schools grew into officially related denominational academies and some remained at least in direct financial support entirely private. If they grew into colleges, as the forerunners of Davidson and Hampden-Sydney and Washington and Lee did, they became permanently or for several generations affiliated with the church. Many of the best-known of them were founded just at the end of the colonial period or in the decades immediately after, as the Moses Waddel school in South Carolina attended by John C. Calhoun and Hugh Swinton Legaré and A. B. Longstreet of the first national period.¹¹⁹

One of the best genuinely private colonial schools in the South was that conducted by the Reverend James Maury (1718-1769) of Fredericksville parish in Louisa (later Albemarle) County in the last years of the period (from 1752).¹²⁰ Effective preacher, thorough and inspiring teacher, writer of verse and prose for the *Virginia Gazette* and probably other periodicals, Maury is usually remembered as the plaintiff in the famous Parsons' Cause law suit in which Patrick Henry gained his first fame. Among Maury's most distinguished pupils were Thomas Jefferson and Bishop James Madison and their friends John Walker and Dabney Carr the elder. As an educational theorist Maury will be considered later in this chapter.

Perhaps Maury's best-known pedagogical contemporary (and personal friend) was another clergyman who years after Maury's death remained a Loyalist and had eventually to return to Great Britain. The Reverend Jonathan Boucher opened his first school in the village in which President James Madison was born, on the Rappahannock in 1759, before he entered holy orders. For most of the remainder of his stay in America, in both Maryland and Virginia, Boucher was a schoolmaster as well as a parson and a prolific writer. He tried to educate George Washington's stepson Jackey (Jacky) Custis, but he was more successful with others who attained prominence in one or the other of the colonies.

As far as daily routine, textbooks, and curriculum are concerned, Maury and Boucher operated boarding schools conducted more or less along the lines of the free grammar schools of their provinces or of rural England. In other words, through classical and scholastic disciplines they prepared their charges for the College of William and Mary or possibly King's in New York or the College of Philadelphia, or for the British universities. Staunch Anglicans, they encouraged no students to enter the College of New Jersey (Princeton). Though Maury did not live to see the Revolution, his letters, sermons, and newspaper writings indicate that he would have sided with the patriots, as his descendants did. Boucher remained "Toryism" all his life, leaving behind his *Reminiscences of an American Loyalist* (published 1925) and his *View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution* (London, 1797), the latter consisting of fourteen discourses or sermons on phases of American life. In his last month in America Boucher preached to a hostile congregation with two loaded pistols before him on the desk.

The two men probably became acquainted through their mutual intense interest in education but specifically through their mutual friend Robert Jackson, who introduced certain written works on education by Boucher to Maury in 1762. Boucher speaks in highest terms of Maury, and tells of his long ride to visit the latter on his deathbed, at Maury's earnest request. What their letters and treatises indicate is that they were themselves keenly intelligent and erudite teachers who must have delighted the better minds that were directed by them. Maury shows a strong sense of history ancient and contemporary and a remarkable perception of the colonies in relation to the French and Indian menace and to one another. Boucher was geographer, dialectician, antiquarian, and political theorist, among other things.

The schools they conducted were for the local day students and for boarders from a distance. In Tidewater Virginia village or the Maryland capital Boucher had among his students many children of the upper level of planters, and even to the relatively quiet Piedmont of Fredericksville parish Maury drew a small number of students from a good many miles around, again probably principally from the upper echelons of plantation society.¹²¹ Of course no one can say these pedagogues were responsible for the later distinguished career of any individual former pupil, but their ideas and even learning methods, especially Maury's, have the habit of reappearing years later in the thinking and arguments of those two remarkable sons of the Enlightenment, Jefferson and the republican and scientific parson-educator-bishop Madison, who was president of William and Mary.

Another well-known private school was that of the Scot Donald Robert-

son in King and Queen County, Virginia, 1758–1769,¹²² and a fourth was that of the Reverend James Marye in Fredericksburg (around 1740), the latter possibly attended by Washington and perhaps for a time by Madison and Monroe.¹²³ Robertson, educated at Aberdeen and Edinburgh, had arrived in Virginia in 1753 and before he opened his own school probably was for some years tutor in the family of Colonel John Baylor. The Robertson account book gives more information about his school than perhaps is known of any other southern colonial institution. Tuition and board and laundry charges, titles of textbooks (including classical authors, manuals, and grammars), cost of school materials and names of students appear along with other information. Middle- and upper-class planters' surnames are here in abundance. The Latin texts used by the Robinson boys in 1759 and Edmund Pendleton, Jr.'s copy of Lily's Latin grammar are listed with the price of each. Harrison, Innes, Taylor, Todd, Holmes, Hoomes, Lomax, Wyatt, Latané, Burwell, Lee, Dabney, and literally scores of other well-known southerners appear through the years. James Madison, the future President, was studying classics at this school in 1762–1764, and to his later chagrin learned French with a broad Scots accent.¹²⁴ Among the more distinguished students were John Taylor of Caroline, the elder John Tyler, and George Rogers Clark. But it is Madison's book purchases, listed by author and title, which tell much of a major scholar-statesman and his preparation for college and career. One would like to know as much about Jefferson at Maury's, though the third President's lifelong indepth interest in the classics and his full mastery of Greek and Latin are attributed by his principal biographer to Maury rather than to his college.

Thus between 1750 and the Revolution the southern private school showed in Virginia alone four distinguished institutions which trained probably as thoroughly as the more famous English schools attended by cousins and friends of those educated in the colony. Two of the four were conducted by clergymen of French Huguenot extraction educated at William and Mary, one by a northern English parson who did not attend any university but was as learned as the others, and the fourth by a lay Scot educated at two universities of his native country. Each of these pedagogues adjusted more or less gracefully, and usually shrewdly, the orthodox grammar school curriculum to American boys and American conditions. As far as their students may be followed, they were on the whole most successful. Maury at least, as Hugh Jones before him, saw that here in the New World all their students marched to the beat of a different drummer. Perhaps their methods were little different from those of less well-known southern colonial teachers whose scholars never at-

tained the distinction theirs did. Nevertheless, the American nation may be grateful that in mind and character these masters of private schools were the kind of men they were.

Just as the private school for profit, or indeed any of the other sorts of institutions just discussed, the old field school grew out of the immediate needs of a community. It was most likely to have been located in a rural area, in an abandoned field of the kind mentioned above. It probably existed in every southern colony well into its period of statehood. Philip A. Bruce believed that in Virginia the greatest proportion of children who received an education in the seventeenth century obtained it in such a school, and if he had written about the eighteenth century he would probably have said the same thing.¹²⁵ Bruce really does not distinguish the old field very clearly from the private school except by location. As he and others point out, institutions of this type came into being when a group of parents got together and decided to have a school in which each would pay the master a part of his salary. Again clergy or their lay readers seem to have been the first masters of of these one-room schoolhouses, except perhaps in Georgia, where some professional lay schoolmasters were on the ground early. As time went on, growing parish duties of the clergy and the greater financial inducement of the private or parish school caused most of them to be relinquished to less qualified teachers. By the last decades of the seventeenth century in the Chesapeake Bay country and soon after in the Carolinas the children of the prosperous, who might want and need the orthodox classical education the clergy were qualified to give, were able to go to Great Britain or to one of the other sorts of schools described above. Thereafter the parson was replaced by almost anyone who thought he could teach the three R's. Frequently this was a formerly or presently indentured servant, who possessed at best a fair British secondary school education.¹²⁶

Backwoodsmen like Patrick Henry and other half-frontiersmen often liked to boast that their education was obtained in an old field school, as probably part of it was. These were the places where the sons and daughters of small farmers and lesser planters insured the literacy of their children. In their simplicity and in their clientele they were genuine forerunners of democratic public schools, though they were pay schools.

Quite unlike them in many respects were the tutorial schools in private families.¹²⁷ The tutor and his school were outgrowths of, and replacements for, the familial education once conducted by the head of the household in both Great Britain and America, as noted near the beginning of this chapter. Here the teacher and the school were so much the same that they have to be considered together. In the South in many instances the parent, male or female, taught the children, carrying them as far as the parent was capable

of going or thought it wise to go under his supervision. But on the large estates of the region, particularly in the eighteenth century, the mother, who was household and inner-plantation manager and bearer of many children, was simply not able to conduct even an informal dame's school sort of instruction. And the male parent, who had to oversee his overseers, prescribe for sick slaves and other servants, serve as a justice of the peace and vestryman and perhaps burgess or councillor of his province, was so busy he had no time for his children's education, though he may have been an English school or university graduate, save to make sure they received the kind of instruction he felt they needed and could take. If he lived remote from a good school, he often sought for a man or woman who would temporarily become a member of his family and take his place as instructor. Except for the ecclesiastical catechizers, these hired or indentured instructors were perhaps the earliest professional southern school teachers. The first record of one who presumably acted as tutor is found under date of May 6, 1637, in which Ambrose Harmar of Virginia petitions the King for the custody of Benoni Buck, retarded son of the late Reverend Richard Buck, for Harmar had already had "the tuition" of the boy and his two brothers for the past thirteen years.¹²⁸ By the 1650s there are several letters recommending tutors, some wills mentioning that tutors are to be secured to teach orphaned children, or instances of small planters acting as tutors for a few neighborhood children who might come and live with them. In 1662 a Robert Jones was tutor in the family of John Hansford, father of Major Thomas Hansford of Bacon's Rebellion, in York County. In Accomac and Northampton on the Eastern Shore several tutors are mentioned, among them young women who taught daughters of a household.¹²⁹ On the other hand, a few women family teachers had either boys or girls or both under their tutelage.

In Maryland in 1671 Moses Stagall had to petition the Talbot County court twice for payment for instruction given the children of Arthur Emry and the daughter of another neighbor; in the latter case at least Stagall also furnished board. The executrix of one veteran tutor who died before 1677 had to sue the estate of Jane Grey, whose seven children he had instructed while he looked after her affairs in general.¹³⁰ In South Carolina in 1694 provision was made in a will to continue Mrs. Hannah Trotter in the testator's family as tutor for his daughter, as Mrs. Trotter had been for the past two or three years.¹³¹

It seems fairly certain that a considerable number of young girls were given instruction in the "graces" under the tutorial school system, either at home or when they boarded in the family of a tutor or where he was resident. Boys might daily travel short distances to learn from a neighbor's resident hired tutor. By the 1650s the hired or indentured male tutor was

usually a man with a grammar school and perhaps some university education who taught primarily the three R's but might give elementary instruction in Latin grammar. The female tutor, perhaps also indentured but more often an impecunious widow of great respectability and some intellectual or pedagogical attainments, might offer the three R's and needlework, possibly French, possibly dancing.¹³²

From the seventeenth century there was great variation in duties and in the degree of social acceptance of the tutor. Sometimes even the indentured teacher was accepted more or less as a member of the planter's inner circle, even as late as the 1770s: for an example, plain lower-middle-class Scot John Harrower. In other instances the tutor was considered a sort of superior servant, though even in the same family the attitude might change according to the educational and social background of the particular family teacher. Some fairly well-educated men took three-year indentures as tutors on condition they be allotted land thereafter. Thus teaching was one way of becoming a planter. Another goal for a tutor might be to marry into the family of a wealthy planter. This did not often happen, but apparently it might have happened to Philip Fithian in the 1770s and did happen to his immediate successor in the same family, John Peck.

South Carolina historians are inclined to believe that their colony had less real need for tutors in the eighteenth century than other southern provinces. They point out that Charleston with its excellent public and private schools was easy of access¹³³ to most planters and that the wealthy increasingly sent their sons and even daughters abroad. This may well be true for the classical and university or legal education, but the scores of advertisements in the *South Carolina Gazette* from 1732 to 1775 indicate not only that a number of persons offered almost any subject from dancing and drawing to navigation, but that the same men and women were often willing to take pupils for individual tutorial instruction. Of course these were not in-family or resident tutors, but there were still persons who even along the Ashley and the Cooper rivers resided with families and gave elementary instruction, usually as a preparation for urban or British schools.¹³⁴

In North Carolina direct evidence and actual names of tutors are almost nonexistent, but there are indications that some prosperous families such as the Moseleys employed them for their children to impart at least elementary reading and writing. In Georgia the real evidence before 1763 is again lacking, though it is probable that a few of the larger landowners may have employed household teachers.

The southern family tutor and tutorial school of the eighteenth century are to be found primarily in the Chesapeake Bay provinces. Though there

were many schools of several kinds, except in the oldest counties near the capital towns they were far apart. Especially in Virginia, but to a considerable extent in Maryland as the frontiers pushed west, planters' younger sons with their families settled farther and farther away from organized private or endowed schools. But both in the oldest counties as well as along the relatively new frontiers of the Northern Neck of Virginia or upcountry Frederick in Maryland, the head of a family was likely to attempt to procure some sort of tutor for his younger children. Sometimes he secured a Charterhouse or Christ's Hospital or Merchant Taylors' graduate who could keep his accounts, copy his letters, and teach his younger children their ABC's. Sometimes, if he were wealthy or fortunate enough, he could secure the services of an English university graduate who expected eventually to enter holy orders, but most of these young men found the masterhips of free or private or even some community schools much more lucrative. Occasionally a clergyman who did not wish to operate either a parish or a personal private school might take two or three children of neighboring parishioners to live and study with him (Maury's school was a little larger and more formal than this). Such may have been the situation of William Fitzhugh's two sons who in the 1680s studied under Huguenot parson John Bertrand.

But usually even the most prosperous planter who did not wish his children to be sent abroad for their secondary school training found a Scottish or Princeton university-trained tutor, or a nonuniversity Scot of good classical background. James Reid of Edinburgh was apparently tutor, probably indentured, for Colonel Ruffin of King William County in the 1760s. In the same decade John Warden, another Scot educated at Edinburgh, taught the children of Colonel Thomas Jones. In 1741 William Beverley of Blandfield wrote to London for a Scottish teacher for his children, though he observed that the dialectal burr from Caledonian instructors never fully rubbed off.

One sprightly little school girl of the 1750s, Maria Carter of Sabine Hall, gives a description of her day under a tutor to her cousin Maria Carter of Cleve:

March 25, 1756

My Dear Cousin:

You have really imposed a Task upon me which I can by no means perform viz: that of writing a merry & comical Letter: how shou'd I, my dear, that am ever confined either at School or with my Grandmama know how the world goes on? Now I will give you the History of one Day the Repetition of which without variations carries me through the three hundred and sixty five Days, which you know compleats the year.

Well then first begin, I am awakened out of a sound sleep with some croaking voice either Patty's, Milly's, or some other of our Domestic with Miss Polly Miss Polly get up, tis time to rise, Mr. Price is down stairs, & tho' I hear them I lie quite snugg till my Grandmama uses her Voice, then I get up, huddle on my cloaths & down to Book, then to Breakfast, then to School again, & may be I have an Hour to my self before Dinner, then the Same Story over again till twilight, & then a small portion of time before I go to rest, and so you must expect nothing from me but that I am Dear Cousin,
Most Affectionately Yours,

MARIA CARTER.¹³⁵

Little Maria's routine is fairly normal in the tutorial school, but much lighter than some. In scores of instances the plantation schoolhouses, brick or frame, stood near the mansion and may have formed a part of the courtyard open quadrangle. Reid probably taught in the frame schoolhouse which existed into this century adjacent to the brick Georgian mansion of Sweet Hall in King William County.¹³⁶ John Harrower describes in his *Journal* the "neat little house" at the upper end of an avenue of trees and shrubs a few hundred yards from "the Main House," where the new tutor was to live and teach. Though indentured, Harrower ate with his master's family and participated in many of their social activities; his agreement called for four years with Colonel Daingerfield if the latter insisted. For his instruction of the family children he was to receive bed, board, laundry, and clothing, and by charging neighboring children four shillings sterling per annum whatever additional in cash he could get. As he wrote to his wife, he could send all the cash to her, as he did not need a penny of it for himself. Harrower's like Reid's was a weatherboarded building, and in Harrower's case at least plastered inside with shell lime.¹³⁷ Harrower taught children from ages four to eight within the family, with children of similar ages from outside. In the evenings and on Sundays he instructed Thomas Brooks, Mr. Spotswood's carpenter, in writing and arithmetic and Lucy Gaines, the young housekeeper at Belvidera, in writing. From time to time he names neighbors' children who came under his tuition. He tells of drilling the Daingerfield children in the Church of England catechism, and also of teaching by the English (as opposed to the Scottish) method and of trying to speak "high English" like the planter's family. He also introduced some of the slaves to the catechism. Though he does not outline a normal day's activity as young Maria Carter did, he mentions early morning instruction, and some afternoon. But apparently his schedule was not so rigid that he could not any day ride to town or neighboring plantations, and frequently even at midweek he was off on a full day's jaunt, sometimes

on business for the Colonel. Though most of his curriculum was elementary, he mentions that on a certain day he began Edwin Daingerfield in "the Latin Grammar."¹³⁸

Philip Vickers Fithian, Princeton graduate, has left in his *Journal and Letters* perhaps the most frequently quoted account of tutorial and general life on a colonial plantation. Like Harrower, he comes after the colonial period proper, for he taught in Virginia in 1773-1774. But in both instances because of references to tutors and methods in other scattered families, one may assume that both men represented the kind of teacher who had been employed for at least a generation before their time. Fithian belongs in several senses to a younger generation than Harrower, for the employment of Americans as opposed to Scots was growing, not so much from dawning patriotism as the English-descended planter's increasing conviction that Scottish burrs were influencing for the worse the pure English he wanted his children to employ.

Fithian was employed at Nomini Hall on the Potomac by Colonel Robert Carter, member of the Virginia Council and a former Inner Templar, highly educated, gentle, and thoughtful. Carter's wife, whom the young tutor greatly admired, was a Tasker of Maryland and had brought into the family a munificent dowery. Of their nine children born up to that time seven were living, and Fithian taught everything from Latin and Greek to eighteen-year-old Ben to the spelling book and ABC's to the youngest capable of taking any instruction at all. The two oldest sons, Ben and Bob, a nephew, and charming daughters of fifteen, thirteen, and eleven, and two more younger beginners, made up his little school in his own building, which also included his bedroom. He was to receive £60 a year, have spacious quarters, dine with the family, have a servant and horse of his own and full use of Colonel Carter's excellent library. His school building was of brick story-and-a-half construction and contained five rooms, two upstairs and three down.

Fithian intended to become a Presbyterian clergyman and marry the young lady at home in New Jersey to whom he wrote many of his surviving letters. He lived to marry his beloved but, as an army chaplain, died early in the Revolution from dysentery and exposure. His papers offer a priceless picture of the daily life led by the grantees of the Northern Neck of Virginia, their religion, their social diversions, their family life, and their intellectual interests as well as of the state and form of education in one of the greatest late golden-age plantation households. The Presbyterian tutor's life was busy and happy, and he grew to respect and admire greatly the moral and intellectual character of the Virginians he came to know. Details of school life (such as whipping Bob), books read by young women, holidays permitted, and a hundred other things are mentioned. One of

the significant documents is his long letter to his chosen Princeton successor, John Peck, warning him of the difficulties and pleasures of life in such a southern household. This one epistle is a generally sympathetic and perceptive treatise on Virginia mind and character and manner. Equally useful is the entry of June 11, 1774, in which he outlines the school day, the periods of all but the last guided by ringing bells. The children arose and dressed at seven, breakfasted at eight, attended school from nine until twelve. Then there was the period of recreation before two o'clock dinner. From three to five-thirty they were again at their books. One gathers that prayers, though never absent, were not as frequent as at Bethesda in Georgia or even in the daily routine of Anglican parsons' boarding schools. Holidays for a dozen reasons were frequent.

Fithian had his evenings free for reading or stimulating conversation with the lord and lady of the manor, for Carter himself was widely and deeply read and a performer and composer of music (of which he had a considerable library), and Mrs. Carter could and did converse intelligently on books and authors, though she occasionally tried to prod the young tutor into more active social life.

By the time he departed in 1774 to be succeeded by the friend who would marry one of the Carter daughters, Philip Fithian had developed a genuine affection for all the family. He had formed a personal friendship with schoolmaster and Scottish poet John Lowe¹³⁹ of the Washington family at nearby Bushfield, and he had seen that country gentlemen could and did possess wide intellectual interest and real moral probity and at the same time could live with grace and some gaiety. In contrast James Reid saw little to admire in any planter of his acquaintance. In Fithian's instance the tutor must easily have learned as much as his pupils. Even though perhaps Colonel Carter was an unusually gifted man, his family and friends were certainly normal representatives of the intellectual interests of their class. And these interests were more than respectable.¹⁴⁰

Though nothing is known of the Mr. Price who taught Maria Carter of Sabine Hall, one does find in her father's diary a considerable amount about the tutor Landon Carter engaged to teach his grandchildren, including a son of Maria, who had married a Beverley. The tutor was a contemporary of Harrower and Fithian in the profession, for Landon Carter (uncle of the Fithian employer) first engaged him in 1772. His name was George Menzies. He was the son of a parson in the area who had died some years before. Young Menzies was not a college graduate but was reported to have studied with great profit for four years under the well-known tutor Mr. John Warden¹⁴¹ at Mr. Thomas Jones' plantation in Northumberland County. He undertook on a trial basis at £30 a year to teach the six grandsons Carter had assembled at Sabine Hall. Billy Beverley, Maria's child, ar-

rived with a letter from his father, Robert, of Blandfield recommending the use of Lily's Latin grammar for his son because it would save the boy time when he went on to school in England, where Lily was everywhere used.¹⁴² All the grandfather really wanted from Menzies was fundamental training in reading, writing, and cyphering. Carter's diary notes even the price of ink pots for Menzies' pupils, but the employer soon came to despise "the absurd creature," and indolent, sullen, dirty, and insolent person Carter conceived him to be. Carter admits Menzies' intelligence several times, but with or without good reason found him otherwise utterly unsatisfactory. From what is known of Landon Carter's captious and carping attitude about everything and everybody, and his constant, almost morbid analysis of himself, one must guess he was more severe than most employers would have been with the young man. The last one reads of the unhappy tutor is that he is ill and has taken his clothes with him to go to stay at a physician's home.¹⁴³ This was in 1773.

It is quite clear that the well-educated large-plantation tutor of the eighteenth century was expected to train more than one student, and probably often as many as twenty or thirty. Like the old field schoolmaster, he usually operated a one-room school with pupils varying from primary-level children to those almost ready to enter a university. His living conditions and salary were perhaps much better than those of the old field schoolteacher's. In isolated or frontier areas he probably labored in humbler families than those of the nabobs of the Northern Neck. For many, perhaps most of these pedagogues, a spell at tutoring was but a steppingstone to land, frontier adventure, or profitable private school. But even his relatively brief sojourns within individual families were important in keeping the literacy rate fairly high in the Chesapeake area.¹⁴⁴

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING FOR THE CRAFTS, TRADES, AND PROFESSIONS

The southern colonies of the seventeenth century, as did old England of the same period, came to feel the necessity of giving many of the poor and underprivileged some degree and sort of formal education which would make them useful citizens. The English poor law of 1601¹⁴⁵ provided for the annual election of overseers of the poor in every parish, consisting of the churchwardens and from two to four "substantial householders," to see to it that children especially (though adults were to some extent included) had flax and other materials for acquiring manual skills, and that as soon as these children were old enough they were to be apprenticed to a useful trade, the males until aged twenty-four, the females until twenty-one or time of marriage. Levies and other forms of taxes for parishes were authorized, with heavy penalties for nonpayment. Several categories of poor were

included under the law, but concern here is that this was the beginning of a system of nationwide apprenticeship. The English children might be taught a trade if the masters to whom they were apprenticed had one themselves, but apprenticeship by this law was principally a device for maintenance and supervision. Since it was a means of giving useful employment to some who might otherwise become a burden upon state and locality, the English law required every person who would "have occasion to use servants" to take these poor under indentures or apprenticeships. Refusal meant prosecution.

The southern system, found first in Virginia but employed also in the other colonies,¹⁴⁶ followed the British law but differed in several essential respects. First, taking an apprentice in the colonies was not compulsory for everyone who could afford servants. Second, the teaching of a specific trade was part of the master's obligation to the person under indenture. Therefore usually only master artisans took apprentices. America desperately needed skilled artisans, and this was to become a major way of getting them. Third, in the southern colonies (again beginning in Virginia) legislation regarding apprenticeship specifically required that the apprentice be given the rudiments of a literary education—reading, writing, and sometimes arithmetic—and usually religious instruction along with them.¹⁴⁷ And in the southeastern area indentures for young men usually ended at twenty-one years of age instead of twenty-four, though for young women it was likely to be as in England, at eighteen or twenty-one or marriage. These were usually the compulsory apprenticeships (compulsory only on the part of the indentured). In rarer cases the son of a substantial family might wish to learn law or how to be a county official or physician or apothecary. Family background might have affected the form of apprenticeship (trade, craft, or profession), but if a boy was poor he might be indentured in any of the three areas.¹⁴⁸ Until the mid-eighteenth century, the average southern practitioner of medicine or law, if he had been born in the colony, very probably learned his profession in a law office or apothecary shop in which he served as apprentice. This system survived for legal studies or licenses until quite recently in parts of the South.

Thus apprenticeship education might be at almost any level. That with which one is primarily concerned, for it led in many respects to the sort of public practical instruction Thomas Jefferson envisaged for all who could or would not go higher, is training in a craft itself and in the three R's and the religious doctrine which accompanied them. The actual training under experienced carpenters, cabinetmakers, silversmiths, and other practicing artisans is known primarily by what survives in account books and what is described of British practice in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century novels

and in a few handbooks of practical instruction like the many extant manuals for the farrier. Of literacy for the apprentice more is known from county or parish records. Scores of these manuscript (and now frequently printed) records for southern communities are full of complaints or court orders concerning the failure on the part of the contracting master to fulfill his agreement. This applied to young women as well as men, for the former were expected to become at least literate as they learned spinning, dress-making, embroidery, or other designated industrial arts.

But here one should pause to consider what native (and sometimes imported) children received apprentice training and why. To say that they were the poor is by no means enough or even exact as far as it goes. Usually they may be divided into orphans, those from generally poor families, the neglected or abandoned, the illegitimate, and the mulattoes. These types overlap, and actually by no means all orphans were poor nor were the illegitimate whites or mulattoes always unprovided for from other sources. But usually or often the parish overseers were guardians of the nonindigent¹⁴⁹ as well as the indigent and determined how they should be brought up.

Sometimes, before the estate inherited by an orphan within the colony had been inventoried or appraised, the overseers ordered that the child should have as much education as his means would allow and that after schooling of from perhaps one to three years he or she should be apprenticed in a useful trade. Naturally such action presupposed the inheritance would not be large. The indigent orphans or neglected or abandoned poor were apprenticed often at a very tender age, with the usual stipulation in the contract between overseers and master for a certain number of months or years of schooling along with instruction in the craft (some masters decidedly neglected the latter, using the apprentices for menial or ordinary labors). The complaints of neglect of literacy and education usually came toward the end of the period of indenture, when the apprentice realized his inadequacies. If the cases were proved, masters were ordered to give them freedom at once and/or provide the required instruction immediately and might in addition be fined.¹⁵⁰

In Virginia there was a kind of compulsory education for poor children from at least as early as 1646 (based on English statutes) empowering county justices to "bind out" children of parents whose poverty did not allow them to provide them with "good breeding" (clearly elementary education), and the resulting indentures, like those for orphans, required reading and writing. The abandoned and the mulatto children might be treated the same way. In several instances mulatto children had their education provided for in the wills of their white masters, perhaps indication of blood kinship but probably affection for the particular children or their black parents. Often mulatto children whose education was paid for were

given their freedom from slavery upon condition they be apprenticed in a useful trade upon completion of their elementary education.¹⁵¹ Thus in the Chesapeake Bay country and the South Carolina city of Charleston toward the end of the seventeenth century and a generation or two afterward there was a considerable body of free Negroes trained as artisans. But more of this later.

Then there were the poor indentured children sent or brought from Great Britain. Their terms were usually long, and sometimes they already had a good education, as the boys William Fitzhugh secured through his London factor from Christ's Hospital, the great London charity school, who would be qualified on arrival to read and act as accountants or bookkeepers, and perhaps serve as secretaries. (The young cousin to whom Fitzhugh gave his freedom from indenture in his will may have been educated before his arrival and may at once have taken his place in plantation society.)¹⁵² Some of these and other "indentured servants"¹⁵³ acted as schoolmasters themselves. In the latter situation they usually served only for a short term of indenture, a term which would at least pay for their transportation. Though these were in origin poor boys, they might get from their professional, merchant, or planter masters practice in a business or skill or learned profession which might allow them to rise to the top in the colony. "Poor" or "apprenticed" or "indentured" might have any of many meanings.

Perhaps the instance of Fitzhugh's freeing his cousin suggests the obvious and undeniable fact that not all indentured servants came from the really indigent classes of Great Britain. Their indentures paid for their passage over and sometimes included the stipulation that they were to be granted lands or set up in a trade they may already have acquired. There are classic cases, as the case of Adam Thoroughgood of Princess Anne County, Virginia, for example, of indentured servants rising to become proprietors of real substance and members of the House of Burgesses. In several instances they were young men of good or even distinguished families and surnames whose immediate circumstances were such that they could not afford to pay for their passage. In other instances they came to America for political reasons, sometimes voluntarily and sometimes under pressure. In any of the latter cases indenture was by no means synonymous with apprenticeship, but they so often overlap that they can hardly be considered separately. For the political or criminal or Christ's Hospital boy, apprenticeship education was not what it was for the indigent young from either side of the Atlantic.

In towns such as Annapolis, Williamsburg, and Charleston, and perhaps lesser villages, native-born or imported apprentices did have the opportunity of working under skilled craftsmen and becoming literate. They

were to form the small artisan class. But a great many of the poor indentured servants for the first century in the Chesapeake colonies and in smaller numbers in Georgia and the Carolinas were "apprenticed" to planters. Since these large-scale farmers had in their establishments some skilled craftsmen, a few of the bondsmen might learn a trade and at least theoretically—if they were young enough and their masters sufficiently affluent—reading and writing if they did not already know them. As late as 1671 there were six thousand indentured servants as opposed to two thousand slaves, before the tobacco industry forced the planters to cheaper labor and the proportions in the next half century became more or less reversed.¹⁵⁴ But indentures for these late teen-agers and adult redemptioners contained no clauses for instruction, nor did colonial laws require that they be taught reading and writing, though the terminal clause required their being given a piece of land and a few supplies. Bonds often required that women servants be taught to spin or sew, and some young ones were to be taught to read and write. But here lay the great problem or weakness of upper-South white literacy—the indentured servant from abroad who was illiterate and for whose compulsory education no laws existed.

For any servant who must be educated in varying degrees, masters, tutors on large plantations, occasionally local clergy, as already noted, might give the requisite instruction in reading and writing and religion. In most instances the servants were so taught. But as in the cities of Great Britain, certain masters, skilled craftsmen, might begrudge the daylight hours, or working hours, for instruction. This might also happen on the plantation, when a driving master counted all the hours he could get from his servants in field work. The result was a certain sort of occasional evening school. In Charleston this evening school might spring up for apprentices but develop as a sort of continuing education school in the fine arts or foreign languages for ladies and gentlemen already possessed of basic communication skills.¹⁵⁵ Primarily by implication, however, and from such evidence as the journal of John Harrower, it is clear that time was devoted in the evening to the instruction of staff members of plantation or other households who had never learned to read and write. On large plantations indentured schoolmasters might be employed to instruct their younger fellow bondsmen at odd hours.¹⁵⁶ The *South-Carolina Gazette* during and immediately after the colonial period contains notices of operating or opening "Evening-Schools," which were obviously aimed at the public but to which the busy artisan might send his apprentices. The evidence that an appreciable number were educated in the evening schools in the South before 1763 is shadowy, but that the apprentice as often as not received instruction in reading and writing after daylight working hours, from his personal

master or from a schoolmaster, would seem to have been the natural and logical method for the planter who wanted a sturdy teen-age boy at profitable labor for as much time as possible. Both Robert F. Seybolt and Carl Bridenbaugh write a good deal about evening schools for apprentices, the latter holding that evening schools came into existence in America for the purpose of training the indentured,¹⁵⁷ but both men are in general describing institutions in the larger colonial cities of New England and the middle states.

In the southern colonies as in other American areas, numbers of apprentices obtained little or no education because they felt no real incentives to do so. Apprentices who were compelled into indenture frequently were as indifferent as some of their masters to the education due them by law. They planned existence on farms or frontiers where they saw no practical necessity for reading and writing, probably because they came from illiterate families or because they preferred to spend labor-free hours in recreation. The high literacy rates Bruce and others have figured for the South indicate that fortunately there were not too many of these. On the other hand, there is little evidence that the poor apprentices wished the open-ended instruction Benjamin Franklin advocated, which might lead them, through juntos or evening schools or simply self-education by reading, into realms of knowledge and fitness for a society beyond that of the mere artisan or dirt farmer.¹⁵⁸

Three at least of the formally organized charity schools already noted, the Talbot County school in Maryland, the Winyaw Indigo Society in South Carolina, and the Bethesda Orphan House in Georgia, were designed to give instruction *before* apprenticeship. That is, they gave the basic education before indenture rather than along with, though they included with it some light training in crafts. The charters of each, or the organizational proposals for each (e.g., the Winyaw Indigo Society)¹⁵⁹ called for binding youths as apprentices at the conclusion of their months or years of schooling. Though these people might have been expected to continue self-education during or after indenture, no known records show what happened to these educated apprentices when they went into the great world.

The southern system of basic education for apprentices could never be as carefully supervised as it could be though not always was in northern cities, for neither supervisors nor masters lived close enough together to report or to check regularly. But the fines and other pressures exerted on uncooperative masters to get the stipulated training for parish wards indicate that the poor at least throughout the southern colonies had the opportunity to become literate.

Perhaps what happened to one poverty-stricken boy born in Virginia in

1721 is the classic example of how far an apprentice to a professional man might rise. Edmund Pendleton came from a good and even educated family, but his father was a struggling farmer who died the year this youngest son was born. The boy worked on the family farm in Caroline County until he was thirteen. The clerk of his county, Benjamin Robinson, perhaps one of the supervisors of the poor of the parish or county, chose him to learn the business of the clerk of the court's office under an indenture of six years and six months.¹⁶⁰ Though a somewhat superior family background may have entered into his getting this particular apprenticeship, others of similar background, such as the poet Charles Hansford, became blacksmiths or tailors, undoubtedly through apprentice training.¹⁶¹

Edmund Pendleton's duties thrust him at once into learning the intricacies of legal forms and pleading and of the county court system, and, in his particular case, of the established church. He was soon clerk of the vestry, a position which carried a salary sufficient for him to begin to buy books "and read them diligently." Office after office came to him, such as clerk of the Caroline County court-martial, a military tribunal. He studied Latin as well as law, the former at a nearby classical school which he was allowed to attend part time. By 1741 Pendleton was free of apprenticeship, took the examination for the bar at Williamsburg under the great King's Attorney Edward Barradall, and began a juridical career perhaps excelled by none in a colony distinguished for its lawyers and judges.¹⁶² Presiding provincial jurist, with Jefferson and Wythe reviser of the laws of Virginia, and Revolutionary patriot and statesman, he was one of the eminent products of the apprenticeship system for the poor, though admittedly not quite a typical example.

As suggested above, it may be doubtful that apprentices in the house or warehouse of the Nelsons at Yorktown, in the offices of Charleston or Williamsburg barristers or colony officials, or of printers or apothecaries or physicians were necessarily from among the poor or without previous education. Certainly successful colonial merchants and lawyers and newspaper publishers from Maryland to Georgia had, as in the middle and northern colonies, served their time. Only toward the end of the period was a large proportion of lawyers or physicians formally educated at Philadelphia or in Great Britain. Merchants even more rarely, unless they inherited a business, rose except through apprenticeship. And the very nature of printing and publishing almost compelled the Parkses and Greens and Timothys of the colonial South to learn their trade-profession, as did their northerly fellow countrymen, through a period of indenture. In-service training then as now was a major means of mastering the techniques of an occupation.

THE NEGRO AND THE INDIAN SCHOOLS

Almost totally or totally connected with conversion to Christianity was colonial education of the Indian and Negro. The attempts at education of the Indian, including schools and literature about and for him, is discussed at some length in the preceding chapter, though there is a little more to be said here. Black conversion-education is outlined briefly elsewhere, but the educational side needs to be considered here somewhat more fully. Curiously, Lawrence A. Cremin seems absolutely ignorant of the details of Negro colonial education when he makes the flat but quite incorrect statement that "there is no evidence at all of the establishment of any all-black schools."¹⁶³ In the eighteenth century there is extensive documented evidence of such all-Negro schools as those at Williamsburg and Fredericksburg in Virginia, and of a more famous one at Charleston in South Carolina.

As has been shown in this and other chapters, the conversion of the red natives of North America was from the first charters given as a primary reason for colonization. Some education had to precede real conversion, and the first planned school and college at Henrico were from 1617 designed first to train the Indian. Under the Virginia Company whenever the aboriginal adults could be persuaded, their children had been placed in white households in order that they might learn to read and write and interpret or understand the Bible and Christian doctrine, and incidentally the tenets of what was then a Calvinist Anglican church in this colony. For the last two years under the Company, after the 1622 massacre, white families were still taking Indians and giving them family-style education. Among the early Virginia statutes are several giving Indians the right to choose the white families with which their children should live and be brought up in "Christianity, civillity and the knowledge of the necessary trades" or "for learning the English tongue."¹⁶⁴ In several instances in the seventeenth century the white family was paid for the Indian youth's "tuition" from the bequest of Nicholas Ferrar, never used by the Henrico College but still in existence later in the century.¹⁶⁵ During the Commonwealth period the natives were still encouraged to bring in their children to be instructed in trades and civility and Christianity. All this culminated in Virginia first in the establishment of the Saponi Indian school at Fort Christanna, sponsored by Governor Spotswood and taught by the very successful Charles Griffin,¹⁶⁶ and then in the Boyle legacy and endowment of "the Brafferton," the handsome building and school for Indian boys at William and Mary. And Morgan Godwyn's plea in the 1680s in *The Negro's & Indians Advocate* may have produced some aid not now discernible or possibly may have been an influence in the forma-

Courtesy of the University of Georgia Libraries

Library of Congress

Above: Bethesda Orphan House, the best-known charity school of colonial America. Below: T. Kitchin's map, from the *London Magazine*, 1757

Courtesy of The College of William and Mary

The Wren Building, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia

tion of Dr. Bray's later organizations for spreading the gospel in America.

Quakers like George Fox thought they "convinced" and instructed the Indians, and Presbyterian Samuel Davies was instrumental in sending two missionary teachers to the Cherokees late in the colonial period, though Davies' efforts had no real results. William Byrd and Thomas Jefferson, among other Virginians, did not believe that the red men would be brought to religious or general instruction save in their own villages, by missionaries who went to live there permanently. They noted that educated Indians, including those who attended William and Mary, almost always reverted to savagery when they returned to their tribes. Such students of the aborigines as Byrd and Jefferson knew that there should be a different approach. No one seems to have recorded doubts, as primitivists were to do later, of the superiority of the white man's civilization over the Indians' savagery.

In Maryland in their annual reports the Jesuit fathers expressed their optimism regarding Christian conversion and humane learning for the natives. Cynical and certainly prejudiced Protestant observers thought they bought their convert students by gifts of clothing and trinkets when the Indians were baptized. As their influence waned so did their school for the natives, though as late as 1681 their boarding school graduated and sent to St. Omer's in France two boys, presumably Indian, whose intelligence and perseverance equalled that of their European classmates.¹⁶⁷ In 1694 Maryland passed the enabling act for general provincial education, stressing the training of "Indian Youths" in schools preparing them "for the university" (William and Mary) ostensibly as part of the means of conversion.¹⁶⁸ Since there are occasional references to educated Indians or red children in schools of several kinds, it may be deduced that after 1700 there was some individual instruction but little concentrated effort to educate Maryland aborigines. This was partially because only on the province's western boundary were there Indians in appreciable numbers, and they were usually only temporary residents.

In North Carolina, as noticed in preceding chapters, some individual instruction of red children began before the colony was chartered for the Proprietors. For Francis Yeardley,¹⁶⁹ who explored northeastern North Carolina in the mid-seventeenth century, was able to bring back to his Virginia-border plantation several children, notably those of one or more chiefs. The Indians were baptized, and apparently a few remained with Yeardley for rearing. Schools, unless one counts a small number of family groupings, as shown above came in the eighteenth century, probably with Charles Griffin's at Pasquotank and another of a parish lay reader nearby, though there is no evidence that Indians attended either of them.¹⁷⁰ In 1712 Mashburn's school at Sarum, on the Virginia frontier near the Indian

towns, was willing to take Indian pupils provided the S.P.G. helped to support them, Giles Rainsford wrote.¹⁷¹ How successful Mashburn and Rainsford were remains unknown though the school as such flourished for at least several years.

South Carolina began active education-conversion of the natives about the same time North Carolina was at least interested in doing so, that is, in the first two decades of the eighteenth century. Both Thomas Nairne and the Rev. Dr. Francis LeJau of St. James' Parish, Goose Creek, attempted education-conversion among the Yamassees and Carolina southeastern tribes in general.¹⁷³ LeJau's school at Goose Creek under the able Benjamin Dennis included among its pupils black and red as well as white children.¹⁷⁴ Though many of the clergy pleaded for support of Indian education, they were never very successful, curiously perhaps not so much as in their pleas to support Negro education. One professional schoolmaster, Ross Reynolds, informed the S.P.G. through Commissary Gideon Johnston in 1712 that he had never been able to teach the Indians gratis, for his living depended upon his work, but that he had taught at least three half-breed traders to read and to speak English, all by contract. Johnston reported John Norris' proposal that Reynolds go among the Indians as schoolmaster provided the society paid him £100 sterling per annum for doing so. Only under such conditions might anyone, even a religiously dedicated and zealous man, be persuaded to risk everything, including his life, in such an undertaking.

There were individual instances of persons such as Captain Cochran, who took the son of an emperor of the Yamassees "to instruct in the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments."¹⁷⁵ Certainly to the end of the colonial period South Carolina, with the ever-present problem of Catawbas and Cherokees, at least thought of education for the red man as a means of solving several problems. But efforts were never sufficiently organized, nor were funds available for development of a general program.

Georgia's early relations with the Indian were on the whole friendly, marked primarily by negotiation and some petty warfare. Original charters and instructions, as in the instances of the older colonies, called for conversion through education. But both Trustees and later royal government were so busy with what they considered more urgent affairs that they did little or nothing about training the aborigines in trades or reading or writing, and thus not in Christianity. For a time the Moravian-built school with an English master on the island of Irene was operated for Indian children.¹⁷⁶ Ingham, the schoolmaster, attempted to get Oglethorpe to undertake in England a campaign for funds for Indian education.

John Wesley and perhaps his successor, Whitefield, had come to Georgia with the expressed desire (and authorization) to become missionaries

to the Indians, but at least Wesley found on his arrival that he had first (and it proved last too) to organize the Church of England parish of Savannah and minister to the needs of the white population.¹⁷⁷ The scarcity of funds for missionary endeavor was in the end perhaps the major reason why Indian education in the youngest province never amounted to much.

With the possible exception of the work at William and Mary and for a shorter period at Christanna, southern missionary education of the Indian really never got underway. Under such conditions as existed in the early colonies, including a desperate and obvious lack of funding for social as well as religious institutions, it is quite understandable. Had education been really available to the southeastern Indian, he might have been absorbed, as his relatives in Latin America largely were by other means, instead of being destroyed.

Though as indentured servants and in other ways under colonial laws "Indians, Negroes, and Mulattoes" were usually lumped together as far as rights, privileges and prohibitions were concerned, the story of education for the blacks was somewhat different from that for the Indians. In many instances, as at the school of Dennis at Goose Creek in South Carolina, red and black joined whites as pupils, and in a few others (more frequently later) red and black children were separated from the whites but were still taught. Like the red people, the majority of blacks received no instruction at all in reading and writing. Yet despite all the opposition or indifference a great many Negroes and mulattoes did receive various kinds of apprenticeship training in the trades, a fair number learned to read and write, and a few went on to ciphering and even more complex subjects. Some of these people were slave and some were free. In all the colonies, the "country-born" as opposed to the African-born were likely to receive the training in a trade because they were considered more intelligent, and perhaps (as the whites believed) were more docile. Marcus W. Jernegan¹⁷⁸ and later students of early American labor have written of these skilled people and their relation to industrialism, general plantation economy, religion, and social structure. Recent historians of the colonies and of labor have seen a direct relationship between advanced training and rebellion, insurrection, or chafing under restraint. That is, they argue that the more training and, in a sense, the more privilege the black had, the more restless he became. The classic case for this argument might be Nat Turner's Rebellion at the end of the first national period, an uprising led by a highly literate black. On the other side are those who see proud African chiefs in bondage, compelled to menial and cruel labor, as the natural leaders of rebellion. That some late colonial and early national political leaders and perhaps others feared the educated Negro

is graphically illustrated by the laws forbidding anyone to teach a black to read or write, but the laws and their promulgation alike indicate that the educated black existed in considerable numbers in the early South.¹⁷⁹

The Negro skilled in a trade connected with utilizing forest or wilderness resources was most frequent in Charleston, the only real city of the colonial southeast. But he could be found anywhere in the Chesapeake region in considerable numbers, and even inland or scattered plantations including large self-sustaining households. The files of the *South-Carolina Gazette* and the personnel working sheets of overseers and planters indicate seven varieties of woodworkers (from ship carpenters to coopers and cabinetmakers), builders (including bricklayers, painters, etc.), blacksmiths, boatmen (some real sailors), and specialists in handling particular crops such as rice, indigo, and even raw silk.¹⁸⁰ Apprenticeships for black freemen were probably identical with those for whites in the same crafts. For slaves, the apprenticeship or learning process may have been formal or informal, taking place on the owner's property or under a master artisan elsewhere. For the slave without the formal apprenticeship there was no compulsory reading-writing training; indeed, even if he were formally apprenticed for a period of years by his owner, the clause regarding literacy may never have been put into effect—if there was such a clause. But frequently he could and did pick up reading and writing and arithmetic, the last being especially useful in many trades.¹⁸¹

As early as 1632 there were laws in Virginia requiring masters to send children, servants, and apprentices to be catechized by the parish priest. As the proportion and number of Negroes grew, slave or indentured, the question whether baptism automatically brought freedom came up, and a law was passed in 1667 declaring that it did not mean freedom.¹⁸² Morgan Godwyn, already mentioned several times, urged in his 1680–1681 books that masters must see to it that all black servants were instructed in Christian doctrine, which meant learning to read the Bible, Prayer Book, and Catechism, and perhaps to write. Despite Godwyn's and others' urging, however, nothing effective was done until Dr. Bray's S.P.G. undertook its great evangelizing and conversion campaign about 1700, backed up by the S.P.C.K. and its books and pamphlets, and finally a generation later by the formation of Dr. Bray's Associates, the last aimed especially at education-conversion of the Negro and establishment of parochial libraries.¹⁸³ Bray's S.P.G. and other organizations reflect the growing concern on both sides of the Atlantic for the colonial unregenerate who had never had a chance to be Christians. Parish priests reflect this feeling of need for conversion of the blacks in their letters to the Bishop of London, as the S.P.G. missionaries (many of whom became parish priests) do in theirs to the secretary of the S.P.G. They began to make distinctions between Indian and

Negro infidels. While they tried to do something for both, the Negro was literally closer home, and his living presence and ignorance of religion haunted many masters, even many who were not themselves especially fervent Christians. S.P.G. missionaries in their letters home list numbers of white, red, and black baptized and taught to read. Apparently all three races were supplied with books, usually of a religious nature.¹⁸⁴ Toward the end of the period, Dr. Bray's Associates were planning to open or opened Negro schools in several colonies. Benjamin Franklin recommended New York, Williamsburg, and Newport in Rhode Island as the first of a number of suitable places for the schools. He further suggested that in Williamsburg Postmaster William Hunter and President Dawson of William and Mary be asked to supervise the school for instruction of thirty Negro children. The salary for master or mistress was not to exceed £20 sterling a year. The idea was received by the two gentlemen with enthusiasm, books were sent, and the school opened early in 1761 with twenty-four black pupils, as many as the schoolmistress could take care of. The Virginia supervisors urged a higher salary, and it was increased to £30 a year.

The minutes of the Associates refer to communications from other southern clergy and laymen seeking help in educating the Negroes through books and if possible through schools. Even though Hunter and Dawson died, the Williamsburg school went on successfully at least as late as 1774. Letters from North Carolina indicate that the Associates wanted to establish a school for blacks at Edenton.¹⁸⁵ Later minutes show projects for opening Negro schools on Chester River in Maryland, on York River and at Norfolk in Virginia, and at Bath in North Carolina.¹⁸⁶ Among the more interesting communications is one from Jonathan Boucher from Hanover Parish in King George County, Virginia, saying he had procured the services of a "well disposed Negro" slave who could instruct his fellows in reading and the first principles of Christianity. Boucher visited him and his twenty to thirty pupils several times each week. A little later it was decided that Fredericksburg would be a proper place to set up a school for blacks.¹⁸⁷ If the 1760-1774 minutes are representative, the Williamsburg school was the most successful of those established by Dr. Bray's Associates in the colonies.

The Presbyterians under the leadership of Samuel Davies in Virginia in the 1748-1759 period also attempted the education-conversion of black slaves. Davies records having his house full of them overnight, and his enjoyment of their singing, evidently something like our Negro spirituals.¹⁸⁸ The gifted preacher appealed to Great Britain for spelling books, Watts' catechisms, and other aids. There seems to have been no serious opposition to the education and baptism of these people, and Davies did not confine his work to the slaves of his own congregation. He participated

in instructing "the poor neglected *Negroes Slaves*" until he went on to become president of Princeton.

South Carolina Negroes were frequently skilled artisans, as has been mentioned, without necessarily the skill to read and write or knowledge enough of Christianity to be baptized. In 1742 Commissary Alexander Garden persuaded the S.P.G., colony officials, and townsfolk to aid him in buying land and erecting a building as a school for blacks. This was more than simply a means to conversion, for Garden planned it as a means of instructing in reading, writing, ciphering, and the Bible and Prayer Book and other Christian volumes a whole body of potential black teachers who could be dispersed through the colony to aid other blacks to conversion through education. Two of the likeliest black boys who could be found, named Harry and Andrew, were purchased to be trained as the first teachers. One of them proved to be excellent, and, as noted elsewhere, the school flourished for some time after the death of Garden. Its alumni were sought after even into the nineteenth century as dependable and capable men who might teach others of their race or serve in capacities requiring trust and intelligence. Clearly the school was planned for the *slave* population, and in some instances, as had happened before, certain masters were reluctant to give or allow the time required for the instruction. On the whole, however, the work conceived in 1737-1744 was eminently successful.¹⁸⁹

There were of course grave deficiencies which led to curious consequences in these half-educations that the religious societies and others were able to give the Negroes. LeJau wrote of the best-educated and most intelligent black of his parish who read strange prophecies into the texts of religious books he could decipher and frightened many of his fellows into confusion and terror.¹⁹⁰ Like Nat Turner, he thought he saw visions and judgments, but evidently not the latter upon his white masters. And planter Hugh Bryan, more than half mentally unbalanced, opened a Negro school in Charleston which might have led to insurrection.¹⁹¹

Black slave education in Georgia occupied only a few years before 1763, for slaves were not admitted by law to the province until October 26, 1749. Promptly efforts were made to see that they received an education. Within three months of the Negroes' legal admission Dr. Bray's Associates appointed a catechist for educating these newcomers. He received £40 a year for his pains. Their principal instructor while Georgia was a colony was a converted Italian Jew, Joseph Ottolenghe,¹⁹² who was appointed catechist in 1751. He was aided by resident Secretary for the Trustees James Habersham and the Reverend Bartholomew Zouberbuhler. Ottolenghe taught blacks for eight years. In 1753 a combined school-house and home were built for him. After a time he came to feel that an-

other method than his, probably a body of itinerant catechists who might visit blacks at the plantations, would reach more and produce more enduring results. He tried the new method himself for some time. He encountered opposition from some masters, who used all the old arguments about baptism legally freeing a slave. And he had other troubles. But he was fairly successful. His efforts made Georgia the one southern colony under either private or public control to try seriously over most of the years to educate the Negro. In the days of the royal government, in 1770, an act forbade anyone to teach blacks to read. But this act came several years after the period covered by this work.¹⁹³ As late as 1766 Zouberbuhler's will provided that black children on his plantation be taught to read and be instructed in the Scriptures and be baptized.

THE TEACHER

Though hundreds of names of secondary and primary school teachers survive in the records of the southern colonies, very little is known about them personally except in the few cases already discussed. If they attended an English or Scottish university, their names sometimes survive in the lists of alumni. If letters of recommendation were written by others or the teachers sent reports back to the mother country, these documents usually reveal something about them. But those we know most about were those, like Robertson, whose account books are extant or those who kept diaries or journals or wrote accounts of their experience, like Harrower or Boucher or Fithian.

It is abundantly evident that they ranged the social order from university graduates of good family to indentured servants of yeoman stock with a grammar school education or even less, and for Indians and blacks the schoolmasters were sometimes themselves barely literate. In the colonial south, as has already been noted, teaching for a few years was a means of attaining some other goal, as holy orders in the Church of England, a professorship at the College of William and Mary (though naturally this was infrequent), or the opportunity to set up as a planter or even merchant. A few dedicated men did devote their lives to teaching, and a few dedicated women (often after widowhood) to inculcating the three R's. These were what may be called the general or orthodox schoolmasters and schoolmistresses.

There were in addition, usually but not always late in this period, men and women who instructed in music, French, dancing, fencing, embroidery, and other polite accomplishments which might add polish to substance. The eighteenth-century gazettes are full of their advertisements, but the legal records of the seventeenth century show them already present and de-

manding payment for their services. They were almost always people who had other occupations, usually related to what they taught.

Among teachers of organ and harpsichord were Bruton Parish, Virginia, organist and composer Peter Pelham, and Charleston organist and composer Charles Theodore Pachelbel.¹⁹⁴ Cuthbert Ogle of Williamsburg conducted an orchestra in concerts and also taught instrumental music,¹⁹⁵ Jeremiah Theus of Charleston taught drawing and painting to augment returns from the sale of his original painting, Healy Holt of the same city taught dancing and performed in the local theater,¹⁹⁶ and Maryland music teachers in Baltimore and Annapolis might paint or build organs or be engaged in any sort of trade along with their teaching—the teaching perhaps for most of those here mentioned having been distinctly an avocation if not simply a voluntary form of amusement.¹⁹⁷

There were, too, the specialist teachers in humbler and less independent positions, as the indentured musicians and painters and language teachers, even occasional fencing masters who might have been criminally convicted indentured servants. But these were few, at least in the records.

In Maryland the highly educated Jesuit fathers did some of the first teaching of Indians and whites, often assisted by lay brothers with perhaps less formal training. Father Poulton and the classical academy at Bohemia Manor as late as 1741 were turning out students who did well at European Catholic colleges or the English Inns of Court—Brents and Carrolls, for example. The advertisers in the *Maryland Gazette* who offered training in classical subjects were Irish, English, and French in origin and probably had some university training. Scores of names of schoolmasters for this colony alone appear without university affiliation. In a few instances, as in the Reverend Thomas Cradock's school in St. Thomas' Parish, it is known that the master attended a particular university, in this case Cambridge. Though there are at least thirteen named headmasters of the first free school in St. Anne's County, only three are vaguely known for their attainments, as Charles Peale ("a fine classical education"), the Reverend Alexander Malcolm (musical composer and performer), and Hamilton Bell (Pennsylvania-trained Presbyterian minister, later an Anglican).¹⁹⁸ Presbyterian schools in the Snow Hill region were staffed by graduates of the Pennsylvania Log College or perhaps of Princeton. Lutherans, almost always German, had good classical backgrounds if they taught in the more advanced schools of their church in western Maryland. In Talbot County there are at least eleven known teachers,¹⁹⁹ but the only one really known today is the notorious Bamfylde Moore Carew, "the King of the Beggars," whose "autobiography" went through many editions and who taught as a criminal indentured servant. He seems to have shown himself an ex-

cellent scholar and teacher, but there is no indication of the source of his erudition.²⁰⁰

Andrew Geddes, first master of the 1696 Annapolis school and reader for All Saints Parish and first officially appointed province and Church of England master, was apparently well qualified, but exactly how one does not know.²⁰¹ Many of the clergy who conducted schools, as the Maryland native Henry Addison, can be affiliated with universities (he was of Queen's College, Oxford), but many others have not been so connected. It is even more difficult to ascertain any of the qualifications of school-mistresses. All one knows of Mrs. Thomas Hynson in 1658, for example, is that she was the wife of a justice of the peace in Kent County.²⁰²

Undoubtedly Boucher exaggerated when at the end of the era he said that two-thirds of the schools in Maryland were taught by indentured servants and/or convicts. But for him even to venture such a statement would indicate that, if the masses became literate, and they did, they were likely to have been taught by masters without the rich erudition which might make intellectuals of them. That there were native-born as well as imported intellectuals may be, and probably is, due to the training some received under very different sorts of masters.

Virginia's teachers were much as Maryland's, though there were perhaps more university-educated parsons conducting schools in the Old Dominion, especially in the last generation of the period. Again from 1619 to 1763 school or university affiliation of most of these pedagogues eludes the modern reader. Even Brinsley's *A Consolation* had not suggested a necessarily university-trained master, but it more than strongly implied a thoroughly educated grammar-school graduate trained in the classics, Hebrew, rhetoric, and mathematics, at least. This sort of teacher was what the seventeenth-century Virginians tried to find and probably did.

The southern clergy and parish readers who taught from the early seventeenth century to the Stamp Act may be assumed to be principally university-bred. In many instances there is proof that they were. The eighteenth-century emphasis placed on licensing the colonial teachers by the Bishop of London or the appropriate provincial governor may indicate, however, that fewer and fewer ordinary pedagogues held degrees or had attended British universities.²⁰³

Most of the better-known tutors (e.g., Virginians Harrower, Menzies, Fithian, and Reid) and their qualifications have already been mentioned. Certainly other tutors were university-trained, but more were indentured products of secondary schools. The best-known of the private headmasters, Maury and Boucher and Robertson among them, have also been noticed together with their training, and one knows several facts about each of

them. But the long succession of masters of the Syms and Eaton academies, even Griffin, the Indian schoolmaster at Christanna and William and Mary, remain faceless, or backgroundless, as far as history is concerned. It may be assumed that some of them had some sort of higher education, and it may be assumed with more confidence for the Lutheran and Presbyterian clergy who taught schools for their congregational children. One may be reasonably sure that the Lutherans were well trained in gymnasia or universities of Germany, and the Presbyterians in Scotland, Princeton, or log colleges. The French Huguenots, unless American born like James Maury or Irish bred like some of that gentleman's Fontaine kin, are harder to place as far as training is concerned. This is especially true in South Carolina, where there were a great many of these French Protestants. They had at least thorough classical training, as their work and writing prove.

The headmasters of the grammar school of William and Mary, men who were almost always or always professors of "Humanity" in the college, were as far as one can tell university men, though not—as some historians imply—always in holy orders. Mungo Ingles, an M.A. probably of a Scottish university, though at times listed as a clergyman, was probably not one, for Perry's several references to him in documents give no indication that he is in orders. The same holds for Arthur Blackamore, who had attended Christ Church, Oxford, except that there is definite proof that he was not a clergyman.²⁰⁴

THE SOUTHERN INTEREST IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The annals of higher education in the southeast before 1763 are, except for the College of William and Mary, largely blank. For only Virginia of the five colonies had a university in the years before independence, and that was even for the period a very small institution without great influence in the constituency it was designed to serve. Or so go most of the accounts in educational histories. And at first glance the legislative and social records of the provinces from Maryland through Georgia would seem to indicate apathy or indifference to possible local higher education, though there is plenty of recognition of the interest in sending sons to European, including British, universities.

