

Christian Servants and Indian Slaves:
Rethinking the Origins of Chesapeake Slavery

Owen Stanwood, Northwestern University*

****NOTE: This paper is a work in progress, and is intended for discussion at the 2002 OIEAHC conference. Any other use without the author's written permission is prohibited.****

In 1680 an Anglican minister published a critique of Anglo-American slavery. Morgan Godwyn had spent several years in the New World, working as a missionary in the English colonies of Virginia and Barbados. What he saw in the colonies saddened and disgusted him. Christian love appeared to be all but dead across the ocean, replaced by greed and avarice. This culture of exploitation was most apparent on the sugar plantations of the Caribbean islands, where white masters worked African slaves nearly to death. Aside from physical abuse, masters also denied their pagan slaves the benefit of Christ, claiming that religious instruction could inspire rebellion and threaten slaveholders' lives and profits. Godwyn decried this attitude and reminded colonizers of their duty to convert the heathens of the far reaches of the world. As an example of what colonists should do, he pointed to New England, where Christianized Indians lived alongside the English and served their white superiors as dutiful Christian servants. Godwyn hoped that white and non-white Americans would become unequal partners, spreading Christianity and civilization across the continent.¹

Godwyn saw in the rise of plantation slavery a clash of ideologies that touched each of early America's three racial groups. He favored an older ideal of Christian servitude that survived in some parts of the English colonial world, inspired by European religious struggles of past centuries and diplomatic exigencies of the present. At the same time, the racial slavery of the plantation moved from the Caribbean to encompass many

of England's colonies. But the plantation model did not simply replace earlier practices of Christian servitude. As Godwyn recognized, many colonists treated Indians as Christian servants, even as they condemned Africans to racial slavery. While European ideology classed both Africans and Indians as heathens outside the pale of civilization, the practice of enslavement eventually led to a separation of the two groups in English minds. Surveying the rise of slavery from the perspective of Indians, the process appears much more contested and complicated than before.²

The Chesapeake region in the seventeenth century provides a perfect setting to examine conflicting visions of race and labor in early America. For decades historians considered the Chesapeake as the birthplace of American slavery, but few of these scholars looked seriously at the role of Indians in the growth of the institution.³ The same cannot be said of those people who actually lived in the seventeenth-century Chesapeake. Virginia's leaders debated Indian slavery throughout the century, and bonded Indians fought their owners in court over the proper role of native labor in the colony. When plantation slavery took hold in the colony during the late-1600s, many Virginians attempted to mold the new labor system to the colony's existing intercultural relations, with mixed results. While blacks rapidly became perpetual slaves on the Chesapeake's tobacco plantations, the region's smaller number of Indians remained closer to Godwyn's ideal Christian servants. Examining slavery from the view of these Indians connects Virginia to an intercolonial and transatlantic debate about the nature of the institution, while affirming the region's distinctiveness. Virginia's intercultural relations over the course of the seventeenth century led colonists to seek their own solutions to the Anglo-American problem of race and slavery.

The first Jamestown colonists expected Indians to figure prominently in the colonial project. The English did not see the natives as stone-age primitives, but as people with a defective religion and an impressive knowledge of North American conditions. Many colonial planners hoped to convert the heathens to Christianity while using their expertise to bring profits to the colony. Above all, English colonists expected their interactions with the natives to be fair and peaceful. The early seventeenth century witnessed the popularization of the “Black Legend” in England, which decried the cruelty of the Spanish conquest of America. English Protestants vowed to avoid the misdeeds of the Papists, and assumed that most natives would willingly give up their pagan beliefs to join English communities, becoming practicing Christians and dutiful servants.⁴

This missionary ideal survived decades of warfare between colonists and Indians in Virginia. Real Indians in the Chesapeake proved far less tractable than the theoretical natives described in promotional pamphlets. During the years before the English arrived in the Chesapeake in 1607, the chief Powhatan had established authority over many of the region’s other Algonquian tribes. His new extended polity, the Powhatan Confederacy, proved just as expansionistic as England during the first years of the 1600s. Powhatan considered himself the supreme leader of the Chesapeake region, and expected the English newcomers to serve his interests as neighboring Indians did. The English and Powhatans skirmished between 1609 and 1614 before finally achieving a tentative truce. Frequent conflict merely strengthened the missionary impulse in some Virginia colonists. During the 1610s a prominent colonist named George Thorpe sought to secure peace between whites and Indians by converting the natives to Christianity and English culture. He lobbied for support to open an Indian college in the colony, and he encouraged

