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ABSTRACT

Thomas Jefferson was born at Shadwell, Albemarle County, Virginia, on April 13, 1743. What began as an archaeological exploration to discover the nature of his home there continued because artifacts and documents revealed a complex story about the many people who lived and worked there. From the 1730s through the 1770s Shadwell was home to Jane and Peter Jefferson, their eight children, over sixty slaves owned by them, and numerous hired workers.

The archaeological and documentary evidence reveals that Shadwell was a well-appointed gentry house at the center of a highly structured plantation landscape during a period of Piedmont settlement that scholars have traditionally classified as frontier. In fact, the Jeffersons accommodated in their house, landscape, material goods, and behaviors the most up-to-date expectations of Virginia's elite tidewater culture. The material remnants of Shadwell raise questions about the character of this frontier and how the Jeffersons maintained a style of living that reflected their high social status. Shadwell extended the boundaries of tidewater culture to include this newly settled region that was five days' journey from the colonial capital of Williamsburg.

The common themes throughout these chapters have to do with the material and cultural influences of the Jeffersons. Their wealth made it possible for them to enjoy the fashionable material goods they desired and also meant that they had the ability to influence the character and development of their community in profound ways. In providing their family with a home and consumer goods that served the familiar functions of elite society, they also fostered the growth of a local community of craftspeople whose skills the Jeffersons needed. The Jeffersons' slaves worked agricultural jobs but also were cooks, personal servants, and nurses to children and had a variety of skills to support the Jeffersons' material needs and heightened social position. The number of African Americans at Shadwell also meant that slaves had opportunities to form effective families and communities. The Jeffersons' various agricultural investments required the building of infrastructure that small planters nearby could also use. Social connections and economic clout translated into political influence, which meant that the Jeffersons and their peers who held public office affected not only how their county grew but how Virginia grew. They made policy and enforced laws that ensured their way of doing things in tidewater worked in newly formed Albemarle County and across the Blue Ridge Mountains.

Archaeology at Shadwell gave new meaning to many of the historic documents as the material culture recovered there prompted fresh reading of much that seemed familiar. The results of the research ultimately offer new views of the Jefferson family and their role in settling Virginia, a rich description of the lives of the slaves who worked for them, and a few new perspectives on Thomas Jefferson himself.
Volume 1
THE JEFFERSONS AT SHADWELL
FOREWORD

In late 1990, as part of the preparations for celebrating the 250th anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth in 1993, the Monticello Archaeology Department entered into documentary and field investigations at Shadwell, the birthplace of Thomas Jefferson. That fieldwork continued through 1995 and provided material to answer initial questions about the character of Peter and Jane Jefferson’s family home. Research centered on the location of the Jeffersons' house, a slave quarter site, and the plantation landscape, details of which fell into place during those field seasons. Yet much of the basic physical description of the site could not be explained from the artifacts and features located archaeologically. In fact, the range and complexity of the artifact assemblage and the seeming formality of the landscape plan prompted the questions that this study proposes to answer. The archaeological fieldwork at Shadwell followed immersion in the documents relating to the site, but the results of the archaeology demanded re-reading and new interpretation of those same documentary sources.

---

1Shadwell and Monticello are adjacent and were part of the same tract of land that Thomas Jefferson inherited from his father. The Thomas Jefferson Foundation (TJF, formerly TJMF for TJ Memorial Foundation), which operates Monticello, owns both properties today.
INTRODUCTION

Thomas Jefferson was born at Shadwell, in what is now Albemarle County, Virginia, on April 13, 1743. From the 1730s through the 1770s Shadwell was home to Jane and Peter Jefferson, their eight children, over sixty slaves owned by them, and numerous hired workers. What began as an archaeological exploration to discover the nature of Thomas Jefferson's early home continued into this project because artifacts and documents revealed a complex story about the many people who lived and worked there.

The archaeological and documentary evidence reveals that Shadwell was a well-appointed gentry house at the center of a highly structured plantation landscape during a period of Piedmont settlement that scholars have traditionally classified as frontier. In fact, the Jeffersons accommodated in their house, landscape, material goods, and behaviors the most up-to-date expectations of Virginia's elite tidewater culture. The material remnants of Shadwell raise questions about the character of this frontier and how the Jeffersons maintained a style of living that reflected their established high social status. Shadwell extended the boundaries of tidewater culture to include this newly settled region that was five days journey westward from the colonial capital of Williamsburg.

The common themes throughout these chapters have to do with the material and cultural influences of the Jeffersons. Their wealth made it possible for them to enjoy the fashionable material goods they desired and also meant that they had the ability to
influence the character and development of their community in profound ways. In providing their family with a home and consumer goods that served the familiar functions of elite society, they also fostered the growth of a local community of craftspeople whose skills the Jeffersons needed. The Jeffersons’ slaves worked agricultural jobs but they were also cooks, personal servants, and nurses to children and had a variety of skills to support the Jeffersons’ material needs and heightened social position. The number of African Americans at Shadwell also meant that slaves had opportunities to form effective families and communities. The Jeffersons’ various agricultural investments required the building of an infrastructure that small planters nearby also used. Social connections and economic clout translated into political influence, which meant that the Jeffersons and their peers who held public office affected not only how their county grew, but also how Virginia grew. They made policy and practiced laws that ensured their way of doing things in tidewater would work in newly formed Albemarle County and across the Blue Ridge Mountains.

Archaeology at Shadwell gave new meaning to many of the historic documents about the Jeffersons because the material culture recovered there prompted fresh reading of much that seemed familiar. The results of the research ultimately offer new views of the Jefferson family, a rich description of the lives of the slaves who worked for them, and, yes, a few new perspectives on Thomas Jefferson himself.²

² Artifacts, field records, and related materials are in the collections of the Monticello Archaeology Department, under whose labor Shadwell was excavated from 1991-1995. See also Susan A. Kern, "Report on Archaeological Investigations at Shadwell, Albemarle County, Virginia, 1991-1995" (ms. TJMF, 1996); also Kern, "A Report on Archaeological Investigation of a Burial Ground at Shadwell, Virginia, 1992-
Two historiographical problems haunt interpretations of Shadwell. The first is the tension between the scholarly and popular perceptions of Thomas Jefferson’s origins. The second is the nature of findings from earlier excavations of Shadwell.

In 1909 historian William Thornton established an oppositional relationship between Thomas Jefferson’s parents when he proclaimed that Jefferson bore the “plebeian red [blood] of Peter,” and the “aristocratic blue of Jane.” In The Jefferson Image in the American Mind, Merrill D. Peterson traces the popular embrace of this view even after the complete scholarly repudiation of it by Marie Kimball in 1943. Marie Kimball certified Peter Jefferson’s gentry status in Jefferson: The Road to Glory, 1743 to 1776, and Dumas Malone reiterated her findings five years later in his celebrated six-volume biography of Jefferson. Most scholars since cite Malone on the parentage of Thomas Jefferson, but, as Malone was, they are left with architectural historian Fiske Kimball’s tentative 1943 thesis about Shadwell on the material circumstances of earlier Jeffersons.  

Interpretations of the social and the material worlds of the Jeffersons have been difficult to reconcile. In 1943 Fiske Kimball excavated portions of Shadwell and his assessment still reverberates through Jefferson historiography. Kimball uncovered the

---

3 For Thornton’s observations, see Merrill D. Peterson, The Jefferson Image in the American Mind (New York, 1960), 418-420, (quotation 248). See also Marie Kimball, Jefferson: The Road to Glory, 1743 to 1776 (New York, 1943), see esp. the prologue, “Aristocrat or Backwoodsman?,” and chap. 1; Dumas Malone, Jefferson the Virginian (Boston, 1948), chaps. 1-2; Fiske Kimball, "In Search of Jefferson's Birthplace," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 51, no. 4 (October 1943): 312-325. The historiography of Jane and Peter will be revisited in chapters 1, 2, and 6.
cellar to the Jeffersons’ house, but he could not understand the archaeological evidence because it did not fit what he wanted to find, namely, a formal "five-part Palladian plan." Kimball wanted to find a "mansion" to dispute the idea then current among some scholars that Thomas Jefferson rose from yeoman origins. Early in the twentieth century, politically liberal scholars and politicians described Jefferson as being born of an overseer class, a characterization made to ennoble the Everyman as a descendent of common American beginnings, but colonial revival conservatism responded with a desire to certify the pedigrees of great American patriots. Kimball excavated the mid-eighteenth-century brick cellar that he called an outbuilding, the later-eighteenth-century stone cellar that he thought might be part of the early Jefferson house (he made the incorrect assumption that stone would be necessarily earlier construction than brick), and the two kitchen-related hearths nearby. Based on the extent of the buildings, he declared that there was little evidence that Jefferson was "a son of the frontier." But Kimball could not bolster his argument with further material evidence and later interpretations echo his tentativeness. Malone summed up Kimball’s findings: "No mansion ever stood on this homesite but his father erected a substantial group of plantation buildings before he died." Citations of Fiske Kimball via Malone have been augmented only by those who cite Jack McLaughlin’s 1988 book, Jefferson and Monticello: The Biography of a Builder, in which he sets up a formalistic contrast between Shadwell and Monticello, thus extending the oppositional paradigm from the social to the material.4

---

4 For the comment about the Palladian plan, Kimball to Shadwell project architect, c. 1954, interview with Floyd E. Johnson, FAIA, August 1996. See also Kimball Papers, Philadelphia Museum of Art. Kimball, "In Search of Jefferson's Birthplace;" 324 (quotation, 319, 325); Malone, Jefferson, I: 27; Peterson, Jefferson
Among historians, Jane Jefferson’s Randolph parentage left little doubt as to her prestige; it is Peter’s ancestry and fortunes that have driven the discussions. For instance, Fawn M. Brodie pursued the oppositional line set up by William Thornton. Jan Lewis cites Malone and the gentry status of Thomas’s grandfather but still chooses to highlight Peter’s “own exertions” as his identifying characteristic. Noble E. Cunningham Jr. calls Shadwell “a modest frame house” and describes Peter as “a rising young planter,” yet says that Thomas was born to the gentry. Willard Sterne Randall uses a safer tactic of noting that in his autobiography Thomas himself said his father was a surveyor and did not mention his father’s elected offices. In other words, Thomas downplayed his father’s achievements. Randall cites McLaughlin that Shadwell was a “typical Virginia farmhouse,” as does Andrew Burstein, who chooses to embrace Peter as a “self-reliant frontiersman.” Joseph J. Ellis uses “moderately successful” to describe Peter, and Gordon Wood calls Peter Jefferson “wealthy but uneducated and ungenteel.” Norman K. Risjord calls Peter “a man of some substance,” but avoids describing Shadwell at all.5


Authors for the popular audience, Page Smith and Elizabeth Langhorne, find utility in the story of a self-made man who had important friendships and married up. Neither describes Shadwell. Page Smith, Jefferson: A Revealing Biography (New York, 1976), 7-9; Elizabeth Langhorne, Monticello: A Family Story (Chapel Hill, 1989), 1-2;
This study of Shadwell demands reinterpretation of historians' traditional characterizations of Peter Jefferson, Jane Randolph Jefferson, and Thomas Jefferson's boyhood experience. The material provisions of the plantation suggest that Peter and Jane Jefferson fashioned a world familiar to Virginia's elite. Though Peter Jefferson is often described as a self-made frontiersman, the imprint of a talented surveyor on Shadwell's landscape speaks of a man who knew what social and political returns came from a carefully planned estate. The provisions for social ritual within the Jefferson dwelling house and the attention to her children's well-rounded education show Jane Jefferson's concern with refined manners. The role of these parents in shaping their children is implicit in the material goods filling their home. This study of Shadwell requires us to think of the Jeffersons as a family, a social unit whose function was to perpetuate genetic lines and to preserve socio-economic investments within their particular cultural system. Most of the evidence from Shadwell shows just how successful the Jeffersons were at promoting the family's interests.

This study begins with the walls of the house---actually with the archaeological remains of those walls---and spirals outward from there to explore the connections that the Jeffersons had from Shadwell across Virginia and beyond. The buildings and objects at Shadwell suggest that the Jeffersons invested in running a plantation but also concerned themselves with furnishing their house for entertaining and as an object for status display. The house was a physical object that both defined and was defined by the

---

This is by no means an exhaustive survey but represents the threads of interpretation. The same range of interpretation is found in children's literature on TJ.
social needs of its users. Its users operated within the building and beyond its walls with
the relentless details of everyday life and the workings of a household that included
Jefferson family members, their slaves, and occasional hired help. Peter Jefferson owned
more than sixty slaves who performed tasks as part of the Jefferson household, of their
own households, and of the agricultural enterprise of the plantation. The plantation
population made contact well beyond its physical bounds as commerce included local
hired help, craftsmen, merchants, and visitors. And the family, business, and professional
dealings of Peter and Jane and other members of the plantation community ensured that
the Jeffersons were not cut off from the larger social landscape of Virginia or the material
wealth of the British colonial world.

This project is by nature descriptive, but it is not merely so. To describe this
plantation and its inhabitants required collection and cataloging of artifacts and evidence.
The detailed analysis of objects and documents, statistics and individuals, and historical
context are what make the description possible. Yet this is not a study of material
culture; it is a history of people written from the things they used and the things they did.
The material remains are a vehicle, just as the account book is, for investigating the
history on this site. The objects set the stage upon which the people act. Until recently
scholars have been uneasy with using material culture as a source for history, since for so
long old objects had been merely curiosities, or the domain of the specialized formalist
language of people who study decorative arts. A generation of historians, material
culture specialists, museum professionals, architectural historians, archaeologists, and
others has changed that and proven that dynamic and meaningful histories come from
what had previously been considered "interdisciplinary" at best. The physical setting
helps us move through the plantation; each chapter describes a different subset of the whole population, as the focus changes from house, to household, slave houses to plantation, to Piedmont, Virginia, and beyond.

The first chapter describes the Jefferson family's house at Shadwell, springing from its fullest flowering recorded in the 1757 inventory of Peter Jefferson's estate. The comprehensive house renovations in the early 1750s present an opportunity to see how the house and its furnishings represented the aspirations and met the needs of the family during those years. In particular, it examines how the house served public functions, domestic repose, and labor and craft production. The house was the enclave for a wealthy family but a place of work for slaves given tasks as various as tending babies or grown ladies and gentlemen, setting up a tea service, or making candles. It was where Jane Jefferson ensured that children learned to dance and where Peter Jefferson hung maps, kept accounts, and inscribed important boundaries on paper. The house contained many objects that encouraged learning; whether from books or teacups or a finely finished room, the house and its furnishings were didactic. The house was also the center of a substantial plantation and the relationship of the parts of the plantation in the landscape shows how the Jeffersons carefully ordered their world.

Chapter one involves critical methodology dealing with objects and buildings. The give and take between the material remains and the documentary evidence drives this study. There is tension between the two types of sources; neither is complete, and each is made both more and less so with consideration of the other. The joining of the material and the documentary sources creates new complexities through which to discuss the Jeffersons' lives. An artifact is three-dimensional and requires consideration of the space
it took up as well as how people used it. It requires that the actions of the people who used it be described in deliberate and concrete ways: actions take up space and also time. The artifacts enable the historian to animate the site and enliven the now-past landscape, but the documents ground the discussion to a particular time and place. Documents, such as inventories, function as snapshots to capture single moments in the lives of people. The objects provide the colors and textures that distinguish the character of the everyday.

The second chapter looks at running the household, the purview of Jane Jefferson. Her oversight extended beyond the walls of the house into the separate kitchen building and home slave quarters and even into the homes of local women who produced goods for Shadwell. The house set the stage for both household and social activities, and running the household relied on the work of Jane Jefferson and her organization of other family members and slaves. Jane's projects can be divided into two broad categories: work that sustained the household, from everyday cooking to seasonal crafts; and work that preserved and perpetuated the family's important social standing vis a vis the proper training of both her children and the slaves who served them. This home belonged to a family of wealthy colonial Virginia planters. That meant that the household included the members of that family, the slaves who tended them and worked in and around their house, and other people whose expertise or labor was hired to aid in the Jeffersons' fortunes and comforts.

Chapter two focuses on the lives of Jane Jefferson and other women at Shadwell because the history of the household was in large part a history of the women who were its primary keepers. The children also occupied a substantial portion of this landscape. Their daily care and the investments made in their upbringing were among the basic
functions of the household. The history of the household, and of these women, is a history of the everyday and the immediate. It relies on our thinking about the most basic functions of various objects and what work those objects facilitated. This means thinking about the time and actions it takes to dress and feed and educate children, to tend animals, to make clothing, to give orders to slaves, or, if a slave, to do all these things for your own children AND someone else’s. And no one—in the eighteenth century or now—wrote down how many buttons they buttoned each day, or how many spoons they set on the table, or picked up off the floor, or picked up off the floor again.

Chapter three defines the plantation and agricultural investments at Shadwell. Peter Jefferson organized his enslaved and hired labor force to make the most of the resources of the vast Shadwell enterprise. Jefferson established local relationships that supported the household and plantation businesses as well as those that fulfilled familial responsibilities. Chapter three relies heavily on the account books kept for the plantation and on family records to explore the status and influence of Peter Jefferson, and how his personal, professional, business, and family relationships describe a man charged with extensive power and responsibility. The material and social worlds of Shadwell support the argument for a socio-economic rather than a geographical diffusion idea about the spread of culture. Peter Jefferson’s many business and personal alliances provide an interesting map of how his associations connected his family across a range of social and geographic settings. Just what was Peter Jefferson’s business? How far geographically did his associations reach and how pervasive was his influence in Albemarle County and abroad? This chapter defines the web of the Jeffersons’ local relationships and begins to chart their geographic horizons. Those horizons are expanded in chapters six and seven.
The Jeffersons' riches and power rode on the backs of African or African-American slaves. The slaves and their material and social lives are the focus of chapters four and five, which depend on archaeological as well as documentary evidence. The sixty or so slaves who lived at Shadwell inhabited a materially rich world that benefited from the connections the Jeffertons had beyond the plantation. Yet the slaves' lives were augmented by their own use of local resources. Their story is tied to the large-scale production of tobacco and grain, but also to the tending of the plantation kitchen and combing and dressing young gentry-in-training. The Shadwell slave lists lend themselves to analysis through aggregate statistics. Archaeology offers insights into particular objects of the slaves' own material culture. There is information about work lives, the domestic landscape, and social opportunities. Their lives, from birth to death, from sun up to sun down, were inextricably intertwined with those of the Jefferson family and those relationships drive much of what we know about these people.

Chapter four explores the Shadwell slaves as a group and how they reflected the experience of slavery in early Albemarle County. Shadwell housed one of the largest populations of African Americans in colonial Albemarle County. The lives of these slaves were unusual because of the size of the group. Yet in other ways Shadwell represented a common experience, especially for the field slaves. Staple-crop production at Shadwell, the keeping of a large labor force, and maintenance of the plantation ensured regular commerce with people outside the plantation population. Overseers kept the slaves working and the tobacco rolling, and overseers' wives provided necessary sewing and knitting for the Shadwell slaves. Craftsmen brought to Shadwell to help finish the house, work on the mill, or tailor a coat passed on valuable carpentry or joinery or
needlework training to slaves, who then had value as skilled labor, not just as handlers of hoes and plows. Business and social visits that brought people and material goods to Shadwell expanded the experience of those who lived on the plantation.

The home-quarter slaves are the subjects of chapter five. While slavery at Shadwell was very much like slavery elsewhere, there were differences within the plantation, particularly between the experiences of the home-quarter slaves and of field laborers, though in the end, an enslaved person’s life responded to her or his owner’s demands. The Jeffersons practiced some management strategies that historians have come to consider were somewhat “better” for the slaves’ personal well-being, such as recognizing slave families in the organization of housing and work. But the most brutal aspects of slavery—of not being able to control the destinies of one’s own body and family—were enacted within the Jeffersons’ holdings. Slaves were moved within and between plantations, their jobs were changed, they were sold, one was murdered. Only a few of the people who were slaves at Shadwell in 1757 died there; most followed Jefferson family members to other places. The lives of the Shadwell slaves changed as their owners’ legal status changed. Instead of a life lived on one patch of land doing the same work for years, most of these slaves experienced at least one major change to home or job, and some experienced many changes during their lives. The evidence of these changes appears in the archaeological and documentary records and suggests that a life that was never quite settled was a common story of slavery. Archaeology at Shadwell, coupled with the Jefferson documents, offers an unusual opportunity to explore both the mundane and the exceptional events in the lives of a single group of enslaved people.
Chapter six explores the public realm, the associations that Peter Jefferson had through elected offices or government appointments and that connected him to people and places well beyond the plantation bounds. Sources for this chapter include public records and the documents generated by land speculation and map making, yet certain artifacts from Shadwell illustrate how Jefferson's public roles were symbolically and literally brought home. Artifacts of surveying, office holding, and hosting Native Americans let us tell these stories from the grounds of Shadwell, bringing them into the lives of everyone who lived there. There is significant overlap between the names of family members, friends, and colleagues who appear in chapter three as part of Jefferson's personal business, and those who appear in chapter six as professional associates or fellow office holders. Much of the business that benefited the colony, for which Jefferson acted as agent, also benefited Jefferson the person. Jefferson's story is one of commonwealth.

Chapter seven follows the occupants of Shadwell, both the Jeffersons and their slaves, into their post-Shadwell lives. Jane and Peter Jefferson left intangible legacies that connected their children and grandchildren to generations past. The futures of sons, daughters, and family slaves were partially determined by the industrious attentions of Peter and Jane Jefferson. Chapter seven uses the genealogy notations made by Jane and Peter Jefferson and their heirs, and looks at the mechanics of wills, funerals, and other ways of remembering family. In addition to preserving wealth and status, Jane and Peter Jefferson instilled in their children a strong sense of family that enabled them to support and care for one another and their families to come. The possibility for an affectionate history of this generation of Jeffersons has been hinted at in documents, but has remained
unexplored by historians (who often find greater entertainment in exposing the possibility of pathologies among their subjects). Chapter seven relies heavily on letters written between the Jefferson children that show how their adult relationships reveal many gestures of love and affection among them. Chapter seven examines also the kin networks between slaves who once lived at Shadwell and moved away, or who stayed at Shadwell, Monticello, or Snowdon and helped facilitate exchanges between members of the Jefferson family. The slaves' familiarity with their owners' families and with each other's plantations helped maintain slave-family connections as well as the connections between the Jeffersons. The histories of the slave families and their owners' families continued together.

Chapter seven is one of the most "text-based" parts of this project, however; documents are also artifacts and offer up evidence beyond the words they bear. The components of a document—ink, handwriting, spelling, paper, and binding—are all part of the material culture of those people whose history the documents hold. The treatment of Jane Jefferson's Bible by cataloguers and historians offers a cautionary tale about how the fashions of history affected how materials have been archived. As the context in which men like Thomas Jefferson lived becomes as important to historians as the man himself, the value of various documents changes. There are a surprising number of surviving letters written by the family of Thomas Jefferson. These have not been handled in any comprehensive way and their association with Thomas Jefferson has been both an asset and a liability in how historians have presented them. Many of the Jefferson family letters also contain glimpses into the lives of the slaves who came and went with the various siblings.
An Afterward sums up observations about the types of evidence used in this study of Shadwell and how the archaeological assemblage from Shadwell, coupled with the surviving documents, offers a unique opportunity to examine the lives of many people who passed over this place more than two centuries ago. Throughout this study new details about the Jeffersons’ lives bring up opportunities to reassess family stories and myths surrounding the early years and family of Thomas Jefferson. Some family stories are reinforced by the material record – the description of the Shadwell house, for instance. Other stories are revealed to have their foundations in minds of nineteenth or twentieth-century historians. This story of Shadwell affects how we interpret much of what we know about Thomas Jefferson.

How does this picture of the early years of Thomas Jefferson adjust our view of him? The image of Jefferson as the self-made architect, epicure, and republican who bursts forth onto the American landscape is at once more complex and simpler. Does his parents’ participation in a larger Virginia social world and larger Atlantic economy explain Jefferson’s worldliness as well as his attention to refinement, taste, and manners? Jefferson knew intimately the hierarchical structure of large plantation landscapes, which he applied with rigor at Monticello. He knew close family life and the support of interested and involved kin spread far and wide. He knew that to appear successful in Virginia meant fostering relationships with slaves and laborers, and itinerant, poor, and improvident neighbors as well as powerful office holders. This examination of Jane and Peter’s family makes young Thomas one of many in his family’s culture, instead of the exception to a pattern from which he alone escaped.
The story of Shadwell could be summarized through placing various quantifiable data within ranges established by other scholars to tell about how much and how many and how early things happened there. Even that adds a new generation of information to what is known about Shadwell. This study is almost the opposite from a work such as Philip Morgan's *Slave Counterpoint*. Morgan's study synthesizes the broad swath of information about slaves and slave life in the Chesapeake in order to compare the details and the trends to those of slavery in South Carolina. My study takes the minutia about people and things in one place and explores their world and the changes in their lives. To compare the Shadwell slaves to slaves in other places, we would need to pick a moment, 1757 for instance, when we have an accounting of people and things. But life changed for each person there, almost immediately before and after that day in 1757 when the inventory list was made. Young adults became parents, children grew, people died or moved and their relationships with each other changed. That story would be impossible on the scale of Morgan's work, but it would also be impossible without it. Without the studies that describe the everyday work routines, the ratios of men and women, the life expectancy of people, a study that focuses as closely as this one might risk being merely provincial or biographical. But this study capitalizes on the broader findings and they bring meaning to both the mundane and the extraordinary details of lives as told through things that people used, discarded, lost, or left behind.
Figure I.1. "A map of the most inhabited part of Virginia containing the whole province of Maryland with part of Pensilvania, New Jersey and North Carolina. Drawn by Joshua Fry & Peter Jefferson in 1751." Courtesy, Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division. [http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gmd/g3880.ct000370] (November 7, 2004).
Children of

Peter Jefferson (1707/8 – 1757) and Jane Randolph Jefferson (1720 – 1776)

Jane (1740-1765) (unmarried)

Mary (1741-1804) m. 1760, Jan. 24
    John Bolling (1737-1800)

Children: Martha, John, Edward, Archibald, Mary, Robert, Jane, Thomas, Ann

Thomas (1743-1826) m. 1772, Jan. 1
    Martha Wayles Skelton (1748-1782)

Children: Martha (1772-1836) m. Thomas Mann Randolph
    Jane (1774-1775)
    Son (1777)
    Mary (1778-1804) m. John Wayles Eppes
    Daughter (1780-1781)
    Lucy Elizabeth (1782-1784)

Elizabeth (1744-1774) (unmarried)

Martha (1746-1811) m. 1765, July 20
    Dabney Carr (1743-1773)

Children: Jane Barbara, Lucy, Mary (Polly), Peter, Samuel, Dabney

Peter Field (1748, died in infancy)

Son (1750, died at birth)

Lucy (1752-1784) m. 1769, Sept 12
    Charles Lilburne Lewis

Children: Randolph, Jane, Isham, Charles, Anna Marks, Elizabeth, Martha Ann Cary, Lucy, Mary, Lilburne

Anna Scott (1755-1828) m. 1787, Oct.
    Hastings Marks

Randolph (1755-1815) m. 1780, July 30
    Anne Jefferson Lewis
    Children: Isham, Thomas, Field, Robert, James, Anna Scott

2, m. 1809 Mitchie B. Pryor
    Children: John

Figure I.2. Children of Peter Jefferson and Jane Randolph Jefferson
CHAPTER 1

THE MATERIAL WORLD OF THE JEFFERSONS AT SHADWELL

Scholars who study Thomas Jefferson have had a difficult time defining his origins in the context of late-colonial Virginia culture. On no topic is Jefferson scholarship more mired in previous generations of interpretation than that of Shadwell, his birthplace, in what is now Albemarle County. The popular mythology of Thomas Jefferson contends that Peter Jefferson was a backwoodsman, a native of the frontier, and that Jane Randolph Jefferson brought her gentry standards to the household, though her influence was not strong. The Jeffersons were a successful planter family, but, the story goes, the young Thomas left his Shadwell and Tuckahoe homes, his boyhood schoolmasters, and went to the metropolis where he acquired his manners and tastes for finer things, first in Williamsburg, then Philadelphia, Paris, and London.