The actual facts are somewhat different. William and Mary, designed to serve both Chesapeake colonies, was indeed small and in its first generation or two had few sons to measure up to those of Harvard and Yale. In the last generation before 1763, however, it produced graduates and non-

graduate alumni who were equal in erudition and perspicacity to any other founders of the nation, even at a time when many of its faculty were reviled as mere gamesters or sots. And before the Declaration of Independence, though in at least one instance after 1763, every southern colony had instituted and/or passed acts establishing institutions of higher education, acts which were usually drawn up after years of discussion and planning and were in fact culminations of long-drawn-out efforts.

North Carolina, despite some urging from successive eighteenth-century governors, did not take legal steps for establishing a college until 1771, when Governor Tryon signed the bill bringing Queen's in Charlotte into existence.²⁰⁵ But from the end of the first decade at Jamestown into the national period, Virginia was intent on at least one major institution of university status. And in the years between, Maryland, South Carolina, and Georgia, though never quite successful in realization until the national period, sporadically made attempts to found or to develop their own universities.

VIRGINIA: HENRICO, THE ACT OF 1660,
AND THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

Higher education in the southern colonies was from the beginning, like all other forms, closely linked with religion. Charters, sermons, and instructions had reiterated the intention.²⁰⁶ The presence of Pocahontas and her retinue in London in 1616 is the event said to have impelled James I to issue in 1617 his letter to the archbishops suggesting means of raising funds for schools and apparently for a college or university in Virginia.²⁰⁷ That such was the purpose of the King's letter seems borne out by his instructions to Sir George Yeardley the next year, 1618, when that early settler was returning to the Virginia colony as governor. For here is mentioned specifically "the building and planting of a college for the training up of the children of those infidels in true religion, moral virtue, and civility," and "the planting of a university at the said Henrico" to be supported by a ten-thousand-acre grant as endowment.²⁰⁸ The university lands extended from Henrico (Ferrar's Island) to the falls of the James. That there was even this early a plan to make this an institution for the sons of settlers as well as for Indians is evident from the description by the treasurer of the Virginia Company of the uses to be made of the ten thousand acres for the university.²⁰⁹

Meanwhile funds were being raised in Great Britain, and Sir Edwin Sandys was able to report in 1619 that about £1500 (£800 in cash, the rest borrowed by the Company to be answered for by general stock) had already been collected. Fifty tenants, men on some sort of indentures or crop-

sharing plan, were recruited to cultivate the university's as well as the Company's land, and provisions were made for Mr. George Thorpe, a learned and pious man much interested in Christianizing the red man, to come as superintendent or perhaps business manager of the college-university, under the title of "deputy for the Company."²¹⁰ He was to control the tenants and see that the buildings were erected. Though English university-educated men such as John Pory and George Sandys speak highly of his intelligence, literary interests, and general administrative abilities, it is never quite clear whether he was at any time destined to be also the academic head of the institution when it opened its doors.

During all these years gifts of books for the college, communion service, altar cloths, and endowments for scholars poured in to the Company, the Ferrar family, it was revealed later, being among the principal donors.²¹¹ The General Assembly ordered settlers of each town or borough to take as many red children as they could get into their homes and begin fitting them (presumably in language) for entrance to the college. Then there was the East India School, the nucleus of endowment having been raised by the Reverend Patrick Copland, as noted above, by soliciting contributions from passengers and crews of a fleet returning in 1621 from the Indies. It was to be located in Charles City County at what is now City Point and was to be a feeder for the college-university as many English schools were for Oxford and Cambridge, with scholarships for able students.²¹² Copland, even after the school project failed, was named as rector "of the intended College," to have pastoral charge of the college's tenants and to receive as salary one-tenth of the revenues of the college's lands.²¹³

Though as already noted the massacre and other factors prevented the realization of the college project, there is good evidence that the Council of the Virginia Company planned to continue after the catastrophe: a letter of August 1, 1622, from the Council recommends that Virginia resident treasurer George Sandys take charge of the Company and college tenants and that the brickmakers go on with the work they had contracted under Thorpe so that the fabric of the main building might be erected as soon as possible. Edward Waterhouse, in *A Declaration of the State of the Colony and . . . A Relation of the Barbarous Massacre* (London, 1622) spends considerable space on George Thorpe's trust and faith in the natives, his influence over them, and his death at their hands in the massacre, a matter which in itself might well have done much to ruin efforts for the college.²¹⁴ At least one authority, however, declares that Thorpe lived on after the massacre, proof lying in his signature on a document recently found in the "Wyatt Papers" dated May 3, 1622, forty-two days after the catastrophe.²¹⁵ Only sixteen people perished on the college lands. Certainly Thorpe's

death, whenever it occurred, was not in itself the real cause of the failure to erect Henrico university. The dissolution of the bankrupt Company in 1624 and Charles I's lack of interest in the work were more important deterrents. But college lands and tenants continued as an entity of the colony for some years.

A study of the attempt to establish what would have been the oldest Anglo-American institution of higher learning reveals several interesting things. Though begun largely as a school for converting Indians, within a year or two of its conception plans were broadened by Company officials on both sides of the Atlantic to make it a New World Oxford for all settlers and natives, and with the Indian preparatory school and the East India School as complete an educational program, though in miniature, as existed in Great Britain. The young people, red or white, were first to be trained in religion, reading, and writing in a white family, then sent to one of the two secondary schools, and finally to the college or university. Virginia thus at the beginning hoped and tried to be as intellectually self-sustaining as did the Puritan colony of Massachusetts Bay a few years later, and far more so than the Plymouth colony alone ever attempted to be. Obviously Sir Edwin Sandys and the Company administration in London and Governor Sir Francis Wyatt and his resident Council in Virginia, not to mention the considerable number of private gentlemen in England and Virginia heartily in favor of the plan, did not envisage the colony as a mere trading center.

The college idea never died in Virginia. Legislative records and statutes through the years of the first royal control and of the Commonwealth mention the college lands, often with reference as to how they might be used; and one of the earliest legislative acts of the year of the Restoration of Charles II, 1660/1661, was to establish an institution "for the advancement of learning, education of youth, supply of the ministry and promotion of piety," and with this purpose authorized the taking up of land for a college and free school and the housing for both levels of students. A year later the act was repeated.²¹⁶ Here as in the past and future, plans for a university were based on the assumption that private donations would supplement public grants. Sir William Berkeley's direct encouragement is not suggested; on the other hand, his opposition to these moves is also not indicated. In 1661/1662 many were still living in the colony who remembered the earlier project, men like William Claiborne and the descendants of the Reverend Hawte Wyatt, brother of Sir Francis.

This consciousness of the need for higher education within the colony undoubtedly remained among Virginia leaders, finally to flower again in the proposals for the college which came into existence toward the end of the century. Fires and at least two wars have destroyed most of the records.

of what is today the second oldest college in the United States, but enough remains to indicate the steps to and of its immediate inception and early development.²¹⁷

Many of the environmental and other difficulties which prevented public school systems in the South from anywhere nearly approaching those of colonial New England certainly held for the establishment of higher education. The "Sylvan Venice" character of Virginia's settlement, with dispersed and scattered dwellings, was utterly unlike the clustered-village organization of Cambridge and Boston and the rest of the Massachusetts Bay province in which Harvard sprang into existence.

The first recorded "orations" were delivered by students of the Virginia college in 1699, probably prepared or suggested by Commissary Blair and the master of the grammar school portion of the institution then in active operation. They insist that the "idea" of the college sprang not from church or government but from a "publick consultation about it at a meeting of some private Gentleman at James City in the moneth of february 1690" and that the "Hon^{ble} Colonel [John] Page" was the first mover.²¹⁸ It would have been unlike James Blair to give the credit elsewhere if he deserved it himself. Therefore one must accept this statement more or less at face value, though churchmen may well have acted in concert with planters in this initial move.

But it seems to have been Blair who made the formal proposal for the founding of a college a month or so after the gathering of gentlemen had considered and encouraged the idea.²¹⁹ The propositions were drawn up some time in 1690,²²⁰ at the July convention of the clergy called by Blair, the recently created Commissary, "for a Colledge in this Country" to consist of three schools (Grammar, Philosophy, and Divinity), a master and usher for the first, two professors (Logic and Natural Philosophy, and Mathematics) in the Philosophy School, one professor in the Divinity School in oriental languages and a second to be president of the college. There were to be salaries of £150 for the president and the other professor of divinity and £80 for each of the two in philosophy, with additional fees from each student except from the poor scholars, who were to be taught gratis. In the Grammar School, the master and usher could collect lesser amounts from all but twenty poor scholars, who would receive free tuition. The proposals further suggested cash advances in order to secure the desired professors, and a recommendation that a convenient location be decided upon at once, sufficient lands bought, and buildings erected.

In the same month and year, apparently authorized by the new Lieutenant Governor Nicholson, various persons, lay and clerical, were appointed "to take subscriptions" toward the erecting of the college. And at the same time the "Merchants of London" who carried on business in Virginia were

requested to contribute to this most worthy cause.²²¹ The movement in support of the proposed institution was thus well under way when the new General Assembly of 1691 (Nicholson's first) met and appointed Blair as agent to go to England to solicit support there from both public and private sources. The emissary sailed in June 1691, armed with letters to the Bishop of London and other members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, a supplication for a charter he was to find some means of presenting to William and Mary, and an outline of what the Council and House of Burgesses (undoubtedly inspired directly by the church- and education-minded governor and by the Commissary) wished included in the charter. The stipulated items were based on those presented by the clergy the year before, but they were considerably expanded. "The Free School & Colledge" was to teach Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, with Philosophy, Mathematics, and Divinity, etc. (as represented in charters of schools and colleges in Great Britain); to be named the College of King William and Queen Mary; to be founded "in the names of" Nicholson, Blair, and sixteen other gentlemen, including William Byrd I and John Page (that is, as Trustees or Visitors); to require all these "governors" and faculty to take oaths of allegiance and supremacy before taking office; and to be further defined by sixteen other acts as to the nature of the faculty, means of raising funds, and matters of financial control.²²²

James Blair was in later years to prove to be a shrewd and successful as well as unscrupulous politician. But if one believes the letters he sent back to Virginia to Nicholson and others and in Britain to the Bishops of London, Salisbury, and Worcester, who sought to aid him, this attempt to reach their Majesties was one of the major and more arduous campaigns of his long career. While he waited for the wheels of ecclesiastical and royal government to grind, he filled quires of paper soliciting assistance from all sorts of people throughout Great Britain. Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, appears to have been the first to reach the Queen's ear, and it took John Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury, to communicate the story of the petition to the King. The idea seems to have been quite favorably received by both monarchs, and the emissary was permitted to present on bended knees his formal petition.²²³ It was approved and referred to the financial officers of the realm. The college was thus on its way to becoming a legal entity.

All this while, Blair and Nicholson had worked in great amity, though the Commissary's later characteristic deviousness appears in his statement to the governor that though he personally favored beginning modestly with a grammar school conducted by a master and one usher, the Bishop of London had persuaded him that to thrive the institution must have at once a president, who would of course head the whole enterprise. Blair maneuvered

so that he himself was recommended and appointed president, with what was at first a fairly modest salary. Within a few years, however, during and after Nicholson's second resident administration of Virginia, so great a proportion of the revenues of the college were going into his inordinately handsome salary (which was in addition, one must remember, to his rectorship of Bruton Parish church and various other perquisites) that one of his own faculty wrote to London that the institution would never develop so long as Blair absorbed personally most of its revenues.

But back in London in 1691 the King and his principal secretary had asked from Blair a detailed plan for financing the college which was to go to the Bishop of London, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Lords of Trade and the Plantations. Again the wheels of government ground slowly, for war matters were absorbing almost everyone's attention. Finally the secretary and auditor-general of the Board, William Blathwayt, a familiar figure to every Virginia official over a long period of years, approved the proposal of the Virginia Assembly that the quitrents (or escheats—taxes paid by landowners in lieu of feudal service) should be granted to the college as its basic revenue. Blair almost immediately managed to get this income augmented by most of the income from the estate of Robert Boyle, the scientist, money invested in Brafferton Manor in Yorkshire. The money was to be used to educate Indians at the new college, of course an old idea. From Boyle and Brafferton the college realized something like £90 a year until the Revolution. After Blair and others combatted considerable opposition to the quitrents plan, the Queen finally approved the grants on September 1, 1692, ten months after the first audience. The college received nearly £2,000 in quitrent tax money which had been accumulated to the credit of the royal treasury; 20,000 acres of rich Virginia land in Pamunkey Neck and Blackwater Swamp; a penny-per-pound tax on tobacco exported from Virginia to destinations other than England, Scotland, and Wales; and the office of surveyor with all its perquisites, which were considerable. From this distance, rather amusing is the tale of a fortune wrested from three captured pirates who agreed to give it to the college if they were pardoned. All together it was a sizable endowment, said by several authorities to be the greatest, after one or two more provincial revenues were bestowed by the General Assembly, of any college in America before the Revolution. This suggested opulence really does not accord, however, with the constant struggle to keep or continue revenues, and above all with the small number of students and faculty, even relatively, who worked there in the colonial era.²²⁴

The charter had yet to be drawn up. Already instructed to study British charters for school and college organization, Blair certainly perused the "constitutions" of the two Scottish universities he himself attended, as well

as those of Oxford and Cambridge, one of the latter of which most of his ecclesiastical superiors in Great Britain and many of his clergy and other fellow Virginians had attended. Granted finally on February 8, 1693, the charter (in Latin and English) follows most of the recommendations the Commissary had made.²²⁵ Here at the beginning the Scottish university models and methods are more evident in Charter and Statutes, just as in the second quarter of the eighteenth century the college seems more closely connected in faculty and ideas with Oxford, especially Queen's College.

Beginning with Patrick Copland in 1621, a strong influence of Aberdeen on Virginia educational theory and practice has been seen by several historians. Both Copland and Blair had attended Marischal College at Aberdeen (though Blair at least went on to Edinburgh), and the former had endowed a professional chair at his alma mater before he embarked on the East India School and College for Virginia. At the other end of the century Blair, in his regulations and charter clauses, is much closer to Scottish models in emphasis on student responsibility for board and lodging and on endowment of professional chairs and professional academic control (as contrasted with English tutorial and loosely organized individual college control), in his belief in the location of the college-university in a town of political and/or economic importance, and in a relatively democratic and representative student body attracted by minimum expense and absence of class distinctions.²²⁶ William and Mary, like Marischal College, was to be a combination of preparatory school and university. Even the original quadrangle plan for William and Mary seems to some commentators much more like that of King's College, Aberdeen, than like the plans of Oxford and Cambridge colleges. The lay "senate" which controlled the Virginia institution at the beginning was much closer to Scottish academic administration than to the predominantly clerical-fellows government of the English colleges. Even the proximity to the church and the separate but adjoining location of the grammar school and of the later President's House bear more than a casual relation to the arrangement of King's, Aberdeen.²²⁷

The charter, in the formal yet graceful style of the day, tells its reader a great deal about the ideas of those who had a hand in it, from King and Queen to Virginia General Assembly and British Board of Trade. It closely follows Blair's recommendations, in themselves based on his own and others' ideas, and it attempts to cover such contingencies as potential endowments from varied sources. At the beginning, in stating its reasons for being, it alludes to the propagation of the Christian faith among the western Indians, certainly an old and obvious reason for its existence, but probably specifically designed in this case to insure the college's eligibility for the Boyle endowment. That it would be a seminary for training a clergy

native to the colony and would educate "the youth" piously "in good Letters and Manners" were orthodox and already traditional enough in earlier secondary-school aims. It names trustees, areas of study, and divisional "schools" or "colleges" making up the institution. Appropriate kinds of professors, number of students, means of obtaining annual revenues and gifts, the appointment of Blair as first president "during his natural Life," the legal corporate nature of the institution, the creation of the office of chancellor and the appointment of the Bishop of London as first incumbent for seven years, and a dozen other matters are mentioned, including lands and buildings.

At about the same time the General Assembly, after considerable debate, officially confirmed the Middle Plantation, on land near the already existent Bruton Parish church, as the site for the college, and at the same session levied additional duties on various furs and skins as additional revenue for the institution.²²⁸ In September 1693 Commissary Blair presented the charter to the governor and Council at Jamestown. He had been paid £100 by order of Queen Mary from the royal bounty, and the Assembly at home voted him an honorarium of £250 in addition to the £600 he claimed as actual expenses.²²⁹ The Statutes, a working form of that part of the Charter concerned with organization and discipline, primarily of matters within the college, were not drawn up until 1727, for Hugh Jones states in his 1724 history of the state that William and Mary is "now a college without a chapel, without a scholarship, and without a statute."²³⁰ The chapel was added soon after Jones wrote, and the Statutes became law with the transfer of the college in 1729 from the remainder of the trustees then living; the Charter had stipulated that as soon as the president and six masters or professors were in office, the control or government of the college should be turned over to them. In 1728 former Governor Nicholson died, and in 1729 Blair and the other surviving trustee, the Reverend Stephen Fouace, met in London to draw up the transfer and present the new statutes. As trustee, Blair was turning over control to himself as president. These statutes were printed in 1736, and they have been reprinted several times later, after the Revolution in much amended form.²³¹ They represent so much of the history and philosophical-educational theory and practical organization developed through the years that it may be well to consider them here.

The somewhat stilted first sentence of the Preface to the Statutes (contained in both pre-Revolutionary editions) reminds the reader that at this college studied Thomas Jefferson and John Marshall:

Towards the cultivating the Minds of Men, and rectifying their Manners, what a mighty Influence the Studies of good Letters, and the liberal Sciences have, appears from hence, that these Studies not only flourished

of Old amongst those famous Nations the *Hebrews, Egyptians, Greeks* and *Romans*; but in the latter Ages of the World likewise, after a great Interruption and almost Destruction of them, through the Incursions of the barbarous Nations, they are at last retrieved and set up with Honor in all considerable Nations.²³²

This is followed by a statement of what a university in America should do, why it was needed, and what the state of education has been in America, and a declaration of the difference between mere literacy and "further Commerce with the Muses, or learned Sciences," necessary to produce cultivated men and minds. This several-page historical and rational summary is followed by sections on the nature and function of the college senate, the chancellor, the president, masters, and schools (Grammar, Philosophy, Divinity, and Indian), the ordinary government of the college, the several kinds of scholars (resident and boarding, day students, foundation students), the bursar or treasurer, and the terms to be kept (three each for Grammar School and Indian School, and the same with some "Vacation" for the Philosophy and Divinity schools).

But between the granting of the charter and the printing of the statutes was at least a generation of troubles, as the institution tried to develop into what its charter had announced it was to be. Church and empire politics played a part in the story, which has to be pieced out from fragments of journals of the meetings of the president and masters,²³³ letters between the Commissary and ecclesiastical or trade authorities in Great Britain, and various governors' letters to many of the same people, the minutes of Council and journals of the House of Burgesses,²³⁴ histories such as those mentioned earlier by Beverley, Jones, and Hartwell-Blair-Chilton, and recently published manuscripts of other kinds.

It is a sad and grim story, occasionally enlivened by comic situation or the inspiring evidence of real achievement. Blair is at once the hero and the villain of the piece. His personal avarice, contentiousness, and iron will represent one side of him, his genuine ability as a pulpit orator and administrator and his ambition for his province and college as well as for himself the other. Nicholson was removed to Maryland and Sir Edmund Andros, a career imperialist administrator, succeeded. Andros had no liking for the Commissary and was sceptical regarding the college's future, but was in general an able official. Blair soon managed, however, to have him removed and to have Nicholson returned as full governor. This hot-tempered viceroy and the scheming churchman who had formerly worked amicably together to procure the charter and revenues now fell out over matters of church, state, and education. Each accused the other to secular and ecclesiastical officials in London of all sorts of malfeasances, including Blair's declaration that Nicholson instigated a rebellion of the grammar

school boys, who allegedly tried to murder the president, and Nicholson's reply with some perhaps true but hard-to-prove charges of Blair's failure with his faculty, students, and clergy. As usual, Blair won; Nicholson was removed. After the short term of a governor who died prematurely in office, Blair met head on a strong imperialist, Governor Alexander Spotswood, who was as interested in education generally as he was, and perhaps even more in the education of the Indians. Spotswood's role in the Christanna Indian School and in getting Griffin to teach Indians in Williamsburg is noted elsewhere. One of Virginia's and the American colonies' ablest administrators, Spotswood found that he too had been undermined by Blair and learned of his dismissal on his return from the journey to Albany to the treaty meeting of 1722 discussed earlier.

Clergy and college were perforce involved in these contentions for a number of reasons, the clergy because the majority of them felt that Spotswood, as Nicholson before him, supported their induction into their rectorships (which meant tenure) and in their plea for more salary, and that Blair was a representative of the "college" or "country party" into which he had married and which opposed these clerical aspirations. The college faculty saw Blair's personal avarice. Mungo Ingles, Scottish first headmaster of the college grammar school,²³⁵ as late as 1705 designated Blair as the only begetter of the college's miseries, and stated that his own intention was to resign as soon as possible. After listing several instances of what he considered malicious or vindictive action on Blair's part to cut Ingles' income by removing boarding scholars from the grammar school, the master concluded:

I have learnt, by 12 years experience, that the intended College of William and Mary will never arrive at greater Perfection than a Grammar School, while Mr. Blair demands & takes his salary yearly as President while it is only a Grammar School, & while there remains no more money behind than will barely pay the Usher & Writing Master & myself. . . . I am resolved . . . to have no more to do with it, while M^r Blair is concerned in it.²³⁶

Earlier, in December 1697, Blair had defended himself in a session at Lambeth, in reply to Governor Andros' accusations through his attorney, young William Byrd II. Or Blair may himself have brought about this crisis in the feud, in which Byrd had to defend Andros. This "conference" apparently was recorded in its entirety; and thus the modern reader gets a vivid and revealing picture and suggestion of the Commissary's adroitness in debate, powerful determination, and ruthless character in the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, Mr. John Povey (secretary of the Lords of Trade and Plantations), Mr. Ralph

Marshall, and Mr. Benjamin Harrison of Virginia. Harrison, Blair's brother-in-law, was present to corroborate the Commissary's statements, and Marshall and Byrd were Andros' only friends present.²³⁷ This was a question-and-answer session on the administration of the college, though other church matters were discussed. Blair won easily, convincing the Lords Spiritual, who apparently wanted to believe, and the Board of Trade as well, for Andros was removed. Recently the argument that Byrd intended to deliver on this occasion, but never did, has come to light. It is a well-reasoned argument, and why Byrd did not use it is not known.²³⁸

It was at this time, too, that Blair prepared his description-defense of the College in collaboration with Hartwell and Chilton in the manuscript printed in 1727 as *The Present State of Virginia, and the College*.²³⁹ In the years between 1697 and 1705 Blair's hysterical accusations against Nicholson's alleged persecution, including the governor's complicity in the ancient English scholastic tradition of nailing up the master's door to obtain a holiday, Nicholson's occasionally unbalanced but usually rational and truthful replies and returned recriminations, the division of the clergy into supporters of the governor (the majority) and of the Commissary, were all connected in one way or another with the College of William and Mary.

Meanwhile the first buildings were erected, including the central brick structure said to have been designed by Sir Christopher Wren and adapted to New World conditions or environment.²⁴⁰ The Indian School building, the Brafferton, was erected near the main building in 1723, and opposite it the equally handsome President's House was begun in 1732, the year the Chapel was added as a wing or another side of the Wren building quadrangle. When he arrived about 1716, Hugh Jones, one of the ablest professors the college ever had, saw a physical plant which had been seriously marred by a fire in 1705. Almost at once he became a leader in an anti-Blair party, and it was probably in that capacity that he was in England in 1723-1724, when he wrote *The Present State of Virginia* and textbooks for beginning students in grammar and mathematics and Christianity. *An Accidence to the English Tongue* (London, 1724) has been called "The First Colonial Grammar in English."²⁴¹ Despite his antipathy for Blair and the latter's "party," Jones gives a relatively unprejudiced account of the college. In 1694 the Grammar School, teaching Latin and Greek as its basic courses, began work. As soon as students were capable, they were admitted to the Philosophy School, which as early as 1712 had one at least of its professors and by 1724 possibly both of them, one in Natural Philosophy and Mathematics, the other in Moral Philosophy (including Rhetoric, Ethics, and Logic). By the 1720s the Divinity School had secured its two professors or masters, one of them usually the president of the college. Jones speaks of a president and six masters and one hundred

students, but the president may even then have been one of the masters, and Jones may not have meant that they were all present in 1723. By the time of the extant 1729 minutes of the college, by then in the hands of its faculty, there were six masters and a president.²⁴² Dancing, music, and drawing, even fencing, could be learned from masters in the town.

But considerably before 1729 there is evidence that two or three public performances had put the college before the people in a quite favorable light. "The public" was primarily the Tidewater gentry of Virginia and Maryland, but one may be sure that middle and even humbler classes of persons observed the exercises, as the records say many Indians did. There are also the copies of certain rhetorical, dramatic, and poetical exercises sent back to London by both Governor Nicholson and President Blair to indicate that the project was on its way.

The first of these ventures before the colonists was on May Day, 1699, when five students gave orations in English (not Latin, for before the first is written "Oration: Vernacule") on subjects of vital interest to the infant college. Those who delivered them had presumably only grammar school training in the classics, principally under Ingles, but this included rhetoric. The subjects chosen, the language employed, the logical arguments, and the learned references are qualities indicating that masters, probably including Blair, had coached long and successfully. They may even have composed much of the speeches.²⁴³ Even if the students wrote little of them, however, the delivery of the speeches is in itself indicative that in six or so short years these young men had learned to speak effectively on their feet.

The first oration is on the excellency and utility of learning, its necessity to Church and State. Proceeding from the point that no nation has been able to flourish without "those Arts & Sciences," the young speaker goes on, in classical style, to show how learning forms the judgment and sharpens the wit, enables one to converse with the great minds of all ages, enhances or produces virtue and advances honor, and brings true pleasure. Sprinkled with names such as Archimedes, Scipio Africanus, Dionysius of Syracuse, Plato, and Aristotle, the sentences include examples of a great variety of rhetorical figures. The second speaker deals less with abstractions, for he applies himself to the advantages of a Virginia as opposed to a European education. In more eloquent language than the several extant letters which illustrate over a century of concern with this particular subject (see, for example, Thomas Jefferson's correspondence), he makes now-familiar points of economy, convenience, health (with the danger of the smallpox contagion in England), and above all, prophetically, patriotism. For a true nation (here Virginia) must train its own leaders of bench and bar, pulpit and vestry room. The fleshpots of Egypt, including the fine plays and jovial company of Old England, ill prepare a man for the simplicity of life in

the colony (an observation William Byrd II often made and to some extent exemplified). This second topic leads naturally to the third, and another young orator explains *how* the youth of Virginia might be educated. He argues on a point significant to an understanding of the philosophy of life of Virginia gentlemen into the national period: that this education can best be achieved by locating statehouse and provincial capital near where the college is already located, for town, college, and government would be mutually advantageous. A much later historian was to point out that no finer place and time for the training of future citizens and leaders of state existed than the Williamsburg of the eighteenth century, where every day college students might see enacted before them the drama of government or observe how its machinery worked, as they attended General Court or General Assembly and heard the governor address agents from other colonies or Indian neighbors, while at the same time in the classroom they studied Cicero and Cato and Quintilian and Sir Francis Bacon's histories. Though the young speaker made other points, as of the advantages for commerce and defense with Williamsburg as the capital, his prophetic suggestion that Middle Plantation might become a school of statesmen is what one remembers. Such it became, for Sir John Randolph and his two famous sons, Peyton and John, for Richard Bland, for John Marshall, and for Thomas Jefferson, among others. On May 18 Mr. Harrison in the House of Burgesses "delivered in at the table the third speech of the scholars spoken at the Royal Colledg of William and Mary on May Day last wch was read in the house."²⁴⁴ Blair's fine hand may be discerned in both oration and result. The fourth speech thanks the chief benefactors of the college and traces briefly its earlier history. The two monarchs, Governor Nicholson and the Council, bishops and archbishops, and the Burgesses are noticed for their generosity. As it bestows thanks naturally it suggests implicitly further gifts. The fifth and final forensic endeavor underscores the great significance of this convocation as a symbol of the bringing of polite literature and the liberal arts to "happy Virginia." Number five is a sort of peroration for the larger discourse of which each of the young man's four predecessors had presented a segment. High-flown as some of the phrases are, the total effect is of a simple presentation of facts and of aspirations. The Grammar School boys' sentences still read well.

Only a year later there were genuine graduation exercises at the college. Graduation *from what* one cannot be sure, for there is no real evidence that the two-year B.A. offered not later than the 1720s was yet conferred. The occasion was probably the conclusion of the Grammar School's classical-scholastic curriculum by a number of young men. It also seems to have marked the completion of the first main college building. What is described as a great concourse of people came in coaches or in sloops from as far

away as New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, it being a new departure in that area of America to have graduates perform their exercises.²⁴⁵ Planters, Indians, town artisans, and clergy rubbed elbows, for "the whole country rejoiced as if they had some relish for learning."²⁴⁵

Two years later, on July 22, 1702, the Reverend Peregrine Coney on Nicholson's order addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury containing "a Pastoral Colloquy in English verse, spoken by some of the younger Scholars, in the College Hall" before Governor Nicholson and the Assembly, on the death of King William. Included also was "a Pastoral" spoken by the same scholars, upon the succession of Queen Anne. One would give much to find the copies of these verses. The letter also contains something on the running feud between governor and Commissary, flaring up this time because of disparaging remarks Blair is alleged to have made regarding James II in a funeral oration on William the Third.²⁴⁶ The Bishop of London's Fulham Palace papers for the next several years are full of accusations and counter-accusations of Nicholson and Blair, most of them directly connected with the college, including schoolboy pranks, "ballads" allegedly against Blair, depositions, and letters.²⁴⁷ Yet despite fires and feuds, the college grew. Well-trained graduates of both Oxford and Cambridge joined its faculty, and as noted the schools and divisions continued to develop. Blair and his allies pushed through the Assembly acts bestowing upon the college revenues from taxes on liquor. The early Scottish university influences on physical and intellectual organization began in the 1720s to be superseded by educational influences from Oxford, especially Queen's College, whose alumni on the Williamsburg faculty took full control after Blair's death in 1743. Queen's influence probably sprang originally from the fact that two of its alumni who were Bishops of London were chancellors and chief consultants for William and Mary, Henry Compton, 1693-1700 and 1707-1713, and Edmund Gibson, 1737-1748, and seemed to have worked to get Queen's M.A.'s to go to teach in Virginia. They, or younger Queen's men, in turn persuaded young Virginians to be educated at Queen's.²⁴⁸

The Indian School was established, and in 1714 about fourteen students were on hand, with the expectation of several more. In 1718 the General Assembly made appropriations for three scholarships for the poor, indicative that superior minds were to be recognized wherever they might be found in the colony. In 1726, however, the House of Burgesses was informed that the college was in a languishing condition and must be supported by additional revenues.²⁴⁹ In 1745 Governor Gooch made a long and impassioned plea to the Burgesses to preserve "that Seminary of Learning and Ornament of *Virginia*" by additional munificence. Actually he was requesting a continuation of an act for college revenues, then just

about to expire (in June, 1747). He was successful, for the new bill was approved May 11, 1749. Incidentally, Gooch had flattered his constituents by calling William and Mary "a College, where good Order, Decency and Discipline, are better maintain'd," as well as pious learning and thorough training, than anywhere else he knew.²⁵⁰

Many sons of Virginia planters attended the Grammar School and then studied in Great Britain at Oxford, Cambridge, the Inns of Court, or toward the last of the period at the medical school at Edinburgh. Others did just the opposite, having their secondary education in England and returning to William and Mary for a degree. Still others had one year of college work at Williamsburg before entering British universities or simply terminating their formal education. Though statute amendments raised the number of years of residence for the B.A. from two to four and for the M.A. from four to seven in accordance with English customs, one rarely finds reference to William and Mary degrees at all—probably because few planters' sons, unless they expected to enter the professions (and not always then), felt the need for graduating. As to how many degrees were granted, there is no way of knowing because of missing records.²⁵¹ The average student body in the college alone was probably not much over fifty.²⁵² The library suffered from several fires and the destruction and pilfering of British troops, but in 1800 it had as many books as Yale and Columbia and more than Princeton and the University of Pennsylvania, though not as many as Harvard.²⁵³ At the same time its philosophical apparatus, or scientific laboratory equipment, was very good indeed, though by 1800 instruments purchased in 1768 were somewhat out of date. The curriculum kept up with the times, as indicated by one statement in the 1727 Statutes which G. M. Brydon sees²⁵⁴ as a declaration of intellectual independence but which would seem to most readers simply a strong indication that the administration and faculty were aware of current trends:

For as much as we see now daily a further Progress in Philosophy, than could be made by *Aristotle's* Logick and Physicks, which reigned so long alone in the Schools, and shut out all other; therefore we leave it to the President and Masters, by the advice of the Chancellor, to teach what Systems of Logick, Physicks, Ethicks, and Mathematicks, they think fit in their Schools.²⁵⁵

The intellectual and academic backgrounds of the faculty have been commented on incidentally. With the occasional exception of the masters of the Indian School and the Grammar School, they held degrees usually from Oxford and Cambridge and in a few instances, as in Blair's own case, from Scottish universities. Like other sons of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, they were capable of teaching, and often did teach, a variety

of subjects from theology to mathematics and natural philosophy, though William and Mary did not generally follow the Oxford and Cambridge regency system by which through rotation one professor might teach in many or all areas.

The masters of the Grammar School were also often professors of humanity in the Philosophy School. If they held both positions, they were of course university-trained. The unfortunate alcoholic Arthur Blackmore, who was master from 1706 to 1716, had to be dismissed. But he was an able man, as the Board of Visitors acknowledged, and when he returned to England published two creditable works of fiction and did hack writing in various causes.²⁵⁶ Joshua Fry, later professor of mathematics and, with Peter Jefferson, author-cartographer for a famous map; Goronwy Owen, the Welsh poet; and William Stith were among those at one time or another masters of the preparatory department and were all Oxford men, from different colleges.

As for other professors, the two Dawsons with Stith were of Queen's and Hugh Jones of Jesus, Oxford. About many we know little, but for the years just before 1763 Jefferson's beloved teacher, the Scot and Scottish-educated William Small, was a major factor in preparing the Revolutionary generation for their part in that struggle.²⁵⁷ Small's choice collection of scientific apparatus for William and Mary in or before 1768, years after he returned to Britain, was to give the college what was probably the best equipment in the country for at least a decade and a half after its arrival. One professor, Edward Ford, held simultaneously with his William and Mary position a fellowship at Oxford.²⁵⁸ Versatile many were, but the college followed Edinburgh rather than Oxford in moving toward the system of specialist professors in the eighteenth century.²⁵⁹

The students, as already noted, came from every and any white social level in the Chesapeake colonies. Many but not all of the wealthiest planters and some clergy still sent their sons to English universities, but perhaps as many did not, and probably most of the clergy and many of the middling planters after 1720 sent their sons to the provincial college.

By the 1730s even home-bred Virginians had acquired a taste for theatrical performances, the students especially being among those who enjoyed the professional productions of Charles Stagg and his group until 1736. Other professional actors were to come later, but in September 1736 the "Gentlemen of the College," probably mostly students with a few young professors, were offering in the Williamsburg theater Addison's *Cato* and, with the townspeople, joined in presenting Centlivre's *The Busy Body*, Farquhar's *The Recruiting Officer* and *The Beaux' Stratagem*, and Addison's *The Drummer*.²⁶⁰ Somewhat later, talented students might play musical instruments in local ensembles, as in the chamber music concerts

in which Jefferson participated with Governor Fauquier. That Blair was no Puritan or puritan, and that the college atmosphere had a gaiety hardly present in the New England colleges of the time, is borne out by Quaker Thomas Story's account of his visit to Williamsburg. The President showed him the new chapel, remarking that "this is the most useful place in the college, for here we sometimes preach and pray, and sometimes we fiddle and dance; the one to edify, the other to divert us."²⁶¹

Among the talented students between 1740 and 1763, besides the already mentioned Jefferson, were such later leaders as Jacquelin Ambler, Theodorick Bland, various Bollings and Burwells, several Harrisons and Nelsons, Wilson Cary, James Maury, James Fontaine, John and Mann Page, a few Randolphs, and many Robinsons.²⁶² These young men, exposed often as student-clerks to a Stith or a Small in the college and to a George Wythe, John Blair, and Benjamin Waller, to name just a few in the town, and to a lively and turbulent General Assembly as it sat—or fought—through its deliberations, should have become reasonably erudite and at the same time have secured in-practice training in politics and law. Miller as late as 1800 remarks, perhaps slyly, that in no other college in America was political science pursued with as much ardor as at William and Mary.²⁶³ Sons of the college, many of them educated before the Revolution, were to flock to the southwestern and western frontiers after Independence and carry their alma mater's brand with them, especially in interest in politics and considerable knowledge of the science.²⁶⁴ Certainly Washington and Madison, who did not attend the college, with Jefferson, had William and Mary in mind as an object lesson or partial model when they proposed a national university, to be located in the new nation's capital, where future leaders of the republic would learn from professors at the same time they observed democratic government in practice. Though in later years Jefferson proposed to revise the college's curriculum drastically in his unsuccessful attempt to make it a state university, both his plan and that of St. George Tucker for a new Virginia public university show the influence that William and Mary exerted upon their expanded suggestions.²⁶⁵ They never forgot, for example, that the first chair of science had been established there in 1711 and that until the Revolution the college at least equalled Yale and Harvard in scientific training. Under the guiding hands of its alumni, especially Jefferson, the college established a short-lived chair of medicine, and a very long-lived chair of law under George Wythe and St. George Tucker.

Its curriculum changing with current fashions in Great Britain, the college offered before 1763 very much what might have been obtained in the classrooms or tutorials of Yale and Harvard, Oxford and Cambridge. Both professors and students, however, probably leaned more to Locke and then Bolingbroke, and then certainly to Godwin, than the New England

colleges did. In 1803, Samuel Miller printed a curriculum outlining subjects and naming some textbooks. Though this was for 1800, so far as one can judge from scanty evidence of earlier years, the subjects had not changed so much as had textbooks since the earliest college-level instruction. Rousseau and the Scottish common-sense philosophy after 1775 had influenced ideas and supplied new texts, such as Hugh Blair's famous *Lectures*, and recent chemists and physicists had supplied new theory and material. Unfortunately, texts in classics, mathematics, and modern languages are not listed. Presumably these were much as they had been before the Revolution,²⁶⁶ though letters after 1776 indicate that the students knew recent editions of the classics and new mathematical theory.

The factors which prevented William and Mary in itself from becoming a major institution comparable to Harvard and Yale are inherent in the Virginia situation. Upper-class Virginians were still English and English-minded up to the Revolution, and in education for some time thereafter, with a few significant exceptions, to be noted later. Furthermore, Virginia did not until the twentieth century produce a merchant class capable of endowing an institution as the New England colleges were endowed. Virginians high and low were too often concerned first with their tobacco crops. The rural, or at any rate nonurban, nature of the colony physically discouraged attendance. Much of New England could reach Harvard or Yale in less than a day's ride. This was not true of William and Mary, and as the frontier expanded westward and there grew to manhood successive generations of the native-born who did not have any acquaintance with English university-type education, interest in erudition waned.

Throughout most of the eighteenth century there are accusations by clergy and laymen of the dissolute habits of the William and Mary faculty. That Arthur Blackamore, William Byrd II's friend, and Commissary-President Thomas Dawson were alcoholics did not help matters. William Stith as chaplain of the House of Burgesses just before his election to the presidency of the college may have had faculty as well as planters in mind when he preached his sermon against gaming. Well-founded or not, the reputation of the faculty as sots and gamblers was so widely prevalent by 1775 that the opulent planter Robert Carter confidentially told his tutor, Philip Fithian, that he would not send his sons to Williamsburg because of the character of the professors and the consequent confusion in the college. Undoubtedly some such condition existed, but it was fairly obviously greatly exaggerated by the opponents of the clergy-and-college party (by no means Blair's country-and-college party of earlier years) which was headed by the Tory John Camm. It was the same accusation the planters had leveled at the parochial clergy, now proved to have been a vastly exaggerated statement of conditions.

That the college was never in size appropriate to the colony is not to be explained by any one of these factors; but all of them together, along with Blair's personal greed and intransigence, may offer at least insights, or hints, of the reasons for the situation. The drying up of the substantial royal revenues and endowments after the Revolution effectively killed any potential the college may have seemed to possess previously for developing into a real university. For a time little more than its shadow and a strong memory of its substance remained.

MARYLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND GEORGIA

That Virginia was not the only southern colony conscious of a need for, or at least desirous of, higher education is indicated in the legislative and other records of at least three provinces. As early as the 1640s Catholic Marylanders thought of a college for themselves as they prepared students for advanced study abroad,²⁶⁷ the Protestant General Assembly brought up the matter of higher education several times, and during the Revolutionary era the Annapolis classical school chartered 1694–1696 did become the college it remains today. South Carolina entertained the idea a number of times, even officially, but again the College of Charleston did not emerge until after the Stamp Act. And Whitefield's Bethesda Orphan House was seeking a college charter and support for advanced curricula as the colonial period and, soon after, its founder's life ended.

Though the Protestant ascendancy in Maryland put at least a temporary end to Jesuit dreams of establishing a Jesuit college, by 1671 an act was introduced in the General Assembly (with a Catholic majority on the Council and a Protestant majority in the house) for "the founding and erecting of a school or college within [the] province for the education of youth in learning and virtue." Lower house amendments refer to it simply as a college, but with the idea that it would begin as a classical school with one Catholic and one Protestant master. The amendments were distasteful to the upper house (or Council) and nothing more is heard of a college-academy for some years. In 1684 the noted cartographer and generally interesting Augustine Herrman in his will left in care of the General Assembly, in case his posterity should become extinct, his three separate estates for the establishment of a free Protestant school and college and a "hospital" for distressed travelers. Since George Washington and other posterity survived and some still survive, nothing has come of this more-than-gesture toward education.²⁶⁸ Meanwhile in 1677 there had been established what has been described as the "first Catholic College in the New World," undoubtedly what it aimed ultimately to be. Actually it remained a secondary school, preparing primarily for St. Omer's, the English

Jesuit College in France.²⁶⁹ As far as the seventeenth century in Maryland is concerned, it was the Act of 1694 and its successor of 1696 which are significant for higher education in that they founded King William's School in Annapolis, destined to become St. John's College in 1784.²⁷⁰

It should be kept in mind that William and Mary had early been granted revenues from Maryland taxes and that officially the Williamsburg institution was the university for both of the Chesapeake colonies. But these expedients were never to prevent Maryland from having aspirations for an institution of its own. In 1732 a very remarkable proposal, probably by poet-schoolmaster Richard Lewis, was presented to the Council and later to the Burgesses. But more of this statement of educational philosophy in the last section of this chapter.²⁷¹ By 1754 Marylanders thought again seriously of the situation. "Philo Marilandicus" on March 6, 1754, addressed a letter to the *Maryland Gazette* pointing out how great a sum Marylanders were spending for education in Pennsylvania—not many ever went to William and Mary—and proposing a college on each shore which would keep Maryland cash within the colony. In May of that year, in opening the Assembly, Governor Sharpe spoke strongly of the need for an institution of higher learning within the province. After considerable discussion in the lower house, the matter was for the time dropped. It came up again in 1761 and made more progress. In 1763 a bill was actually drawn up which would have made the half-erected building in Annapolis, intended originally as a governor's mansion, into a main unit for a college. Again after the bill passed back and forth between upper and lower houses, it was shelved. Governor Eden was to bring it up again in 1773.²⁷² The two colleges (at Annapolis and Chestertown) materialized only after Independence had been achieved. But obviously higher education within the province was on the minds of many colonists throughout Maryland's early history.

Though North Carolina appears to have made no move toward establishing a college or university until Governor Tryon's first proposal and the act for establishing Queen's, a Presbyterian college, in Charlotte in 1771,²⁷³ South Carolina made some efforts much earlier. As already indicated, several of the endowed free or grammar schools established through legacies were intended as but the first step toward institutions of higher learning. The James Child bequest of 1718 is but one of several instances providing, it was hoped, for a later college or university. In 1723 the provincial secretary brought before the upper house "the Rever'd Mr. Morritts Proposal for a college."²⁷⁴ In 1711 James de Gignillat wrote from Goose Creek proposing a college for Indians.²⁷⁵ Sporadically, and perhaps halfheartedly, interested men such as Commissary Garden explicitly or implicitly suggested the need for a collegiate institution, though

no fully authenticated proposal survives for the period 1723-1769, in the last year of which a bill was provided for "the College of South Carolina." This was to be an institution with much the same organizational structure as William and Mary, and with a professor of civil and canon law and of the municipal laws of the province. From this proposal probably grew that of 1785, which established colleges at Charleston, Winnsborough, and Ninety-Six, of which the first still survives.²⁷⁶ As early as 1770 the College of Charleston was conceived and gifts were solicited, and by 1772 about £10,500 besides thousands of books were promised. When in 1785 the charter was sought and granted, however, the money was divided among three localities. Thus the Charleston institution never benefitted properly from the original bequests, which if they had been used for it alone might have got the institution off to a strong start.

Georgia, least of all the southern colonies, might have been expected to make an effort toward higher education before 1763, for it had been in existence only one generation and its controlling Trustees had what may be considered more urgent problems. But the evangelist Whitefield and his friends who had founded the Bethesda Orphan House, encouraged by gifts and what they felt was successful operation, became convinced that their world-famed institution should be developed into a college.²⁷⁷ Though no official move was made toward collegiate status before 1764, the project and proposal were in several minds many years earlier.²⁷⁸ Whitefield, much interested in higher education as such, memorialized the Georgia governor in 1764 with a plan for what might be the first college south of Virginia. Georgia authorities heartily approved, and Whitefield returned to England to seek funds and a charter. Perhaps if he had lived beyond 1770, and the main building at Bethesda had not been destroyed by fire soon after his death, he might even before the Revolution have achieved his goal.

Thus, before independence, every southern colony had shown itself conscious of higher education, and major citizens or leaders of each had attempted to establish colleges. Several came into existence between 1763 and 1776, and many more between 1776 and 1800. That William and Mary was the only recognized southern university before 1764 by no means proves, nor should it suggest, southern colonists' indifference to the advantages of advanced learning. Maryland sent her sons to Pennsylvania or to New Jersey or to Great Britain, and South Carolina hers to New England and more frequently to England and Scotland and the Continent. Two or more generations before the Stamp Act, perceptive southerners were fully aware that even for a lawyer, apprenticeship in a provincial barrister's office was simply not enough, just as the would-be physician and his parents soon found that a sort of apothecary's local apprenticeship was not enough. The clergy had from the beginning usually gone to universities, and they

continued to do so. Even planters' sons preparing to manage the ancestral estates, in a multitude of instances in every colony, sought collegiate training as necessary for their adult careers.

EDUCATION ABROAD, GENERAL AND PROFESSIONAL

Southern colonists, from the Roanoke voyages to the Declaration of Independence or the slightly earlier Stamp Act, were in thousands of instances educated in Great Britain or on the European continent, as has been said. Already noted are Oxonians such as Thomas Hariot at Roanoke and the numerous Oxford and Cambridge and Inns-of-Court men at Jamestown. British-born alumni of these institutions, the Scottish and Irish or Continental universities and many kinds of British elementary and secondary schools, continued throughout the period before independence to assume active and often leading roles in American affairs. These men—and women—became southern provincials for a few years or for life. In many instances it is impossible to distinguish them from native Americans who, especially from the 1650s, began returning to Great Britain for their education. What is important here is that persons with varying degrees of education, including thousands of former grammar school scholars and at least hundreds of former university and professional school students, continued steadily to bring with them current ideas of pedagogical theory, usually quite incidentally, as well as varying attainments in erudition to stimulate New World activity in creating a desire for good breeding and at the same time to shape ideas.

The British born-and-bred sons of the realm's schools and universities were the South's first clergy and continued in actual numbers to be the majority of its religious leaders at least through 1763. These same clergy were the first schoolmasters and professors and continued to form a large segment of the teachers to the end of the period. Essential in organizing and developing each southern province was the intellectual equipment of British-born colonists who were governors, provincial secretaries, chief justices, practicing attorneys, physicians, and educated gentlemen in a dozen other occupations, including farming and membership in provincial councils or in the lower houses of assembly.

Native-born southern colonials, or those who had been brought to the region as infants or young children, who went back to Europe for their schooling, followed most of the same professions as did the British-born. Naturally they began to appear in these occupations later than the emigrants, and often, except for specifically recorded information, it would be

impossible to distinguish them until the last generation before 1764. As far as politics are concerned, at the time of the Stamp Act probably a larger percentage of the native-born were leaning toward independence and resistance, though even here there are notable exceptions. Among the clergy, Bishop Meade and others before him declared that the best men (those of blameless life and character, or of ability?) were those educated at William and Mary rather than abroad, by whom were almost always meant native sons. But again Meade and earlier commentators were thinking of the clergy of the established church for not more than a generation or two before the Revolution, and even then surely home-bred James Maury was no more an average parson than was English university-educated William Stith or Thomas Cradock or Thomas Bacon or Alexander Garden. What the good bishop was probably thinking of, as he looked over parish and Fulham Palace diocesan records, were the too frequent entries regarding the alcoholics, gamblers, bigamists, and other sinners or eccentrics among parsons of Oxford or Cambridge or Edinburgh or Dublin education. Most of these "corrupt clergy," as Cradock called them, were British born as well as bred, and usually had come to the colonies because they could not make their way at home. This was a situation existing in every British colony in the world. It meant not that the majority of colonial Anglican clergy were not able and good men, but that among them were a larger proportion who disgraced or debased their cloth and calling than existed in Great Britain. Meade might have noticed that native-born but British-educated clergy such as Henry Addison of Maryland or William Stith of Virginia were in a variety of ways among the ablest of all colonial clergy.

The southern barrister and physician was also, to begin with, British born, though there was an appreciable body of native lawyers before there were physicians. Whatever their origin, their education seems to have varied from apprenticeships to universities and British Inns of Court. By the 1650's a few American planters were sending their sons and daughters to British schools and continued to do so in increasingly greater numbers up to the very threshold of the Revolution. The classical-scholastic education they received was of much the same order, and from the same textbooks, as that of their brothers and cousins who stayed at home and attended the better provincial academies. But in Great Britain they had on the whole abler teachers, often really distinguished ones. And it is interesting that many if not most of the major book collectors among southerners before the age of Jefferson and Madison had part or all of their schooling in England, where there were more books, booksellers, and printers than at home. William Byrd II was such a collector, and even the greatest of Jefferson's collections had its origins in books he picked up from the libraries of Randolphs and Blands and Byrds who had been educated abroad. These he

augmented with volumes he bought during his own period of adult education abroad, when he was Minister to France, and continued to order from England and France and other countries after he returned home.

It was in the two generations before 1764, especially the second of them, that Maryland and Virginia and South Carolina sent so many of their children abroad to young ladies' finishing schools or to well-known academies or grammar schools, to the universities, and to the Inns of Court. Statistics to be noted below show that two, and sometimes only one, of these colonies sent as many as all the northern and middle colonies put together.²⁷⁹ The literature of the Parsons' Cause and Pistole Fee and Stamp Act controversies in the South, the immediately pre-Revolutionary pamphlets for and against independence, much of the writing on the Constitution, were produced by men who had been educated at least in part abroad. Jefferson and Madison and Washington were American bred, but Daniel Dulany and Jonathan Boucher and Richard Bland and Peyton Randolph and Christopher Gadsden and Eliza Lucas Pinckney's two famous sons were English educated. And one should not forget that the Scot William Small was Jefferson's great teacher, just as the Scot John Witherspoon at Princeton was Madison's.

SCHOOLS

The history, organization, and curriculum of the British secondary school as it existed in the seventeenth century have been discussed earlier in this chapter in their relation to the first schools of the colonial South. The English free, endowed, private or semiprivate grammar school, founded largely in the sixteenth century, flourished through the seventeenth century and levelled off in the eighteenth, though a steady stream of southern colonials went to these academies in the reigns of Anne and the first three Georges.

Perhaps the children of Sir George Yeardley of Virginia and of other colonial governors and lesser officials were educated within the family circle in the colonies, but it is more than likely that many of them were sent to Great Britain for schooling even as early as the 1620s, 1630s, and 1640s. The little known of Argall and Francis Yeardley, including the famous 1654 letter of the latter to the Ferrars in England or the 1655 inventory of books of Argall Yeardley is among other indications that both the "Virginians born" had spent some time in England, for they seem to have been very well acquainted with John Ferrar, who had never been to America.²⁸⁰ By 1644 Thomas Willoughby of Lower Norfolk County was attending the Merchant Taylors' School, and by 1658 Augustine Warner, Jr., of Gloucester, the same institution.²⁸¹ There seems to be no proof that

Ralph Wormeley (1650–1701) who entered Oriel, Oxford, in 1665, had previous academic education in England, but almost surely he did.²⁸² Colonel John Catlett, explorer, letter writer, and mathematician of Rappahannock, left directions in his will that his children be educated in England and that the entire income from his estate should be used in meeting the expenses entailed.²⁸³ Bruce lists dozens of instances of seventeenth-century Virginia children educated in England. Unfortunately neither he nor his county-record sources are usually able to name or locate the schools the boys and girls attended. William Fitzhugh directed that his second son be entered in a “French School” near Bristol in 1698 and William Byrd II and his sisters, when they were quite young in the 1680s, attended unknown schools in England. Later Byrd had a tutor and then attended Felsted Grammar School in Essex, under Christopher Glasscock, before he studied business in the Netherlands and then law at the Middle Temple.²⁸⁴ In 1692 a son of Christopher Robinson of Middlesex in Virginia was at school in London. In 1699 Arthur Spicer of Richmond County provided in his will for the education of his son at the Charterhouse, which he judged to be the best. Undoubtedly early Carters and Lees attended British grammar schools before they entered one of the universities or the Inns of Court. Almost all historians except Bruce tend to underestimate the number of Virginians in English schools in the seventeenth century, possibly because they were unable to identify individuals with particular schools.

For Maryland and the Carolinas the education of children in British secondary schools is even harder to pin down. In Maryland especially, one may be sure that the leading families of Diggeses, Chiseldines, Chews, and others (related by marriage and blood to some of the Virginia families just named) sent their children to English schools. Since there is specific evidence that dozens of young persons from all three colonies attended English schools in the eighteenth century, it seems more than likely—and can be proved for Virginia—that frequently parents or friends or relatives had done so earlier. Individual planters had not arrived at the stage of prosperity from which they operated in the eighteenth century, but there were a number wealthy enough, even in the Carolinas before 1700, to have sent children to England. Though the voyage was somewhat longer and rougher in the seventeenth century, the susceptibility to smallpox contagion which prevented many in the eighteenth century from sending their offspring to England for education apparently was not as much of a consideration earlier.

For secondary school instruction of southern colonials in Great Britain in the eighteenth century there is again considerable information on Virginians, less on Marylanders and South Carolinians, and almost none on North Carolinians and Georgians before 1764. Maryland was represented

in European schools by both Catholics and Protestants. Though Charles Carroll of Carrollton seems to have had only his college work at St. Omer's in France, his cousin Daniel Carroll spent six years from 1742 at schools in Flanders. John Carroll, first Roman Catholic Bishop of Maryland in the national era, attended a school near St. Omer's for two years before he entered the college. The scion of another great Maryland family, Daniel Dulany, Jr., attended Eton before he entered Cambridge in 1739. Stephen Bordley, nephew and son of two other prominent gentlemen of the province, was sent to England for the education which culminated at the Inns of Court.²⁸⁵

Eighteenth-century South Carolinians who received their training abroad attended English schools. Among them were at least two Middletons, including the older Arthur (though perhaps he completed his higher education at the end of the seventeenth century) and Henry Middleton. The younger Arthur attended the academy at Hackney before he entered the Middle Temple in 1757. Henry Laurens was sent to London in 1744 for commercial training, as William Byrd II had gone to Holland a half-century earlier for the same purpose. Christopher Gadsden about mid-century attended a classical school in England, and about 1754 Ralph Izard was at Hackney for several years. Eliza Lucas Pinckney made sure that her sons Charles Cotesworth and the younger Thomas attended Westminster School before enrolling at Christ Church, Oxford, and the Middle Temple.²⁸⁶

Virginia boys' names appear in the records of at least a score of known schools in the eighteenth century. Obviously in many cases there were family traditions or affiliations or prestige, which might mean that this or that particular school seemed to offer the best quality of education and thus impelled them to attend it. Therefore certain schools in certain areas were particular favorites. Though a few boys went to English tutors or, if very young, to dames' schools, most attended what were then called free grammar schools, and at the end of the period a few, such as Eton and Westminster and Winchester, which began to be called public schools. London and its environs, and Yorkshire were the sites of the majority of the schools these well-to-do young Virginians attended. Very few of these or other southern boys were on the way to the priesthood, but in most known cases their headmasters and masters were in holy orders, which usually meant that they held university degrees.

Probably Robert "King" Carter and certainly several of his sons, including Landon, attended Solomon Low's school, presumably an excellent institution beginning to use new textbooks in the classics of which the Carter parent did not approve.²⁸⁷ Scattered about England were Rodham Kenner at St. Bees Grammar School in Northumberland, George Parker at Bristol, Francis Weekes and William Stephens at Winchester, and Gawin

Corbin at Grinstead in Essex. For some reason Lawrence and Augustine Washington, George's older half brothers, were educated at Appleby Grammar School in Westmoreland.²⁸⁸ Several generations of Skipwiths, some before they came to America, attended Rugby.²⁸⁹ At least twelve Virginians were students at Eton before 1764: two or more Burwells, two Grymses, Arthur Lee, Mann Page, Beverley Randolph, a Ralph Wormeley, two Spotswoods, and two other Wormeleys. In the London area John Baylor Senior and Junior attended the Putney Grammar School,²⁹⁰ John Carter the Mile End School, Augustine Warner the Merchant Taylors', George Lee the school at Islington, and Thomas Nelson and others the Hackney School. Many Virginians as well as South Carolinians considered the Westminster School the best in Great Britain. At least thirteen Virginia names appear on its rolls, including a late (third generation, born about 1713) John Banister, two Beales, Edward Bland, several Lees, Francis and Thomas Hobbes Weekes, and Valentine and Beverley Peyton.²⁹¹

But Yorkshire, which was widely known for its free grammar schools and from which came many early southern colonials, had the greatest attraction for Virginia schoolboys. These schools were probably less expensive than the London group. There seem to have been Blands at Scarborough, and a Holt and perhaps others at Sedbergh. But the grammar schools at Beverley, Skipton, Wakefield, Heath, and Leeds were the most popular. The record is confusing because some boys attended more than one of them, apparently following a great headmaster who moved from a good school to a better one and also confusing because of some similarity in school names.²⁹² At any rate, at least one or two sets of Virginia parents removed temporarily to Yorkshire with their families in order to enter their sons in some of these institutions.²⁹³ The Wakefield Grammar School at mid-eighteenth century, under a succession of brilliant headmasters, was perhaps the best known of this northern English cluster of institutions.