Indians to send their children to live with English families. Thorpe's model of benevolent servitude would mold Indians into good Christians and prepare them for a future as subordinate members of English society. While Thorpe's proposal reflected his cultural chauvinism, it probably resonated with some of the local Algonquians. Indians willingly sent their children to the English to cement alliances, including Powhatan's famous daughter Pocahontas, and the natives also accepted English children to live in their communities for similar purposes.⁵

In 1622 Virginia's shaky peace shattered with the blow of a significant Powhatan uprising. Led by the old chief's brother Opechancanough, the 1622 attack killed several hundred English colonists and nearly sent the survivors back to England. While the colony endured, its relations with the natives never fully recovered. George Thorpe died in the attack, though one of his Indian servants attempted to warn him of the coming onslaught. Rejecting Thorpe's benevolence, some colonists called for more extreme responses to Virginia's Indian problem. One commentator suggested the Indians be "compelled to servitude and drudgery" for their treachery, and another remarked that Indian captives could be as great an economic resource in English as in Spanish colonies, mining for precious metals in the interior and working on West Indian plantations. The horrors of intercultural war challenged the English distaste for Spanish methods of colonization.⁶

Nonetheless, the promotion of slavery for war captives did not contradict Thorpe's model of Christian servitude. Forced labor for defeated combatants was an accepted facet of warfare for both Europeans and Native Americans. In the Mediterranean, for example, Christians and Muslims routinely enslaved one another, and

both sides sought to demonstrate the superiority of their faith through conversion of the captives. As early as 1595 English men and women could read about the experiences of redeemed captives from among the Muslims, and prominent colonial figures like Captain John Smith had experienced slavery while fighting against the “Great Turk” in Europe. Many Indian nations in eastern North America practiced similar rituals. Captured warriors and non-combatants sometimes became members of the victorious tribe; the Iroquois League maintained their strength through the constant adoption of captives, some of whom rose to positions of authority. Whether in North Africa, Europe, or America, captives had to adjust to the culture of their enslavers in order to survive. For Indians in Virginia, therefore, only the adoption of Christianity and English culture could counteract the degrading effects of forced servitude. The English encouraged this conversion as a desirable path for captives of “just wars.” Conversion did not imply equality or eventual freedom, but it did serve to place the captives within English society.

7

In the years after 1622 Virginia’s leaders attempted to make Christian servants out of both friendly and hostile Indians. Despite Thorpe’s grisly end at the hands of the Powhatans, several Virginians imitated him in following decades. In the 1630s, for example, the London merchant Nicholas Farrar left £300 in his will for the education of three Indian children in Christianity. A decade later a colonist attempted to win some of this money by bringing his Indian boy servant before the colony’s ruling council. Impressed by the boy’s knowledge of Christianity and English culture, the council gave his English guardian a yearly allowance of £8 from Farrar’s estate to continue instruction. While they encouraged these attempts to convert wild Indians into dutiful servants,

Virginia's leaders also condemned enemy Indians to slavery. When Opechancanough's Powhatans rose up again in 1644, the English transported several captives to the West Indies. Two decades later Governor William Berkeley quelled a dispute between colonists and Potomac Indians by demanding that the natives "deliver such hostages of their children or others as shalbe required." By converting the children of friendly and hostile Indians, Berkeley intended to neutralize Virginia's Indian problems through forced conversion of children and forced transportation of more dangerous male warriors.⁸

The early laws regarding servitude and slavery reflected the goals of Christian servitude. A 1646 treaty with the Necotowance, for example, invited Indian children under 12 to "freely and voluntarily" live with the English. A decade later the House of Burgesses defined the terms of this service. Indian parents had the power to choose an English guardian for their child, who bore responsibility for teaching the child "knowledge of necessary trades." In 1658 the Burgesses prohibited guardians from transferring ownership of Indian servants and mandated freedom on the servant's twenty-fifth birthday. Authorities attempted to enforce these laws. That same year, for example, the chief of the Weyanoke Indians sold "a boy of my nacon named Weetoppin" to Elizabeth Short in exchange for a one-year old foal. The assembly soon learned that the boy was not a Weyanoke and set him free, "he speaking perfect English and desiring baptism." In the late 1650s the ideals of Christian servitude still overruled Elizabeth Short's property rights.⁹