In contrast to the popular perception, most scholars acknowledge that Peter Jefferson, Gent., had nearly the status his wife had; he was, after all, a county surveyor, a county justice, a burgess, and an acquaintance of many important people in midcentury Virginia. Yet historians still embrace a story that Thomas Jefferson necessarily moved between dramatically different worlds when he left Shadwell for the best tables in Williamsburg and to the refined home that he ultimately created at Monticello. The material world of Shadwell shows, however, that young Thomas and his siblings did not have to seek refinement elsewhere: they grew up with it and carried it with them.
Shadwell was full of the proper tools for entertaining and for teaching children manners: the objects there and the behaviors they imply reveal who the Jeffersons were and what they expected from their world. Their expectations, moreover, were not dictated by their location, for Albemarle County indeed was still a frontier in many ways. Instead, the Jeffersons acquired both the consumer goods and the manners that allowed participation in the colonial gentry world wherever they could find—or make—it. The material world of the Jeffersons at Shadwell illustrates the pervasive reach of the gentry and how their world of goods extended their political and social dominance across Virginia.

The recent work of archaeologists and architectural and social historians has enabled a better understanding of just how most of the gentry, and the larger body of folk who were not gentry, lived. Gentry houses were alike, not because of appearance but because of function: how people arranged activities within their living spaces and what those activities were. In the mid-eighteenth century, many prosperous people lived in relatively small houses made of wood with wooden chimneys, even as they added specialized spaces and new furnishings for entertaining and created private rooms for family in their homes. This readjusting of historians' expectations proved that many of our extant models for colonial architecture were in fact outliers. The most visible grand

---

6 When Peter Jefferson died, Albemarle Co. was a frontier of settlement and a politically and socially immature region; its final boundaries were determined in 1777 and its political center relocated in 1761. Except for its wealthiest residents, most people in Albemarle had only limited access to markets. For various definitions of frontier, see Gregory H. Nobles, “Breaking into the Backcountry: New Approaches to the Early American Frontier, 1750-1800,” WMQ, 3d Ser., 46, no. 4 (October 1989): 641-670; for a discussion of the market accessibility model of the frontier see John Solomon Otto, The Southern Frontiers, 1607-1860: The Agricultural Evolution of the Colonial and Antebellum South, (Westport, Conn., 1989), esp. 1-8, 24-26.
houses such as Rosewell and Westover were extraordinary creations of a very few wealthy families. Scholars have put houses and their families in context by looking at buildings and furnishings as records not simply of design details but as artifacts that can show how people thought of themselves and how they related to other members of their households and communities. Ironically, recent research at Shadwell, backed by a generation of social history and archaeology of the common man, began looking for the yeoman model—

7 In eighteenth-century Virginia Gazette advertisements eighty-four percent of houses that listed dimensions had fewer than 1000 square feet of living space, more than half had less than 600 square feet. Ninety percent were built of wood or were wood with masonry features such as a chimney or foundation. Camille Wells, "The Planter's Prospect: Houses, Outbuildings, and Rural Landscapes in Eighteenth-Century Virginia," Winterthur Portfolio 28, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 1-31, esp. table 6, figure 9. But the 1798 Federal Direct Tax for three counties in Maryland (few tax lists exist for Virginia) show that the advertisements were skewed toward the wealthy. Tax records reveal that between 80 percent and 90 percent of property owners lived in houses that were 800 square feet or smaller at the end of the eighteenth century. Mean house size in square feet in Anne Arundel Co. was 591 (n=567), Prince George's was 618 (n=126), and Baltimore Co. 509 (n=331), and the percentage of houses with fewer than 800 square feet was 80.8 percent, 81 percent, and 89.4 percent, respectively. Liz Gallow, "Preliminary Analysis of the 1798 Tax Record in Maryland," Department of Architectural Research, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Spring 2004.

-a frontier cabin, perhaps—and found, instead, Peter Jefferson's mansion.

The Jeffersons occupied the high end of the social scale in a culture that produced leaders through its members' regular participation in the militia, the church vestry, and county and colonial government. Of course, the heights to which Thomas Jefferson rose were exceptional, yet he neither struggled against excessive economic or material hardship nor occupied an exclusive existence. Rather, he grew up in a culture of plantation owners whose responsibilities included public service and the professional tasks of hiring and coordinating workers such as overseers, slaves, road crews, and militia, as well as the social tasks of educating family members to these roles to perpetuate the civic culture.

Archaeological and documentary research at Shadwell reveals a picture of a well-appointed gentry house at the center of a highly structured plantation landscape in a period when the Piedmont was still undergoing frontier settlement (Figure 1.1). In fact, the Jeffersons clearly accommodated, in their house, landscape, material goods, and behaviors, the most up-to-date social expectations of Virginia's elite tidewater culture. The material circumstances of Shadwell raise questions about the character of this frontier and how people could maintain a style of living that reflected their high social status. Shadwell seems to extend the boundaries of tidewater culture to include a world that was at least five days' journey from the colonial capital of Williamsburg. In this remote region where there were no store displays with the latest goods, those concerned with status had to actively pursue their acquisition of objects and behaviors; they could not come by them

L. Herman (Columbia, Mo., 1989), 149-59.
casually. The geography of this settlement is important. Tidewater refers to both the location and the dominant culture of the Virginia Chesapeake region. This culture was characterized by a gentry class who lived on large tobacco plantations worked by slaves. It extended along Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, including the James River, inland to the fall line. Piedmont refers to the terrain between the fall line and Blue Ridge Mountains that contain the great Shenandoah Valley of Virginia. Historians consider both the Piedmont and the Valley as frontiers of English settlement late in the first half of the eighteenth century. The central Virginia Piedmont and the Valley settlements differed in their dominant agricultural practices and their ethnic make-up. The Piedmont continued the tobacco culture of the eastern regions and the domain of second sons or lesser gentry of the great tidewater families. The Valley accommodated a few of these same gentry offspring, but also became home to a variety of German, Scots, Irish, and Welsh settlers, many of whom entered Virginia through the northern end of the Valley and never set foot in tidewater. This period of Virginia settlement marked the Piedmont and the Valley as distinctly different cultural regions. Historians have noted that Piedmont society was more like that in the tidewater region than not, but the Piedmont is often omitted from studies of Chesapeake society and culture. In terms of institutional structures, patterns of

---

8 Peter Jefferson charged the county "To 5 day Going 5 days Returning," for traveling from Shadwell to the House of Burgesses, a trip that may have been by carriage and certainly with attendants. PJAB, 37. Robert Rose recorded a three-day journey between Albemarle Courthouse and Tuckahoe, still only half way to Williamsburg. Robert Rose, *The Diary of Robert Rose: A View of Virginia by a Scottish Colonial Parson 1746-1751*, ed. Ralph Emmett Fall, (Verona, Va., 1977), 60.
slaveholding and agriculture, and slave life, the Piedmont ultimately extended the character of tidewater culture in the second half of the eighteenth century rather than replicating an earlier stage of tidewater development.\(^9\) Evidence from Shadwell suggests that at least some who settled the Piedmont early thought of themselves as very much a part of the older Virginia culture: distance did not preclude the persistence of culture for very wealthy Virginians.

Contemporaries thought of the Piedmont as remote. Jefferson's friend James

\(^9\) For the defining elements of gentry culture see Rhys Isaac, *The Transformation of Virginia, 1740-1790* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1982); and Allan Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1986). See also chaps. 2 and 3.

There are few studies of the Piedmont, and fewer still that include or compare both the tidewater and the Piedmont. Those in the forefront have focused on the movement of slaves and slavery from tidewater west. On the Piedmont see Allan Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves*; Philip D. Morgan, "Slave Life in Piedmont Virginia, 1720-1800," in *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, ed. Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1988), 433-484; Philip D. Morgan and Michael L. Nicholls, "Slaves in Piedmont Virginia, 1720-1790," *WMQ* 46, no. 2 (April 1989): 211-51; Michael L. Nicholls, "Piedmont Plantations and Farms: Transplanting Tidewater Traditions?," *Magazine of Albemarle Co. History* 49 (1991): 1-17. See also S. Edward Ayres, "Albemarle Co., Virginia 1744-1770: An Economic, Political, and Social Analysis" (master's thesis, University of Virginia, 1968). There are no intact Piedmont buildings as early as Shadwell and little archaeology that falls in the same period; however, recent archaeological work at Montpelier in Orange Co., Virginia, has the potential to furnish some material for comparison of early settlers who were well-off.

Maury lived about eight miles from Shadwell. Maury’s uncle Peter Fontaine lived at Westover in Charles City County and described Maury’s parish as “amongst the mountains.” Maury referred to his situation as “we mountaineers.” Fontaine’s son Peter lived in southside Piedmont, which, as Fontaine wrote to his brother in England, was “threescore miles, in the woods back from the river. I can send a letter to you in as short a time as to him. No post travels that way, and I have not heard from him at all this two months.” Distance did not keep Fontaine’s wife from visiting her grandchildren there. Her complaining husband was the same Peter Fontaine who had traveled with William Byrd to survey Virginia’s southern boundary in 1728 and appears (often in ill humor) in Byrd’s account of that adventure. Reverend Devereux Jarratt called 1750s Albemarle “nearly a frontier county.” Thomas Jefferson did not use the word frontier but described what historians now call a frontier of settlement. In Jefferson’s granddaughter’s retelling, Shadwell was in the midst of a “thinly peopled and densely wooded” country. Jefferson’s nineteenth-century biographers used “wilderness” and “primeval forest” to describe early Albemarle, features that Ellen Coolidge credited with causing her grandfather to become “well versed in all the ways of the woods and fields...a fearless rider, a bold hunter and skillful in the use of his gun.” But the post-Turnerian Jefferson historians took these lessons in wilderness skills and transformed them into lessons of frontier culture. They linked Jefferson to the idea that the frontier nurtured the growth of democratic ideals because a still-forming community ensured that its members learned life lessons from the necessary interaction of people of different social ranks there. In the twentieth century,
Jefferson became known as a "child of the frontier."\textsuperscript{10}

In his autobiography, Thomas Jefferson stated that his father was "the third or fourth settler about the year 1737" in what became Albemarle County (Figure 1.2). Peter Jefferson, partner to Joshua Fry in making the famed 1751 \textit{Map of the Inhabited part of Virginia}, perhaps first saw this land on the Rivanna River during one of his surveying ventures. Jefferson acquired land in this region in 1734 and obtained the homesite of two hundred acres from his friend William Randolph for the price of "Henry Weatherburn's biggest bowl of Arrack punch" in 1736 at a tavern in Williamsburg. Peter may have moved to Shadwell as early as 1737, from Fine Creek, also in Goochland County. Jane joined him after their marriage in 1739. They named their home Shadwell after the London parish where Jane was born, and daughter Jane, the first of their ten children, was born at the Virginia Shadwell in June 1740. Before his death in 1757, Peter Jefferson amassed more than fifteen-hundred acres along the Rivanna River adjacent to this tract (including the mountain that his son later named Monticello) and other land in the

Piedmont and beyond to total more than seventy-two-hundred acres.\footnote{1}  

Peter’s own peers noted the honorific “Gent.” behind his name in court documents as early as 1736—before he married a Randolph—and Peter’s parents and grandparents held office and had important associations.\footnote{12} Though Thomas Jefferson called his father’s


\footnote{12} Peter Jefferson’s grandfather Thomas Jefferson (TJ I, d. 1698) left a substantial estate that listed a number of amenities that signal elevated status, including table and bed linens, pewter, plantation tools and livestock, and a large quantity of furniture including 5 “rusha” leather chairs, 10 other chairs, 3 feather and 1 other beds, 3 tables, 2 couches, 30 pewter plates (24 new and 6 old), and 12 “new alchymy” spoons plus 11 old ones. His estate totaled £97.16.6-1/2, without slaves. He owned slaves and at least one indentured servant but the list is incomplete. Among his endeavors other than planting he owned speculative land in Yorktown, which he evidently did not build on. He was prominent enough for a public funeral that included mourning rings, serving a mutton, and he was buried in a coffin. TJ I’s wife was Mary Branch whose father Christopher was a justice in Charles City Co.; TJ I was an executor of Branch’s estate. TJ I certainly had money and important associates. Charles E. Hatch Jr., Yorktown’s Main Street (Denver, 1974), p 35. For TJ I’s inventory (no will exists), see Henrico Co. Wills & Deeds 1697-1704, p. 114, printed in VMHB I (1893-94), 208-212, VMHB 23 (1915), 173.

Capt. Thomas Jefferson (TJ II, 1677-1731), son of TJ I, left his son Peter a number of items that signaled wealth or prescribed social behaviors, including slaves, clothes, six silver spoons, two feather beds, a table cloth and six napkins, six leather chairs (possibly the ones TJ II received from his father in 1698) and a couch and two tables. The couch “in the hall” and “two tables there” offer a clue that PJ’s boyhood home had more than one room with seating furniture. This hall was likely where William Byrd came to drink persico and dine on roast beef with the Captain as part of a day of mustering. TJ II visited with Byrd and Col. Benjamin Harrison and others at times that did not revolve around public duty, and he witnessed legal documents with future in-law Isham Randolph: his associates in matters both legal and social were other gentry. TJ II had the wherewithall to act as undertaker to build a chapel in Varina Parish (Henrico) in 1723 and invest in a mill. He was sheriff and justice of the peace for Henrico, owned a racehorse, and land investments. He and Captain Henry Randolph chose each other as guardians for
education "quite neglected," Peter Jefferson shows attributes of many other gentry whose education came from a tutor instead of a school. Peter was an accomplished surveyor and a respected public official, a keeper of accounts who had fine handwriting and a decent library, the husband of the literate Jane Randolph, and a father concerned with the education of both daughters and sons. The sophisticated house and landscape at Shadwell matched the company Peter Jefferson kept in his professional work and social life.

Peter's wealth ensured his wife Jane Randolph Jefferson the material provisions needed to raise their sons and daughters to the same standards of propriety that the parents knew. Born in London, Jane grew up in the household of the well-established Virginia and London merchant and agent for the colony Isham Randolph and his English wife, Jane Rogers. Their Virginia home, Dungeness, included extensive gardens enclosed with brick walls, specialized plantation buildings including a coach house, mill house, well

---

their minor children. Peter's mother Mary Field was daughter of Peter Field, a burgess for Henrico, and Judith Soane, widow of Henry Randolph and daughter of Henry Soane, who was speaker of the house of burgess. Like PJ, with one exception, his siblings fared well in marriages to people of property and titles. PJ's brother Thomas (1700-1723) died aboard Isham Randolph's ship The Williamsburg on a voyage to Virginia. In his will Isham Randolph appointed his nephew Beverley Randolph and PJ guardians to his children. Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling, eds. William Byrd of Virginia: The London Diary (1717-1721) and Other Writings (New York, 1958), 411-412; Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling, eds. The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712 (Richmond, 1941), 414, 486; Henrico Co. Court Records 1677-99, p 181, in VMHB, II (1894-95), 296-298; For TJ II's will (no inventory exists) Henrico Wills and Deeds 1725-1737 p. 293; also Henrico Co. Wills and Deeds 1725-1737, 31. Bishop William Meade, Old Churches Ministers and Families of Virginia (1857, reprint Baltimore, 1995), 440. Prince George Co. Records, printed in VMHB 4 (1897), 277. For Isham Randolph's will, Goochland Co. Deed Book 4, 110-111.

13 Autobiography, 3.
house, and hen house, horses and a chariot for riding, and family portraits. A
contemporary offered a glimpse of the social and material standards expected by these
Randolphs. An impending visit to their home, Dungeness, by John Bartram in 1738
prompted Bartram's sponsor Peter Collinson to advise his colleague:

I know no person will make thee more Welcome than Isham
Randolph. He lives 30 or 40 miles above the falls of James River in
Goochland above the other settlements. Now I take his house to be a very
suitable place to make a settlement att for to take several Days’ Excursions
all Round, and to return to his House at Night. One thing I must Desire of
thee and do Insist that thee oblige Mee therein that thou make up that
Druggett Clothes, to go to Virginia In and not appear to Disgrace thyself
or Mee for tho I would not Esteem thee the less to come to Mee in what
Dress thou Will, yet these Virginians are a very gentle, Well Dress’d
people, & look phaps More at a Man’s Outside than his Inside, for these
and other Reasons pray go very Clean, neat & handsomely Dressed to
Virginia.

Bartram reported being treated with “all ye expression of kindness & Civility.”

Accounts kept for Shadwell after Peter Jefferson's death indicate Jane Jefferson’s attention

---

14Edmund Berkeley and Dorothy Smith Berkeley, eds., The Correspondence of
John Bartram 1734-1777 (Gainesville, Fla., 1992), 84, 102. Goochland Deed Book 2,
1734-1736, 259; for a portrait of Isham Randolph see, VMHB 34, no. 2 (April 1926):
opposite 183. TJ’s granddaughters reported that Jane was agreeable, intelligent, lively,
cheerful, humorous, fond of writing letters, and wrote readily and well. Randall, Jefferson
I: 16-17. See also Kimball, Road to Glory, 16; Malone, Jefferson I: 14-17; Harvie I;
Harvie II. We will revisit the historiography of Jane in chap. 2.
to and investment in teaching her children as well as surrounding them with fine consumer goods.

Though the Jefferson family moved east to Tuckahoe from about 1746 to 1753, Shadwell remained an active plantation, worked by Jefferson's slaves and hired managers, and visited by family members.\(^{15}\) In the early 1750s, when the family was to return, Peter Jefferson repaired and improved the dwelling house and outbuildings at Shadwell. The Jeffersons' pending move from Tuckahoe back to Shadwell was an opportune time to think about furnishing this plantation as a cohesive statement of the growing family's physical needs and social status. Agricultural investments at Shadwell included cleared land, dwellings, stores, and barns, vegetable and flower gardens, tobacco and grain cultivation, a grist mill, brewing, and livestock, including horses, cattle, pigs, and sheep, for transportation, draft, food, hide, and fiber. Peter Jefferson died at age 49 in 1757 in good gentry standing. He held major public office, serving as county justice, lieutenant colonel of the militia, and county lieutenant. He represented Albemarle County as a burgess and served on the vestry at St. James, Northam. He left his wife, six daughters, and investment in teaching her children as well as surrounding them with fine consumer goods.

\(^{15}\)The Jeffersons moved to fulfill the wishes of Peter's friend—and Jane's first cousin—William Randolph, who in a codicil to his will requested that his friend Peter Jefferson and family come live in his house Tuckahoe, in eastern Goochland Co., and raise his son Thomas Mann Randolph to majority. Jane gave birth to four children at Tuckahoe: Martha in 1746, Peter Field in 1748 who died a month later, a son in 1750 who died at birth, and Lucy in October 1752. In part because it is still standing, historians have relied on Tuckahoe for statements about architectural influence on the young TJ. Goochland Co. Deed Book 5, 1745-1749, 73-76; Jefferson Family, Bible. Activity at Shadwell during these years included business and social occasions, see Rose, *Diary*, 33; AICOB, 1744-1748, 139, 231-2, 254, 332, 365. Payment for work on the house ranged over three years from 1750 to 1753, PJAB, 26, 36. To date archaeology has located only a few of the buildings and landscape features that supported this sizable plantation. For agricultural investments, see AICWB 2: 41-48; GB, 1-14.
and two sons a fashionable house, sixty slaves, two improved plantations, speculative land holdings, rental properties, and, unlike many of his peers, no debt. He bequeathed the plantations and most of the slaves to his sons. His daughters received money for their educations, dowries, and personal servants. Jane retained life rights to Shadwell, her slaves, and other property, which she disposed of in her own will in 1776.

This ideal gentry world at Shadwell ended February 1, 1770, when the house burned to the ground. The houses and plantation landscape described here are reconstructed from the archaeological recovery of building remains and material goods, the wills, account books, and documents left by the Jefferson family, and the inferences allowed by these methods of research. The physical landscape of Shadwell reveals the

---

16 PJ was the wealthiest decedent in colonial Albemarle of estates that were valued. Ten decedents (6 percent, n=143) had estates valued at more than £1000, PJ's was more than twice that at £2399 Os. 6-1/2d. PJ was the second largest slaveholder in the county and one of three slave holders who owned more than fifty slaves. Fifty-one percent of decedents (n=162 [this figure includes estates that were not valued and thus not included in the number above]) owned slaves and fifty-five percent of slaveholders (n=83) owned one to five individuals. He also served as sheriff, justice, and surveyor in Goochland before the forming of Albemarle Co. AICWB 1; AICWB 2: esp. 41-48 for PJ's specifics. More on PJ in chap. 3.

Jane was the second wealthiest female in colonial Albemarle Co., with an estate of £73 1s. 1d., making her the 74th (n=143) ranked individual. Her daughter Jane Jr., who died in 1768, was the wealthiest woman, with an estate of £114.15.3 (55th percentile), including three slaves. If the eleven slaves Jane Sr. deeded to TJ before her death are included in her estate value, she ranked 19th in the county, with an estate value of £623 1s., over 87 percent of other decedents. Her 11 slaves put her with the top 27 percent of slaveholders (n=83). AICWB 1; AICWB 2: esp. 32-34, 367; her deed to TJ is reprinted in FB, 8-9.

17 TJ wrote to John Page following the fire and lamented the loss "of every pa[per I] had in the world, and almost every book." He estimated the value of the books at £200 sterling, and wished all he had lost were the money, Papers, I: 35 (quotation, 34).

The probate inventories offer "snapshots" that show the plantation at particular moments, especially the comprehensive 1757 list of PJ's estate. Artifacts and account
social landscape of the plantation explicitly (Figures 1.3 and 1.4). In the early 1990s archaeologists for the Thomas Jefferson Foundation excavated house sites and work areas for both white and black residents and exposed part of the layout of the plantation. Specialized spaces indicate a clear hierarchy of slave and owner, domestic and industrial, and public and private across the center of the plantation and within the dwelling houses of Shadwell’s white and black residents, reflecting the familiar patterns of plantation architecture adopted by Virginia’s slaveholding elite. Peter Jefferson’s accomplishments as a surveyor emerge in the landscape plan, but the enslaved occupants used the same landscape in ways that seem counter to the planter’s grander scheme. The plantation landscape offers the first clue to the formality of the Jeffersons’ world at Shadwell.

The Jeffersons’ dwelling house at Shadwell occupied the literal and figurative center of this plantation world. It sat on a ridge, facing south to the Rivanna River and north to the mountains, at the middle of a ten-acre square. This ten-acre area was the domestic seat of the plantation. Within this curtilage, or enclosed area, were the outbuildings, quarters, shops, barns, stables, gardens, and orchards. Beyond this central area lay the tobacco fields and pastures, mills along the river, and unimproved woodlands. The "Three-Notch'd Road" that connected the Valley of Virginia to tidewater followed the Rivanna River past Shadwell. Archaeological research located the main house, a book entries provide both confirmation of and counterpoint to the inventories. Jane lived at Shadwell for six years following the fire until her death. Her house stood over the western portion of what had been her house with PJ. It was decidedly smaller, but fashionably furnished. After she died her two minor children lived with siblings. See also chap. 2, and Kern, "Report on Shadwell."
kitchen building that also served as slave housing, and one group of slave quarters, forming a line east-west along the ridge. Fences and gates defined the approaches to the main house, and separated the house and kitchen from the quarters. A fence line running north-south toward the east end of the ten-acre square provided a visual and physical barrier between the Jefferson family and quarters for some of the Shadwell slaves. Archaeological evidence indicates that the major components of the landscape were planned and put in place before work on and enlargement of the main dwelling house around 1750.\(^\text{18}\)

The ten-acre center of this plantation reflects the mind of its maker, Peter Jefferson. Ten acres equals 660 feet, or 40 poles, on a side. The gates and fences within the square divide the ten acres mathematically and geometrically. A pedestrian-scale gate north of the house places a fence line one-third of the way from the house to the curtilage edge. The split-rail fence between the house and quarter area had larger gates on its north and south ends to allow carriage or wagon access to the main dwelling house. These

\(^{18}\)Shadwell was a landmark near milepost twelve as measured from the mountains back to the east. Peter Jefferson became surveyor of this road in 1734 when it was still called the Mountain Road. Nathaniel Mason Pawlett and Howard H. Newlon Jr., \textit{The Route of the Three Notch'd Road: A Preliminary Report}, rev. ed. (Charlottesville, Va., 1980), 9.