By 1748 Edward and John Ambler, sons of Richard Ambler of Yorktown, had crossed the Atlantic and were in school at Wakefield, though the letters addressed to the boys from Virginia do not make it clear whether they attended a Leeds Academy at Heath, near Wakefield (and Halifax), to which the letters are addressed, or the equally well-known, or better-known, Wakefield Grammar School. John at least attended the latter (and possibly the former), for his name appears on its fragmentary rolls. The boys were joined by their younger cousin Augustine Smith of Shooter's Hill and two sons of Thomas Lee, one being Richard Henry.²⁹⁴ A little later, in 1750, William Beverley of Blandfield and his whole family were in Yorkshire with a son Robert, William Fairfax, and Robert Munford, to enter them in a school. As best the story can be pieced out, the elder Beverleys settled in the town of Beverley so that the boys might attend the Beverley Gram-

mar School.²⁹⁵ But soon the boys were at nearby Wakefield Grammar School (officially the Free Grammar School of Queen Elizabeth at Wakefield). The move was perhaps inspired by the great headmaster John Clarke,²⁹⁶ accomplished classical scholar, who himself in 1751 moved from the Beverley school to that at Wakefield. The Beverley group at Wakefield were joined in 1751 by precocious young Robert Bolling.²⁹⁷ Bolling records that immediately they began the study of French under a Frenchman, and his poetry indicates his lifelong familiarity with the language and its literature. Bolling remained in Yorkshire until November of 1755. Other friends or neighbors who attended the Free Grammar School of Queen Elizabeth at Wakefield and made the customary parting gift of a book to the library, included Thomas Preston (c. 1752), John Banister (perhaps the same one who attended Westminster), Thomas Ball, Samuel Carr (1753), Thomas Dade (1754), Francis and Theodorick Bland (1759), and Robert Tucker (1761).²⁹⁸ Clarke was to say that "the Virginia boys were all good Scholars."²⁹⁹ Most of them had Yorkshire or even London relatives they could and did visit during holidays, and the few who did not accompanied one or another of their fellow colonials. Some of these boys went on to Oxford or Cambridge or Edinburgh or the Inns of Court, but most of them returned to Virginia as soon as they or their parents, or both, felt they had acquired a classical education. From this little group alone came the gallant officer and framer of the Articles of Confederation, John Banister; the orator and statesman and signer Richard Henry Lee; the physician and poet and Revolutionary officer Theodorick Bland; the playwright and patriot Colonel Robert Munford; and the ablest man of letters of his time in Virginia, Robert Bolling. Some of the others displayed almost as much ability. The fact that the Wakefield boys who lived to see the Revolution and independence were patriots, not Tories, may or may not tell us anything about the Yorkshire school. That they studied history as well as Latin and Greek and French is evident from the surviving titles of certain textbooks.³⁰⁰

Only a word need be said about women's education abroad. There was a great deal of it, though little when compared with that of males. William Byrd II's two sets of children and many other young ladies from Chesapeake families studied in Great Britain, usually the three R's, embroidery, dancing, music, French, and sometimes Latin, just as they would have done at home. British kin sometimes boarded or even taught these pupils. But the fact that the polite accomplishments deemed suitable for them could be acquired as well at home, their parents usually thought, kept most of them in the colonies. British education entered the woman's world of the southern colonies primarily through the wives that young men often brought back with them from their educational stays in Britain. Margaret

Brent of Virginia, and Sophia Hume, Henrietta Johnston, Martha Logan, and Hanna Williams of South Carolina probably were educated in Great Britain. A book on gardening, entrancing miniatures, and intelligent botanical observations are among their contributions to the culture of their colonies and of the mother country.

UNIVERSITIES AND THE LIBERAL ARTS

Though it is probable that more southern colonists studied in British secondary schools than in universities or professional colleges, it is by no means sure. Many young men from America who entered English, Irish, or Scottish universities had some previous education in Great Britain, but many of them did not, at least as far as surviving records indicate. For no college of any university does one know or feel that the lists of matriculates are complete; there are in existence, and in print, however, many more student rolls for Oxford and Cambridge and Aberdeen and Edinburgh, in the liberal arts alone, than for the secondary schools.³⁰¹ Here it seems proper to notice the southern colonists who were studying the liberal arts, not law or medicine. Such students included the theologians, who rarely proceeded beyond the B.A. or M.A., with a sort of major in Divinity, though a few took the B.D. and a few more the earned D.D. Since some of the surviving lists are of matriculates, many of whom, then as now, never obtained a degree, and others are of graduates, they do not tell us all we would like to know even about those named, and their fragmentary nature leaves us with no real foundation for even approximate figures. Some names, such as Hugh Jones, occur several times, and it is often impossible to tell whether any of those named were born in America or went there.

The clergy, as noted above, were often British born, though it is frequently difficult to identify the minority among them who were American born. But by combining the universities' surviving alumni roles with Weis' lists³⁰² of southern clergy and those in Goodwin's *The Colonial Church in Virginia*, and Rightmyer's *Maryland's Established Church* together with the Virginia and Maryland volumes of Perry's *Historical Collections*, one can offer some rough figures for British university affiliations of southern colonial clergy who were in the colonies by 1763, the majority but not all of them Church of England parsons.

Even these rough tables are interesting. For Virginia, for example, from twenty-three Oxford colleges ninety-one clergy were serving, with ten from Queen's, nine from Brasenose, and three or four from each of the rest. Cambridge, certainly in the seventeenth century regarded as pre-eminently puritan, before 1764 supplied Virginia with forty-three clergy from fifteen colleges, the greatest number from Trinity. Trinity College,

Dublin, provided fourteen clergy, Edinburgh four, Aberdeen three, German universities three or four, and the American William and Mary nine, Princeton five, and Harvard two.

Maryland appears to show only fifteen who attended Oxford, of whom nine are identified with named colleges. Only three had their education at Cambridge, and others were scattered among Aberdeen, Glasgow, Trinity in Dublin, French St. Omer's, Liege, Württemberg, Uppsala, Halle, with Dublin showing the greatest number, five. North Carolina shows none before 1764 who can be positively identified with European colleges, save one man from Trinity, Dublin, and another from Jena, though there were at least three from Princeton in America. South Carolina is another story, with thirty Oxonians serving its parishes, six Cantabrigians, and others from Aberdeen, Glasgow, Trinity in Dublin, Geneva, Edinburgh, and Marburg. Because of accessibility through Charleston as a seaport, there were also six Harvard-educated parsons (usually Independents, Puritans, or Presbyterians), two each from Yale and Princeton, and one from the University of Pennsylvania. Georgia's brief pre-1764 history includes at least three Oxonian parsons (the Wesleys and Whitefield), and one each from Halle, Trinity in Dublin, and Princeton.

Perhaps the most interesting figure and deduction to be drawn therefrom is the large proportion from Cambridge in the Chesapeake colonies. Though Oxford predominates, it in no way overwhelms. The repetition of names without other identification in the Trinity, Dublin, lists makes it impossible to tell with certainty about clergy who were Irish bred, though from other sources it is known that several were in Maryland, such as the Reverend James Sterling. Probably many more Anglo-Irish and Scotch-Irish parsons, Anglican and Presbyterian, are still to be identified.

American-born clergy who were European-educated included some of the more prominent. In Maryland, William Brogden, Jr., was apparently educated in Great Britain, and of course Catholic Bishop Carroll was Maryland born, as was Anglican Henry Addison (Queen's, Oxford), all connected by blood or marriage with many leading families of the colony. In Virginia it is often difficult to tell whether a clergyman with an old name in the colony was born there. Rodham Kenner, Sr., studied at Glasgow early in the eighteenth century. Chicheley Thacker had attended Oriel, Oxford. William Stith, like Addison allied by blood and marriage to almost all prominent families of his colony, held the B.A. and M.A. from Queen's, Oxford, as did the Reverend Cuthbert Spann and several nonclerical Virginians and some of the professors at William and Mary who were not American born. Bartholomew Yates, Jr., B.A. Oriel, Oxford, in 1735, was the son of the professor of divinity of the same name at William and Mary. There were a few others; but, as already noticed, few planters' sons

became clergymen during the colonial period, despite the precedent set in English families of the same period and social level.

Southern provincials whose parents believed in British university education as preparation for life or management of estates or as a step toward professional training in law and medicine are more frequent. Almost complete lists for two Cambridge colleges name a number of such Virginia-born students. Christ's College, for example, had William Spencer as early as 1684-1686, Arthur Holt in 1716-1723, Gawin Corbin in 1756, Philip Thomas Lee (born in Maryland) in 1757, and Thomas Nelson in 1758. Trinity College shows on its rolls John Carter (son of Robert) in 1714, Wilson Cary in 1721, Daniel Taylor, B.A. in 1727, Ralph Wormeley after 1757, John Ambler in 1753, Robert Beverley in 1757, Thomas Smith in 1759, and several more after 1763 but before 1791. In 1725 Robert Porteus and John Reade were at Peterhouse, in 1733 George Carter and in 1762 another Ralph Wormeley at Trinity Hall, in 1729 Lewis Burwell at Caius, in the 1720's Thomas Clayton at Pembroke, and at various times John Putney, Sr. and Jr., at Caius.

At Oxford Henry Fitzhugh was at Christ Church in 1722. John Lee had been at Queen's as early as 1658, to be followed in 1724 by the already mentioned William Stith. In 1709 Mann Page matriculated at St. John's. Two Christopher Robinsons in 1721 and 1723 respectively, Peter Robinson in 1737, a Ralph Wormeley as early as 1668, and Bartholomew Yates in 1732 (mentioned above) were all at Oriel.

In addition to these Virginians at the major British universities, at least two Marylanders, Daniel Dulany, Jr., and Lloyd Dulany, and probably Alexander Lawson, were at Clare, Cambridge, and Charles Carroll of that province was at Caius in 1742. A South Carolina Ketelby (or Ketteley) was at Balliol, and a Kimberley at Christ Church, Oxford. A recent survey reveals some curious facts about South Carolinians in British universities. Colonials from that province who went to England during the reign of George II all attended Oxford, but in the next reign there were also a considerable number at Cambridge. For the five years from 1764 to 1769 every American at Cambridge was from South Carolina, and in the fifteen years from 1761 to 1776 South Carolinians at both universities outnumbered the previously dominant Virginians two to one. The same period survey speaks of a Virginia tradition at Oriel, Oxford, and a Maryland one at Clare, Cambridge, a condition suggested by the names already given. Christ's, Cambridge, was strongly Virginian (five), Caius all South Carolinian and Virginian, as was also Trinity Hall.

At Oxford South Carolinians included Joseph Yeamans at University College in 1745, and Charles and William Drayton at Balliol in 1761. Marylanders were John Hammond at Oriel in 1758³⁰³ and Thomas Rich-

ardson at University College in 1759. Though numbers of clergy attended the Scottish and Irish universities, as did physicians and lawyers, it is difficult to locate a native-born southern colonial who was sent back to Trinity, Dublin, or to Aberdeen, or Glasgow or Edinburgh for a general education, though there were probably several.

Clearly, as a survey of professional education will show, many of these liberal arts students at Oxford and Cambridge were preparing for medicine or law, but just as clearly many of them were not. What is evident in the southern colonies is a tendency for father and son and often grandson, brother and cousins, to attend the same university and often the same college. Connely tells us that this tradition of overseas education never existed in New England, and that from the Harvard- and Yale-oriented colonies "no two members of the same family ever studied in the universities of the old country."³⁰⁴

MEDICAL TRAINING

For the story of medicine itself, and much less for medical training, there are detailed studies for only South Carolina and Virginia among the southern provinces, though studies by Shryock and others offer a good deal for a general view.³⁰⁵ Medical education, like other forms of training, followed the trends of the times. Though in the seventeenth century most practitioners in the southern colonies were British or European trained, many of them brought with them or acquired after they arrived young men to act as apprentice chirurgens, surgeons, or physicians. Thus the Jamestown and St. Mary's physicians were already, under the indenture system, training others to take their places. Probably a majority of practicing medical men throughout the colonial period were so trained in this country or abroad. And probably the greater part of those who attended formal courses and clinics (in this period almost entirely in Scotland and London and the Netherlands) did not hold the M.D. A few held the B.M. and a few others the M.A. Even of the most elite body of British medical men, the Royal College of Surgeons, which listed from 1570 to 1700 some 642 members, 167 had no degree in medicine and only 473 were doctors of medicine and 2 were bachelors of medicine. Their medical education was at Cambridge, Oxford, Padua, Leyden, Utrecht, Montpellier, Caen, and Basle.

In its first years Virginia did have two "Doctors of Physicke," Walter Russell and Lawrence Bohun (the latter probably an M.D. of Leyden), and John Pott, M.A., a man with considerable experience in chirurgery and physic. Pott had apprentices. In these first years, also there were at least two chirurgens (one a surgeon and apothecary), "Dr." Thomas Wotton and William Wilkinson. Wotton is called "Chirurgion General" in the

early years of the colony.³⁰⁶ There is no evidence that Wotton or Wilkinson had education other than apprenticeship. In the seventeenth century there were many other "Doctors" of unknown background, such as George Eland, a physician who was also master of Eaton School. Several were undoubtedly indentured servants. Patrick Napier and Frances Hadden of York County were among them. In apprenticeships Richard Townshend served under John Pott, and John Tilney probably under Dr. Holloway of Northampton County. John Lee, B.A. of Queen's, Oxford, 1658, and later M.D., is said to have been the first native-born Virginia physician. Dr. Henry Willoughby in 1677 left forty-four books of physic in his library, many in Latin and Dutch, but no evidence survives as to his education.³⁰⁷

As Virginia population increased in the eighteenth century, so did physicians of varying kinds. Most undoubtedly were trained under the apprentice system. But such men as Theodorick Bland, John Tennent, Jr., Walter Jones, and James McClurg completed premedical training at William and Mary between 1754 and 1762 and then went to medical school, usually abroad. Thomas Walker, George Gilmer, Jr., and John Tankard probably attended William and Mary and then served apprenticeships, though Gilmer attended Edinburgh for a time. One eighteenth-century medical indenture survives by which Michael Wallace was to be apprenticed to his uncle, Gustavus Brown of Maryland, from 1734 to 1740. He married one of his master's daughters and settled at Falmouth, Virginia.³⁰⁸ Another type of medical practitioner was granted a certificate of proficiency at the end of a term of service.

Many Virginians in the eighteenth century were attracted by the rise of the medical school of the University of Edinburgh. Others went to London to St. Thomas', Guy's, or St. Bartholomew's. The Edinburgh medical faculty, organized about 1726, was by mid-century renowned throughout Europe and America. By 1761 there were so many Virginians enrolled that they formed the Virginia Club. Its members petitioned the House of Burgesses that in the future no one be allowed to practice in the colony without a proper license and medical degree.³⁰⁹ Sixty-five of the 139 Americans *graduated* at Edinburgh between 1749 and 1812 were Virginians, out of a total of 86 from the South. By no means all who matriculated received degrees,³¹⁰ though they may later have become eminent in the profession before 1764, men like William Marshall, William Marye, James Bankhead, Jr., George Gilmer, Jr., and James Feild. The lists of theses of those who did receive the M.D. still exist. First was Valentine Peyton in 1754, followed by Thomas Clayton in 1758, Theodorick Bland in 1761, and Arthur Lee, Corbin Griffin, and James Tapscott, who graduated between 1763 and 1765. Between the latter date and the War of 1812 comes a list of physicians especially well known in the nineteenth century.

The young men who attended during the period 1762-1793 studied under such eminent practitioners and theorists as William Cullen and Joseph Black, Alexander Munro, *secundus*, Alexander Hamilton, and Daniel Rutherford, among many others. The fame of its faculty was not the sole reason for one's going to Edinburgh. As Samuel Johnson advised Arthur Lee in 1760, if there were fortune enough and fourteen or fifteen years to spare, study physic at Oxford or Cambridge; if not, at Edinburgh or Leyden. The London courses did not lead to a degree, though some of Virginia's best physicians (such as William Baynham) studied under this almost entirely clinical form of training; others were Gustavus Richard Brown, Robert Carter, and James McClurg (the last after graduation from Edinburgh). Dr. Thomas Clayton, son of the Virginia attorney-general, took his M.B. degree at Cambridge in 1726, as did Dr. William Cocke earlier, in 1693, to become distinguished as physician and secretary of state in the colony.

Dr. John Mitchell, later well known for research and publication in several fields, received the M.A. but not the M.D. at Edinburgh. He probably took the latter degree at Leyden.³¹¹ John Clayton, the botanist, another son of the Virginia attorney-general, perhaps studied medicine somewhere but never obtained a degree. His contribution to medicine through his two editions of *Flora Virginica* (Leyden, 1739-1743, 1762) did more for materia medica than any other New World publication of the century. Dr. John Tennent, the most prolific Virginia medical publisher (see Chapter VII) had no degree, though he had recommendations from Drs. Mead, Munro, and Pellet in Great Britain for Edinburgh to grant him the M.D.³¹² As will be shown later, there was some pioneer medical investigation going on in Virginia in the eighteenth century. Whatever their degrees, these performing physicians and surgeons had solid training and experience.

Though Maryland in the national period was to outstrip Virginia as a medical center, not very much is known about its physicians in the colonial era. In 1637 Henry Hooper, chirurgion, arrived in Maryland and performed probably the first American autopsy (on a man killed by a falling tree). In 1638 Thomas Ger[r]ard, surgeon, who through his descendants was to be remembered in both Chesapeake colonies, had established himself in St. Mary's County and was elected to the General Assembly. In 1641 and 1642 a number of barber-surgeons settled in Maryland. Concerning the medical training of these men nothing is known, but it was probably the usual indenture-apprenticeship method.³¹³ Baltimore's later illustrious history as a medical center began in 1730, though very little is known of the pre-Revolutionary physicians, except for a few to be noted hereafter.

Alexander Hamilton, M.D. of Edinburgh, son of a professor at that university, is remembered for his witty writing as well as his medical ability.

He was secretary of the Tuesday Club of Annapolis throughout its existence (1745-c.1756).³¹⁴ His contemporary Dr. Adam Thomson was a writer on medical subjects and a poet. Henry Stevenson studied at Oxford and became a physician, perhaps through training there. He settled in Baltimore in 1750. In 1755 an able Prussian, Dr. Charles Frederick Wiesenthal, also established himself in the same town.³¹⁵

Georgia from its first establishment in 1732 had a number of physicians, some called chirurgeons, of widely differing backgrounds. A Dr. William Cox appears to have offered his services to the Trustees and to have gone out with the first settlers. The earliest known M.D. was Noble Jones, who arrived in 1733, was granted the first great Georgia estate of Wormsloe, and like his son Dr. Noble Wymerley Jones (who studied under his father) was one of the major military, juridical, and political figures of the colony's history.³¹⁷ Of quite different background was the distinguished Portuguese Jewish physician Dr. Samuel Nunez Ribiero, who fled to London and then to Georgia to escape the Inquisition. In 1734 the Salzburger under Bolzius brought with them their own physician-apothecary, Dr. Zwiffler, German trained. Perhaps the most interesting medical education of early Georgia is that the Reverend John Wesley gave himself. The result, his *Primitive Physic*, went through twenty-three editions in the author's lifetime. Wesley's attainment grew out of his general Oxford education and a great deal of interest, observation, and probably practice. Whitefield in his account of the Bethesda Orphan House states that to establish it he took over "only a Surgeon and a few more of both sexes" and that one of his first buildings was an infirmary, or free clinic. Other physicians, such as Thomas Hawkins, William Bowler, and Patrick Graham, were attached to military regiments. But regarding the professional qualifications of any of them one can only guess. Georgia also had physicians from abroad and at least one trained by his own father. Considering its age and population little more could be expected for the colony.

South Carolina, declared David Ramsay in his history, had in Charleston the most active medical center in the American colonies before Benjamin Rush began work in Philadelphia.³¹⁷ In the eighteenth century Charleston was indeed lively in medical research and debate. Before 1700 there was the usual assortment of chirurgeons trained through indenture and a few medical graduates. Dr. Joseph I. Waring traces their activities in some detail but is unable to give much about their training. Several physicians were French, as might be expected in a population with a fairly large Huguenot proportion.

Some of South Carolina's most famous physicians in the eighteenth century were Thomas Dale, a graduate of Leyden; Alexander Garden, M.D. of Marischal College at Aberdeen; John Lining, an M.D. probably of

Leyden; Lionel Chalmers, probably a graduate of St. Andrew's without a formal degree in medicine; Thomas Cooper (d. 1734), educated at Wadham, Oxford, again probably without a degree in medicine; John Rutledge, who arrived as a ship's surgeon and probably once had been an apprentice in physic; and Dr. Samuel Wilson, educated at Edinburgh but apparently leaving without a degree. All these men save Rutledge, who soon took up another profession, experimented with inoculation and other remedies for epidemics and published voluminously, arguing among themselves.

Along with them were two native sons equally as intelligent and perhaps better trained for the medical profession. One was William Bull, M.D. of Leyden, claimed to have been the first native-born American graduate in medicine (1734) as John Lee is claimed to have been the first Virginian. There is little to show that he ever practiced, but soon after his return to Charleston in 1736 he embarked on a distinguished political career. He maintained a semiprofessional interest by supplying Peter Collinson in London with information on South Carolina flora, and he entertained Mark Catesby in Charleston. The second was John Moultrie, Jr., who in 1749 received the first M.D. secured by a native American at the University of Edinburgh. Like Bull, he soon gave up medical practice (having married an heiress) and became a fairly prominent political figure. And also like Bull, he ended his career as a Loyalist, in his case dying in England in 1798.³¹⁸

This is about all that is known about medical education in the southern colonies by 1763. Though much of it was provincial apprenticeship training, even this was influenced by the steady flow of British and Continental medical graduates who brought new ideas. Only after 1740 were colonists in any considerable numbers educated in medicine abroad. Returning northern graduates of European medical schools about the time of the Revolution and soon after established American medical centers first in Philadelphia and then in New York and New England. The great figure of early American medicine, Dr. Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia, had himself graduated from Edinburgh and studied further in London. The medical centers he and others established in the northern cities grew out of their European training. A generation after the Revolution the largest group of Philadelphia medical students were from the South, often sons or relatives of men who had studied with Rush at Edinburgh.

THE INNS OF COURT

In London is the cluster of Inns of Court, which by the seventeenth century constituted the great legal university of England and possessed the sole right to call aspiring legal students to the bar (that is, to license them

as barristers). The history of these Inns is a long, varied, and at times tumultuous one, representing a slow evolution from groups of living quarters for would-be lawyers to what amounted to full-fledged colleges, each possessing a dining hall, a library, and a chapel, the Middle and Inner Temples sharing the Temple Church as chapel, and each Inn including living quarters (suites of rooms) for their students. The Inns, as clusters of buildings, still stand today just outside the old city wall, toward Westminster, adjacent to the great law courts.

Thus in the middle of the great city presumably mature students could study under eminent barristers, observe the courts in operation, and above all read law. But the Inns were social centers also, schools of manners as well as of law, where students could learn all kinds of music, dancing, and other accomplishments of the complete gentleman. These Inns derived their names from the men in whose "tenements" they settled (the noblemen Gray and Lincoln) or from the relative position of the original institution on whose former property they were located (the Middle and the Inner Temple). Under and near each of these four major Inns, which supplied advocates below the degree of sergeant, and barristers of not quite full standing, were the subordinate Inns of Chancery, bearing much the same relation to the Inns of Court as Eton and Westminster did to Oxford and Cambridge. That is, the Inns of Chancery were preparatory institutions.

It is the Inns of Court which were attended by southern colonists in great numbers throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Many colonists went there before they set foot in America, but American- or British-born might go after university education in England, Scotland, Ireland, or William and Mary, or after concluding a course at a good grammar school. Many more southern than northern colonists attended these law colleges, and their philosophy of and attitude toward the common law are, among other juridical matters, reflected in southern colonial legal practice and in political theory. Relatively few English or American members of these schools were called to the bar, or graduated and became barristers, but those who did not qualify (usually from personal choice) were not thus prevented from practicing in America along with their colleagues who had studied for their profession under local or provincial lawyers. And of those who became barristers, some, such as William Byrd II, never practiced, or practiced for only a little while. For the southern planter, who needed considerable knowledge of the law to defend his property rights in a litigious age, attendance at one of the Inns for a few months or a few years offered opportunity to learn some law, see gay London, and improve his manners by association with the learned and even the great.³¹⁹ For many the Inns were more legal clubs than law schools in our sense, especially in

the eighteenth century, when regular courses of instruction through lectures had ceased.

From Jamestown on there were members or former members of the Inns of Court in the new settlements. Usually they used their training incidentally if at all, though certainly members of the resident council of the Virginia Company sat as judges in many cases where points of law were involved. George Percy and George Sandys (both Middle Temple), Gabriel Archer, Governor Sir Francis Wyatt and his brother, the Reverend Hawte Wyatt, and William Strachey (all Gray's Inn) were major administrative or ecclesiastical figures under the Company before 1624. With new land policies and increasing population after 1640 real practicing attorneys were needed. Sir William Berkeley (Middle Temple) was the second legally trained governor in the southern colonies, and there were to be several more in Virginia and other provinces. Edward Chilton, at different times historian and attorney-general of both Virginia and Maryland and a learned lawyer, studied at the Middle Temple, probably after his Cambridge years, which ended in 1676. Edward Digges, son of Sir Dudley, Master of the Rolls to Charles I, studied at Gray's Inn about 1637 and sailed for Virginia in 1650. He was for a year governor of the colony and later its agent in England. Nathaniel Bacon, the rebel, after attending Cambridge was at Gray's Inn in 1664. Native Virginians William Byrd II and his neighbor Benjamin Harrison were at the Middle Temple in the 1690s. Harrison was to become attorney-general of Virginia, and a grandson would be a signer of the Declaration of Independence and two more remote descendants presidents of the United States. Nicholas Spencer, president of the Council and acting governor of Virginia, had been at Lincoln's Inn in 1629. His son William was of the Inner Temple, after Cambridge, by 1685. Another attorney-general of Virginia was Stevens Thompson, admitted to the Middle Temple in 1688 and later attending Cambridge. He was the grandfather of George Mason, author of the Virginia Bill of Rights.

Maryland in the seventeenth century had several prominent citizens at the Inns of Court. Among them were William Bladen (Inner Temple, 1687), attorney-general and father of a governor of the colony; Charles Carroll, admitted to the Inner Temple in 1685, receiver-general for the Lord Proprietor; and probably Henry Jowles of Gray's Inn, 1663, who became judge of the provincial vice-admiralty court. South Carolina Landgrave Abel Kettelby or Ketteley attended the Middle Temple in 1693, being called to the bar in 1699. Whether he was actually ever in the colony is unknown. The great chief justice Nicholas Trott had been admitted to the Inner Temple in 1695 at the age of thirty-two.

In the eighteenth century the number of southerners at the Inns increased enormously, and in the years between 1763 and the Revolution

South Carolina sent far more than any other American colony north or south. For the earlier part of the century Virginia was overwhelmingly first in numbers, but every southern colony was represented by natives or by men who became residents. As in the case of the universities, there are several instances of sons following fathers to the Inns, though not always to the same Inn.

From Maryland came Stephen Bordley (Inner Temple, 1729), one of the best educated men of the colonies and owner of one of its best libraries; his relative Thomas Bordley (Middle Temple, 1744); John Brice (Middle Temple, 1757); Benedict Leonard Calvert (Inner Temple, 1719), governor by 1727; Charles Carroll II (Middle Temple, 1751), active Revolutionary patriot and U.S. Senator; Henry Carroll (Gray's Inn, 1718); Daniel Dulany, Sr. (Gray's Inn, 1716-1717) and Daniel Dulany, Jr. (Middle Temple, 1741-1742), both eminent lawyers; Lloyd Dulany (Middle Temple, 1761), bosom friend of George Washington; Robert Goldsborough (Middle Temple, 1752), attorney-general and later member of the Continental Congress; John Hammond (Middle Temple, 1753); Philemon Hermsley (Middle Temple, 1750); James Hollyday (Middle Temple, 1754); Edmund Key (Middle and Inner Temple, 1759 and 1762), attorney-general; Philip Thomas Lee (Middle Temple, 1756, and *later* Cambridge); Richard Lee (Middle Temple, 1719), president of the Council of Maryland; William Paca (Inner Temple, 1762), signer of the Declaration of Independence and third governor of the state; and George Plater (Inner Temple, 1713).³²⁰

The Virginia eighteenth-century list is longer and just as impressive. Although all names cannot be given here, the list does include John Ambler (Inner Temple, 1754), member of the House of Burgesses; John Banister (Middle Temple, 1753, previously mentioned); Robert and William Beverley (both Middle Templars, 1719 and 1757 respectively); John Blair (Middle Temple, 1753), later U.S. Supreme Court justice; Robert Bolling (Middle Temple, 1755), already identified; Lewis Burwell (Inner Temple, 1733), president of the Council and acting governor; three Carters of the Middle or Inner Temples; Wilson Cary (Middle Temple, 1721); Gawin Corbin (Middle Temple, 1756), House of Burgesses and Council member; Henry Fitzhugh (Middle Temple, 1722), grandson of the noted earlier Virginia lawyer; John Grymes (Inner Temple, 1736), who was buried in the graveyard of the Temple Church; Carter H. Harrison (Middle Temple, 1754), brother of a signer of the Declaration, as was Thomas Ludwell Lee (Inner Temple, 1798); Thompson Mason (Middle Temple, 1751), son of George and a patriot; Thomas Nelson (Inner Temple, 1733), uncle of a signer of the Declaration of the same name, who, like his nephew, was also at Christ's, Cambridge; Sir

John Randolph (Gray's Inn), attorney-general; his sons Peyton and John (Middle Temple, 1739 and 1745), respectively first president of the Continental Congress and Loyalist, both brothers attorneys-general under the Crown.

North Carolinians include Gabriel Cathcart (Middle Temple, 1763), brother-in-law of Governor Samuel Johnston; Thomas Child (Middle Temple, 1746), attorney-general; Sir Richard Everard (Gray's Inn, 1731), later in Georgia; Enoch Hall (Gray's Inn, 1749), attorney-general; and Thomas McGuire (Gray's Inn, 1754), attorney-general.

Though most of the South Carolinians who studied law in London came after 1763, the list of those who attended the Inns before that date is impressive. Among them were Daniel Blake (Inner Temple, 1750), a legislator, son of a Landgrave and grandson of a governor of the colony; his brother William (Inner Temple, 1758), also a member of the legislative Assembly; William Drayton (Middle Temple, 1750), chief justice of East Florida; John Garden (Gray's Inn, 1747-1748), son of Commissary Alexander Garden; Benjamin Guerard (Lincoln's Inn, 1758), later governor; Daniel Horry (Inner Temple, 1758), colonel of a regiment of light dragoons in the Revolution; Colonel Robert Johnston [later Ketelby] (Middle Temple, 1717), son of Commissary Gideon Johnston and a member of the Council; Thomas Kimberley (Middle Temple, 1713), chief justice and attorney-general; Sir Egerton Leigh, Bart. (Inner Temple, 1757), attorney-general; Governor Lord Lyttleton (Middle Temple, 1743), in South Carolina 1755-1760; John Mackenzie (Middle Temple, 1754), who left his fine collection of books to the Charleston Library Society; Peter Manigault (Inner Temple, 1749), member of the Assembly; Arthur Middleton (Middle Temple, 1757), signer of the Declaration of Independence; Charles Pinckney (Inner Temple, 1734), attorney-general; John Rutledge (Middle Temple, 1754), chief justice of South Carolina, U.S. Supreme Court justice, president of the Continental Congress; and William Wragg (Middle Temple, 1725), a great and conscientious Loyalist.

Georgia before 1764 is represented by two members of Gray's Inn, William Clifton (1720-1721) and Anthony Stokes (1758), as well as by Sir Richard Everard, also of Gray's, mentioned under North Carolina above. Before the end of the century many others from the youngest North American colony attended the Inns.

By any count this is a remarkable list. Before 1764, thirty-four Virginians were Middle Templars, twelve were Inner Templars, thirteen were at Gray's Inn, and one was at Lincoln's. Maryland was represented by fourteen at the Middle Temple, eight at the Inner, and five at Gray's. South Carolina had thirteen at the Middle and eleven at the Inner Temple, two at Gray's, and two at Lincoln's. There were eleven North Carolinians and

five Georgians at the several Inns.³²¹ Obviously not all were native Americans. Of those who were born in the colonies or whose descendants were, there are dozens of instances of more than one member of a family, such as Dulanys, Harrisons, Lees, and Pinckneys, staying at the Inns, and if the period is extended to 1800 the family tradition of education at the Inns becomes more and more obvious. By no means all who attended after the Revolution were Loyalists, or even leaned in that direction, though a number of those named above did remain loyal to the Crown after 1776.

Sachse's figures for the nearly two hundred Americans who attended the Inns of Court before the Revolution (not 1763) show that South Carolina and Virginia accounted for a good half and Maryland for about one sixth. In other words, three southern colonies have an overwhelming majority over the twenty each from New York and Pennsylvania and twelve from Massachusetts. Five southern Middle Templars (four from South Carolina) signed the Declaration of Independence, as did one Inner Templar. The first and last presidents of the Continental Congress, Virginians Peyton Randolph and Cyrus Griffin, had attended the Inns, as had another president of that body, John Rutledge of South Carolina. A century after the colonial period Henry Adams, in summing up the character of Virginia (and he ought to have added several other colonies) said that law and politics were the principal objects of Virginia thought. He exaggerated greatly, but that they were major objects is obvious. These men, trained at the great British legal university, were in very large measure responsible for the high quality of provincial and early national juridical practice in the South, from county commissions of the peace to the general courts of each colony, and for able chief justices and attorneys-general who themselves wrote on the law. These British-educated men trained other young men in their offices and in jurisprudence generally. For all southern colonists the English common law and its traditions were the foundations of their liberties. The ability to defend it, or to use it in arguing against taxation without representation, was by no means confined to Americans educated in the Inns of Court. But the quality of legal argument in pamphlet or legislative assembly, from the Pistole Fee to Independence, was affected directly and indirectly by learning and practice acquired in the London law colleges.

THEORIES AND PHILOSOPHIES OF EDUCATION

That southern colonists had theories as to the purpose, form, and means of achieving formal education is implicit in what they did and explicit in

a number of documents already quoted. From the charters of the Virginia Company through the charters for the Trustees of Georgia, education, and thus conversion of the heathen, is a declared purpose of settlement. In the instructions to governors regarding the establishment of Henrico College, the Indian school, and the East India School, the purposes are restated along with some advice or command as to the means of building and organizing and by 1619-1621 broadened to include children of settlers as well as aborigines. Spread on the records of provincial legislatures from that first General Assembly at Jamestown to the last Georgia enactments of the 1760s are acts for encouraging formal schooling, acts which usually restate briefly the obvious purposes and objectives for colonial education. In some respects they resemble what the British Parliament might have felt as it coped with matters of English rural and general Irish education. But in other respects it was quite different, for the red men and black men and a fast-moving frontier had to be considered, and were.

A basic premise in legislation regarding red and black education was that it was first and last a way of leading to Christianization. In some colonies for some decades it was also concerned with indenture-apprenticeship training to make skilled artisans of "Negroes, Indians, and Mulattoes." That education, even in the simplest forms of writing and reading, was occasionally prohibited for the black late in the period has already been noted. The Church of England commissaries and the missionaries of the S.P.G. fought and worked long and hard for basic education for the red man, obviously out of religious motives. Historian-observers such as John Lawson, William Byrd II, and the Reverend Hugh Jones, as well as William Strachey and John Smith, just as obviously hoped for more than conversion, wishing to bring them to civility: that is, to civilize them or Europeanize them.

For the black the situation in the beginning was much the same as for the red man. But the quick evolution from indentured to slave status, fear of possible insurrections by newly imported Africans, and sheer greed to squeeze every drop of these servants' strength into profits caused many planter-owners to change their attitude. They began to refuse to allow time for schooling and catechizing, though they did allow some slaves and free blacks to learn manual trades. To their credit, it should be said that the Church of England clergy prodded the consciences of their parishioners throughout the colonial period and on the whole stood as stoutly for Negro education as did the Presbyterian and Quaker preachers who had no livings to lose by taking such a stand. Backing the Anglican clergy were their commissaries, the Bishop of London, the S.P.G., the S.P.C.K., and Dr. Bray's Associates. That Benjamin Franklin was an active member

of the governing body of the Associates in London indicates that more than mere Christian zeal animated that philanthropic body, for the schools Franklin suggested for Negroes in various towns and cities of the colonies were designed to make the blacks useful as well as pious citizens. But, except for Morgan Godwin's two early pamphlets, *The Negro's & Indians Advocate* and its supplement of the 1680s, and Thomas Bacon's several sermons, very little printed expression of theory and intent for black advancement appeared in the South before 1764.

Education of the orphans, the poor, and the illegitimate, sometimes one and the same, sprang in part from the English Poor Law of 1601 already noted and was in no sense originated in America, though the sense of responsibility for the unfortunate, and the civil and Christian necessity of training them, may have developed beyond what it ever reached in rural England. A principal entry in the many surviving vestry books of southern parishes has to do with guardianship over these minors and the problems involved.

LAY AND CLERICAL EXPRESSIONS OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

Individual expression of educational theory for the seventeenth-century southern colonies certainly begins in 1622 with that remarkable manual, *A Consolation for Our Grammar Schooles* noted early in this chapter and quoted from in an epigraph for the chapter. Though not written in the colonies, it was composed with them particularly in mind, for John Brinsley gives by precept and example what the rural or frontier schoolmaster, dealing with savage or illiterate children, must do to bring them to "civility," to Christ, and to useful citizenship in what he assumes will be a Europeanized or Anglicized community. Relying on the great books of the immediate Renaissance past which are concerned with schoolmaster and schoolboy, he outlines the skeleton of an educational process and then fleshes it out as far as he can see or anticipate from the eastern side of the Atlantic. Brinsley was about fifty-fifty schoolman and pious Christian in his theory and program.

R[oger] G[reen]'s *Virginia's Cure* was dedicated to the Bishop of London, written by a clergyman from Virginia, and ninety percent concerned with the sad state of the Anglican church in the first colony. The author urges a supply of ministers, a bishop if possible, organized towns, and education: "This want of Schools, as it renders a very numerous generation of Christians Children born in Virginia (who naturally are of beautiful and comely Persons, and generally of more ingenious Spirits than those in England) unserviceable for any great Employments either in Church or State, so likewise it obstructs the hopefulllest way they have,

for the Conversion of the Heathen, which is, by winning the Heathen to bring in their Children to be taught and instructed in our Schooles, together with the Children of the Christians."³²²

Parson John Clayton, a remarkably able scientist, made an oblique comment on colonial theories and practice in education in a letter to a "Doctor of Physik" in England: "They have few Schollars so that evry one studys to be halfe Physitian halfe Lawyer & with a naturall accutenesse would amuse thee for want of bookes they read men the more."³²³ Lawyer William Fitzhugh, whose letters lament his lack of opportunity for learned conversation and civil society on his isolated frontier estate, wrote to an English friend two years after Clayton's observation, in 1686/7, of his dependence on books for stimulation and of his anxiety to see his children educated, for "better never be born than ill bred."³²⁴ Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton, who wrote the first version of *The Present State of Virginia, and the College* in 1697 (published in 1727) speak of their natural paradise being marred by lack of facilities "for well educated Children."³²⁵ And at the very end of the century, the first three of the 1699 speeches by the five William and Mary schoolboys already considered present a rationale for higher education in the colony, reasons why it should be conducted at home rather than abroad, and a long exposition on the advantages of college, market town, and seat of government being located together. These first three offer a fairly complete argument for a liberal education in a colony and its capital city, a philosophy hardly capable of being paralleled in England, although certain aspects or details may have come ultimately from Blair's Scottish educational background.³²⁶ All this is much more original than the beautifully expressed preamble to the royal charter granted the College a few years earlier. The charter itself spells out general purpose, specific schools, and number of masters or professors and students, but says little of these matters which might not have been considerations for a college in Wales or Scotland. Close to theory is the statement concerning a combination of initial royal endowment and subsequent provincial revenues to support the institution: that is, after one upward push from the Crown the College should become to a great extent locally tax-supported, unlike Oxford and Cambridge and Dublin.³²⁷

Thus by 1700 the administrators of free, grammar, and charity schools and a number of tutors in Virginia were working from hypotheses that there were obligations to educate the poor, the red man, and the black, and that the sons of settlers who could afford to pay for instruction were or should be able to get it. The Maryland archives evidence much the same attitude. That higher education had from the beginning been considered a necessity in Virginia (as it was to be considered in every other colony

later) reflects not only an educational or intellectual philosophy but a political one, for it assumes that the colony will indeed become an English nation. This was not always in everyone's mind, but throughout the first century it was in the thoughts of at least many leading Virginians.

LAY EXPRESSIONS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Most expressions on education from the region in the eighteenth century before the Stamp Act are incidental to or implicit in references to individuals or tangential subjects. The ideas are on class education, the particular sort of curriculum essential for a gentleman, a new collegiate school for a whole colony and the necessity therefor, some general observations on the inherent values in a knowledge of the arts and sciences and the relationship between taste and education, and the significant place of the study of history in a complete education. A few of these expressions appeared anonymously in provincial newspapers and may or may not have been written by clergymen, but the failure to emphasize Christianity as a prime reason for intellectual training seems to indicate their lay or secular origin.

One of the earliest is by a prominent Virginian, Nathaniel Burwell, in a letter to one brother concerning a third, on June 13, 1718. Apparently the third brother, Lewis, was not taking his studies very seriously at William and Mary. Whether he is a blockhead or a man of parts, Nathaniel says, he is my brother and must go to school until he can at least learn to write well and master mathematics under Mr. Jones and Latin translation under Mr. Ingles, the last of which will help him to learn to spell well. Lewis appears to have been on the borderline between the grammar school and college proper, and may have been in either. But the inherent motivation is that a Virginia gentleman, whether he likes learning or not, must master its fundamentals as a means of preparation for life in the provincial community. This Lewis Burwell, like most others of the same name, appears to have turned out well.³²⁸

Robert "King" Carter's letter from Virginia to a friend in England who was watching over Landon Carter's education at Solomon Low's school reveals a great deal about the educational ideas and ideals of the Virginia ruling class. The letter was written on January 28, 1723/4, and is concerned principally with Carter's reminiscence of his own schooldays and the all-importance of Lily's Grammar and one other book which he found of greatest use to him, John Comenius' *Janua Linguarum Trilinguis*, in Latin, English, and Greek. Carter wanted Low to use these books, especially the latter, with Landon, who was a good student and would profit fully from them. Comenius, Carter was sure, is the prettiest compendium

of the arts and sciences in existence, and moreover the book is written in a handsome style which will attract a youthful mind. Carter thoroughly approved of the discipline and order of Low's school, but he implied that it might be a little weak or thin in the learning it presents. It was not enough, he averred, to read scraps of the classics. They must be studied in depth. By the time Landon was eighteen he should be a master of "the languages," presumably Latin and Greek. If he could not become so at Low's, he should be transferred elsewhere. So reasoned the wealthiest man in his colony concerning a son who, although not the eldest, would inherit vast properties. Landon became more than a good classicist, for he was also a trenchant and influential writer of pre-Revolutionary pamphlets and the author of one of the more significant of colonial American diaries. What his son became would not have surprised Robert Carter. For the classics were for him and most others the gate or doorway to understanding of the world past and present.³²⁹

Richard Lewis, Etonian, schoolmaster, and poet, is believed to have been the author of "Proposals for an Academy at Annapolis," submitted to the Maryland governor and General Assembly before January 1732/3. They form a petition for the improvement of the whole educational system of the province, to be centered in a collegiate school at Annapolis. The preamble reminds the reader of the 1699 speeches at Williamsburg, for the author sums up the advantages of instruction in the home colony; but he also points out that in instruction the proposed institution will go beyond Eton and Westminster into university subjects and some practical skills not usually obtainable at Oxford or Cambridge. Sons of gentlemen of the province may be completely prepared for the Bishop of London's examinations for holy orders and may have benefices presented to them in their own country. Trade or husbandry, law or physic, may be acquired; adults who have had no opportunity heretofore may enter what is called today continuing education. And finally, dissenters as well as Anglicans are to be accepted.

The organization or institution proposed seems to have been envisioned as a sort of combination of the grammar school and the college at Williamsburg and of the subjects taught in both. The collegiate school was to have a Chancellor, lectures on oratory, practice in declamation, careful disciplinary regulations, and honors and prizes for proficiency, among other usual things. The proposer next suggests that the legislative body find its own ways to support such an institution and declares he is willing to answer questions before either House or both Houses concerning it. The proposal³³⁰ would establish a potential competitor for William and Mary, which at the time received some revenue from Maryland duties. It also seems to ignore the King William's School at Annapolis which half

a century later would become St. John's College, a genuine rival of the Williamsburg institution. That Annapolis should develop such a rival was not a new idea, for as early as 1719 there had been proposals to the Maryland Assembly for an institution supported by public revenues granted by William III to William and Mary.³³¹ But among the several interesting elements of the 1732/3 proposal are not only the inclusion of adult and technical education in a collegiate curriculum but also the acceptance of dissenting as well as Anglican students.

In 1732 the *South-Carolina Gazette* of Saturday, April 1, ran as its lead article an epistle on education, general in tone and complimentary of Carolina youth on their abilities or capacities. The author refers to the good example set by a neighboring colony, almost surely Virginia, which has had for some time a university and has employed one of her own sons "to transact her Affairs at one of the politest Courts in *Europe*."³³² With some elaborate rhetoric the writer envisions Carolina "Bar, Bench, and the Pulpit" honorably filled with products of collegiate education within the province. Learning, he concludes, is the surest way to riches and honor. The implication is that it will be fully available only when it is offered within the province.

In 1747, in the December 7 and 28 issues of the same *Gazette*, appeared an essay on taste and education. Beginning with an observation on the author's pleasure in seeing in a recent paper an advertisement of a newly arrived gentleman who is willing to instruct in several languages, arts, and sciences, the writer goes on to urge the "many excellent natural Geniuses" of the colony to take advantage of this opportunity to improve themselves in knowledge, judgment, and taste in discerning virtue from vice. What he seems to mean by taste is intellectual and moral perception based on learning, hardly a new idea but perhaps here expressed a little differently from the way it usually was in early America.

The *South-Carolina Gazette* of August 6, 1750, presented a front-page essay dated from Eutaw Springs, combining interest in the Charleston Library Society with the promotion of a possible advanced academy which might offer a *guide* to the education which books might afford. Education, says the author Philanthropos, does much for mankind, including developing our dawning reason, refining our manners, subduing our passions, and refining and socializing our natures. Interesting contrasts are drawn between the educated white and the red savage as represented in Colden's *History of the Five Nations*.³³³ The next week Philanthropos continued in another essay elaborating on his previous points and emphasizing that "moral culture" is the true aim of education. He discusses the broadening effects of good literature and the inquisitive nature it stimulates even in such areas as agriculture, architecture, navigation, and astronomy. Such

are the fruits and effects of "a virtuous and liberal education."³³⁴ Not very original, but indicative. The absence of emphasis on Christianity or conversion as a result or purpose of education seems to indicate these Carolina authors to be laymen, too.

On June 7, 1745, the *Maryland Gazette* carried an essay by Philoeleutheros which is concerned with only one phase of education which indeed might be self-acquired, the study of history. Even wretches, the writer avers, admire great and virtuous characters, and one learns of the latter two by reading history. History offers patterns for our imitation and directions for our conduct. Proper reading is not to memorize a rabble of names, but to know mankind by studying his motives, opinions, and passions, and to observe how they operate upon him. "Young and tender Minds should be taught to fall in love with amiable characters, and habitually trained to act a parallel Part themselves." Again not original, but perhaps indicative of the tendencies of the southern colonial political mind to draw parallels, as the Revolution approached, between itself and its representative men and all those history had to offer. Histories were a principal element of every fair-sized library. To pre-Revolutionary southern minds Richard Henry Lee was the Cicero and Patrick Henry the Demosthenes of their time, and it was the latter who exclaimed that Caesar had his Brutus and George III might profit by the example.

THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY CLERGYMEN'S IDEAS

Southern clergy, Anglican and dissenting, were so directly involved in colonial education for religious and personal reasons that many of them expressed themselves on the subject in pamphlets, sermons, newspaper essays, letters, and the histories they wrote. They were by no means all agreed on thrust or direction, but naturally they were unanimous in feeling the need for learning in the colonies. Many established schools and often taught in them, as has been shown. Others were disinterested promoters of learning for their parishes or provinces or for America. Their expression, taken as a whole, is the most thoughtful and forceful from the southern colonies.

First in time, if one excepts for the moment James Blair, is Presbyterian Francis Makemie, who in *A Plain and Friendly Persuasion to the Inhabitants of Virginia and Maryland for Towns and Cohabitation* (London, 1705), on the old subject of the Chesapeake society's urgent need for towns as centers for commerce and civilization generally, includes education as a principal inducement for the laying out of port towns. The population is too scattered, Makemie declares, to maintain a competent number of scholars at a given place so that a schoolmaster or schoolmistress might be main-

tained. Though a dissenter, he believed strongly in preparing students for the Anglican university: "It is still to be feared, it cannot flourish and prosper without particular schools, over the Government, to prepare Students for the Colledge; which can never be expected without Towns and Cohabitation."³³⁵ He is ranging himself alongside his Anglican brethren in urging a complete system of education for the Chesapeake society. He sees the answer in terms of towns.

James Blair's part in *The Present State of Virginia, and the College* (1697, 1727) has already been commented upon, as has been the fact that he and the Reverend Stephen Fouace probably drew up the first statutes for William and Mary in 1727 in anticipation of turning the college over from trustees to president and faculty two years later. The preface to the statutes is beautiful prose, as was the preamble to the charter. The English form of the preface begins with a passage already quoted: "Towards the cultivating the Minds of Men, and rectifying their Manners, what a mighty Influence the Studies of good Letters, and the liberal Sciences have, appears from hence, that these Studies not only flourished of Old amongst those famous Nations" and continues with the usual parade of the religious and civil uses of higher education and an eloquent summary of the history of the first planters, their desire for learning, and the beginnings of the college itself. It is a relatively perspicacious statement of the proved function and necessary organization of a college in the American colonies, both function and organization being adaptations from the Scottish and English institutions with which its founders had been familiar.

Perhaps an even more perceptive view of the nature of the college, of the characteristic qualities of the Virginia students, and of the Chesapeake community's needs is to be found in *The Present State of Virginia* (1724) by Blair's enemy and former colleague, the able Hugh Jones. In the main text and in the appendix this history has much to say on education, including descriptions of training for girls, subjects taught in grammar schools, the state of the college and ways in which it might be improved, and a dozen other matters. Jones' observation on the capacity and inclination of southern colonials reminds one of John Clayton's, though Jones is more detailed and perhaps more perceptive. After remarking that their habits, language, manners, and even clothing are much like those to be found in the vicinity of London, he adds:

... The climate makes them bright, and of excellent sense, and sharp in trade, an idiot, or deformed native being almost a miracle.

Thus have they good natural notions, and will soon learn arts and sciences; but are generally diverted by business or inclination from profound study, and prying into the depths of things; being ripe for management of their affairs, before they have laid so good a foundation of

learning, and had such instructions, and acquired such accomplishments, as might be instilled into such good natural capacities. Nevertheless through their quick apprehension, they have a sufficiency of knowledge, and fluency of tongue, though their learning for the most part be but superficial.

They are more inclinable to read men by business and conversation, than to dive into books, and are for the most part only desirous of learning what is absolutely necessary, in the shortest and best method.³³⁶

And Jones puts his finger on a point to be made somewhat differently later by James Maury and Thomas Jefferson, among other Americans:

As for education several are sent to England for it; though the Virginians being naturally of good parts (as I have already hinted) neither require nor admire as much learning, as we do in Britain; yet more would be sent over, were they not afraid of the small-pox, which most commonly proves fatal to them.

But indeed when they come to England they are generally put to learn to persons that know little of their temper, who keep them drudging on in what is of least use to them, in pedantick methods, too tedious for their volatile genius.

For grammar learning taught after the common roundabout way is not much beneficial nor delightful to them; so that they are noted to be more apt to spoil their school-fellows than improve themselves; because they are imprisoned and enslaved to what they hate, and think useless, and have not peculiar management proper for their humour and occasion.

A civil treatment with some liberty, if permitted with discretion is most proper for them, and they have most need of, and readily take polite and mathematical learning; and in English may be conveyed to them (without going directly to Rome and Athens) all the arts, sciences, and learned accomplishments of the antients and moderns, without the fatigue and expense of another language, for which most of them have little use or necessity, since (without another) they may understand their own speech.³³⁷

Here is an early expression of the theory that the southern, or American, colonist required disciplines somewhat different from those for his Old World contemporary, above all that he neither liked nor needed to approach all knowledge through the classical languages. By no means all of his former William and Mary colleagues or southerners educated in Great Britain would have agreed with Jones, nor have all scholars ever done so, for there remained in the South a strong classical tradition down through the Nashville Fugitives and William Alexander Percy. But Jones had perceived thus early the temper of mind of perhaps a majority of the literate regarding the "unnecessary" acquirement of foreign languages, especially Greek and Latin.

On the College of William and Mary, in which he had taught and fought with James Blair, Jones is caustic and realistic. He expresses strong opinions of the need for licensing all teachers in parish schools, the general requirements for admission to the college, and what should be the procedure toward graduation in the college. He goes into detail on almost every phase of the institution, including its finances; the masters teaching music, fencing, and dancing; the Indian school; the organization of professors or masters and ushers; the need of a group of fellowships in English universities for William and Mary men and for fifteen scholars in the college; even the seating arrangements in the dining hall according to rules of obvious precedence.³³⁸ In any or all of these he was undoubtedly influenced by his own English university experience, but in the education of Negroes (only a little on this topic) and girls and the matter of language training he was writing from observation made in Virginia. Here, even more than in the Maryland proposal noticed above, is outlined a complete system of education for red, white, and black, for girls and for the poor of several kinds, and for the sons of planters great and small.

Though Jones was a clergyman, he thought and wrote more like a modern lay college professor. Not so did the Reverend Thomas Bray, for a brief period Commissary for Maryland and at home the founder of the S.P.G. and S.P.C.K., the two great missionary-educational societies still in existence. Before he came to the colonies, he published in London in 1697 *An Essay Towards Promoting all Necessary and Useful Knowledge, Both Divine and Human, in all the Parts of His Majesty's Dominions, Both at Home and Abroad*.³³⁹ He begins his address "To the Reader" with the words which present part of the philosophy under which he labored: "Knowledge is the fairest Ornament of the Soul of Man; and whosoever is Endow'd therewith, let it be of any kind, which is not mischievous, fails not of Esteem amongst all sorts of Persons." Then he gives four reasons for acquiring it, the first being the theological. His proposal is to further the knowledge, or education, of all those Englishmen now resident in remote places and to do it by several means, the first and most important of which was to establish a series of lending libraries, of which more in the next chapter. The essay is a plea for funds for the purpose and includes at the end a proposed book list which would form the nucleus of each collection. Bray's approach here and in his later works³⁴⁰ as far as education is concerned is to solve the problem of religious education through books and catechizing. The empire-wide system of libraries was aimed to reach all classes. Though Bray personally wrote and spoke little in the colonies, his influence on education, including parish schools and schools for Negroes and Indians, often through his missionaries and societies, endured long after his death. The societies continued to adhere to the primary purpose of

conversion through education, but the schools they sponsored taught a number of non theological subjects, from navigation through the classics to some manual arts.³⁴¹

In the spirit of Bray's plan was the modest charity school sponsored by the Reverend Thomas Bacon and founded at mid-century in Talbot County, Maryland. The features of *A Sermon* (London, 1751) on the school, with its proposals and list of benefactors and philosophy of education for the underprivileged, are discussed above. Bacon considered the school a colonial version of the famous bluecoat schools of Great Britain, in which the children of the poor or orphans were taught Christian doctrine, reading and writing, and general morality. The reference to preparing for apprenticeships, of educating Negroes as well as whites, shows that he also shared with his contemporaries Cotton Mather and Benjamin Franklin a belief in *doing good*.

More urbane and rhetorical is the sermon of Bacon's friend the Reverend Thomas Cradock, given in Philadelphia on the occasion of the founding of an academy there. The sermon exists only in manuscript, and its date and the academy referred to remain undetermined.³⁴² Beginning with the great text from Acts 26: 24-25, at Festus' comment to St. Paul, "Much learning hath made thee mad," and Paul's reply, Cradock launches into "the advantages of a learned and liberal Education," declaring that a very ignorant man can not well be a good man. He sees advanced education, or erudition, as essential to physician and lawyer and statesman and even merchant as well as clergyman. The new academy is viewed in the context of the progress of learning through ancient to modern nations, tracing its movement from the Chaldeans to the New World. All this offers strong historical support for creating such an institution: piety and learning must and will go hand in hand. And though it may all be almost trite, it is a good indication of how a clergyman who was also a poet and schoolmaster saw education in and of provincial America. Though he defends traditional classical learning only by implication, clearly he believed in it.

Two clerical friends who took opposite sides in at least one phase or element of secondary education in the Chesapeake colonies were Jonathan Boucher and James Maury. It has been observed already that they are remembered as much as schoolmasters and even men of letters as clergymen, and that their contemporaries knew them well in all three capacities. Though Maury was to ask that Boucher visit him on his deathbed in 1770, at the time Maury wrote his epistolary dissertation on education he was addressing a friend who had sent him a copy of Boucher's argument for a classically based education.³⁴³ Each had had experience in training sons of prominent men, though only Maury had a Thomas Jefferson and Bishop James Madison among his pupils. Maury's long letter to his friend Jackson

considers the whole question of a practical education for a young colonial. Unlike Cradock or apparently Boucher, Maury sees the needs of a young American as being quite different from those of young Britishers, even among the gentry on both sides of the Atlantic. What Maury objects to particularly in Boucher's plan is the emphasis on the thorough grounding in Greek and Latin as the foundation for all further intellectual acquirements. Like Hugh Jones, he saw that the dull plodding necessary for most boys to become reasonably proficient in the classics is not compatible with the impatient and, he seems to imply, intellectually indolent American temperament. But Maury has a more practical reason for abandoning the classics in the training of the average boy—he will never need them. Few young men even in proportion to grammar school population plan to follow a learned profession in after life. Most will be planters, a few merchants, some public officials.

Even these last three must have some acquaintance with polite literature, however, albeit in the vernacular, and every American youth should have at least a smattering of geography and chronology if he is to study history, which is the *sine qua non*. The point of his argument is that "tho' the knowledge of these ancient languages be valuable; may it not be bought too dear?" He goes on to cite more "practical" subjects which should consume the time hitherto devoted by all grammar school students to Latin and Greek. The gentlemen of the colonies are called often and soon to positions of political responsibility and trust. Should they not prepare for these public duties with the study of English grammar, rhetoric, and the geography and chronology and history already alluded to? For the enjoyment of their leisure hours, is not training to read books in their own tongue the most helpful? For some indeed, as the clergyman and the lawyer, a knowledge of Latin and Greek is indeed indispensable. But, for most people and occupations, a thorough mastery of English grammar, which is not easy, should be acquired in the time usually devoted to the ancients. Maury did not believe, as Boucher seemed to, that English grammar is to be learned through Latin. And he concludes that "the exclusive Property of Knowledge is *now* no longer vested in the dead Languages."

It is somewhat curious and ironic that Maury, one of the best classical scholars of his time, who quoted Latin and Greek in essays or sermons, should take such a stand. And equally remarkable is the fact that his pupil Thomas Jefferson, who got pleasure all his life from the Latin and Greek he learned under Maury, should oppose the requirement of the dead languages as basic to learning.