The necessity of this legislation shows that all Virginians did not accept the colony's official position regarding Indian labor. A clandestine trade in Indian slaves developed among backcountry traders, bringing bonded Indians into the colony who were

neither children sent for conversion nor captives of just wars. The Assembly passed a law in 1658 restricting the sale of any Indian by an Englishman, as some colonists encouraged rival Indians to steal children from each other, causing intertribal strife and placing the colony at risk.¹⁰ Despite restrictions, the Indian slave trade grew over the second half of the 1600s, just as Virginia transformed itself from a colony of small farms to a plantation society. The arrival of the plantation system brought new ideologies of race and labor that threatened the ideals of Christian servitude that had shaped Virginia's first half-century.

The plantation system did not grow spontaneously in the Chesapeake. Colonists in the region imported this new economic and labor system from other English colonies, particularly the sugar islands of the Caribbean. The growth of plantation slavery in the West Indies constitutes one of the most important transformations in the history of the British Empire, and one of the most tragic passages in western history. The transformation to sugar plantations in Barbados occurred by 1650, accompanied by a remarkable jump in imported African slaves. The plantation system required a level of labor exploitation unknown in the colonies before the mid-seventeenth century; the system's brutality increased the psychological distance between masters and slaves while the size of plantations separated them physically. The system promised great wealth, but it abandoned the benevolent aims that justified the servitude of heathens during the first years of colonization.¹¹

The plantation system soon moved beyond the West Indies to embrace many of England's mainland colonies as well. While Barbados was the richest colony during the mid-1600s, the island's limited supply of land forced residents to migrate to other parts of

the English Atlantic. When Barbadians emigrated, they brought their racial attitudes with them, and often their African slaves as well. The islanders settled in every part of the English Atlantic world, including Virginia, but they were particularly abundant several hundred miles south of Chesapeake Bay. In 1672 a group of West Indian planters settled on the Ashley River in the new colony of Carolina, where they hoped to build a plantation society in the Caribbean model. South Carolina was the first English colony to endorse racial slavery at its outset, and white Carolinians saw local Indians not as conversion targets or possible allies, but as another source of slave labor.¹²

The growth of South Carolina changed the role of Indian laborers in the Chesapeake by changing the character of the southeastern Indian trade. Virginians had traded with neighboring Indians since they settled in America, and they occasionally trafficked in Indian children, but traders probably used these servants as personal assistants instead of selling them to work in Virginia's tobacco fields. Some traders believed in the ideals of Christian servitude. In 1654, for example, the trader Francis Yeardley reported that a Carolina chief desired to send his son to Yeardley's post for education in Christianity, a proposal which the English trader welcomed. After the 1670s, however, a trade war with the English in Carolina changed the motives of the Virginia Indian traders. They began to see Indians not as candidates for conversion or assistants in the trade but as commodities in themselves. By the early eighteenth century, a French official reported that Virginia and Carolina traders operated as far west as the Arkansas River, where they paid the powerful Chickasaws to make war on weaker tribes primarily for the acquisition of slaves.¹³

The rise of the Indian slave trade in Virginia can be detected in the surviving records from the frontier county of Henrico. Located on the falls of the James River, Henrico County was a remote part of the colony that looked west as well as east. The soil proved less fertile than the Tidewater counties on Chesapeake Bay, so Henrico's small planters supplemented their tobacco income by trading with Indians of the interior for deerskins and beaver. One of the county's leading citizens, William Byrd I, routinely sent mixed shipments of tobacco and skins home to England. In the 1670s and '80s these traders imported larger numbers of Indian slaves as well. In 1682, for example, an established trader named Edward Hatcher drafted an agreement with two partners at the outset of an expedition stating that "what goods or slaves shall by Gods blessing and our Endeavour be purchased" would be split evenly between the parties. Hatcher gained a reputation in the county as a dealer in Indians; the county court ordered him in 1684 to honor a contract made with Bartholomew Burrows to provide an Indian boy through his trading links among the Catawba Indians. On the very same day, the court recorded a gift made by Hatcher of an Indian girl to his daughter.¹⁴