The brief list of buildings here includes only the mid-eighteenth-century domestic remains. Later features include a stone cellar that artifact distributions suggest was built for Jane following the house fire and also served overseers or tenant farmers at Shadwell into the early nineteenth century. The fences dividing the landscape persisted until the turn of the nineteenth century, coinciding with TJ’s removal of his slaves from Shadwell to lease the land to tenant farmers. Other parts of the plantation - the kitchen and slave quarter buildings - disappeared at the same time, ca. 1800. The family burial ground was used by nineteenth- and twentieth-century Shadwell occupants who left other archaeological remains as well, see Kern, “Report on Shadwell.”
gates, 220 feet apart, divided by one-third the total ten-acre square. The axes of the fences and the line of buildings describe a highly ordered schema laid on the land by Peter’s surveying tools (Figure 1.5). The Jeffs organized vegetable and flower gardens in numbered beds that they then ordered in rows designated by letters. A sundial in a prominent position in this landscape suggests that the ordering of time was as important as the ordering of space in this world: both passions would be inherited by the surveyor’s oldest son.19

The Shadwell landscape, like the house and other material goods, had explicit social functions. It arranged the people who lived and worked there according to the familiar divisions of plantation society; that is, it separated master from servant, planter from laborer, and white from black, and controlled their interactions through hierarchically arranged spaces and routes of access. Slaves left the main quarter site via a small gate in a split-rail, or Virginia, fence, passed by the kitchen building and up a slight rise to arrive at the south porch of the main house, where they might receive work assignments or enter the house to finish domestic tasks. The slaves who lived and worked in the plantation kitchen building occupied a physical and social space in between the Jeffs in their house and the site farther east that served as a center of African American life. Slaves who worked and slept in the Jeffs’ house formed a social niche that regularly separated them from both the black and the white members of their larger community.

19A pole, the surveyor’s unit of measurement, equals 16-1/2 feet. Garden organization is in GB, 1-14, and subsequent entries show TJ’s use of beds and rows as the defining element of the vegetable gardens at Monticello. Dial post is in PJAB, 36. Will Rieley, Landscape Architect and Historian at the University of Virginia, helped decipher the landscape plan.
The landscape also mediated between those on the plantation and those entering the bounds from outside. From the passing road, visitors climbed the hill, entered through a gate, and crossed a yard, before reaching the door that may or may not have allowed them into the passage of the house. From the passage a slave or family member judged whether or not the visitor would then enter into one of the Jeffersons' better rooms. The landscape clearly communicated the customary order of plantation society to those within this particular community and to those outside it.

Excavation of quarters for some of the Shadwell slaves on the east end of the ten-acre plantation center revealed the remnants of at least two buildings that continued the axial arrangement of the plantation laid out by Jefferson. There may have been four houses on this site, for all but a few of the thirty-one people who lived on the home quarter, some of whom worked as domestic slaves or personal servants. The quarter site, separated by a fence away from the main plantation house, describes a community with its own local center. The yard between the buildings here accommodated a range of activities, including food preparation, cooking, and eating, pipe smoking, doing crafts, playing games, and performing spiritual or medicinal rituals. A cooking or smoking pit (Figure 1.6) in the yard not only shows that slaves prepared food here but also suggests that the slaves used their prescribed space according to their own particular proclivities. The cooking pit reflects people's preference in hot Virginia summers to move the smells and hazards of kitchen activities out of dwellings, just as wealthier Virginians established

outbuildings to remove the cooking and baking from their houses. The Shadwell slaves used a variety of European ceramics and iron cooking implements, as most slaves living on Anglo-Virginian plantations did. Most of the ware types that occur in association with the Jefferson dwelling house also appear in the quarter area, with heavier concentrations of utilitarian wares on the quarter site. Slaves cooked in iron pots, prepared foods in glazed earthenware pans, and stored food in stoneware and glass jars and bottles. Fishhooks suggest just one of the ways the Shadwell slaves augmented their diet by using local and unrationed resources. Spades in the quarter tool inventories bespeak gardening activities, whether for the slaves own use or for the larger plantation garden. The fence that separated this main quarter area from the larger plantation yard contained any small livestock or poultry kept in the quarter area, and protected gardens there from other roving animals. A trash pit just north of the quarter buildings and straddling the fence line suggests that people on both sides of this boundary recognized it—whether or not they respected it.21

Within this quarter area slaves not only smoked tobacco in English pipes but also made pipes of their own from steatite, a local stone that was easily cut, drilled, and polished. They sewed cloth, leather, and perhaps wove cloth, and had scissors to cut cloth and heavier fabrics or leather. Some of these scissors and needles may have belonged to the mulatto slave Sandy who ran away in 1769, taking his shoemaking tools with him. A

---

21 The 1757 slave list indicates that thirty-one slaves lived on the main quarter site and kitchen area at the plantation center near the Jeffersons' house. Twenty-two slaves lived in outlying quarters at Shadwell and seven people lived on PJ's Fluvanna River lands. AICWB 2: 41-48. Slaves and slave life at Shadwell are explored more fully in chapters 4 and 5.
large cache of buttons of various sizes and materials indicates that slaves did tailoring here or recycled clothes and their parts into new garments, out of necessity or as a means of personal expression. These artifacts do not reveal, however, whether these activities were labor or leisure-time pursuits. Leisure pursuits may be represented by small pieces of worked and polished shell and ceramic that often served as markers for games. A broad category of artifacts with medicinal applications shows that slaves used European drug jars of delft and earthenware, but also made their own colonoware pots that may have served combined spiritual and medicinal practices.\(^{22}\)

Between the main dwelling house for the Jefferson family and the main quarter site stood at least two buildings that served as the plantation kitchen and living quarters for the slave cook and her family. Large quantities of utilitarian food preparation and storage vessels indicate large-scale food processing here, and fireplace-related equipment and iron cookwares support this pattern of use. This area also contained numerous tablewares and eating utensils, probably evidence of the home activities of the cook and her family as well as the everyday circulation of dishes from kitchen to table to scullery. Like the main

\(^{22}\) For runaway ad, see *Virginia Gazette* (Purdie and Dixon), Sept. 14, 1769.
quarter site, artifacts here included colonoware, a few Indian objects, and many buttons mixed amongst the general kitchen and domestic refuse. A bed in the main kitchen room stood between “4 potts & 3 pr pot Hooks” and “2 old Tables.” Two old chairs offered some comfort for the cook during both work and leisure hours, although the surrounding dishes, andirons, tubs, pails, copper kettles, and pot racks were constant reminders of work. Two beds accommodated people in a separate storeroom or wood shed where they slept amid meal bags, a cask, two barrels, tight casks, old lumber, and a cleaver. Field slaves lived in outlying quarters, also among the tools of their daily labors: hoes for grubbing, weeding, and hilling; spades and plows for other crop production; saws, axes, wedges, and yokes for clearing; casks and steelyards for processing and packing; a gun for hunting or pest control; and grindstones for maintaining tools. Jefferson furnished each quarter with a pot and pothooks as part of its most basic equipment, but what else the slaves used for their comforts they supplied themselves.\(^{23}\)

The landscape that separated white and black people and their activities also contained the spaces in which they interacted. Thomas Jefferson's earliest memory reveals

\(^{23}\)It makes economic sense that the slave cook was female, despite TJ’s choice at Monticello to train a male slave as a chef when males were more valuable as laborers. Many of the tablewares and utensils appeared in the inventory with the contents of the Jefferson dwelling house, suggesting that there, and not the kitchen, was their appropriate place when not in use. For kitchen, see AICWB 2: 43. For tools, see AICWB 2: 43, 44, 46, 47. These lists of tools reflect the slave quarters on the home plantation and outlying fields. Excavations at Shadwell reflect only the plantation center. Excavations led by Fraser Neiman on the south (Monticello) side of the Rivanna River in the later 1990s uncovered evidence of one of the field quarters. The resulting artifact assemblage revealed the use of utilitarian and tablewares on the site, tobacco smoking, and production of lead shot. Derek Wheeler, Leslie McFaden, and Fraser D. Neiman, “The Early Farm Quarter at Monticello” (paper presented at the Society for Historical Archaeology Annual Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, January 1999).
physical intimacy with family slaves when one carried him on horseback in their move to
Tuckahoe. For the planter child and the family slaves common experiences were
inescapable. The shared material culture of the plantation community extended beyond
pots and bowls to language and music, events surrounding birth and death, and even
patterns of work and leisure that may at first glance separate the activities of planters and
slaves. Family stories remembered by Thomas Jefferson’s granddaughters recounted that
a slave summoned their grandfather on the night the Shadwell house burned: they had not
rescued Thomas’s books, but a slave saved his fiddle. The planter may later claim to not
remember the Africans’ songs, yet the fiddle stands conspicuously as a meaningful and
perhaps valuable object across the boundaries within this community. Isaac Jefferson, a
slave of Thomas Jefferson’s at Monticello, recalled Thomas’s younger brother Randolph
Jefferson as “a mighty simple man [who] used to come out among black people, play the
fiddle and dance half the night.” This planter did not deny the community nor the pleasure
he knew in his extended household. Isaac Jefferson’s authority on the familiar names of
Thomas Jefferson’s sisters, referring to Mary as “Polly,” Martha as “Patsy,” and Anna
Scott as “Nancy,” reveals further the intimacies between these residents of the same
household.24

24 Rhys Isaac explored the stories, songs, and activities that formed common
experiences at plantations such as Shadwell. He proposes that TJ was driven to formally
“deny the African part of his upbringing” in his later attitudes towards African Americans
because of this early intimacy. Isaac, “The First Monticello” in Jeffersonian Legacies, ed.
Peter S. Onuf (Charlottesville, Va., 1993), 77-108, esp. 79-81, (citation, 100-1). See also
Mechal Sobel, The World They Made Together: Black and White Values in Eighteenth-
story about the fiddle is recounted in Randall, Jefferson, I: 59. Isaac Jefferson, “Memoirs
of a Monticello Slave,” in Jefferson at Monticello, ed. James A. Bear Jr., (Charlottesville,
The strong spatial order that allowed separation of the different social functions and cultural groups on the landscape also informs the physical evidence for the main dwelling house. The archaeological record for the Jeffersons' house at Shadwell is somewhat diffuse. The Shadwell ridge was plowed throughout the nineteenth century, and earlier excavations wiped out any physical remains of the western end of the house and most of the stratigraphic artifact record for the house proper. Only a few intact archaeological deposits can be associated with the Jefferson occupation of the main house, though period artifacts exist across the site in the plowed earth and in other valid contexts. Yet the scant archaeological record, augmented by the copious furnishings listed in Peter Jefferson's account book, will, and probate inventory, offer a fairly complete picture of the house and how it functioned during the 1750s. The Shadwell house of the previous decade was smaller, yet the landscape plan indicates that it occupied the formal center of the plantation and the furnishings Peter inherited from his father suggest that social activities as represented by amenities such as table linens, seating furniture including chairs and couches, and silver utensils had long been a priority for the Jeffersons.25

Va., 1967), 3-24, (citation 22). Even TJ's daughters and granddaughters who grew up in the highly regulated spaces of Monticello remembered the songs and music of the slaves there, see Lucia Stanton, ""Those Who Labor for My Happiness": Thomas Jefferson and His Slaves," in Onuf, Jeffersonian Legacies, 147-80, esp. 166-7.

25The first house may have been as small as 601 square feet on the ground floor, if it occupied only the space marked by the brick cellar; however, evidence of rebuilding of the west wall of the cellar suggests that the house may have been larger than the cellar footprint. Kern, "Report on Shadwell," 54-65; see note 5 for comparative sizes. See note 10 for PJ's patrimony.
A great English-bond brick cellar outlines the eastern portion of the house (Figure 1.7 and 1.8; also Figure 1.1; Figure 1.4, center). The cellar measures 18-1/2' by 32-1/2' outside and was probably raised well above grade, as the cellar entrance suggests its use for large-scale storage. Scaffolding holes outside the cellar mark the location of the east outside chimney (referred to in survey notes) and locate the fireplaces that heated the parlor and chamber above the cellar, and the upstairs chamber above those rooms. Three postholes designate a porch on the south side of the house, added during the 1750s renovations. The total length of the house cannot be determined from what remains archaeologically, nor is there any remaining evidence of the chimney to the west that demanded a surveyor to denote the other as "east" when referring to the house chimneys. The porch aligns with the gate to the north of the house and defines a center passage axis that extended through the house into the landscape.

Peter Jefferson's estate inventory supports the earliest recorded family history of Shadwell describing a house "a story and a half in height [with] four spacious ground [floor] rooms and hall[way], with garret chambers above." The inventory lists an unheated room first, which served as Peter Jefferson's office and contained his desk and bookcase, books, maps, and mathematical instruments. The inventory then follows the pattern observed by architectural historians in listing a formal entertaining room--known as a dining room or hall--furnished with the best goods; a parlor that served as best bedchamber, entertaining, and secondary food-preparation area; and a lesser chamber that

---

26PJAB, 36; Randall, Jefferson, I: 2; Thomas Jefferson surveys, 1799-1800, HM 9379-5, HM 9379-4, CSMH; and N198 verso, N233, Mhi. The conjectural dimensions of the house are 32-1/2 x 50 feet for 1625 square feet (see Fig. 6).
accommodated beds and odd storage. Like some other houses of the period, such as
George Mason's Gunston Hall in Fairfax County or George Wythe's house in
Williamsburg, the two public rooms—the dining room and office—were paired on one
side of the passage, with the two private chambers opposite them. The upstairs had two
heated bed chambers, both of which held bed furniture and case furniture. The special-
purpose rooms and fine furnishings at Shadwell displayed more than simply Peter and Jane
Jefferson's refined tastes, however; the material goods reveal that the Jeffersons invested
in the spaces and equipment to entertain properly and also to teach their children the social
rituals required to occupy an elevated status in Virginia. The Shadwell house shows that
the Jeffersons participated in gentry culture and expected to continue to do so, even if they
lived on a "frontier."

The formal entertaining room, the dining room, held an array of furnishings that set
the Jeffersons apart from most people who lived in Virginia in the eighteenth century.

27 Randall, Jefferson, I: 2. Randall uses hall in the nineteenth-century fashion; as in,
hall way, what would have been passage in the eighteenth century. Peter Jefferson's
probate inventory does not name the rooms in the house. I refer to them by their most
likely names based on the nature of the furnishings in each room and according to the
patterns observed in eighteenth-century Virginia probate inventories. The early 1750s
renovations added the dining room and its substantial furnishings, which altered the
functional relationship of the spaces in the house. The passage may have been added at
this time, or converted from an existing space. The first house probably had two or three
rooms on the ground floor and the main entrance may have been directly into one of these
rooms instead of into a passage that buffered inner living spaces from the outdoors. The
porch added in the 1750s united the old and new parts of the house and framed the
entrance that now opened to the passage flanked by imposing rooms. The 1750 furniture
order confirms that the social function of the rooms was updated with the architectural
plan. Jane's first cousin Peyton Randolph added the dining room to his Williamsburg
house in the later 1750s. See Carl R. Lounsbury, An Illustrated Glossary of Early
Southern Architecture and Landscape (New York, 1994); Upton, "Domestic Vernacular
Peter Jefferson ordered a substantial quantity of furniture for this room from joiner Francis West in 1750, concurrent with the expansion of the house. The movable goods listed in the inventory describe a range of social activities at Shadwell and archaeological finds augment the spare legal descriptions in the inventory with details of material, form, and color. The Jeffertsons could seat twenty people for dinner (twenty-one if one counts the closestool chair that hid a chamber pot there) at two large and two smaller oval tables. If ten chairs held Peter, Jane, and their children, at least ten guests could join them, though younger children were probably fed out of the dining room. The Jeffertsons set the tables with knives, forks, spoons, and napkins, in an era when many people still ate with only a spoon or their hands. They had silver soup spoons, tablespoons, and teaspoons, and ladled punch with silver. They served two courses on silver-plated or white salt-glazed stoneware plates, and a soup course in silver-plated soup plates. Both the silver-plated and the white salt-glazed plates were new to the consumer market in the 1740s. Chafing dishes show that the food served at Shadwell demanded tools for finer detail than the large kitchen fireplace, spits, and pots and pans offered. A lacquered plate oven by the fire warmed the dishes that waited for the table, and a cruet stand and silver "salts" held spices to adjust seasonings in the food.28

The Jeffertsons served tea, coffee, and punch in their hall using equipment that elevated these luxuries to the status of ritual. They had a tea service of silver, a "China teapot," and a "Black teapot" to put on their three tea tables. Fragments of teapots in

blue-and-white Chinese porcelain and of a "Jackfield"-type ware, a lustrous black-glazed
earthenware, denote two of these pots. There was a white salt-glazed stoneware teapot
and small rectangular tea chest, and at least one item of black basalt, a fashionable
English-made earthenware that frequently took neoclassic form. Eight guests could sip
from matching china cups and saucers. White stone tea ware, and "Glass" (perhaps glazed
china) teacups rounded out the service that could include at least fourteen, and probably a
few more, participants. Teabowls and saucers were blue-and-white Chinese porcelain or
salt-glazed stoneware. Some of the porcelain was augmented with overglaze decoration
in gilt and other colors or Batavian porcelain with its rich brown exterior finish. The
inventory lists two milk pots, in china and silver, and a china sugar dish. The Jeffersons
also had a tea strainer, tong, tea chest, silver-plated basket, and two tea kettles for hot
water to aid in this affair. The inventory lists eight teaspoons and two "old tea spoons," as
well as "6 old silver spoons" of unspecified type. A single silver teaspoon recovered in the
remains of the dwelling house at Shadwell was made around the middle of the eighteenth
century (Figure 1.9). Tea-related items in the parlor suggest that family members also
took tea in this more private room. In addition to tea, Jane Jefferson administered coffee
from a silver coffeepot to a set of coffee cups. The "silver coffee pot teapot & milk pot" at
£17.10 was the costliest entry in the entire inventory, except for slaves. A silver ladle and
two wooden ones completed the service for punch, which may have been served from the
large china bowls, one of which was painted with a polychrome overglaze decoration.
Wine glasses had elegant air-twist stems. Peter's funeral expenses included 2 s. 6 d. for
sugar, used for punch and other beverages for guests that day.\textsuperscript{29} Punch, or at least social
drink, had a role in Jefferson's initial coming and final parting from Shadwell.

At midcentury, the variety of spoons, table knives, forks, porcelain tea wares, and
tables put this room among the more fashionable in all of Virginia. Peter Jefferson
specified oval tables in his order to furniture maker Frances West in 1750: tables without
corners ensured ease of conversation. West also made at least a dozen of the eighteen
black walnut chairs and the two armchairs that encircled these tables, ensuring that at least
fourteen diners sat in matching chairs. The pair of armchairs allowed Peter and Jane to
preside together at their table, a fairly new style of performance as host and hostess. The
lack of case furniture in this room suggests that built-in cupboards held the finery, perhaps
within paneled walls. A "Large Looking Glass Cherry tree frame & Candlesticks" lit the
room with candlelight reflected from a framed mirror.\textsuperscript{30} In addition to social gatherings,

\textsuperscript{29}For the purposes of these settings, I have made "minimum vessel counts" for
each activity. The inventory specifies eight china cups and saucers, four glass teacups and
six saucers, and "a parcel of white stone tea Ware." Thus eight and four indicate twelve
minimum at a setting, and the white stone teaware suggests at least two additional
services, for a minimum total of fourteen (AICWB 2: 42). Estate appraisers valued
healthy adult slaves between £30 and £57 10s. Children ranged from £8 to £27. Boys
Peter and Jesse, and Ephey, a girl, each cost £17 10s., the same as the silver coffee service
(AICWB 2: 42, 45). Captain Charles Lewis, Jane's brother-in-law, obtained the sugar for
the funeral (Harvie I: 5).

\textsuperscript{30}Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles," tables 1-6, 11; Carson, "Consumer
Revolution," 483-697, 590-91; Walsh, "Urban Amenities," table 1; Wenger, "Dining
Room," 150-53; PJAB, 26; AICWB 2: 42. Shadwell was not just well furnished, but
fashionably so, as indicated by the shape, material, and matched sets of objects and by the
behaviors they imply, such as the oval tables, matching side chairs and armchairs; the
various matching sets of dining wares that specified certain foods or courses at a meal and
the ability to prepare carefully cooked and seasoned dishes; the substantial tea and coffee
service; a list of clothing including double-channel pumps and sacks and gowns of
lutestring and India chintz; and items to aid in personal hygiene such as dressing tables and
Peter Jefferson may have entertained in his public role as county justice or held occasional official functions in this well-appointed room that surely impressed both family member and stranger alike with its finery.

The parlor served as secondary entertaining as well as private space and workspace for Jane, Peter, other family members, and whatever slaves attended them. This room was furnished for sleeping—it was the best bedroom—and minor entertaining, for small-scale food and drink preparation and finishing, and for the safekeeping or control of precious commodities. The parlor was the closest room to the kitchen building and may have had a side door through which to usher food and attendants en route to the dining room, though having slaves pass through the main door and the passage to the dining room was perfectly within the bounds of acceptable accommodation at midcentury. Entertaining in the parlor required two oval black walnut tables and two square tea tables. There were two chairs of unspecified material that were almost but not quite as good as the black walnut chairs in the hall. Four chairs with harrateen upholstery were the most valuable chairs in the house (not counting the closestool). One large and one small teakettle and a tea chest occupied this room to aid both tea-making and tea-taking there. Whereas the tea chest and twenty-two tin canisters held tea and seasonings to be doled out under the watchful eye of the plantation mistress, the dining wares stored in the parlor were not the status objects kept and displayed in the hall. The parlor contained silver-

---

a closestool. These details of form allow consideration of an object's fashionability, which offers an additional level of information than Carr and Walsh’s amenities index that measures incidence of a particular item to gauge broader shifts across a population (see footnote 42).
plate plates, a serving basket, and soup plates; old pewter, glasses, knives and forks of less-expensive material, and various dishes, basins, and porringerers. A pair of scales and weights and a mortar and pestle aided whoever used the bell metal and copper skillets there. While slave women did most of the larger-scale cooking in the separate kitchen building a little more than one hundred feet east of the main house, Jane and others coordinated the movement of food from storage to kitchen and from kitchen to table, perhaps with adjustments at the parlor hearth. In the parlor or in the passage, Jane oversaw and coordinated the activities of the slaves who worked in or around the house.31

Peter Jefferson’s inventory includes no evidence of spinning or other textile production; however, the white women at Shadwell participated in this activity. Jane had a cotton wheel, hackle, brushes, a bag and cotton, and a parcel of spun cotton, and Thomas recorded payments for a spinning wheel for his mother and sent her “wool in dirt” and picked cotton. Eldest daughter Jane Jr. had a spinning wheel and a pair of cards and Martha received a “Wheel &c” when she was sixteen, harkening her coming of age into a craft that was the women’s domain. Jane and her daughters were spared the job of

31The four harateen upholstered chairs had a combined value of 50s., the closestool was 18s. The parlor tables compared less favorably than those in the hall. The two oval parlor tables cost 35s., or 17s. 6d. each, compared with values of 26s. to more than £1-1/2 for any table in the hall. The tea table in the hall was valued at 26s. those in the parlor were 20s. and a mere 7s. each. The parlor chairs were 9-1/2s. each, the hall chairs were 10s. each (AICWB 2: 41-48).

Other items that represent traditionally female-centered production include a book on brewing, kept in the office, and candle molds in the parlor, the only craft item to occur in both Jane’s and her husband’s inventory (AICWB 2: 41-42, 356). See also chap. 2.

The accepted use of major circulatory spaces—such as the passage—by slaves changed by the beginning of the nineteenth century, when house plans were more likely to include lateral passages, secondary stairs, and side doors to hide servants as they moved through houses.
making clothes for the slaves and instead paid local women to make slave clothes and to knit stockings for the children. The Jeffersons wore professionally made garments by tailors Richard Rice, John Bell, and George Twynman. Cloth was imported from England, India, and Ireland, with some Virginia-made. Jane purchased tabby stays for the young ladies, shoes for the girls and young Randolph, and gloves from England. Daughter Jane, who died unmarried in 1765, left a collection of clothing that included a dozen fashionable gowns, of various silk, chintz, calico, and Virginia cloth, hats, stays, satin shoes, and gold and silver rings, buckles, and buttons. Most of the clothing suggests participation in genteel visiting and dining, with one more formal, and a few everyday pieces. Even at fifteen the young ladies wore hairpieces or wigs. Eight dressing tables at Shadwell confirm that attention to clothing went beyond merely covering the body.\(^{32}\)

To serve as a bedroom, the parlor held two sets of beds with bed furniture, a chest of drawers, two dressing glasses, four upholstered chairs, and one warming and one bedpan by the fireplace. Peter and Jane’s bedroom suite included a harrateen bed and furniture, valued at £12, the single most expensive piece of furniture at Shadwell. The bed

\(^{32}\)AlCWB 2: 356. Wool in dirt was unwashed wool. MB 1: 406, n. 38.

These women owned their own tools for a polite hobby rather than as an integral part of the domestic economy, which may explain why these implements were not represented in PJ’s list of property. There is no evidence that Jane and her daughters needed to earn additional income following PJ’s death. Roughly 43 percent (61 of 143) of colonial Albemarle Co. inventories included spinning wheels, 59 of 61 owners were male (Harvie I: 36; AlCWB 1 and AlCWB 2: esp. 227 for Jane Jr.’s estate. Harvie I: 4; Harvie II: 26

For tailors, see Harvie I: 20, 23, 28, 36. For Jane Jr.’s clothing, see AlCWB 2: 227. I thank Linda Baumgarten at The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation for helping me understand this list of garments and pointing me to sources for information on textiles. For wearing apparel, see AlCWB 2: 367. For hairpieces, see MB, 32. For dressing tables, see PJAB, 14.
matched the four harrateen upholstered chairs. The second bed and furniture was valued at £6.10, a substantial sum but only half of what the best bed cost. The chest of drawers probably held clothing and the two dressing glasses served Jane and Peter in their daily grooming. For their personal comfort, they had a warming pan, and a bed pan, a reference that could mean either an object for heating or for sanitation. Five brass candlesticks augmented light from the fireplace for work, dining, or reading.³³

Peter Jefferson’s office served his professional needs and also as the family library. Historians most often analyze the library holdings of a person in order to discuss the possible impact of the books’ intellectual content, but there are other ways to talk about books. Besides educational content, books had status as objects that cost money and displayed taste, and were physical objects that occupied space and required furniture to hold and display them. Peter Jefferson’s Shadwell library is most often discussed as the seed of Thomas Jefferson’s first – and lost – library. Peter’s forty-nine volumes worth £16 17s. 9d., grew to a collection worth over £200 under his son’s attention. By Thomas’s report, “almost every book” of his burned in the Shadwell fire. But what kind of books did he and his siblings grow up with? In short, Peter owned a range of topics that reflected the tendencies of other educated men in colonial Virginia. The greatest number of books were history and literature (28 of 49 volumes, or 57 percent), second were books

³³Harrateen was a worsted wool fabric polished and imprinted with wavy or watery patterns. The cloth usually was a deep, rich red, green, yellow, or blue, and, though unspecified in these documents, the chairs and bed most likely matched in color. See Florence M. Montgomery. Textiles in America 1650-1870. (New York, 1984). For definition of harrateen, see 35, 256. For Montgomery’s assessment of matching materials within rooms based on upholsterer’s bills, advertisements, and inventories, see 58. For candlesticks, see AICWB 2: 42.
The total value of the books was £16.17s. 9d., equal to less than 1 percent of the estate and just under 8 percent of the total value of household items. The appraised value of the books was less than the three-piece silver tea service valued at £17.10s. But the choices of topics tells us what the Jeffersons found important or interesting, and one title stands out as a large investment. While the greatest number of volumes (39 percent) was in the periodical collections that included *The Spectator*, *The Guardian*, *The Tattler*, and *Addison’s Works*, the greatest monetary investment was in history at 43 percent. The combined categories of history and literature made up 57 percent of the books and 68 percent of the investment. The legal category occupied 18 percent of the investment in books, while three religious books used 10 percent (see Table 1.1 and Figure 1.10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of volumes</th>
<th>% cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural philosophy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular culture/literature</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(history and literature)</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Peter Jefferson’s books by percentage of total number of volumes and percentage of total cost.