Whether Boucher replied to Maury's indirect rebuttal of his argument is not known. But many years later, when the Loyalist was established back in England, he published his *View of the Causes and Consequences of the*

American Revolution, a series of fourteen sermons delivered in America. Number IV is "On American Education," beginning with a text from Deuteronomy 6: 6-7.³⁴⁴ Boucher traces some of the history of education as it has developed in modern times, including the influence of Locke and Rousseau.³⁴⁵ He notes that in no country has education been entirely neglected, and he spends several pages on Hebrew education as depicted in the Old Testament (which he sees as a Loyalist or Tory system) and then by way of application turns to the state of education in Maryland. After a strongly Loyalist interpretation of affairs, he assumes the position his friend Maury had taken in regard to the classics:

Instead of indiscriminately compelling all our youth, to spend the whole period of education in fruitless attempts, "merely (as Milton says) to scrape together a little miserable Greek and Latin," it is much to be wished some discrimination could be made; and that boys hereafter may be taught, not words only, but such things as they are best qualified to learn, and such as are likely to be of most use to them in the part they are hereafter to act in the great drama of life.³⁴⁶

With or without Maury, probably through his maturing experience as a schoolmaster, Boucher of Maryland had come round to the anticlassical, pragmatic view of education which was to become dominant in America long before it did in Great Britain. From Boucher and Maury on back through Cradock and Jones and Blair to John Brinsley, education in southern colonial society was a principal interest of some men in each generation. As in England, Newton and Locke and Rousseau and others were to affect its aims and forms. But in the colonial South it developed from the region's own ideas and experience, in ways different from the education in New England or Old England. The Indian has almost disappeared, but formal education for the black continues as an increasing rather than a decreasing problem, though today, at last, most descendants of those white colonial settlers are willing to face it directly. Though some aspects of education have become nationally more or less uniform, several others remain peculiarly southern, influenced as always by density of population, agrarianism, and proportions of black and white, and frequently by conscience on the part of the latter such as Morgan Godwyn and Thomas Bacon tried to arouse from two and a half to three centuries ago.

Abbreviations

FOR THE THREE VOLUMES

Bibliography and Notes

TO VOLUME ONE

Abbreviations for the Three Volumes

AHA	American Historical Association
AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AL	<i>American Literature</i>
AQ	<i>American Quarterly</i>
<i>Archives of Md.</i>	William H. Browne et al, eds., <i>The Archives of Maryland</i> (60-plus vols. to date, Baltimore, 1883—)
Barbour, ed., <i>Jamestown Voyages</i>	Philip L. Barbour, ed., <i>The Jamestown Voyages under the First Charter, 1606–1609</i> (2 vols., Cambridge, Eng., 1969)
BM	British Museum (now the British Library), London
Bruce, <i>Econ. Hist. Va. Seven. Cent.</i>	Philip A. Bruce, <i>The Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century</i> (2 vols., New York, 1935)
Bruce, <i>Inst. Hist. Va. Seven. Cent.</i>	Philip A. Bruce, <i>The Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century</i> (2 vols., New York, 1910)
<i>Cal. St. Papers, Col.</i>	See Sainsbury
Candler, ed., <i>Col. Rec. Georgia</i>	Allen D. Candler and Lucien Knight, eds., <i>The Colonial Records of Georgia</i> (26 vols., Atlanta, 1904–1916)
CMHS	<i>Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society</i>
Cohen, <i>S.C. Gaz.</i>	Hennig Cohen, <i>The South Carolina Gazette, 1732–1736</i> (Columbia, 1953)
Conway, <i>Barons, or Barons of the Potomack and Rappahannock</i>	Moncure D. Conway, <i>Barons of the Potomack and Rappahannock</i> (New York, 1892)
Coulter, <i>Georgia: A Short History</i>	E. Merton Coulter, <i>Georgia: A Short History</i> (Chapel Hill, 1960)

· *Abbreviations and Short Titles* ·

Craven, <i>Sou. Col. Seven. Cent.</i>	Wesley F. Craven, <i>The Southern Colonies in Seventeenth Century</i> (rev. ed., and Supplement, Baton Rouge, 1970)
DAB	Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone, eds., <i>The Dictionary of American Biography</i> (31 vols., New York, 1928-1944)
DNB	Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee, eds., <i>The Dictionary of National Biography</i> (22 vols., Oxford, 1917, and many reprints)
EAL	<i>Early American Literature</i>
Easterby, ed., <i>Col. Rec. S.C.</i>	J.H. Easterby et al., eds., <i>The Colonial Records of South Carolina</i> , ser. I (10 vols. to date, Columbia, 1951-1974)
ELH	<i>English Literary History</i>
Evans	Charles Evans et al., <i>American Bibliography: A Chronological Dictionary of All Books, Pamphlets, and Periodical Publications Printed in the United States . . . 1639 . . . 1820</i> (14 vols., Chicago and Worcester, Mass., 1903-1959)
Force, <i>Tracts</i>	Peter Force, ed., <i>Tracts and Other Papers, Relating Principally to the Origins, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America . . . to the Year 1776</i> (4 vols., rpt., Gloucester, Mass., 1963)
GaHQ	<i>Georgia Historical Quarterly</i>
GaR	<i>Georgia Review</i>
HEH	Henry E. Huntington Library
Hening, <i>Statutes</i>	William H. Hening, ed., <i>Statutes at Large of Virginia . . .</i> (13 vols., rpt., Charlottesville, 1969)
HLB	<i>Huntington Library Bulletin</i>
HLQ	<i>Huntington Library Quarterly</i>
HMPEC	<i>Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church</i>
JEGP	<i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i>
J.H.U. Stud. Hist. & Polit. Sci.	Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science
JPHS	<i>Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society</i>
JSH	<i>Journal of Southern History</i>
Kingsbury, ed., <i>Records Va. Co.</i>	Susan M. Kingsbury, ed., <i>Records of the Virginia Company of London</i> (4 vols., Washington, D.C., 1906-1935)
LC	Library of Congress

Lemay, <i>Calendar</i>	J.A. Leo Lemay, <i>A Calendar of American Poetry in the Colonial Newspapers and Magazines and in the Major English Magazines Through 1765</i> (Worcester, Mass., 1972)
LHUS	R.E. Spiller et al., eds., <i>Literary History of the United States</i> (3 vols., New York, 1948)
Lib. Journ.	<i>Library Journal</i>
Lib. Q.	<i>Library Quarterly</i>
Lorant, <i>The New World</i>	Stephen Lorant, ed., <i>The New World: The First Pictures of America</i> (New York, 1946)
McIlwaine, ed., <i>Exec. Journ. Council Col. Va.</i>	H.R. McIlwaine et al., eds., <i>Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia</i> (6 vols. to date, Richmond, 1925-1961)
McIlwaine, ed., <i>Journals H. of B. of Va.</i>	H.R. McIlwaine et al., eds., <i>Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia</i> [1659 to 1765] (13 vols., Richmond, 1909-1915)
McIlwaine, ed., <i>Leg. Journ. Council Col. Va.</i>	H.R. McIlwaine et al., eds., <i>Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia</i> (3 vols., Richmond, 1918-1919)
McIlwaine, ed., <i>Minutes Council and Gen. Court Col. Va.</i>	H.R. McIlwaine, ed., <i>Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia 1622 . . . 1676</i> (Richmond, 1924)
Md. Gaz.	<i>Maryland Gazette</i>
MdHM	<i>Maryland Historical Magazine</i>
Meade, <i>Old Churches</i>	William Meade, <i>Old Churches, Ministers, and Families of Virginia</i> (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1857)
MLN	<i>Modern Language Notes</i>
Morton, <i>Col. Va.</i>	R.L. Morton, <i>Colonial Virginia</i> (2 vols., Chapel Hill, 1960)
NCHGR	<i>North Carolina Historical and Genealogical Register</i>
NCHR	<i>North Carolina Historical Review</i>
NEHGR	<i>New England Historical and Genealogical Register</i>
NYPL	New York Public Library
PAAS	<i>Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society</i>
PAPS	<i>Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society</i>

· *Abbreviations and Short Titles* ·

PBSA	<i>Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America</i>
Philos. Trans.	<i>The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society</i> (London)
PMHB	<i>Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography</i>
PMHS	<i>Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society</i>
PMLA	<i>Publications of the Modern Language Association</i>
PQ	<i>Philological Quarterly</i>
QJS	<i>Quarterly Journal of Speech</i>
Quinn, ed., <i>The Roanoke Voyages</i>	David B. Quinn, ed., <i>The Roanoke Voyages: 1584-1590</i> (2 vols., London, 1955)
Sabin	Joseph Sabin et al., <i>Bibliotheca Americana. A Dictionary of Books Relating to America from Its Discovery to the Present Time</i> (29 vols., New York, 1868-1936)
SAB	<i>South Atlantic Bulletin</i>
Sainsbury, ed., <i>Cal. St. Papers, Col.</i>	W. Noel Sainsbury et al., eds., <i>Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and the West Indies . . .</i> (42 vols. to date, London, 1860-1953)
Saunders, ed., <i>Col. Rec. N.C.</i>	William L. Saunders, ed., <i>The Colonial Records of North Carolina</i> (10 vols., Raleigh, 1886-1890)
SB	<i>Studies in Bibliography</i>
S.C. Gaz.	<i>South-Carolina Gazette</i>
SCHM	<i>South Carolina Historical [and Genealogical] Magazine</i>
Sew Rev	<i>The Sewanee Review</i>
SF&R	<i>Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints</i>
Sirmans, Col. S.C.	M. Eugene Sirmans, <i>Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663-1763</i> (Chapel Hill, 1966)
SLJ	<i>Southern Literary Journal</i>
SM	<i>Speech Monographs</i>
Smith, <i>Works</i>	John Smith, <i>Travels and Works of . . .</i> , eds. Edward Arber and A. C. Bradley (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1910)
SP	<i>Studies in Philology</i>
S.P.C.K.	<i>Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge</i> (London)

S.P.G.	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (London)
Stanard, <i>Col. Va.</i>	Mary N. Stanard, <i>Colonial Virginia: Its People and Its Customs</i> (Philadelphia, 1917)
Swem, <i>Va. Hist. Index</i>	Earl G. Swem, comp., <i>Virginia Historical Index</i> (2 vols., Roanoke, 1934-1936)
<i>Trans. APS</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philosophi- cal Society</i>
TSL	<i>Tennessee Studies in Literature</i>
TUSAS	Twayne United States Authors Series
<i>Tyler's Q.</i>	<i>Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genea- logical Magazine</i>
<i>Va. Gaz.</i>	<i>Virginia Gazette</i>
<i>Va. Hist. Reg.</i>	<i>Virginia Historical Register</i>
Va. Hist. Soc.	The Virginia Historical Society
VMHB	<i>Virginia Magazine of History and Biog- raphy</i>
Va.St.Lib. or VSL	Virginia State Library (Richmond)
WHR	<i>Western Humanities Review</i>
WMQ (1) (2) (3)	<i>William and Mary Quarterly</i> , First, Sec- ond, and Third Series
YR	<i>Yale Review</i>

Bibliography and Notes to Volume One

CHAPTER ONE: PROMOTION, DISCOVERY, AND HISTORY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Only general references are included here and in the bibliographies for later chapters. Many other items appear only in the text or notes.

A vast amount of critical writing concerns the literature of promotion and discovery in the New World, and much of it is included in more general studies. Useful background works are Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period in American History* (4 vols., New Haven, 1934-1938); Wesley F. Craven, *The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century, 1607-1689* (Baton Rouge, 1949, with rev. ed. and supplement, 1970); Carl Bridenbaugh, *Vexed and Troubled Englishmen, 1590-1642* (New York, 1968); Daniel Boorstin, *The Americans: The Colonial Experience* (New York, 1958); E.D. Neill, *History of the Virginia Company of London* (Albany, 1869); and *The English Colonization of America during the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1871); Louis B. Wright, *Religion and Empire: The Alliance between Piety and Commerce in English Expansion, 1558-1625* (Chapel Hill, 1947); *The Colonial Search for a Southern Eden* (University, Ala., 1953); and *The First Gentlemen of Virginia: Intellectual Qualities of the Early Colonial Ruling Class* (San Marino, Calif., 1940); Howard M. Jones, *O Strange New World: American Culture: The Formative Years* (New York, 1964); Percy G. Adams, *Travelers and Travel Liars, 1660-1800* (Berkeley, 1962); Verner W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (Durham, N.C., 1928); James M. Morse, *American Beginnings: Highlights and Sidelights of the Birth of the New World* (Washington, D.C., 1952); Charles L. Sanford, *The Quest for Paradise: Europe and the American Moral Imagination* (Urbana, 1961).

Among studies of particular colonies containing some useful information are Richard L. Morton, *Colonial Virginia* (2 vols., Chapel Hill, 1960); Matthew P. Andrews, *History of Maryland: Province and State* (Garden City,

N.Y., 1929); Hugh T. Lefler and Albert R. Newsome, *North Carolina: The History of a State* (Chapel Hill, 1954); Hugh T. Lefler and William S. Powell, *Colonial North Carolina* (New York, 1973); M. Eugene Sirmans, *Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663-1763* (Chapel Hill, 1966); Alexander Hewatt, *A Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia* (2 vols., London, 1779); E.M. Coulter, *Georgia: A Short History* (rev. ed., Chapel Hill, 1960, 1968); Trevor R. Reese, *Colonial Georgia: A Study in British Imperial Policy in the Eighteenth Century* (Athens, Ga., 1963).

Useful especially for colonial writing are Moses C. Tyler, *A History of American Literature, 1607-1765* (2 vols. in one, New York, 1895); Howard M. Jones, "American Prose Style: 1700-1770," *HLB* no. 6 (1934), 115-152, and "The Colonial Impulse: An Analysis of the Promotion Literature of Colonization," *PAPS*, XC (1946), 131-161; Hugh T. Lefler, "Promotional Literature of the Southern Colonies," *JSH*, XXXIII (1967), 3-25; Peter A. Fritzell, "The Wilderness and the Garden: Metaphors of the American Landscape," *Forest History*, XII (1968), 16-22; and John Q. Anderson, "Trends of Thought in Early Southern Writing" (Ph.D. diss., Louisiana State Univ., 1948).

Among the studies of history, historiography, and historians generally helpful are Peter Gay, *A Loss of Mastery: Puritan Historians in Colonial America* (Berkeley, 1966); George B. Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages* (New York, 1928); John Higham, *Writing American History: Essays on Modern Scholarship* (Bloomington, Ind., 1970), and *History: Professional Scholarship in America* (New York, 1965); H. Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (New York, 1951); J. Franklin Jameson, *The History of Historical Writing in America* (New York, 1891, 1961); Michael Kraus, *The Writing of American History* (Norman, Okla., 1953); Harvey Wish, *The American Historians, A Social-Intellectual History of the Writing of the American Past* (New York, 1960); Sigmund Diamond, "The European Basis of American Civilization," in *Interpreting American History: Conversations with Historians*, ed. John A. Garraty (New York, 1970); Richard Hofstadter, *The Progressive Historians: Turner, Beard, Parrington* (New York, 1968). Especially pertinent are Clarence L. Ver Steeg, "Historians and the Southern Colonies," in *The Reinterpretation of Early American History: Essays in Honor of John Edwin Pomeroy*, ed. Ray A. Billington (San Marino, Calif., 1966); Hugh F. Rankin, "The Colonial South," in *Writing Southern History: Essays in Historiography in Honor of Fletcher M. Green*, ed. Arthur S. Link and Rembert W. Patrick (Baton Rouge, 1965); Richard S. Dunn, "Seventeenth-Century English Historians of America," in *Seventeenth-Century America: Essays in Colonial History*, ed. James M. Smith (Chapel Hill, 1959); Alden T. Vaughan, "The Evolution of Virginia History: Early Historians of the First Colony," in *Perspectives on Early American History: Essays in Honor of Richard B. Morris*, ed. A. T. Vaughan and George A. Billias (New York, 1973).

PRIMARY SOURCES

For bibliographical data on individual items, see Joseph Sabin et al., *Bibliotheca Americana. A Dictionary of Books Relating to America from Its Earliest Discovery to the Present Time* (29 vols., New York, 1868-1936); R.W.G. Vail, *The Voice of the Old Frontier* (New York, 1949), especially "A Bibliography of North American Frontier Literature, 1547-1800," pp. 84-466; Thomas D. Clark, ed., *Travels in the Old South: A Bibliography* (2 vols., Norman, Okla., 1956; covers years 1527-1825, travel accounts and geographical descriptions); Charles Evans et al., *American Bibliography: A Chronological Dictionary of All Books, Pamphlets, and Periodical Publications Printed in the United States . . . 1639 . . . 1820* (14 vols., Chicago and Worcester, Mass., 1903-1959); and Richard B. Davis, *American Literature through Bryant* (New York, 1969). In addition to individual items given in the notes below are a number of valuable collections of primary materials, frequently edited with useful historical and critical comment. The most inclusive is Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and Other Papers, Relating Principally to the Origins, Settlement, and Progress of the Colonies in North America from the Discovery of the Country to the Year 1776* (4 vols., rpt., Gloucester, Mass., 1963). Others are Eva G.R. Taylor, ed., *The Writings and Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts* (2 vols., London, 1935); David B. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584-1600* (2 vols., London, 1955); Philip L. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages under the First Charter, 1606-1609* (2 vols., Cambridge, Eng., 1969); Newton D. Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies* (New York, 1916); *American Colonial Tracts Monthly*, I (May-April, 1897-1898) [Rochester, N.Y., including twelve tracts]; W. Noel Sainsbury et al., eds., *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and the West Indies, 1574-1736* (42 vols. to date, London, 1860-1953); Paul Hulton et al., eds., *The American Drawings of John White, 1577-1590* (2 vols., London and Chapel Hill, 1964); Stephen Lorant, ed., *The New World: The First Pictures of America* (New York, 1946); Theodor deBry, *America*, Part i (in Latin, Frankfurt, 1590); David B. Quinn et al., eds., [Richard Hakluyt's] *Principall Navigations Voiages & Discoveries of the English Nation* (2 vols., Cambridge, Eng., 1965); Richard Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations . . .* (rpt. of the 1598-1600 ed. of 3 vols., in 12 vols., Glasgow, 1903); and Samuel Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumous; or, Purchas His Pilgrimes* (orig. ed. 4 vols., London, 1625; now in 20 vols., Glasgow, 1905-1907).

For the colony of Virginia, there are a number of nineteenth- and twentieth-century collections: Alexander Brown, ed., *Genesis of the United States* (2 vols., Boston, 1890); Lyon G. Tyler, ed., *Narratives of Early Virginia, 1606-1625* (New York, 1907, 1952); Susan M. Kingsbury, ed., *Records of the Virginia Company of London* (4 vols., Washington, D.C., 1906-1935); W.W. Hening, ed., *Statutes at Large of Virginia* (13 vols., orig. ed., Phila-

delphia, 1823; rpt., Charlottesville, 1969); Clarence W. Alvord and Lee Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations of the Trans-Allegheny Region of the Virginians, 1650-1674* (Cleveland, 1912). More limited in their scope are Samuel M. Bemiss, ed., *The Three Charters of the Virginia Company of London with Seven Related Documents*, Jamestown 350th Anniv. Hist. Booklet no. 4 (Williamsburg, 1957), and *Proceedings of the General Assembly of Virginia . . . 1619 . . . by Mr. John Pory*, ed. William J. Van Schreeven and George H. Reese (Jamestown, Va., 1969); and the journals and proceedings of the Council, General Court, and House of Burgesses of Virginia published by the Virginia State Library, Richmond, during the earlier twentieth century.

Maryland has been especially active in publishing its records, in W. H. Browne et al., eds., *The Archives of Maryland* (more than sixty volumes to date, Baltimore, 1883-), and C.C. Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland* (New York, 1910). The Maryland Historical Society through its Fund Publication Series has brought out such items as John G. Shea, ed., *George Alsop's "A Character of the Province of Maryland"* (no. 15, Baltimore, 1880).

The many collections for the Carolinas begin in the earlier nineteenth century. For both colonies, A.S. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina* (New York, 1911) is representative. William L. Saunders, ed., *The Colonial Records of North Carolina* (10 vols., Raleigh, 1886-1890), is being superseded by a newly edited series just beginning with Mattie E.E. Parker, ed., *North Carolina: Charters and Constitutions, 1578-1698* (Raleigh, 1963), a Tercentenary publication, an earnest of what is to follow. For South Carolina some materials appear in J.H. Easterby et al., eds., *The Colonial Records of South Carolina*, series I (10 vols., Columbia, 1951-1974); William L. McDowell, Jr., ed., series II (3 vols., 1951-1970); Langdon Cheves et al., eds., *Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society* (5 vols., Charleston, 1856-1897); B.R. Carroll, ed., *Historical Collections of South Carolina* (2 vols., New York, 1836); Thomas Cooper and David J. McCord, eds., *The Statutes at Large of South Carolina* (10 vols., Columbia, 1836-1841).

For Georgia, there are Allen D. Candler and Lucien Knight, eds., *The Colonial Records of the State of Georgia* (26 vols., Atlanta, 1904-1916); *Collections of the Georgia Historical Society*, I-XIII (Savannah, 1840-1959); the Wormsloe Foundation Series, which includes the journals of William Stephens, the Earl of Egmont, and Peter Gordon, and among recent items (no. 8) G.F. Jones, trans. and ed., *Henry Newman's Salzburger Letterbooks* (Athens, Ga., 1966), which includes letters and other documents by a number of founding fathers. For handsome recent reprints of this colony's early documentary and other material see the books issued by the Beehive Press of Savannah: e.g., Trevor R. Reese, ed., *The Most Delightful Country in the Universe: Promotional Literature of the Colony of Georgia* (1972).

Unique or rare printed copies and manuscripts are widely scattered. In Great Britain the British Museum contains the greatest number of rare pamphlets, the Public Record Office the greatest number of manuscripts. In America there are some useful items in the John Carter Brown Library, the New York

Public Library, the American Antiquarian Society, the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the Houghton Library at Harvard. By far the greatest number of books and manuscripts still remain in the South, including several in the Library of Congress, and many in the Maryland Historical Society, the Virginia Historical Society, the Virginia State Library, the North Carolina Department of Archives and History, the South Carolina Historical Society, the Charleston Library Society, and the Georgia Historical Society. Even more exist in southern university repositories than in general institutions such as those just mentioned, for the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia, the University of North Carolina Library, the Duke University Library, the University South Caroliniana Library, the Emory University Library, and the University of Georgia Library contain unusual and rare documents and printed material concerning the history and promotion of their respective states and regions.

MISCELLANEOUS MATERIALS ON PROMOTION TRACTS AND THEIR AUTHORS

These include Henry Stevens, *Thomas Hariot the Mathematician and His Associates* (London, 1900); M.C. Bradbrook, *The School of Night: A Study of the Literary Relationships of Sir Walter Raleigh* (Cambridge, Eng., 1936) [includes Hariot]; and S.G. Culliford, *William Strachey, 1572-1621* (Charlottesville, 1965). Howard M. Jones in *The Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (rev. ed., Charlottesville, 1968) discusses among other writers Smith and Strachey and the Bacon's Rebellion documents. Richard B. Davis, *George Sandys, Poet-Adventurer* (London and New York, 1955), has a good deal on Pory and other minor writers. Useful too is William S. Powell, *John Pory, 1572-1636: Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts* (Chapel Hill, 1977).

E.D. Neill, *The Founders of Maryland* (Albany, 1876), is somewhat outdated but worth reading. Lawrence C. Wroth, "The Maryland Colonization Tracts," in *Essays Offered to Herbert Putnam*, ed. William W. Bishop and Andrew Keogh (rpt. ed., Freeport, N.Y., [1967?]), and Bernard C. Steiner, *Descriptions of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1904), are still standard though on this and other Maryland writing the most perceptive discussions are in J.A. Leo Lemay, *Men of Letters in Colonial Maryland* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1972). For the Carolinas, helpful are Hope Francis Kane, "Colonial Promotion and Promotion Literature of the Carolinas, 1660-1700" (Ph.D. diss., Brown Univ., 1930; publ. abstract, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, 1948); Lefler's "Promotional Literature" mentioned above; and William S. Powell, "Carolina in the Seventeenth Century: An Annotated Bibliography of Contemporary Publications," *NCHR*, XVI (1964), 74-104. For Georgia, one should see among other sources Verner W. Crane, "The Promotion Literature of Georgia," in *Bibliographical Essays: A Tribute to Wilberforce Eames* (Cambridge, Mass., 1928); and *Catalogue of the Wymberley Jones DeRenne Georgia Library at Wormsloe, Isle of Hope near Savannah Georgia* (3 vols., Savannah [Wormsloe], 1931).

INDIVIDUAL HISTORIANS AND HISTORIES

These have received varying degrees of attention, with Captain John Smith by far the most popular.

John Smith. Among the most useful Smith criticism is the work of his most recent and ablest biographer, Philip L. Barbour, in *The Three Worlds of Captain John Smith* (Boston, 1964), *Pocahontas and Her World* (Boston, 1970), his edition of *The Jamestown Voyages* noted above, and at least a dozen essays. His immediate predecessor, Bradford Smith, discovered and used some new materials in *Captain John Smith: His Life and Legend* (Philadelphia, 1953), as did his collaborator Laura Polanyi Striker in a number of essays and in her edition of Henry Wharton, *The Life of Captain John Smith, English Soldier* (Chapel Hill, 1917). Smith and Striker together wrote "The Rehabilitation of Captain John Smith, *JSH*, XVIII (1962), 474-481, doing much to prove the anticipatory conclusions or suggestions of Jarvis M. Morse in "Captain John Smith and His Critics: A Chapter in Colonial Historiography," *JSH*, I (1935), 123-127. See also Ben C. McCary's *John Smith's Map of Virginia with a Brief Record of Its History*, Jamestown 350th Anniv. Hist. Booklet no. 3 (Williamsburg, 1957); Edwin C. Rozwenz, "Captain John Smith's Image of America," *WMQ* (3), XVI (1958), 27-36; and Everett Emerson, "Captain John Smith as Editor: *The Generall Historie*," *VMHB*, LXXXV (1967), 143-156, and his *Captain John Smith* (New York, TUSAS, 1971). Though an edition of *The General Historie* is now available in handsome facsimile (Cleveland, 1966) with an introduction by A.L. Rowse and bibliographical notes by Robert O. Dougan and Barbour has reedited *A True Relation* and *A Map of Virginia* in his *Jamestown Voyages*, the most convenient edition is still *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith*, ed. A.C. Bradley and Edward Arber (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1910). A new, completely collated and edited edition of Smith's complete works is now in process by Barbour.

Bacon's Rebellion. Most useful historically as interpretations and accounts of the Rebellion are Mary N. Stanard, *The Story of Bacon's Rebellion* (New York, 1907), which contains a still-essential bibliography; Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *Torchbearer of the Revolution: The Story of Bacon's Rebellion and Its Leader* (Princeton, 1940), again with an indispensable bibliography; Wilcomb E. Washburn, *The Governor and the Rebel: A History of Bacon's Rebellion* (Chapel Hill, 1957), in which a supplementary volume of documents is promised to support the author's contentions; Craven, "Bacon's Rebellion," in his *The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 360-393; and Morton, four chapters of his *Colonial Virginia*, I, 227-296. A recent thoughtful but not entirely convincing essay, employing some new material and suggesting plausible explanations for the conflict, is Warren M. Billings, "The Causes of Bacon's Rebellion: Some Suggestions," *VMHB*, LXXVIII (1970), 409-

435. Regarding it as literature or in literature, see Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 104-120; Bertha M. Stearns, "The Literary Treatment of Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia," *VMHB*, LII (1944), 163-179; and Jay B. Hubbell, *The South in American Literature* (Durham, N.C., 1954), pp. 23-26, 928-929, and his "John Cotton, the Poet-Historian of Bacon's Rebellion," in *South and Southwest: Literary Essays and Reminiscences* (Durham, N.C., 1965), pp. 205-227. Perhaps the most perceptive and comprehensive analysis of the Rebellion literature is Wilber H. Ward, "Bacon's Rebellion in Literature to 1861" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Tennessee, 1971), to which the present study is much indebted. Two more recent studies are Jane Carson, *Bacon's Rebellion, 1676-1976* (Jamestown, Va., 1976), and John D. Neville, comp., *Bacon's Rebellion: Abstracts of Materials in the Colonial Records Project* (Jamestown, Va., 1976).

Dozens of texts of letters, petitions of grievances, and other documents are to be found in various issues of *VMHB*, *WMQ*, and *Tyler's Q*. Force, *Tracts*, I, viii, ix, x, and xi, represent four accounts; Charles M. Andrews, ed., *Narratives of the Insurrections* (New York, 1915) contains three. William Sherwood's "Virginia's Deplored Condition" was printed in the Aspinwall Papers, *CMHS*, 4th ser., IX (1871), 162-176, with other Bacon material on pp. 176-187; Sir Thomas Grantham's *An Historical Account of Some Memorable Actions, Particularly in Virginia* (orig. ed., London, 1716) was reprinted with an introduction by R.A. Brock (Richmond, Va., 1882); the *American Colonial Tracts Monthly*, I, nos. 8, 9, and 10, reproduce some of those in Force and Andrews; the news pamphlets printed in England have been edited by T.P. Abernethy, *More News from Virginia: A Further Account of Bacon's Rebellion* (facsimile, Charlottesville, 1943), and by Harry Finestone, *Bacon's Rebellion: The Contemporary News Sheets* (Charlottesville, 1956); George B. Goode printed "Dialogue between the Rebel Bacon and One Goode as it was presented to the Right Honourable Sir William Berkeley, Governor of Virginia," in *Virginia Cousins* (Richmond, 1887); Aphra Behn wrote a play, *The Widow Ranter or, The History of Bacon in Virginia. A Tragi-Comedy* (London, 1690); and Ebenezer Cook produced a satirical poem based on the Cotton account, "Bacon's Rebellion, &c.," in *The Maryland Muse* (Annapolis, 1731).

Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton. Though a few lines on *The Present State of Virginia, and the College* (orig. ed., 1727) appear in *Tyler's History of American Literature* (II, 261-62) and elsewhere, the only extensive criticism of this work is that of Hunter D. Farish, in his edition published by Colonial Williamsburg, Inc. (Williamsburg, Va., 1940). See also Robert A. Bain, "The Composition and Publication of *The Present State of Virginia, and the College*," *EAL*, VI (Spring, 1971), 31-54.

Robert Beverley. Though *Beverley's History* appeared (from 1705) in at least two English and several French editions in the author's lifetime and was re-

printed once in the nineteenth century (Richmond, Va., 1855), it has never received the critical attention it merits. Something of its value is indicated by Jameson in his *History of Historical Writings in America*, (pp. 62-67), Kraus in *The Writing of American History* (pp. 39-40), and especially Hubbell in *The South in American Literature* (pp. 26-30, 917). The best discussions of Beverley as man and writer are by Wright in his *First Gentlemen of Virginia*: (pp. 286-311); "Beverley's History . . . of Virginia (1705), a Neglected Classic," *WMQ* (3), I (1944), 49-64; and his introduction to his edition of the work (Chapel Hill, 1947). A recent sprightly comment is the introduction to the *History* by David Freeman Hawke (Indianapolis, 1971). A useful but slightly inaccurate account or analysis of Beverley's book from a special point of view is Leo Marx's *The Machine in the Garden* (New York, 1964), pp. 75-88. Marx sees it as the first full-scale treatment of the pastoral ideal by a native American.

Hugh Jones. The Present State of Virginia (orig. ed., London, 1724) has been frequently quoted and used by the creators of Colonial Williamsburg, but it received no extensive treatment as history or literature until Richard L. Morton edited it with introduction and notes (Chapel Hill, 1956). There was a small edition by Joseph Sabin in 1865. Howard M. Jones devotes some attention to it in "American Prose Style: 1700-1770" (pp. 144-147). Tyler notices it in his *History of American Literature* (II, 268-270), as does Hubbell in *The South in American Literature* (pp. 30-31).

William Stith. For Stith as a clergyman, see Chapter VI and its bibliography. As a historian, he is discussed at length by Toshiko Tsuruta, "William Stith, Historian of Colonial Virginia" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Washington, 1957). Recent and useful is Thad W. Tate, "William Stith and the Virginia Tradition," in *The Colonial Legacy, Volumes III and IV*, ed. Lawrence H. Leder (New York, 1973), pp. 121-145. Other commentaries include those of Jameson, *History of Historical Writing in America* (pp. 68-73); Jones, "American Prose Style: 1700-1770" (pp. 146-147); Kraus, *The Writing of American History* (pp. 51-52); Rankin, "The Colonial South" (pp. 5-6); and A.C. Gordon, Jr., in *DAB*. Stith's place among colonial liberals is noticed in Richard B. Davis, ed., *The Colonial Virginia Satirist: Mid-Eighteenth Century Commentaries on Politics, Religion, and Society* (Philadelphia, 1967; pp. 9, 41n-42n).

The History of the First Discovery and Settlement of Virginia appeared in Williamsburg in 1747 and 1753, in London in 1753, and in a Joseph Sabin reprint in 1865. Recently there have been two reprintings: the Reprint Company of Spartanburg, S.C., issued a facsimile of the 1747 edition in 1965 with Morgan P. Robinson's valuable bibliographical notes and index originally published in 1912 in the *Bulletin of the Virginia State Library*, V. no. 1; Darrett B. Rutman wrote a critical introduction for the Johnson Reprint Corporation's facsimile (in 1969, New York) of the Sabin edition. Both reprints are useful, but a new and fully edited and collated edition is much needed.

NOTES

1. London, 1589. See Quinn et al., facsimile reprint for the Hakluyt Society, 1965. Also see Parks, *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages*; Taylor, ed. *Writings of the Hakluyts*; and Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*. In general pattern the *Principall Navigations* in this and the 1598-1600 editions follows that of Ramusio's collection at Venice, 1550-1559, and parallels de Bry's between 1590 and 1634.

2. London, 1598-1600, and (12 vols.) Glasgow, 1903.

3. In Glasgow ed., XIX, 218-267, under the title "Virginia's Verger: Or a Discourse shewing the benefits which may grow to this Kingdome from American English Plantations, and specially those of Virginia and Summer Ilands." Further references to Purchas' work will be to Glasgow ed., cited as *Purchas His Pilgrimes*.

4. See, e.g., Fritzell, "The Wilderness and the Garden," pp. 16-22; Peter N. Carroll, *Puritanism and the Wilderness* (New York, 1969), passim; and Wright, *The Colonial Search for a Southern Eden*, passim. See also Lefler, "Promotional Literature," pp. 1-25. Of course New Englanders occasionally spoke of turning their wilderness into a land of Canaan or vaguely of being led through this wilderness to Canaan.

5. "The Colonial Impulse: An Analysis of the Promotion Literature of Colonization," pp. 131-134. See also Lefler, "Promotional Literature," and Kane, "Promotion and Promotion Literature."

6. Anderson, "Trends of Thought in Early Southern Writing," pp. 57 and passim.

7. Charles Woodmason, *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution*, ed. Richard J. Hooker (Chapel Hill, 1953).

8. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 29-30, 255-294, etc.

9. *Ibid.*, I, 314-387.

10. *Principall Navigations*, II, 737-748, 748-764.

11. A facsimile edition of the quarto of 1588 was published by the William L. Clements Lib. (rpt., New York, History Book Club, 1951), ed. Randolph G. Adams; and a good reprint with illustrations of the 1590 Frankfort folio was published by Bernard Quaritch in London in 1893. Also see Paul Hulton's excellent and inexpensive Dover edition of Hariot, (New York, 1972), which has the White-deBry drawings and maps.

12. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 203. In this letter of August 12, 1585, Lane remarks that he has volunteered to remain at least until the arrival of a new supply. Several other letters are included in *The Roanoke Voyages*.

13. September 3, 1585. This text is from Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 208.

14. For the drawings and watercolors in remarkably fine reproductions, see Paul Hulton, David B. Quinn, et al., eds., *The American Drawings of John White, 1577-1590* (2 vols., Chapel Hill, 1964). Less faithfully reproduced but more accessible in that more copies were printed at a much lower price,

is Stephen Lorant, ed., *The New World: The First Pictures of America* (New York, 1964). For the deBry engravings, the Quaritch edition (London, 1893) is useful, and of course Theodor deBry, *America*, Part i (Frankfort, 1590), as well as the Hulton, Dover edition. For Hariot, see Stevens, *Thomas Hariot*; DNB; Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 35-44, etc.; and Bradbrook, *The School of Night*, passim.

15. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 316-317. For more on illustrations and maps, see Ch. VIII below. These are, of course, references to the 1590 edition.

16. *Ibid.*, I, 51-55.

17. Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations*, passim. Frobisher, Gilbert, Willes, Barlow, Amadas, Hawkins, Davis, and Cavendish are among those who participated in and commented upon New World exploration and settlement before 1598. See also Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, passim.

18. These Spanish-English documents were reproduced in reasonably accurate translations and edited by Alexander Brown in *Genesis* along with translations of letters from Spanish agents in London. Better translation of some of the same and of new material appears in Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*. Barbour's comprehensive and fascinating collection includes even such items as the Rev. Robert Hunt's will, which strongly suggests some of the reasons impelling the clergyman to the expedition.

19. Signed Edward Maria Wingfeild [*sic*], John Smith, John Martin, Bartholomew Gosnold, John Rattcliffe, George Kendall.

20. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 79-80.

21. *Ibid.*, I, 80-98, 98-102, 102-104. See also Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 19n.

22. The most accurate printing is in Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 104-106, which also includes a reduced drawing-engraving of Tindall's "Draughte [Map] of Virginia." The map has been reproduced in color accompanied by a descriptive essay by W.C. Ford, "Tyndall's Map of Virginia, 1608," *PMHS*, LVIII (1924-1925), 244-247.

23. Letter cut off here. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 107.

24. Reprinted from this text in David B. Quinn, ed., *Observations Gathered out of "A Discourse of the Plantation of the Southern Colony in Virginia by the English, 1606"* (Charlottesville, 1967), and Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 129-146, 146-147. In the editing of *Purchas His Pilgrimes* the narrative was cut off just at the point at which it might have been compared with Captain John Smith's account of his personal exploits.

25. Besides his "Discourse" of 1606 Percy composed "A True Relation of the Proceedings and Occurrents of Moment Which Have Happened in Virginia from the Time Sir Thomas Gates Was Shipwrecked upon the Bermudas Anno 1609, until My Departure out of the Country Which Was in Anno Domini 1612," not printed until 1922 (in *Tyler's Q.*, III [1922], 259-282) from a copy of the original MS. deposited by E.D. Neill in the Virginia State Lib. See also John W. Shirley, "George Percy at Jamestown, 1607-1612,"

VMHB, LVII (1949), 227-243, and Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 16.

26. Barbour, *Three Worlds*, passim. They are not hostile at least until later, when Percy criticizes Smith's *Generall Historie*. See Shirley, "George Percy at Jamestown," pp. 240-243.

27. All these, including Wingfield's, Smith's, and the lesser writers', are included in Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 165-246.

28. The first edition was edited by Charles Deane for the *Archaeologia Americana* series and appeared again in the same year (Boston, 1860) in a separate printing of 100 copies. It is also in Marshall Wingfield, *A History of Caroline County, Virginia* (Richmond, 1924), pp. 496 ff.; in Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 213-34 (a meticulously accurate text); and in Bradley and Arber, eds., *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith*, I, lxxiv-xci. Further references to the last-named work are cited as Smith, *Works*.

29. *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 21-23.

30. The title varies and in the first issue assigns the work to another author. For a discussion of these variants and a complete text of the pamphlet, see Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 128, 165-208. For a brief discussion of the work, see Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 42-44.

31. E.g., Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 42-44.

32. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 208.

33. See Barbour, *Three Worlds*, pp. 296-302, and *The Jamestown Voyages*, II, 321-326. See also Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 48-49, and Ben C. McCary's *John Smith's Map of Virginia*. The best modern text is in Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, II, 327-464. Smith probably drew other scattered bits of information from fellow colonists. McCary (p. 4) points out that this first part was probably a revised and more complete version of the "annexed Relation" sent by Smith to the Council in London about November 1608, but never published.

34. For the accuracy of the names and their owners' possible part in the composition of the "Proceedings," see esp. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, II, 375n.

35. For emphasis on the epic quality of the "Proceedings" see Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 25-28. For the appeal of the dying red race indicated here, see Ch. II of the present work.

36. Henry Spelman, *Relation of Virginia, 1609* (London, 1872, the first printing). Excerpts appear in Brown, ed., *Genesis*, I, 483-488, and it is completely reprinted in Smith, *Works* I, ci-cxiv.

37. Spelman, considered by Smith one of the best Indian translators of the colony, died in 1623 at the hands of the red men he both despised and trusted.

38. See Wright, *Religion and Empire*, esp. Ch. IV, pp. 84-114. Also see Ch. VI of the present work. For texts, see Robert Gray, *A Good Speed to Virginia (1609)* (New York, 1937); Richard Crakanthorpe, *A Sermon at*

the Solemnizing of the Happie Inauguration of our most gracious and Religious Sovereign King James (1609); David Price, *Sauls Prohibition Staide . . . with a reproofe to those that traduce the Honourable Plantation of Virginia* (1609); William Symonds, *Virginia. A Sermon Preached at White-Chappell* (1609); Robert Tynley, *Two Learned Sermons* (1609); and William Crashawe, *A Sermon Preached in London before the right honorable the Lord La Warre, Lord Governour and Captaine Generall of Virginia, and others* (1609/10).

39. See esp. Ch. VI.

40. *Nova Britannia* was edited and reprinted in 250 copies by Joseph Sabin (New York, 1867). Both books are reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, I, vi and vii.

41. Jones, "The Colonial Impulse," p. 134. *Virtù* is a strong quality in Smith as historian and explicitly or implicitly in the eighteenth-century Virginia historians.

42. See texts of charters and instructions, 1606–1621, in Bemiss, ed., *The Three Charters of the Virginia Company*.

43. For text of *A True Declaration*, see Force, *Tracts*, III, i; of *A True and Sincere Declaration*, see Brown, ed., *Genesis*, I, 338–353. Also see Wright, *Religion and Empire*, pp. 100–103. *A True Declaration* seems to have been based on Strachey and Jourdain. See note 53 below.

44. *A True Relation*, pp. 14, 24.

45. Originally in Purchas *His Pilgrimes*, XIX, 73–84, but reprinted in Brown, ed., *Genesis*, I, 428–439.

46. Reprinted in Brown, ed., *Genesis*, I, 478–83; Tyler, ed., *Narratives of Early Virginia*, pp. 209–214. For facsimile title page see William H. Robinson, *A Selection of Extremely Rare and Important Books and Ancient Manuscripts*, Catalogue 77 (London, 1948), p. 57.

47. Two of his three brothers in Virginia served at one time or another as acting governors.

48. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 29–31.

49. Brown, ed., *Genesis*, I, 501–508. There is also in the Bodleian (Ashmolean MSS. 1141 ff. 207–210) Dale's letter of May 25, 1611, to the Council, relating to this voyage to Virginia. See Jamestown 350th Anniv. Survey Report no. X.12.

50. Wesley F. Craven, ed., *A Good Speed to Virginia* (1609) [by Robert Gray] . . . *Newes from Virginia* (1610) [by R. Rich] (New York, 1937), pp. vii–viii.

51. Reproduced as an inset-fold facsimile in Robinson, *A Selection*, p. 103, with strong arguments for its claim to be "the earliest known piece of printed American verse." Reprinted with discussion in *WMQ* (3), V (1948), 351–358. The tune given under the title is "All those that be good fellowes." See also John C. Wyllie's note in *VMHB*, LVI (1948), 206.

52. See Ch. V, note 16, and Ch. VI, note 8, and text of both chs. *Good Newes from Virginia* (London, 1613), contains a long "Epistle Dedicatorie" by William Crashawe to Lord Ure, and Whitaker's dedication to Sir Thomas

Smith, "Treasurer of the English Colonie in Virginia." For Crashawe as preacher-promoter, see Ch. VI below.

53. See Culliford, *William Strachey*; Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, passim, esp. pp. 6-7, 57-65; Strachey, *Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania* (1612), ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund (London, 1953), and ed. R.H. Major (London, 1849); *A Voyage to Virginia in 1609: Two Narratives: Strachey's "A True Reportory" & Jourdain's Discovery of the Bermudas*, ed. Louis B. Wright (Charlottesville, 1964); and *For the Colony in Virginea Britannia: Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiiall, etc.*, ed. David H. Flaherty (Charlottesville, 1969), also in Force, *Tracts*, III, ii. Major's edition of the *Historie of Travell* contains Strachey's dispatch to the Virginia Council of July 7, 1610, "From the Lord De La Warr, Governor of Virginia, to the Patentees in England" (also in Brown, ed., *Genesis*, I, 402-413, and Neill, *Virginia Company of London*, pp. 36-49). "A True Reportory" was first published as late as 1625, in *Purchas His Pilgrimes* (XIX, 5-72). There are some separately printed Strachey poems in the Bodleian, Douce Fragments, f. 51. ff., 143, 144.

54. Printed in *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, XIX, 5-72 and more conveniently in *A Voyage to Virginia in 1609*, ed., Wright. The recipient of the letter (which was "A True Reportory") may have been Sara, wife of Sir Thomas Smith.

55. Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 57-62; and Culliford, *William Strachey*, pp. 151-158.

56. (London, 1610), in Force, *Tracts*, III, i. This quotation was almost surely added by Purchas, for it was not published in time for Strachey to have seen it. Strachey's description of the Lord Governor's procession to church appears in *A Voyage to Virginia in 1609*, ed. Wright, pp. 79-81.

57. For the most complete analysis see Flaherty's introduction to the 1969 edition, pp. ix-xxxvii. See also Culliford, *William Strachey*, pp. 146-148, who concludes that Strachey had no hand in their compilation. Early governors Thomas Gates, Thomas Dale and others were at least sources.

58. See Ch. V for an excerpt from the prayer, which is so long it becomes tedious.

59. The *Historie* survives in three manuscripts: that of the British Museum (Sloane MS. 1622), edited by R.H. Major for the Hakluyt Society in 1849; the Princeton Univ. text, "the most carefully prepared of the three," edited and published for the Hakluyt Society by Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund in 1953; and the Bodleian, Ashmolean MS. 1758. Differences among the three are discussed in the Wright-Freund edition, pp. xiii-xvii. See also note 53 above.

60. Page 58. There is a facsimile reprint of the London 1615 edition, with introduction by A.L. Rowse and prefatory note by R.B. Harwell (Richmond, Va. St. Libr., 1957). Most of Hamor is in *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, XIX, 95-102. The 1615 edition also contains John Rolfe's famous letter to Sir Thomas Dale concerning marriage with Pocahontas.

61. First published in paraphrase in *Purchas His Pilgrimage* (first print-

ing in 3rd. ed., London, 1617, VIII, ch. 5, section 4, pp. 946-948). It was published in part in *SLM*, V (1839), 401-406; *Va. Hist. Reg.*, I (1848), 101 ff.; and Neill, *Virginia Company of London*, pp. 106 ff. Three known manuscripts survive, one in Rolfe's own hand addressed to the Earl of Pembroke, and two fair copies sent to King James and Sir Robert Rich (later Earl of Warwick) respectively. The Pembroke copy was published in handsome format in an edition of 212 copies, with a complete facsimile of the manuscript, a letterpress rendition, and three illuminating introductory essays. Quotations in the present text are from this Pembroke copy (printed for Henry C. Taylor, New Haven, Printing Office of Yale Univ. Press, 1951). A reprint of the Taylor edition (Charlottesville, 1971) is in smaller format with no facsimiles. Rolfe probably wrote *A True Relation* during the winter of 1616/1617.

62. See Davis, *George Sandys, Poet Adventurer*, pp. 97-118, 280-282.

63. For Pory, see *DAB* and *DNB*; Davis, *George Sandys*, passim; Brown, ed., *Genesis*, passim; Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 65-71; Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, esp. Vols. III and IV; *Proceedings . . . Pory*, ed. Van Schreeven and Reese, and Powell, *John Pory*. Also see Champlin Burrage, ed., *John Pory's Lost Description of the Plymouth Colony* (Boston, 1918), including two letters by Pory; Sydney V. James, ed., *Three Visitors to Early Plymouth* (Plymouth, Mass., 1963); and Tyler, ed., *Narratives of Early Virginia*, pp. 249-278 etc.

64. For Pory's perfidy, especially in bribing a clerk to hand over to him copies of documents addressed by the General Assembly to the King and Privy Council, see Davis, *George Sandys*, p. 184; Powell, ed., *John Pory*, passim; Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, IV, 481, etc..

65. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 306. Sir Edwin was probably thinking of such letters as that quoted just below.

66. *Ibid.*, III, 221-222, 256. Abbreviations have been expanded.

67. A complete edition of Pory's English and American letters by Powell has just appeared. The collection certainly enables the reader to place some of Pory's opinions or statements of the moment in context, and hopefully may resolve a few apparent contradictions or explain his shifting attitudes.

68. London, 1620. Reprinted Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 307-312, etc.

69. Noticed again in Chapters V and VI. Copland's *Virginia's God Be Thanked* (London, 1622) and preached before the Company April 18, 1622, just before news of the massacre reached London. To combat the unfavorable publicity upon reception of the news, Dean John Donne of St. Paul's addressed the Company on November 13 in a discourse printed as *A Sermon Upon the VIII. Verse of the I. Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1622). See Wright, *Religion and Empire*, pp. 109-111.

70. *A Declaration* survives in several copies in America. It is reprinted in Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 541-579.

71. London, 1622. Reprinted with introduction by Robert C. Johnson in *VMHB*, LXXII (1964), 259-292.

72. January 1, 1621/22, in Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 589. See

also letters of April (?) 1623, *ibid.*, IV, 89-90, 230, etc. For Arundel, see Parks, *Hakluyt and the English Voyages*, and Brown, ed., *Genesis*, II, 887, etc.

73. The manuscript, in the Lambeth Palace Lib., was printed by Neill, *The Founders of Maryland*, pp. 19-37, and in *Northern Neck of Va. Hist. Mag.*, VI (1956), 479-489.

74. Apparently first published in Awnsham Churchill, *A Collection of Voyages and Travels* (London, 1732). Modern reprints are in Force, *Tracts*, III, x; and Francis C. Rosenberger, ed., *Virginia Reader: A Treasury of Writings* (New York, 1948), pp. 115-171. For the little known of Norwood see *VMHB*, XXXIII (1925), 1-10; Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 92n-96; and Rosenberger, ed., *Virginia Reader*, p. 115; and Leota Hirsch, "Henry Norwood and His Voyage to Virginia," in *Essays in Early Virginia Literature Honoring Richard Beale Davis*, ed. J. A. Leo Lemay (New York, 1977), pp. 53-72.

75. For a discussion of this work, see Lefler, "Promotional Literature," p. 12.

76. Included in Force, *Tracts*, II, viii.

77. Pp. 13-14.

78. A facsimile reprint (12 pages) with introduction by Thomas R. Stewart was published in 250 copies at Norwalk, Conn., 1914.

79. See Stewart's introduction, p. 7.

80. *A Perfect Description of Virginia*, in Force, *Tracts*, II, viii.

81. For authorization of an even earlier southern expedition, by Act of Assembly March 1642/3, see Hening, ed., *Statutes*, I, 262, and Alvord and Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations*, pp. 101-102. There were Assembly orders of Nov. 1652, July 1653 (or 1658?), and March 1659/60 for exploration, one for discovery of "the Mountains." See Alvord and Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations*, pp. 102-104.

82. Reprinted in facsimile with introduction by Howard H. Peckham (Ann Arbor, 1954), in modern letterpress in Alvord and Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations*, pp. 105-130, and in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 1-19. Bland told the Indians the expedition was authorized by the governor, and there is a Council of State order of September 25, 1651, concerning exploration to the west of the James River falls (Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col. . . 1574-1660*, no. 360).

83. See Alvord and Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations*, pp. 52-53.

84. *Ibid.*, p. 55.

85. For an excellent though brief introduction and accurate text, see William P. Cumming, ed., *The Discoveries of John Lederer with Unpublished Letters . . . and an Essay on the Indians of Lederer's Discoveries* (Charlottesville, 1958). For more background on Lederer and seventeenth-century Virginia exploration, see Alvord and Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations*, pp. 17-69 (with text of Lederer, pp. 131-171). "The Indians of Lederer's Discoveries," by Douglas L. Rights and William P. Cumming, forms a useful adjunct in the Cumming edition.

86. See Thomas Ludwell's letter to Lord Arlington of June 27, 1670, printed in *VMHB*, XIX (1911), 360-361, reporting the first part of the second expe-

dition. Major Harris, Lederer's companion who turned back about June 3, probably supplied the story of broken white cliffs and rising fogs which may have led to the conjecture that a great sea was near. In his account of the continuation of the second expedition, Lederer ridicules Harris as an inventor of "strange things" to excuse himself for turning back and for believing Lederer would never survive to contradict him. See Alvord and Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations*, pp. 177-178; and Cumming, ed., *Discoveries of Lederer*, p. 22. That is, Ludwell's account of marvels possibly suggesting a South Sea were derived from the matter-of-fact Lederer.

87. Alvord and Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations*, pp. 76-78.

88. There are two copies of the Fallam manuscript, one printed in the eighteenth century: "A Journal from Virginia, beyond the Apalachian mountains, in Sept. 1671. Sent to the Royal Society by Mr. Clayton, and read Aug. 1, 1688, before the said Society" (in *Miscellanea Curiosa* [London, 1727], iii, 336 etc.). Modern reprints are in Alvord and Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations*, pp. 183-205, and Edmund and Dorothy Berkeley, eds., *The Reverend John Clayton, a Parson with a Scientific Mind* (Charlottesville, 1965), pp. 68-77. Clayton's manuscript copied in Virginia 1684-1686, is preserved as BM Sloane MSS. 4432, f. 9. There are other reprintings.

89. Alvord and Bidgood, eds., *The First Explorations*, pp. 28-90, 207-226.

90. Reprinted in a separate edition of 150 copies (31 pages) at Oxford by B.H. Blackwell in 1904.

91. Printed in Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*.

92. Wroth, "Maryland Colonization Tracts," pp. 539-555; Lefler, "Promotional Literature," pp. 13-14; Steiner, *Descriptions of Maryland*, passim.

93. For a perceptive description of the Maryland situation, see Craven, *Sou. Col. Seven. Cent.*, pp. 183-223. See also Andrews, *History of Maryland*, pp. 17-22, which is inclined to overestimate "tolerance."

94. Wroth, "Maryland Colonization Tracts," pp. 540-541; the charter is included in the rpt. of *A Relation of Maryland*, in Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 67-69, 101-112. See Lemay, *Men of Letters in Colonial Maryland*, p. 351, citing from John Cook Wyllie.

95. For White (1579-1656) see *DAB*; *DNB*; Wroth, "Maryland Colonization Tracts," 544n-545n, etc.; and Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, passim.

96. See Wroth, "Maryland Colonization Tracts," pp. 544-545, 554-556. The only known contemporary copy is in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Westminster, London. It was printed in an edition of 100 copies in facsimile "through the interest of Willard Augustine Baldwin," with an introduction by Wroth (Baltimore, 1929).

97. See *ibid.* pp. 544n-545n. For text, see Force, *Tracts*, IV, no. 12; Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 29-45; as "Relatio Itineris," Md. Hist. Soc. Fund Publication, no. 7 (Baltimore, 1877). See also Lemay, *Men of Letters in Colonial Maryland*, passim.

98. The two known copies are in the British Museum and the John Carter

Brown Lib. A reprinting with serious and unnoted omissions occurs in J.D.G. Shea's *Early Southern Tracts*, no. 1 (Albany, 1865).

99. Wroth, "Maryland Colonization Tracts," pp. 550-552. Copies of the tract are located on p. 556. Lemay, *Men of Letters in Colonial Maryland*, p. 351, etc., indicates that part of *A Moderate and Safe Expedient* was written by Father White.

100. Shrigley's *A True Relation* is in Force, *Tracts*, III, vii; Hammond's account, in Force, *Tracts*, III, xiv, and in Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 277-308.

101. Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 306-307; Force, *Tracts*, III, xiv, 26-27. The Hall edition has "covert" and is said to have been taken from the Harvard copy of the original. Either "covert" (perhaps with a double entendre) or "covet" makes sense.

102. Reprint editions are those of Newton D. Mereness (Cleveland, 1902); Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 337-387; John Shea, Md. Hist. Soc. Fund Publication no. 15 (Baltimore, 1880, from Shea's 1869 edition, New York). For Alsop as belletrist and humorist, see Lemay, *Men of Letters in Colonial Maryland*, pp. 48-70, 356-357; and Ch. IX below.

103. Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 334.

104. Hugh T. Lefler, ed., "A Description of 'Carolana' by a 'Well-Wisher,' 1649," *NCHR*, XXXII (1955) 102-105. For this and other pamphlets see Powell "Carolina in the Seventeenth Century," pp. 74-104. For a general discussion of early Carolina promotion literature, see Kane, "Promotion and Promotion Literature."

105. The second edition, with the title *Virginia: More especially the South part thereof . . .* (London, 1650), makes no mention of the Parliament and beginning of the year on the title page, but it does include a long letter of dedication to the Parliament. This edition is reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, III, xi.

106. See note 82.

107. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 21-29 (orig. publ. in 1742).

108. For texts and discussion of these and later official papers through 1698, see Parker, ed., *North Carolina: Charters and Constitutions*. The 1663 charter is in Raleigh; the 1665, in a patent roll copy in the Public Record Office, London, as is the 1665 "Concessions and Agreement."

109. Powell, "Carolina in the Seventeenth Century," (pp. 85, 94, 104) describes editions of 1670, 1682, and 1698.

110. See Parker, ed., *North Carolina: Charters and Constitutions*, pp. 128-131.

111. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 37-61.

112. See John T. Lanning, introd. to *A Brief Description of the Province of Carolina* (Charlottesville, 1944), pp. 6-7.

113. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 66-73. The facsimile edition edited with introduction by Lanning is cited in note 112 above.

114. There is an abstract in Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col. . . . 1661-*

1668. A complete transcription appears in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 82-107, and in several other South Carolina collections.

115. For more on Lederer and his *Discoveries* . . . and on other expeditions see notes 81 and 85 above and text.

116. In *Coll. South Carolina Hist. Soc.*, V, 456-462, and more easily available in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 130-134. The Westo town stood on the Savannah River near the present site of Augusta, Ga. For Woodward, see *DAB*.

117. There were also at least three other promotional tracts in French in 1686 at The Hague. See Powell, "Carolina in the Seventeenth Century," pp. 101-102; Lefler, "Promotional Literature," p. 18; and Kane, "Promotion and Promotion Literature," *passim*.

118. For the scattered notices, see Powell, "Carolina in the Seventeenth Century," pp. 90-102.

119. Text in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 138-159. Powell, "Carolina in the Seventeenth Century," p. 93, points out that a Thomas Amy rather than Ash may have been the actual author.

120. See Chs. V and VI below.

121. Reprinted in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 224-264. For a thorough examination of circumstances and sources of this publication and a briefer printed analysis of the "Act of Exclusion" by Defoe see John R. Moore, "Defoe's 'Queries upon the Foregoing Act': A Defense of Civil Liberty in South Carolina," in *Essays in History and Literature Presented by the Fellows of the Newberry Library to Stanley Pargellis* (Chicago, 1965), pp. 133-155. Defoe's *Case of the Protestant Dissenters in Carolina* (p. 148) seems largely an expansion of the "Queries."

122. Reprinted in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 282-311. It was reprinted also in other places.

123. *Ibid.*, p. 315, and rpt. of the Carolina sections, pp. 317-375.

124. A copy of this pamphlet is in the John Carter Brown Lib.

125. By R. Smith. A copy is in the University South Carolina Lib.

126. There are also editions of 1727, 1741, 1840.

127. A copy is in Tracy W. McGregor Lib., Univ. of Virginia. Yonge's *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the People of South Carolina in the Year 1719* (London, 1726) is reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, II, x.

128. Reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, II, xi, and in Carroll, ed., *Historical Collections*, II, 121-140.

129. Reprinted in facsimile with introduction by Chapman J. Milling, ed., in *Colonial South Carolina: Two Contemporary Descriptions by Governor James Glen and Doctor George Milligen-Johnston* (Columbia, 1951), and in Carroll, ed., *Historical Collections*, II, 193 ff.

130. Printed in Milling, ed., *Colonial South Carolina*, and in Carroll, ed., *Historical Collections of South Carolina*, II. The Milling edition gives the author's manuscript "additions" (made in 1775) to the pamphlet, the original copy being in the University South Caroliniana Lib.