The changing nature of the Indian trade mirrored a gradual transformation of slave law in Virginia. While early acts of the House of Burgesses prohibited trade in Indians, the assembly passed a series of acts that acknowledged a gradual acceptance of the plantation system. In 1670 the Burgesses attempted to compromise between the two labor systems. A new act prescribed slavery for all non-Christians arriving by sea, while those arriving by land served until the age of 30. With this distinction all black migrants from the West Indies and Africa faced lifetime bondage, while Indians could still expect freedom after a set term of service. Over the next two decades this compromise solution

fell apart. In 1676 a planter named Nathaniel Bacon led a military expedition against both local Indians and Governor William Berkeley. As part of the settlement after Bacon's defeat, the Assembly allowed his former followers to keep all the Indians they had enslaved during their raids, and legalized the perpetual enslavement of war captives. While these previous acts indicated tensions over the role of Indian laborers in the colony, a 1682 measure marked the end of the ideals of Christian servitude in Virginia law. An act of that year defined all those not born Christians – Indians and Africans alike – as eligible for perpetual slavery.¹⁵

Virginia traders and lawmakers agreed in the 1680s that some Indians and most Africans were suited for perpetual bondage on the tobacco plantations of the Chesapeake. This ideology matched the demographic and economic changes of the late-1600s, as large plantations replaced the small farms of the early colony. By 1700 the tidewater region of Virginia resembled the Caribbean much more than it had fifty years earlier. Average land-holdings were larger than in previous decades, and a growing population of black slaves lived in legal and physical separation from the white community.¹⁶ But despite the overwhelming growth of plantations in Virginia, Christian servitude did not die. The traders' dreams of creating a plantation labor force of Indian slaves never materialized, and Virginia's Indians continued to occupy a place closer to white society than their African neighbors.

The two decades after Bacon's Rebellion saw an increase in the numbers of bonded Indians in Virginia. Colonial law required incoming servants and slaves to appear before the county court on their arrival. The court determined the newcomer's age, establishing when they would become eligible for taxation. In 1683 alone, 30 Indians

appeared before the Henrico County court for this purpose, the highest number in any year for which court records survive, and higher than the number of Africans or white servants in the same period. The arriving Indians ranged in age between 3 and 14, and contained a majority of males over females. But while these children resembled the captives taken to maintain the peace during earlier years, clear differences appeared. The court recorded no tribal affiliation for the newcomers, probably because the children came from far in the interior and the English did not know from which nations they originated. Additionally, the court specified the recent change in Virginia law that allowed Indians to be perpetual slaves. For each arrival, the court recorded whether the child entered “since the late act of assembly making Indians slaves.” Twenty of the 30 Indians met this new definition. Many Henrico planters desired to exploit the new law and create a new enslaved Indian labor force.¹⁷

Despite the best efforts of Henrico slave traders, Indians did not become an essential component of Virginia’s labor force. The reasons for this failure remain elusive, as bonded Indians were shadowy figures who rarely appeared in official proceedings. Nonetheless, some prosaic passages from the court records suggest that Indians continued to possess the ambiguous social status common during Virginia’s early years. The surviving resident lists from Surry County indicate that the few Indians living there in the late-1600s worked on small farms, not large plantations. Instead, natives served as jacks-of-all-trades, engaging in activities such as hunting wolves or acting as messengers. In 1686, for example, the Henrico court presented 200 pounds of tobacco to Arthur, a servant of John Wilson, for killing two wolves. Since Indians lived on smaller farms than Africans, and since their work provided both comparative independence and interaction

with English masters, Indians could continue in the customary mold of a Christian servant.¹⁸