Jefferson’s legal books included summaries of court cases (Salmon), and lists of laws (Laws of Virginia). Two titles instructed how to carry out various public offices: Nelson’s *Office of a Justice* and Webb’s *Virginia Justice*. In addition to justices, they offered advice, respectively, “for constables, commissioners of sewers, coroners” and “sheriffs, coroners, church-wardens, surveiors of highways, constables, and officers of
militia.” *Scrivener’s Guide* advised “all gentlemen, but chiefly...those who practice the law” on the correct form for writing wills, articles of agreement, indentures, and other legal documents. Except for *State Trials*, all of the legal books were octavos (roughly 6” x 9”) or smaller, which made them easy to hold, carry, and use often.\(^{35}\)

The two titles with practical application also were octavos. Brewer William Ellis published *The London & Country Brewer* in 1744. He explained the art of brewing malt liquors “as practised both in town and country,” after touring “several counties” in England over four years. He also explained preserving in the cask and bottling beer. This book was likely used by Jane in overseeing the making and bottling of beer for the cellar at Shadwell. They also owned Stephen Switzer’s *The Practical Husbandman and Planter*, which, like Switzer’s other work, included observations on horticultural and ornamental aspects of administering a country seat. Switzer’s book invoked classical as well as eighteenth-century scientific ideas about horticulture and was aimed at the estate nurseryman or elite hobbyist. His illustrations were horticultural in nature, such as

\(^{35}\) Thomas Salmon, *A complete collection of state-trials, and proceedings for high-treason, and other crimes and misdemeanours....* (London, 2\(^{nd}\) ed., 1730), LOC no. 33008748. Nicholas Covert, *The scrivener's guide: being choice and approved forms of precedents of all sorts of business now in use and practice....* (London, 1740 and other years), LOC no. 17016670. Robert Beverley, *An abridgement of the publick laws of Virginia, in force and use, June 10, 1720. To which is added, for the ease of the justices and military officers, &c., precedents of all matters to be issued by them, peculiar to those laws and varying from the precedents in England.* (London, 1722 and other years), Swem Catalog no. KFV2430.A34.

diagrams of tree grafting. The history books included works that were popular in Virginia: Rapin’s *History of England* and Chamberlayne’s *Magnae Britanniae or Present State of Great-Britain*. Other Virginians also owned the titles on natural history and discovery such as Ogilby’s *Description of America* and Anson’s *Voyage round the World*. The *Secret History of the White-Staff...* or “Queen Anne’s Ministers” written by Daniel Defoe, was less common among Virginia libraries.

---


One entry, "Trents Astronomy," remains tantalizing. Astronomy appears in the titles of eighteenth-century books on stars, almanacs that include sun and moon charts, and guides to navigation. Astronomy also enters into the philosophical and religious, in books on the nature of man and God and the universe and it is a word used in practical mathematics. Thus it may have served the Jeffereons' professional, scientific, natural history, or religious interests. It cost 5s., making it worth more than Anson's Voyage, an octavo volume at 4s. but that had plates and maps, and more than a single volume of the quarto-sized periodicals at 4s. 6d. each. Thus it may have been a substantial size or have had illustrations, but it was not as impressive a book as Ogilby or Rapin.38

Another means to analyze a book list is as a group of objects that had shape, color, and size and unique storage and display needs. When we think about the Shadwell books from the standpoint of artifacts, we enter an interesting room. Peter's books resided in his office, where he kept his mathematical instruments and a collection of maps, a room that spoke of charting and exploration, in the real woods and mountains of Virginia, and on paper around the world. The books were part of the intellectual apparatus for that exploration, and indeed, the maps and other illustrations contained in the books added the books to the decorative as well as intellectual landscapes. Peter owned ten maps that were not part of books, including "Maps of the 4 Quarters of the World," "A map of the

---

the White-Staff, : being an account of affairs under the conduct of some late ministers, and of what might probably have happened if Her Majesty had not died (London, 1714), Swem cat. no. DA496 1714.D38.

38 Searches of "Trent" and "Astronomy" in library catalogs and databases such as Early English Books Online and English Short Title Catalog have not helped identify this book. The unidentified "Three old Books" have even less prestige, at 1s. each (ALCWB 2:
city London...Do of Virginia,” and “Four old maps.” The maps announced not only Peter’s profession and the Jeffersons’ worldliness, they asserted the place of Shadwell within the larger British realm and the place of the British realm in the world. Like the maps, some of the books dominated in their presence. They were not content to line a small shelf in the background, waiting to be called on behind a glass-front door.

Of the forty-nine volumes, three were smaller than octavo, and might have been called pocket books, small enough to fit in a pocket, be carried on a horse, or taken in a carriage. Nine were octavos, about 6 x 9 inches, the size Thomas Jefferson preferred because it was easily held in the hand for reading. This is the size of most of the legal and practical books at Shadwell. Over half the family books, however—twenty-one—were quartos, about 9 x 12 inches. Quartos were serious, impressive books, generally used at a table or bookstand, and often the size chosen for family Bibles by those who could afford to pay for things to impress other people. Then there were folios, measuring 16 to 18 inches high, and perhaps 12 inches wide. A folio could seem magical to a small child and required a space of its own, not an ordinary library shelf. A book in folio was an investment in art and object, not a mere manual for helping the reader attend to some other business. In 1769 Thomas Jefferson contracted with a Williamsburg cabinetmaker to make a large reading desk capable of holding and possibly displaying folios. The desk required a person to stand or use a tall stool to read there. It was to be surmounted by a “[Chinese?] railing at the back and ends of top,” and so had decorative as well as

41). For the family uses of religious books, see chap. 7.
functional quality. Folios were an investment in more ways than one, as this specialized desk shows.

Twelve volumes comprised the three titles in folio at Shadwell and were impressive books indeed. Salmon's *State Trials* impressed with its gravitas. It compiled "proceedings for high-treason, and other crimes and misdemeanours," from the late fourteenth century under Richard II to the early-eighteenth-century reign of George I. Its six volumes were a history of English rule as well as a collection of court cases.

Like many early books, Ogilby's work had a long title meant to invoke a sense of wonder in a would-be reader:

*America: being the latest, and most accurate description of the new world: containing the original of the inhabitants and the remarkable voyages thither, the conquest of the vast empires of Mexico and Peru and other large provinces and territories: with the several European plantations in those parts: also their cities, fortresses, towns, temples, mountains, and rivers: their habits, customs, manners, and religions, their plants, beasts, birds, and serpents: with and appendix containing, besides several other considerable additions, a brief survey of what hath been discover'd of the unknown south-land and the arctick region:"

---

On TJ's preferred book size, see E. Millicent Sowerby, "Thomas Jefferson and His Library," *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 50 (Third Quarter, 1956), 219. The designations octavo, quarto, folio refer to how many times a full sheet of paper was folded to make a book and do not designate specific sizes in the eighteenth century, as the size of the full sheet was not standard. For TJ's specifications for his reading desk, see MB 18.
collected from most authentick authors, augmented with later observations, and adorn'd with maps and sculptures.

This book offered an encyclopedia of the Americas and shared the Old World fascination with the New, leading the reader through the exploration and discovery (for Europeans) of America's natural and cultural history. Ogilby's work included thirty-two plates, as well as six portraits, and nineteen maps (some larger than the book and folded to fit). Ogilby's maps were decorated with both exotic and familiar heroic imagery: naked natives present their continents' wonders to the cartographic order of the (always dressed) colonialists. On many maps, the scale for measuring the world is presented by winged puti, naked messengers from above who bring the legitimacy of the Christian heaven and the classical world to the empirical (and Imperial) enterprise. Ogilby was a single volume, but at 674 pages, a very substantial one. Though not a folio, Anson's Voyage also contained images of exploration, including, "charts of the southern part of South America, of part of the Pacific Ocean, and of the track of the Centurion round the world." ⁴⁰

Ogilby's work was no doubt as impressive and favorite a book as Rapin's History of England, a five-volume folio set that included seventy-seven copper plate engravings of maps, genealogical tables, and "heads and monuments of kings." The imagery in Rapin also invoked the classical past, of 'Britannia Romana," and the ancient past, of "Britannia Saxonica." Maps connected the pasts of England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, France, and western Europe. Genealogies of kings legitimized royal authority from the combined

---

⁴⁰ Salmon, titlepage to State Trials, Ogilby, titlepage to America; Walter, titlepage to Voyage.
inheritance of Essex, Sussex, Mercia, and other English counties. And puti presented royal portraits in baroque frames, championed by allegorical images of victory or justice. Rapin’s *England* was the most expensive title in the library. In fact, Rapin cost more than many pieces of furniture in the house. At £6, the five-volume Rapin cost the same as “A set of surveyor or other mat. Instruments,” the same as one of the upper chamber beds (others cost £2 10s., and one with curtains cost £9), more than “10 black walnut chairs” at £5 in the hall, and more than a cart and wheels at £4. Rapin was a luxury good.41

A record of Peter Jefferson and his colleagues exchanging books reveals another title that was not listed in the inventory. In 1746 Robert Rose “wrote Col. Jefferson…& sent home, Brown’s Vulgar Errors to him.” Other Virginians owned works by Sir Thomas Browne. This particular book, called *Pseudodoxia Epidemica; Enquiries into very many commonly received Tenets and commonly presumed Truths*, contained what might be called late superstition and early science. Chapters included topics such as unicorns’ horns, griffins, and the phoenix, “That Storks will only live in Republics and free states,” and “That the Chicken is made out of the yolk of the egg.” Inquiries into social science and the Biblical world included, ”That the forbidden fruit was an Apple,” “That Jews sin,” and “Of the blackness of Negroes.” In the book, Browne traced man’s deception in— or inability to understand — all things, from man’s original deception by the serpent in the Garden of Eden. Browne cataloged mankind’s errors in ancient Egypt, his errors in the classical world, in a continuum across the ages that sought to explain why

41 Rapin, titlepage to *History of England*, also 33, 132, various plates; AICWB 2: 41, 44.
there was errant judgment of natural philosophy in the seventeenth century. The format of the book was of a single statement—given as the title of the chapter—followed by a multipage response. It was a format used by many philosophers who tried to make sense of the world for others, including Thomas Jefferson in his *Notes on Virginia*. The 1650 edition of this book was in folio, but others were quarto.\(^{42}\)

The single largest group was the nineteen volumes of *belles lettres* contained in the periodicals *The Tattler, The Guardian, The Spectator,* and *Addison’s Works*. This group of related publications was influential in its presentation of literature and poetry, plays, satire, opinion, and, in the *Guardian*, politics of the Whig persuasion. It is impossible to know from the descriptions what volumes the Jeffersons owned and thus what stories, plays, poems, essays, or images they saw in them. The family remembered that Peter Jefferson liked “reading historians, essayists, and even poets.” Also that “Addison, Swift, and Pope were prime favorites with him—but Shakespeare was his great favorite! His well-worn and fine old edition of the work is still extant.” The periodicals at Shadwell were part of the popular culture of eighteenth-century Virginia, and their influence extended beyond the set volumes to essays republished in the *Virginia Gazette* and reflected in letters written by Virginians to the *Gazette*. Like the popular history books, the material contained within these titles was a medium for communication among literate people of taste. They served their readers in many ways, and offered another form of

cultural currency for the Jeffersons.\textsuperscript{43}

The rest of the inventory lists an array of furnishings that offered every white and free member of the household a striking level of accommodation and comfort. There were eight beds for ten family members, though three children were under five years old at the date of the inventory. In addition to Peter Jefferson's cherrywood desk and bookcase in his office, a walnut desk and bookcase in the hall and a desk in the smaller downstairs bedchamber encouraged various members of the family to scholarly pursuits or to keep plantation accounts. Other clues to the social life at Shadwell appear in accounts kept for Mrs. Jefferson after Peter's death. Jane paid for dancing lessons and attendance at a dance for the children, and at least three of her children, and probably all, had musical training. The Jeffersons owned all of the amenities that signal to historians positive changes in the standard of living over the mid-seventeenth through the late-eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{44}


\textsuperscript{44} For beds and desks, see A1CWB 2: 41-2. For dance, see Harvie I: 4; Harvie II: 26. Lois Carr and Lorena Walsh chose twelve items to measure changes in amenities. These are: (1) coarse earthenware and (2) bed or table linens, for basic convenience and sanitation; (3) table knives, (4) forks, or (5) fine earthenware, for refinements in convenience and elegance at the table; (6) spices and cookery tools for variety and elaboration of food; books (7) religious and (8) secular for educational and leisure pursuits; and objects of luxury such as (9) wigs, (10) time pieces, (11) pictures, and (12) silver. Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles," see 69 for definition of categories, and tables 1-6. Based on the Carr and Walsh figures from table 6, "Incidence of selected consumer items, York Co. (urban)," over the years 1745-67, showing the percentage of decedents with the richest estates (more than £491) who owned each of twelve particular
Clearly the physical and social standards at Shadwell did not suggest that the Jeffersons thought of themselves as removed from society. In fact, their social world included both tidewater and Piedmont families. The tobacco economy extended into this part of Virginia, and with it, tobacco culture. The Jeffersons built at the head of navigation on the North Branch of the James, later called the Rivanna River, and thus shipped tobacco to market via the same water as other great planters. For people of wealth such as the Jeffersons, the connection to the markets was direct, not second-hand. At Shadwell, stockpiles of cloth and building materials such as glass, lead, and nails suggest that the Jeffersons, like many planters whose seats were on the periphery, operated a store for neighbors, influencing the material expectations of the county further through this mercantile role. The location of Shadwell did not prohibit the Jeffersons from contact with major markets. In fact, they placed orders directly with ship captains for leather gloves, riding traces, letter seals, coffee, salt, and nails from Bristol, England (Figure 1.11). From Shadwell, in the Piedmont, they were as connected with the supplies of the British Atlantic realm as any merchant in Williamsburg. Mobility between items, the Jeffersons would have compared as favorably in Virginia's biggest city as they did at home.

The children's marriages show exchange across the colony and locally. Mary and Thomas married into tidewater families (Bolling and Wayles, respectively); Martha married Dabney Carr, who lived in Louisa Co., just east of Albemarle, Co., but who served colony-wide interests as a burgess. Lucy and Randolph married their Albemarle-based Lewis cousins (siblings Charles and Anna) whose family held local office. Anna Scott married Hastings Marks, a small planter in Albemarle Co.

For new goods, see AlCW B 2: 43-45. Payments to women (some the wives of Shadwell overseers) in the 1760s show that the Jeffersons supported a local economy of home workers who sewed clothes for the Shadwell slaves and knitted stockings for the Jefferson children, thereby enabling the economic well-being of neighbors (Harvie I: 36,
the Piedmont and the tidewater must have been a simple and usual thing for some, despite
the distance.

By understanding the connections of Shadwell to crop markets, labor, crafts, and
material goods, the geographical limitations suggested by the word frontier melt away. In
fact, there is almost nothing about the material world of this plantation only thirteen years
after the county's founding that supports the argument that establishing a fashionable
home was somehow limited due to location on Virginia's mid-century frontier. Yet the
frontier was not a myth. The access to goods and information that the Jeffersons had was
unavailable to poorer Virginians; most people in these new Virginia counties had only
remote contact to any metropolitan center of politics and fashion. Unsettled lands and
non-English immigrants such as French Huguenots, Scottish, Irish, and Germans ensured
that the region remained a zone of cultural interaction. Shadwell also hosted Cherokees
traveling between Tennessee and the colonial capital in Williamsburg, adding the role of
ambassador to the plantation community. Indian visits doubled the population of the
plantation for a day or two and affected its cultural and material world, as well as
reminded its members that unfamiliar realms lay nearby. From Shadwell, nestled on the
east side of the Blue Ridge, Peter Jefferson authorized surveying parties as far west as the
Mississippi. Closer to home, men like Jefferson who were wealthy planters, large-scale
land speculators, surveyors, and public officials played formative and lasting roles not only
in their new county governments, but also in the way immigrants imprinted on their new
land and how the local society grew from that. The fences and curtilage defined the

42; Harvie II: 1-3). For overseas orders, see Harvie I: 20; Harvie II: 3.
Jeffersons' realm as separate from the untamed beyond and signaled improvement in this recently settled region. Peter and Jane Jefferson used the recognizable idioms of the gentry in a very conscious material display that advertised their own standing and enforced social ritual within the plantation and beyond it.

No colonial Virginia town was the standard for a plantation such as Shadwell. The material world of wealthy Virginians in this period cannot be classified in terms of urban versus rural, expecting that high culture filters through a small tidewater capital out to a

---

46 On Native American artifacts, see chap. 6, and Kern, "Where Did the Indians Sleep?: An Archaeological and Ethnohistorical Study of Mid-Eighteenth Century Piedmont Virginia," Franklin and Fesler, Historical Archaeology, 31-46. But cultural curiosity was not the only reaction, in 1756 neighbors in Louisa Co. called the news of Indians allied with the French within 75 miles "terrifying," and commented that "no doubt [the Indians'] numbers were greatly augmented by our fears." “Letters of Francis Jerdone,” WMQ 1st Ser., 16, no. 2 (October 1907): 127-28.

Historian Ann Martin reports a rural-urban dichotomy in consumption of ceramics that was greater for both the middling and lower sorts than for the elite, and notes that it becomes more marked toward the end of the eighteenth century. See Martin, “‘Fashionable Sugar Dishes, Latest Fashion Ware’: The Creamware Revolution in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake,” in Historical Archaeology of the Chesapeake ed. Paul A. Shackel and Barbara J. Little (Washington, D.C., 1994), 169-187, esp. 179-183; and Martin, “Buying into the World of Goods: Eighteenth Century Consumerism and the Retail Trade from London to the Virginia Frontier,” (Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1993).

For other men like Jefferson, see, for instance, Archibald Henderson, “Dr. Thomas Walker and the Loyal Company of Virginia,” Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society 41 (April 1931), 77-123. For the importance of these professionals in the formation and growth of Virginia, see Sarah S. Hughes, Surveyors and Statesmen: Land Measuring in Colonial Virginia, (Richmond, Va., 1979).

Jack Greene argues that people sought visible symbols of improvement as they moved. Landscape historian Barbara Sarudy suggests that fences, garden walls, and hedges demarcated civilized space from wilderness, and gave settlers a feeling of security within safe, familiar bounds. Jack P. Greene, Imperatives, Behaviors, & Identities: Essays in Early American Cultural History (Charlottesville, Va., 1992), 193; Barbara Wells Sarudy, Gardens and Gardening in the Chesapeake, 1700-1805 (Baltimore, Md., 1998), 45, 150.
vernacular hinterland. Many large plantations were towns unto themselves, with craft-manufacturing and imported goods flowing directly into their storerooms. Francis West, the craftsman who made the Jeffersons' fashionable tables and chairs for Shadwell, worked at Tuckahoe, and also for Colonel Nicholas Cabell at Liberty Hall in Nelson County, Virginia. He did not, however, work among Williamsburg craftsmen. He plied his trade for an elite culture that defined itself through its country seats. Virginia's gentry were the makers and keepers of culture; they did not wait for it to be passed to them second or third-hand.

Though a young Thomas Jefferson, home from the College of William and Mary, complained about the remoteness of Shadwell, he was more likely lamenting the lack of companionship other than his sisters and brother. Peter and Jane Randolph Jefferson built a home that prepared in every material way for the social expectations of their planter

---

47 Jefferson biographers have assumed that both distance from Williamsburg and Shadwell's rural location if not near "wilderness" prescribed a necessarily simpler life. Burstein, *Inner Jefferson*, esp. 12-18; Cunningham, *The Life of Thomas Jefferson*, 1-2; Malone, *Jefferson I*: chaps. 1-2, esp. 30, 33. The assumption that towns defined culture and that distance from a town was necessarily equal to distance from culture is the reason many historians of the Chesapeake have to first define the region's settlement pattern and lack of towns, and perhaps contrast the relationship of people to towns in New England or in Europe. See, for instance, Isaac, *Transformation of Virginia*, 13-17; Kevin P. Kelly "'In disper'd Country Plantations:' Settlement Patterns in Seventeenth-Century Surry Co., Virginia," in *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society*, ed. Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman (New York, 1979), 183-205; Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, *A Place in Time: Middlesex Co., Virginia 1650-1750* (New York, 1984), esp. 19-25, 47. For Francis West, see PJAB, 7; Cabell Papers, Box 1, 1727-1776, accession no. 5084, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, Va.

Lois Carr and Lorena Walsh find that proximity to an urban area did not mean that a county had more amenities. In fact their study of four Chesapeake counties shows that entirely rural counties ranked higher on mean amenities scores and mean value of consumer durables than rural parts of counties with urban centers. Carr and Walsh,
class. The site on a ridge signaled to the passerby that this was an important home. The landscape told the visitor how to approach the house and told the servants where they could relax. The house told guests how to enter, the rooms told them where to sit, and the teacups told them how to act. In this frontier there was plenty of room to grow, but there was no room for mistaking whose world would grow there.

Figure 1.1. Brick cellar of Jefferson house at Shadwell. The brick cellar was under the eastern end of the Jefferson dwelling house that burned February 1, 1770. Photo taken during 1991 excavations, facing northwest. Courtesy Monticello/Thomas Jefferson Foundation.
Figure 1.2. Detail of Fry-Jefferson Map. Shadwell is in the upper left corner of the map, located at the break in the mountain range that lies to the left of the “N” in “VIRGINIA.” Williamsburg is to the lower right. Courtesy, Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division. [http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.gmd/g3880.ct000370] (November 7, 2004).
Figure 1.3. Shadwell lands as surveyed by Thomas Jefferson in 1799. The legend "magnetic East" at lower center is the southern limit of the ten-acre domestic area of the plantation. The diagonal line just above that reads "bearing of old house." Jefferson used the east chimney of the house as a reference point for surveying from nearby hills. The 1799 surveys of the property reveal remnants of earlier plantation use, including the cemetery (marked "cedars," lower center), the Three-Notch'd Road along the northern boundary, and the farm road to Monticello (dotted line from "yard gate" that leads west to the Rivanna River). The Rivanna River runs just outside the southern and western boundary of the plat. HM 9379-4, HM 9379-5, TJF, from originals at the Huntington Library. This item is reproduced by permission of The Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
Figure 1.4. Ten-acre domestic center of Shadwell showing the arrangement of some buildings and fencelines and gates. The Jefferson house lies at the center. At least two buildings to the east served kitchen activities and housed a small group of slaves. A slave quarter site farther east contained at least two houses for slaves and a yard area that served both cooking and social activities. Drawing by author.
Figure 1.5. Eighteenth century surveying and drafting instruments found at Shadwell (clockwise from upper right): brass ring for an “inclining” or “equatorial” sundial that was mounted in a box and carried by a surveyor or traveler to tell the time at any latitude; brass hinge for wooden scale, marked at 1/8”; brass plate or hinge for wooden drafting scale, marked with “H”, 1/8”; brass hinge or arm for rectangular protractor.
Monticello/Thomas Jefferson Foundation.
Figure 1.6. Cooking pit in yard of slave quarter area. The circular rock with flat sides (seen to left of pit) sat on a bed of corncobs and other charred material. The fill in the pit included fish scale, fragments of bone, brick, and English Staffordshire slipware vessels. Monticello/Thomas Jefferson Foundation.
Figure 1.7. Jefferson house at Shadwell: archaeological remains at cellar level.

This conjectural plan of Shadwell is based on archaeological evidence, documents pertaining to Shadwell, and studies that examine the various functions, arrangement, and proportions of rooms in eighteenth-century domestic architecture. Shadwell's largest artifact, the brick cellar represents the oldest (eastern) part of the house and the chimney evidence here indicates it was below two adjoining rooms that were listed as heated in the 1757 inventory, the more private rooms of parlor and chamber. These rooms were on the east side closest to the separate kitchen building whose role was directly related to the function of the parlor as secondary dining but also food preparation space. The cellar gives the dimensions for the house depth at 32-1/2 feet.
Figure 1.8. Jefferson house at Shadwell: conjectural ground-floor plan.

The ten-foot intervals for the three existing porch postholes give the best tool for approximating the length of the house in conjunction with the proportions of the rooms above the cellar. The Three Notch’d Road and gate to the north of the house describe a formal route of access, and most likely the hall and parlor were on the north front. With a ten-foot-wide passage, the porch extends west twenty feet more for a total length of fifty feet. Dell Upton’s idea of “social molecule” illustrates the customary communication between rooms. The proportions of the hall are based on Upton’s observation that the hall was generally square. The hall chimney is interpreted as internal in order to allow space for the cupboards or closets implied by the lack of case furniture in this room that was filled with dining equipage. Walls are drawn six inches on the exterior and four inches on the interior, approximating the average sizes for frame houses.
Figure 1.9. Silver teaspoon recovered from Jefferson house at Shadwell. Monticello/Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Edward Owen photograph.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal (5 titles, 11 volumes)</strong></td>
<td>Solomons state trials</td>
<td>6v</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nelsons office of a Justice</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>8vo</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scriveners guide 2 vols</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>8vo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virginia Justice</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>8vo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laws of Virga.</td>
<td>184b</td>
<td>6\text{1/16}</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History (5 titles, 9 volumes)</strong></td>
<td>Rapins Hist. of England 2 v &amp; 2 v Cont.</td>
<td>5v</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oglvies Discription of America</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The present state of great Britain</td>
<td>274\text{c}</td>
<td>8vo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a secret History of Queen Annes Ministers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7\text{1/16}</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ansons Voyage round the World</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>8vo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Philosophy (1 title, 1 volume)</strong></td>
<td>Trents Astronomy</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical (2 titles, 3 volumes)</strong></td>
<td>the London &amp; Country brewer</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>8vo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swissers husbander, 2 vols.</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>8vo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious (3 titles, 3 volumes)</strong></td>
<td>1 Quarto bible w\text{d} Book of Common Prayer</td>
<td>4to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Large Prayer book</td>
<td>4to\text{e}</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop of sodor &amp; mans Instructions for indians</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>6\text{1/16}</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popular culture/literature (4 periodicals, 19 volumes)</strong></td>
<td>Specf\text{f} 9V</td>
<td>4to</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tattler 5V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaurd\text{g} 2V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addis\text{g} Work 3 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three old Books</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.10. 1757 inventory list of books in Peter Jefferson's library, by category (spelling and titles as written), (ACWB 2: 41).