131. Milling, ed., *Colonial South Carolina*, p. xxii.
132. April 29-May 6 and May 6-May 13, 1731. Edited separately under the same title by Earl G. Swem (Perth Amboy, N.J., 1922).
133. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, VI, 605-623, from the Public Record Office.
134. There were two 1709 editions. It actually first appeared in John Stevens, ed., *A New Collection of Voyages and Travels* (London, 1708-[1710]), and then under the title given in the text. Later editions in English in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries carried the title *A History of Carolina* (as 1714, 1718, 1903, 1937, 1952, and 1960). German editions appeared in 1712 and 1722. The first reprinting, with annotations, illustrations from deBry and John White, and an index, is Hugh T. Lefler, ed., *A New Voyage to Carolina* (Chapel Hill, 1967), which also includes an excellent introduction and further facts about Lawson and his book.
135. Later editions Dublin, 1743 and Raleigh, 1911. A new facsimile reprint with introduction by Carol Urness was published in New York, 1969. For Brickell's use of Lawson, see Adams, *Travelers and Travel Liars*, pp. 149-157, who tabulates some word-for-word borrowing and discusses others. See also Lefler, "Promotional Literature," pp. 19-20. Urness points out that Brickell borrowed primarily from the second part of Lawson, and from his lists of birds and animals and descriptions of Indians. The 1969 edition includes the earlier J. Bryan Grymes introduction, which claims that Brickell's work is "fuller, more systematic, and seems more like that of a student," an observation of doubtful accuracy.
136. Adams, *Travelers and Travel Liars*, pp. 144-149, and "The Real Author of William Byrd's Natural History of Virginia," *AL*, XXVIII (1956), 211-220; and Lefler, "Promotional Literature," pp. 19-20.
137. See Richmond C. Beatty and William J. Mulloy, eds. and trans., *William Byrd's Natural History of Virginia or The Newly Discovered Eden* (Richmond, Va., 1940).
138. Portions of a mutilated manuscript did appear in the Petersburg (Va.) *Republican* as early as 1822.
139. Reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, I, i; *American Colonial Tracts*, I, i; and, with J. Max Patrick as editor, as *Azilia: A Discourse by Sir Robert Montgomery, 1717, Projecting a Settlement in the Colony Later Known as Georgia* (Atlanta, Emory Univ. Lib., Ser. IV, 1948), the first reprinting with the Appendix.
140. For Purry and this scheme, see *DAB*; Lefler, "Promotional Literature," p. 21; and Coulter, *Georgia: A Short History*, p. 13.
141. At least six later editions appeared in the eighteenth century. See Crane, "Promotion Literature of Georgia," p. 284.
142. *Ibid.*, pp. 288-289, 291-292. In *BM Catalogue* this pamphlet is assigned to Oglethorpe with a question mark. Crane discusses in detail the problem of authorship.
143. Crane, "Promotion Literature of Georgia," p. 288, describes the John

Carter Brown Lib. copy, once the personal property of the Rev. Samuel Wesley, father of John and Charles, and an enthusiastic "collector" for the colony as well as a celebrant in verse of its virtues.

144. Reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, I, ii, and *American Colonial Tracts*, I, ii.

145. See introduction by John C. Stephens, Jr., ed., to "*Georgia*," and *Two Other Occasional Poems on the Founding of the Colony, 1736* (Atlanta, Emory Univ. Lib., Ser. VI, 1950), pp. ix-x.

146. One of the earliest propaganda tracts printed in the South, this was published by Peter Timothy for the authors. Reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, I, iv; *American Colonial Tracts*, I, iv; and recently, with introduction and notes by Clarence L. Ver Steeg, at Athens, Univ. of Georgia Press, Wormsloe Foundation Publications Number Four, [1960].

147. Thomas Stephens, son of the Trustees' loyal secretary in the colony, William Stephens, had been in London as agent for the malcontents and had been spreading "libel" about the administration for at least a year or two.

148. Reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, I, v, and *American Colonial Tracts*, I, v. See also Crane, "Promotion Literature of Georgia," p. 295. A fine brief description and defense of Georgia by an anonymous gentleman who had resided there seven years and was going back to make it his permanent abode is *A Description of Georgia* (London, 1741), reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, II, xii. This is clearly a pro-Trustees pamphlet.

149. Listed and described among other rarities in the *Catalogue of the Wymerley Jones De Renne Georgia Lib.* Many of the Georgia pamphlets from the Earl of Egmont's collection are now in the John Carter Brown Lib.

150. Reprinted in *American Colonial Tracts*, I, iii. See note 147 above.

151. In Force, *Tracts*, IV, v. A copy of the original is in Sion College Lib., London. London sermons, as William Best's, were preached in behalf of the persecuted Protestants. See Best, *The Relief of the Persecuted Protestants of Salzburgh* (London, 1734), or George Watts, *A Sermon Preached . . .* (London, 1736).

152. Trans. and ed., G.F. Jones. These letters are Continental, British, and American in authorship and origin.

153. G.F. Jones, trans. and ed., "J. M. Bolzius Reports on Georgia," *GaHQ*, XLVII (1963), 216-219. See also, G.F. Jones, ed., and Hermann J. Lacher, trans., *Detailed Reports on the Salzburger Emigrants Who Settled in America . . . Edited by Samuel Urlsperger*, (3 vols. to date, Athens, Ga., 1968-).

154. Klaus G. Loewald, Beverly Starika, and Paul S. Taylor, "John Martin Bolzius Answers a Questionnaire on Carolina and Georgia," *WMQ* (3), XIV (1957), 218-261; XV (1958), 228-252. Candler, ed., *Col. Rec. Georgia*, includes many Salzburger and general continental European documents. The Wormsloe Foundation appears to be embarked on a program of translating and printing German-Georgia materials.

155. There is a considerable bibliography on Kimber, who is mentioned under his father Isaac's name in *DNB*. See [anon.], "Eighteenth-Century Maryland as Portrayed in 'Itinerant Observations' of Edward Kimber," *MdHM*, LII (1956), 315-336; F.G. Black, "Edward Kimber: Anonymous Novelist of

the Mid-Eighteenth Century," *Harvard Stud. Philol. and Lit.*, XVII (1935), 27-42; Sidney A. Kimber, "The 'Relation of a Late Expedition to St. Augustine,' with Biographical and Bibliographical Notes on Isaac and Edward Kimber," *PBSA*, XXVIII (1934), 81-96, etc. The "Itinerant Observations" was reprinted in full in *Coll. Ga. Hist. Soc.*, IV, pt. 2 (Savannah, 1878), and issued separately as a pamphlet of 64 pages.

156. For a list of his voluminous publications see Sidney A. Kimber (note 155 above), pp. 90-94, though the list is by no means complete. Edward Kimber wrote a number of novels with American settings, presumably based upon his own experiences, containing some attempts at Negro dialect.

157. Richard Hofstadter, *The Progressive Historians: Turner, Beard, and Parrington* (New York, 1968), p. 6.

158. *History of Historical Writing in America*, pp. 11-12.

159. For Smith material, primary and secondary, see the bibliography above. See especially Jarvis M. Morse, "John Smith and His Critics," and Barbour's essays and books.

160. Court for Virginia, in Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, I, 451-452.

161. *Works*, II, 385.

162. Another extremist faction did want royal control. E.g., see Davis, *George Sandys*, passim, and Barbour, *Three Worlds*, passim.

163. Smith, *Works*, II, 622.

164. *Ibid.*, II, passim (see index).

165. *Ibid.*, II, 533.

166. *Ibid.*, II, 948, in *Advertisements For the Unexperienced Planters . . .* (1631).

167. *Ibid.*, II, 526. See also II, 488, conclusion of Book III.

168. *Ibid.*, II, 936, *Advertisement For the Unexperienced Planters . . .*

169. *Ibid.*, 344, *A Map of Virginia*, Bk. I, rev. for *Generall Historie*. These words echo earlier remarks by Ralph Lane and parallel later comments by contemporaries and successors in the colony.

170. For secondary and primary materials on the rebellion, see the bibliography above, which presents only the most significant items. Two elegies are included in the "Burwell Papers." For Berkeley's comment, see Richard S. Dunn, "Seventeenth-Century English Historians of America," p. 210. Berkeley also upbraided his own followers for cowardice.

171. See in bibliography above the books by Wertenbaker, Washburn, and Morton. Washburn's "documentation" in another volume is yet to appear. Morton has used much of Washburn's "proof" (in manuscript) for his own study and has arrived at conclusions somewhat closer to Wertenbaker's. Clearly the end is not yet.

172. The two have been printed together by Harry Finestone, and T. P. Abernethy has edited the second pamphlet. See bibliography above.

173. Published in the Aspinwall Papers (see bibliography above). Washburn, *The Governor and the Rebel*, pp. 171-172, gives the evidence of Sherwood's authorship and promises a more complete study of Sherwood, an interesting figure. Sherwood fled the country soon after writing the tract and

returned with the King's commissioners in 1677. Thenceforward he was an enemy of Berkeley, for complex reasons.

174. Originally published in *VMHB*, IV (1896), 117-154, and then in Andrews, ed., *Narratives of the Insurrections*, pp. 105-111. An additional commissioner who did not sign the document was Colonel Herbert Jeffreys.

175. Mrs. Cotton's letter appeared first in the *Richmond Enquirer* of September 12, 1804, and then in Force, *Tracts*, I, ix. Her epistle was written to a Mr. C.H. (possibly Christopher Harris) in Northamptonshire in England, a man who had at one time lived in Virginia. For identification of this lady and of her husband, John Cotton, as author of the next work to be discussed, see Jones, *Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 108-109, and especially the several articles on the subject by Jay B. Hubbell, the most complete and recent being "John Cotton, the Poet-Historian of Bacon's Rebellion." Jones is skeptical about the writer's being a woman, suggesting that probably some male literary hack awkwardly condensed the "Burwell Papers" material. For an excellent discussion of the "Cotton" version as literature, see Ward, "Bacon's Rebellion in Literature to 1861," pp. 61-88. See also Ch. IX below.

176. *CMHS*, 2nd ser., I (1814), 27-80, and in corrected form in *PMHS* 1866-67, IX (1867), 298-342. Force, *Tracts*, I, xi, unfortunately reproduces the faulty early printing, but the later version appears in Andrews, ed., *Narratives of the Insurrections*, pp. 47-98, as "The History of Bacon's and Ingram's Rebellion."

177. T.M.'s account first appeared in the *Richmond Enquirer* of September 1, 5, and 8, 1804, from a copy of the original manuscript made by Thomas Jefferson. Rufus King, American minister in London, had bought the original at a sale and sent it to Jefferson. This original is now in the Library of Congress. The work was also published in John Holt Rice's *Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine*, III (1820), 128-149; Force, *Tracts*, I, viii; *Va. Hist. Reg.*, III (1850), 61-75, 121-136; and Andrews, ed., *Narratives of the Insurrections*, pp. 15-41. Any references are to the Andrews edition.

Thomas Mathew(s) wrote his will in England in 1706/7 (see *VMHB*, XV [1907], 57), showing among his legacies his lands in Stafford and Northumberland counties in Virginia. Mathew was still corresponding with and visiting his Stafford friend Fitzhugh as late as 1682, but in 1690 seems to have been in England. See *William Fitzhugh and His Chesapeake World, 1676-1701*, ed. Richard B. Davis (Chapel Hill, 1963), esp. pp. 101, 101n.

178. For some discussion of the influence of the Royal Society's insistence on precision and exactness on English and American prose style after about 1670 see Chs. V and VI below. Incidentally, as early as 1669 the Royal Society had sent "Directions and Inquiries Concerning Virginia recommended to Edw. Diggs, Esq. July 22. 69" with a returning colonial. The first "Inquiry" was for "a good History of the Virginia Plantation." This text is reproduced in Raymond P. Stearns, *Science in the British Colonies of America* (Urbana, 1970), pp. 694-698.

179. *History of American Literature*, II, 261-262.

180. London, 1727. In his modern edition, with introduction, Hunter D. Farish (Williamsburg, Va., 1940) discusses the lives of the three authors and the circumstances of composition. He also notes the three contemporary manuscript copies still extant, two clearly being copies of the third, the original. The authors of the different sections of the book are indicated in the original. The work was published in part in *CMHS*, 1st ser., V (1798 and 1835) and in abstract in Sainsbury, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial* . . . 1696-1697 (London, 1904). See also Bain, "Composition and Publication of *The Present State of Virginia, and the College*," pp. 31-54.

181. See Ch. V, esp. "Bishops and Commissaries."

182. This book was printed in French in 1707 (at Amsterdam and at Orléans) and in 1712 (at Amsterdam), in a revised English edition in 1722, and in America (Richmond, Va.) in 1855. A modern edition, with a useful introduction and notes by Louis B. Wright, appeared in 1947 (Chapel Hill). This is a reprint of the 1705 edition, with an appendix showing the principal differences between it and the 1722 version. In the latter Beverley softened his tone and deleted sharply critical passages and the names of those he criticized. The 1722 seems superior only for the little added information to bring affairs up to date. All references are to the Wright edition.

183. See Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History*, pp. 11-16.

184. This actually may have been out of loyalty to Berkeley. For the case of Beverley, Senior, see *William Fitzhugh and His Chesapeake World*, ed. Davis, passim, esp. pp. 114-115.

185. For a more detailed account of Beverley, see Wright's *First Gentlemen of Virginia*, pp. 286-311, and his introduction to his edition of Beverley's *History*, pp. xi-xvii. The inception of the *History* and an analysis appear in the introduction to the *History*, pp. xviii-xxvii.

186. 1741 ed., p. x. Thus Oldmixon knew Byrd during the Virginian's law-study period at the Inns of Court. That Byrd actually composed several drafts of a history is evident from his diaries and other sources. See below Ch. IX.

187. William Byrd I died in December 1704. For sketches of him, see Wright, *First Gentlemen of Virginia*, pp. 312-22; Philip A. Bruce, *The Virginia Plutarch* (2 vols., Chapel Hill, 1929), I, 135-143; Pierre Marambaud, "Colonel William Byrd I: A Fortune Founded on Smoke," *VMHB*, LXXXII (1974), 430-457; and T.J. Wertenbaker in *DAB*. Also see Earl G. Swem, comp., *Virginia Historical Index* (2 vols., Roanoke, 1934-1936). Joseph and Nesta Ewan, *John Banister and His Natural History of Virginia* (Urbana, 1970), passim, points out that Beverley and others borrowed word for word from Banister's incomplete and unpublished manuscript. Beverley probably secured the material through Banister's friend William Byrd I.

188. Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, p. 44.

189. *Ibid.*, p. 89.

190. *Ibid.*, pp. 202-209.

191. *Ibid.*, p. 264. Even though few had tenure, about this time the av-

erage clergyman had been in his parish for more than twenty years. See Ch. V below.

192. See note 182 above.

193. Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, p. 298.

194. London, 1724. Two hundred copies were printed by Joseph Sabin in 1865; but not until Richard L. Morton edited the work, with detailed introduction and notes (Chapel Hill, 1956), was there an easily available modern edition. Morton is the source of most of the information here given about Jones. For the little more there is about Jones, see the bibliography above.

195. III (London, 1707) and in the Royal Society's *Philosophical Transactions* (1694–1695); in Force, *Tracts*, III, xii, and Edmund and Dorothy Berkeley, eds., *The Reverend John Clayton*, pp. 1–30. The Berkeley edition is based on original manuscripts where available. Clayton's observations are almost entirely scientific. For more of Clayton's work see Chapter VII below.

196. For a discussion of the three, see Morton's introduction to Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, pp. 3–4.

197. See Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, pp. 20–24.

198. No known copy. See Lawrence C. Wroth, *A History of Printing in Colonial Maryland* (Baltimore, 1922), p. 191.

199. Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, p. 83.

200. See Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History*, pp. 11–16. Butterfield states (p. v) that "the tendency in many historians [is] to write on the side of Protestants and Whigs, to praise revolutions provided they are successful, to emphasize certain principles of progress in the past and to produce a story which is the ratification if not glorification of the present." He treats the subject, he declares, not as a philosophy of history but as "an aspect of the psychology of historians." Stith departs from this "tendency" in at least one respect: he praises a revolution which was *not* successful—the Virginia's Company's experiment in community-commercial society.

201. For these and other facts about Stith see *DAB* and Tsuruta, "William Stith, Historian of Colonial Virginia," as well as certain manuscript documents noted below and in Ch. VI. The Dawson Papers, LC, tell a great deal about one side of Stith and his circle of friends and enemies.

202. See Ch. III below.

203. See Ch. VI below.

204. See Davis, ed., *The Colonial Virginia Satirist*, pp. 41n–42n and *passim*, for this circle in which Stith was a leader.

205. Curiously, but not accidentally, Thomas Jefferson managed to acquire for his own great collection most of the manuscripts once belonging to his uncle Sir John, and the unique copies of the Virginia Company of London's Court Records from the Byrd Library, along with some discarded official records. Thanks to Jefferson's antiquarian and patriotic zeal, most of the manuscript materials Stith had available (though not all the public records, many of which afterwards disintegrated or were destroyed) have survived and in printed form may be compared with Stith's interpretation of them. See Hening, ed., *Statutes*; and Kingsbury, ed., *Records of the Virginia Company of*

London (4 vols., Washington, D.C., 1906-1935); also Richard B. Davis, "Jefferson as Collector of Virginiana," *SB*, XIV (1961), 117-144.

206. The book appeared in at least two Williamsburg issues in 1747, in London and Williamsburg editions in 1753, in a reprint by Sabin in 1865, and more recently in Spartanburg, S.C., in 1965 and New York in 1969 (see bibliography above). The two latter editions are listed here because each supplies helpful materials, though text pagination for all references in notes below is exactly the same.

207. Stith to Daniel Dulany, June 16, 1753, Dulany Papers, Md. Hist. Soc. The ledgers of the *Virginia Gazette* bookshop (now at the University of Virginia) reveal the names of many who purchased the book.

208. See Thomas Wilson to [William Dawson], London to Williamsburg, September 29, 1747, and George Fothergill to President Dawson of William and Mary, March 10, 1749/50, Dawson Papers, LC.

209. See note 207, and Dulany Papers, Md. Hist. Soc.

210. Darrett B. Rutman, "Introduction" to 1969 reprint, p. xiii (see bibliography above).

211. *History of the First Discovery*, p. 329.

212. *Ibid.*, p. 207. For a series of accusations against Sir Thomas Smith (Smythe), see p. 329.

CHAPTER TWO: THE INDIAN AS IMAGE AND FACTOR IN SOUTHERN COLONIAL LIFE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Though little of it is genuinely comprehensive, there is a vast amount of literature on the relation of the white man and the Indian in the colonial period. And since there is also a vast quantity of overlapping material, much of the matter discussed in other chapters of the present study, especially that in Chapter I, is concerned with white-red relationships. Perhaps the most useful single book is John R. Swanton, *The Indians of the Southeastern United States*, Bur. Amer. Ethnol., *Bulletin*, 137 (Washington, D. C., 1946). Swanton employs writings from the earliest British colonial periods and includes a useful bibliography of primary sources and criticism up to the date of publication of his book. A quite recent study, Charles Hudson, *The Southeastern Indians* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1976), is comprehensive for the period beginning with James Adair's book in 1775 and goes into some detail on certain matters here only lightly touched upon.

Almost exclusively bibliographical are such works as William N. Fenton et al., *American Indian and White Relations to 1830: Needs & Opportunities for Study* (Chapel Hill, 1957); Thomas D. Clark, ed., *Travels in the Old South: A Bibliography* (2 vols., Norman, Okla., 1956), the two volumes covering 1527-1825, with summary of content and critical commentary on each item; and Frederick J. Dockstader, comp., "The American Indian in

Graduate Study: A Bibliography of Theses and Dissertations," Mus. Amer. Indian, Heye Foundation, *Contributions*, XV (New York, 1957). Other more general bibliographies, principally but by no means entirely of colonial primary material, are some of those already mentioned for Chapter I, including Joseph Sabin et al., *Bibliotheca Americana. A Dictionary of Books Relating to America from Its Earliest Discovery to the Present Time* (29 vols., New York, 1868-1936); R.W.G. Vail, *Voice of the Old Frontier* (New York, 1949); Charles Evans et al., *American Bibliography: A Chronological Dictionary of All Books, Pamphlets, and Periodical Publications Printed in the United States . . . 1634 . . . 1820* (14 vols., Chicago and Worcester, Mass., 1903-1959); and Richard B. Davis, *American Literature through Bryant* (New York, 1969). Always useful for reference and bibliography is F.W. Hodge, ed., *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico*, Bur. Amer. Ethnol., *Bulletin*, 30, pts. 1, 2 (Washington, D.C., 1907-1910; rpt. 1912), and Harold E. Driver, *Indians of North America* (2d. ed., rev., Chicago, 1969). There are Indian sections in Lewis Leary, *Articles on American Literature, 1900-1950* (Durham, N.C., 1954) and *Articles on American Literature, 1950-1967* (Durham, N.C., 1970).

The greatest body of material on the southeastern Indian is concerned with tribes and linguistic stocks, primarily from ethnological or anthropological points of view. For the period to 1946, most of this is included in Swanton, *Southeastern Indians*, bibliography. More recent studies include David H. Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival* (Norman, Okla., 1962); Jesse O. McKee, "The Choctaw Indians: A Geographical Study in Cultural Change," *So. Q.*, IX (1971), 107-141; Henry T. Malone, *Cherokees of the Old South* (Athens, Ga., 1956); *Red, White, and Black: Symposium on Indians of the Old South*, ed. Charles M. Hudson (Athens, Ga., 1971), which includes a useful essay by William S. Pollitzer, "Physical Anthropology of Indians of the Old South," pp. 31-43, though it does little more than mention the colonial commentators, and John H. Petersen, Jr., "The Indians of the Old South," pp. 116-133; James Mooney, *Myths of the Cherokee*, Bur. Amer. Ethnol., *19th Ann. Report*, 1897-1898, pt. 2 (Washington, D.C., 1900), 3-576; and various other studies by Swanton.

In early Maryland, George Alsop and Father Andrew White were concerned with these matters. More recently David I. Bushnell has written much of tribes in the whole Chesapeake area in a dozen journals. See also Raphael Semmes, "Aboriginal Maryland, 1608-1689," *MdHM*, XXIV (1929), 157-171. In colonial Virginia almost all observers touched on these matters: there are descriptions of the Algonkians from a dozen men, such as those of the Saponis from John Fontaine and William Byrd, among others, with vocabularies from Hariot and Smith and Strachey on. Typical recent studies are the several by Maurice A. Mook in *WMQ* (2) and the *Amer. Anthropologist*; Frank G. Speck, *Chapters on the Ethnology of the Powhatan Tribes of Virginia*, Mus. Amer. Indian, Heye Foundation, *Ind. Notes and Manuscripts*, I (1928), 225-455; and Theodore Stern, "Chickahominy: The Changing Cul-

ture of a Virginia Indian Community," *PAPS*, XCVI (1952), 157-225. Douglas L. Rights, *The American Indian in North Carolina* (2nd ed., Winston-Salem, 1957), appears to be the standard study for that colony. Many of the South Carolina contemporary observers and later commentators are mentioned in other relationships below, but one must notice especially here Chapman J. Milling, *Red Carolinians* (Chapel Hill, 1940), and the McDowell-edited documents cited more fully below. Though not pointed toward ethnological or anthropological matters, John P. Corry's *Indian Affairs in Georgia, 1732-1756* (Philadelphia, 1936) is essential for the youngest southern colony even here.

A few twentieth-century books and essays are concerned primarily or solely with the Indian in literature. Among the most useful are Benjamin Bissell, *The American Indian in English Literature of the Eighteenth Century* (New Haven, 1925); Gilbert Chinard, *L'Amérique et le Rêve Exotique dans la Littérature Française au XVII^e et au XVIII^e Siècle* (Paris, 1934), generally too late for use here despite its title, as is Hoxie N. Fairchild, *The Noble Savage: A Study in Romantic Idealism* (New York, 1955); Albert Keiser, *The Indian in American Literature* (New York, 1933), the first few chapters and bibliography of which are somewhat helpful, though only the first chapter is really concerned with the southern Indian; Roy H. Pearce, *The Savages of America: A Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization* (Baltimore, 1953), the ablest study to date of intellectual attitudes toward the Indian, but except for the first chapter concerned with a theory fully applicable only to a later period than the colonial (for the best critical explanation of Pearce's thesis regarding "savagism," see W. N. Fenton's review of the book in *WMQ* [3], X [1953], 650-652); Pearce's "The Significances of the Captivity Narrative," *AL*, XIX (1947), 1-20; and F.C. ten Kate, "The Indian in Literature," *Smithsonian Institution, Annual Report 1921* (Washington, D.C., 1922), pp. 507-528, a pioneer brief survey.

Two of the ablest studies of the southern and eastern Indian with whom the colonial southern settler came into intimate contact were actually written "on the scene" before 1763. One of these, Cadwallader Colden's *The History of the Five Nations* [of the Iroquois] (orig. ed. New York, 1727; rpt. London, 1747, with additions; ed. used here 2 vols., New York, 1902), contains much on treaties between southern colonies and their tributary Indians in the eighteenth century. The other, Adair's *The History of the American Indians Particularly those Nations adjoining to the Mississippi East and West Florida, Georgia, South and North Carolina, and Virginia* (London, 1775), is generally acknowledged to be the best study of the North American Indian during the colonial period. Modern editions of this history are the facsimile rpt. by Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr. (New York 1968), and—most useful—that of Samuel C. Williams (Johnson City, Tenn., 1930), with introd. and notes. Despite his title, Adair devotes himself almost entirely to the southeastern red man, revealing a perspective critical attitude toward and discussion of white-Indian relations.

General studies containing at least some material on the southern Indian and his white neighbor are of interest for varying reasons. The first thirty-five pages of Robert S. Cotterill, *The Southern Indians: The Story of the Civilized Tribes before Removal* (Norman, Okla., 1954), are pertinent. Verner W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier 1670-1732* (Durham, N.C., 1929), and Wesley F. Craven, *The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century* (Baton Rouge, 1949; rev. biblio., 1970), provide facts, perceptive interpretations, and immensely reliable footnotes or bibliography. See also William T. Hagan, *American Indians* (Chicago, 1961), which connects Indian-white relations with major streams of American history; A. Irving Hallowell, "The Backwash of the Frontier: The Impact of the Indian on American Culture," in *The Frontier Perspective*, eds. W.D. Wyman and C.B. Kroeber (Madison, Wis., 1957), pp. 229-258; Michael Kraus, "Literary Relations between Europe and America in the Eighteenth Century," *WMQ* (3), I (1944), 210-234, and *The Atlantic Civilization: Eighteenth-Century Origins* (Ithaca, 1949); Nancy O. Lurie, "Indian Cultural Adjustment to European Civilization," in *Seventeenth-Century America: Essays in Colonial History*, ed. James M. Smith (Chapel Hill, 1959), pp. 36-60; Russell B. Nye, "Parkman, Red Fate, and White Civilization," in *Essays on American Literature in Honor of Jay B. Hubbell*, ed. Clarence Gohdes (Durham, N.C., 1967), pp. 152-163; Howard Peckham and Charles Gibson, eds., *Attitudes of Colonial Powers toward the American Indian* (Salt Lake City, 1969); Francis P. Prucha, *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962); Henry Nash Smith, *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970), in most respects covering too late a period to be of much use here; B.B. Thatcher, *Indian Biography; or, An Historical Account of Those Individuals Who Have Been Distinguished Among the North American Natives as Orators, Warriors, Statesmen, and Other Remarkable Characters* (2 vols., New York, 1832); and Louis B. Wright, *The Atlantic Frontier: Colonial American Civilization [1607-1763]* (New York, 1947), and *The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, 1607-1763* (New York, 1957).

Recent general studies published after the original draft of this chapter had been written but used with profit in its revisal are Wilcomb E. Washburn, *The Indian in America*, New American Nation Series (New York, 1975), a general study by this distinguished authority, as the title suggests, and only occasionally applicable to the present study; Gary B. Nash, *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1974), and "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind," *WMQ* (3), XXIX (1972), 197-230, the latter a succinct and suggestive analysis of the reasoning behind white concepts of red neighbors; and Wilbur R. Jacobs, *Dispossessing the American Indian: Indians and Whites on the Colonial Frontier* (New York, 1972), and *Wilderness Politics and Indian Gifts: The Northern Colonial Frontier, 1748-1763* (Lincoln, Neb., 1966), especially useful for presentation of the details and facts behind treaty-making, naturally not all pertinent to southern negotiations or to some of the other negotiations in which southern commissioners participated.

PRINCIPAL PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOURCES

Primary documents in some cases unfortunately still exist only in manuscript, as in certain records of individual colonies to be found in Great Britain or in the state archives of the appropriate colony, with a few others scattered at random. The notes below will refer to these. But in the twentieth century an enormous number of southern colonial records concerning the Indian have been or are now being printed for the first time or in expanded and corrected form. These will be mentioned by colonies. A number of collections touch upon more than one colony: for example, Alexander Brown, ed., *Genesis of the United States* (2 vols., Boston, 1890) though primarily concerned with Virginia, touches upon her neighbors. More general are Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and Other Papers* (4 vols., rpt. Gloucester, Mass., 1963), a magnificent collection representing almost all the colonies; Richard Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations Voiages & Discoveries of the English Nation* (2 vols., rpt. from 1589 ed. at Cambridge, England, 1965). and *Principal Navigations . . .* (rpt. from 3 vols. 1598-1600 ed. in 2 vols., Glasgow, 1903); [Edward Kimber], *Itinerant Observations in America* (orig. London Mag. 1745-1746); rpt. in *Coll. Ga. Hist. Soc.*, IV (Savannah, 1878), 1-64, and issued separately as a pamphlet; Charles H. Lincoln, ed., *Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699* (New York, 1913); Newton D. Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies . . .* (New York, 1916); John Oldmixon, *The British Empire in America* (2 vols., London, 1741); Samuel Purchas, *Hakluytus Posthumous or Purchas His Pilgrimes* (orig. ed. 4 vols., London, 1625; now in 20 vols., Glasgow, 1905-1907); W. Noel Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col. Series, America and West Indies, 1574-1736* (42 vols. to date, London, 1862-1953); Reuben G. Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (73 vols., Cleveland, 1896-1901); Samuel C. Williams, ed., *Early Travels in the Tennessee Country, 1540-1800* (Johnson City, Tenn., 1928).

There are three or four especially useful collections of source materials on the southern Indian of the Roanoke Island period. The 1589 Hakluyt noted just above and Theodor deBry, *America*, Part I (in Latin, Frankfort, 1590) are among the earliest. Both editions of Hakluyt given above contain Thomas Hariot's *A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia*, a vital primary source also printed in quarto (London, 1588; facsimile rpt. Ann Arbor, 1931) and in folio (in English, Frankfort, 1590); rpt. London, 1893). Though Stephen Loran's *New World: The First Pictures of America* (New York, 1946) is easier of access for pictures of Carolina coastal Indians, Paul Hulton et al., eds., *American Drawings of John White, 1577-1590* (2 vols., London and Chapel Hill, 1964) is far more accurate and comprehensive. The standard edition of pre-1590 English-American colonial documents is Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages, 1584-1590* (2 vols., London, 1955), with perceptive and learned headnotes and footnotes.

For Virginia, several bibliographies cite Indian material: Lester J. Cappon and Stella Duff, comps., *The Virginia Gazette Index, 1736-1780* (2 vols.,

Williamsburg, 1950); Earl G. Swem et al., eds., *A Selected Bibliography of Virginia, 1607-1699* Jamestown 350th Anniv. Hist. Booklet no. 1 (Williamsburg, 1957); and Earl G. Swem, comp., *Virginia Historical Index* (2 vols., Roanoke, 1934-1936), with column after column of Indian references in the surveyed periodicals; William C. Torrence, *A Trial Bibliography of Colonial Virginia* (2 vols., Richmond, 1908-1910). Studies include Philip L. Barbour's *Three Worlds of Captain John Smith* (Boston, 1964) and *Pocahontas and Her World* (Boston, 1970); S. R. Hendren, *Government and Religion of the Virginia Indians* (Baltimore, 1895, J.H.U. Stud. Hist. & Polit. Sci., XIII ser., XI-XII); Ben C. McCary, *Indians in Seventeenth Century Virginia*, Jamestown 350th Anniv. Hist. Booklet no. 18 (Williamsburg, 1957); Wesley F. Craven, *White, Red, and Black: The Seventeenth-Century Virginian* (Charlottesville, 1971); Richard L. Morton, *Colonial Virginia* (2 vols., Chapel Hill, 1960). Among the major primary sources are the histories by John Smith, William Strachey, Robert Beverley, Hugh Jones, and William Stith discussed at length in Chapter I above; Ralph Hamor, *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia* (London, 1615); George Percy, "A Trewe Relacyon," *Tyler's Q.*, III (1922), 259-282; Henry Timberlake, *The Memoirs of . . . 1756-1765*, ed. Samuel C. Williams (Marietta, Ga., 1948); William Byrd, *Prose Works*, ed. Louis B. Wright (Cambridge, Mass., 1966); Philip L. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages, 1606-1609* (2 vols., Cambridge, England, 1969), the best texts of all the early observers; W. W. Hening, ed., *Statutes at Large of Virginia* (13 vols., orig. ed. Philadelphia, 1823; rpt. Charlottesville, 1969); and W. V. Winfree, ed., *The Laws of Virginia . . . Supplement to Henning* (Richmond, 1971)—all most valuable for Indian land policy, social and political status, etc.; Susan M. Kingsbury, ed., *Records of the Virginia Company*, (4 vols., Washington, D. C., 1906-1935), unique printings of miscellaneous records 1606-1624 and vital accounts of the 1622 massacre; H.R. McIlwaine et al., eds., *Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia* (6 vols. to date, Richmond, 1925-1966), *Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia* (3 vols., Richmond, 1918-1919), *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia, 1622 . . . 1676* (Richmond, 1924), and *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia [1659 to 1765]* (13 vols., Richmond, 1909-1915); *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith*, ed. A.C. Bradley and Edward Arber (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1910); Lyon G. Tyler, ed., *Narratives of Early Virginia, 1606-1625* (New York, 1907).

William H. Browne, C. C. Hall, et al., eds., *The Archives of Maryland* (more than sixty volumes to date, Baltimore, 1883-), is a rich source for Indian as well as other materials, and C.C. Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, (New York, 1910), is valuable for the reprinting of many rare early documents.

For North Carolina, the most complete collection of documents is William L. Saunders, ed., *Colonial Records of North Carolina* (10 vols., Raleigh, 1886-1890), though it is being superseded by Mattie E.E. Parker et al., eds., *Colonial*

Records of North Carolina (n. s., Vol. I, Raleigh, 1963). Alexander S. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina 1650-1708* (New York, 1911), is valuable as a collection of rare pamphlets frequently concerned with the Indian man in both Carolinas. John Lawson, *A New Voyage to Carolina* [1709], ed. Hugh T. Lefler (Chapel Hill, 1967), has much on the Indian and a valuable introduction. John Brickell's *The Natural History of North-Carolina* (Dublin, [1737]), facsimile with introd. by Carol Urness (New York, 1969), though its material is largely from Lawson, has some additional aboriginal data. Among modern histories with some Indian-white material, see Hugh T. Lefler and Albert R. Newsome, *North Carolina: The History of a Southern State* (rev. ed., Chapel Hill, 1963).

Contemporary accounts touching on the red man in South Carolina include the James Glen and Milligen-Johnston accounts in *Colonial South Carolina*, ed. Chapman J. Milling (Columbia, 1951). J.H. Easterby et al. edited *The Colonial Records of South Carolina*, Series I (10 vols., Columbia, 1951-1974), which contain some Indian material; but far more useful is William L. McDowell, Jr., ed., *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs . . . , in Colonial Records of South Carolina . . . , 1710-1718; 1750-1754; 1754-1765* (3 vols., Columbia, 1955, 1958, 1970), materials referred to many times in this chapter. Also among early sources is Alexander Hewatt's *Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia* (2 vols., London, 1779). Frank J. Klingberg's editions of the S.P.G. letters of two clergymen reveal much of the Indians with whom they came in contact: *Carolina Chronicle: The Papers of Commissary Gideon Johnston, 1707-1716* (Berkeley, 1946) and *The Carolina Chronicle of Dr. Francis LeJau, 1706-1717* (Berkeley, 1956).

Chapman J. Milling's *Red Carolinians* (Chapel Hill, 1940) is the standard study of tribes of the lower southeast. As items listed below will indicate, there are many other specialized studies of various phases of southeastern red-white relations. For Georgia, the book by Edward Kimber noted above is a good general contemporary account; also useful is the Indian chapter in Trevor R. Reese's more recent *Colonial Georgia: A Study in British Imperial Policy in the Eighteenth Century* (Athens, Ga., 1963).

Contemporary white conceptions of the Indians in general run from Purchas to Henry Timberlake, including all the major historians and observers, most of them mentioned in Chapter I above, and relatively minor commentators such as Henry Spelman, John Banister, Peter Arundel, and others noted in text and notes for the present chapter.

The Indian as Noble Savage. See the works referred to above by Bissell, Chinard, Crane, Fairchild, Fenton, Hallowell, Kimber, Kraus, Nye, Pearce, Peckham and Gibson, and perhaps some others. See also F.J. Klingberg, "The Noble Savage as Seen by Missionaries of the S.P.G. in New York," *HMPEC*, VIII, (1939), 128-165, and L.O. Saum, "The Fur Trader and the Noble

Savage," *AQ*, IV (1963), 554-571. Among colonials, John Smith, Ralph Hamor, Mark Catesby, Robert Beverley, and a score of others occasionally saw the Indian as actually or potentially in this capacity, as text and notes indicate.

THE RED MAN AS HIS WHITE NEIGHBOR SAW HIM

Divergent attitudes regarding *Indian personal character* begin in 1585 with Lane and Hariot and continue far past the chronological limits of this study. For sources, see text and notes for the present chapter. *Indian modes of living* are discussed by almost every contemporary observer: besides those already mentioned are the later William Bartram, in *Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida, the Cherokee Country . . .* (Philadelphia, 1791), which contains what has been called the classic description of the southeastern Indian; Mark Catesby, *The Natural History of Carolina, Florida, and the Bahama Islands* (2 vols., London, 1731-1743); *The King of Beggars: Bamfylde-Moore Carew*, ed. C.H. Wilkinson (Oxford, 1931), pp. 172-186 ff.; and others mentioned in text or notes. The *portraits of many individual Indians* are drawn from an enormous variety of sources from Manteo in 1585 to Ostenaco in 1761. *Typical or individual personal appearance* is recorded by pre-English observers such as Garcilaso de la Vega and Laudonnière, by Purchas and Hakluyt, who recorded other men's impressions, and in Virginia alone by British colonists from White and Hariot to trader Adair or soldier Timberlake. Most of the Maryland records of appearance are included in Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*. The North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia observers have already been noted or will be in text or notes, and there are dozens if not scores for all except Georgia. These personal impressions regarding the southeastern Indian far surpass in quantity, and perhaps in quality, all those for the northeastern and middle colonies combined.

Indian *dances* and *dancing* are commented upon from Hariot in 1585 to Timberlake in the 1760s, with varying explanations of their nature and significance. See also Mary Austin, "American Indian Dance Drama," *YR*, XIX (1929-1930), 732-745, though most of this article concerns the dancing of the national period. Aboriginal *music* interested the British colonial from the beginning, but relatively little has been written concerning it in recent times. See the general studies already noted by Adair, Hallowell, McCary, and Swanton mentioned above. See also Francis Densmore, "Choctaw Music," *Bur. Amer. Ethnol., Bulletin*, 136 (1943), 115-158 (Anthrop. Paper No. 28); Edward Lueders, "Color Symbolism in the Songs of the American Indians," *WHR*, XII (1958), 115-120. On Indian *medicine* there is a good deal scattered through the colonial printed archives already mentioned, and again scores of colonial observers having something to say about it. Besides Adair and Swanton, see Wyndham B. Blanton, *Medicine in Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (Richmond, 1930) and *Medicine in Virginia in the Eighteenth Century* (Richmond, 1931); John Duffy, "Medicine and Medical Practice

among Aboriginal American Indians," in *History of American Medicine: A Symposium*, ed. Felix Marti-Ibañez (New York, 1958), pp. 15-33; James Mooney and Frans M. Olbrechts, *The Swimmer Manuscript: Cherokee Formulas and Medicinal Prescriptions*, Bur. Amer. Ethnol., *Bulletin*, 99 (Washington, D.C., 1932); Raymond P. Stearns, *Science in the British Colonies of America* (Urbana, 1970); Joseph I. Waring, *History of Medicine in South Carolina* (Columbia, 1964). Aboriginal *sports and games*, a part of intellectual as well as physical and social life, are described by many contemporary observers and discussed more recently by Swanton and McCary. Customs regarding *marriage*, *burial*, and *huskanawing* (adolescent initiation into manhood) appear frequently in colonial accounts and are considered in detail by Swanton and to some extent by McCary.

The southeast as an actual or potential red as well as white man's *utopia* is frequently suggested by many observers from Harriot to Adair in the colonial period. Sir Alexander Cuming's attempt to establish an ideal community is discussed in Crane, *The Southern Frontier*, pp. 276-280; Milling, *Red Carolinians*, pp. 275-277; Cotterill, *The Southern Indians*, pp. 24-25; Carolyn Thomas Foreman, *Indians Abroad, 1493-1938* (Norman, Okla., 1943), pp. 44-54; Samuel G. Drake, *Early History of Georgia, Embracing the Embassy of Sir Alexander Cuming to the Country of the Cherokees, In the Year 1730* (Boston, 1872). Cuming's "Journal" appears in Williams, ed., *Early Travels*, pp. 113 ff. The fantastic Christian Gottlieb Priber's projected "communistic" experiment among the Cherokees is discussed in Cotterill, *The Southern Indians*, pp. 26 ff.; in Wright, *The Atlantic Frontier*, pp. 296-299; at length in Verner W. Crane, "A Lost Utopia of the First American Frontier," *Sew Rev.*, XXVII (1919), 48-61; and in Milling, *Red Carolinians*, pp. 277-280. See also André Lichtenberger, *Le Socialisme Utopique: Etudes sur quelques précurseurs inconnus du socialisme* (Paris, 1898), pp. 217-218.

White colonials' ideas of the *origin of the red men* include (though there are several earlier) Spanish-Portuguese theories such as those of Joseph de Acosta (1590), Gregorio Garcia (1607), and Antonio Herrera y Tordosillas (1601-1613) and early British theories of Stephen Batman (1582), Nicholas Fuller (1650), Richard Hakluyt (1589, 1598-1600), and Samuel Purchas (1613, 1617), with others. For a succinct summary see Nash, "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind," pp. 197-207. Among the British who came to southeastern North America and at least comment on theories of origin are Strachey, John Smith, Lawson, Hugh Jones, Milligen-Johnston, and most elaborately (with his Jewish-origin thesis), James Adair. An anonymous essay begun but never completed on "The First Peopling of America" appeared in the *South-Carolina Gazette*, October 6, 1758; it devotes some attention to the Carthaginian theory. Jefferson in his *Notes on the State of Virginia* was to advocate the long-held Bering Straits-Alaska migration theory still generally accepted.

Among recent commentators already mentioned are Cotterill, Lurie, Mil-

ling, and Mooney (the last in *Myths of the Cherokees*). Don Cameron Allen's *The Legend of Noah: Renaissance Rationalism in Arts, Science, and Letters* (Urbana, 1948), has much on America. Other useful studies are Theodore Hornberger, "Acosta's *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias*: A Guide to the Source and Growth of the American Scientific Tradition," *Texas Studies in English*, XIX (1939), 139-162; Lee E. Huddleston, *Origins of the American Indians: European Concepts, 1492-1729* (Austin, 1967); Alfred L. Kroeber, "North America Indians," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Chicago, 1946), XVI, 504-505; Samuel E. Morison, *Oxford History of the American People* (New York, 1965); Robert Wauchope, *Lost Tribes and Sunken Continents: Myth and Method in the Study of American Indians* (Chicago, 1962); Justin Winsor, "Pre-Columbian Migrations" and "The Progress of Opinion Respecting the Origin and Antiquity of Man in America," in *Narratives and Critical History of America* (8 vols., Boston and New York, 1889), I, 45 ff., 368 ff.; Clark Wissler, "The American Indian and the American Philosophical Society," *PAPS*, LXXXVI (1942), 189-204.

As a Renaissance or Enlightenment man of enormous curiosity and sometimes as a pious Christian, the southern colonial observer was fascinated by *aboriginal religion*, including temples, burial customs, idols, devil worship, beliefs as to origins and afterlife, and supposed analogies to Christianity. All the observers, including the major historians, had something to say about it, usually a great deal. See also Swanton, McCary, and Hendren. Indian traditions of a Deluge are commented upon at least as early as George Sandys in his 1632 edition of Ovid's *Metamorphosis*. Allen, Huddleston, and Mooney all consider these beliefs and their possible sources. Creation myths (see also *origin of the red men* above) are discussed from Henry Spelman in Purchas (see Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*) to the Georgia mid-eighteenth century (Egmont Papers, Phillips Coll., Univ. of Georgia, vol. 14201).

The other side of this interest in religion, the *conversion* and education of the Indians, one of the avowed major intentions in colonization, receives even more attention. Intention, method, and accomplishment are discussed from the beginning to the end of the period by major and minor writers, including historians, clergy, and officials of the colonies. Collections such as Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, Kingsbury, ed., *Records of the Virginia Company*, the individual colonies' official published records and statutes already noted, and the collected "narratives" of early Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas contain a great deal. Education in the South is inextricably intermingled with conversion for the Indian, from the schools and university at Henrico in 1619 to Whitefield's orphanage or William and Mary's Indian school in the eighteenth century. Modern studies and editions of early work are especially revealing. Among those already mentioned are Craven, *The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, Hening, ed., *Statutes*, Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle* (both works), Wright, *Cultural Life of the American Colonies*. Significant also are John R. Alden, "British Mis-

sionaries to the Southern Indians, 1754-1775," in *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier . . . , 1754-1775* (Ann Arbor, 1944), pp. 351-355; B.U. Campbell, "Early Christian Missions among the Indians of Maryland," *MdHM*, I (1906), 293-316; Wesley F. Craven, "Indian Policy in Early Virginia," *WMQ* (3), I (1944), 65-82; Leonidas Dodson, *Alexander Spotswood, Governor of Colonial Virginia* (Philadelphia, 1932), especially for Christian education; Walter Havighurst, *Alexander Spotswood, Portrait of a Governor* (Williamsburg and New York, 1967); Frank J. Klingberg, "Early Attempts at Indian Education in South Carolina, a Documentary," *SCHM*, LXI (1960), 1-10; William S. Perry, ed., *Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church* (5 vols., privately printed, 1870-1878), especially vols. I and IV, on Virginia and Maryland respectively; William Richardson, "An Account of the Presbyterian Mission to the Cherokees, 1757-1759," ed. Samuel C. Williams, in *Tenn. Hist. Mag.* (2), I, (1931), 125-137, and Richardson's manuscript diary, "An Account of my Proceedings . . ." signed and dated 1759 (original in NYPL; copy in Univ. of Illinois Library); W. Stitt Robinson, Jr., "Indian Education and Missions in Colonial Virginia," *JSH*, XVIII (1952), 152-168; Wilcomb E. Washburn, ed., *The Indian and the White Man*, Documents in American Civilization Series, Anchor Books (Garden City, N.Y., 1964), esp. pp. 161-218; Larzer Ziff, ed., *John Cotton on the Churches of New England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), on Maryland Catholics' mode of converting Indians in 1640.

EFFECTS OF THE SOUTHERN FRONTIER ON RED AND WHITE

General studies already mentioned containing much of this subject are Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier*; Crane, *The Southern Frontier*; Hallowell, "Backwash of the Frontier"; Corkran, *Cherokee Frontier*; Wright, *Cultural Life of the American Colonies*; and the studies by Nash and Jacobs noted above in this bibliography. Others include Louis DeVorse, Jr., *The Indian Boundary in the Southern Colonies, 1763-1775* (Chapel Hill, 1966); Wilbur R. Jacobs, ed., *Indians of the Southern Colonial Frontier: The Edmond Atkin Report and Plan of 1755* (Columbia, 1954), and his "British-Colonial Attitudes and Policies toward the Indian in the American Colonies," in *Attitudes of Colonial Powers toward the American Indian*, eds. Peckham and Gibson, pp. 81-106; Robert L. Meriwether, *The Expansion of Upper South Carolina, 1729-1765* (Kingsport, Tenn., 1940); Otis K. Rice, *The Allegheny Frontier: West Virginia Beginnings, 1730-1830* (Lexington, Ky., 1970); Wilcomb E. Washburn, "The Moral and Legal Justifications for Dispossessing the Indians," in *Seventeenth-Century America*, ed. Smith, pp. 15-32. See also Craven, *The Southern Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History* (4 vols., New Haven, 1934-1938), and the collected documents of the five colonies.

Policy regarding the frontier and its inhabitants and land is suggested by almost every contemporary commentator discussed here and in Chapter I

above. Pseudonymous newspaper writers such as "Americanus" in the *Maryland Gazette* or the "Virginia Centinel" in the *Virginia Gazette* are to be added to the list. John Smith and John Martin in early Virginia, James Glen and Christopher Gadsden and Henry Laurens in later South Carolina comment on the subject. See also Lurie, "Indian Cultural Adjustment," in *Seventeenth-Century America*, ed., Smith pp. 33-60, and again the multiple collected primary sources. Directly pertinent are Corry, *Indian Affairs in Georgia, 1732-1756*; W.F. Craven, "Indian Policy in Early Virginia," *WMQ* (3), I (1944), 65-82; Dodson, *Spotswood*, pp. 186 ff.; Peckham and Gibson, eds., *Attitudes of the Colonial Powers toward the American Indian*; Francis P. Prucha, *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962); Hugh F. Rankin, *Criminal Trial Proceedings in the General Court of Colonial Virginia* (Williamsburg, 1965); Reese, *Colonial Georgia*; W. Stitt Robinson, Jr., "Virginia and the Cherokees: Indian Policy from Spotswood to Dinwiddie," in *The Old Dominion: Essays for Thomas Perkins Abernethy*, ed. Darrett B. Rutman (Charlottesville, 1964), pp. 21-40.

The special *problem of the trader* is a major item of frontier policy from 1621 to 1763, with an enormous amount of primary material in collections already cited. Studies throwing some light on the subject include Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier*; De Vorsey, *The Indian Boundary*; Francis Jennings, "The Indian Trade of the Susquehanna Valley," *PAPS*, CX (1966), 406-424; Mary U. Rothrock, "Carolina Traders among the Overhill Cherokees, 1690-1760," *E. Tenn. Hist. Soc. Publications*, I (1929), 3-18; Saum, "The Fur Trader and the Noble Savage"; M. Eugene Sirmans, *Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1665-1763* (Chapel Hill, 1966); Swanton and Wright, *The Atlantic Frontier*. Especially enlightening are "Letters from John Stewart to William Dunlop [1690-1693]," ed. J.G. Dunlop and Mabel L. Webber, *SCHM*, XXXII (1931), 1-33, 81-114, 170-174; the documents for South Carolina Indian affairs edited by McDowell; and Adair's *History*. See also the studies by Nash and Jacobs above in this bibliography.

Policy regarding acquisition of Indian lands has been a major problem from Roanoke Island to contemporary Alaska. In the southern colonies it varied from decade to decade and from colony to colony. Our most enlightening contemporary records are the collections of the individual colonies' legislative, judicial, and executive enactments. See also W. Stitt Robinson, Jr., *Mother Earth: Land Grants in Virginia, 1607-1699*, Jamestown 350th Anniv. Hist. Booklet no. 12 (Williamsburg, 1957); Washburn, "The Moral and Legal Justifications for Dispossessing the Indians"; Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier*; De Vorsey, *The Indian Boundary*; other items under general studies of the effects of the frontier; and certain of the general studies mentioned above and cited in the notes below. Though his investigation is confined almost entirely to New England, Francis Jennings in *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (Chapel Hill, 1975), offers damning indictments, with the evidence, of northeastern

American Englishmen's greed and unscrupulous acquisition of Indian land, indictments which to some extent hold also for southern land policy and its results.

The Indian agent does not really appear until the eighteenth century, but some documentary material and a few studies have been published indicating something of his function and significance. See David B. Trimble, "Christopher Gist and the Indian Service in Virginia, 1757-1759," *VMHB*, LXIV (1956), 143-165; Corry, *Indian Affairs in Georgia*; and Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier*. South Carolina has published more on this subject than other southern colonies: the three volumes of documents edited by McDowell contain much on the matter, and Jacobs, ed., *Indians of the Frontier: Edmond Atkin Report*, is entirely concerned with the agent. Useful also are the journals of George Chicken, John Herbert, and Tobias Fitch listed in the notes below; Klingberg's two editions called *Carolina Chronicle*; Meriwether, *Expansion of Upper South Carolina*; and Richard P. Sherman, *Robert Johnson, Proprietary and Royal Governor of South Carolina* (Columbia, 1966), which is concerned with establishing a board of Indian commissioners to deal with Indians' problems.

The frontier Indian's view of the white man and his civilization is hard to come by, but from Powhatan and Pocahontas through Tomocomo and Tomochichi to Cherokee chiefs and warriors such as Ostenaco, there are hints and occasional "quoted" statements. Pertinent secondary material includes Bissell, *The American Indian in English Literature*; Cotterill, *The Southern Indians*; Crane, *The Southern Frontier*; Drake, *Early History of Georgia*, . . . *Sir Alexander Cumming*; Foreman, *Indians Abroad*, 1493-1938.

Accounts of southern frontier *captivity and torture*, though never so numerous or popular as those of New England, indicate nevertheless a good deal about Indian-white relationships, beginning with the most famous of them all, John Smith's captivity under Powhatan. In the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library are printed versions of alleged southern captivities including those written by Samuel Bownas (London, 1756), John Davis (London, 1806, etc.), Wills De Hass (Philadelphia, 1851), Jonathan Dickinson (Philadelphia, 1699), Richard Falconer (London, 1720), John A. McClung (Maysville, Ky., 1832), Charles Saunders (Birmingham, Eng., 1763), and Col. James Smith (Lexington, Ky., 1799); the most famous of southern eighteenth-century captivities—that of Mary Ingles, whose story was told by descendants in the nineteenth century—was recently retold by M. Clifford Harrison, "The Charmed Life of Mary Ingles," *Va. Cavalcade*, X, No. 2 (1960), 34-41, and Gary Jennings, "An Indian Captivity," *Amer. Heritage*, XIX (Aug., 1968), 64-80. For some others see Richard Van Der Beets, ed., *Held Captive by Indians: Selected Narratives*, 1642-1836 (Knoxville, Tenn., 1973).

Bibliographies including southern captivity and torture tales are Vail, *Voice of the Old Frontier*, and *Narratives of Captivity among the Indians of North America: A List of Books and Manuscripts on This Subject in the Edward E. Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library* (Chicago, [1912]), with *Supplement I*, comp. Clara A. Smith (Chicago, 1928). Collections or anthologies contain-

ing one or more southern narratives include Frederick Drimmer, ed., *Scalps and Tomahawks: Narratives of Indian Captivity* [1750-1870] (New York, 1961); Newton D. Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies* (New York, 1916); Howard H. Peckham, ed., *Captured by Indians: True Tales of Pioneer Survivors* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1954); and Lewis P. Summers, *History of Southwest Virginia, 1746-1786, Washington County, 1777-1870* (orig. ed. 1907; Baltimore 1966). The captivity and/or torture of John Smith, Thomas Nairne, and John Lawson, among the most famous, are imbedded in larger histories or documents. Interesting studies are Philips D. Carleton, "The Indian Captivity," *AL*, XV (1943), 169-180, and Roy H. Pearce, "Significances of the Captivity Narrative," *AL*, XIX (1947), 1-20, the latter disagreeing with the former as to literary and historical meanings; Nathaniel Knowles, "The Torture of Captives by the Indians of Eastern North America," *PAPS*, LXXXII (1940), 151-225; John P. Hale, *Trans-Allegheny Pioneers: Historical Sketches . . . 1748 and After* (Cincinnati, 1886); and Jason A. Russell, "The Narratives of the Indian Captivities," *Education*, LI (1930), 84-88.

COMMUNICATIONS: PRACTICAL AND ARTISTIC

Communication between red man and white came primarily through the *interpreter as intermediary*; the oratory of representatives of both races in parleys, dialogues, and conferences; and the *treaties*, which employed both interpreter and orator and were art forms as well as historical documents. The various colonial printed archives contain scores of names of individual interpreters, the occasions for their services, even their method of rendering discourse. Swem, comp., *Virginia Historical Index*, alone has almost a whole column of names of interpreters and when and where they acted. The present writer has found no book or essay which is concerned with the special role, ability (including education), relative effectiveness, or tremendous significance of the work of this familiar figure. Hariot himself and Manteo were probably the first interpreters at Roanoke Island, and at the Augusta all-southern conference of 1763 there was a battery of at least six interpreters. The interpreter for the southern Indian journeyed to Great Britain or to Albany or Lancaster with him, but he appears most frequently in McDowell's *South Carolina Documents* as an Indian trader who is a part-time employee of the colonial government. He may however, have been a clergyman, a frontier scout, a half-breed chief, or a planter.

White-Indian oratory is significant from a dozen points of view. Though no comprehensive study of it has been made from literary, ethnological, or generally historical bases, there are a few books which at least touch upon the subject. Among those already mentioned are Adair's *History*, Bissell's *The American Indian in English Literature*, Thatcher's *Indian Biography*, and Washburn, ed., *The Indian and the White Man*. Louis T. Jones' *Aboriginal*

Indian Oratory: The Tradition of Eloquence among the Indians of the United States (Los Angeles, Southwest Museum, 1965) is vague, brief, and inadequate. A useful study only recently brought to the writer's attention is Wynn R. Reynolds, "Persuasive Speaking of the Iroquois Indians at Treaty Councils, 1678-1776: A Study of Techniques as Evidence in the Official Transcripts of the Interpreters' Translations," (Ph.D. diss., Columbia Univ., 1957). Suggestive and revealing are Constance Rourke, *The Roots of American Culture* (New York, 1942), pp. 61-69; and Paul A.W. Wallace, *Conrad Weiser, 1696-1760: Friend to Colonist and Mohawk* (Philadelphia, 1945). For other commentators, see text and notes in this chapter.

The treaty between the southern Indian and the white man, as in the middle colonies, is artistically and perhaps historically the most significant of the forms of communication. The collected archives and statutes of each colony contain many such documents, though too often in abstract form without record of how they were produced. Though a number of the greatest treaties were negotiated in New York and Pennsylvania, southern colonists and certain southern tribes participated most actively in them, as one learns to some extent in Dodson, *Spotswood*; Milling, *Red Carolinians*; Wallace, *Weiser*; and other studies mentioned above or in chapter notes. Rourke, *The Roots of American Culture*, considers the treaties as our first indigenous plays, as do A.M. Drummond and Richard Moody, "Indian Treaties: The First American Dramas," *QJS*, XXXIX (1953), 18-24, and Lawrence C. Wroth, "The Indian Treaty as Literature," *YR*, XVII (1928), 149-166. *Two Hundred Years of the Maryland Gazette* (Annapolis, 1927), refers to a tulip tree in present-day Annapolis and the treaty made beneath it in 1652. For bibliography, see Julian P. Boyd, ed., *Indian Treaties Printed by Benjamin Franklin, 1736-1762*, introd. Carl Van Doren (Philadelphia, 1938); and Henry F. DePuy, *A Bibliography of the English Colonial Treaties with the American Indians, Including a Synopsis of Each Treaty* (New York, 1917). Boyd includes full texts, though there are extant variant versions of the treaty negotiations, as the Williamsburg printing of the 1744 Lancaster treaty, for which see text and notes for this chapter. As noted above, Jacobs, *Dispossessing the American Indian*, pp. 41-83, gives useful details of the significance, substance, and history of many aspects of the treaty, as of wampum, covenant chain, and white gifts though little of this history-detail appears in the accounts of treaties left by southeastern participants, the prime source and subject of part of this present chapter.