Many Indians called on the rhetoric of conversion to claim legal advantages in the colony. The most successful case involved Edward Gunstocker, a Nanzattico Indian who served as a liaison to the English and then received land in Rappahannock County. In 1676 Gunstocker prepared a will before setting out with neighbors to fight “my people, the Indians” during Bacon’s Rebellion. As a freeholder and a faithful soldier, Gunstocker proved Morgan Godwyn’s point that Indians could become loyal subjects. Other Indians exploited English conversion desires more overtly, as a Pamunkey shoemaker named Robin did in 1709. The General Court ordered Robin to return to the Pamunkeys in compliance to a recent court order, but the Indian protested, claiming his trade to be “of no use to him” in Indian country, and lamenting that he would be “compelled to forsake the company & conversation of the English...with which he is much more delighted than with the barbarous Customs & manners of living of his own nation.” Colonial authorities delighted in Robin’s acceptance of English culture and granted his request to stay in the colony and “exercise his trade.”¹⁹

Some Indians without the economic advantages of Gunstocker and Robin attempted to claim places as Virginians. Some of the most persistent were a mother-daughter pair named Mary and Hagar. These two Indians had the misfortune to be both Indian and female. The records are almost completely silent regarding the occupations of female Indians in the colony, but they could not gain the advantages Indian men found in wolf hunting, artisanship, or occasional land-ownership. Nonetheless, Mary and Hagar battled in the courts for freedom and further concessions. In 1688 Mary appeared in the

Henrico court to petition for Hagar's freedom, claiming that her daughter, "being a Virginian born" was therefore "capable of the same privileges & imunitys as other natives." While Mary's petition did not succeed, it indicated a remarkable understanding of the English rhetoric of laws and liberties. Seven years later Hagar had obtained her freedom, and she returned to court to request exemption from county levies. Non-white women in Virginia, unlike their English counterparts, had to pay taxes since the law defined them as laborers. Hagar failed in this effort as well, but succeeded several years later when her parish declared that she was "a very sickly person and maintained by her mother." This final declaration underscores the importance of Indian conversion even in the 1690s. By calling on her links to the English community as a fellow Christian, Hagar overcame the racist laws that held her back so many times before.²⁰

Even in the eighteenth century bonded Indians challenged their status in court while their African neighbors suffered from the expansion of racial slavery. Between 1708 and 1712 seven Indians petitioned the Henrico court for their freedom from servitude, and four succeeded. While this statistic is not overwhelming, it indicates willingness among English officials to bend the strict rules that allowed all Indians to be slaves for life. Some of the petitioners had arrived in the county as children in the 1680s, and had reached the age when Indians received freedom under mid-seventeenth century statutes. The arguments and depositions in these cases have not survived, but their frequency suggests that some Indians recalled the earlier practice of Christian servitude, and expected freedom by their thirtieth birthday in exchange for the loyal service provided during their formative years. Some of these Indians even called English

neighbors as witnesses on their behalf, proving their connections to the colonial society.

21

These Indians succeeded in their appeals for freedom because some of their English neighbors held similar beliefs. Plantation slavery had not replaced Christian servitude; the two systems coexisted in Virginia's peculiar intercultural climate. Some of Virginia's leading residents agreed with Morgan Godwyn about the importance of Indian conversion both to fulfill the duties of colonization and keep the colony safe from attack. The founder of the College of William and Mary, James Blair, wrote a private appeal for the conversion of black and Indian slaves that mirrored Godwyn's earlier proposal. When seeking funding for his college, Blair secured funding from the estate of Robert Boyle, an English scientist who had been a key supporter of Indian conversion in New England. The new college's charter specified the conversion of natives as a primary goal, and Virginia's governor Francis Nicholson aided Blair by instructing backcountry traders to buy Indian children for instruction in the new college. Blair's vision of Indian relations corresponded to that of George Thorpe almost a century before.²²

Several royal governors agreed with Blair's proposals because of the diplomatic advantages that could come from Indian education and conversion. Nicholson hoped that Indian conversion would make the natives allies rather than rivals in colonization, and his successor Alexander Spotswood agreed. Spotswood presided during a difficult time in Indian relations for Virginia's leaders. Two decades of warfare between England and France made colonists fearful of a combination of Indians against the colony, and in 1711 the powerful Tuscaroras attacked the neighboring colony of North Carolina. Spotswood dealt with the Indian threat by pushing conversion and acculturation just as his

seventeenth-century predecessors had done. He shored up the support of his Indian allies by encouraging them to send their children to the college for education and conversion in return for reduction in tribute payments. With the Tuscaroras, Spotswood took a harder line, prohibiting trade between the tribe and colonists and demanding hostages to ensure good conduct. The hostages lived and attended school alongside the tributary children, ensuring that both allies and enemies learned the blessings of Christianity and English civilization.²³