\text{a} The 1730 publication of Salmon's State Trials had 6 volumes, it is unclear how many of these PJ owned. This column has number of text pages or volumes.

\text{b} Robert Beverley's 1722 Laws of Virginia had 184 pages. It is possible this could also be the collection of British laws for the colonies printed by John Nicholson in 1704.

\text{c} Various editions have from 274-529 pages.

\text{d} Unknown, see text.

\text{e} I have assumed that large here means quarto.
Figure 1.11. Peter Jefferson N[ote] One. A bale of goods arrived for the Jeffersons, November 1760 aboard the ship The Planter. The bale contained seven kinds of cloth, including Irish and German made fabric, English-made monmouth caps, knives, two sizes of nails, sickles, German steel, and salt. The entry also shows the cost of the goods and the duties and insurance paid on the bale. (Harvie II: 3).
On August 17, 1757, Jane Jefferson became a widow. She was thirty-seven years old and the mother of eight children, ranging in age from seventeen to almost-two-year-old twins. Two more children, boys who died in infancy, would have been nine and seven that year. She may have begun preparations for widowhood in advance of her husband’s death. In mid-July, about a month before his death, Peter wrote his will and Dr. Thomas Walker visited the ailing patriarch fourteen times that summer. When Peter died, Jane’s immediate job was to make funeral arrangements for her husband and to participate in the legal processes of probate that would settle her husband’s estate and ensure that his wishes for care of his family were carried out. Her long-term charge was what it had been since she married and bore children: to raise her children to their roles as young Virginia gentry. Her day-to-day tasks were little changed. Children needed still to be fed and dressed and house slaves to be guided through their work. Jane spent almost nineteen more years at Shadwell following Peter’s death. During this time she would see two young men off to school, four children marry, two daughters die unmarried, and the house where she and her remaining children lived burn to the ground.

We know Jane through few documents, but beyond bearing children—two roles can be assigned to Jane Jefferson as the mistress of the Shadwell household. One of her roles was the organization of the daily household activities that ensured that each person
was fed and clothed. Additionally, she had oversight of everyone, her children or her
slaves, who prepared food, clothing, and other basic household items. In 1757 the family
enjoyed the labor of 60 slaves (16 adult males, 16 adult females, 10 boys, and 18 girls)
and various hired help, whose positions Jane oversaw if they worked in the house or on
tasks related to household consumption. Jane’s other major role was the preservation and
perpetuation of her family’s important social standing through proper training of her
children and the slaves who served them. Her acceptance of this role is evident in the
few documents she left. Her training for this role came from her own upbringing as the
eldest daughter in a gentry family.48

The history of women at Shadwell comes from both traditional and non-
traditional sources. More detail about their lives exists for those Jefferson women who,
like Jane, outlived their husbands or who died unmarried, for the fortunes of these women
were not hidden in their husband’s legal documents. From archaeology, the small finds
can be used to illustrate the history of those whose lives we know something of from
documents for those whose history is not written in detail, each artifact, even the tiniest
shard contributes a larger piece to the whole. What do artifacts tell us about Peter
Jefferson that is more important than what we know from documents? Not much, though
they make nice illustrations. Of Jane, however, her history murkier in documents, and
the Jefferson children—especially the girls, each artifact, whether known through a
document or through archaeology, carries more meaning. The slaves, whose names are

48 AICWB 2: 41-48, see chap. 3 for hired labor at Shadwell, chaps. 4 and 5 for
slaves.
in a list, have a history from artifacts that is more articulate than what is written: their history is greatly enriched by archaeological finds.\textsuperscript{49}

Using objects and spaces to write history requires the proper identification of artifacts and the roles people played within their families and the plantation economy. Artifacts reveal only a few of the experiences of the women who were slaves at Shadwell, the rest, we must conclude, were much like those on other large plantations in the eighteenth century. Their history remains painted with a broad brush, a few details added. Finding Jane Jefferson in her husband’s inventory requires making assumptions about her activities, based on what were the traditional domestic labors of women. But the same objects in her own inventory suggest that her activities reflected choices about how she used her time and expertise. Some of her labor was her own, and she expended it on objects and lessons of refinement for her family. Sons Thomas and Randolph went off to William and Mary and wrote part of their histories in public places. Jane and her daughters shared books, fine clothes, and other genteel past times, filling the domestic spaces with their histories as wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters, teachers and

\textsuperscript{49} This study of Jane Jefferson, and of everyone at Shadwell, is grounded in the particulars to Shadwell. My analysis is based on action – what people wrote; what they owned, purchased, made, kept, used; the relationships they had with others around them at Shadwell and the other places they went. Secondary works on women in eighteenth-century Virginia are useful for comparison in the most general way, and statistics provide a counterpoint for comparing demographic data. The more prescriptive women’s studies are of limited use. I refuse to see all the action here as either dictated by or limited by the patriarchal structure of society, I make no claims that Jane occupied a “golden age” for women, nor that her “agency” made her a strong or unusual woman for her time. There are no halo-laden images of Jane as “motherhood,” but there are actions that suggest she was revered for a job well done. The particulars of this place and time lead to some insights about broader trends.
taskmasters, investing everyday objects with their legacies as the bearers of stories about the women who used them.

Peter Jefferson’s inventory and account books give a sense of the plantation whole and its connections across Virginia and the Atlantic world: through purchases and sales, through hiring and trade. And yet this history could be read without ever knowing the names of the rest of Peter Jefferson’s family. But the history of the women is within the plantation bounds and the home. The history of Jane Jefferson comes to us from the small and immediate, from the everyday activities that require an accounting of each individual in her family and under her charge, and from the everyday objects that they used. Writing about the women at Shadwell requires more detail than what the meager documents referring directly to these women offer us. It requires assumptions about the roles of women within their families, within their larger household economies, and the spaces within which various household activities took place.

Family

To say that a history of Peter Jefferson could be written without knowing much about his family is not to say that family did not matter to him. He named Shadwell for the London parish where his wife was born. He was most deliberate in his will to provide for his wife and children. He thought enough of his wife to give her life rights to his estate and “household stuff” (as he referred to his furniture) and the provision to dispose of said “stuff” and her portion of the slaves. To each daughter by name he provided an education, £200 for her “fortune,” and a particular female slave or two. That is, he named each slave who was to go to one of his children; for instance, the Negro Girl Cate,
who was about ten, was bequeathed to daughter Elizabeth, who was twelve at the time. Each of his sons received a particular slave, land, and one half of the remaining slaves after the distribution of the named slaves. The elder Jefferson made one specific bequest, of his books, mathematical instruments, and cherry tree desk and bookcase to eldest son Thomas. Peter's bequests performed a number of functions that affected the landscape of the household following his death. He arranged the future relationships of certain slave children with his own children. The careers of these young, and even tiny, servants and masters were set when Peter wrote his will. It also meant that certain areas of the house inhabited by these bequests remained the patriarch's. By leaving his desk and bookcase, books, and mathematical instruments—essentially the entire contents of his office—to his son, he conferred both the space and the roles that had presided there to his heir. Jane, with Peter's executors, carried out her husband's charges and continued his legacy in the spirit in which he had intended: this was her legacy too.⁵⁰

Jane Randolph married Peter Jefferson on October 3, 1739. She had known many homes in her life (Figure 2.1). She was born in Shadwell Parish, London, February 9, 1720, to Isham Randolph and his English bride, Jane Rogers. She was their second child of ten; an older brother named Isham was born but lived only ten days in June 1718. Her father had an address in Shakespeare's Walk and was listed as "merchant" there. When Jane was four her family lived in Whitechapel Parish, where her younger bother Isham was born. The next year they moved across the Atlantic Ocean to Williamsburg, Virginia, where Mary was born in October 1725. Sister Elizabeth was born in the years

⁵⁰ AICWB 2: 32-34.
between Mary and William. In July 1729 Jane’s younger brother William was born at Turkey Island in Henrico County, the home of Jane’s (now dead) grandparents and her father’s older brother William. Jane’s sister Dorothea, born in 1730 when Jane was ten, was the first of their family born at Dungeness in Goochland County (formed from Henrico in 1728), their family’s own home. Younger siblings Thomas (born and died 1732), Anne (1734), Thomas (1736), and Susanna (1738) were all born at Dungeness. The next year Jane married Peter Jefferson and moved with him to Shadwell. By the time Jane was twenty, she had lived in six different locations. In a few more years she would add one more address to this list, when her own family moved to her cousin’s house, Tuckahoe, then back to an enlarged Shadwell in 1753. When the Shadwell house burned, Jane lived at Shadwell six more years in a smaller dwelling. At the end of her fifty-six years she had moved at least eight times.51

Jane was not the only Randolph to move to the part of Goochland that became Albemarle County, however. She was part of a kin network that ranged within a few


miles of Shadwell. The nearest was her younger sister Mary, who married Charles Lewis in 1744 and moved to his plantation called Buck Island, about three miles from Shadwell. Some of Jane's children shared schooling with the Lewises, and two marriages came from the Jefferson and Lewis connection. Another of Jane's sisters, Anne, may have been the Anne who married Daniel Scott, on whose farm Albemarle Courthouse was established. With the exception of her youngest sister Susanna who moved to Cumberland County, Jane's other siblings remained in Goochland County. Their connections within Goochland were already strong, from the Randolph cousins on their father's side at Tuckahoe to their mother's brother Robert Rogers on Lickinghole Creek. Their connections were strengthened through multiple associations and marriages in each generation. Jane's cousins sold Peter land in what would become Albemarle County. Peter surveyed in Goochland with John Woodson, a prominent Goochland County office holder who would marry Jane's sister Dorothea. Jane's grandchildren would someday visit Dungeness with descendants of Jane's brother Thomas. These kin networks were an engine in the social and political workings of Virginia.

Family mattered to Jane Jefferson. She not only married and bore children, she recorded their history and provided a legacy for her heirs of these facts. Two years following the Shadwell fire in 1770, Jane acquired a new family Bible and in it recorded important information about her family. She listed births and birthplaces (Shadwell and Tuckahoe), and for two of her children and her husband, their deaths. This family Bible reveals a number of things about Jane Jefferson. First, there are the facts—births, deaths—

---

52 The various associations of the Jeffersons with the other founders of Albemarle County are further explored in chaps. 3 and 6.
of her own family, which Jane reconstructed. The Bible also confirms the early family histories that remark that Jane was literate, able to write about people and places and events; indeed, her penmanship is elegant and well wrought. Her inscriptions offer insight into both the creation of her family and what she thought they should remember. Jane’s son Thomas, the most prominent of the Jeffersons before or since, left voluminous writings that give historians cause to celebrate his interests in books, gardening, food, and music, among many other past times and passions. There are few documents from his siblings, but enough writings survive to reveal that his sisters and brother shared many of these same interests. These interests were undoubtedly formed at Shadwell from the domestic landscape established by Peter and Jane Jefferson there.

Thomas Jefferson wrote to his own daughter when she was thirteen outlining what she should know of the “domestic arts.” He advised, “go on in your reading, in attention to your music, in learning in the manage the kitchen, the dairy, the garden, and other appendages of the household.” He also advised her to “suffer nothing to ruffle your temper or good humor.” These were the traits she should have to enter adulthood. The ideal planter’s wife would have tools to learn and entertain; that is, she could read and perform musically. She would master the diverse parts of the household devoted to foodways. She would learn to do all this with good humor. Evidence from Shadwell argues that Jane Jefferson was this sort of planter’s wife.

52 See chap. 7 for details.

Childbearing and Health

Jane lived to be fifty-six years old, past the life expectancy for women of forty-some years, and past the half-century mark that her husband almost reached. In some ways, these Jeffersons reflect the demographic averages for mid-century Piedmont: in other ways they do not. Although Jane was an immigrant, not native born, she married at nineteen, within the typical range of late-teens to early-twenties in which white Virginia women married. Peter married at the older age of thirty-one, past the average of five years older than his wife. Jane’s age follows the pattern some demographers have found of women marrying younger when land was readily available. However, Peter’s age fits better into a pattern of limited land availability, when men waited until they could acquire land before starting a family.⁵⁵ Jane’s marriage age allowed her ample time to bear children.

Jane’s reproductive history can be reconstructed from the record she left in the family Bible. Jane had ten pregnancies in sixteen years. Between October 3, 1739 and October 1, 1755, assuming her pregnancies were full-term, she was pregnant almost fifty percent of the time (90 out of 192 months, 46.8 percent). Women in the Chesapeake who married in their late teens or early twenties gave birth, on average, every 30 months. Jane’s average was just over nineteen months (19.2). The actual birth rates of her children offer a number of observations about Jane and life at Shadwell. In women with high fecundity, which Jane appears to have had based on the number of healthy children she bore, pregnancy follows relatively quickly following the onset of ovulation. Jane

⁵⁵ Kulikoff, Tobacco and Slaves, 49-50, 54-55.
became pregnant less than ten and a half months following five of her births, and in three of these, less than nine and a half months (Table 2.1). Her three pregnancies with longer periods from the last birth to conception ranged from just under to just over two years.\textsuperscript{56}

A number of factors may account for these birth patterns. Studies of natural fertility populations find an average duration of postpartum amenorrhea (the period during which ovulation is suppressed) at 20.10 months.\textsuperscript{57} The birth rates of her first five children, and of the son who died at birth, suggest that Jane did not nurse her babies; likely a slave performed the important duty of nourishing and nurturing the young Jefferson children. The longer periods between last birth and conception may reflect periods of stress or illness in Jane's life or a time when Peter was traveling. There may be unrecorded miscarriages in her history as well. Women who did not nurse their babies did not receive the benefits that nursing offers the mother's body. For instance, they were at higher risk for conditions such as a prolapsed uterus, which normally contracts with nursing. Had Jane nursed her children herself, she likely would have had fewer pregnancies during the seventeen-plus childbearing years she and Peter were married.

\textsuperscript{56} Pregnant women were commonplace on the landscape. The tutor Philip Fithian described how the girls among his young charges stuffed their gowns to play at being pregnant. Morgan found an average of 28 months between births among slaves. Fithian, \textit{Journal}, 193; Kulikoff, \textit{Tobacco and Slaves}, 57; Morgan, \textit{Slave Counterpoint}, Table 21, 92. See chap. 4 for comparative statistics for some of the Shadwell slaves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Jane's age</th>
<th>Date of conception, est.</th>
<th>Days from LB</th>
<th>Months from LB</th>
<th>Years from LB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>10/01</td>
<td>Shadwell</td>
<td>d. Mary born</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1/7/41</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>4/02</td>
<td>Shadwell</td>
<td>s. Thomas born</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7/9/42</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td>11/04</td>
<td>Shadwell</td>
<td>d. Elizabeth born</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>2/11/44</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>Tuckahoe</td>
<td>s. Peter Field born</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>3/7/48</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>11/29</td>
<td>Tuckahoe</td>
<td>s. Peter Field died</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>3/09</td>
<td>Tuckahoe</td>
<td>s. born</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6/15/49</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>3/09</td>
<td>Tuckahoe</td>
<td>s. died</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>Tuckahoe</td>
<td>d. Lucy born</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>1/5/52</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>10/01</td>
<td>Shadwell</td>
<td>s. Randolph born</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1/7/55</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>10/01</td>
<td>Shadwell</td>
<td>d. Anna Scott born</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1/7/55</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Birth dates of Jane Jefferson's children, her age at their birth, the date of conception assuming an average 267 day gestation period, the time from the last birth (LB) to conception in days, months (30 days), and years.
Giving birth to twins may be part of the family genes because Jane’s daughter Martha also bore twins.\(^5^8\)

That a slave nurse was part of the family circle and that Jane did not nurse her babies herself is in keeping with ideas about childbearing and nursing in the eighteenth century. Philip Fithian noted a dinner with his patrons, the Carters, and Dr. Walter Jones, where the topic of conversation was nursing children. Fithian was surprised to find that “it is common here for people of Fortune to have their young Children suckled by the Negroes!” Mrs. Carter said that several of her thirteen children had been nursed by “wenches,” and Dr. Jones said that his child was now with a nurse. For this mixed company to discuss this topic at supper suggests that neither nursing nor nursing by a slave was taboo in polite conversation. Although some people in the early modern world feared that the baby might absorb any character flaws of the nurse, this must have been reconciled by the same mechanism that rationalized so many other parts of the slave system. Many elite women in both England and America used wetnurses in the first days following birth, inadvertently decreasing the likelihood that they could develop a good milk supply for their infants. Contemporaries noted the inability of elite women to nurse and even blamed this “curse” on their tight corsets, which were not worn by working women, who seemed to have little trouble nursing their babies. Elite women knew a tradition of passing their babies to others to nurse and some women feared for their own

\(^{58}\) On nursing, see Catherine Clinton, *The Plantation Mistress: Woman’s World in the Old South* (New York, 1982), 154. If Jane had averaged the 30-month birth rate that Kulikof found, she and Peter would have had 7.13 children in their years together. They were married 17.8 years, or 214 months. In 1768 Martha and Dabney Carr had twins Lucy and Mary, although it appears only Lucy survived childhood. Douglas Register, 168.
health from the demands of nursing. There is no evidence that using a wetnurse
diminished maternal affection and concern in any way.59

The slave woman (or women) who nursed the Jefferson babies bore more than the
demands of feeding another. She was likely nursing a child of her own at the same time.
Perhaps Peter Jefferson’s bequests of slaves to his children reflected a relationship
formed at the breast of one of these slave women. The nurse likely was an expert in child
care from her own experience. She now tolerated Jane’s scrutiny at the care of her
mistress’s child and likely from time to time had to deny maternal care to her own
children in order to see to the Jefferson children to whom she was assigned. If she had
sore nipples, fatigue, or breast infections, she bore them as well. Planters gave extra
care—at Shadwell generally a measure of sugar and brandy—to slaves in childbirth, but
there is no evidence that women who were nurses to the planter’s children received any
extra provisions. Their proximity in the master’s house, however, may have given them
access to different fare than that at the quarter. Isaac Jefferson recalled that his mother
Ursula suckled Thomas Jefferson’s daughter Martha and described himself as “one year’s

59 Fithian, Journal, 39. Catherine Clinton presents evidence that elite women
nursed their own babies in the eighteenth century and more likely used a nurse by the
middle of the nineteenth century. Clinton, Plantation Mistress, 155. Marylynn Salmon
find other trends when women - especially elite women - nursed their own babies. They
were more likely to do so toward the end of the eighteenth century. Coincidental with the
time Jane Jefferson was bearing children, William Cadogan's 1748 treatise on the
benefits of breastfeeding one’s own babies influenced many elite women to do this
themselves. Before this treatise that also celebrated the benefits of colostrum to
newborns, many elite women had their babies nursed by others until their milk came in,
which very often did not happen because their bodies lacked the stimulation of the first
nursing. Marylynn Salmon, “The Cultural Significance of Breastfeeding and Infant Care
in Early Modern England and America,” Journal of Social History 28: 2 (Winter 1994),
8, 10-12.
child with Patsy Jefferson.” Although historian James Bear discounts Isaac’s claim about his mother nursing both babies because Martha was born in 1772 and Isaac in 1775, Isaac tells us something of the arrangement of slave women, their babies, and the babies of their owners. Being born in the same year was a way of identifying the children as a group – an age cohort – tied to the same nurse. That he was aware of this relationship with Patsy was something he had to have been told, not something he could have remembered, thus Isaac made this personal and individual connection to his owner’s child via a story told in the slave quarters.⁶⁰

There are few references to Jane’s health, good or bad, but her ability to bear children, move numerous times, keep her own house and affairs following the death of her husband and the burning of her house suggest that she was strong in body and in mind. Jane’s family remembered her with these words: amiable, lively; of cheerful, sweet, and hopeful temper; mild, peaceful, and gentle. While none of these words describe health necessarily, none bespeak an ailing or frail person. Jane retained Dr. George Gilmer numerous times during the years 1770-1774, but for whom and for what is not clear. He sold the Jeffersons medicines in the form of pills, tinctures, drops, lotions, and plasters. He sometimes treated slaves on visits and sometimes members of the Jefferson family, and Jane may have been ill. She wrote her will sometime between January 1, 1772, when Thomas married, and September 29, 1773, when she deeded slaves to Thomas. She also acquired and began to record her family history in her Bible in September 1772. Illness was often what motivated people to write wills and otherwise

⁶⁰ Jefferson, Memoirs, 3, 123 n. 2.
settle their estates, and her will coincides with Dr. Gilmer’s period of visits. She may have lived in good health the last two years of her life because his visits to Shadwell ended in 1774. Jane’s probate inventory contains no items of a specifically medicinal or nursing application. The only suggestion of medicine in the entire archaeological assemblage for the Jefferson house was a single fragment of a pale aqua-colored, blown glass vial, of the sort used for medicine in the eighteenth century.61

A single reference to illness comes after her death. Three months following his mother’s death, Thomas reported to his friend William Randolph that Jane died on March 31, 1776, “after an illness of not more than one hour. We suppose it to have been apoplectic.” Her dying was not a lingering illness, but likely something quick like a stroke. Her son Thomas entered in his memoranda for March 31th (his only entry that day): “My mother died about 8. oclock this morning in the 57th. Year of her age.” The family histories speak of Jane as “educated,” able to write “readily and well,” and of

61 Dr. Gilmer (d. 1796) practiced medicine in Williamsburg before moving to Albemarle Co. By 1780 he advertised his apothecary as Charlottesville. His fee book lists 25 entries for Jane Jefferson from 1771 to 1774, 15 of those were visits, four times for slaves, once for a “Miss Jefferson” (could be Elizabeth or Anna Scott). Dr. George Gilmer’s Feebook, 1767, 1771-1775, Gilmer-Skipwith Papers, ViU, Mss 6145. PJAB 53-55; Virginia Gazette,, 27 June 1755; Virginia Gazette (Richmond), 16 Aug 1780. On Jane’s will, see AlCWB 2: 367; “Jane Jefferson's slaves deeded to Thomas Jefferson, September 29, 1773,” FB, 8-9, also MB 346; “Jefferson Family, Bible.” Randall, Jefferson, I: 17; Randolph, Domestic Life, 7.

The vial was found in feature SW649F, a disturbed layer that contained much mid-eighteenth-century house-fire-related material, but with disturbances that included a turn-to-the-nineteenth-century horizon as well. A number of artifacts with medicinal applications appear in the kitchen and slave quarter areas. Drug jars may have been used by slaves, or may have been used by the Jefferson family before being passed to slaves. Regardless, the single vial was the only artifact for the house site. See Kern, Shadwell Report, “Appendix 3 SURFER Distribution Studies,” “Medicinal Related.” See also chaps. 4 and 5, and Jane Jr.’s smelling bottle, below.
“clear and strong understanding.” Jane was also described as “a notable housekeeper.”

Her intellectual pursuits we shall see more below.

Childrearing

Jane’s household changed as her children and their slaves grew, married, moved away or back again. Visiting among these households seems to have been a regular and customary thing. Peter left a household of nine, Jane and eight children, when he died, although Thomas was away at school much of that time and Randolph some of it. During the 1760s three daughters married and one died. Mary was the first to marry, with John Bolling in January 1760. Mary and John Bolling and the slave Nan lived at Fairfields in Goochland County, although they may have lived at Shadwell for a time after their marriage. Thomas recalled that his brother-in-law “planted two [cedars] near the grave of one of his children at Shadwell about the year 1755 (sic) from which all in that neighborhood came.” Jane gave her daughter Mary the slave Fanny in 1766, “In & of consideration of the Natural love & affection which I have and so bear unto my Daughter Mary Bolling also for Divers Other good Causes & considerations me Hereunto moving.”

---

62 MB 415, 415 n. 76. We will see the son’s role in settling the affairs of his mother and siblings in chap. 7.

63 “Extracts from the Diary of General John Hartwell Cocke, of Bremo, Fluvanna County, Virginia,” July 26, 1817. Reprinted in GB 637. The Bollings lived at Fairfields in Goochland County. In 1785 they moved to Chestnut Grove in Chesterfield County, MB n. 32. The Shadwell burial ground is indeed covered with cedars today. See also Kern, Shadwell Burial Ground. AICDB 4: 234. Various aspects of bequests and the movement of both Jefferson and slave families is covered in chaps. 3, 6, and 7.
Eldest daughter Jane next crossed a legal threshold, to majority, though not to marriage. On June 27, 1761 she turned twenty-one and her father's estate was charged “By pd. Mrs. Jane Jefferson Junr. Cash £200 & a Negroe Girl bequeathed her Valued at 55” that same day. Peter had bequeathed a slave girl to Jane, either Chloe or Pat; Jane chose Pat. Although the ownership of Pat changed on paper, it probably altered little the day-to-day workings of the household. Jane Jr., remained at home and so did Pat, each probably performing the same roles they had before Jane's majority, except that by 1768 Pat also had two children, Betty and Sancho. Pat may have had a husband at Shadwell, the father of these children, but his name is not known. Jane never moved away from Shadwell and never married. She died October 1, 1765 at the age of twenty-six. Her estate was probated by the court and the settlement disbursed among her siblings. The appraisers valued her three slaves, Pat, Betty, and Sancho, at £50, £15, and £13, respectively.  

Jane's furnishings do not describe a complete room, so it is likely that she continued to share a room with a sister or two throughout her life. She did not own her own fireplace equipment, nor did she own cooking tools, past those for making tea, which suggests she remained part of the family circle for meals and household activities. The "ring for keys" in her possessions was a marker of the plantation mistress whose job it was to control access to regulated foods and supplies among various household staff. The owner of the key ring could designate who might use it on a given shift. "Carrying the keys" was part of a girl's household training and one that Thomas Jefferson's
granddaughters disliked. They complained about being bored “locking and unlocking the doors” on their day to practice this aspect of housekeeping.65

Jane owned a bed and two bed quilts, a table, a large trunk, a large “half worn portmantean trunk,” three smaller old trunks, and a small box. She had entered into the womanly realm of keeping and drinking tea, and owned “a Large Copper Kettle & Hook,” and a tea chest. She had a spinning wheel, cards, a small work basket, a pair of flat irons, and a large earthen jar. She also owned six books, “an old saddle without a pad,” and a single riding chair, on which the estate paid extra taxes. Like the other Jefferson women, Jane Jr. spent time reading, spinning and working fibers, drinking tea, and riding. She did, however, own a substantial inventory of clothing, more details of which are below. From her brother we know that she took an interest in plants, music, and the outdoors. The only indication of a medical condition is her ownership of “one smelling bottle seal,” but this may also have been for fashion.66 In short, Jane Jr.’s estate reflects the household roles, fashionable pursuits, and intellectual pastimes of elite Virginia women.