NOTES

1. Pearce, *Savages*, pp. ix-xiii, 3-49, and a review of this book by William N. Fenton in *WMQ* (3), X (1953), 650-652. See also Gary B. Nash in the bibliography for this chapter. Henry Nash Smith's introduction to Cooper's *The Prairie* (New York, 1950) more or less assumes that Cooper developed

his tale with this as one of the paradoxical or contradictory philosophies of the white man regarding the frontier. See also Nye, "Parkman, Red Fate, and White Civilization," pp. 152-153.

2. The major source is naturally Swanton, *The Indians of the Southeastern United States*, with its useful bibliography, pp. 832-856. This book is referred to hereafter as Swanton. See also Fenton et al., *American Indian and White Relations to 1830*, esp. pp. 31-74, for bibliographies. More specifically useful are Milling, *Red Carolinians*; and Rights, *The American Indian in North Carolina*; the articles on Virginia Indians by David I. Bushnell and Maurice A. Mook in a number of journals, including the *American Anthropologist*, *William and Mary Quarterly* second series, and *VMHB*; and Cotterill, *The Southern Indians*.

3. There are many more tribal names and divisions and subdivisions. See the charts in Swanton, and, for South Carolina alone, Milling's *Red Carolinians*, which devotes whole chapters to tribes here unnamed. Contemporary and even modern spellings of Indian tribal and individual names vary greatly (see Swanton) and so may appear variously in this chapter, though the variants are similar enough to be recognized as representing the same person, place, or tribe.

4. For a discussion of the source and time of arrival of the southeastern Indians see Swanton, pp. 22-23, and the other studies mentioned in note 2 above.

5. Raphael Semmes, "Aboriginal Maryland," *MdHM*, XXIV (1929), 157-172, 195-209; and Milling, *Red Carolinians*, passim.

6. For the tribes of North Carolina, see Swanton, plate and chart opp. p. 10; and Rights, *The American Indian in North Carolina*, passim.

7. Swanton covers most but not all of the South Carolina tribes, though not always under the same names Milling employs in *Red Carolinians*. Both books should be consulted concerning the tribes of this province.

8. See Swanton, passim; and Reese, *Colonial Georgia*, esp. Ch. VIII, pp. 106-120.

9. See Roy H. Pearce, "Primitive Ideas in the *Faerie Queene*," *JEGP*, XLIV (1945), 131-151; Michael Kraus, "Literary Relations between Europe and America in the Eighteenth Century," *WMQ* (3), I (1944), 216-234 and Bissell, "Theories of Savage Life and the State of Nature," in *The American Indian in English Literature*, pp. 37-54.

10. Chinard, *L'Amérique et le Rêve Exotique dans la Littérature Française*, passim, esp. pp. 122-150; also, on somewhat different facets of attitude, Nash, "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind," pp. 197-230, and his *Red, White, and Black*, pp. 8-67, 121-156; and Jacobs, *Dispossessing the American Indian*, passim.

11. Wilbur R. Jacobs, "British Colonial Attitudes and Policies toward the Indian," in *Attitudes of Colonial Powers*, ed. Peckham and Gibson, p. 86. Pearce, *Savages* (p. 6), believes Harriot found the natives "interesting as they avoid beastliness, not as they approach humanity."

12. See Saum, "The Fur Trader and the Noble Savage," pp. 554-571; and Charles L. Sanford, *The Quest for Paradise: Europe and the American Moral Imagination* (Urbana, 1961), pp. vi, 3, 95, etc. For more on the Indian as noble savage, see below, "Tomo Chachi: An Ode" (1736), etc.

13. See William Randel, "Captain John Smith's Attitude toward the Indians," *VMHB*, XLVII (1939), 218-229; and Keith Glenn, "Captain John Smith and the Indians," *VMHB*, LII (1944), 228-248.

14. *A True Discourse* (London, 1615), p. 48.

15. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 281-282, 284, etc.

16. For sketches of the two, see Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 35-60. See also deBry's *America*, the 1588 and 1590 editions of Hariot's *A briefe and true report* (the latter with White's drawings); Henry Stevens, *Thomas Hariot the Mathematician and His Associates* (London, 1900); Lorant, ed., *New World*; and Hulton et al., eds., *Drawings of John White*. Both Hariot and White are in *DNB* and White in *DAB*. For Wingina, or Pemispan, as depicted by Hariot, see Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 376-379.

17. In *Purchas His Pilgrimes* (Glasgow ed.), XVIII, 403-419; Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 129-149; and separately edited by David B. Quinn (Charlottesville, 1967). This is a pruned account, cut off abruptly at the end by its first editor.

18. Printed in *Tyler's Q*, III (1922), 250-282, from a copy of the original in the possession of Lord Leconfield, now in the Virginia State Lib. It is dedicated to the author's brother, "Lord Percy."

19. For Randel's and Glenn's contrasting essays on Smith, see note 13 above; see also the various biographies of Smith, esp. John Gould Fletcher, *John Smith—Also Pocahontas* (New York, 1928); Bradford Smith, *Captain John Smith* (Philadelphia, 1953); and Philip Barbour, *The Three Worlds of Captain John Smith* (Boston, 1964). Glenn's article is primarily concerned with why Smith never determined on a policy of extermination, a study actually having only a little to do, and that obliquely, with estimates of character.

20. *The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania* (1612), ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund (London, 1953), pp. 74-76.

21. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, II, 93; III, 541-544.

22. Hening, ed., *Statutes*, I, 354, 402-403; McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes Council and Gen. Court Col. Va.*, p. 172; Williams, *Virginia: More Especially the South Part thereof . . .*, in Force, *Tracts*, III, xi, 38.

23. Catlett's letter of April 1, 1665, from Sittingbourne Parish on the Rapahannock is in the Archives of Colonial Williamsburg. For Catlett as mathematician, surveyor, militia officer, presiding justice, and a godly puritan, if not Puritan, see this letter.

24. *Archives of Md.*, V, 134-149, dated 1676 (?) in a discussion of the causes of Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia.

25. White, *A Relation*, in Force, *Tracts*, IV, xii; Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 5-16, 27-45; and Md. Fund Publication no. 7.

26. William Hilton, *A Relation of a Discovery*, in Salley, ed., *Narratives of*

Early Carolina, p. 40; Lawson, *A New Voyage to Carolina*, ed. Hugh Lefler (Chapel Hill, 1967), p. 209. Many other statements attest to the revengeful nature of the Indians.

27. Easterby, ed., *Col. Rec. S.C.*, IX, 97.

28. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.* III, 438, from Ferrar Papers, Cambridge Univ. Lib.

29. Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 243, 245, etc.; White, *A Relation*, in Force, *Tracts*, IV, xii, 23; Mary N. Stanard, *Colonial Virginia: Its People and Its Customs* (Philadelphia, 1917), pp. 236-239, for the Cherokee empress; Timberlake, *Memoirs*, ed. S.C. Williams (Marietta, Ga., 1948), p. 78; Henry Norwood, *A Voyage to Virginia*, in Force, *Tracts*, III, x, passim; two letters of 1712/13 in Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 857-870; II, 53-55; *The Treaty Held with the Indians of the Six Nations at Lancaster . . . in June, 1744 . . .* (Williamsburg, [1744]), p. x; Timberlake, *Memoirs*, ed. Williams, p. 78; Andrew Burnaby, *Travels through the Middle settlements in North America in the Years 1759 and 1760* (2nd ed., London, 1775; here cf. to 3rd ed., Appendix III, pp. 155-156), in Jane Carson, ed., *We Were There: Descriptions of Williamsburg, 1699-1859* (Charlottesville, 1965), pp. 16-17; Jacobs, ed., *Indians of the Frontier: Edmond Atkin Report*, pp. 38 ff. P.G.F. Von Reck and J. Martin Bolzcius in *An Extract of the Journals of . . .* (publ. by the S.P.C.K., London, 1734), in Force, *Tracts*, IV, v, 21 (original in Sion College Lib., 43, B. 21), testify that the Creeks are honest "Serviceable and Disinterested," gratified for kindness, affectionate toward each other, charitable to the poor and widows and orphans, and never obscene, having no words for obscenity in their language.

30. From p. 424 of the 1741 edition.

31. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 403-464; Lorant, ed., *New World*, passim; and Hulton et al., eds., *Drawings of John White*, passim. Some later copies of these and other engravings from drawings appear in Christian F. Feest, "The Virginia Indian in Pictures, 1612-1624," *Smithsonian Journal of History*, II (1966-1967), 1-30.

32. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 185-187. A second meeting is described on pp. 191-192. For something of Powhatan's ancestry, suggesting that his father was a Virginia Algonkian earlier carried away and "civilized" by the Spaniards, see Frank T. Siebert, Jr., "Resurrecting the Virginia Algonquian from the Dead: The Reconstituted and Historical Phonology of Powhatan," in *Studies in Southeastern Indian Languages*, ed. James M. Crawford (Athens, Ga., 1975), pp. 285-453. Here is shown the possibility that Powhatan and his father may have built their empire on what the latter had learned from the Spaniards during his life among them. Incidentally, this long essay is most interesting and probably significant for the student of the southeastern languages. Siebert declares that the manifest differences between Smith's and Strachey's rendition of Powhatan's dialects indicate that Algonkian speech was by no means uniform.

33. *Ibid.*, I, 193-194. See also pp. 205-206.

34. *Maps of Virginia*, in *ibid.*, II, 370, 392-395, 413-414.
35. *Ibid.*, II, 423-460.
36. Facsimile rpt. ed., foreword by A.L. Rowse (Richmond, 1957), p. 42.
37. *Historie of Travell* (1612), ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund (London, 1953), pp. 57-60. Strachey goes on to speculate that the divine right of kings is exercised even among such savage instruments as Powhatan. Here of course is the suggestion that the Carolina Algonkians were a part of Powhatan's empire in the 1580s. Philip L. Barbour, now editing Smith's writings, informs the author that he has real proof that Roanoke was indeed a part of Powhatan's empire. See the note on the emperor's jurisdiction in Morton, *Colonial Virginia*, pp. 162-163.
38. From pp. 154-155 (William Parks' Williamsburg edition of 1747). A facsimile of an issue of that edition, with the useful Morgan P. Robinson index and bibliographical note, was printed in 1965 by the Reprint Company, Spartanburg, South Carolina.
39. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 181-186, 196-198; II, 433; also Smith, *Works*, 142, 262, and *passim*.
40. Oldmixon, *British Empire in America* (2nd ed., 1741), I, 374 and Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, p. 62.
41. Boston, 1970. There are in addition several unpublished theses and the fine essay by Jay B. Hubbell, "The Smith-Pocahontas Literary Legend," in his *South and Southwest: Literary Essays and Reminiscences* (Durham, N.C., 1965), pp. 175-204. For contemporary notices of Pocahontas, see the bibliography in Barbour, *Pocahontas and Her World*, pp. 285-288, and for later secondary works and literary treatments, *ibid.*, pp. 289-299. Young's study is in *Kenyon Review*, XXIV (1962), 391-415. As far as fiction and verse are concerned, Barbour's list is by no means exhaustive, but it is essential.
42. Smith, *Works*, II, 400. Barbour very properly leaves the question somewhat open. In his *Three Worlds* he asserts his belief that Smith did not correctly interpret what was about to happen to him, even though he saw real executions all around him. In the later *Pocahontas and Her World* (pp. 24, 258), his most recent study, Barbour seems to have become convinced that the "rescue" was actually a mock-execution part of an initiation rite.
43. *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, p. 62.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 72. The editors add a long note expressing their considerable doubt that this was Smith's or Rolfe's Pocahontas.
45. Hamor, facsimile rpt., ed. Rowse, pp. 4-7, 10-11, 52-56, 57, 61; Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, pp. 38-44; Stith, *History of the First Discovery*, 1965 reprint, *passim*. Other accounts of or references to Pocahontas appear in Samuel Clarke (1678); Bishop Kennett (1711); Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, *passim*; John Rolfe to Dale (1614); and Spelman (c. 1613).
46. Smith, *Works*, II, 530-534.
47. See Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, *passim*; Percy's *A Discourse*, ed. Quinn (Charlottesville, 1957); Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, p.

137; Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, p. 65; White, *A Relation*, in Force, *Tracts*, IV, xii, 20; Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 91, 118; Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*, pp. 179-180; Force, *Tracts*, I, ii (on Oglethorpe and various chiefs). On Tomochichi, see Kimber, *Itinerant Observations*, passim; "Tomo Chachi: An Ode," in "*Georgia*," and *Two Other Occasional Poems . . . 1736*, ed. J.C. Stephens (Emory Univ. Lib., Atlanta, 1950), Sources and Reprints Ser. VI, no. 2, pp. 12-16; Hewatt, *Hist. Acct. of S.C. and Ga.*, II, 22, among others. See also Foreman, *Indians Abroad, 1493-1938*, pp. 56-64. Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, describes many of the eighteenth-century Indian leaders, as does editor McDowell in *Documents . . .*, passim.

48. Timberlake, *Memoirs*, ed. Williams, passim. For reproductions of the seven chiefs and of the portrait of Tomochichi and the boy, see Foreman, *Indians Abroad, 1493-1938*, opp. pp. 48, 56. For Reynolds and Goldsmith, see Milling, *Red Carolinians*, p. 308.

49. *Purchas His Pilgrimes* (1625, etc.) became a prime source for writers on through the nineteenth century. Even much of Smith was borrowed through Purchas rather than from Smith's own books.

50. Feest, "Virginia Indians in Pictures, 1612-1624." Engravings from oil portraits of visiting Indians sometimes appeared in eighteenth-century London publications.

51. The 1931 reprint of the 1588 quarto and 1893 reprint of the 1590 folio of Harior's report are listed above in the bibliography for this chapter. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 314-387, is the best-edited text of Harior and is followed by a useful chapter on John White and his drawings, pp. 390-464. Lane is most easily read in *ibid.*, I, 197-214, 244-294, with the editor's comments.

52. See Philip L. Barbour, "The Honorable George Percy, Pioneer Chronicler of the First Virginia Voyage," *EAL*, VI (1971), 7-17. This essay refers to a manuscript of "A Trewe Relatyon" in the Ekins Collection of the Free Library of Philadelphia. The essay has been printed (spelling differing for title), as noted above, in *Tyler's Q.*, III (1922), 259-282, from a copy of Lord Leconfield's original manuscript, and in Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 129-146, under title "George Percy's Discourse" from Hakluyt, with varying title "Observations gathered out of a Discourse. . . ."

53. The text of Spelman is in Smith, *Works*, I, ci-cxiv. Whitaker's *Good newes from Virginia* (1613) is in facsimile (New York [1936]); see also Chs. V and VI. The best edition (of one of the three extant manuscripts) of Strachey is that done by Wright and Freund. Strachey touches on the Indian briefly also in "A True Reportory" (reprinted in Louis B. Wright, ed., *A Voyage to Virginia in 1609: Two Narratives* [Charlottesville, 1964]), pp. 89-94.

54. For Smith, see Smith, *Works*; bibliography of Smith's works in Barbour, *Three Worlds*, pp. 520-521; and Wilberforce Eames, *A Bibliography of Captain John Smith* (New York, 1927). For this early period of Virginia see miscellaneous materials on the Indians from largely hitherto unpublished

materials in Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, passim. For Fleet, Neill, *The Founders of Maryland* (Albany, 1876), pp. 19-37, and *Northern Neck of Va. Hist. Mag.*, VI (1956), 479-489. Norwood is reproduced in Force, *Tracts*, III, x; Bland appears in a facsimile edition (Ann Arbor, 1954). Yeardley's letter, often reproduced, is perhaps most easily available in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 21-29. Bland is also in *First Explorations of the Trans-Allegheny Region by the Virginians, 1650-1674*, ed. Clarence W. Alvord and Lee Bidgood (Cleveland, 1912); see also Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col.*, pp. 270-271, and *The Discoveries of John Lederer*, ed. D. L. Rights and William P. Cumming (Charlottesville, 1958), passim.

55. Glover, in *Philos. Trans.*, XI, 623-626; Clayton, in *ibid.*, XLI (1739), 143-162, the latter reprinted with annotation in Edmund and Dorothy Berkeley, *The Reverend John Clayton: A Parson with a Scientific Mind* (Charlottesville, 1965), pp. 21-39. The Banister manuscript, Bodleian Sherard 26, pp. 11-32, is now printed in Joseph and Nesta Ewan, *John Banister and His Natural History of Virginia* (Urbana, 1970), pp. 372-401. For the unknown clergyman, see Stanley Pargellis, ed., "Indians in Virginia," in *WMQ* (3), XVI (1959), 228-243. For Durand, see *A Huguenot Exile in Virginia*, ed. Gilbert Chinard, from the Hague ed. of 1687 (New York, 1934), pp. 152-154.

56. See Beverley, *History and Present State*, ed. Louis B. Wright (Chapel Hill, 1947), p. 233. In this edition, there are engravings by Simon Gribelin from deBry's 1590 edition, fourteen of the fifteen plates concerned with Indians and their way of life.

57. See Oldmixon's 1741 ed., pp. 416-424, for the Virginia Indian. His Carolina chapters of the 1708 ed. are given in Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, with a little Indian material on pp. 371-372. For Fontaine, see Anne Maury, ed., *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family* (New York, 1853), pp. 264-278, and Edward P. Alexander, ed., *The Journal of John Fontaine, An Irish Huguenot Son in Spain and Virginia, 1710-1719* (Charlottesville, 1972), pp. 90-100. For Jones, see *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. R.L. Morton (Chapel Hill, 1956), pp. 49-62; for Byrd, *William Byrd's Histories of the Dividing Line*, ed. W.K. Boyd and Percy G. Adams (New York, 1967) passim; for Stith, the 1965-1966 Spartanburg, S.C., rpt. and the 1969 New York rpt., passim; for Timberlake, *Memoirs*, ed. Williams, passim.

58. Rutman, introd. to 1969 Johnson Reprint Corporation's facsimile rpt. of Stith, *History of the First Discovery*, ed. Sabin (1865). For *Archives of Maryland*, see Abbreviations and chapter bibliography above. Alsop's book was edited by John G. Shea, Md. Hist. Soc. Fund Publication, no. 15 (Baltimore, 1880) [see pp. 80-81], and Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland* [see p. 371; this edition does not include the mildly obscene paragraph]. The final paragraph contains some characteristic Alsopian ribaldry at the expense of the Indian women.

59. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*; Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.* The Indian section in Lefler's edition of Lawson (Chapel Hill, 1967) includes pp. 172-246. De or von Graffenreid's account has been translated and printed in Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 922-923, and as *Account of the Founding*

of *New Bern*, ed. and trans. Vincent Todd and Julius Goebel (Raleigh, 1920). Meredith has been republished, ed. Earl G. Swem (Perth Amboy, N.J., 1922). For Brickell, see edition with intro. by Carol Urness (New York, 1969) and Percy G. Adams, *Travelers and Travel Liars* (Berkeley, 1962), pp. 149-157.

60. See Craven, *White, Red, and Black*, which considers some earlier backgrounds for the situation. For its aftermath, see *Red, White and Black*, ed. Hudson, *passim*.

61. For the LeJau and Johnston chronicles, ed. Klingberg, see bibliography for this chapter above.

62. Evans' MS. is LC Acc. 4884 A (5 leaves). For the work of Nairne (?) see Clark, ed., *Travels in the Old South*, I, 109, no. 118; for Nairne himself, Verner W. Crane's sketch in *DAB* and his *The Southern Frontier*, *passim*. For Chicken, see his "A Letter from Carolina in 1715 . . .," ed. Langdon Cheves, in *Year Book 1894* (Charleston, 1894), pp. 313-354; Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*, pp. 93-172; and Williams, ed., *Early Travels* [1725 journal], pp. 93-106. For Fitch, see "Captain Fitch's Journal to the Creeks, 1725," in Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*, pp. 173-212. For Herbert, see *Journal of Colonel John Herbert . . . 1727/8*, ed. A.S. Salley (Columbia, 1936).

63. The date for Cuming's visit was 1730. For bibliography of documents and studies of this strange undertaking, see bibliography for utopias above.

64. See George F. Frick and Raymond P. Stearns, *Mark Catesby, the Colonial Audubon* (Urbana, 1961), *passim*.

65. De Brahm's MS. has recently been published as *De Brahm's Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America* (Columbia, 1971). Williams, ed., *Early Travels*, pp. 185-194, includes that part describing the mountains and the Cherokees. Milligen-Johnston's book is reprinted in its entirety in Chapman J. Milling, ed., *Colonial South Carolina: Two Contemporary Descriptions* (Columbia, 1951), chapter on the Indians, pp. 182-202.

66. For McDowell, ed., see bibliography for this chapter. The three volumes edited by McDowell are all that survive of the "Indian books" of the colony. See also Robert J. Turnbull, *Bibliography of South Carolina, 1563-1950*, Volume I (Charlottesville, 1956).

67. James Oglethorpe, *A Brief Account of the Establishment of the Colony of Georgia Under General Oglethorpe*, February 1, 1733, in Force, *Tracts*, I, ii. A reprint of Moore's *A Voyage to Georgia* (London, 1744) is in *Coll. Ga. Hist. Soc.*, I (1840), 79-152.

68. See the bibliography for this chapter, which also gives two twentieth-century editions of Adair. Unless otherwise specified, references are to the Williams edition. For Adair, see the two introductions and William J. Ghent, "James Adair," in *DAB*, and Wilcomb E. Washburn, "James Adair's 'Noble Savages,'" in *The Colonial Legacy, III and IV*, ed. L. H. Leder (New York, 1973), 91-120.

69. No copy of the book is known to exist. It was probably never published.

70. See Adair's *History*, ed. Williams, pp. xviii, xxii, xxiii, xxvi. Williams (p. xxvi) raises the question of a possible 1770 Boston edition.

71. For the green-corn festival, see Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 213, and Swanton, p. 775 (the latter the more complete description). For White's figures, see Quinn, ed., I, 427-428; Lorant, ed., *New World*, pp. 191, 196-197, 260-261, 265. See also Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, and Hulton et al., *Drawings of John White*, for further pictures and notes, and for the Harriot quotation, Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 345. For William White, see *Purchas His Pilgrimage* (1614), pp. 766-767, and Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, pp. 147-152.

72. See Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 84, 92, 136, 146, 148-149, 216; II, 368-369, 412-413; Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, pp. 86, 89-90; Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 241-242. See also *Purchas His Pilgrimage* (1614), pp. 766-767; Joseph and Nesta Ewan, *John Banister*, pp. 380-381, 395-396; Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, pp. xvii, 205-209.

73. For Spelman, see Smith, *Works*, I, cxiv; for Whitaker in a letter to William Crashawe, August 9, 1611, Brown, ed., *Genesis*, I, 498. For the Lancaster dance, see Witham Marshe, *Lancaster in 1744. Journal of the Treaty of Lancaster in 1744, with the Six Nations*, ed. W.H. Egle (Lancaster, Pa., 1884), p. 17. For Bland, *Discovery of New Brittain* (London, 1651), pp. 5 ff.; for Gibbon, E.D. Neill's "John Gibbon, in 1659 a Guest of Richard Lee in Virginia," *NEHGR*, XLIII (Oct. 1889), 430, and Martha Hiden and Henry Dargan, eds., "John Gibbon's MS. Notes Concerning Virginia," *VMHB*, LXXIV (1966), 3-22; for Clayton, Edmund and Dorothy Berkeley, *The Reverend John Clayton*, p. 38; for Michel, William J. Hinke, ed. and trans., "Report of the Journey of Francis Louis Michel from Berne, Switzerland, to Virginia, October 2, 1701-December 1, 1702," *VMHB*, XXIV (1916), 133.

74. Anne Maury, ed., *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family* (New York, 1853), p. 278; Havighurst, *Alexander Spotswood*, p. 99.

75. For Cuming, see bibliography above for utopias, esp. Drake, *Early History of Georgia*, *Sir Alexander Cuming*, p. 13, and Williams, ed., *Early Travels*, p. 125; for Moore, *A Voyage*, p. 127; for "A Ranger's Report," Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*, pp. 220-221.

76. The 1744 story is told in Witham Marshe, *Journal of the Treaty of Lancaster in 1744*, p. 23. For South Carolina items, see McDowell, ed., *Documents . . . , 1750-1754*, pp. 92, 98, 154; 1754-1765, p. 323.

77. See Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 103-117 (esp. p. 116), 119-121, 430. And Timberlake, *Memoirs*, ed. Williams, passim, especially pp. 88, 107.

78. Barlowe's account is in Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 112-113, 271, 373, 429; II, 741. For some modern studies of Indian music see the bibliography for this chapter above.

79. See Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 136-137, 146; II, 362-363, 366, 401, 407, 412-413; Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, pp. 85 etc. Percy twice describes the singer in the midst of the

circle. In addition, see *Purchas His Pilgrimage* (London, 1614), p. 768; also Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, p. 224; Lawson, *A New Voyage*, pp. 44-45; Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, p. 105; Brickell, *Natural History*, p. 281; Maury, ed., *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family*, p. 278; Williams, ed., *Early Travels*, p. 125; Force, *Tracts*, IV, V, 21; for the treaties, discussion below and bibliography for this chapter.

80. Timberlake, *Memoirs*, ed. Williams, pp. 81-83, where he states that the Indians have a kind of loose poetry, including love songs; "The Other Thing" is listed in Turnbull, *Bibliography of S.C.*, I, 146 [116?]; "Death Song" is in the De Renne Coll., Univ. of Georgia, Vol. III, p. 142 (it differs from Joseph Warton's "The celebrated death song of the Cherokee Indian," *idem*, p. 144).

81. Maury, ed., *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family*, p. 278; Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 183-184. That a banjolike instrument should be played with a bow is puzzling, though French-Spanish influence may be the explanation. A much larger Indian mouth-bow, certainly akin to the jew's-harp, was pictured in a Knoxville (Tenn.) *News-Sentinel* of July 29, 1971. Among its anthropological exhibits, the McClung Museum at the University of Tennessee (Knoxville) has a case full of jew's-harps found in Indian village sites in the Cherokee country.

82. Hakluyt, *Principall Navigations* (1589), I, 788; Smith, *Works*, I, cxiv; Strachey, *Histoire of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, p. 84; Swanton, pp. 674-686; and Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, *passim*, mention several kinds of games. See also Cheves, ed., "A Letter from Carolina in 1715," *Year Book* 1894, pp. 338-339.

83. Swanton, pp. 674-686; Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 34, 170-180; *The Discoveries of John Lederer . . .*, ed. and trans. Sir William Talbot (London, 1672) in turn ed. Rights and Cumming (Charlottesville, 1958), pp. 26-27, 113; Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, p. 221; Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 130, 328, 428, 488; Timberlake, *Memoirs*, ed. Williams, p. 79. Swanton describes several variations of football played by Creeks, Chickasaws, Choctaws, etc.

84. Richard N. Shryock, *Medicine in America: Historical Essays* (Baltimore, 1966), pp. 1, 48; Duffy, "Medicine and Medical Practice," in *History of American Medicine: A Symposium*, ed. Felix Marti-Ibañez (New York, 1958), pp. 15-32. For Hariot, White and deBry, see Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 339, 378, 444, 447, 442-443.

85. For Smith's comments, see Smith, *Works*, I, 369-370, and Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, II, 36-364; see also Spelman, in Smith, *Works*, I, cx; Strachey, *Histoire of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, pp. 110-111, 113, 122; *Discoveries of Lederer*, ed. Rights and Cumming, p. 36; Ashe, Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, p. 156. Matthews' letter is in the Univ. of Edinburgh Lib., La. II. 718/1. B.R. Crick et al., *A Guide to Manuscripts Relating to America in Great Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 1961), p. 513, notes the item under the name Matthew and indicates only that it is a description of Charleston. See also SCHM, LV (1954), 157-158.

86. For Banister, Joseph and Nesta Ewan, *John Banister*, pp. 53, 311, 378, 394, 399. For Clayton, Edmund and Dorothy Berkeley, *The Reverend John Clayton: Parson with a Scientific Mind* (Charlottesville, 1965), passim, esp. pp. 21-37. Clayton's use of at least four expressions are the earliest recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. The first of the several Hugh Joneses who were clergymen may also have gone to Maryland at this time with similar activity in mind (see *ibid.*, p. xxiii). Pargellis, ed., "Indians in Virginia," pp. 230-242. Pargellis thought Clayton the probable author of the Newberry Library manuscript he here edits but the Berkeleys prove such authorship impossible.

87. Moreau in Fulham Papers, Lambeth Palace Lib., vol. XI, Virginia 1626-1723, and Perry, *Hist. Coll. of the American Church*, I, 29-32. Henchman in BM Sloane 3321 ff. 196-199 (seven pages). See also Raymond P. Stearns, "James Petiver, Promoter of Natural Science, c. 1669-1718," *PAAS* LXII, pt. 2 (1952), 345, 243-379, and *Science in the British Colonies of America*, pp. 303-308.

88. Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, pp. 221-224. For Beverley's knowledge of Banister, see the Ewans, *John Banister*, passim. Brickell, *Natural History*, pp. 369-376, 373-405.

89. Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. R.L. Morton (Chapel Hill, 1956), pp. 35, 59-60, 141, 264. For Byrd, see the general discussion in Ch. IX below, the editions of his three diaries, *The Prose Works*, ed. L.B. Wright (Cambridge, Mass., 1966); and *William Byrd's Histories*, ed. Boyd and Adams, passim. See also Blanton, *Med. in Va. in the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 181-186. For Catesby, Frick and Stearns, *Mark Catesby*; Earl G. Swem, ed., "Brothers of the Spade: Correspondence of Peter Collinson and John Custis," *PAAS*, LVIII, pt. 1 (1949), 39, 163-164; Blanton, *Med. in Va. in the Eighteenth Century*, pp. 146-147. Pertinent excerpts from the *Natural History* are in Swanton, pp. 790-791, and in Frick and Stearns, *Mark Catesby*, p. 79.

90. Oglethorpe's letter BM Sloane 4053 f. 53, September 19, 1733. Another Charlestonian, Dr. John Lining, wrote to Dr. Whytt of the medicinal qualities of the "Indian Pink" that same year, 1753. See Edmund and Dorothy Berkeley, *Dr. Alexander Garden of Charles Town* (Chapel Hill, 1969), pp. 29-30, 31. For Garden, see also Stearns, *Science in the British Colonies of America*, pp. 593 ff.; Margaret Denny, "Linnaeus and His Disciple in Carolina, Alexander Garden," *Isis*, XXXVIII, pts. 3 and 4, nos. 113-114 (February 1948), 161-173; "Correspondence between Alexander Garden, M.D., and the Royal Society of Arts," ed. Joseph I. Waring, *SCHM*, LXIV (1963), 16-20, 86-94; Waring, *Hist. of Med. in S.C.*, pp. 70-72, 221-237 ("Indian Medicine in Carolina" is discussed briefly, pp. 5-7).

91. P.C.J. Weston, ed., *Documents Connected with South Carolina* (London, 1856), pp. 216-217, and Waring, *Hist. of Med. in S.C.*, pp. 70-71; Edmund and Dorothy Berkeley, *John Clayton, Pioneer of American Botany* (Chapel Hill, 1963), pp. 143-144, 213. The *Puccoon* reference is on page 57 of the 1739-1743 and p. 80 of the 1762 eds. of *Flora Virginica* (both printed in Leyden).

92. Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 93, 131, 181-186, 246-247, 364, 388, 469-470.

93. Waring, *Hist. of Med. in S.C.*, pp. 5-8; Richard Shryock, *Medicine and Society in America, 1660-1860* (New York, 1960), pp. 47-50. See also Mooney and Ollbrechts, *The Swimmer Manuscript*, Bur. Ann. Ethnol., *Bulletin* no. 99 (Washington, D.C., 1932), pp. 14-44. See also the Ewans' and the Berkeleys' studies noted above.

94. Strachey, *Historie*, ed. Wright and Freund, Book I, Ch. 9, and *A Huguenot Exile in Virginia*, ed. Gilbert Chinard (New York, 1934), pp. 153-154.

95. Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, pp. 170-171; *The Writings of Colonel William Byrd of Westover in Virginia, Esqr.*, ed. J.S. Bassett (New York, 1901), pp. 9, 305; *William Byrd's Histories*, ed. Boyd and Adams, pp. 3 ff.; Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 35, 40, 190, 192.

96. Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 128-130, 133, 145-153, 198-199, 480. See discussion of tribal government below at beginning of section on Peterson, "The Indians of the Old South," p. 122; see also Washburn, *The Indian in America*, pp. 40-50, who cites several other sources. This is of course a highly complex and intriguing subject, though to the colonial south-eastern writers rarely so interesting as other matters. The number of monographs from the Bureau of Ethnology and other sources used in preparing this chapter offer little real evidence of detailed knowledge or description from the colonial southern writer.

97. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 189; II, 364-365; Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, II, 425-427; engraving and description of scaffold-tomb in 1893 reprint of 1590 deBry edition of Hariot, plate XXII with description; also Lorant, ed., *New World*, pp. [201, 269]. The priest's figure in the engraving is not in the watercolor original, and there are more bodies in the engraving. The copy deBry used was probably altered by White. Quinn believes that the building on piles was a southern culture trait but badly documented by Swanton and others. He sees no evidence that it was exclusively Algonkian, though the scaffolding may have been used because of low, swampy ground along the coast. Observers here quoted would bear out the contention that the building and scaffolding were not exclusively Algonkian. Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, pp. 94-95; *Discoveries of Lederer*, ed. Talbot, p. 14.

98. Pargellis, ed., "Indians in Virginia," p. 234; Beverley, *History*, ed. Wright, pp. 214-215, 195-197; Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, p. 68; Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 27-28, 52, 185-189, and Swanton, pp. 72, 723; F. Varnod in Manuscripts, S.P.G., number F.P.B. r.s. p. 173, London S.P.G. Lib.; Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, pp. 59, 168; Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 19, 38, 61, 90-91, 132, 186-199. Timberlake, *Memoirs*, passim.

99. Woodward, in Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 208-209. For Georgia and Montgomery, see Chapter I above and *Azilia: A Discourse by Sir Robert Montgomery, 1717*, ed. J. Max Patrick (Atlanta, Emory Univ. Lib., 1848),

which includes a plan of the projected feudal community. For Cuming, see Williams' ed., pp. 113-143 and text of journal; also Crane, *The Southern Frontier*, pp. 276-277; Swanton, pp. 110-115; Cotterill, *The Southern Indians*, pp. 24-25; Drake, *Early History of Georgia*, . . . *Sir Alexander Cuming*, passim; Foreman, *Indians Abroad, 1493-1938*, pp. 44-55; Hewatt, *Hist. Account of S.C. and Ga.*, II, 8, 9, 10; and Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, III, 129-132.

100. Milling, *Red Carolinians*, p. 227; L.B. Wright, *The Atlantic Frontier* (New York, 1947), pp. 298-299; Cotterill, *The Southern Indians*, p. 26; most important, Verner W. Crane, "A Lost Utopia of the First American Frontier," *Sew Rev.*, XXVII (1919), 48-61; Sirmans, *Col. S.C.*, p. 197; and Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 252-257. Adair says Priber was captured in the "fifth year of that red imperial aera" as he was about to enlarge his dominions.

101. For Morison, Huddleston, Wauchope, Allen, and others see bibliography for this chapter above; especially see Huddleston, *Origins of the American Indians*, p. 13.

102. *The Interlude of the Four Elements . . .*, ed. J.O. Halliwell, in *Early English Poetry, Ballads, and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages*, Vol. XXII (London, Percy Society, 1848).

103. *Principall Navigations*, II, 506-507, 602-606. Wynne's letter of November [1606?] is in Huntington Lib. Quoted in Matthew P. Andrews, *Virginia: the Old Dominion* (New York, 1937), pp. 39-40, and in H.M. Jones, *The Literature of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (Boston, 1946, 1st ed.), p. 4.

104. *Principall Navigations*, pp. 602-606; Smith, *Works*, I, 303-304; Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, pp. 53-55; Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, pp. 49-53; Swanton, bibliography, pp. 832-856.

105. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 42-114, 213-214, 278, 281, 307, 372-381, 413-443; II, 504-505, 530-532; Lorant, ed., *New World*, passim; Hulton et al., *Drawings of John White*, passim.

106. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 143, 150, 188; II, 369.

107. Spelman, in Smith, *Works*, I, cvii-cviii; Whitaker, *Good Newes from Virginia* (1613), pp. 24-26, and in Brown, ed., *Genesis*, I, 498; Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, pp. 88-103. For the Jack of the Feather episode, see Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 228; IV, 10-11; and Smith, *Works*, II, 572. Jack of the Feather's possible ritualistic or supernatural symbolic significance was suggested to the author by Professor Gary N. Nash.

108. *Discoveries of Lederer*, ed. Rights and Cumming, pp. 88-103; Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, p. 88; for Durand, *A Huguenot Exile in Virginia*, ed. Chinard, p. 155; Edmund and Dorothy Berkeley, *The Reverend John Clayton*, pp. 21-34; Pargellis, ed., *Indians in Virginia*, pp. 234-236.

109. *History*, ed. Wright, pp. 200-201, 207-209, etc.

110. Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 219 ff.; Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of Lefau*, pp. 61, 67-68, 73, 126, etc.; Varnod, S.P.G. F.P.B. 4. 2. p. 175, April 1, 1723/4, MS.; Von Reck and Bolzius, in Force, *Tracts*,

IV, V (the quotation is from Bolzius); Clark, ed., *Travels in the Old South*, I, 136; and Sion College Lib., 43. B. 21.

111. *The Writings of Colonel William Byrd of Westover in Virginia, Esqr.*, ed. J.S. Bassett (New York, 1901), pp. 128, 136, 200; Byrd, *Prose Works of*, ed. L.B. Wright (Cambridge, Mass.), pp. 118-126, 246-248; *William Byrd's Histories*, ed. Boyd and Adams, pp. 198-203.

112. *The Legend of Noah* and other works mentioned in the bibliography for this chapter.

113. *Myths of the Cherokee*, Bur. of Amer. Ethnol., *Nineteenth Report*, Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C., 1900), pp. 239-242, 261, 430-431, 444-445.

114. Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, p. 102. Strachey probably got this straight from young Spelman, who was in Jamestown when Strachey arrived (Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, II, 325). *Purchas His Pilgrimage* (London, 1626 ed.), p. 843, has a detail of a hoop or sphere doubled across and set upon a heap of stones as altar in the houses. The two versions were probably orally and individually presented to Strachey and Purchas.

115. Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, p. 68; the Cussetaw account in Egmont Papers, Phillips Coll., Univ. of Georgia Lib., vol. 14201, pp. 1-12.

116. Allen, *The Legend of Noah*, p. 92; Richard B. Davis, "America in George Sandys' Ovid," *WMQ* (3), IV (1947), 297-304; Sandys, trans. etc., *Ovid's Metamorphosis* (Oxford, 1632), p. 31; Pargellis, ed., "An Account of the Indians in Virginia," *WMQ* (3), XVI (1959), 236; Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 45, 172-173.

117. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 857-860 (Rainsford to Chamberlain); also in S.P.G. "A" Vol. VII, 418 (July 25); Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, pp. 105-106.

118. For bibliography of primary and secondary studies of Indian missions and education see that of the present chapter and scattered materials in Chs. V and VI.

119. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 277, 376-380; II, 531. Ernest A. Strathmann, *Sir Walter Raleigh: A Study in Elizabethan Scepticism* (New York, 1951), gives a balanced study indicating that both Raleigh and Hariot represented a healthy balance of skepticism with orthodoxy. One recalls that Hariot could speak to the Indians directly in their own language.

120. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 14-15; Bodleian MSS for the Ashmolean 1147 ff. 175-190. For the 1606 statement and charter, see Stith, *History of the First Discovery* (1747), Appendix I, Article III, and Samuel M. Bemiss, ed., *The Three Charters of the Virginia Company*, 350th Anniv. Hist. Booklet no. 4 (Williamsburg, 1957), p. 2.

121. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 154; II, 390; Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, pp. 89-94, 100-101; Whitaker, *Good Newes from Virginia* (1613), passim; Hamor, *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia*, pp. 48, 51-52, 55, 61-88.

122. Rolfe, *True Relation of the State of Virginia . . . 1616* (Charlottesville, 1971), pp. 12-14 (1st ed., New Haven, 1951); Kingsbury, *Records Va. Co.*, III, 71, etc.; *Proceedings of the General Assembly of Virginia {of 1619} . . . by Mr. Pory*, ed. W.J. Van Schreeven and George H. Reese (Jamestown, Va., 1969), pp. 43, etc.

123. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, passim, esp. Quo Warranto of 1624; McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes Council and Gen. Court Col. Va.*, p. 166; *Journals H. of B. Va.*, 1619-1659, p. 10, etc.; *Leg. Journ. Council Col. Va.*, I, 414; Hening, ed., *Statutes*, I, 396, 410, 455-456, 547; II, 143, 155, etc.

124. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 5-6, 217-218; Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, pp. 40-41, 90, 125, 128-130, 138-140, 143, 394, 396, 400, 405; Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 27-28.

125. *Archives of Md.*, XIX, 100, 484 ff.; XXIII, 83; Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton, *The Present State of Virginia, and the College*, ed. H.D. Farish (Williamsburg, 1940), pp. 73, 74; Robert A. Bain, "The Composition and Publication of *The Present State of Virginia, and the College*," *EAL*, VI (1971), 31-54, as to reasons for believing Blair himself had the report published; Samuel C. McCulloch, "James Blair's Plan of 1699 to Reform the Clergy of Virginia," *WMQ* (3), IV (1947), 85-86; Blair's 1700 letter in Fulham Papers, Lambeth Palace Lib., V. XI, Virginia 1626-1723; Oldmixon, *British Empire in America* (London, 1741), I, 434, 437. Up to the threshold of the Revolution Virginia was still "recruiting" Indian students for the college.

126. Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, passim, and *Carolina Chronicle: Papers of Gideon Johnston*, pp. 53, 108-109, 118-119, 129, 144.

127. Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 20, 57-58, 80, 169, 219, 243-245; Jones, *Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, pp. 5-6, 59, 67, 105, 253; Perry, ed., *Hist. Coll. Relating to the Col. Church*, I, 129, 191, 196-197; Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col.*, 1716-1767, pp. 142-143; "William Byrd Title Book," *VMHB*, XLIX (1941), 275; Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 816-818; II, 53-55; *Coll. Va. Hist. Soc.*, new ser., I (Richmond, 1882), 126; McIlwaine, ed., *Exec. Journ. Council Col. Va. . . . 1705-1720*, pp. 293-294; Maury, ed., *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family*, pp. 264-268, 277-281; 857-860; Havighurst, *Alexander Spotswood*, p. 99; Dodson, *Spotswood*, pp. 71-72, 85, etc.; *The Official Letters of Alexander Spotswood . . . 1710-1722*, ed. R.A. Brock (2 vols., Richmond, 1882), passim; E.L. Goodwin, *The Colonial Church in Virginia* (Milwaukee, 1927), p. 275.

128. Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, p. 233; *William Byrd's Histories*, ed. Boyd and Adams, pp. 118, 120; *Secret Diary*, ed. Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling (Richmond, 1941), pp. 424, 425. Byrd had a copy of John Eliot's Algonkian Bible in his own library, perhaps an indication that the New England work was used by Virginia teachers. For Robinson, see his "Indian Education and Missions in Colonial Virginia," p. 168.

129. E.M. Coulter, *Georgia: A Short History*, p. 70; Ingham's letter to Sir John Phillips, in Phillips Coll., Egmont MSS, Univ. of Georgia Lib.; "A Curious Account of the Indians," in *A New Voyage to Georgia*, rpt. in *Georgia Hist. Coll.*, II (1842), 61-63 [from London, 2nd ed., 1737]; for the Bishop of

Man's books, see William Orr to S.P.G., Sept. 30, 1742, in Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, IV, 609 (the Bishop was Thomas Wilson [1663-1755]). The "book" was probably his "Essay towards an Instruction for the Indians . . . in . . . Dialogues," 1740, dedicated to the Georgia Trustees and written at Oglethorpe's insistence. For Walcot, see Turnbull, *Bibliography of S.C.*, I, 115, and Clark, ed., *Travels in the Old South*, I, 133-134.

130. Samuel C. Williams, "An Account of the Presbyterian Mission to the Cherokees, 1757-1759," *Tenn. Hist. Mag.*, 2nd ser., no. 1 (1931), pp. 125-137; W.M.E. Rachal, ed., "Early Minutes of Hanover Presbytery," *VMHB*, LXIII (1955), 70-75, 161-185; G.W. Pilcher, *Samuel Davies, Apostle of Dissent in Colonial Virginia* (Knoxville, Tenn., 1971), pp. 116-118. The NYPL original of Richardson's MS. may now be lost, but Professor Pilcher lent the author his photostat of it; see also the Richardson report to Davies of the "Evangelizing Mission to the Cherokees," in Southern Hist. Coll., Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

131. Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 471-479. For American bishoprics and the northern colonial antagonisms, see Carl Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics* (New York, 1962). Actually southern opposition to episcopacy developed only in the immediate pre-Revolutionary period (see Ch. V below). The southern clergy, and many of the laity, begged for a century and a half for one or more bishops.

132. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, II, 439, 464; Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 704-707. For Smith's reasons for not wishing to annihilate the Indians see Keith Glenn, "Captain John Smith and the Indians," pp. 228-248.

133. Jacobs, ed., *Indians of the Frontier: Edmond Atkin Report*, p. vii; McDowell's 3 vols., passim; No. XVI by the Centinel, preserved in the *N.Y. Gaz.*, Feb. 21, 1757, is especially pertinent (rpt. in Richard B. Davis, C. Hugh Holman, and Louis Rubin, eds., *Southern Writing, 1585-1920* [New York, 1970], pp. 155-159). See also James Glen, in *Colonial South Carolina*, ed. Milling, passim.

134. Jacobs, ed., *Indians of the Frontier: Edmond Atkin Report*, passim. For Gadsden as *Philopatris*, see Richard Walsh, ed., *The Writings of Christopher Gadsden* (Columbia, 1966), pp. 14-15; for Laurens as *Philolethes*, see *ibid.*, p. 14n, and Corkran, *Cherokee Frontier*, pp. 142-172; and for the Laurens MSS see S.C. Hist. Soc., which will publish them in the *Laurens Papers* now appearing. The *S.C. Gaz.*, 1750-1752, contains much on Indian policy, some of it probably by Adair. Glen's work is reproduced in *Colonial South Carolina*, ed. Milling.

135. Hening, ed. *Statutes*, passim; Craven, "Indian Policy in Early Virginia," pp. 65-82; W. Stitt Robinson, *Mother Earth*, and other of his books and essays; Reese, *Colonial Georgia*, pp. 106-120; John P. Corry, *Indian Affairs in Georgia, 1732-1756* (Philadelphia, 1936), passim.

136. See Chapter I under "History and Major Historians"; *Discoveries of Lederer*, ed. Talbot, p. 41; Norwood to Williamson, 1667, in *VMHB*, XIX

(1911), 184; Francis Yeardley's letter noted above, which mentions "a trader for beavers"; Force, *Tracts*, IV, xii; for Fleet in E.D. Neill, *Founders of Maryland* (Albany, 1876), 19-37; Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," pp. 3-18.

137. "Letters from Stewart to Dunlop," ed. Dunlop and Webber, pp. 1-33. The memorandum for Sir Nathaniel Johnson is in John Archdale MSS, Duke Univ.

138. Henchman, BM Sloane 3321 ff. 196-199; also Stearns, *Science in the British Colonies of America*, pp. 303-305, and his "James Petiver, Promoter of Natural Science, c. 1663-1710," *PAAS*, LXII, pt. 2 (1952), 351-353. *Carolina Chronicle: Papers of Gideon Johnston*, ed. Klingberg, p. 53, and his *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, pp. 58, 61, 116. Instructions in McDowell, ed., *Documents . . . 1710-1718*, p. 34.

139. George Chicken, "Journal to the Cherokees," in Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*, pp. 93-122, and in Williams, ed., *Early Travels*, pp. 93-109; also his "A Letter from Carolina in 1715," in *Year Book 1894*, ed. Cheves, pp. 313-354; "Captain Fitch's Journal to the Creeks," in Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*, pp. 123-312; *Journal of Colonel John Herbert*, ed. Salley.

140. *William Byrd's Histories*, ed. Boyd and Adams, pp. 246, 248; Daniel B. Trimble, "Christopher Gist and the Indian Service in Virginia," *VMHB*, LXIV (1956), 143-165.

141. McDowell, ed., *Documents . . . , 1750-1754*, pp. 149-151; *Documents . . . , 1754-1765*, pp. 507-557; Milligen-Johnston's attack on traders in Milling, ed., *Colonial S.C.*, pp. 187-188; Jacobs, *Indians of the Frontier: Edmond Atkin Report*, passim.

142. *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 96 ff., 151n, 241, 279 ff., 342 ff., 393-394, 443-444, 481-485.

143. E.g., Robinson, "The Land and the Indian," in *Mother Earth*, pp. 1-10, and his bibliography, pp. 75-77, as well as his several other books and essays on the subject. But see especially Jacobs, *Dispossessing the American Indian*, passim.

144. Hening, ed., *Statutes*; McIlwaine's various editions of Court, Council, and Legislative records; *Archives of Md.* Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*; Easterby, ed., *Col. Rec. S.C.*; and Candler, ed., *Col. Rec. Georgia*. McIlwaine's *Minutes Council and Gen. Court Col. Va.*, is especially revealing.

145. See Jacobs, *Dispossessing the American Indian*, passim, and *Wilderness Politics and Indian Gifts*, passim; the succinct but useful statement in Washburn, *The Indian in America*, pp. 32-40; and Driver, *Indians of North America*, pp. 269, 271, passim. See also Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 141 ff.; II, 439; McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes Council and Gen. Court Col. Va.*, pp. 320, 370, 415, 502, 505, 508, 510, 518, etc., and his *Leg. Journ. Council Col. Va.*, I, 414; Hening, ed., *Statutes*, I, 184, 393-396; III, 465-467; *Calendar of Virginia State Papers . . .* (11 vols., Richmond, 1875-1893), I, 184.

146. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, p. 285; Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 243-244; *S.C. Gaz.*, May 18, 1745, three-column speech; Milling, ed., *Col. S.C.*, pp. xiii-xiv, and his *Red Carolinians*, p. 284;

Alden, *John Stuart and the Frontier*, pp. 20-37; Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 232, 233, 274, 304, 377 ff., 384, 440, 490-491; Lois Mulkearn, ed., *George Mercer Papers Relating to the Ohio Company of Virginia* (Pittsburgh, 1954), passim.

147. For Nairne, see sketch by Crane in *DAB*; Sirmans, *Col. S.C.*, passim; McDowell, ed., *Documents . . . 1710-1718 (Journals of the Commissioners, 1710-1718)*, pp. viii, 30 ff., a most useful volume. See journals of George Chicken, John Herbert, and Tobias Fitch, mentioned above, note 62, and elsewhere. Also McDowell, ed., *Documents . . . 1750-1754*, pp. 264-342 (including Bosomworth's journals), and Alden, *John Stuart and the Frontier*, p. 31. For Glen's Indian policy, see Alden, *ibid.*, and Sirmans, *Col. S.C.*

148. Alden, *John Stuart and the Frontier*, pp. 69-73; Jacobs, ed., *Indians of the Southern Colonial Frontier: the Edmond Atkin Report . . .*, passim; Sirmans, *Col. S.C.*, pp. 326-329 and passim; DeVorsey, *The Indian Boundary*, p. 53; Trimble, "Christopher Gist," pp. 143-165.

149. Trimble, "Christopher Gist," pp. 143-165, and Corry, *Indian Affairs in Georgia*, Chs. II-IX, 46-151.

150. Cotterill, *The Southern Indians*, p. ix.

151. Smith, *Works*, II, 531-534, 638-639; Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, passim; Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, passim; *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, XIX, 118-119. Purchas also amplifies the notched-stick story.

152. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, I, 485, 496; *VMHB*, III (1895/6), 362.

153. Foreman, *Indians Abroad, 1493-1938*, pp. 44-55, etc.; Crane, *The Southern Frontier*, p. 295. For the anticlimactic return of the seven to their mountains see *S.C. Gaz.*, June 3, 1732, and Sherman, *Robert Johnson*, pp. 85-88. It should be noted that there are a few colonial records of Indian views of the settlers in the eighteenth century, as William Byrd's observations of Indians' laughter at the whites' inability to endure rough or hazardous travel (*Prose Works*, ed. Wright, p. 288, etc.). For Tomochichi's speech, see Hewatt, *Historical Account of S.C. and Ga.*, II, 22 (or rpt. in Carroll, *Historical Collections of South Carolina*, I, 4ff); Foreman, "Tomochichi, Creek Miko," in *Indians Abroad, 1493-1938*, pp. 56-64. For the verse, see "Tomo Chachi, An Ode," in "*Georgia*," and *Two Other Occasional Poems . . . 1736*, ed. Stephens, p. 12.

154. Timberlake, *Memoirs*, ed. Williams, passim. For Toanahowi, see *Coll. Ga. Hist. Soc.*, IV (1878), p. 58, rpt. from *London Mag.*

155. Pearce, "The Significance of the Captivity Narrative," 1-20, and his "Spirituals and Temporals," in *Savages*, pp. 3-49; also Carleton, "The Indian Captivity," pp. 169-180; and Vail, *Voice of the Old Frontier*, pp. 30-61. In 1912 the Newberry Lib. published Vail's *Narratives of Captivity*, and in 1928 Supplement I, comp. Clara H. Smith. These items have been examined personally by the present writer.

156. Jane Dickinson in Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, IV, 473; Jones in *Gentleman's Mag.*, X (March 1740), 104 ff. (not listed in Goodwin, *Colonial*

Church in Virginia, nor in George McL. Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church and the Political Conditions under which It Grew*, I, [Richmond, 1947]); Jonathan Dickenson, original in Ayer Collection, Newberry Lib.; the Supplement to the catalogue of this collection adds several other editions.

157. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 905-923, 935-936; Clark, ed., *Travels in the Old South*, I, 80-81, no. 84. In the introduction to his ed. of Lawson's *A New Voyage* Lefler explains the situation more clearly, indicating the Baron's attitude toward Lawson as unfair (pp. xxxiii-xxxvi). William Byrd II, writing two or more decades later, declares that Lawson was "waylaid and had his throat cut from Ear to Ear," information which he probably got from the de Graffenreid family, whom he knew (*Writings of Byrd*, ed. Bassett, p. 228).

158. *Carolina Chronicle: Papers of Gideon Johnston*, ed. Klingberg, pp. 146-147, and *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, pp. 116, etc.; Crane, *The Southern Frontier*, pp. 168-169 (esp. on Nairne). In the Archives in Paris is the journal of Antoine Bonnefay describing his captivity among the Cherokees, 1741-1742, with an account of his escape. He was so much disfigured his captain did not recognize him (trans. by J.F. James, in Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*, pp. 250 ff.). The Falconer narrative is in the Ayer Collection, Newberry Lib. (the Supplement gives the edition as edited by William Rufus Chetwood; see also Vail, *Voice of the Old Frontier*, p. 207).

159. *Collected Poems of Samuel Davies*, ed. Richard B. Davis (Gainesville, Fla., 1968), pp. 169-172; Mary Ingles in *VMHB*, XV (1908), 256-257; Lewis P. Summers, *History of Southwest Virginia* (Baltimore, 1966), pp. 59-60, 362-363; John P. Hale, *Trans-Allegheny Pioneers: Historical Sketches . . . 1748 and After* (Cincinnati, 1886), passim. Hale devotes many scattered chapters to the Mary Draper Ingles capture and subsequent escape. He says he got it from a short sketch published by the wife of Governor John Floyd of Virginia, and believes she got it directly from Mrs. Ingles. The two recent accounts are in the *Virginia Cavalcade*, X, no. 2, and *American Heritage*, XIX, no. 5, of the 1960s.

160. Charles Saunders in the Ayer Collection, Newberry Lib. For a discussion of Charles Johnston's work, see Richard B. Davis, *Intellectual Life in Jefferson's Virginia, 1790-1830* (Chapel Hill, 1964; rpt. Knoxville, 1973), pp. 274-275.

161. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 16, 37, 119, 279, 348, 368; II, 741, 873-900 (this last the Rev. James A. Geary's appendix, "The Language of the Carolina Algonkian Tribes"). Geary includes a list of Indian words found in the documents printed in these volumes edited by Quinn. Hariot, describing the Indian religion, says that they might have learned more "then [they] had means for want of perfect utterance in their language to expresse" (Quinn, ed., I, 375, 389).

162. Philip Barbour's biography and essays on Smith's use of various language and place and personal names in them would seem to bear out this contention.

163. Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, p. xxvii; Bar-

bour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, passim; Brown, ed., *Genesis*, II, 996, 1020-1021; Smith, *Works*, I, ci, 606; Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, IV, 89 (for details of Spelman's death); Hamor, *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia* (1615), p. xiv, etc.; Hodge, *Handbook*, I, 23.

164. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 244-245, 253, 555; Morton, *Colonial Virginia*, I, 75; Henning, ed., *Statutes*, I, 328, 521; McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes Council and Gen. Court Col. Va.*, p. 230 (October 14); Golden, *History of the Five Nations*, I, 34-51. It is probable a New York or Pennsylvania interpreter was employed at Albany.

165. *Archives of Md.*, II, 14-16; V, 29-30, 555, 558; VIII, 532-538, etc.

166. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, p. 118; Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 217; see Stewart's 1693 letter to Dunlop in *SCHM*, XXXII (1931), 172.

167. Hugh Jones' copy of Andrews' Mohawk prayer book is now in the Library Company of Philadelphia. See also Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, pp. 173-175. For Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 36, 233-289; Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 926-936. There is much on Wiggan in the three volumes of McDowell, ed., *Documents*, passim; Sherman, *Robert Johnson*, passim; Crane, *The Southern Frontier*, passim; Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, passim; Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*; and Rothrock, "Carolina Traders," 3-18. There is some confusion and contradictory evidence as to whether Wiggan made the 1730 journey to London. Sherman, *Robert Johnson*, p. 86, seems to solve the problem by citing South Carolina official documentary evidence of the Council of S.C., Vol. V, p. 16 (Jan. 1, 1730/31).

168. McDowell, Mereness, Easterby, Salley (ed. of the text), and other primary edited sources. For Georgia, see Force, *Tracts*, I, ii, pp. 10-11 (1733, *A Brief Account . . .*).

169. Henning, ed., *Statutes*, IV, 461; Maury, ed., *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family*, p. 272; *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, ed. John R. Brodhead (Albany, 1855), I, 669-677; also William Byrd, *Journey to the Land of Eden and other Tracts*, ed. Thomas H. Wynne (Richmond, 1866), pp. 249-265. The intracolony interpreters' office was not finally abolished until 1734 (see Henning, ed., *Statutes*, IV, 461).

170. See Wallace, *Weiser*, passim; Carl Bridenbaugh's sketch of Weiser in *DAB*; L. J. Gilliland, "Conrad Weiser, Indian Interpreter and Frontier Diplomat" (M.A. thesis, Univ. of Virginia, 1929?); *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania . . . Minutes of the Provincial Council . . . 1745 . . . 1754*, Vol. V (Harrisburg, 1851), passim; Witham Marshe, *Lancaster in 1744. Journal of the Treaty of Lancaster in 1744, With the Six Nations*, ed. W.H. Egle (Lancaster, 1884), passim; Cadwallader Colden, *History of the Five Nations* (2 vols., New York, 1904), passim; and texts of various treaties listed or mentioned below. Historians lately tend to belittle Weiser's importance.