The policies of Virginians like Blair and Spotswood ensured that Indians retained an ambiguous place in colonial society into the eighteenth century. The conversion and acculturation of Indians contrasted with the dehumanization of Africans during the same time period, and eventually white Virginians considered only blacks to be fit for perpetual slavery.²⁴ As Indians dwindled in numbers, Anglo-Virginians recast the natives as romantic vestiges of the colony's past and soon forgot their previous status as bonded laborers. While Indians fared better than blacks in Virginia's new racial order, their romanticization reflected the ultimate victory of plantation slavery over Christian servitude. Unable to fit Indians into a bi-racial labor regime, white Virginians excluded the natives altogether, turning their backs on the conversion ideals that motivated Thorpe, Berkeley, Blair, and Spotswood. This change became apparent during Spotswood's attempts to educate Indians on Virginia's frontier during the 1710s. Despite the governor's reports of success in conversion, the House of Burgesses considered the project a waste of time and refused to support it. By recasting the Indians as unconvertible others, the Burgesses predicted the genocidal Indian policies of their successors in following centuries.²⁵

*The author thanks T. H. Breen and Stephanie McCurry for commenting on earlier drafts of this essay. As this is a work in progress, please do not cite or quote without permission.

¹ Morgan Godwyn, *The Negro's and Indian's Advocate, Suing for their Admission into the Church*, (London, 1680). For recent interpretations of Godwyn, see Alden T. Vaughan, "Slaveholders' 'Hellish Principles': A Seventeenth-Century Critique," in *Roots of American Racism: Essays on the Colonial Experience*, (New York, 1995), 55-81; David Brion Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*, (Ithaca, 1966), 204-6.

² After decades of inaction, scholars are returning to the study of Indian slavery in early America. Recent or forthcoming works include Alan Galloway, *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670-1717*, (New Haven, 2002); James Brooks, *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwestern Borderlands*, (Chapel Hill, 2002); and studies of Indian slavery in such diverse contexts as New England, South Carolina, and Louisiana. The only comprehensive study of the practice in North America is Almon W. Lauber, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times Within the Present Limits of the United States*, (New York, 1913).

³ Scholars long debated the comparative influence of race and economics in the rise of Chesapeake slavery. For the most important interpretations, see Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1815*, (Chapel Hill, 1969), 3-100; Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of*

Colonial Virginia, (New York, 1975); Russell Menard, "From Servants to Slaves: The Transformation of the Chesapeake Labor System," *Southern Studies*, XVI (1977), 355-90; Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Race, Gender, and Power in Colonial Virginia*, (Chapel Hill, 1996). Of these historians only Morgan and Brown considered Indians as contributing to the development of race and slavery in the Chesapeake, along with J. Leitch Wright, Jr., *The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the American Indians in the Old South*, (New York, 1980), ch. 4 and 6.

⁴ The most recent interpretations of contact are Karen Ordahl Kupperman, *Indians and English: Facing Off in Early America*, (Ithaca, 1999); and Joyce Chaplin, *Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500-1676*, (Cambridge, Mass., 2001). See also Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, 7-24, 44-70; and Nicholas P. Canny, "England's New World and the Old, 1480s-1630s," in Canny, ed., *The Origins of Empire: British Overseas Enterprise to the Close of the Seventeenth Century*, (Oxford, 1998), 148-69.

⁵ On these first encounters, see Nancy Oestrich Lurie, "Indian Cultural Adjustment to European Civilization," in James Morton Smith, ed., *Seventeenth-Century America: Essays in Colonial History*, (New York, 1959), 33-60; Frederic Gleach, *Powhatan's World and Colonial Virginia*, (Lincoln, Neb., 1997); J. Frederick Fausz, "An Abundance of Blood Shed on Both Sides: Virginia's First Indian War, 1609-14," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, XCVIII (1990), 3-56; Fausz, "Middlemen in Peace and War: Virginia's First Indian Interpreters," *ibid.*, XCV (1987), 41-64; Kupperman, *Indians and English*, 174-240.