Thomas boarded at least part of the year with his teachers, as many young gentlemen did. In the 1750s he lived first with the Rev. William Douglas from 1752 to 1757, then with the Rev. James Maury until 1760. He entered the College of William and Mary in March 1760 and two years later he left the school to read law with George Wythe in Williamsburg. In Williamsburg young Thomas stepped into the embrace of his

---


66 MB 251, 369. Jane Jr., died in 1765 but her estate inventory was dated 1768. AICWB 2: 227, 233.
father's associates and his mother's kin. His arrival prompted a warm welcome from such cousins as Archibald Cary and John and Peyton Randolph. Thomas returned to Shadwell and continued to live there even after he reached majority in 1764. His personal slave Sawney, inherited from his father, probably moved with him to Williamsburg and back. Thomas' major impact on the house must have been the addition of his ever-growing book collection — both legal subjects and general reading — probably to the office where his inherited desk and bookcase and books resided. Thomas also kept plantation accounts. After 1765, executor John Harvie's account-keeping ended. Later Thomas acted legally responsible for Shadwell and his father's estate as well as for the estates of his minor siblings.67

At the age of ten Randolph left home to board with his Lewis cousins at Buck Island, where Benjamin Sneed was their teacher. Randolph lived with the Lewises, possibly to absorb the role of a plantation owner from his uncle in addition to the academic training that Sneed offered. Randolph spent the years from 1762 through 1764 with the Lewises, and possibly longer. He ultimately married his cousin Anna Jefferson Lewis, whom he had known since childhood.68

Martha married Dabney Carr in 1765. The slave Rachel became part of Carr's estate. Carr was Thomas's close friend and now his brother-in-law. The Carrs lived at Spring Forest in Goochland County, but they were at Shadwell in May 1773 when

67 Kimball, Road to Glory, ch. 3; Malone, Jefferson I: ch. 4; Randall, Jefferson, I: 21-22.

68 Harvie I and II.
Dabney died there. The family history reports that he was buried at Shadwell, and Thomas returned from Williamsburg, had his slaves clear land for the graveyard at Monticello, and moved Carr’s body there. Thomas and Dabney had a boyhood pact that the survivor would bury the one who died first at the foot of their favorite oak tree on Monticello Mountain. Thomas served as an executor of Dabney’s estate and arranged for the Reverend Charles Clay to read at his funeral. Martha continued to live at Spring Forest and to visit Shadwell and the homes of her siblings. She lived for a time at Monticello where their uncle looked after her sons’ and daughter’s educations. Although she later moved back to Spring Forest, she died at Monticello in 1811.69

Elizabeth reached majority in 1765 and remained at home. Peter had bequeathed her the slave girl Cate, although she may have taken a maid with equivalent training. She and the slave Little Sall died trying to cross the Rivanna River during the winter of 1774. Elizabeth’s mental capabilities have been questioned and may be the source for speculation about the health and ability of other family members. A family friend wrote: “I have always understood that she was very feeble minded if not an idiot -- & that she and her maid were drowned together while attempting to cross the Rivanna in a skiff.”

Thomas entered in his account book the payment to the Reverend Charles Clay “for performing the funeral service this day on burying my sister Elizabeth.”70

69 TJ settled the account between Clay and Carr’s estate in March 1774. MB Mar. 7, 1774, 370-371. See also chap. 7. Martha and her six children moved to Monticello in 1781. They were back at Spring Forest in 1790. GB n.41-42, MB n. 21, 340, 523, 748.

70 The stronger tradition is the one reported here, that Elizabeth was the weak link. This story appeared in a letter from Wilson Miles Cary to Sarah N. Randolph, n.d., Collection of Mrs. Mary Kirk Moyer, Geneva, N.Y., cited in MB n.370. But TJ’s biographer Sarah Randolph reported that one sister “was rather deficient in intellect,” and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
At age sixteen Lucy married her cousin Charles Lilburne Lewis in 1769 and took her inheritance, which included slaves Catchina and her daughter Phebe. They lived at Monteagle, part of Lewis's father's Buck Island estate, about five miles from Shadwell. Buck Island was the home of Mary Randolph and Charles Lewis Jr., sister and brother-in-law of Jane Randolph Jefferson. Lucy's husband was the brother of the woman who would eventually marry Lucy's brother Randolph.\footnote{MB 144, 438.}

Thus in February 1770, at the time of the Shadwell fire, the regular occupants of Shadwell were Jane, and her children, Thomas, then twenty-six, Elizabeth, twenty-five, and Randolph and Anna Scott, who were fourteen. Other families came on visits and spent time at Shadwell. The requirements for a new house at Shadwell were quite different from the house the family had known there. Jane and two daughters and two sons needed places to sleep and perform their respective daily duties. Jane needed to be able to run her household, Thomas, his law practice, Elizabeth, Randolph, and Anna Scott their roles as students, and daughters and son. Thomas had office space at Shadwell – his accounts of his library and papers relating to his legal practice reveal that his loss from the fire was great. He had already begun clearing and leveling Monticello Mountain and had begun construction on what would be his house there when the fire occurred.\footnote{In May of 1768 Thomas Jefferson contracted to begin leveling for a house at Monticello, on which was begun construction the next year. MB xlv.}
Randolph and Anna Scott were fourteen and Randolph would leave for school at William and Mary the next year.

Jane’s probate inventory reveals some of what was important to her and the family following the fire, if we accept that what she replaced and did not replace is meaningful. If Jane’s inventory describes the whole house, it was indeed smaller than the house the family had known for the previous two decades. Thomas’s daughter Martha repeated the story she heard from her parents about their nighttime journey to Monticello as newlyweds, only to find the fires out in the small brick pavilion that was Thomas’s house there. They decided to stay and make the best of it. “The house that had been fitted up for [Thomas’s] mother’s use after the burning of the Shadwell house was too small for the accommodation of the two families, and was still four miles farther.”

Household Economy

Managing a plantation household was greater than coordinating the activities of a single family – not that the latter is any small feat. The plantation household had a broad and changing membership, and Jane Jefferson was in a position to oversee it closely. The years spent at Tuckahoe between 1746 and 1753 meant mothering nieces and nephews as well as her own children. Some decisions about running the plantation were clearly her own, and others must have been: Peter Jefferson traveled extensively, sometimes for weeks or even months while on duty as a surveyor and public officer in this still-young region of the colony. The account books for the years 1757-1765, kept by John Harvie, executor of Peter’s estate, reveal a few of the more personal family expenditures,

---

73 Papers of the Trist, Randolph and Burke Families [manuscript], 1721-1969, Accession no. 10487, Box 2, University of Virginia.
although most of the entries involve running the plantation. The few documents to which Jane was party during her widowhood were of a legal or financial nature, in which she deeded slaves to a daughter, lent laborers to a son, and sold agricultural products. These reflect the broader economic relationships in which she engaged; the probate inventory taken after her death reflects more personal aspects of her world.

The inventory of Jane’s estate, taken after her death six years following the Shadwell fire, offers a glimpse into what was important to Jane by showing what she reestablished after the loss of the house and its contents. First were the necessities: the beds and blankets; things for preparing, storing, and eating food; tables, chairs, and livestock, although the range of these items and their values indicate they were, for the most part, fine versions of what was available. Then there were the things for craft production, the hackle, brushes, cotton wheel and cotton, and the candlemolds. Jane’s more personal interests can be seen in the “parcel of books,” and a “Large Bible,” in which she recorded her family genealogy following the fire. Jane owned good clothing and a looking glass.74

The three probate inventories from Shadwell, of Peter, Jane Jr., and Jane, also suggest that the Jeffersons considered different types of property as belonging to different family members – and that the estate appraisers were advised of this. The differences may reflect ideas about what appropriately represented the wealth of these wealthy people or ideas about men’s and women’s estates. Jane’s inventory contains things not listed in Peter’s. The appraisal of Peter’s estate included textiles for kitchen and dining,

74 AlCWB 2: 356.
but not for bedroom use. Jane’s includes £10.15 worth of bedroom textiles, including three counterpanes, three blankets, “oznabrig sheets,” rugs and matts. Yet other wealthy men, such as Joshua Fry, had bedroom textiles included in their inventories. Peter’s estate included nothing for spinning or weaving, activities in which the Jefferson women engaged, as evidenced by Jane and Jane Jr.’s inventories and account book entries; yet other men’s inventories include tools for textile processing and production.  

Peter’s inventory is completely silent about clothing, except for some ornaments of military office. Jane Jr.’s inventory provides a substantial list of clothing, “which the administrator was advised not to offer for appraisement but of which he thought himself Pledged to Subjoin an Inventory.” In other words, her clothing was itemized but not assigned a monetary value. Jane the mother specified in her will that all her “wearing apparel” was to go to daughter Elizabeth, but her inventory appraisers did not include her clothing, either by item or by value, with the other contents of her estate. Roughly one-third (46 of 143) of Albemarle inventories included clothing as an item that had value to the estate, most of these for men.  

Certain categories of household objects rarely showed up in inventories. Objects specifically related to childhood such as toys or cradles that may have been in the house when Peter died were absent, and rare in other county inventories. There were no musical instruments included in the Jefferson inventories, though smaller instruments such as


76 Jane Jr.’s estate is AICWB 2: 227. The bequest was not the reason her clothing was eliminated from her estate inventory. The cherry tree desk and bookcase that Peter willed to Thomas was appraised with all the other goods Peter owned. Statistic from AICWB 1and 2.
fiddles appeared from time to time in other Albemarle inventories. Musical skills were part of the training a young lady or gentleman was expected to have—and the Jefferson children did. In fact, a granddaughter described Thomas's violin accomplishments as "gentlemanly proficiency." Their father's ability to purchase luxury goods may be why their violins, violoncellos, and spinets are absent from the documentary record. When parents gave their children pianofortes or other large gifts, they became the property of the child, even while that child lived at home. Accordingly, children's musical instruments do not appear in parent's probate inventories, even if the objects were in the house. The dining room at Shadwell contained folding tables that could be repositioned along the walls when not in use. The dining room was most likely the dancing classroom, music room, and no doubt the room for dancing when theJeffersons entertained.77

Jane was a wealthy individual and a very wealthy woman. The contents of her probate inventory total only £73.1.0, placing her in the second lowest quartile of Albemarle decedents. However, if her estate total is corrected with the value of the eleven slaves she deeded to Thomas in 1773, her estate rises to £623.1.0, making her the 19th wealthiest person in the county during the colonial period. Her clothing was not included in her estate value. Jane Jr., was the next wealthiest woman at £114.15.6,

---

77 Coolidge Letterbook, 36. Both Betty Leviner at Colonial Williamsburg and Susan Borchardt at Gunston Hall have noted in their on-going analyses of probate inventories the pattern of not listing musical instruments. Personal communication, 2001. On the violin, violincello, and spinet, see MB 29. In Albemarle Co., five men owned fiddles or violins and one owned a flute (although this could be a food-related object). Of these six, all but two owned slaves, and all but one had estates over £100 that included at least a few amenities. AJCWB 1: 22-4; AJCWB 2: 20, 26, 105, 141, 181-4.
including her slaves but not her clothing. Jane Jr. was wealthier than 55 percent of all
decedents in colonial Albemarle. The only female rivaling the two Jane Jeffersons may
have been Mary Fry, wife of Joshua Fry; her estate was inventoried but not valued. The
court ordered probate of the estates of only three other women and all of them were in the
lowest quartile of estate value: Elizabeth Massons, £28.14.3; Susanna Ballow, £27.9.0,
and Sarah Fitzpatrick, 10 s. – the value of her woman’s saddle - the lowest valued estate
recorded. None of the inventories of women included clothing in the value of the estate.
None of the three women in the lowest quartile owned slaves. The Jeffersons were the
only women in colonial Albemarle county who had books listed among their property.78

The plantation system required its members to know the boundaries between
master and servant, household worker and laborer. The overseer of the household—Jane
Jefferson--- had to help both family members and slaves learn their roles. The slaves that
Peter Jefferson bequeathed to his children in 1757 became part of each child’s daily
experience. With two exceptions, each Jefferson child was paired with a slave who was
the same sex and just younger than him or herself. By 1762, when the children ranged
from age seven to twenty-two, and their servants from seven to nineteen, Jane charged
the estate for “clothing for the children’s slaves,” a separate charge from the clothes for

78 Jane’s rank at number 19 is greater than 87% of all decedents, n=143. Mary
Fry’s inventory included only better furniture and specialized cooking equipment and no
slaves, livestock, or work tools, suggesting that her retirement was just that. Mary’s
husband Joshua Fry was the 10th wealthiest decedent in Albemarle in this period.
AICWB 1 and AICWB 2; esp. 300 for Fry inventory.
the rest of the plantation labor force.\(^79\) These slave children were well on their way to
learning their specialized roles and the differential treatment they would get as personal
attendants or house slaves. While the plantation culture surely aided in the domestic
training of this combined group of fourteen children, one can only imagine the demands
on Jane and other adult household workers in guiding all these children toward
adulthood, slave children toward servitude, and gentry children toward their roles.
Peter’s attention to family did not stop with his own. The Shadwell quarter system
housed slave families together. This meant that slaves maintained some control over the
raising of their children and some assurance of a spouse at home. For the planter family,
this meant learning to understand and cultivate their slaves’ personal lives within the
plantation, an investment that could bring benefits to the entire community.

In 1760 Jane chose her “sixth,” the portion of slaves allotted to her in the legal
settlement of Peter Jefferson’s estate. Eleven slaves became hers and she was “lent”
three others to “allow the Children were not divided.”\(^80\) Part of Jane’s strategy—as had
been Peter’s—for running this household and this labor force was to maintain the slaves’
own family ties. At least seven of the eleven slaves Jane chose belonged to three families
(Figure 2.2). Probably the parents of the children’s slaves also knew about being
household slaves and they helped train their children for these roles. Jane had learned the
paternalism necessary to be a planter, or, perhaps she knew that this compassionate
method of dealing with her charges would benefit her and her family in the end.

\(^79\) Harvie I: 42. More details of the slave children and Jefferson children in chap.
5.
\(^80\) Harvie II: 10.
Maintaining clothes for themselves, children, and slaves was one of the many regular tasks of the plantation mistress, although investment in dressier clothing for family also incorporated the taste and connections of the planter. Jane and her daughters were spared the job of making clothes for the slaves; account book entries record payments to local women for this, as well as for knitting stockings for the Jefferson children. Jane and her daughters and sons made choices about their wardrobes. The Jeffersons hired tailors John Bell and George Twynman and invested in professionally made garments for the family. The Jeffersons imported cloth from England, India, and Ireland and some was Virginia made. Jane purchased tabby stays for the young ladies, shoes for the girls and young Randolph, and gloves from England. Daughter Jane, who died unmarried in 1765 at the age of twenty-five, left a collection of clothing that included a dozen fashionable gowns, of various silk, chintz, calico, and Virginia cloth, hats, stays, satten shoes, and gold and silver rings, buckles, and buttons. Her estate included also a pattern for another gown of Virginia cloth. Most of the clothing suggests participation in genteel visiting and dining, with one more formal and a few everyday pieces. Jane Jr.'s clothes may reflect the pre-marriage acquisitions of a young lady who, once marriageable, was required "to be clothed more expensively than at any earlier period." Jane the mother specified in her will that "all [her] wearing apparel" was to go to unmarried daughter Elizabeth. Jane, Sr.'s wearing apparel was not specified, but was probably equivalent to what her daughter owned.81

81 On tailors, Harvie 1:23, 28. Jane Jr.'s clothing, see AlCWB 2:227, I thank Linda Baumgarten, Curator of Textiles at Colonial Williamsburg, for her help understanding this list of garments. On clothing prior to marriage, see TJ to Overton Carr, March 16, 1782, Papers, 166-167. On Jane's bequest, see AlCWB 2:367.
Other objects for personal adornment appear in the archaeological collections. Two buckles, one of brass and the other silvered were used to fasten clothing. Wigs were probably part of the elder Jeffersons’ dress, although they are not mentioned in any of the probate inventories. The younger generation wore wigs: Thomas did and in 1770 he made a note to “Get a pr. Curls for A.S. Jefferson ordered to measure.” The eight dressing tables at Shadwell confirm that attention to clothing went beyond merely covering the body. Peter and Jane’s records do not reveal which of them made the decisions about fashionable investments in clothes, but likely Peter made purchases when he was “abroad” in Williamsburg or meeting with friends recently returned from another metropolis. Thomas’s memoranda reveal his role in acquiring fashionable goods for his siblings and his wife and daughters. 82

Young planters and planters’ wives to be needed to learn how to attend to their own appearances and how to read the subtle clues packaged in the fabric, cut, and adornment of clothing worn by others, as John Collinson advised his friend John Bartram upon his impending introduction to Virginia. The quality and fashion of dress of others could offer important information that both daughters and sons needed to help them make judgments about potential spouses. This lesson was not lost on the rising Jefffersons. Thomas revealed these lessons many times in raising nephews and nieces, daughters, and grandchildren. It was his letter to another uncle (and executor) of his nieces where he recognized that the young ladies were required “to be clothed more expensively than at

82 Clothing related artifacts include: SW437A had a cut brass buckle that was double pierced on the cross piece for use on clothing. SW213B contained a cast alloy buckle that had likely been silvered. Kern, Report on Shadwell, Appendix 6. On TJ’s purchase of curls, MB 32. Dressing tables, see PJAB 14; AICWB 2: 41-48.
any earlier period.” In his travels he often purchased clothing for his sisters, daughters, and granddaughters and instructed recipients on the wearing of these gifts. For instance, in a pair of letters written from Philadelphia to his daughter Martha, he described a “kind of veil lately introduced here,” then included the veil and rather complicated instructions for wearing it down over a hat or wearing it up.\(^{83}\) His admonitions to his daughters about their appearance were part of his role as a parent, especially since their mother had died, but his instructions extended beyond neatness and hygiene to fashion. Attention to clothing and appearance was part of the training for young gentry, and males as well as females were involved in the family presentation.

There is no evidence of spinning or other textile production in Peter Jefferson’s inventory, but later documents show that the white women at Shadwell participated in this activity. Jane had a cotton wheel, hackle, brushes, a bag and cotton, and a parcel of spun cotton in her inventory when she died in 1776. In September 1775 Thomas Jefferson paid William Sumpter 12 s. (of 16 s. due) for a spinning wheel. Later that month he sent Jane “20. lb wool in dirt & 4 lb of picked cotton.” The unwashed wool that Thomas sent his mother ties her household production also to the sheep listed in her and Peter’s inventories. When she died, Jane owned “22 Sheep with 8 Lambs” valued at £12/2. In 1757 the family owned only eleven sheep valued at £3.6. Jane had a flax wheel for which her son paid merchant William Sumpter after her death. In 1762, Miss Pattey Jefferson (who was almost sixteen) purchased a “wheel, &c” to pursue her own

\(^{83}\) See chap. 1 on Collinson’s visit. On his niece’s clothing, see TJ to Overton Carr, March 16, 1782, Papers, 166-167. On the veil for Martha, see TJ to MJR, April 17, 1791; April 24, 1791, Family Letters, 78, 79.
spinning. Jane Jr. also had a spinning wheel and a pair of cards. There is no evidence to suggest that money was tight following Peter Jefferson’s death or that the women took on fiber production because of necessity. Spinning was a polite activity for ladies and augmented the family wardrobe, no doubt, but perhaps when it was not perceived as an integral part of the domestic economy it was not included in a man’s list of property.

The wheel purchase for a young lady suggests her coming of age in a craft that was the women’s domain. Young ladies learned these pastimes both as play and as part of their “formal” education. Philip Fithian was amused by the girls at Nomini Hall “imitating what they saw in the great house; sometimes tying a String to a Chair & then run[ing] buzzing back to imitate the Girls spinning.” Fithian also saw the young girls taking sticks and pretending to knit “small round stockings, Garters &c,” or pretending to wash clothes or scrub the floor. The Jefferson daughters learned to knit as well and may have enjoyed this as both a craft and a duty to do well. Much later in their lives, Martha and Lucy involved themselves in knitting stockings for their brother, who was then president of the United States. Thomas’ daughter Martha Randolph, in an apologetic letter to her father, sent stockings to him but feared they would not be to his satisfaction. Martha Carr had tried to send her brother’s stockings out to be made, but Lucy took the stockings home for her and her daughters to make. Except for a few straight pins, all archaeological evidence of sewing at Shadwell occurred in the areas where slaves lived, the kitchen and slave quarter sites. A large iron needle may be evidence of weaving by

---

84 On the wool and wheel from TJ, see MB 406, and 406, n. 36, 415. On sheep, see AlCWB 2: 44, 356. On Pattey’s wheel, see Harvie I: 36.
the Jefferson women, but there is no further documentary or archaeological evidence for this activity at Shadwell.\textsuperscript{85}

A book on brewing and four candlemolds represent traditionally female-centered craft production in Peter’s inventory. The Jeffersons kept the book in the office with other books, but it was likely Jane’s job to brew, bottle, and store beer – or to oversee the daughters and slaves who did it under her direction. Jane’s inventory included a cork screw and a variety of “Carry boys,” bottles, and jugs for brewing or storage. Thomas took stock of the Shadwell cellar in September 1769. It contained at least 250 bottles of alcohol, including rum (85 bottles), Madeira (15 bottles), cider (54 bottles), Lisbon wine (4 bottles [+52 more?]), small beer, and empty bottles, some of which had just been purchased from a Hanover town merchant. In the next month he received sixty gallons of rum from a tavern keeper in Staunton. Jane may have spent that month brewing beer and bottling spirits. In early September the cellar contents included empty bottles: twelve “in possn of Mrs. Jefferson,” and 28 in Thomas’s, and he added “Note this day take out [14] bottles of J. Smith’s for small beer.” On October 2, Thomas counted 434 bottles of alcohol, including 66 bottles small beer and new stock of rum and Lisbon wine, in addition to the Madeira and cider there. Processing other beverages is not mentioned specifically but it remained women’s work and the women who lived at Shadwell had

\textsuperscript{85} Fithian, \textit{Journal}, 189. MJ to TJ, June 19, 1801, \textit{Family Letters}, 205. SW731, where the needle was found, lies about 100’ north of the Jefferson house in the vicinity of the gate to the house yard. Domestic debris in this area likely dates from the destruction of the house and later plowing, but cannot be tied directly to the house. It is further removed from the areas inhabited by slaves, although the needle could also represent the work of Sandy, a slave shoemaker. Kern, \textit{Report on Shadwell}, Appendix 6, for illustration.
experience with it. In 1808 Anna Scott, or Aunt Marks, as she became, visited her niece Martha and Martha’s daughter at Monticello and helped them and Thomas’ butler Burwell bottle wine. They decanted 203 bottles and drew off the contents of a large cask to two smaller ones for safe storage.86

Candlemolds were the only craft item to occur in both Jane’s and her husband’s inventory. Jane kept the candlemolds in the parlor with kettles, scales, and food preparation items, and this was likely where candle-making went on during the cooler months. The four candlemolds in 1757 were worth 5 s., but the four in 1777 were valued at 6 s. Jane’s may have been larger, or simply worth more money at the later date.87

Jane also maintained specialized cooking equipment, tools that had the potential to elevate cooking from mere food production to the level of craft in its preparation and display. In fact, redefining this category, from the labor of food to the craft of presentation changes the way we can talk about this woman’s role. Her most basic task was to provide sustenance, but elevating that to a craft lets the historian talk about it in

86 Jane’s inventory is AICWB 2: 356. For the delivery of rum, TJ paid Will, a slave wagoner who belonged to Mr. Matthews. Shipments from J. Smith may have been empty bottles. Whether he suspected someone enroute of theft, or whether this was his standard procedure, TJ carefully recorded the number of bottles present, broken, or missing in each hamper from Smith. Lisbon wine was generally a white table wine. MB 28, 30, 148-9. On wine at Monticello, Ellen Wayles Randolph to TJ, Family Letters, 352-353. The Jeffersons did not own a still.

87 AICWB 2: 41-48, 356. The appraised values in Jane’s inventory are not the highly-inflated values that came during the Revolution. There is no date when the appraisers made her inventory, just when the clerk entered it into the court records and she is among the last year of pre-Revolutionary values that show up in Albemarle Co. inventories. The inventories entered in the years following Jane’s show inflation, such as that of her brother-in-law Charles Lewis in 1779, in which, for instance, the values assigned to slave children range from £300 and £500.
terms of choices she made rather than drudgery she tolerated. The Jeffersons may have owned tools for basic eating, but what stands out are the amenities they owned for dining. Jane kept chafing dishes, irons, toasters, and ovens in the parlor, separate from the tools in the main plantation kitchen, which points to her attention to the details of finer cooking and food finishing. Like most plantation mistresses, Jane was the keeper of seasonings and expensive foodstuffs: tea, coffee, sugar, pepper, and other spices. She owned the sugar box and bag, the tea basket, the pepper box, and spice mortar. A cruet stand in both inventories suggests the prominent place of seasonings at the dining table, and the presence of a pair of armchairs in the dining room shows the Jeffersons’ adoption of the new fashion of both host and hostess presiding at dinners there. In conjunction with the recent trend toward specialized spaces for dining, the Jeffersons invested heavily in a house, furnishings, utensils, and even food that would help display their status as people of cosmopolitan taste.  