171. Hodge, ed., *Handbook*, I, 937-939; Louis K. Koontz, *Robert Dinwiddie: His Career in American Colonial Government and Western Expansion* (Glendale, Calif., 1941), pp. 142n-143n, 326; *Col. Rec. Pa.*, V, passim.

172. Alden, *John Stuart and the Frontier*, pp. 176-191; De Vorse, *The Indian Boundary*, p. 37, 48, 149; Reese, *Colonial Georgia*, p. 120. Copies of the treaty are in the Clements Lib., Univ. of Michigan, and two in the Public Record Office, London. Swanton, p. 112, calls this the final peace between the English and the southern tribes.

173. Colden, *History of the Five Nations*, I, xxxiv-xxxvi; Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, ed. William Peden (Chapel Hill, 1955), p. 62.

174. Jones, *Aboriginal American Oratory*, pp. 8, 13.

175. February 1, 1775, from Northumberland House, London, in *PMHS*, 1st ser., XV (1876-1877), 240.

176. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages*, I, 137, 413-414, 424-428, 433, 438-440, 443-444; Barbour, *Three Worlds*, pp. 247-248, 253; Smith, *Works*, I, 133-134.

177. Strachey, *Historie of Travell*, ed. Wright and Freund, pp. 84-85, 101-102; Hamor, *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia*, pp. 40-42, 54; Smith, *Works*, II, 533-534; Purchas His Pilgrimes, XIX, 117-120; Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 438; Sir William Berkeley, *A Perfect Description of Virginia* (London, 1649), p. 13, in Force, *Tracts*, II, viii.

178. *Archives of Md.*, II, 14-16; V, 29-30, 551, 555, 558; VI, 321; VII, 532-538; XXV, 84-90, 102-166, 394, 450; XXVIII, 272; XXXII, 45; *Discoveries of Lederer*, ed. Talbot, p. 14; Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina*, pp. 130 ff.; Colden, *History of the Five Nations*, I, 34-51.

179. For Henschman see BM Sloane 332 ff. 196-199, and Stearns, *Science in the British Colonies of America*, pp. 303-305; Lawson, *A New Voyage*, ed. Lefler, pp. 187-188, 221-222; Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, pp. 105-106; Chicken, "A Letter from Carolina in 1715, and Journal . . .," in *Year Book 1894*, ed. Cheves, pp. 330-331, etc., and in Mereness, ed., *Travels in the American Colonies*, pp. 93-172, or Williams, ed., *Early Travels*, pp. 93-106, 138-143, 173-212; Easterby, ed., *Col. Rec. S.C.*, I (*Journals of the Commons House of Assembly, 1736-1739*), pp. 111-112; Herbert, *Journal of Colonel John Herbert . . .*, ed. Salley, pp. 4-28. For Ketagustah, see Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, III, 129-132; also South Carolina version in Hewatt, *Hist. Acct. of S.C. and Ga.*, II, 22 For the Cherokees in Charleston, see *S.C. Gaz.*, June 3, 1732, and Sherman, *Robert Johnson*, p. 88.

180. Byrd, *Journey to the Land of Eden and other Tracts*, ed. Wynne, pp. 249-265; *Documents Rel. to the Col. Hist. of the State of N.Y.*, ed. Brodhead, I, 669-677; Morton, *Colonial Virginia*, II, 481.

181. Cussetaw origin, etc., Force, *Tracts*, I, ii, 10; Phillips Coll., Egmont MSS, Univ. of Georgia Lib., June 11, 1755; Cukaouskassette, *S.C. Gaz.*, May 18, 1745; Glen at Ninety-Six, *S.C. Gaz.*, June 2, 9, 16, 23, 30 and *Pa Gaz.*, June 26, 1746; for various conferences, the three volumes of McDowell, ed., *Documents . . .*, {II} 1750-1754, e.g., pp. 43-45, 47-48, 92-99, 138, 147, 150-151, 175-178, 258-259, 268-342, 380-381, 387-458, 537; see also *Pa. Gaz.*, Aug. 23, 30, 1753; *S.C. Gaz.*, July 11, 23, 30, 1753; *Gentleman's Mag.*, XXIII (Sept., 1753), 423-426; *Papers of Henry Laurens*, ed. Philip Hamer

and George C. Rogers, (Columbia, 1968—), I, 291-292; Alden, *John Stuart and the Frontier*, p. 46; De Vorse, *The Indian Boundary*, pp. 120-121; Hewatt, *Hist. Acct. of S.C. and Ga.*, II, 205, 221-224; *S.C. Gaz.*, July 14, 1755; *Md. Gaz.*, Sept. 18, 1755; *Scot's Mag.*, XVII (Oct. 1753), 504-507.

182. Ellis, in *S.C. Gaz.*, Feb. 23, 1760; speech in Henry Ellis Papers, Univ. of Georgia; Haigler, in Rights, *The American Indian in North Carolina*, pp. 130-139; Saunders, *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 141-144; McDowell, ed., *Documents . . .*, 1754-1765, pp. 321-323, and *Documents . . .*, 1750-1754, pp. 151-154 (primarily excerpts from the *Va. Gaz.*); also *Pa. Gaz.*, Sept. 26, 1751; *Md. Gaz.*, Sept. 4, 1751.

183. Mulkearn, ed., *George Mercer Papers*, pp. 54-67, 476-485, 540-545; McDowell, ed., *Documents . . .*, 1754-1765, pp. 102-103; *Md. Gaz.*, Dec. 4, 1755, and May 12 and 19, 1757; see also *Archives Md.*, XXI 193-194 for April 29, 1757, speech to the governor.

184. Timberlake, *Memoirs*, ed. Williams, pp. 59-60, 80-81, 143; Timberlake quotes Ostenaco on pp. 130-131, and he notes Ostenaco's speech to the King in London but says it is difficult to translate and record.

185. Three quotations and references are in Adair, *History*, ed. Williams, pp. 12, 34-35, 66, 83, 460. Adair goes into greater detail on a war speech on pp. 161-168.

186. Wroth, "The Indian Treaty as Literature," p. 753. This essay is the best critical study of the form.

187. Quinn, ed., *The Roanoke Voyages*, I, 417-441, etc. Jacobs, *Dispossessing the American Indian and Wilderness Politics and Indian Gifts*, passim, devotes considerable space to and gives a few examples (almost all from northern treaties) of the exchange, of the significance of wampum and other exchanges and gifts, and of terms such as "burying the hatchet" and "the chain of friendship." In the latter book he compares the British and French systems of gifts and analyzes types of presents. For the mechanics of treaty-making, especially in the middle and northern colonies, see Jacobs' two books.

188. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III and IV, passim; Hening, ed., *Statutes*, I, 157, 237, 323-326. In 1657-58 an act forbade further grants to Englishmen until every Indian Bowman had been allotted fifty acres and if any land already in patents granted to white men were found to be Indian, the Indian should be recompensed or the white should relinquish the same. We may be sure there was very little relinquishment.

189. *Archives of Md.*, II, 14-16, 25; V, 29-30, 551, 555-558; VIII, 532-538; (only one of several treaties in the decade); XXV, 84-90, 102-106, 394, 450. Blakiston was governor in 1700 and was treating with the Piscataway Indians. Apparently he was a man of some formality and considerable tact. We should like to leave the details of his meeting with the then small Indian tribes within the province.

190. This 1675 treaty-purchase is quoted in full in Milling, *Red Carolinians*, pp. 58-59 (original is in South Carolina Archives).

191. Mooney, *Myths of the Cherokees*, p. 31, gives the *Cherokee Advocate*

of January 30, 1845, as his source for the 1684 treaty. In a letter to the present writer Mr. William L. McDowell, Jr., Deputy Director of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, states that frequent search has never revealed the document.

192. *Articles of Peace between the Most Serene and Mighty Prince Charles II. . . . And Several Indian Kings and Queens . . .* (London, 1677); DePuy, *Bibliography of the English Colonial Treaties . . .* (New York, 1917), no. 1; Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col.*, p. 97, item 272; 164, 443, 444; Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. R.L. Morton (Chapel Hill, 1956), pp. 171-172; Morton, *Colonial Virginia*, I, 291; James Mooney in *Amer. Anthropologist*, n.s., IX (1907), 129-152. The treaty is printed in *VMHB*, XIV (1906/7), 289-296; see also *idem*, V (1897/8), 141, 362-363.

193. Colden, *History of the Five Nations*, I, 34-51, includes the text of the treaty conference in detail but probably not entirely accurately. See also Morton, *Colonial Virginia*, I, 315; Byrd was skeptical of the efficacy of the treaty at the time.

194. Perry, ed., *Hist. Collections Relating to the Col. Church*, I, 129; Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 816-818; for the Tuscarora treaty, or treaties, McIlwaine, ed., *Exec. Journ. Council Col. Va.* (1705-1720), pp. 293-294, 301, 303, 366.

195. *Documents Rel. to the Col. Hist. of the State of N.Y.*, ed. Brodhead, I, 669-677, from "the New-York Papers"; and Byrd, *Journey to the Land of Eden and other Tracts*, ed. Wynne, pp. 249-265.

196. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, III, 129-132; Hewatt, *Hist. Acct. of S.C. and Ga.*, II, 8, 9, 10; Milling, *Red Carolinians*, pp. 275-277; Sherman, *Robert Johnson*, p. 86; Drake, *Early History of Georgia . . . Sir Alexander Cuming*, p. 29; Foreman, *Indians Abroad, 1493-1938*, pp. 42-55. The Indians attending the King were painted in full ceremonial fashion, with feathers in their head-dresses (Drake, p. 17).

197. *A Brief Account of the Establishment of Georgia . . . 1733*, in Force, *Tracts*, I, ii, 10 ff.; Hewatt, *Hist. Acct. of S.C. and Ga.*, II, 27; Foreman, *Indians Abroad, 1493-1935*, pp. 56-64 (on Tomochichi). Oglethorpe reported he brought Tomochichi, "Chief of the Yamacrees," to confirm the peace made with that people and their allies. Georgia Trustee Lord Egmont's diary gives many details, including the fact that there were seven in his party and that interpreter Musgrove was frequently drunk while he was in Great Britain. See also Moore, *A Voyage to Georgia . . . 1735*, pp. 78-152; and *Ga. Hist. Q.*, IV (1920), 3-16.

198. See Boyd, ed., *Indian Treaties, 1736-1762*, e.g., p. 3, on the October 1736 treaty at Philadelphia; and Wallace, *Weiser*, passim.

199. It is believed that 300 copies were sent abroad, though Wroth says 200. A copy of the Virginia edition was sent by Governor Gooch to the Board of Trade in London; the copy used here was made from microfilm in the Virginia 350th Anniversary Survey Reports, 789, Reel 43 ff., 55-100, PRO c/o/5/1326.

200. Boyd, ed., *Indian Treaties, 1736-1762*, a printed facsimile of Franklin's version, which is that used by Colden in *History of the Five Nations*, II, 119-204.
201. Wallace, *Weiser*, 185; Marshe, *Journal of the Treaty of Lancaster in 1744*, p. 14n; see also Black's journal, printed in *PMHB*, I, (1877), 117-132, 233-249, 404-419; II (1878), 40-49.
202. For Cradock, see Chs. V, VI and IX below; for his part in the treaty action, Marshe, *Journal of the Treaty of Lancaster in 1744*, passim, and *Archives of Md.*, XLIV (1925), 121-122. The latter contains the text of the treaty with the interesting list of signers, including Cradock, James Logan, Jr., Marshe, Philip Ludwell Lee, and Conrad Weiser among the whites, and Weiser again as "Turrighia Waggon" (one spelling of his Indian name) signed with his red brethren.
203. Parks edition, pp. 17, 19; Franklin edition, ed. Boyd, pp. xvi-xvii (Carl Van Doren's introduction).
204. For the offer to educate the Indian boys, see the Parks edition, pp. 58, 65-69; for treaties as drama, Rourke, *Roots of American Culture*, pp. 66-75; Wroth, "The Indian Treaty as Literature," passim; Drummond and Moody, "Indian Treaties: The First American Dramas," pp. 15-24.
205. For Bull's letter to Glen, July 25, 1751, and the secretary's report of negotiation, see McDowell, ed., *Documents . . . , 1750-1754*, pp. 92-99, 138-146. For Weiser's journal and his biographer's comments, see Wallace, *Weiser*, pp. 326-331.
206. Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, pp. 32, 33; McDowell, ed., *Documents . . . , 1750-1754*, pp. 151-154, 125-128, 154-196; *Pa. Gaz.*, August 23 and 30, 1753; *S.C. Gaz.*, July 4, 23, 30, 1753; July 24, 1755; *Md. Gaz.*, Sept. 18, 1733; *Gentleman's Mag.*, XXXII (Sept. 1953), 423, 426; *Scot's Mag.*, XVII (Oct. 1955), 504-507. Hewatt, *Hist. Acct. of S.C. and Ga.*, passim.
207. McDowell, ed., *Documents . . . , 1750-1754*, pp. 151-154; *Pa. Gaz.*, Sept. 26, 1751.
208. Morton, *Col. Va.*, II, 615; "The Treaty of Logg's Town, 1752," ed. W.B. Stanard, *VMHB*, XIII (1906), 143-174; Mulkearn, ed., *George Mercer Papers*, pp. 54-67, 476-485, 540-545.
209. Rights, *The American Indian in North Carolina* (2nd ed., 1957), pp. 130-139; Saunders, *Col. Rec. N.C.*, V, 141-146, 579-584.
210. Really two treaties were printed at Williamsburg in this pamphlet by William Hunter, 1756, rpt. in *VMHB*, XIII (1906), 225-264. It includes letters, introduction, and other extra materials.
211. Besides the *VMHB* printing of the twin treaty given in the note just above, see the copy of the original in the Alderman Lib., Univ. of Virginia, McGregor Collection, and DePuy, *A Bibliography of the English Colonial Treaties*, pp. 35-36.
212. McDowell, ed., *Documents . . . , 1754-1765*, pp. 321-323.
213. *S.C. Gaz.*, April 1 and May 29, 1760; Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, VI, 220-221.
214. Published in 1764. Copy recorded in *DeRenne Catalogue*, ed. Oscar

Wegelin (Savannah, 1911), pp. 16, 21-41 (and thus now in the Univ. of Georgia); see also DePuy, *Bibliography of the English Colonial Treaties*, pp. 47-48.

215. Alden, *John Stuart and the Frontier*, pp. 176-191; De Vorse, *The Indian Boundary*, pp. 36-39, 149.

CHAPTER THREE: FORMAL EDUCATION, INSTITUTIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many of the items for this chapter are also used for other chapters, the number of studies of at least one colony and its educational activity far overbalance those of other provinces, and some of the still-relevant volumes were published three centuries and a half ago. Many of the more recent studies come from the revisionists of educational and intellectual history, but several accounts or criticisms written two or three generations ago are also useful. The critical and documentary are as usual frequently fused.

Among bibliographies which are accompanied by critical commentaries perhaps the starting point is Bernard Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study* (Chapel Hill, 1960), a little book by a major revisionist (see the beginning of this chapter) which has been a major cause for outdating itself: it has been the inspiration or instigation of a number of significant studies. But its own lists are still generally useful even though they are far from exhaustive for the literature of the subject which had appeared up to the time of its publication. Another revisionist, Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1776* (New York, 1970), includes an enormous amount of bibliographical reference in his essay-type chapter notes, though individual items are not easily located. Two valuable introductions and bibliographies to American materials in Great Britain include many manuscript items: B.R. Crick and Miriam Alman et al., eds., *A Guide to Manuscripts Relating to America in Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1961), and William W. Manross, comp., *The Fulham Papers in the Lambeth Palace Library, American Colonial Section, Calendar and Indexes* (Oxford, 1965), neither of them by any means complete in their coverage. Most of the other books mentioned below contain bibliographies of varying value because of size, degree of selectivity, and date.

Next to Bailyn in general usefulness is Cremin's *American Education* mentioned above, which in accordance with its author's theories emphasizes the ideas, especially European, behind colonial schooling or learning but almost incidentally contains a great deal that is useful concerning types of formal schools and colleges, something on curriculum, and more than a little on almost every facet of intellectual training touched upon in the present chapter.

The southern provinces are well represented in some discussions, scantily in others. R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, in *A History of Education in American Culture* (New York, 1953), offer a beginning for colonial education somewhat but not entirely along the lines of Cremin's later book. Still most useful for the purposes of this chapter is Allen G. Umbreit, "Education in the Southern Colonies" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Iowa, 1932), and Colyer Meriwether, *Our Colonial Curriculum, 1607-1776* (Washington, D.C., 1907), and basic is Edward Eggleston's *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1901), *The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, 1607-1763* (New York, 1957), by Louis B. Wright, is—like his other books—stimulating and detailed.

Useful in various ways are Carl Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness: The First Century of Urban Life in America, 1625-1742* (2nd ed., New York, 1955), especially for Charleston in comparison with other urban centers; Clifton H. Brewer, *A History of Religious Education in the Episcopal Church to 1835* (rpt. New York, 1969); Henry A. Bullock, *A History of Negro Education in the South from 1619 to the Present* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), which despite its title contains almost nothing for the period before 1764; Vincent Buranelli, "Colonial Philosophy," *WMQ* (3), XVI (1959), 343-362; Donald R. Comer, "The Influence of Princeton on Higher Education in the South before 1825," *WMQ* (3), II (1945), 359-396; Marcus W. Jerne-gan, *Laboring and Dependent Classes in Colonial America, 1607-1783* (rpt. New York, 1965), and the somewhat kindred Abbot E. Smith, *Colonists in Bondage: White Servitude and Convict Labor in America, 1607-1776* (Chapel Hill, 1947), generally later in period or nonapplicable in its material; and Julia C. Spruill, *Women's Life and Work in the Southern Colonies* (Chapel Hill, 1938). Samuel Miller, *A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century* (2 vols., orig. ed. 1803; rpt. New York, 1970), contains useful details, including library and student-body statistics of colonial colleges and a good deal on Scottish common-sense philosophy in America. See also Robert F. Seybolt, *The Evening School in Colonial America*, Bull. no. 24, Bur. of Educ. Research, Univ. of Illinois (Urbana, 1925), and his *Source Studies in American Colonial Education: The Private School*, Bull. no. 28, Bur. of Educ. Research, Univ. of Illinois (Urbana, 1925); Raymond P. Stearns, *Science in the British Colonies in America*.

General foreign influences, including colonials studying abroad, are discussed in William L. Sachse, *The Colonial American in Britain* (Madison, Wis., 1956); George S. Pride, *The Scottish Universities and the Colleges of Colonial America* (Glasgow, 1957); Douglas Sloan, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal* (New York, 1971), and a number of items listed below under separate colonies and the American student abroad.

One general church or religious-education item is listed above. Other more or less general studies include John Calam, *Parsons and Pedagogues: the S.P.G.*

Adventure in American Education (New York, 1971); William S. Perry, ed., *Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church, I, Virginia* (privately printed, 1870), and *IV, Maryland and Delaware* (1878), largely Anglican and documentary; Richard Webster, *A History of the Presbyterian Church in America, From Its Origin Until the Year 1760. With Biographical Sketches of Its Early Ministers . . .* (Philadelphia, 1857); and Frederick L. Weis, *The Colonial Clergy of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina* (Boston, 1955), and *The Colonial Clergy of Maryland, Delaware, and Georgia* (Lancaster, Mass., 1950).

Absolutely indispensable are "European Inheritances," Volume I, of Edgar W. Knight, *A Documentary History of Education in the South before 1860* (5 vols., Chapel Hill, 1949-1953; hereafter referred to as Knight, followed by volume and page), and Manross, *Fulham Papers* (noted above). Useful as they both are, Knight is necessarily selective, and Manross missed a few items which have turned up in other calendars such as the Jamestown 350th Anniversary Survey Reports.

Education Abroad. Books and essays on Anglo-European educational institutions are often as useful for the educational backgrounds of the first colonists and of many later clerical settlers as they are for the students who went from the South to study across the Atlantic. There is a considerable bibliography for English grammar schools alone. Some which have direct American allusions or show affiliations are Richard S. Thompson, *Classics or Charity? The Dilemma of the Eighteenth Century Grammar School* (Manchester, 1971); W.A.L. Vincent, *The Grammar Schools: Their Continuing Tradition, 1660-1714* (London, 1969); Nicholas Carlisle, *Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales* (2 vols., London, 1818); Sir Wasey Sterry, ed., *Eton College Register, 1753-1790* (Eton, 1921); *Rugby School Register . . . From 1675 to 1874 . . .* (2 vols., Rugby, 1881); G.F. Russell Barker and Alan H. Stenning, *The Record of Old Westminster: A Biographical List . . . from the Earliest Times to 1927* (2 vols., London, 1928); T. Pape, "Appleby Grammar School and Its Washington Pupils," *WMQ* (2), XX (1940), 498-501; "Some Virginians Educated in Great Britain," *VMHB*, XXI (1913), 196-199, 433-434; Thomas Cox, *A Popular History of the Grammar School of Queen Elizabeth, at Heath, Near Halifax . . .* (Halifax, 1879); William Page, ed., *A History of Yorkshire* (9 vols., n.d., The Victorian History of the Counties of England, Volume I, London, 1907); Matthew H. Peacock, *History of the Free Grammar School of Queen Elizabeth at Wakefield . . .* (Wakefield, 1892); J.W. Walker, *Wakefield: Its History and People* (2 vols., Wakefield, 1939); Philip A. Bruce, *Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (2 vols., New York, 1910), which contains long lists of students abroad; Lucille Griffith, ed., "English Education for Virginia Youth: Some Eighteenth Century Ambler Family Letters," *VMHB*, LXIX (1961), 7-27; and Knight, I, passim, esp. pp. 553 ff.; "Members of the Corbin Family Educated in England," *VMHB*, XXI (1913), 204-205; Mary N. Stanard, *Colonial*

Virginia: Its People and Its Customs (Philadelphia, 1917), passim; T.H. Wynne, ed., *A Memoir of a Portion of the Bolling Family in England and Virginia* (Richmond, 1868); Charles Campbell, ed., *The Bland Papers* . . . (2 vols., Petersburg, 1840).

Some of the items above include university as well as secondary school students, or show that many colonials went to both kinds of institutions of learning. Certain books and essays are concerned primarily with those from the colonies, especially southern, who attended universities or professional schools: W. Innes Addison, *A Roll of the Graduates of the University of Glasgow from . . . 1727 to . . . 1897 . . .* (Glasgow, 1898), and his *Matriculation Albums of the University of Glasgow . . . 1728 to 1858* (Glasgow, 1913); George D. Burchaeli and Thomas U. Sadleir, eds., *Alumni Dublinenses* . . . (Dublin, 1935); Willard Connely, "Colonial Americans in Oxford and Cambridge," *American Oxonian*, XXIX (1942), 75-77; Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, pp. 208 ff.; Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses* . . . (8 vols., Oxford, 1887-1899); *A Catalogue of the Graduates in the Faculties of Arts, Divinity and Law of the University of Edinburgh Since Its Foundation* (Edinburgh, 1858); P.J. Anderson, ed., *University and King's College (Aberdeen) Roll of Alumni in Arts* (Aberdeen, 1900), and his *Fasti Academiae Mariscallanae Aberdonensis* . . . 1593-1860 (2 vols., Aberdeen, 1889-1898); John and J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* . . . (4 vols., 1922-1954); and Phyllis W. Jacobs, "Registers of the Universities, Colleges, and Schools of Great Britain and Ireland," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, XXXVII (1964), 185-229.

For medical training, see Richard H. Shryock, *Medicine and Society in America, 1660-1860* (New York, 1960), and his *Medicine in America: Historical Essays* (Baltimore, 1966); Maurice B. Gordon, *Aesculapius Comes to the Colonies* (Ventnor, N.J., 1949), to be used with care; Brooke Hindle, *The Pursuit of Science in Revolutionary America, 1735-1789* (Chapel Hill, 1956); Thomas S. Cullen, *Early Medicine in Maryland* (Baltimore [1927? 15 pp.]); Joseph I. Waring, *A History of Medicine in South Carolina, 1670-1825* (Columbia, 1964); Wyndham B. Blanton, *Medicine in Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (Richmond, 1930) and *Medicine in Virginia in the Eighteenth Century* (Richmond, 1931); J. Calvin Weaver, "Early Medical History of Georgia," *Journal of the Medical Association of Georgia*, XXIX (1940), 89-112, William F. Norwood, *Medical Education in the United States before the Civil War* (Philadelphia, 1944), pp. 9-28; S. Lewis, ed., *List of the Graduates in Medicine at the University of Edinburgh* . . . (Edinburgh, 1867). Despite some of their titles, all of these deal at least to some extent with American medical education abroad. For connections with the medical college of the University of Edinburgh, see text and notes for this chapter.

Legal education abroad is best observed in E. Alfred Jones, *American Members of the Inns of Court* (London, 1924), and J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton, "Southern Members of the Inns of Court," *NCHR*, X (1933), 273-286. See also Lyon G. Tyler, "Education in Colonial Virginia," *WMQ* (1), VI (1897),

171-189; Horatio G. Somerby, "Americans Admitted to the Middle Temple," *NEHGR*, XVII (July, 1863), 251-252. Other items concerning particular colonies are included in footnotes or bibliographies for those colonies and in such studies as Aubrey C. Land, *The Dulanys of Maryland* (rpt. Baltimore, 1968).

Secondary Education. Curriculum and several sorts of schools are considered in a number of the books and essays listed just above. They are included with other matters in a list which is perhaps most easily used if grouped according to individual colonies.

MARYLAND grammar, free, charity, parish, and private schools, the teachers in them, and the family tutors are mentioned or described in all kinds of material, from official records through provincial and county histories to individual studies. Most useful in showing the general drift of secondary education is William H. Browne et al., eds., *Archives of Maryland* (more than 60 vols. to date, Baltimore, 1883-); *Calendar of Maryland State Papers*, No. 1. *The black Books* . . . (Annapolis, 1943); Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, IV; Bernard C. Steiner, *History of Education in Maryland*, U.S. Bur. Educ. Circ. Info. no. 2, 1894 (Washington, D.C., 1894); and W. Noel Sainsbury et al., eds., *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial America and the West Indies, 1574-1736* (42 vols. to date, London, 1860-1953). Background studies, many of which contain directly applicable material, include Land, *The Dulanys of Maryland*; Charles A. Barker, *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland* (New Haven, 1940), indispensable; Jonathan Boucher, *The Reminiscences of an American Loyalist* (Boston, 1925); John L. Bozman, *The History of Maryland, from Its First Settlement* . . . (2 vols., Baltimore, 1837); Charles B. Clark, ed., *The Eastern Shore of Maryland and Virginia* (3 vols., New York, 1950), esp. I, 123 ff.; Dieter Cunz, *The Maryland Germans: A History* (Princeton, 1948); Clayton C. Hall, ed., *Baltimore: Its History and Its People* (3 vols., Chicago, 1912); Edward Ingle, *Parish Institutions of Maryland with Illustrations from Parish Records*, Johns Hopkins Stud. Hist. & Polit. Sci., ser. I, no. 6 (Baltimore, 1883); Katherine A. Kellock, *Colonial Piscataway in Maryland* (Accokeek, Md., 1962), esp. pp. 46-47; Francis S. McGrath, *Pillars of Maryland* (Richmond, Va., 1950); E.D. Neill, *Terra Mariae* (Philadelphia, 1867); George Petrie, *Church and State in Early Maryland*, Johns Hopkins Stud. Hist. & Polit. Sci., ser. X, no. 4 (Baltimore, 1892); Hester D. Richardson, *Side-Lights on Maryland History with Sketches of Early Maryland Families* (rpt., 2 vols., Cambridge, Md., 1967); Nelson D. Rightmyer, "The Character of the Anglican Clergy of Colonial Maryland," *MdHM*, XLIV (1949), 229-250, and *Maryland's Established Church* (Baltimore, 1956); Elihu S. Riley "The Ancient City." *A History of Annapolis, in Maryland, 1649-1887* (Annapolis, 1887); H.S. Spalding, *Catholic Colonial Maryland* (Milwaukee, 1931); Oswald Tilghman, *History of Talbot County, Maryland, 1661-1861* (2 vols., Baltimore, 1915); and Clayton Torrence, *Old Somerset on the Eastern Shore of Maryland: A Study in Foundations and Founders* (rpt. Baltimore,

1966). Enlightening are Lavinia C.R. Wenger, "The Preparation of White Teachers for the Secondary Schools of Maryland, 1634-1940" (Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins Univ., 1950); Joseph T. Wheeler, "Literary Culture in Eighteenth Century Maryland, 1700-1776," *MdHM*, XXXVIII (1943), 273-276. Typical essays on particular schools are Edwin H. Brown, "First Free School in Queen Anne's County," *MdHM*, VI (1911), 1-15; and Daniel R. Randall, "Notes on a Colonial Free School in Anne Arundel County . . .," *MdHM*, XVIII (1923), 248-256.

VIRGINIA has had even more written on schools, curriculum, and teachers, and much of it included in such general studies as those of Eggleston, Wright, and Knight already noted. Useful in tracing the documentary and official history of secondary education are W.W. Hening, ed., *Statutes at Large of Virginia* (13 vols., Philadelphia, 1823; rpt. Charlottesville, 1969), and W.V. Winfree, ed., *The Laws of Virginia . . . Supplement to Hening* (Richmond, 1971); Susan M. Kingsbury, ed., *Records of the Virginia Company of London* (4 vols., Washington, D.C., 1906-1935); H.R. McIlwaine et al, eds., *Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia* (6 vols. to date, Richmond, 1925-1966), *Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia* (3 vols., Richmond, 1918-1919), *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Virginia, 1622 . . . 1676* (Richmond, 1924), and *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia [1659 to 1765]* (13 vols., Richmond, 1909-1915). Contemporary official and unofficial writing on the subject is included in Peter Force, ed., *Tracts and Other Papers* (4 vols., rpt. Gloucester, Mass., 1963). The histories mentioned in Chapters I and II by Hartwell-Blair-Chilton, Hugh Jones, Robert Beverley, and Richard L. Morton contain varying amounts of observation on education. Philip A. Bruce, *Social Life in Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (rpt. Williamstown, Mass., 1968), and his *Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* (2 vols., New York, 1910) have several informative chapters on secondary education. See also Susie M. Ames, *Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic in Virginia, 1607-1699*, Jamestown 350th Anniv., Hist. Booklet no. 15 (Williamsburg, 1957); J.L. Blair Buck, *The Development of Public Schools in Virginia, 1607-1952* (Richmond, 1952); Thomas K. Bullock, "Schools and Schooling in Eighteenth Century Virginia," (Ph.D. diss., Duke Univ., 1961); Helen Jones Campbell, "The Syms and Eaton Schools and Their Successors," *WMQ* (2), XX (1940), 1-61; Charles Campbell, *History of the Colony and Ancient Dominion of Virginia* (Philadelphia, 1860); Jack P. Greene, "Foundations of Political Power in the Virginia House of Burgesses," *WMQ* (3), XVI (1959), 485-506, including more than secondary schooling; Cornelius J. Heatwole, *A History of Education in Virginia* (New York, 1916); John B. Henneman, "Historic Elements in Virginia Educational and Literary Effort," *Proc. Va. Hist. Soc.* [1891], ed. R.A. Brock (Richmond, 1892); Mrs. W. P. Hiden, "Education and the Classics in the Life of Colonial Virginia," *VMHB*, XLIX (1941), 20-28; Edgar W. Knight, "The Evolution of Public Education in Virginia," *Sew Rev*, XXIV (1916), 24-41; "Letters of Jonathan Boucher," *MdHM*, VII (1912), 1-26, 150-165,

286-304, 337-356, etc.; Charles G. Gordon Moss, "Education in Colonial Virginia, Formal and Informal: An Interpretative Study," in *Education in the South*, Inst. Sou. Hist. Cult. Lectures, Longwood College (Farmville, Va., 1959), pp. 97-119; E.D. Neill, *History of Virginia Education in the Seventeenth Century* (Washington, D.C., 1867), and *Virginia Carolorum* (Albany, 1886), both continuing more than secondary education; Calvin Phippkins, "Legislation Affecting Secondary Education in Virginia from 1619 to 1845" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Virginia, 2 vols., 1932); Stanard, *Col. Va.*; Guy Fred Wells, *Parish Education in Colonial Virginia*, Teachers Coll. Columbia Contribs. to Educ. no. 138 (New York, 1923); Lyon G. Tyler, *Cradle of the Republic: Jamestown and James River* (Richmond, 1900), and "Education in Colonial Virginia," *WMQ* (1), V (1897), 219-223; VI (1897/8), 1-6, 71-86, 171-186; Louis B. Wright, *The First Gentlemen of Virginia . . .* (San Marino, Calif., 1940); William H. Foote, *Sketches of Virginia, Historical and Biographical* (1st ser., rpt. Richmond, 1966); William Meade, *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1857 or 1885); Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.* Interesting is the material in "Donald Robertson's School, King and Queen County, Va., 1758-1769: Extracts from His Account Book," *VMHB*, XXXIII (1925), 194-198, 288-293; XXXIV (1926), 141-148, 232-236; XXXV (1927), 55-56; and H. Carrington Lancaster, "The East India School Planned for Charles City," *Tyler's Q.*, V (1923-1924), 239-240. Douglas Southall Freeman's *George Washington* (7 vols., New York, 1948-1957), I, 32-203, contains a good deal on late colonial schools in Virginia, and Jernegan, *Laboring and Dependent Classes*, has something on secondary education. Grace W. Landrum, "The First Colonial Grammar in English," *WMQ* (2), XIX (1939), 272-285, discusses Hugh Jones' textbook. Various individual institutions are considered in "Schools in Virginia" *WMQ* (2), XVII (1908/9), 244-247; W.E. MacClenny, "Yeates' Free Schools," *WMQ* (2), V (1925), 30-38; and various chapters in Knight, I, and Stanard, *Col. Va.*

NORTH CAROLINA has not received proper attention from educational historians. Quaker education in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries merits further consideration, including delving into records in this country and in London. Most important for documents are Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col.*, and W. L. Saunders, ed., *The Colonial Records of North Carolina* (10 vols., Raleigh, 1886-1890), now being superseded by Mattie E.E. Parker et al., eds., *Colonial Records of North Carolina* (new ser., Vol. I, Raleigh, 1963). See also Knight, I, for documents. From various general or group historical studies much can be learned about education: R.D.W. Connor, *History of North Carolina* (6 vols., Chicago, 1919), esp. Vol. I; Beth G. Crabtree, *North Carolina Governors, 1585-1958* (Raleigh, 1958); William H. Foote, *Sketches of North Carolina, Historical and Biographical* (New York, 1858; rpt. New Bern, N.C., 1966); Adelaide L. Fries, "The Moravian Contribution to Colonial North Carolina," *NCHR*, VII (1930), 1-14, *The Road to Salem* (Chapel Hill, 1944), and (ed.) *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina, I, 1752-1771* (Raleigh, 1922); F.L. Hawks, *History of North Carolina* (2

vols., Fayetteville, N.C., 1857-1858); Zora Klain, *Quaker Contributions to Education in North Carolina* (Philadelphia, 1925); Hugh T. Lefler, "Religion, Education, and Culture in Eighteenth Century North Carolina," in *History of North Carolina* (4 vols., New York, 1956), I, 137-153; Duane Meyer, *The Highland Scots of North Carolina, 1732-1776* (Chapel Hill, 1961); David B. Oliver, *The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in North Carolina*, James Sprunt Hist. Publications (Chapel Hill, 1909); James S. Purcell, Jr., "Literary Culture in North Carolina before 1820" (Ph.D. diss., Duke Univ., 1950); Charles L. Smith, *The History of Education in North Carolina*, U.S. Bur. Educ. Circ. Info. no. 2, 1888 (Washington, D.C., 1888); Stephen B. Weeks, *The Religious Development of the Province of North Carolina*, Johns Hopkins Stud. Hist. & Polit. Sci., 10th ser., V-VI (Baltimore, 1892). There are manuscripts of value at Duke, Chapel Hill, the Library of Congress, and the S.P.G., the Public Record Office, and Lambeth Palace in London. Above all, see Mary Lindsay Thornton, *A Bibliography of North Carolina, 1589-1956* (Chapel Hill, 1958). The best study of a teacher is Elizabeth Kaye, "The Case of Thomas Thomlinson," *HMPEC*, V (1936), 27-41.

SOUTH CAROLINA colonial education has received considerable attention, especially at the secondary school level. Much of the material is in edited documents and general historical or cultural studies: J.H. Easterby et al., eds., *The Colonial Records of South Carolina* (9 vols. to date, Columbia, 1951-1974); Frederick P. Bowes, *The Culture of Early Charleston* (Chapel Hill, 1942); Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness*, and his *Myths and Realities: Societies of the Colonial South* (rpt. New York, 1963); B.R. Carroll, ed., *Historical Collections of South Carolina* (2 vols., New York, 1836); Hennig Cohen, *The South Carolina Gazette 1732-1775* (Columbia, 1953); *Collections of the South Carolina Historical Society* (5 vols., Charleston, 1856-1897); Frederick Dalcho, *An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South-Carolina, From the First Settlement . . . to the War of the Revolution . . .* (Charleston, 1820); Alexander Hewatt, *An Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the Colonies of South Carolina and Georgia* (2 vols., London, 1779; also in Carroll, ed., *History and Collections of South Carolina*, I); Arthur H. Hirsch, *The Huguenots of South Carolina* (Durham, N.C., 1928); Charles Woodmason, *The Carolina Backcountry on the Eve of the Revolution*, ed. Richard J. Hooker (Chapel Hill, 1953); Edward McCrady, Jr., *The History of South Carolina Under the Proprietary Government, 1670-1719* (New York, 1897), and *The History of South Carolina Under the Royal Government* (New York, 1899); Sirmans, *Col. S.C.*; Warren B. Smith, *White Servitude in Colonial South Carolina* (Columbia, 1961); Rosser H. Taylor, *Ante-Bellum South Carolina: A Social and Cultural History* (Chapel Hill, 1942); D.D. Wallace, *The History of South Carolina* (3 vols., New York, 1934), and *South Carolina: A Short History, 1520-1948* (Columbia, 1961); and Waring, *Hist. of Med. in S.C.* More specifically educational, or concerned with the subject, are G.S. Dunbar, "Geographic Education in South Carolina," *Journ. of Geography*, LXIX (1970), 348-350; Gertrude Foster, "Documen-

tary History of Education in South Carolina," (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of South Carolina, 13 vols., 1932, esp. Vols. I and II); Frank J. Klingberg, "Early Attempts at Indian Education in South Carolina, a Documentary," *SCHM*, LXI (1960), 1-10, and ed., *The Carolina Chronicle of Dr. Francis LeJan, 1706-1717* (Berkeley, 1956) and *Carolina Chronicle: The Papers of Commissary Gideon Johnston, 1707-1716* (Berkeley, 1946); Helen E. Livingston, "Thomas Morritt, Schoolmaster at the Charleston Free School, 1723-1728," *HMPEC*, XIV (1945), 151-167; Edward McCrady, Jr., "Education in South Carolina Prior to and during the Revolution," *S.C. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, IV, 7-15; Colyer Meriwether, *History of Higher Education in South Carolina and a Sketch of the Free School System*, U.S. Bull. Educ. no. 4 (Washington, D.C., 1889); Edgar L. Pennington, "The Rev. Thomas Morritt and the Free School in Charles Town," *SCHM*, XXXII (1931), 34-45; B. James Ramage, "Free Schools in South Carolina," in *Local Government and Free Schools in South Carolina*, Johns Hopkins Stud. Hist. & Polit. Sci., VII (Baltimore, 1883); George C. Rogers, Jr., *The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina* (Columbia, 1970); Robert F. Seybolt, "Carolina Schoolmaster of 1744," *SCHM*, XXX (1930), 314-315; Henry A.M. Smith, "The Town of Dorchester in South Carolina—A Sketch of Its History," *SCHM*, VI (1905), 62-95; and Knight, I. *passim*. Important bibliographical tools are Robert J. Turnbull, *Bibliography of South Carolina, 1563-1950*, Vol. I, 1563-1814 (3 vols., Charlottesville, 1956), J.H. Easterby, *Guide to the Study and Reading of South Carolina History: A General Classified Bibliography* (Columbia, 1950), and Hennig Cohen, *Articles in Periodicals and Serials on South Carolina Literature and Related Subjects, 1900-1955* (Columbia, 1956).

GEORGIA colonial secondary education is represented by documents in Knight, I, *passim*; Allen D. Candler, and Lucien Knight, eds., *Colonial Records of the State of Georgia* (26 vols., Atlanta, 1904-1916); G.F. Jones, trans. and ed., *Henry Newman's Salzburger Letterbooks* (Athens, Ga., 1966); Jones, ed., and Hermann J. Lacher, trans., *Detailed Reports on the Salzburger Emigrants Who Settled in America . . . edited by Samuel Urlsperger* (3 vols. to date, Athens, Ga., 1968-). For education in histories, see Reba C. Strickland, *Religion and the State in Georgia in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1939); E.M. Coulter, *Georgia: A Short History* (Chapel Hill, 1960); R.L. Brantley, "The Salzburgers in Georgia," *GaHQ*, XIV (1930), 214-224. Studies of phases of secondary education include John P. Corry, "Education in Early Georgia," *GaHQ*, XVI (1932), 136-145; James B. Lawrence, "Religious Education of the Negro in the Colony of Georgia," *GaHQ*, XIV (1930), 41-57; R.L. McCaul, Jr., "A Documentary History of Education in Colonial Georgia" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Chicago, 1953), and "Education in Georgia during the Period of Royal Control, 1752-1776: Financial Support of Schools and Schoolmasters," *GaHQ*, XL (1956), 103-112, 248-259; James R. McCain, *Georgia as a Proprietary Province* (Boston, 1917); Martha G. Waring, "Savannah's Earliest Private Schools, 1733 to 1800," *GaHQ*, XIV (1930), 324-334; George Whitefield, *A Brief Account of the Orphan House in Georgia* (Edin-

burgh, 1748); Adelaide L. Fries, *The Moravians in Georgia, 1735-1740* (Raleigh, N.C., 1905); Charles E. Jones, *Education in Georgia*, U.S. Bur. Educ. Circ. Info. no. 4, 1888 (Washington, D.C., 1889); G.F. Jones, "J.M. Bolzius Reports on Georgia," *GaHQ*, XLVII (1963), 216-219; William Harden, "The Moravians of Georgia and Pennsylvania as Educators," *GaHQ*, II (1918), 47-56. See also Oscar Wegelin, *Books Relating to the History of Georgia in the Library of Wymberley Jones DeRenne . . .* (Savannah, 1911).

Higher Education. College or university training within the colonies before 1763 was all in Virginia, though the sporadic attempts at its establishment in other colonies are worth noting because they often led to the founding of universities after the colonial period.

Virginia began its program with the attempted establishment in 1617-1624 of a college or university at Henrico. Pertinent documents are in Knight, I, passim; Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, passim; Hening, ed., *Statutes*, I, passim; Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col.*, passim; McIlwaine, et al., eds., *Journals H.B. of Va.* (1619-1659), p. 10, and McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes Council Gen. Court of Col. Va.*, p. 166, etc. Robert H. Land, "Henrico and Its College," *WMQ* (2), XVIII (1938), 453-498, is the best single study. H.B. Adams, *The College of William and Mary*, U.S. Bur. Educ. Circ. Info. no. 1, 1887 (Washington, D.C., 1887) touches on the subject. More directly pertinent are George J. Cleaveland, "At Henrico," *Wm. and Mary Alumni Gazette*, XXXVII, no. 3 (March 1970), 4-10; Elizabeth Coleman and W. Edwin Hemphill, "Founding Virginia's First College," *Va. Cavalcade*, VII, no. 1 (Summer 1957), 14-22; John S. Flory, "The University of Henrico," *Publications of the Southern History Assoc.*, VIII (1903), 46-52; Umbreit, "Ed. in Sou. Colonies," pp. 200-205. Several of these are concerned with the later William and Mary as well as Henrico. Though most official records of the College of William and Mary have been destroyed by the three or more fires at the institution, a considerable amount has been written about the second oldest American college. H.B. Adams' pioneer work (1887) is noted just above; Perry, *Historical Collections*, I, contains much on the subject; the histories of Hartwell-Blair-Chilton, Beverley, and Hugh Jones are especially concerned with it; Miller, *A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, II, passim, has useful statistical and other details, as does Knight, I, 368-552, including charter and statutes. See also *The Official Letters of Alexander Spotswood . . . 1710-1722*, ed. R.A. Brock (2 vols., Richmond, 1882); Thomas K. Bullock, "Schools and Schooling"; "Notes Relating to some of the Students who Attended the College of William and Mary 1753-1770," *WMQ* (2), XXI (1941), 243-247; John M. Jennings, *The Library of the College of William and Mary in Virginia, 1693-1793* (Charlottesville, 1968); Herbert L. Ganter, "Documents Relating to the Early History of the College of William and Mary and the History of the Church in Virginia," *WMQ* (2), XIX (1939), 446-470, XX (1946), 524-544, and "William Small, Jefferson's Beloved Teacher," *WMQ* (3), IV (1947), 505-511; Parke Rouse, Jr., *James Blair of Virginia* (Chapel Hill, 1971); "Speeches of the Students of the College of William and Mary De-

livered May 1, 1699," *WMQ* (2), X (1930), 323-337; "Supplementary Documents Giving Additional Information Concerning the Four Forms of the Oldest Building at William and Mary College," *WMQ* (2), X (1930), 68-69; "Journals of the Meetings of the President and Masters of William and Mary College," *WMQ* (1), I (1892/3), 130-137, 214, 220; II (1893/4), 50-59, 122-127, 208-210, 256-259; III (1894/5); 60-63, 128-132, 195-197, 262-265; James J. Walsh, *Education of the Founding Fathers of the Republic: Scholasticism in the Colonial Colleges . . .* (New York, 1935); Lyon G. Tyler, *Williamsburg, the Old Colonial Capital* (Richmond, 1907), and *The College of William and Mary: Its Work, Discipline, and History, from Its Foundation to the Present Time*, Bull. Coll. Wm. & Mary (Williamsburg, 1917); *Vital Facts: A William and Mary Chronology, 1693-1963* (Williamsburg, 1963); A.B. Cutts, "The Educational Influence of Aberdeen in Seventeenth Century Virginia," *WMQ* (2), XV (1935), 229-249. For attempts at higher education in the other four southern colonies before 1764, see notes to the present chapter. In this chapter, except where otherwise noted, the terms *university* and *college* are often used interchangeably, partly because they are so used in colonial records, and partly because Henrico and William and Mary were obviously intended as universities, or the first units of universities, in the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century sense.

Negro and Indian Education. See Chapters II and V and such studies as Mary F. Goodwin, "Christianizing and Educating the Negro in Colonial Virginia," *HMPEC*, I (1932), 143-152; George W. Pilcher, "Samuel Davies and the Instruction of Negroes in Virginia," *VMHB*, LXXIV (1966), 293-300; Thad W. Tate, *The Negro in Eighteenth-Century Williamsburg* (Charlottesville, 1965); Knight, I. *passim*; Klingberg's two *Carolina Chronicle* works above; Meade, *Old Churches*, *passim*; Bullock, *History of Negro Education*; Edgar L. Pennington, "Dr. Thomas Bray's Associates and Their Work among the Negroes," *PAAS*, n.s., XLVIII (1938), 311-403; James B. Lawrence, "Religious Education of the Negro in the Colony of Georgia," *GaHQ*, XIV (1930), 41-57.

Theories and Philosophies of Education. Many of these are explicit or implicit in the documents in collections named above, as in legal enactments for establishment of schools, charters, statutes, and textbooks. They begin with the Virginia charters and John Brinsley's *A Consolation for Our Grammar Schools* (London, 1622, facsimile rpt., New York, 1943), a book written for colonial teachers. R[oger] G[reen]'s *Virginia's Cure: or An Advisive Narrative Concerning Virginia* (London, 1662), contains some ideas by a clergyman of the colony, as does Morgan Godwyn's *The Negro's & Indians Advocate* (London, 1680) and its sequel (London, 1681), which might also have been included in the Negro-Indian Education bibliography just above; John Clayton (1684), William Fitzhugh (1686/7), Francis Makemie (1705), Hugh Jones (1724), Blair, Hartwell, and Chilton (1697, 1727), Robert Beverley (1705), N. Burwell (1718), and Robert Carter (1723/4) expressed themselves in letters

and histories referred to in text and notes. "Proposals for an Academy at Annapolis," *Archives of Md.*, XXXVIII, 456–461, probably by Richard Lewis, is more comprehensive, perceptive, and direct. The essays in the *South Carolina Gazette* (1732, 1747, 1750) and the *Maryland Gazette* (1745, 1760) are both interesting and suggestive, as are the charity school sermon by Thomas Bacon (1750) and the general education sermon by Thomas Cradock (c. 1750s?). The exchanges on the value to a colonial of a classical education is discussed at length by James Maury in "A Dissertation On Education [1762]," ed. Helen D. Bullock, *Papers of the Albemarle County Historical Society*, II (1941–1942), 36–60, which favors doing away with classical education for the average colonial, and by Jonathan Boucher, whose defense of such training provoked Maury's remarks and who himself by 1773 in a discourse "On American Education," in *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution* (London, 1797), comes round to Maury's point of view.

NOTES

1. Eggleston, *Transit* (New York, 1901); Butts and Cremin, *A History of Education in American Culture* (New York, 1953); Cremin, *American Education: The Colonial Experience 1607–1783* (New York, 1970); Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society* (Chapel Hill, 1960). Less successful are the books by Cremin's students, such as John Calam, *Parsons and Pedagogues: The S.P.G. Adventure in American Education* (New York, 1971), and Douglas Sloan, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal* (New York, 1971). See the reviews of Calam and Sloan in *WMQ* (3), XXIX (1972), 189–191, 191–192.

2. Eggleston, *Transit*, p. 246.

3. Bruce, *Social Life in Va.*, pp. 40–43.

4. See the first pages of Walsh, *Education of the Founding Fathers: Scholasticism in the Colonial Colleges*, and various histories of British grammar schools cited above in the chapter bibliography.

5. For statistics on clergy, see Cremin, *Am. Ed.*: *Col. Exp.*, p. 207; Weis, *Col. Clergy Va., N.C., and S.C.*, and *Col. Clergy Md., Del., and Ga.*, passim; Bruce, *Social Life in Va.*, passim, and *Inst. Hist. Va.*, esp. Vol. I, passim. My own rough count is based on Weis' books and E.L. Goodwin, *The Colonial Church in Virginia* (Milwaukee, 1927), and Rightmyer, *Maryland's Established Church*. For my count, see section on "Universities and Liberal Arts" under *Education Abroad*, below, in this chapter.

6. *Proceedings of the General Assembly of Virginia July 30–August 4, 1619 Written . . . by Mr. John Pory . . .*, ed. W.J. Van Schreeven and George H. Reese (Jamestown, Va., 1969), pp. 31, 77 (see also for names of assemblymen). In addition, see Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, passim, and Alexander Brown, ed., *Genesis of the United States* (2 vols., Boston, 1890), and *The First Republic in America* (Boston, 1898).

7. For the story of these schools and their curricula see the bibliography for this chapter, under *Education Abroad*.

8. Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, p. 112.

9. Louis B. Wright, *Culture on the Moving Frontier* (Bloomington, Ind., 1955), and *The First Gentlemen of Virginia* (San Marino, 1940). See also T.P. Abernethy, *Three Virginia Frontiers* (Baton Rouge, 1940).

10. Bailyn, *Ed. in Forming Am. Soc.*, pp. 61-62; Peter Laslett, "The Gentry of Kent in 1640," *Cambridge Hist. Journ.*, IX (1948), 148-164, and, as ed., "*Patriarcha*" and *Other Political Works of Sir Robert Filmer* (Oxford, 1949); Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, Ch. IV, "Household," pp. 113-137; Peter Laslett and John Harrison, "Clayworth and Cogenhoe," in *Historical Essays, 1660-1750, Presented to David Ogg*, ed. H.E. Bell and R.L. Ollard (New York, 1963), *passim*. Certain figures quoted by Cremin indicate that the families of the gentry were the largest, of yeoman next, and of tradesmen, laborers, and "the poor," smallest of all. Cremin points out that the family was indeed the educational center for the large numbers of children of the gentry, often taught for years by a household tutor before going out to an organized school, and that religion remained a strong factor in Tudor and Stuart home training: "The household was to be a school of religion, with the clergy encouraging and overseeing the instruction." (p. 119).

11. Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, "Education," I, 293-460, esp. 450-459; Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, pp. 174-175, 231n, 533n, 543n.

12. For discussion of these schools see Carlisle, *Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales*; Vincent, *The Grammar Schools: 1660-1714*; Eggleston, *Transit*, pp. 214-217; Cremin, "School," in *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, pp. 167-176, 606-607; Butts and Cremin, *Hist. of Ed. in Am. Cult.*, p. 57; Meriwether, *Colonial Curriculum*, p. 36; Umbreit, "Ed. in Sou. Colonies," pp. 103-104. See also books on individual schools in this chapter's bibliography and in notes below. Definitions of "free schools" and grammar schools appear in dozens of studies of both British and colonial institutions. Cathedral schools such as St. Peter's at York or Westminster or Winchester were to evolve into much the same sort of public (again in the British sense only) schools as Eton and Harrow and Rugby. See A.F. Leach, "Schools," *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed. (Cambridge and New York, 1911), XXIV, 359-372.

13. See Robert Carter to William Dawkins, January 28, 1723/4, *VMHB*, XXX (1923), 39-41; or Eliza Lucas Pinckney to various writers, 1760-1761, *The Letterbook of Eliza Lucas Pinckney, 1739-1762*, ed. Elise Pinckney (Chapel Hill, 1972), pp. 156, 160, 163, 167, 172.

14. For popular pious books for everyone (some used in schools) see Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, pp. 44ff., and Ch. IV of this study.

15. In the grammar and lower schools, the hornbook and the primer and ABC books preceded guides to the more advanced subjects, and it is probable that the simpler texts and manuals were individually owned by each child. Perhaps too, many younger children owned an English translation of Comenius' *Orbus Pictus*, a simple Latin-English "rhetoric" with the first textbook illustrations.

16. Meriwether, *Colonial Curriculum*, passim, in discussion of American courses of study suggests strongly the British sources from which they sprang.

17. Republished in facsimile, with introd. by T.C. Pollock (New York, 1943). See also John Brinsley in *DNB*.

18. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, I, 574, "Minutes."

19. *A Consolation*, p. 54, number 33. It should be kept in mind that the author appears to have regarded *A Consolation* as a sequel to his earlier *Ludus* and that the reader of the second book already knew the first.

20. Brinsley's direct influence in England is suggested in the *DNB* sketch of him and in the bibliography in Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, p. 589. The proof of direct influence in America is not quite so positive, though Cremin (pp. 55-57) makes some case for it. Eggleston (*Transit*, pp. 216-219) indicates widespread knowledge of both of Brinsley's major guides in seventeenth-century educational circles without differentiating between British and American. Wright (*First Gent. Va.*, pp. 136-137) records Brinsley's *Ludus* in a Virginia library of 1635 and another Brinsley book in a 1648 collection. But there seems little doubt that *Ludus* and *A Consolation* were used widely throughout the seventeenth century wherever English was spoken.

21. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 1-2, and Land, "Henrico and Its College," pp. 474-475. The essay by Land is the best single study of the subject. A photographic copy of one of the rare broadsides sent to parishes by G. Newman, Commissary General to the Archbishop of Canterbury, is dated April 15, 1616, with the King's order at the top of the sheet dated February 28, 1615[-16], and is in the Virginia Historical Society. This particular copy "To the Minister and Church-wardens of" completes the printed form with the handwritten word "Beatresden."

22. Samuel M. Bemiss, ed., *The Three Charters of the Virginia Company of London*, Jamestown 350th Anniversary Hist. Booklet no. 4 (Williamsburg, 1957), pp. 21, 57, 73, 111. By 1621 in the instructions to Yeardley or Wyatt the word "educated" was being used in regard to the Indians, for the college-school had already been planned.

23. (London). Reprinted in Force, *Tracts*, I, vii, 8.

24. Bemiss, ed., *The Three Charters of the Virginia Company*, p. 100.

25. Alexander Brown, *The First Republic in America* (Boston, 1898), pp. 428, 442, etc.; Knight, I, 13-16, 18-21, 27-31; Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, I, 152, 532-533, 538-541, 550-551, 558-559, III, 537-540; Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, pp. 12-13, 177; H. Carrington Lancaster, "The East Indian School Planned for Charles City," *Tyler's Q.*, V (1923/4), 239-240.

26. For Palmer's *Academia*, see Adams, *The College of William and Mary*, pp. 11-12; Knight, I, 2-4n; Neill, *Hist. Va. Ed. Sev. Cent.*, p. 23. For Palmer as a member of the Virginia Company and patents granted him, see Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, II, 75, 77, 90, 217, 218; III, 65, 66; IV, 80, 210. Palmer had transported great numbers to Virginia and thus held considerable land; he owned many shares in the Virginia Company. He is probably the same Edward Palmer described by Anthony à Wood in *Athenae Oxoniensis* (2 vols., London, 1721), I, 346, as antiquarian and student of heraldry and history.

See also Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England* [1662], ed. P. Austin Nuttall (3 vols., London, 1840), I, 566–567. Fuller says Palmer was an uncle of Sir Thomas Overbury, was married, and had children.

27. Quoted in L.G. Tyler, "Education in Colonial Virginia. Part III. Free Schools," *WMQ* (1), VI (1897), 72. See *DNB* and Fuller, *Worthies*, noted just above.

28. See W. Stitt Robinson, "Mother Earth"—*Land Grants in Virginia, 1607–1699*, Jamestown 350th Anniv. Hist. Booklet no. 12 (Williamsburg, Va., 1957), *passim*.

29. The present writer lived three years of his boyhood within a hundred yards of the Syms-Eaton Academy, a brick elementary school presumably on an original site. The Syms and Eaton bequests and the resulting schools, eventually combined, have been written of extensively scores of times: e.g., Knight, I, 203–234; Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, I, *passim*; Tyler, "Ed. in Col. Va.," pp. 72–77; Ames, *Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic in Va.*, pp. 8–9; Campbell, "The Syms and Eaton Schools," pp. 1–61; Neill, *Hist. Va. Ed. Sev. Cent.*, p. 24, and *Va. Carolorum*, pp. 42–113n; and Phippings, "Legislation," I, 56–60.

30. Copy in Virginia State Lib. Here quoted from Knight, I, 205.

31. Hening, ed., *Statutes*, I, 252. The whole history of bequest and school is reviewed in a new enabling act a century later (*ibid.* VI, 389–392), where the "charter" and statutes of organization are spelled out.

32. Phippings, "Legislation Affecting Secondary Educ. in Va. . . . 1619 to 1845," I, 52–53; Buck, *The Development of Public Schools in Virginia, 1607–1952*, pp. 16–17, 21. The author of *A Perfect Description of Virginia* (London, 1649; in Force, *Tracts*, II, viii, 15) gives a paragraph to the excellent "Free-Schoole" endowed by "Symes."

33. Perry, ed., *Hist. Coll. Col. Ch.*, I, 294.

34. Reputed to have been the brother of the famous or infamous Nathaniel Eaton, of Massachusetts (original Harvard master) and the Eastern Shore of Virginia. For his will, see Knight, I, 205–206, and Campbell, "The Syms and Eaton Schools," p. 4.

35. Knight, I, 206–207, 211–214, 216–219, 219–234; Tyler, "Ed in Col. Va. Part III. Free Schools," pp. 73–77.

36. Hening, ed., *Statutes*, VII, 317 (Eaton), VI, 389 (Syms); Knight, I, 211–214. "Charity" and "Free" were perhaps used synonymously here, though one cannot be sure.