⁶ On 1622, see J. Frederick Fausz, “The Powhatan Uprising of 1622: A Historical Study of Ethnocentrism and Social Conflict, (Ph. D. dissertation, College of William and Mary, 1977); Alden T. Vaughan, “‘Expulsion of the Salvages’: English Policy and the Virginia ‘Massacre of 1622,’” in *Roots of American Racism*, 105-27 (quotation on 123-4). For a primary account that includes Thorpe’s death, see Edward Waterhouse, “A Declaration of the state of the Colonie and Affaires in Virginia,” [1622] in Warren M. Billings, ed., *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century: A Documentary History of Virginia, 1606-1689*, (Chapel Hill, 1975), 220-4.

⁷ On the European roots of American slavery, see Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern, 1492-1800*, (London, 1997), 31-93; Linda Colley, “Going Native, Telling Tales: Captivity, Collaboration, and Empire,” *Past and Present*, no. 168 (2000), 170-93; Robert C. Davis, “Counting European Slaves on the Barbary Coast,” *ibid.*, no. 172 (2001), 87-124; Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*, (New York, 1999), 43-107; G. E. Aylmer, “Slavery Under Charles II: The Mediterranean and Tangier,” *English Historical Review*, CXIV (1999), 378-88. On John Smith, see Alden T. Vaughan, *American Genesis: Captain John Smith and the Founding of Virginia*, (Boston, 1978), 10-12. On Native American captivity practices, see Ian K. Steele, “Surrendering Rites: Prisoners on Colonial North American Frontiers,” in Stephen Taylor, Richard Connors, and Clyve Jones, eds., *Hanoverian Britain and Empire: Essays in Memory of Philip Lawson*, (Woodbridge, 1998); Daniel K. Richter, “War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., XL (1983), 528-59.

⁸ H. R. McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Virginia*, (Richmond, 1924), 477-8, 483; “Mr. Streeter’s Extracts from the Minutes of the Council and General Court, 1642-45,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 2d ser., XX (1940), 69; William Waller Hening, ed., *The Statutes at Large, Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia, from the First Legislature in 1619*, (Richmond, 1809-23), II: 193-4.

⁹ Hening, *Statutes*, I: 323-6, 393-6, 455-6. On Weetoppin see Surry County, Deed Book #1, 1652-1672, 137; Hening, *Statutes*, II: 155. The latter document identified the boy as “Matappin.”

¹⁰ Hening, *Statutes*, 481-2.

¹¹ On the growth of plantations see Philip D. Curtin, *The Rise and Fall of the Plantation Complex: Essays in Atlantic History*, (Cambridge, 1990), 46-57; Blackburn, *Rise of New World Slavery*, 95-126, 161-84. On Barbados see Richard S. Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West Indies, 1624-1713*, (Chapel Hill, 1972); Hilary Beckles, *White Servitude and Black Slavery in Barbados, 1627-1715*, (Knoxville, 1989); Carl and Roberta Bridenbaugh, *No Peace Beyond the Line: The English in the Caribbean, 1624-1690*, (New York, 1972), 69-100; Gary A. Puckrein, *Little England: Plantation Society and Anglo-Barbadian Politics*, (New York, 1984).

¹² On the dispersion of Barbadians, see Dunn, *Sugar and Slaves*, 110-16; Jack P. Greene, “Colonial South Carolina and the Caribbean Connection,” *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, LXXXVIII (1987), 192-210. On Carolina’s early years, see Peter H. Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion*, (New York, 1974). On the development of Indian slavery in South Carolina,

see Gallay, *Indian Slave Trade*, 40-100; William L. Ramsey, “‘Heathenish Combination’: The Natives of the North American Southeast During the Era of the Yamasee War,” (Ph. D. dissertation, Tulane University, 1998), 176-220.

¹³ “Francis Yeardley’s Narrative of Excursions into Carolina, 1654,” in Alexander S. Salley, ed., *Narratives of Early Carolina, 1650-1708*, (New York, 1911), 25-6; Pierre Margry, ed., *Mémoires et documents pour servir a l’histoire des origines françaises des pays outre-mer: Decouvertes et établissements des français dans l’ouest et dans le sud de l’Amérique septentrionale*, (Paris, 1881), IV: 531, 544. On the Indian trade, see James H. Merrell, *The Indians’ New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal*, (Chapel Hill, 1989), 49-91; Gallay, *Indian Slave Trade*.