Elaborate cooking demanded a variety of ingredients, unknown to or beyond the time constraints of most Virginia farmers. The Jeffersons kept livestock to provide beef, pork, mutton, dairy, turkey and other poultry, and they could hunt deer and other game, as well as fish. They imported oysters from tidewater. It is possible that the passion for gardening shared by multiple Jefferson children came from their mother, if not both their parents. Thomas Jefferson’s earliest garden book entries reveal that the diet at Shadwell included asparagus, different kinds of peas, celery, Spanish onions, lettuce, radishes, broccoli and cauliflower, cucumbers, English and black walnuts, cayenne pepper — in

---

88 AICWB 2: 41-48, 356. See also chap. 1 on amenities.
short, enough variety for the vegetable-focused diet that Thomas continued at Monticello. Fruits included both hearty and desert fruits: cherries, gooseberries, plums, and strawberries. Thomas, Randolph, and sisters Martha, Jane, and likely others, all shared an interest in plants, seeds, and horticultural pursuits.89

In Jane’s nine years at Dungeness she came to know the gardens there and the family enjoyed horticulture as an intellectual pursuit. Brick walls and “a double ditch of 300 feet square” enclosed Isham Randolph’s gardens. Isham hosted botanist John Bartram on his travels through Virginia, and corresponded with Bartram and his patron John Collinson in their efforts to collect and document plant and animal life. On Bartram’s 1738 travels in Virginia, Isham traveled with him as a guide and lent “his man” to continue when he could not. Isham may have introduced Bartram to Peter Jefferson on this trip. In a 1739 letter to Bartram, Isham apologized: “I wish I could entertain you with an acct. of Some new discovery Since your progress here; but for the want of a penetrating genius in the curious beauties of Nature, I must make it good in assuring you that I am with great sincerity of heart.” Isham and Jane’s entire family must have joined some of these conversations. Isham signed this letter with the note that “my wife & family join in their best respects to you & Mrs. Bartram.” Even after Isham’s death Collinson, corresponded with Jane Randolph to acquire seeds from her.90

89 AICWB 2: 41-48, 356. See entries for 1766, 1767, 1768, GB 1-14. See also chap. 7.


Bartram reported traveling up the north branch of the James River to “a Gentlemans house where my good friend Isham recommended me.” Bartram’s description of the landscape suggests a situation much like Shadwell and the view from
Jane Jefferson was a mother, the guardian, and the guide of privileged, well-connected, white Virginians. She made choices about their education — provided for in her husband’s will—and their training for gentry society. Both sons and daughters could read and write, and Jane paid for dancing lessons, music lessons, good clothes, and the accessories, including a well-trained servant, that one needed to know how to use in order to participate in their world. The boys took their schooling out of the house, but the daughters learned at home. Thus the house also had to accommodate a visiting tutor.

Benjamin Sneed instructed Martha in 1757 and 1758, when she was about ten to twelve. He taught Lucy from 1762 to 1764 when she was ten to twelve. Sneed also taught Jefferson children in 1761, but they were unnamed in the account. Peter’s estate paid £6 a year for Randolph to board with his cousins. Sneed received £1.10 a year for teaching Randolph, £1 for each year teaching Martha, and 13 s. 4 d. for eight months teaching Lucy. In both 1759 and 1760, James Maury received £20 for schooling and board of Thomas Jefferson.91

Monticello Mountain. The gentleman’s house was “at ye foot of ye mountain [he] entertained us civilly. I rose early this morning a little before day with a design to go up to ye top of ye mountain (which is allways my constant practice in all my travails after plants to rise as soon as it light & search all about before breakfast for I cant afford to loos any time) it being about one mile & half & light moon shine I got up to ye top just before ye sun rose where I had ye fines prospect of ye largest Landskip that ever my eyes beheld. A grand view from ye east to ye south & south west all ye land of Virginia as far as sight could reach all seemed as even as ye sea. I seemed to bid adieu to all ye pleasant entertainments of virginia & conversations after I had observed ye sun to rise upon this wide horizon I descended down ye mountain & got my breakfast & parted with my host.” Berkeley and Berkeley, John Bartram, 99, 102.-3, 119-120, 228.

91 There are extant letters written by all of the Jefferson siblings except Jane and Elizabeth. These letters have not been published in any comprehensive volume, unless written to TJ and are included in the Jefferson Papers series. Others are cited in part in works as various as Randolph, Domestic Life, or Daniel Blake Smith, Inside the Great...
Peter’s office contained things that reflected his numerous professional roles, including surveyor, justice, and planter. There were a few books for general reading that likely served the entire household. There was no space that was so specifically female; instead, the activities of Jane Jefferson, as defined above, inhabited parts of a number of rooms. The dining room furnishings reflected both an investment in the type of status display required for Peter Jefferson’s public role within the county and colony, as well as participation in gentry society. The acquisition and display of status objects—the expensive and fashionable equipment for social dining and drinking—was in her purview, and this room reflected her taste and attention to detail. Most likely, it was she who entertained with the fine tea service, but both Jane and Peter presided at their finely appointed table when they had guests.

The parlor is the room to which we could most easily assign Jane as the center of her daily work. This room was furnished for sleeping—it was the best bedroom (Peter’s and Jane’s)—and minor entertaining, but also for small-scale food and drink preparation and finishing, as well as candle making. Cooking on a larger scale was done by slave women in a separate kitchen building a little more than 100 feet east of the main house. Most likely Jane coordinated the movement of food from storage to kitchen and from kitchen to table. In the parlor or in the passage, Jane oversaw and coordinated the work and activities of the slaves who worked in or around the house. The desk in the dining

 house: Planter Family Life in Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake Society, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 1980). Although further study needs to be done, it appears that the older siblings all have a better command of language and are more likely to use standardized spellings than the three youngest siblings. It may reflect the social status to which each married or the attention that each had at home during schooling that may have been more rigorous for the older children than for the younger. Harvie I.
room may have served Jane’s own writing and account-keeping, and account-keeping became a necessary part of Jane’s life, if it had not already been.

Peter’s will included the clause that “all my Family live & be maintained & my Children Educated out of the Profits of my Estate,” and that Jane should have her Division “ascertained and laid out for her.” When Peter died, he bequeathed to Jane “during her Natural Life or Widdowhood the use and profits of the House & plantation whereon I now live.” In addition to the sixth part of the slaves and one third of the cattle, hogs, and sheep, and “two Good serviceable Work Horses,” he willed that she should have and enjoy “all my Houshold Stuff,” with the exception of the desk and bookcase that was to be Thomas’s. In 1760 Jane claimed her allotment of the slaves and also “By Household Furniture deliverd Mrs. Jefferson as pr. Inventory £202.2.6.” By keeping separate the estates of Peter and Jane, they ensured that Jane could enjoy her fortune and that the children’s inheritances would be preserved. Additionally, Jane would dispose of her estate, both goods and slaves, as she saw fit. Like her mother before her, Jane wrote her will to make bequests to her unmarried children. Jane’s will is undated, but she must have written it between the time Thomas married in January 1772 and Elizabeth died in February 1774. Thus, Anna Scott and Randolph received slaves, and Elizabeth received “all my wearing apparel with one good bed an (sic) furniture.” Jane appointed Thomas her executor with the charge to divide everything else equally among all.92

Jane’s probate inventory of 1776 differs from her husband’s of twenty years earlier in a number of ways. First, it is not spatial; the appraisers did not proceed from

---

room to room in their listing, and thus the historian cannot reconstruct from it the house Jane and her family occupied at Shadwell following the destruction of the first house. Secondly, it includes items not listed in her husband’s inventory and leaves out other items. The house where Jane lived following the Shadwell fire was small. Jane’s family was no longer growing—she needed a house for her retirement years.

It is not known where Jane and her remaining family moved immediately after the fire, but archaeological evidence suggests that a new house at Shadwell was built just west of and almost on the remains of the earlier one. A veneer of finer goods from the late third quarter of the eighteenth century presents itself in the statistical artifact distributions for the site. Just west of the brick cellar remains of the Jeffersons’ house is a smaller stone-lined cellar that also has been excavated with each excavation of the main house (Figure 2.3). The builders of this smaller, stone-lined cellar used bricks recovered from the brick cellar to build the stairs to the cellar floor. The reused bricks had been the only evidence that the stone cellar was built later than 1770, but there are no artifacts from its excavations to date it further. However, distribution studies of artifacts across the whole site create a distinct pattern of later-eighteenth-century occupation just to the west of the brick cellar and north of the stone cellar (Figure 2.4). The distribution studies are the first to pinpoint the use of the earlier house site—in its central location—as the site of continued occupation. While the creamware and some finer porcelain suggest more-elite occupation in the 1770s, the 1780s brought the lesser-status pearlware. Following Jane’s death, younger children moved to the homes of older siblings. Shadwell became a quarter farm in Thomas’s plantation system and his overseers or tenants occupied the
house. Thus the general orientation of the plantation remained consistent throughout the eighteenth century, from its use as the seat of an estate to its use as a quarter farm in a larger plantation system.93

Jane's inventory suggests a number of activities, but not the rooms in which they occurred. The "2 pr. Hand Irons" and "2 pr. Tongs Shovel & poker" may come the closest to objects that describe specific architectural features, in this case, two heated rooms. But the contents of the inventory describe areas of activity: for sleeping, dining or other "polite" pursuits, and food preparation and other work. Jane had three bedsteads with bedding (mattresses), and a chaise bed, as well as sheets and blankets for them all. Three chamber pots may have resided beneath the three beds. Two feather beds were valued at £6, while a "Virginia Tick [Bed] Bolster and Pillow" was worth £4.0.10. In Peter's inventory beds ranged from £2.10 to £12, with £6 being about average on the eight beds in the house. Additionally, "3 bedsteads & 2 Cords 13/6" may be bed parts in storage, or space for servants. There were twelve chairs and two tables that were probably for better use. These included three cherry chairs, two walnut chairs and an elbow walnut chair, and five flat-bottomed chairs. It appears the close stool chair was not replaced following the fire, and that chamber pots sufficed.94

Jane's kitchen equipment offered a similar range of cooking possibilities to those she had before the house fire. She had heavy hearth cookware such as a Dutch oven, grid

93 Statistically, the two cellars are holes in the data; that is, there are few or no artifacts in these locations relative to the plowzone data from across entire site. Kern, Report on Shadwell, esp. 52-53, 59, 65-66, and Appendix 3, "SURFER Distribution Studies."

94 AlCWB 2: 41-48, 356.
irons, pots and pot hooks, as well as a spit and rack and camb for roasting, and a frying pan. She also had a "peperbox," spice mortar, and, as before, a stand of cruets for adjusting seasonings. As in the house she shared with Peter, Jane maintained serving wares for various beverages. She had a tea basket and tea, "tea kittle & Trivett," another kettle, and a tea board. She owned coffee, a coffee pott, and sugar and a sugar box.95 Tea pots and cups are not specified, but are likely included in the "parcel China" or "parcel of Old Silver." She had a cork screw, a pair of horn tumblers, the requisite bottles and jugs, but glassware is unidentified. Jane’s table wares included knives and forks, and spoons may be included in the "Old Silver," listed above. Twenty-one plates valued at 44 s. makes them about equivalent to the silver-plated plates in Peter’s inventory, where three dozen plates had a value of 70 s., or twelve soup plates were 24 s.

The two dozen “Earthen plates and bowl” valued at 10 s. may have been creamware, the latest fashionable ware on the English market that became available about the time of the Shadwell house fire. For Jane to replace her dining assemblage with the latest wares was in keeping with the attention the Jeffersons paid to other details of their lifestyle. Yet the plantation was a place of work and a workspace in Jane’s house was just that. It contained two old tables, “Pails Tubs & Box.” Among general tools, Jane owned an ax. Her livestock included 7 turkeys, 22 sheep, 8 lambs, 1 cow and calf, a bull, and a heifer. The inventory does not include her horses.96

95 Jane’s inventory includes mention of sugar, coffee, and tea. Peter’s inventory includes no foodstuffs.

96 Jane Jefferson owned “2 doz. Earthen plates & 1 bowl 10/.” At 25 units (2 dozen + 1), each plate or the bowl is worth .4 s. each or 4.8 d. each. A comparable value for creamware can be found in the estate of Anthony Hay, keeper of the Raleigh Tavern,
Jane conveyed her slaves to Thomas in 1773, so they were not part of the estate to be settled and thus not listed. At various times Jane leased slaves to Thomas and ultimately she deeded them to him. Jane's house at Shadwell, the house "fitted up" for her following the fire, served the same purposes as the earlier Shadwell house. It provided a place to work, to sleep and eat, to dine and entertain, though on a more modest scale than in the bigger house. Like the family house, the retirement house was a place to enjoy polite pastimes such as reading, spinning, and time with her family.

**The Jane Jefferson Image in the American Mind**

Jane is little known from documents, yet historians have sought her and made much of her in their quest to explain her son Thomas, especially his relationships with women. Jane suffered greatly during the twentieth century at the hands of the Momists, psychob historians, psychosexual historians, and the worshipers of the patriarchy—who often left her out of the histories. In the twentieth century, Jane Jefferson has been less-than-celebrated. Somehow in the charge to elevate the mothers of the founding fathers, Jane, instead, fell. Jane Jefferson stands as the often-maligned mother with whom her son Thomas just could not relate. Historians have evaluated his move to Monticello as a rejection of her world at Shadwell, his birthplace and her home until her death in 1776,

even though he chose to live with her for seven years beyond his majority. Yet the
family remembrances of Jane and the nineteenth-century biographers of Thomas
Jefferson who relied on those remembrances present Jane in glowing terms, suggesting
that in her own time she was revered.

offers the best insight into the twists and turns of interpreting Thomas Jefferson and
hence his ancestry. In 1909 William Thornton proposed that Thomas Jefferson was
composed of the “plebeian red [blood] of Peter,” and the “aristocratic blue of Jane,”
thereby establishing an oppositional relationship between Peter and Jane, the two sides of
their son. As Peterson points out: “The tendency around 1900 was to emphasize the
‘backwoodsman’ side of [Thomas Jefferson’s] heritage; then, with the recognition of
Monticello a quarter century later, the emphasis shifted to the ‘aristocrat.’” Marie
Kimball’s 1943 *Jefferson: the Road to Glory*, offered the first scholarly revision that
Thomas Jefferson came from prominent, propertied ancestors on both sides of his family
line, and this has become entrenched in only some of the *academic* literature on
Jefferson. Yet the mythological power of the frontier Jefferson continues to permeate
*popular* literature, including children’s books, plays, and movies. The lusty
backwoodsman has been a more acceptable revolutionary hero than his opposite, a prim
and grand lady. Historians who have favored one side of this have done so at the expense
of the other.97

Foundation purchased Monticello to open as a museum and “shrine” in 1923. Dumas
Those historians who see conflict between Thomas and Jane Jefferson base their arguments on a number of circumstances. One is that the extant references to Jane in Thomas’ writing are perceived to lack affection, although there is evidence that Thomas burned his correspondence with her, just as he later burned letters between him and his wife. He was careful with intimate correspondence and more has been made of it than necessary. The remaining accounts are just that, accounts, keeping separate the charges and debts for each plantation to facilitate bookkeeping, and in a way, a clever tool to prevent the younger generation from bearing the charges that could be assumed by the parents’ estate.98 In his 1954 book, The Head and Heart of Thomas Jefferson, John Dos Passos used the word “frigid” to describe Thomas and Jane’s relationship, a term that by the 1950s had become associated with sexual dysfunction, especially in women. Dos Passos suggested that Thomas’s “scanty references” to his mother “may well betoken real dislike.”99 Dos Passos planted a seed that other writers and historians cultivated.

I. For the context in which Marie Kimball’s book was received, see Carl Becker’s glowing review in American Historical Review, Vol. 49, No. 1. (Oct., 1943), 109-111. The backwoods v. aristocrat was a popular Colonial Revival theme and showed up in works such as David Lloyd’s 1940 film, The Howards of Virginia. One scene shows the [male] patriot’s mother, a proud woman sitting in the shadows in her rocking chair, keeping distant from the excited talk and rustic activities of the rest of the family around their cabin.

98 See also chap. 7.

99 See the OED for the career of the word frigid in regards to sexual interest and its 20th-century connotation as a “problem” that was particularly female. Dos Passos, Head and Heart, 75-76. On page 76 Dos Passos enters part of Jane Jr.’s inventory as the entirety of her mother’s.
A second circumstance that has led historians to interpret Jane and Thomas' relationship as cold is the misogynist strain in many of the early entries in Thomas' literary commonplace book. This has been interpreted as the "inescapable suggestion" that Jane Jefferson was "the implied antagonist of these unique tirades." According to Kenneth Lockridge, Thomas' frustration was strongest in his teen years when his mother was in control of the household and he was denied access to patriarchal resources, what should have been "his first exercises of masculinity." Jack McLaughlin credits Thomas Jefferson's decision to build his own house on Monticello Mountain as a "conscious desire to escape from the rule of his mother and the crush of too much family in too little space." While there is evidence for the too little space, there is little evidence that the rule of his mother drove Thomas' action, unless we consider the normal adolescent response to growing up and wanting to establish oneself.100

The recent celebrated biography by Andrew Burstein echoes the twentieth-century trend of casting Jane and Thomas's relationship into question by looking at the spatial arrangement of their final resting places. He writes of the Monticello graveyard: "It seems of more than passing significance that Jefferson's mother, who died in 1776, lies well off to the side of this planned configuration, remote from the family circle, while boyhood friend Dabney Carr (d. 1773) and Jefferson's sister Martha (d. 1811), Carr's widow, lie much closer." Burstein's analysis is undone by simple chronology and the

100 Lockridge, Sources, 69-70, 75, 80, 121 n. 8-9. Lockridge credits Fawn Brodie with the germ for this interpretation, and Jack McLaughlin with the interpretation of the literary notebooks. Brodie, Jefferson; McLaughlin goes on to say that by building his own home, TJ could create a "womblike place of warmth, comfort, and love," Jefferson and Monticello, 46-51.
fact that Thomas’s plan was never executed. Jane Jefferson, who died in 1776, was the second burial in the graveyard, after Dabney Carr (d. 1773), and six years later Martha Jefferson (d. 1782) joined them, on the opposite side of Carr from his mother-in-law. Martha, “Carr’s widow,” as Burstein calls her, was also Jane Jefferson’s daughter, so her position represents a family group with Jane as well. Thomas Jefferson’s formal plan for the burial ground was never put in place.  

Even an advocate of material culture must admit that it may be difficult or even impossible to use artifacts to decipher the complex relationships between a mother and son two and a half centuries ago. Yet the material culture of Shadwell nonetheless shows that, following her husband’s death, Jane Jefferson carefully attended to the physical and social world her children would inhabit. Shadwell represented gentry Virginia, a place where manners and social ritual mattered, and Jane Jefferson was the agent who procured these social tools for her children. Certainly parents can hand children material wealth and social opportunity without also handing them love and affection, but family histories and the legacy of family ties suggest this was not the case at Shadwell.

Nineteenth-century stories about Jane Jefferson are glowing, as the style of biography tended to be in that period. Henry S. Randall culled stories from Thomas Jefferson’s granddaughters to write about Jane:

She was an agreeable, intelligent woman, as well educated as the other Virginia ladies of the day, of her own elevated rank in society --- but that by no means implying any very profound acquirements --- and like most

---


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
of the daughters of the Ancient Dominion, of every rank, in the olden
time, she was a notable housekeeper. She possessed a most amiable and
affectionate disposition, a lively, cheerful temper, and a great fund of
humor. She was fond of writing, particularly letters, and wrote readily and
well.”

Ellen Coolidge, granddaughter of Thomas Jefferson, supplied some of the earliest family
history in letters she wrote to Randall answering his queries for his biography. Coolidge
wrote that Mrs. Jane Rogers Randolph, the wife of Isham, mother of Jane Randolph
Jefferson, was “a stern and strict lady of the old school, and feared and little loved by her
children.” She went on to report that Mrs. Jefferson (as she called Jane Jefferson) was
“mild and peaceful by nature, a person of sweet temper and gentle manners.” Sarah
Randolph, herself a descendant, related that her great grandfather’s “mother, from whom
he inherited his cheerful and hopeful temper and disposition, was a woman of a clear and
strong understanding, and, in every respect, worthy of the love of such a man as Peter
Jefferson.”

With a single exception, each of Peter and Jane Jefferson’s children who had
children named a daughter “Jane,” (Figure 2.5). Mary and John Bolling’s third daughter
was Jane, following Martha, Mary, and sons. Thomas and Martha Jefferson’s second
daughter was Jane Randolph; their first daughter was named for her own mother Martha.
Martha and Dabney Carr’s first daughter was Jane Barbara. Lucy and Charles Lewis’

---

first daughter was Jane Jefferson. Randolph and his wife Anna Jefferson Lewis had only one daughter, but she was named for Randolph’s twin sister Anna Scott (who never had children). Lucy also named a daughter for her sister Anna Marks, Anna Scott’s married name. Of the four children who bore sons, only Martha used the name Peter. Other names of siblings, grandparents, and family reverberate through the next generation in homage to the important people and connections already in the family. These names include Martha (3 uses), Mary (3), Lucy (3), Thomas (2), Isham and Isham Randolph, Field, Randolph, Elizabeth, and Lilburne. There is no denial of family in the making of these families.

Thomas Jefferson buried his mother at Monticello, in the graveyard begun three years before when his childhood friend Dabney Carr died. He paid the Reverend William Clay to read at her funeral, and had her burial marker inscribed: “Jane Randolph, wife of Peter Jefferson. Born in London 1720 – Died at Monticello 1776.” This inscription is the only suggestion that she died other than at Shadwell. Whether she in fact moved up the mountain in her final days, or whether her son now thought of Shadwell as part of his Monticello estate is unclear. What is clear is that in his mind they were part of the same household. Thomas’ only entry in his memorandum book that day read: “[1776 Mar.] 31. My mother died about 8. o'clock this morning in the 57th year of her age.” Other matters of business did not take his attentions that day. In April 1777 Thomas paid Rev. Charles Clay for “preaching my mother’s funeral sermon 40/.”

103 MB 415, 444.
responsibility for his mother's estate as well as looking after his youngest sister and brother, half a year from their majority.

Thomas acted as legal guardian as well as caretaker, companion, and advisor to his siblings and their children following their mother’s death and throughout the rest of their lives. His sister Anna Marks lived (and died) at Monticello and was a great favorite of her brother’s daughters and grandchildren. Sister Martha Carr was buried in the Monticello graveyard and her children spent much time at Monticello. (Her sons Peter and Samuel Carr were the nephews most often blamed for fathering Sally Hemings’ children by those seeking paternity other than Thomas Jefferson’s.)

Lucy Lewis was visited by Thomas’ daughters and granddaughters, who kept their grandfather supplied with news of the Lewis family. Thomas and Randolph exchanged letters and agricultural products, and the younger sought the older brother’s advice on numerous occasions. Family letters show that the grandchildren of Thomas and his siblings knew and held affection for each other. Family ties were strong and show that close family commerce was a regular and expected part of the Jefferson’s social landscape. We will revisit this theme in a later chapter. For now it shows that family ties were established early and deeply, between parents, siblings, and generations. If Jane’s charge in life was in creating a caring and involved family, she created a lasting legacy.

---

104 The post-Shadwell relationships of the siblings are explored more fully in chap. 7. The Carr brothers’ paternity was ruled out by the 1999 DNA studies of the descendants of Sally Hemings. Fraser D. Neiman, "Coincidence or Causal Connection? The Relationship between Thomas Jefferson’s Visits to Monticello and Sally Hemings's Conceptions," WMQ, 3d series, LVII, no. 1 (Jan. 2000), 198-210.
Figure 2.1. Both Jane and Peter Jefferson moved to various homes along the James River, moving west at almost the same pace as the newly forming counties.
1760 Janr. 5 x

Pursuant to the Will of Peter Jefferson & at the Request of his Widow Jane Jefferson divided the Slaves belonging to the said Estate & allowed her her Share being one Sixth part Viz:

- Squire aged abt. 30 years Valued at £60
- Sampson 30 35
- Sall 35 45
- Cain[Lucinda?] her Child 10
- Belinda 23 55
- Suckey her Child 14
- Casar 12 45
- Little Salley 8 35
- Fanny Myrtillas Child 14
- Jesse 5 25
- Aggey 3 17

Note that the following Slaves being lent to Mrs. Jefferson to allow the Children were not divided Viz Myrtilla aged abt. 25 years Valued at £50 Phil 19 year old £45 Jupiter 16 year old £45 90--

Families among the eleven slaves Jane chose in 1760.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sall</th>
<th>Belinda m. Squire</th>
<th>(Myrtilla)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucinda</td>
<td>Suckey</td>
<td>Fanny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casar</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Peter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Salley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jupiter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undetermined relationships:
- Sampson
- Jesse
- Aggey
- (Phil)

Names in parentheses are slaves not owned by Jane but still on the plantation and also belonging to these families. Myrtilla’s son Peter belonged to Randolph, who was still at home, which may be why Jane requested Myrtilla to stay.

Figure 2.2. Jane’s sixth part of the Shadwell slaves (above, Harvie II: 10) and the family groups among them.
Figure 2.3. Archaeological plan of Shadwell cellars. The large brick cellar (to right) and porch posts (below) belonged to the Jefferson house that burned in 1770. The smaller stone cellar to the west (left) post dates the brick cellar – bricks from the first house were reused to build the stairway in the stone cellar. The surface distribution of status goods from the later 18th century points to the stone cellar as part of the house built for Jane Jefferson following the fire (see Figure 2.4).
Figure 2.4. Surface distribution of artifacts suggesting location of post-1770s house, with peak of activity just to west and north of earlier house. The map shows porcelain (both Chinese and European), which continued to be fashionable during Jane's era at Shadwell. Various types of porcelain were available during the entire Shadwell period, yet the statistical distribution of porcelain was the first suggestion of post-fire elite domestic activity in this area of the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary and John Bolling</td>
<td>Thomas and Martha Jefferson</td>
<td>Martha and Dabney Carr</td>
<td>Lucy and Charles Lewis</td>
<td>Randolph and Anna Jefferson (Mitchie Prior)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Jane Barbara</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>Isham Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Jane Jefferson</td>
<td>Thomas Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Jane Randolph</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Isham</td>
<td>Robert Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archibald</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>James Lilburne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Lucy Elizabeth</td>
<td>Anna Marks</td>
<td>Anna Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Dabney</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>(John)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Lucy Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Lucy Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.5. Naming patterns of grandchildren of Jane and Peter Jefferson.
CHAPTER 3
PLANTATION BUSINESS: PETER JEFFERSON AT HOME

In 1757 Peter Jefferson died and, by his own request, his family buried him at
Shadwell. Samuel Cobbs, a local carpenter, built a coffin for Jefferson, for which he was
paid 10 s. 6 d.. Cobbs worked on Jefferson’s mill at Shadwell in previous years and also
witnessed Jefferson’s will when it was registered in the county will book. James Maury
received £2 for speaking at Jefferson’s funeral. Reverend Maury was parson of
Fredericksville Parish and became the tutor of young Thomas Jefferson (and, in 1763, the
champion of “The Parson’s Cause”). Captain Charles Lewis procured sugar for the
funeral at the expense of £2.6.. Lewis was Jane and Peter’s brother-in-law and had
various family and business relationships with the Jeffereons. Someone in the household,
probably the slave cook or housekeeper, followed Jane Jefferson’s orders and used the
sugar to produce between 35 and 100 gallons of punch or other drink for guests who
attended the funeral or stopped to pay their respects at Shadwell.¹⁰⁵ This event not only

¹⁰⁵ TJ’s granddaughter Septimia Anne Randolph Meikleham reported hearing
that PJ requested burial at Shadwell, and wrote: “After Mr. Jeffereons death the grave
was lost sight of an now it cannot be found.” If the grave had a marker it was gone by
the nineteenth century. See Meikleham, “Everyday Life at Monticello,” Mss 4726-a
Randolph-Meikleham Family Papers, 1792-1882. ViU.