37. Hening, ed., *Statutes*, VII, 319. The fact that "Gentlemen's children" were admitted to endowed charity schools was a common complaint. The Reverend Alexander Rhonnald in nearby Norfolk County alleged that a school he once conducted for underprivileged children had become so overrun with the offspring of the upper classes that he had had to complain to the General Assembly and as a consequence the "Grandeess" had driven him from his mastership (Wells, *Parish Ed. Col. Va.*, p. 38). In this instance Rhonnald may have been referring to the Eaton school.

38. The county as a political entity has recently been absorbed into the city of Hampton.

39. Knight, I, 216-234. See also Wells, *Parish Ed. Col. Va.*, pp. 32-39.
40. January 20, 1652, *VMHB*, X [1903], 318; Umbreit, "Ed. in Sou. Colonies," pp. 101ff., points out the seven schools he located.
41. "Free Schools and the Church in the Seventeenth Century," *VMHB*, I (1893/4), 326-327. Intended as an answer to M.C. Conway's *Barons of the Potomack and Rappahannock* (New York, 1892), which states that the first free school in Lower Norfolk was in 1736.
42. Perry, *Historical Collections*, I, 309; Knight, I, 327-329.
43. Knight, I, 202-234; Wells, *Parish Ed. Col. Va.*, pp. 30-48; Tyler, "Ed. in Col. Va.," pp. 77-84; Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, I, 350-360. For the Farneffold "Winchester school," *WMQ* (2), XVII (1908/9), 244-246; for the Yeates' schools, *WMQ* (2), V (1925), 30-38, and Phippkins, "Legislation," I, 103; Meade, *Old Churches*, I, 265-266; McIlwaine, ed., *Journals H. B. Va.* (1712-1722), p. 264. Stanard, *Col. Va.*, pp. 268-270, lists dozens of endowed free schools.
44. *History and Present State of Virginia*, ed. L.B. Wright (Chapel Hill, 1947), pp. 275-276.
45. For general Maryland educational history, see the bibliography for this chapter. Steiner, *Hist. Ed. Md.*; *Archives of Md.*, passim; Richardson, *Side-Lights on Md. Hist.*, I, 169-177. All men of the province were encouraged to contribute to the building fund as well as the endowment for the school. The province itself did not intend to be the principal supporter of the institution, at least at this time.
46. Probably after 1707, for early in that year Governor Seymour declared to the Council on Trade and the Plantations that there was as yet not one grammar school in the whole province (Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col.*, 1706-1708, pp. 468-473). In 1719 the Assembly was still reminding the Lords of Trade that they needed money for a good free school, comparing their plight with Virginia's good fortune, for the other colony had "a Magnificent College," *Archives of Md.*, XXXIII, 353-354. Yet the Annapolis school as a teaching institution without a building seems to have begun operating in 1701.
47. Steiner, *Hist. Ed. Md.*, p. 23. See also Chapter XX, "King William's School, 1696-1785," in Riley, *The Ancient City*, pp. 77-80; Daniel R. Randall, "Notes on a Colonial Grammar School in Anne Arundel County . . .," *MdHM*, XVII (1923), 248-256. For acts for revenue, see *Archives of Md.*, XXV, 275-278, etc., and note 46, just above.
48. Edwin H. Brown, Jr., "First Free School in Queen Anne's County," *MdHM*, VI (1911), 1-15.
49. *Archives of Md.*, XLII (Assembly Proceedings, Upper House), 164, 168-245, 457.
50. *Ibid.*, XLIV, 116, 214, 246-396.
51. *Ibid.*, XLVI, 229.
52. E.g., *ibid.*, LVI, 50.
53. For colonial educational legislation see *Archives of Md.*, passim, as exemplified in notes just above, and Steiner, *Hist. Ed. Md.*, pp. 19-26, 26-32, etc.

54. *Archives of Md.*, I, 244-247.
55. Wenger, "Prep. of White Teachers for Sec. Schools of Md.," pp. 6-7; Archibald Alexander, *The Log College* (Philadelphia, 1851), pp. 204-207.
56. Wenger, "Prep. of White Teachers for Sec. Schools of Md.," pp. 7-10.
57. See Ch. V below.
58. Tilghman, *Hist. Talbot County, Md.*, II, 443, 450, 452. For Quaker schools see Wenger, "Prep. of White Teachers for Sec. Schools of Md.," pp. 7-9, who offers evidence that from the time of Fox's visits to Maryland in 1672 education was a major project of the Friends. Most of it appears to have been conducted in their homes, though there are mentions of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses who may have taught in buildings set aside for education. That some Quakers were far more than merely literate is suggested by the books and pamphlets they published.
59. For more on Bacon, see esp. Chs. VI and IX, and Ethan Allen, "Rev. Thomas Bacon, 1745-1768," *American Quarterly Church Review*, XVII (Oct., 1865), 430-451, etc.; Tilghman, *Hist. Talbot County, Md.*, I, 272-301 (the most extensive personal account).
60. *A Sermon* . . . was published in Lincoln by J. Oliver in 1751. Included with it are the resolutions by "The Trustees and Managers of the Charity School" and a statement that the sermon and other matter are printed "for the Advantage of the School."
61. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
62. *Archives of Md.*, IX, 415.
63. Steiner, *Hist. Ed. in Md.*, pp. 35-36.
64. *A Sermon*, p. 19.
65. Connor, *Hist. N.C.*, I, 200; Smith, *Hist. Ed. N.C.*, pp. 13-14; Oliver, *S.P.G. in N.C.*, pp. 10-14; Weeks, *Relig. Develop. Prov. N.C.*, pp. 25-27, 41-42; Lefler, *Hist. N.C.*, I, 146-150.
66. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 215, 216-218, 226, 448; II, 172; Stephen B. Weeks, "Libraries and Literature in North Carolina in the Eighteenth Century," AHA, *Annual Report for the Year 1895*, pp. 119-174. For possible Quaker schools, see Klain, *Quaker Contribs. to Ed. N.C.*, pp. 24-34, 37-50. She demonstrates, however, that Quaker schools and schoolbooks (as Fox's primers) appeared in the first half of the eighteenth century.
67. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 719-721; Hawks, *Hist. N.C.*, II, 369-370. The clergymen Gordon and Adams thought Griffin's the best school in Carolina during the Proprietary period.
68. Mashburn's school was highly recommended in a 1712 letter to the S.P.G. secretary by Rainsford, who suggested that the S.P.G. pay Rainsford a salary so that he might extend the good services he had already performed and teach Indian children gratis. Thus the school, though probably private, may have been partially endowed for white pupils but not sufficiently to allow for red children.
69. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, V, 306. See below for legacies never implemented, or not until after the Revolution.
70. *Ibid.*, V, 1137. This power was granted in the "Instructions" Dobbs

received as he went to North Carolina. For Dobbs' speech in the Assembly, see *ibid.*, V, 496-497, 1095; VI, 3, 5, etc. See also Knight, I, 715-720.

71. *Ibid.*, VI, 709-710.

72. See Elizabeth Kaye, "The Case of Thomas Thomlinson," *HMPEC*, V (1936), 27-41.

73. Connor, *Hist. N.C.*, I, 203.

74. Fries, ed., *Records of Moravians in N.C.*, I and II, *passim*.

75. Smith, *Hist. Ed. N.C.*, pp. 22-26, etc.; Foote, *Sketches of N.C.*, *passim*.

76. Smith, *Hist. Ed. N.C.*, pp. 22-26.

77. Foote, *Sketches of N.C.*, p. 178. For the Reverend David Caldwell, see pp. 231-243. See also Smith, *Hist. Ed. N.C.*, pp. 28-32.

78. Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness*, p. 121. He is speaking specifically of Charleston, but his generalization applies to the whole colony if at all. See also McCrady, *Hist. S.C. Under Royal Govt.*, p. 494.

79. Bridenbaugh, *Cities in the Wilderness*, p. 285.

80. Both acts have been reprinted in Knight, I, 671-685, from Thomas Cooper and David J. McCord, eds., *Statutes at Large of South Carolina* (6 vols., Columbia, 1838-1841), II, 341-346, 389-396.

81. Pennington, "Morritt and the Free School in Charles Town," pp. 34-45, and Livingston, "Thomas Morritt, Charleston," pp. 151-167.

82. Pennington, "Morritt and the Free School in Charles Town," pp. 37-38. He received the advance.

83. See *ibid.*; Livingston, "Thomas Morritt, Charleston," *passim*; and Knight, I, 697-698.

84. Copy of Lee's will is in Knight, I, 301-302.

85. The will appears in Knight, I, 303-307, under the date 1715. Meriwether, *Hist. Higher Ed. S.C.*, p. 15, gives 1722 and McCrady, *Hist. S.C. Under Royal Govt.*, p. 484, gives 1721 as the date of the bequest. Knight prints from a copy of the original (in Charleston) now in the University South Caroliniana Lib., Columbia. The differences in date are probably the result of the fact that the will was probated after 1722, in which year Beresford died in "a sad accident" (Foster, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in S.C.," I, 100ff.). Foster gives further details of bequest and school under 1726, 1734, 1740, etc.

86. See Knight, I, 317, 324.

87. Meriwether, *Hist. Higher Ed. S.C.*, pp. 15-16.

88. Child's will (given in Knight, I, 307-312) is in Charleston, and a copy is in the University South Caroliniana Lib. Meriwether, *Hist. Higher Ed. S.C.*, p. 19, recounts the story of the enlarged fund and describes the school building. See also Foster, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in S.C.," I, 194 ff. Child died in 1720.

89. For the act for erecting the school at Childsbury, June 9, 1733, see Knight, I, 314-317.

90. Foster, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in S.C.," I, 197.

91. See Edward McCrady, "Col. Ed. in S.C.," in Meriwether, *Hist. Higher Ed. S.C.*, Appendix II, p. 214; also Knight, I, 353, 367, and for documents and letters regarding the Ludlam legacy coming down to 1846, when the lands supporting the schools were sold.

92. McCrady, "Col. Ed. in S.C.," in Meriwether, *Hist. Higher Ed. S.C.*, p. 10, or in separate edition.

93. The will is in Knight, I, 324.

94. Knight, I, 276-295, "Philanthropy and Education: Winyaw Indigo Society." It was also to lead to apprenticeship training. See below.

95. Henry Smith, "The Town of Dorchester in South Carolina: A Sketch," *SCHM*, VI (1905), 93-95.

96. McCrady, "Col. Ed. in S.C.," in Meriwether, *Hist. Higher Ed. S.C.*, p. 222, points out historian McMaster's false and misleading statements regarding the existence of free schools in the colony.

97. *Ibid.*, p. 222n. The source is Ramsay's *History*, II, 353, as here cited.

98. Coulter, *Georgia: A Short History*, p. 70; and Knight, I, 178-201.

99. For a letter by Ingham about the Indian school, see Knight, I, 189. For Savannah, see Waring, "Savannah's Earliest Private Schools, 1733 to 1800," p. 324. Actually the Common Council of the town moved for a school to educate all children.

100. Strickland, *Religion and State in Ga.*, pp. 93-94. See also Corry, "Ed. in Early Ga.," pp. 136-145.

101. Jones, trans. and ed., *Henry Newman's Salzburger Letterbooks*; and Jones, ed., and Lacker, trans., *Detailed Reports of the Salzburger Emigrants*. . . . Edited by Urlsperger, II, passim. German and German-English textbooks are named in Knight, I, 180-183.

102. Knight, I, 192-195.

103. *Ibid.*, I, 179-184. Most are religious books or primers and horn-books. The advertisements of schools and masters (*ibid.*, I, 660-661) indicate that the classics were taught in Georgia.

104. For documents, *ibid.*, I, 235-275. See also Jones, *Ed. in Ga.*, pp. 11-16.

105. The college was being considered or was in the planning stage, at least by 1760 (Knight, I, 243). A college charter was applied for in 1764 (Jones, *Ed. in Ga.*, pp. 14-15).

106. Phillips Collection, Egmont MSS, Univ. of Georgia, v. 14204 (vol. 5),

107. See, for example, the answers from Virginia in 1724 in Perry, ed., *Hist. Coll. Col. Ch.*, I, 257-344; also Wells, *Parish Ed. Col. Va.*, passim. Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, has a great deal to say about education but very little about parish schools *per se*. The Fulham Papers at Lambeth include the South Carolina 1724 answers (in vol. IX). Hugh Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. R.L. Morton (Chapel Hill, 1956), p. 229, summarizes the 1724 reports from Virginia, pointing out that the twenty cures not reporting or lost may also have had schools of various kinds. See Morton's definitions of "public" and "private" schools.

108. Wells, *Parish Ed. Col. Va.*, p. 21; Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, p. 98. Jones recommends that no one teach in the parish schools who has not been nominated by rector and vestry and licensed by the president of William and Mary (p. 109). He implies that these schools are genuinely elementary, merely preparing for entrance into the grammar school of the college. Wells points out that he could find only one instance of a

schoolhouse built by a parish for its own children (pp. 27–28), that of Linhaven [*sic*] in Princess Anne County, though he gives a second instance of one built of old materials from a dismantled church. Undoubtedly many other schoolhouses existed.

109. Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, pp. 228–229; Wells, *Parish Ed. Col. Va.*, pp. 22–27.

110. Wells, *Parish Ed. Col. Va.*, pp. 30–57, devotes a chapter to these endowed parish schools.

111. *Ibid.*, p. 64.

112. *Archives of Md.*, XXXIV, 388, Act of November 1, 1722.

113. Carl Bridenbaugh (*Cities in Revolt: Urban Life in America 1743–1776* [New York, 1955], p. 176, *passim*) says Charleston had more schools, mostly private, than any other city. This included French Huguenot schools, for which see Arthur H. Hirsch, *The Huguenots of South Carolina* (Durham, N.C., 1928), pp. 157 ff. Desire to study French was one reason for their popularity. But Frenchwomen were also active in conducting general schools for young ladies, teaching not only their language but embroidery, art, needlework, and dancing.

114. Foster, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in S.C.," I, 25, 32; and Knight, I, 685.

115. Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, *passim*, esp. pp. 70n, 182n. See also Foster, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in S.C.," pp. 42–43.

116. William Fitzhugh and His Chesapeake World, 1676–1701, ed. R.B. Davis (Chapel Hill, 1963), pp. 273n, etc. Bertrand was the rector of St. Mary's White Chapel, Lancaster County, Virginia. Also see Goodwin, *Colonial Church in Va.*, p. 250. Stanard, *Col. Va.*, pp. 271–275, names a number of private schools, from the seventeenth century in Henrico to those of Boucher and others just at the end of the colonial period.

117. Wright, *Cult. Life of Amer. Colonies*, p. 113; Knight, I, 573. Bridenbaugh, *Cities in Revolt*, p. 176, asserts that Charleston probably had more children in boarding schools than any other colonial city. They were undoubtedly endowed—free, sometimes parish, and especially private schools.

118. Carl Bridenbaugh, *Myths and Realities: Societies of the Colonial South* (New York, 1963), pp. 183–186; Foote, *Sketches of Virginia* and *Sketches of N.C.*, both *passim*.

119. See Waddel in *DAB*.

120. For Maury, see *DAB*; Anne Maury, ed., *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family* (New York, 1853), pp. 379–424; and Bullock, ed., "A Dissertation on Education . . .," pp. 36–60; Swem, comp., *Va. Hist. Index*, *passim*; and Meade, *Old Churches*, I, 128.

121. For Maury's school in Jefferson's time, see Dumas Malone, *Jefferson the Virginian* (Boston, 1948), pp. 40–46. Malone believes that Maury began the school principally for his own children and added a few others, perhaps never more than five or six at a time. Jefferson paid £20 a year for each of his two years (1758 and 1759) at Maury's.

122. "Donald Robertson's School, King and Queen County, Va. 1758–1769: Extracts from His Account Book," *VMHB*, XXXIII (1925), 194–198,

288-293; XXXIV (1926), 141-148, 232-236; XXXV (1927), 55-56 (through 1773). The MS. is in the Va. Hist. Soc., MSS 5:3, R5456:1.

123. Oscar Darter, *Colonial Fredericksburg and Neighborhood in Perspective* (New York, 1957), p. 134; Stanard, *Col. Va.*, pp. 271-277, names many other small private schools before 1763. Washington's attendance at Marye's school is local legend, but the dates of neither man nor institution fit particularly well.

124. For Madison at Robertson's school, see Irving Brant, "Much Greek and More Latin," in his *James Madison, The Virginia Revolutionist, 1751-1780* (Indianapolis, 1941), pp. 56-65. This chapter offers good evidence that secondary schooling was usually preceded by elementary instruction at home. See also the note in William T. Hutchinson and William M. E. Rachal, eds., *The Papers of James Madison* (Chicago, 1962), I, 5.

125. *Inst. Hist. Va.*, I, 331-342; see also Umbreit, "Ed. in Sou. Colonies," pp. 120-127; Eggleston, *Transit*, p. 263; Knight, I, 571 ff.; *Tyler's Q.*, I (1919), 286.

126. Jonathan Boucher, perhaps thinking of the old field schoolmasters, asserted that in his time in Maryland two-thirds of the teachers were ex-convicts and/or indentured servants, certainly an exaggeration. Jonathan Boucher, *A View of the Causes and Consequences of the American Revolution* (London, 1797), p. 189.

127. Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, I, 323-330; Stanard, *Col. Va.*, pp. 278-282; Lyon G. Tyler, "Private Schools and Tutors," *WMQ* (1), VI (1897), 1-6; the advertisements in all the gazettes of the southern colonies and in Cohen, *S.C. Gaz.*, pp. 25-39; Knight, I, 652-662.

128. The petition was granted. Sainsbury, ed., *Col. St. Papers, Col. . . . 1574-1660* (London, 1860), pp. 251-252. Harmar was probably of the family of Charles Harmar, who lived on the Eastern Shore in 1622, and was said to be the brother of one of the John Harmars (see *DNB*), who were professors of Greek at Oxford. See *VMHB*, III (1896), 273-274; XIX (1911), 129.

129. Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, I, 325-328.

130. *Archives of Md.*, LIV, 494, 497; LXVII, 154.

131. Foster, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in S.C.," I, 3; and Bowes, *Cult. Early Charleston*, p. 35n.

132. Girls were educated in the three R's, French, music, embroidery, and other arts, and occasionally went into the classics and mathematics. Plantation matrons, when they had the time and strength, seemed fully capable of instructing their children in reading and writing and certain household and fine arts. See Thomas Woody, *A History of Women's Education in the United States* (2 vols., New York, 1929), I, 268-298, and Spruill, *Women's Life and Work in the Sou. Colonies*, pp. 185-207. Provision for their schooling, as noted elsewhere, appears frequently in wills.

133. See text and note 113 above for Charleston as a boarding school center (Bridenbaugh, *Cities in Revolt*, p. 176).

134. Cohen, *S.C. Gazette*, pp. 27-48; Bowes, *Cult. Early Charleston*, pp.

34-38. *S.C. Gazette*, March 14, Aug. 30, 1748; Oct. 1, 1750; Aug. 14, 1755; January 17, 1761.

135. Stanard, *Col. Va.*, p. 281, for text of letter. For Reid, see Richard B. Davis, "James Reid, Colonial Virginia Poet and Moral and Religious Essayist," *VMHB*, LXXIX (1971), 3-19; for Warden, etc., Stanard, *Col. Va.*, p. 279. The Carter and Sabine Hall Papers at the Univ. of Virginia fail to offer identification for Mr. Price, nor have the Virginia Historical Society librarians been able to learn who he was. A Thomas Price who later took holy orders was a William and Mary student in 1754 and was ordained about 1759.

136. R.B. Davis, ed., *The Colonial Virginia Satirist: Mid-Eighteenth-Century Commentaries on Politics, Religion, and Society* (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 44-45n.

137. *The Journal of John Harrower: An Indentured Servant in the Colony of Virginia, 1773-1776*, ed. E. M. Riley (New York, 1963), pp. 41, 56, 68.

138. *Ibid.*, p. 134.

139. See *DNB* for John Lowe and "Brief Memoir of the Life of John Lowe, Author of Mary's Dream," in R.H. Cromek, *Remains of Northsdale and Galloway Song* (London, 1810), pp. 342-370; and Thomas Murray, *Literary History of Galloway* (Edinburgh, 1822), pp. 209-253.

140. For all this and more see *Journal and Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian, 1773-1774: A Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion*, ed. H.D. Farish (Williamsburg, 1943), passim, esp. pp. 157 and 208-222 (letter to John Peck "On going to Virginia in character of a Tutor"). In conversations with Carter, Fithian learned that the councilor had no respect for drunken and gaming young professors at William and Mary, and planned to send his eldest son to Cambridge, with perhaps a year or two at Princeton or Philadelphia beforehand.

141. Warden, educated at Edinburgh, was called "a good scholar in Greek, Latin, Philosophy, and Mathematics." Stanard, *Col. Va.*, p. 279.

142. See *Journals and Letters of Fithian*, ed. Farish, pp. xxiv-xxv, and *WMQ* (1), XIII (1904), 160-163. Apparently £30 was the usual salary for a teacher of elementary subjects. See Knight, I, 657 (*Va. Gaz.*, [Rind] Nov. 15, 1770). Of course other grammars based on Lily were as frequently used as one of the many editions of Lily.

143. *The Diary of Landon Carter of Sabine Hall, 1752-1778*, ed. Jack P. Greene (2 vols., Charlottesville, 1965), passim.

144. For the whole tutorial situation in Virginia, see Bullock, "Schools and Schooling," pp. 143-177.

145. Given in Knight, I, 37-45.

146. Bullock, "Schools and Schooling," pp. 190-191; Umbreit, "Ed. in Sou. Colonies," pp. 25-27; Knight, I, 33-45; Wells, *Parish Ed. Col. Va.*, pp. 70 ff.

147. Knight, I, 46-61; Hening, ed., *Statutes*, I, 336-337 (Act of 1642 which required only teaching a trade, as flax spinning); II, 298 (Act of 1672, largely the English 1601 poor law); III, 325-326 (1705, when teaching to read and write was required). Actually parish vestry books from the earlier

seventeenth century provide evidence that by the 1650s at latest most indentures included teaching the three R's (e.g., Knight, I, 53-57, and Swem, comp., *Virginia Historical Index*, passim). In Virginia after 1715 many other acts specified education for the indentured.

148. Knight, I, 61; *WMQ* (1), XXVII (1918), 139. See also below for the case histories of Edmund Pendleton, jurist and statesman, and Charles Hansford, blacksmith, lay reader, and poet.

149. Bruce, *Econ. Hist. Va. Seven. Cent.*, I, 573-575. Many who came from Britain appear in the records as "gentleman" or "gentleman's son" and sometimes inherited considerable wealth from England and purchased their freedom.

150. See Knight, I, 53-61, for examples from all the southern colonies. See also Lyon G. Tyler, "Poor Children and Orphans," *WMQ* (1), V (1897), 220-223, and again Swem, comp., *Va. Hist. Index*, passim, under Indentures, Apprentices, Orphans, etc. If granted freedom because of neglect, the apprentice was theoretically at least made literate by some one of several procedures not entirely clear in the records.

151. Actually the compulsory education laws for *apprenticed* children did not include mulattoes, who, together with the Indians, came under different regulations. See below.

152. *William Fitzhugh*, ed. Davis, pp. 268-269n. Fitzhugh wrote for one in 1680, but there are records of many of these boys in the Chesapeake colonies before and after that date. In 1692 the headmaster of the school complained that the boys never wrote back to him. The result was that in Virginia governor and Council ordered each master to see that the boy wrote back to English authorities at least twice a year. See *ibid.*, p. 269n, and Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, I, 314. Other schools also supplied literate "apprentices."

153. Through the colonial period, the term "indentured" was often used for "indentured." Today's historians, especially British, seem not to know this, judging by a review in the *Times Literary Supplement*.

154. Bullock, "Schools and Schooling," pp. 12-13, 180-181n; Jernegan, *Laboring and Dependent Classes*, pp. 134-135, 146-147, 178; Abbott E. Smith, *Colonists in Bondage: White Servitude . . . 1607-1776* (Chapel Hill, 1947), passim, though Smith gives little on apprenticeship education before 1763; Bruce, *Econ. Hist. Va. Seven. Cent.*, I, 610.

155. Bridenbaugh, *Cities in Revolt*, p. 176; Knight, I, 653; also Seybolt, *Evening School*, pp. 9-43.

156. *Journal of John Harrower*, ed. Riley, pp. 59, 72, 73, mentions a cooper and a carpenter taught at night.

157. Bridenbaugh, *Cities in Revolt*, p. 176; Bailyn, *Ed. in Forming Am. Soc.*, pp. 32-33. Also Seybolt, *Evening School*, pp. 11, 31, 43.

158. Bailyn, *Ed. in Forming Am. Soc.*, pp. 34-36.

159. Knight, I, 279.

160. The indenture appears in full in *The Letters of Edmund Pendleton*, ed. David J. Mays (2 vols., Charlottesville, 1967), I, 3.

161. See *The Poems of Charles Hansford*, ed. James A. Servies and Carl R.

Dolmetsch (Chapel Hill, 1961), pp. ix-xv. The poems and other evidence indicate that Hansford, lay reader in his parish, was largely self-educated. Benjamin Waller, his friend, says, "He was bred a blacksmith, and worked at his trade as long as his strength would permit." Hansford seems to have borrowed most of the books he read.

162. David J. Mays, *Edmund Pendleton, 1721-1803* (2 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1952), I, 20-24. See also *DAB*.

163. *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, p. 195.

164. Hening, ed., *Statutes*, I, 386 [March, 1655/6], 410, 471 [March, 1657/8], and 455, on Indian instruction and apprenticeship and freedom from the latter not later than at twenty-five years of age.

165. See Ch. II above, text and note 123.

166. See Ch. II above and Charles Campbell, *History of the Colony and Ancient Dominion of Virginia* (Philadelphia, 1860), pp. 384-385.

167. Steiner, *Hist. Ed. Md.*, p. 16. These boys were "natives," though it is not entirely clear whether they were Indians or whites born in the colony. Later, after 1694, "natives" usually refers to white persons.

168. *Archives of Md.*, XIX, 484, governor to House of Burgesses. Also *ibid.*, XXIII, 83. The governor was Nicholson, an ardent missionary and educational promoter in both Chesapeake colonies.

169. See his letter of 1654, discussed earlier. It is printed in several places, including Alexander S. Salley, *Narratives of Early Carolina* (New York, 1800), pp. 25-29.

170. Smith, *Hist. Ed. N.C.*, pp. 16-17.

171. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, I, 684, 714, 716, 859; Smith, *Hist. Ed. N.C.*, p. 17. For Rainsford's letters of July 25, 1712, see S.P.G. "A" Vol. VII, p. 418, and Lambeth Palace Lib., "Fulham Papers, Vol. III, Mass. 1751 Undated . . . North Carolina." The first letter was directed to John Chamberlayne; part of it is in Knight, I, 83-84. The second letter went to the Bishop of London.

172. Klingberg, "Early Attempts at Indian Education in South Carolina, a Documentary," *SCHM*, LXI (1960), 1-10.

173. See Ch. II and Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, passim.

174. Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, p. 95n.

175. Klingberg, "Early Attempts at Indian Ed. in S.C.," pp. 9-10. This was in 1715. See Ch. II, and its reference to James Walcot's *The New Pilgrim's Progress: or the Pious Indian Convert* (London, 1748).

176. See the Reverend Benjamin Ingham to Sir John Phillips about the Indian school in Candler, ed., *Col. Rec. Georgia*, III, 221-223; Knight, I, 189-190 and I, 117. Ingham taught two years and learned the Indian language well enough to attempt to write a Creek grammar, as already mentioned.

177. Knight, I, 117-118.

178. Jernegan, *Laboring and Dependent Classes*, passim.

179. A law prohibiting anyone from teaching a slave to write was passed in South Carolina as early as 1740. See Knight, I, 705. But in other colonies there were schools for blacks up to the Revolution. See reference on note 181 below.

180. Jernegan, *Laboring and Dependent Classes*, p. 13. That the growing proportion of illiterate blacks in the southern colonies had a deleterious effect on public education is fairly obvious.

181. See Knight, I, 60, for the 1716 case of a mulatto boy who was apprenticed and was to be given three years of schooling and afterwards carefully instructed in the Bible.

182. Mary F. Goodwin, "Christianizing and Educating the Negro in Colonial Virginia," *HMPEC*, I (1932), 143-152.

183. For an account of Dr. Bray's Associates, with minutes of London meetings in which Benjamin Franklin was an active member of its board, see Knight, I, 139-177.

184. Letter to S.P.G. from Alexander Stewart of North Carolina in 1763, Knight, I, 90-91. Stewart counted eleven black adults and eleven infants in one of the several chapels he visited and in which he taught and baptized.

185. Knight, I, 147, 150, 164.

186. *Ibid.*, I, 149, 153; Edgar L. Pennington, "Dr. Bray's Associates and Their Work among the Negroes," *PAAS*, n.s., XLVIII (1939), 311-403. Since Thomas Bacon's work in Maryland for Negro education in his charity school sermon is discussed elsewhere in this chapter and in Chapter VI, it has not been included here.

187. Knight, I, 155; 156-157.

188. Pilcher, "Samuel Davies and the Instruction of Negroes in Va.," *VMHB*, LXXIV (1966), 293-300.

189. Dalcho, *Hist. Acct. Prot. Episc. Ch. in S.C.*, pp. 148-149, 164, 178. Garden made his first plans in 1737 and worked out details with others between then and 1743/4. See also Foster, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in S.C.," I, 205-226; Knight, I, 114-115. As early as 1734, the Rev. Mr. Guy had announced a legacy of £200 for a school for poor white and Negro children. See Brewer, *Hist. Relig. Ed. in Episc. Ch. to 1835*, p. 45.

190. Foster, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in S.C.," I, 43; Klingberg, ed., *Carolina Chronicle of LeJau*, p. 70 (1709-1710).

191. Bullock, *Hist. of Negro Ed.*, p. 12.

192. Candler, ed., *Col. Rec. Ga.*, II, 510. His salary came partly from the S.P.G. and partly from Dr. Bray's Associates. See also McCaul, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in Col. Ga.," p. 23.

193. Lawrence, "Relig. Ed. Colony of Ga.," pp. 41-57; McCaul, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in Col. Ga.," pp. 23-27; Pennington "Bray's Associates and their Work," pp. 34-38.

194. Bowes, *Cult. Early Charleston*, pp. 105-106; Cohen, *S.C. Gaz.*, pp. 33, 77. Pachelbel at least taught singing as well as instrumental music (March 6, 1749).

195. John W. Molnar, "A Collection of Music in Colonial Virginia: The Ogle Inventory," *Musical Quarterly*, XLIX (1963), 150-162; Maurer Maurer, "The Library of a Colonial Musician," *WMQ* (3), VII (1950), 39-52. Ogle taught organ, harpsichord, and spinet.

196. Cohen, *S.C. Gaz.*, pp. 27 ff.; Bowes, *Cult. Early Charleston*, pp. 108–110.

197. Though there is much on Maryland music and musicians, there is little on music teachers per se. See Lubov Keefer, *Baltimore's Music* (Baltimore, 1962), pp. 6–20. *Archives of Md.* records several suits for payment for teaching violin, cittern, etc. See Ch. VIII below. The *Md. Gaz.* contains music teachers' advertisements: e.g., Nov. 21, 1750, and Oct. 27, 1757, but the advertisers describe themselves simply as musicians.

198. See Rightmyer, *Maryland's Established Church*, for Bell and Malcolm; and the *DAB* sketch of Charles Wilson Peale for the information on his father.

199. Tilghman, *Hist. Talbot County, Md.*, II, 434–444.

200. See *DNB* and *The Life and Adventures of Mr. Bamfylde-Moore Carew* (London, 1785), passim.

201. Steiner, *Hist. Ed. Md.*, p. 20.

202. *Archives of Md.*, LIII, lix, 13, 14, etc.; LIV, 523, 591, etc. For Addison's school, in which he had two assistants or ushers, see Katharine A. Kellock, *Colonial Piscataway in Maryland* (Accokeek, Md., 1962), pp. 22–24. The school was founded about 1760. See also Wenger, "Prep. of White Teachers for Sec. Schools of Md.," pp. 1–20.

203. Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, I and II, passim.

204. Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, I, passim. Both Blackamore and Ingles are listed among the clergy in Goodwin, *Col. Ch. in Va.* For Blackamore, see Richard B. Davis, "Arthur Blackamore: The Virginia Colony and the Early English Novel," *VMHB*, LXXV (1967), 22–34.

205. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, VIII, 486–490.

206. See the bibliography for this chapter and especially Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*; Bemiss, ed., *The Three Charters of the Virginia Company London with Seven Related Documents*, Jamestown 350th Anniv. Hist. Booklet no. 4 (Williamsburg, 1957) passim; Knight, I, 4–31; Land, "Henrico and Its College," pp. 453–498; Cleaveland, "At Henrico," pp. 4–10.

207. Land, "Henrico and Its College," pp. 474–475.

208. Bemiss, ed., *The Three Charters of the Virginia Company*, p. 100; Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 102. The words "college" and "university" seem to have been at times in the seventeenth century used interchangeably, though in the case of Henrico the institution planned was to be both. Later in colonial history "college" seems to have meant a higher preparatory school such as Winchester or what it is essentially today in America, in British terms, a "university college." The context usually makes some sort of distinction as to meaning. But there can be no doubt that real universities, of the Scottish and/or English order, were at times planned for various colonies.

209. Land, "Henrico and Its College," p. 475; Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, I, 268 (November, 1619); for erecting buildings, III, 161.

210. Thorpe had been a Gentleman of the King's Privy Chamber and a member of the Virginia Company Council in London. See Land, "Henrico and Its College," pp. 480–481, and Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, passim.

He was a Cambridge graduate and a cofounder of Berkeley Hundred plantation.

211. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, I, 310-311, 307-308, 335, 585-588. For books presented, *ibid.*, III, passim, and Ch. IV of this study.

212. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 540; Copland's "A Declaration how the monies . . . were disposed"; Knight, I, 13-16.

213. Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, II, 91; Knight, I, 21-22. The "Rector" may even have been head of the Board of Trustees or Visitors, chief administrative officer, chief chaplain, or something else.

214. Waterhouse's pamphlet is reprinted in Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, III, 552-553 etc.

215. Cleavland, "At Henrico," p. 8. Some blamed Thorpe's trust of the Indians for the massacre itself (Kingsbury, ed., *Records Va. Co.*, II, 375-376; III, 552-553, 565-567; IV, 38, 76). One should not forget that Palmer's planned institution at the mouth of the Susquehanna was also to be a combination of university and grammar school.

216. Hening, ed., *Statutes*, II, 25, 30, 37, 56. On page 30 the institution is described as "a colledge of students of the liberall arts and sciences," commissioners of county courts are authorized to receive subscriptions, and Act XXXV of 1660/1 asks that a petition be drawn to the King for permission to solicit and collect funds in Great Britain for "colledges and schooles in this country."

217. For some of the many books and essays concerning the history of the College of William and Mary see the bibliography for this chapter. The full history of this institution has been published since this chapter was written, though there is little or nothing in it which is not referred to in the chapters of the present work. See J.E. Morpurgo, *Their Majesties Royall Colledge: William and Mary in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* ([Williamsburg], 1976).

218. *WMQ* (2), X (1930), 333 (Speech Four).

219. Rouse, *Blair*, pp. 43, 277-278; Robert Beverley, *History and Present State of Virginia*, ed. L.B. Wright (Chapel Hill, 1947), p. 97. Beverley says the first move for the college was during the interim presidency of the Council (acting governorship) of Nathaniel Bacon, Sr., in 1689-1690, before the arrival of Nicholson in 1690. Beverley also alleges that Nicholson delayed calling a general assembly until 1691.

220. MSS. in Bristol Record Office. Given in *WMQ* (1), VII (1898). See Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, p. 335.

221. "Papers Relating to the Founding of the College," *WMQ* (1), VII (1898), 158-161; Knight, I, 374-377; Rouse, *Blair*, pp. 43-44.

222. *WMQ* (1), VII (1898), 162-164; Knight, I, 377-388.

223. Rouse, *Blair*, pp. 66-67, depicts the scene, basing his account on Blair's letters.

224. For much of this material, see Rouse, *Blair*, pp. 67-71; Knight, I, 380-388; Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, I, passim; Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, pp. 335-337. At the end of the colonial period the college was smaller

than Yale, Harvard, and probably King's (Columbia), College of Philadelphia, and Princeton (certainly by 1800).

225. The charter is reproduced in English in Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton, *The Present State of Virginia, and the College*, ed. H.D. Farish (Williamsburg, 1940), pp. 22-94; and in the Latin and English text of 1758 in Knight, I, 397-439. The Statutes only are reproduced in Latin and English in Knight, I, 500-528, as of 1728 (with the 1727 transfer to the President and Faculty); and in English in *WMQ* (1), XXII (1913/14), 281-296 [of 1728], and in *WMQ* (1), XVI (1907/8), 241-256 [of 1758].

226. Cutts, "The Ed. Influence of Aberdeen," pp. 229-249, and Douglas Sloan, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal* (New York, 1971), p. 21n; Rouse, *Blair*, p. 74; Cremin, *Am. Ed.: Col. Exp.*, p. 337. Cutts shows how the wording of various proposals and charters for Henrico College and the East India School might have been taken straight from the charter of King's College, Aberdeen.

227. Cutts, "The Ed. Influence of Aberdeen," p. 248.

228. Hening, ed., *Statutes*, III, 122-124.

229. Rouse, *Blair*, p. 77.

230. *The Present State of Virginia*, ed., Morton, pp. 168, 247.

231. Morton (ed., *ibid.*, p. 5n) points out that the Statutes drawn up on June 24, 1727, were first printed by William Parks in Williamsburg in 1736 (Latin and English). With some change they were reprinted in 1756 on the recommendation of Visitors and Governors in 1752. More recently the 1736 Statutes have been reprinted (for both texts, see note 225 above). In a sort of colophon or postscript dated London, June 24, 1729, Blair and Fouace confirm the statutes they now deem necessary. This may mean that the statutes were entirely separate from the transfer, though certainly they anticipate the later action. The 1758 version raised the period for the B.A. from two to four years, the M.A. from four to seven, actually in an attempt to conform to English university practice.

232. Knight, I, 501.

233. Printed for 1729-1763 in *WMQ* (1), I-III, passim.

234. Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, I, passim; McIlwaine, et al., eds., *Minutes and Journals of the Council and General Court and of the House of Burgesses*, passim; several of the Jamestown 350th Anniv. Survey Reports, e.g., 257, 346, 245; and unpublished items from the Fulham Papers, Lambeth Palace Lib., VI, Virginia; and Stanard, *Col. Va.*, pp. 230 ff.

235. He also later (in 1717) succeeded Blackamore, who had been dismissed as an alcoholic, though by then Blair knew quite well that Ingles was opposed to him. See R.B. Davis, "Arthur Blackamore: The Virginia Colony and the Early English Novel," *VMHB*, LXXV (1967), 25. Rouse, *Blair*, pp. 129-130, etc., points out various criticisms made by Ingles, who had earlier in 1697 been defended by William Byrd II as an excellent schoolmaster (Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, I, 39). Beverley (*History*, ed. Wright, pp. 99-100, 104-105) blamed Nicholson for various troubles.

236. August 8, 1705, Ingles to Governor Nicholson (Perry, ed., *Historical*

Collections, I, 139-140). Blair kept his £150 a year as president for another decade or two but seems eventually to have been reduced to £100.

237. For the full text, see MS. in Fulham Papers, Lambeth Palace Lib., XI, Virginia, 1626-1720; in print in Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, I, 36-65; Knight, I, 442-470.

238. Louis B. Wright, "William Byrd's Defense of Sir Edmund Andros," *WMQ* (3), II (1945), 47-62.

239. See bibliography for Ch. I above. See also Robert A. Bain, "The Composition and Publication of *The Present State of Virginia, and the College*," *EAL*, VI, i (1971), 31-54. Bain believes that the 1727 publication of the old manuscript was due directly to Blair, who wanted it in print as support for the liquor revenue bill for the college. Nicholson was in England in 1727 and opposed the bill because the revenues were to be used for salaries, especially Blair's.

240. Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, pp. 5-6, 67. Jones here gives many details of buildings, faculty organization, and other college matters as they were when he sailed for England in 1723. For a good account of the growth of the college in its first decade, see Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va. Seven. Cent.*, I, 308-401. Bruce notes several specific bequests to the college not here named.

241. Jones, *The Present State of Virginia*, ed. Morton, pp. 81, 202n; also *WMQ* (2), XIX (1939), 272-285; I (1921), 55. No evidence of publication of the other two manuals now exists.

242. E.g., November 6, 1729. There were present the President, Bartholomew Yates as Professor of Divinity, William Dawson of Philosophy, Francis Fontaine of Oriental Languages, Alexander Irvine of Mathematics, and the two schoolmasters, Joshua Fry of the Grammar School and later Professor of Natural Philosophy and Mathematics, and John Fox, of the Indian School. See *WMQ* (1), I (1892/3), 132.

243. The manuscript of these exercises is in the library of the S.P.G. in London (photographic copy in the Library of Congress). They are printed in *WMQ* (2), X (1930), 323-337. Though there is reference to at least one of them in the Journals of the House of Burgesses, their texts appear to have been unknown, or forgotten, until this century.

244. *WMQ* (2), X (1930), 323n, from Journals of the House of Burgesses, 1695-1702.

245. Charles Campbell, *History of the Colony and Ancient Dominion of Virginia* (Philadelphia, 1860), pp. 361-362.

246. The letter is printed in Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, I, 126-127.

247. See, e.g., the printed "Ballad" in P.R.O., C.O. 5/134, ff. 299-301 (also Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, I, 179-182), 1704; a printed *Modest Answer to a Malicious Libel Against His Excellency Francis Nicholson, Esq. . . .* 1704 (BM 8365. b. 9) 1705 (?); Ingles to Lords of Trade, 1704, *VMHB*, VII (1899/1900), 391-393; Stephen Fouace's affidavit against Nicholson in Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, I, 87-93; Blair on Nicholson, May 1, 1704 (deposition, Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col.*, 1703-1705, item 284, pp. 111-

113); and many later comments in Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, and Sainsbury, ed., *Cal. St. Papers, Col.*; Jamestown 350th Anniv. Survey Reports, as no. 652. For a good general summary of the Blair-Nicholson feud see Morton, *Colonial Virginia*, I, 385-388.

248. See Dawson Papers, LC. William and Thomas Dawson and William Stith were all alumni of Queen's, as were others of the Williamsburg faculty. Certain English and Latin literary exercises in the Dawson Papers seem to be a mixture of Queen's and William and Mary compositions. And there are a number of letters between the three above-mentioned presidents of the Virginia college and their friends at Queen's. See Courtlandt Canby, "A Note on the Influence of Oxford upon William and Mary in the Eighteenth Century," *WMQ* (2), XXI (1941), 243-247. Canby indicates that several Virginia-born Oxonians besides Stith, men such as a Robinson of Oriel, also joined the William and Mary faculty.

249. Governor Hugh Drysdale to the House of Burgesses (McIlwaine et al., *Journals H.B. of Va.* [1712-1726], p. 400).

250. This interesting speech is in McIlwaine et al., eds., *Journals H.B. of Va.* (1742-1747, 1748-1749), p. 154.

251. Lyon G. Tyler, president of the college who was cognizant of almost everything extant concerning its history, emphasizes the lacunae in its records in several writings on the institution, such as *Williamsburg, The Old Colonial Capital* (Richmond, 1907), *The College of William and Mary*, and his articles and edited documents in *WMQ* (1).

252. Adams, *Coll. of Wm. and Mary*, p. 29, estimates that in the seventy years before the Revolution there was an annual average of sixty students.

253. Miller, *A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, II, 492. For the library, see Jennings, *Library of William and Mary*. Spotswood in 1740 bequeathed all his books, maps, and mathematical instruments to the college.

254. George M. Brydon, "The Antiecclesiastical Laws of Virginia," *VMHB*, LXIV (1956), 260. For Edinburgh's potential influence, see Rouse, *Blair*, pp. 216, 217.

255. Knight, I, 513.

256. Davis, "Arthur Blackamore," pp. 22-34.

257. Ganter, "Small, Jefferson's Teacher," pp. 505-507. Small was an M.A. of Marischal College, Aberdeen. Ganter includes a 1775 letter from Jefferson to Small.

258. Gooch to Bishop of Norwich, Feb. 25, 1741/2, Colonial Williamsburg. Typescript.

259. Rouse, *Blair*, p. 216.

260. Morton, *Col. Va.*, II, 488.

261. Thomas Story, *A Journal of the Life of . . .* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1747), pp. 387-388. For more about Story see chapters V and VI.

262. "Notes Relating to Some of the Students Who Attended the College of William and Mary, 1753-1770," *WMQ* (2), I (1921), 27-41.

263. *A Brief Retrospect*, II, 504.

264. Richard B. Davis, "The Jeffersonian Virginia Expatriate in the Building of the Nation," *VMHB*, LXX (1962), 56.

265. Richard B. Davis, *Intellectual Life in Jefferson's Virginia, 1790-1830* (Chapel Hill, 1964), pp. 51, 61, for details on William and Mary in the early national period.

266. *A Brief Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, II, 503-504.

267. Umbreit, "Ed. in Sou. Colonies," p. 230.

268. Steiner, *Hist. Ed. Md.*, pp. 17-18.

269. Umbreit, "Ed. in the Sou. Colonies," p. 177.

270. Steiner, *Hist. Ed. Md.*, pp. 69-72. Though the Kent Free School had been established in 1723, Dr. William Smith, formerly president of the University of Pennsylvania, was instrumental in founding Washington College there in 1782. This college and St. John's together formed the first University of Maryland.

271. Steiner, *Hist. Ed. Md.*, pp. 26-29. For the text of the proposal, see *Archives of Md.*, XXXVIII, 456-461.

272. Steiner, *Hist. Ed. Md.*, pp. 29-30.

273. Saunders, ed., *Col. Rec. N.C.*, VIII, 486-490. The college may have been first proposed in 1765. Queen's, not the college of that name now existing, grew out of a classical school established in 1767. See Smith, *Hist. Ed. N.C.*, pp. 32-36, and Foote, *Sketches of N.C.*, pp. 513-518, etc. The Rev. David Caldwell's log college and academy in present-day Greensboro may by some authorities be considered to have been a college, but if the 1766/7 institution ever achieved that status it was after the Revolution. See William S. Powell, *The First State University: A Pictorial History of the University of North Carolina* (Chapel Hill, 1972), p. 3, and Foote, *Sketches of N.C.*, pp. 517-543.

274. Knight, I, 369, from "MS. House Journal," Hist. Commission of S.C., Dec. 7, 1713. Also Livingston, "Thomas Morritt," pp. 162-163; Meriwether, *Hist. Higher Ed. S.C.*, p. 52.

275. Foster, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in S.C.," I, 109-111, and Klingberg, "Early Attempts at Indian Ed. in S.C.," pp. 1-10.

276. Meriwether, *Hist. Higher Ed. S.C.*, pp. 52, 56-57. See also Bowes, *Cult. Early Charleston*, p. 49.

277. Robert L. McCaul, Jr., "Whitefield's Bethesda College Project and Other Attempts to Found Colleges," *GaHQ*, XLIV (1960), 263-277, 381-398, and Jones, *Ed. in Ga.*, pp. 14-15.

278. McCaul, "Doc. Hist. Ed. in Col. Ga.," pp. 118-133.

279. See Sachse, *Col. Amer. in Britain*, pp. 47-69.

280. For Francis Yeardley letter, see Bodleian Rawlinson A. 14. ff. 84-87; *Va. Hist. Reg.*, V (1852), 17-20; and Thomas Birch, ed., *A Collection of State Papers of John Thurloe . . .* (7 vols., London, 1742), II, 273-274. For Argall Yeardley's books, see Nora M. Turman and Mark C. Lewis, eds., "Inventory of the Estate of Argall Yeardley of Northampton County, Virginia, in 1655," *VMHB*, LXX (1962), 410-419.

281. Stanard, *Col. Va.*, p. 287. Henry Sewell of Lower Norfolk, sent abroad to study in the 1650s, may also have attended this school.

282. Wright, *First Gent. Va.*, pp. 189-190.

283. He died about 1670. See Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, I, 318; Fairfax Harrison, *Landmarks of Old Prince William* (Berryville, Va., 1964), p. 34n.

284. For Fitzhugh, see *William Fitzhugh*, ed. Davis, pp. 361, 363. Fitzhugh outlines the education his son has already had under the French clergyman Bertrand in Virginia. For Byrd, see Pierre Marambaud, *William Byrd of Westover, 1674-1744* (Charlottesville, 1971), p. 17. See also Bruce, *Inst. Hist. Va.*, I, 321, and Tyler, "Education in Colonial Virginia," VI, 173-174, for other seventeenth-century Virginians in English schools.

285. For the Carrolls, see *DAB*; for Dulany, Aubrey C. Land, *The Dulanys of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1968), pp. 153-154; for Bordley, McGrath, *Pillars of Maryland* (Richmond, Va., 1950), pp. 374-376.

286. Eliza Pinckney and her two sons all appear in *DAB* and the correspondence on the subject of what school they should attend is in *The Letter-book of Eliza Lucas Pinckney, 1739-1762*, ed. Elise Pinckney (Chapel Hill, 1972), pp. 158-159, etc. Middleton, Izard, and Laurens also appear in *DAB*.

287. The librarians of the British Museum and the present writer have not been able to locate Low's school, though it probably was in the London area. Carter's letter (January 28, 1723/4) about the grammar his sons should study is quoted in *VMHB*, XXX (1923), 40. Lists of schools with their Virginia students appear in *VMHB*, XXI (1913), 196-199. See also the alumni registers of Eton, Rugby, and Westminster and such articles as "Members of the Corbin Family Educated in England," *VMHB*, XXI (1913), pp. 204-205; Griffith, ed., "English Ed. for Va. Youth," pp. 7-27; Pape, "Appleby Grammar School and Its Washington Pupils," pp. 498-501; Tyler, "Education in Colonial Virginia," VI, 171-189; Cox, *Hist. of the Grammar School at Heath*; Peacock, *Hist. of the Free Grammar School at Wakefield*; Carlisle, *Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales*; Campbell, ed., *The Bland Papers*; and Wynne, ed., *Memoir of the Bolling Family*.

288. See Pape, "Appleby Grammar School and Its Washington Pupils," pp. 498-501. George's father as well as his brothers may have attended this school.

289. *Rugby School Register*, I, 25, 32, 34.

290. Stanard, *Col. Va.*, pp. 252, 282, and portraits.

291. Barker and Stenning, eds., *Record of Old Westminster*, passim. This is not a complete record, and other former students can be identified from other sources. See *VMHB*, XLVII (1939), 50. One of the Weekses was evidently at both Westminster and Winchester.

292. Griffith, "English Ed. for Va. Youth" (p. 8), speaks of the Leeds Academy at Wakefield, and gives letters addressed to Leeds Academy, Heath, near Wakefield. Both the Heath and Wakefield schools had the official titles of "The Free Grammar School of Queen Elizabeth at _____." See Cox, *Hist. of the Grammar School at Heath*, Ch. II.

293. Griffith, ed., "English Ed. for Va. Youth," pp. 8-9; and "Diary of William Beverley of 'Blandfield' during a Visit to England, 1750," *VMHB*, XXVI (1928), 161 ff.

294. Griffith, ed., "English Ed. for Va. Youth," pp. 11-12. Professor Griffith cites opposite opinions from local Wakefield authorities as to which school the boys attended. But the fact is that they may have attended both. For Heath, see Cox's *Hist. of the Grammar School at Heath* (bibliography), pp. 68-70. Heath was under the direction of the excellent classical scholar Samuel Ogden (M.A., St. John's, Cambridge). The Leeds Academy at Heath never seems to have been the same as the Leeds Grammar School at Leeds. Actually there may have been some confusion about the name of the Heath school. See Griffith, p. 11.

295. William Beverley's diary, 1750-1752, is included in his 1696-1756 account book, now in the Va. Hist. Soc., MSS 1. B4678. a.4780. Beverley names the boys accompanying him and the books bought or "at the school." For Robert Munford, playwright, see Chs. VIII and IX.

296. For Clarke (1706-1761) see *DNB*. Clarke was successively master or headmaster at Skipton, Beverley, and Wakefield.

297. The facts that he arrived at Wakefield and that in September 1751 the Beverley boys were studying Latin under John Clarke seem to *prove* that the school was the Wakefield Grammar School. See Wynne, ed., *Memoir of the Bolling Family*, pp. 8-9.

298. The dates are those of departure. See Peacock, *Hist. the Free Grammar School at Wakefield*, pp. 166 ff. For Bland, see Campbell, ed., *The Bland Papers*, I, xi-xviii.

299. Griffith, ed., "English Ed. for Va. Youth," p. 13.

300. See Beverley's diary, note 295 above.

301. The best lists of university matriculates are Venn, eds., *Alumni Cantabrigienses*; Foster, ed., *Alumni Oxonienses . . .*; Burtchaeli and Sadleir, eds., *Alumni Dublinenses: A Catalogue of the Graduates of the Faculties of Arts, Divinity, and Law of the Univ. of Edinburgh*; Connely, "Colonial Americans in Oxford and Cambridge," pp. 6-17, 25-77; Addison, ed., *Matriculation Albums of the Univ. of Glasgow*; Anderson, ed., *University and King's College {Aberdeen} Roll of Alumni in Arts and his Fasti Academiae Mariscallanae Aberdonensis*. See also Jacobs, "Registers of the Universities, Colleges, and Schools of Great Britain and Ireland," pp. 185-229.

302. Weis, *Col. Clergy Md., Del., and Ga. and Col. Clergy Va., NC., and S.C.* See also Chs. V and VI below.

303. Connely, "Col. Americans in Oxford and Cambridge," pp. 6-17, 75-77. Many of the South Carolinians at Cambridge were there after 1763, however. In fact, the majority from that province at Cambridge attended between 1764 and 1773.

304. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

305. See the bibliography for this chapter, especially the studies by Shryock, *Med. and Soc. in Am.*, and *Med. in Am.: Essays*; Hindle; Waring; Blanton; Cullen, *Early Med. in Md.*; and Sachse.

306. Philip L. Barbour, ed., *The Jamestown Voyages, 1606-1609* (2 vols., Cambridge, Eng., 1969), I, 232; II, 333; and Norwood, *Med. Ed. U.S. before the Civil War*, p. 10.
307. Blanton, *Med. in Va. in the Seventeenth Cent.*, pp. 81-89.
308. Blanton, *Med. in Va. in the Eighteenth Cent.*, pp. 75-76.
309. Blanton, *Med. in Va. in the Eighteenth Cent.*, pp. 208-209. Blanton quotes earlier acts by the Virginia General Assembly to license only trained physicians. For the "Articles Relating to the Virginia Club—1761," see p. 91. They are signed by Theodorick Bland.
310. Sachse, *Col. Amer. in Britain*, p. 57, says 117 Americans received degrees at Edinburgh between 1749 and 1800.
311. Blanton, *Med. in Va. in the Eighteenth Cent.*, pp. 137-138.
312. An extensive sketch of Tennent and his activities appears in *ibid.*, pp. 119-129.
313. Cullen, *Early Med. in Md.*, p. 1.
314. Gordon, *Æsculapius Comes to the Colonies*, pp. 233-234, etc. For Hamilton's degree (Gordon is confused on this) see S. Lewis, ed., *List of the Graduates in Med. of the Univ. of Edinburgh*, p. 3.
315. Norwood, *Med. Ed. U.S. before the Civil War*, p. 19. Norwood says Wiesenthal was deeply revered by pupils and patients and was looked upon as "the Sydenham" of the town.
316. Weaver, "Early Med. Hist. of Ga.," pp. 91-93. There seems proof that the elder Jones held the degree.
317. Quoted in Norwood, *Med. Ed. U.S. before the Civil War*, p. 19.
318. Moultrie's thesis was his 1745 account of the yellow fever in Charleston. See Waring, *Hist. of Med. in S.C.*, *passim*.
319. See bibliography for *legal training* for this chapter. Names of southern colonists who studied at the Inns crop up in a number of places. The best sources are the E. Alfred Jones and J.G. de Roulhac Hamilton studies. See also Tyler, "Education in Colonial Virginia," VI, 171-175; "Some Virginians educated in Great Britain," *VMHB*, XXI (1918), 196-199; Somerby, "Americans Admitted to the Middle Temple," pp. 251-252, Sachse, *Col. Amer. in Britain*, pp. 47-68; and Joseph T. Wheeler, "Reading Interests of the Professional Classes in Colonial Maryland, 1700-1776 [Lawyers]," *MdHM*, XXXVI (1941), 282-283 (list of Marylanders educated at Middle Temple, Inner Temple, and Gray's Inn).
320. These are primarily from Jones, *Amer. Members of the Inns of Court*. Hamilton, "Sou. Members of the Inns of Court," adds a few more names, but none were of great importance. The Virginia list derives from the same sources and a few others mentioned in the bibliography and in note 319 above. Wheeler's (above, note 319) is a good Maryland list.
321. Giving these figures seems necessary because the summaries by Hamilton and Jones and others (see note 319 above) are based on later terminal dates which do not seem as significant as the Stamp Act milepost.
322. Force, *Tracts*, III, xv, 6.

323. Edmund and Dorothy Berkeley, *The Reverend John Clayton, A Parson with a Scientific Mind* (Charlottesville, 1965), p. 4.
324. *William Fitzhugh*, ed. Davis, p. 203.
325. Hunter D. Farish, ed., p. 4. See also Robert A. Bain, "The Composition and Publication of *The Present State of Virginia and the College*," *EAL*, VI, i (Spring 1971), 31-54. Bain goes into the Andros-Blair struggle over the recently chartered College of William and Mary.
326. The other two orators are concerned with the history of the college's founding and with an appeal to the General Assembly to take the institution under its protection.
327. For a printing of the Charter, see Knight, I, 399-439.
328. Burwell's letter is from "Abington," and ends with the postscript "Show him this letter." It is printed in *WMQ* (1), VII (1898/9), 43-45.
329. Carter's letter to William Dawkins is quoted at least in part in *VMHB*, XXX (1923), 39-41. Carter founded a scholarship at William and Mary, which Landon later attended.
330. *Archives of Md.*, XXXVIII, 456-461.
331. *Ibid.*, 353-355.
332. Probably Sir John Randolph, at least twice agent, the second time in 1732, in London. He attended William and Mary as well as the Inns of Court.
333. In the copy in the Charleston Library Society, at the end of the essay, after "Philanthropos" and a note on Colden, is written in ink "Dr. Hewet?" [as author].
334. *S.C. Gaz.*, Aug. 13, 1750.
335. Page 11.
336. Ed. Morton, pp. 80-81. There is a good deal more.
337. Page 82.
338. See the long Appendix, Scheme I, "Of Education in Virginia," pp. 108-116.
339. Reprinted in Bernard C. Steiner, ed., *The Reverend Thomas Bray: His Life and Selected Works Relating to Maryland*, Maryland Hist. Soc. Fund Publication, no. 37 (London, 1697; rpt. Baltimore, 1901).
340. See others, sermons and tracts, represented in *ibid.*, pp. 71-205.
341. See Ch. VI below.
342. See David C. Skaggs, ed., "Thomas Cradock's Sermon on the Governance of Maryland's Established Church," *WMQ* (3), XXVII (1970), 630-653, for notes on Cradock. Skaggs is preparing an edition of Cradock's extant sermons.
343. Though two of Boucher's books and some verse and other pieces of his are well known, the "small treatise" on education Robert Jackson sent to Maury has disappeared. See Helen D. Bullock, ed., "A Dissertation on Education . . . July 17, 1762," *Papers of the Albemarle County Historical Society*, II (1941/1942), p. 37.
344. Pp. 152-201. A note on page 152 says he preached on this discourse in 1773 in the church of Portabacco in Charles County, Maryland, when

three free schools were being consolidated. Like Cradock's, it was a combined educational and homiletic oration, though perhaps not quite a full-fledged sermon as Cradock's was.

345. In a note perhaps later added.

346. Page 197.