¹⁴ Marion Tinling, ed., *The Correspondence of the Three William Byrds of Westover, 1684-1776*, (Charlottesville, 1977), I: 30, 37, 47, 48, 62, 69, 110; Henrico County, Record Book 1 (Deeds and Wills), 1677-1692, 216; Henrico County, Order Book (and Wills), 1678-1693, 166; Henrico County, Wills, Deeds, Etc., 1677-1692, 222; Merrell, *Indians’ New World*, 36.

¹⁵ Hening, *Statutes*, II: 283, 346, 404, 440, 491-2. On Bacon’s Rebellion, see Wilcomb E. Washburn, *The Governor and the Rebel: A History of Bacon’s Rebellion in Virginia*, (Chapel Hill, 1957); Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, 250-70.

¹⁶ See Menard, “From Servants to Slaves;” Allan Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800*, (Chapel Hill, 1986).

¹⁷ Henrico County, Order Book (and Wills), 1678-1693, 138-51. The calendar year is measured from January to December.

¹⁸ For resident lists, see Surry County, Wills, Deeds, Etc., where lists appeared annually throughout the late-1600s. For Arthur, see Henrico County, Record Book 1 (Deeds and Wills), 1677-92, 403. Numerous similar examples can be found throughout the Henrico court records.

¹⁹ On Gunstocker, see Old Rappahannock County, Deeds &c., #3, 1663-1668, 257-8; Nell Marion Nugent, ed., *Cavaliers and Pioneers: Abstracts of Virginia Land Patents and Grants*, (Richmond, 1977), I: 566; "Will of Edward Gunstocker," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 2d ser., XVI (1936), 593; Old Rappahannock County, Records, 1681-1688, #7, 69-70; Old Rappahannock County, Orders, #1, 1683-1686, 100, 284. On Robin, see William Palmer, ed., *Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts, 1652-1781, Preserved in the Capitol at Richmond*, (Richmond, 1875), I: 133-4.

²⁰ On Mary and Hagar, see Henrico County, Order Book (and Wills), 1678-1693, 280; Henrico County, Record Book 3 (Orders), 1694-1699, 77, 191. On women and the laws of slavery, see Kathleen Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs*, 116-20.

²¹ For these cases, see Henrico County, Court Orders, 1707-1709, 99; Henrico County, Orders, 1710-1714 (part 2), 45, 56, 92, 167, 175, 176, 185, 197, 205, 215, 216.

²² Henry Hartwell, James Blair, and Edward Chilton, *The Present State of Virginia and the College*, ed Hunter Dickinson Farish, (Williamsburg, 1940), 73; Blair, "A Proposition for encouraging the Christian education of Indian, Negroe, and Mulatto Children,"

[manuscript], Nicholson Papers, Colonial Williamsburg; Francis Nicholson to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 27 May 1700, in William Stevens Perry, ed., *Historical Collections Relating to the Early American Church*, (Hartford, 1870), I: 121, 123-4. For a comprehensive history of Indians at William and Mary, see Karen A. Stuart, “‘So Good a Work’: The Brafferton School, 1691-1777,” (M. A. thesis, College of William and Mary, 1984).

²³ “Copy of part of a speech to the General Assembly of Virginia in Nov. 1711,” in Perry, ed., *Historical Collections*, I: 129; R. A. Brock, ed., *The Official Letters of Alexander Spotswood*, (Richmond, 1882), I: 121-2, 167, II: 113-4, 258; Palmer, ed., *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, I: 179.

²⁴ On the declining status of free blacks in the eighteenth century, see Douglas Deal, “A Constricted World: Free Blacks on Virginia’s Eastern Shore, 1680-1750,” in Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean Russo, eds., *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, (Chapel Hill, 1988).

²⁵ For changing views of Indians and race during this time period, see Jordan, *White Over Black*, 101-265; Gary B. Nash, “The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., XXIX (1972), 220-3; Ronald Takaki, “*The Tempest in the Wilderness: The Racialization of Savagery*,” *Journal of American History*, LXXIX (1992), 892-912; Alden Vaughan, “From White Man to Redskin: Changing Anglo-American Perceptions of the American Indian,” in *Roots of American Racism*, 3-33; Brock, ed., *Spotswood Letters*, II: 258.