Jarratt tells us that forty s. or £2 was the legal fee set by the church for a funeral.
Jarratt, Life, 57. Harvie I: 5, 28, 30. A number of recipes in The Virginia House-wife
use the ratio of a pound of sugar, brown or white, per gallon of liquid for brandies and
cordials. The sum of £2.6 would have purchased about 100 pounds of brown sugar or
about 35 of white sugar, suggesting these same quantities in gallons of punch were on
marked the end of Peter Jefferson’s life: it also served to extend his largess from beyond
the grave to make yet one more statement about his family’s ability its display its wealth
and social prowess.

The funeral preparation was a microcosm of Peter Jefferson’s life. Both involved
the work of slaves, of skilled local craftsmen, of educated professionals, of high-ranking
relatives and fellow office holders, of his family, and of an unnamed populace who
helped reinforce the intangible but coherent benefits and identity brought of status. Peter
Jefferson’s many business and personal alliances provide an interesting map of how one
person’s or family’s associations connect them across a range of social and geographic
settings. Just what was Peter Jefferson’s business? He was a planter and he was a
surveyor. He served on the church vestry and had a family. He was a slave owner, mill
owner, and public official. In short, he fulfilled varied roles that identified him publicly
and professionally and ensured his own status and that of his family. His business, social,
and family connections were inextricably intertwined.

Furthermore, Jefferson’s involvements widely affected the community around
him. His family’s desire for fine consumer goods and clothes exposed others in the
community to these things, and also provided work for neighbors who could sew, weave,
or tailor. His agricultural investments supported the families of overseers, carpenters,
wagoners, and canoemen, as well as one of the largest populations of slaves in colonial
Albemarle County. His mill provided a service to small planters or farmers who could

especially 213-216. Estimates on sugar quantities from York County Wills &
Inventories 22, 1771-1783, p. 337-341, from file, “Williamsburg Inventories in the
never have afforded the expense of such an enterprise and so he affected the agricultural ecology and economy of the region. His ability to extend credit ensured that many of those around him were beholden to him. Jefferson invested in the new county seat, both in his service as a justice and as a landowner there who could lease a parcel for an ordinary to supply beds and drink and to profit from those who came to court. As a public official and perhaps as a friend, he hosted native Americans traveling to Williamsburg for official business with the colonial government. These visits enlivened plantations and brought revenue to the owners of ordinaries and taverns along the way. His surveying and partnership in land companies not only changed the fortunes of his fellow investors, but affected the lives of those living on and moving to land newly mapped and entered into the public consciousness. Peter Jefferson profited from his many and varied associations; that was the nature of his business.

Contemporaries remarked on the particular traits that identified Virginia’s elite and historians have pondered Virginia’s colonial gentry since. Charles Sydnor, among others, discussed the authority of the revolutionary generation as a product of the many and varied roles that young planters inherited from their powerful fathers. Eugene Genovese and others defined hegemonic power of paternalism, a system based on both absolute right and the ideals of Christian charity. Bertram Wyatt-Brown explored the culture of honor and how it defined gentility in the South. Timothy Breen examined the gentry as planters, whose common experience in tobacco production and debt laid the foundations of their culture. Rhys Isaac prompted consideration of the eighteenth-
century idea of "liberality," the condition by which a gentleman was free from material worries, from the servitude of others, from any question about his honor, and free to explore higher learning, all of which made him free to "undertake responsibilities in the community at large." Peter Jefferson was one of the gentry, however we define them and measure their influence. Their power manifested itself in exchanges as mundane as buying shoes for slaves or selling corn, or as privileged as purchasing land with a bowl of punch. My interest here is in identifying the connections through which gentry power spread and the social and material structure by which it was maintained. The social web only begins to suggest the endlessly overlapping realms of influence within colonial Virginia.

It is barely possible to separate the business of gentry such as Peter Jefferson into personal or private versus public realms. For the purposes of this study, I will separate them, though the distinction is for our use, not the Jeffersons': they would not have recognized so strict a division between these roles. Chapter three focuses on the personal business of Jefferson, the purchases and small mercantile exchanges that reveal the prosperity of his family's home and plantation, that facilitated neighborly relations, and that met the responsibilities of family and friend, sometimes as investments. It is the agreements between family and friends that have the most obvious overlap with Jefferson's public roles, both in the coincidence of names involved and in the benefits to

---

both individual and public bodies. The public business, which I explore in chapter six, includes that which involved greater-than-local exchange and appointment or election.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Business</th>
<th>Public Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td><strong>Colony</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Official host to Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large Landowner &amp; Slaveholder</strong></td>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantation</td>
<td>County Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit to locals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord (at courthouse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Obligations to Family and Friends:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executor of estates, accounts, guardianship</td>
<td>Vestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Investments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Companies,</td>
<td>Land Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Development</td>
<td>Town Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Categories of personal and public business of Peter Jefferson.

Peter Jefferson left no self-reflective letters or diary, no self expression of his own determination, other than his Last Will and Testament. The records he left are of business: of accounts charged and paid, of requests fulfilled, of shipments made. There are few entries that challenge the impression of successfully closing a transaction. We know this Jefferson from work completed: from maps he drew, from offices he served, from the family he fathered. The slaves on his plantation labored and reproduced. His

wife bore a goodly number of children who survived childhood and grew up learning their lessons. Despite the fact that his children were all minors when he died, they successfully claimed their bequests and carried out their father’s legacies. Jefferson’s backwoods exploits fell into the category of brave adventure, not mishap, and became the foundation of family lore. The family tragedy of losing two infant sons was all too familiar in this era, and the fire that destroyed the family home occurred fourteen years after his death. All of this gives the impression of a very orderly world, and there is little evidence otherwise during Peter Jefferson’s lifetime. About the only threat to this order was an account of an unruly slave who was dealt an iron collar before running away. Contemporaries fretted about ungodly neighbors or the proximity of the French and their “Savage” allies, but Peter Jefferson did not leave such a record. His name is paired with other successful planters whose power came from their ability to deal equally in the realms of public service and private speculation. He pales only in comparison to his very famous son, the author of most of what we know about the father.\footnote{On the runaway slave, see \textit{VG}, Hunter, November 7, 1751, no. 45. There is another story that challenges the myth of the eminently successful PJ. Biographer Henry Randall reports that Archibald Cary was “at mortal feud with Colonel Peter Jefferson---as dauntless and unbending an antagonist as himself---at the time of [PJ’s] death.” PJ and Cary were married to cousins, both wives were daughters of a son of William Randolph of Turkey Island. Cary lived at Amphill in Chesterfield County. He appears in PJ’s account book for business of an unremarkable nature. Cary and TJ became friends in Williamsburg. I can find no other sources for this story and no explanation. Its sum total is in Randall, \textit{Jefferson}, 21-22, TJ’s other early biographers do not repeat it as they do many of the family stories.} Power

Peter Jefferson was charged with both extensive power and responsibility, and there is no evidence that he squandered either. Jefferson seemed to take these charges
seriously, or at least there is little to contradict the record of his attention to both his
privilege and his role in preserving it. Surely Peter Jefferson's power was to the
detriment of many lives, including those of slaves owned by him and others, and of many
native Americans whose landscape forever changed after it was mapped and claimed by
Jefferson and his colleagues. His role in the misfortunes of these two groups in particular
is implicit in his place in this society whose structure defended the legal and property
rights of Anglo-Virginians. But Peter Jefferson also held and commanded power that
he did not wield in any negative way that is evident from the existing documents. Rhys
Isaac defined power as "the capability of determining the actions, even the destinies, of
fellow members of society and is most generally institutionalized in the control of valued
resources and the distribution of the products of labor." The effect of a wealthy planter
on the local economy had many implications for those of lesser means who lived nearby.
Perhaps influence is a more subtle term for power in this sense. That Peter Jefferson's
influence in early Albemarle County was broad is unarguable. That his power spread
beyond local bounds is clear.

Peter Jefferson's power was manifest on many scales. Some of his power lay in
his command of land and labor, capital resources that gave him direct say over people he
owned, people he hired, and people affected by what he did with his real property. His
wherewithal created markets were there had been none, demanded craftspeople where
there had been wilderness, and required the participation of many in his neighborhood.

108 The Marxist view that unequal power relationships are inherently negative is
not what I am exploring here. The power wielded by Jefferson and his peers is
undeniable. My focus is what the historical record shows about how they used and
maintained their power.
More than just deference to a wealthy landowner, locals depended on Jefferson’s success because it was part of their own economic landscape. Some of his power came from the associations he had with others like him, wealthy planters, slaveowners, and family members who enjoyed the benefits of each other’s investments. It is hard to measure the social capital of Peter and his family and their many peers, but it is not hard to see the influence they had. Political power will wait until chapter 6.

Land and Labor

Organization of the Plantation

Peter Jefferson owned substantial quantities of land for planting, but he also invested in land that had a potential return for timber, copper, limestone, access to water power, or resale to settlers. He was a land speculator as much as he was a planter. This chapter is only about the plantation lands - those his slaves and overseers worked for agricultural profits (Figure 3.1). In his personal papers, Peter referred to his lands by location: “my lands on the Rivanna River” or “my lands on the Fluvanna River,” occasionally by the name of an overseer, and in only one instance by a name for the land, although the Fry-Jefferson map refers to both “Shadwell” and “Snowdon” in 1751. Estate executor John Harvie used a mix of farm names and overseer names in his accounts to keep his records straight. He used Shadwell, Mountain Quarter, Snowdon, and North River, as well as names of overseers to keep his records for the Jefferson lands. Thomas Jefferson used another set of names for his land and fields and it is not always possible to reconcile the names that the elder and the younger Jefferson and John Harvie assigned to the land. Planters divided their land into farms or quarters to facilitate

---

organizing both crops and workers across large holdings. For Shadwell the records about the crops and about the workers tell us about the land divisions.¹¹⁰

Like most large plantations, the Jeffersons' enterprise at Shadwell required various kinds of skills and labor, including the sixty-some slaves who Jefferson owned, two-to-eight hired overseers, and a hired miller who made up the regular work force. Much of their work was directly involved in crop production or care of livestock, but it also included carpentry, sewing, weaving, shoemaking, cooking for themselves or the planters, tending the planters as household and personal servants, and tending their own families. Other skilled craftspeople occasionally augmented the everyday labor force. Hired workers included blacksmiths, carpenters of varying specialties, shoemakers,

¹¹⁰ I use Shadwell to indicate Jefferson's entire agricultural enterprise, that is, his entire plantation holdings. The land comprising the home quarter is also called Shadwell and I use Shadwell site or Shadwell tract or Shadwell quarter when I am referring only to that piece of land. I use TJ's field and land names freely in this section because they are the most precise about specific properties as we know them today. Shadwell and Snowdon are the only names both TJ and Harvie used. Where PJ or Harvie's citation is apt I use that name. Certain properties, North River among them, I have been unable to locate.

There is not a definitive answer to how much land Peter Jefferson actually owned. Marie Kimball catalogued PJ's land acquisitions and patents: over 25,000 acres passed under his eye, if only his portions of joint ventures are added. With other investors PJ speculated in at least 71,770 acres of land. Neither of these figures includes the 800,000 acres granted (but not realized) to the Loyal Land Company. Henderson, "Doctor Thomas Walker and The Loyal Company," 88; Kimball, Road to Glory, 309-311; see also chap. 4. PJ referred to "New Quarter" in 1753. AI-CWB 2: 32-34; PJAB, 19

The Harvie accounts are more detailed than PJ's accounts for PJ's plantation, just as PJ's accounts for William Randolph's plantation have very specific detail. Executors were more careful with unfamiliar records and accounting that had to be made clear to the court as part of the public record. The Harvie accounts for Shadwell have greater detail about crop yields and clothing for slaves, for instance, than PJ's records. I have assumed that the operations of the plantation changed little during the period of executorship. See also below.
people to cut, sew, or knit slave clothing, people to knit or tailor planters' clothing, and carters and boatmen to roll or float tobacco to markets.

On the most profound level, Peter Jefferson's wealth gave him power over the lives of the more than sixty slaves who he owned during his lifetime. As a whole, the Shadwell slaves' world was materially richer because of Peter Jefferson's wealth, as we shall see in chapter four. In so large a group, everyone still knew everybody else's name, but no doubt hierarchies formed within the group, sometimes reinforced by the roles assigned them by their owners. The slaves belonging to the Jeffersons had certain status among themselves and within the greater African American community. Shadwell slaves had the opportunity to meet and share skills with carpenters, tailors, or shoemakers hired by the Jeffersons. They also met and heard news and stories from hired laborers, from the slaves who came with Jefferson guests to Shadwell, and from travelers who stopped at Shadwell because it was a planter's seat and therefore offered the promise of hospitality. Like all slaves, their well-being depended upon the charitable conduct of the Jeffersons and their agents and on the continued good fortune of their owners. In the end, however, each slave was an investment, and while Peter and Jane Jefferson acknowledged the importance of the slaves' own families, the Jefferson family took precedent and investments were disbursed for the benefit of the estate.111

The major divisions in the 1757 slave list represent three divisions of Peter Jefferson's plantations in terms of location, land, and labor organization. The three divisions were Shadwell, other Rivanna River land, and Snowdon (Table 3.2). The five

---

111 The lives of slaves at Shadwell are explored in depth in chapters four and five.
subgroups within the three locations represent quarter sites that included the slaves' houses and domestic areas. Within the first two parts of the list, slaves appear four times in the order of men, then boys, women, and lastly, girls, divisions that may represent households or another way of organizing domestic units. Quarter I was at Shadwell. Quarters II-IV were on other Rivanna River lands. The last group, Quarter V, listed the slaves who lived on Peter Jefferson’s land on the Fluvanna River (Snowdon) and were inventoried separately from the body of Jefferson’s estate. Other documentary material suggests that the quarter groups supported family ties as part of the organizational strategy for keeping slaves at Shadwell.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{112} Other Rivanna River land includes what became Monticello and the rest of TJ’s patrimony. Inventory appraisers entered subtotal lines that marked these three divisions. AICWB 2: 45, 48.

The labels Quarters I-V are my own way of distinguishing the groups in the list. For consistency in this study, I have used “quarter” to refer to the five groups of slaves as indicated by the 1757 inventory. I have used “quarter site” or “site” for the domestic area that included houses or yards. I have used “house” or “building” in talking about the structures in which the slaves lived. See chap. 4.

Adult or childhood for slaves was established as follows, based location within the list, on the occasional specification of “a boy” or “a girl” following a person’s name, and the valuation given by the appraisers. Unless the appraisers specified, I decided a person was probably an adult male if they were listed at over £32, although some boys were valued at just under £33. Adult women generally were valued at over £30 and girls generally under that figure. Exceptions within these criteria are sometimes accountable to advanced age or infirmity.

In addition to the groupings made in Peter Jefferson’s will and inventory, a few lists that indicate relationships survive from Jane Jefferson’s years as plantation mistress. Additionally, Thomas Jefferson’s extensive \textit{Farm Book} lists provide information about family relationships among the slaves who remained at Shadwell or Monticello. A bit of negative evidence can be gained from those missing from the \textit{Farm Book}, in suggesting which slaves went to Randolph Jefferson’s estate when he and his older brother divided the Shadwell slaves as per their father’s directions. There are few post-Shadwell references to Randolph’s slaves by name, however, and nothing to tell us who may have died prior to the brothers dividing the estate. While it may seem naïve to pair up the adult male and female slaves into “families,” the fairly even sex ratio and the distribution...
Table 3.2. Shadwell slaves listed by quarter (I-V) and sex (m=men, b=boys, w=women, g=girls), from 1757 inventory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>w</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>home quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(location undet.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Monticello?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(location undet.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Snowdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of slaves among the quarters represents different roles slaves had on the plantation, but the agricultural enterprise engaged everyone to some degree. Slaves of all levels, whether they tended babies or tobacco, lived with their work and were rarely far from it night or day. At least eleven buildings housed slaves and their tools. Archaeology recovered information from two of the areas where slaves lived at the home quarter at the center of the plantation and one related site on the south side of the Rivanna River that was for field hands (see table 3.3). The plantation kitchen building or buildings housed also slaves. Archaeology provides some record of the kitchen site and at least two buildings to the east of it, on what is referred to here as the home quarter site. In outlying areas, the inventory has three separate entries that include field tools and cooking equipment, evidence of at least three quarter sites, two of which may have had two buildings. Additionally, on the Jeffersons' Fluvanna River lands seven slaves lived together in a single building.

of the adults among the quarters suggests that this is a valid means of describing their social structure.
On the Shadwell ridge
kitchen (2 rooms or buildings)(I) Sites buildings
main quarter: 2 buildings found (A), 4 possible (I) 1 2

Outlying Rivanna River land
three quarter sites, four buildings est.(I/A) 3 4-5

Fluvanna River:
1 building (I) 1 1

Totals 6 11

(I) indicated by inventory (A) indicated by archaeology

Table 3.3. Number of houses per slave quarter.

Although only a few slaves can be directly associated with specific tools or skills, the tool inventory of each quarter site suggests some of the activities that engaged its residents. The home quarter housed slaves trained as domestic and personal servants, cooks, horse grooms, and craft producers. All the sites had agricultural tools: tobacco hoes were nearly ubiquitous. Each site also had axes or saws for cutting trees or wood and a grindstone for maintaining tools. The three outlying sites specialized in their non-tobacco activities. Slaves in one outlying quarter drove oxen, possibly to clear land, perhaps to cart crops. Two quarters had plows and tools for growing grain crops and one of these also housed tools for butchering or rendering animals. Another quarter housed a gun for pest control or hunting. The sites all had at least a pot and pothooks: only one listed any other furniture. Slaves skilled in handling tobacco also spent time each fall in

113 I use the pothooks listed in the inventory as the indicator for the number of hearths and thus the number of buildings that housed slaves. They could indicate buildings - or separate sides of a duplex. It is possible that some buildings had hearths but not fittings for cooking equipment, or that some buildings were not heated. See chapters four and five.
the tobacco barns that stood in the fields. These buildings, 20 by 40 feet, sheltered the crop as it dried and those who processed it for packing.114

The Jeffersons clothed their slaves according to the codes of “enlightened” paternalism. By meeting society’s minimum requirements for supplying their people with clothes, the Jeffersons took on the appearance of “good” slave owners, whose attention to the physical care of their slaves partially obscured the fact that the owners were denying the bondspeople larger human rights. The Jeffersons invested in keeping their slaves, whether field or house labor, comfortable and presentable according to their station as defined by Virginia’s slaveholding elite. In 1759 alone, the investment in “Clothing & Tools for the Negroes” totaled £62. 8. 8-3/4, a sum greater than the net worth of 47 percent of all estates recorded in Albemarle County during the colonial period. This investment in capital inventory returned £188. 4. 3-3/4, clear profit after payment to overseers and to overseers’ wives for sewing, after purchasing fabric, blankets, and tools, after seeing the tobacco packed and shipped. The 1759 profit was greater than the value of 65 percent of all estates in colonial Albemarle.115 Keeping this large slave force did not come cheaply, but it resulted in large profits for the planter -- who used the profits to cloth and feed his enslaved workers.

Tobacco dictated the material, seasonal, and social experiences of Virginia’s planters and slaves. A crop took more than a year from seed to shipping with an intensive work schedule much of that time. Planters sowed seeds in nurseries during late

114 At least four tobacco houses were 20’ by 40’, of log construction. PJAB 19.

115 N=165, see AlCWB1, AlCWB 2.
December and early January. In late April through May the entire walking labor force—including small children to non-infirm elderly—from worked to transplant seedlings to the fields. Children toted plants to the prepared hills, adults carefully planted them. Both male and female slaves hoed weeds during the summer months, tending each field at least weekly. Skilled and experienced workers topped the plants before they produced seeds so that the plants would send all their nutrients to a dozen or so large leaves. Others removed the new leaves or suckers and even children picked worms from the plants.

Work crews cut and carted the crop in early fall and hung it to dry in tobacco barns. As it dried, both women and men skilled at stripping leaves from stalks and removing stem fibers from the leaves worked long hours to prepare each leaf. By Christmas the crop could be “prized” or packed in hogsheads to await shipment in the spring.116 Field slaves at Shadwell also plowed fields and planted corn and grain crops, tended vegetable gardens, livestock, and orchard crops, and cleared new land as part of their regular tasks.

Much like the wares in the dining room in the Jeffersons’ house, many of the agricultural tools at Shadwell showed a degree of specialization in their design and intended use that was rare in the eighteenth century. Peter’s interest in experimenting with and exploring tools and methods of husbandry extended beyond farm implements to his bookshelf. The appraisers who recorded the farm tools at Shadwell noted particular details that suggest they were impressed by the range of special tools in their neighbor’s outbuildings. Tobacco can be cultivated with a stick, but iron hoes are better. Different

hoes—broad for weeding and narrow for hilling—made those jobs even more efficient, especially for a large-scale agricultural enterprise (Figure 3.2). The Jeffersons also had grubbing hoes for clearing land and foot hoes. Plows prepared fields for seed that was sown (as opposed to the nursery culture of tobacco). Peter had an English plow hoe (a type of plow) for work in heavier soils. The English plow hoe had a flat share that American planters reinvented as the shovel hoe (a trowel-shaped share replaced the flat share). He also had a Dutch (or hog) plow with an upright triangular share that could be used in lighter soils but may have had other uses in the heavier clay-based loam of the Piedmont. The plow hoe had applications in both grain and tobacco. It could cut furrows for small-grain seed, or it could be used for cross-marking a field before slaves hilled it for tobacco - thereby ensuring a regular - and efficient - use of the space. Thus African slaves used a European tool to aid their practice of an American Indian agricultural technique. The harrow hoe had an iron spike for breaking and combing the soil surface. A slave may have used the plows alone, but probably with draft animals. Peter’s orderly and scientific management of his agricultural enterprise is reflected in the first few entries in his son’s Garden Book, and Thomas Jefferson was and is certainly famous for his empirical approach to his plantation management.\footnote{See chap. 1 on Switzer’s \textit{The Practical Husbandman}. PJ’s hoes were also distinguished by the shape of the shaft to which they would be attached as either round eyed or axe eyed. Noël Hume’s study of eighteenth-century Virginia found only hoes with round eyes. Many colonial Albemarle inventories list just “hoes,” and if they specify type most identify hilling (or narrow) and weeding (or broad). Next most often listed are grubbing hoes, used to create fields after trees were removed from an area. A few other planters had more specialized hoes, including one that had “garden [hoe]” distinguished from “old hoes” (presumably old hoes were tobacco hoes). AICWB 1; AICWB 2: citation 416-417, Ivor Noël Hume, \textit{A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America} (New York: 1970), 275.}
Peter Jefferson and his estate after him employed a number of overseers who acted as intermediaries between the Jeffersons and their slaves. The 1763 list of “Negroes Cloths delivered out for Jefferson Estate” identified groups of slaves by their overseer or their location with headings such as: “To Mrs. Jefferson,” “To the Qur. at Snodon,” “To Matt: Moore.” The slave Sawney was acknowledged by name, but otherwise an overseer represented the slaves to their owners - or to an executor of the estate, John Harvie. In all, at least twelve overseers worked at Shadwell or Snowdon between 1747 and 1774. Some, such as Martin Dawson, worked for the Jeffersons from as early as 1747 until at least 1760, providing continuity to both Dawson’s life and those of the slaves who worked under him. Additionally, other Dawsons also worked for the Jeffersons: Joseph from at least 1753 to 1761, and John c. 1758-1760. Peter Jefferson paid a carpenter “By his work on a Quarter 22 by 12 feet at Jos: Dawsons,” evidence that Jefferson too thought of his land according to its overseers. The frequency of the Dawsons in the account books and the range of their activities suggest that they had a solid and productive role in the plantation. Martin Dawson supervised the Snowdon

I am indebted to Wayne Randolph of the Rural Trades Division at Colonial Williamsburg Foundation for his help identifying the tools in the Jefferson inventory. His observation is that this is fairly early usage of specialized tool terminology and range of types. Personal communication, August 1, 2002. See also, Peter H. Cousins, Hog Plow and Sith: Cultural Aspects of Early Agricultural Technology (Dearborn, Mi.: 1973).

TJ, surprisingly, was less specific about hoes in his Farm Book notes, lumping them into a count, “18 hoes,” although in his section called: “Aphorisms, Observations, Facts in husbandry,” TJ describes both weeding and grubbing activities with hoes. His interest, though, was not in the tool, but in gauging the amount of work that could be done by a group of laborers. FB 54, 64; also GB.
plantation. Joseph Dawson oversaw the plantations on the Rivanna River, with some
exceptions. Fred Gillam oversaw the Shadwell tobacco crop from 1759 to 1761.\textsuperscript{118}

John Moore worked for the Jeffersons from c. 1758 to 1770 and bore the title
"steward" rather than overseer in both the executors' and Thomas Jefferson's records. At
least some years Moore received a salary rather than a share of crops as payment. Moore
engaged with the Jeffersons on levels other than simply as a hired hand. He contracted
with Thomas in 1768 to level Monticello Mountain and also served as an appraiser for
the estates of Jane, Jr., and Jane Sr. In addition to the family connections between
overseers, some of their other family members worked for the Jeffersons. Matthew
Moore's wife Letitia, or "Letty," and William Gooch's wife Lucy sewed clothes for
Jefferson slaves.\textsuperscript{119} In addition to overseers, a tenant named Peter Shepherd paid his rent
with his wife Nel or Nelly's work sewing of clothes for Shadwell slaves.

The overseers ran specific tracts of land called "quarters" or "farms," but they
also worked together at times. Table 3.4 shows the probable distribution of slave and
overseer labor during one year. The North River land produced forty percent of the
estate's tobacco in 1760, using overseers and evidently slaves who normally lived and

\textsuperscript{118} On the clothing distribution, see Harvie I: 1. The relationships between the
Dawsons are unclear. Martin Dawson may or may not have been the father of the Martin
Dawson who became one of the earliest Baptist preachers in Albemarle in 1774. About
the same time another Martin Dawson became a prominent merchant in the Rivanna
River town of Milton. The Martin Dawson who served as an inventory appraiser in 1762
signed with his mark. AICWB 2: 140; Woods, \textit{Albemarle}, 176-177. Work at Jos.
Dawsons, see PJAB 19. Other overseers mentioned in Harvie II.

\textsuperscript{119} Matthew had an older brother John, who may have been the John Moore
working for the Jeffersons. Matthew & Letitia Moore owned land near the Albemarle
border with Louisa County that they sold in 1774 to Rev. Maury. Harvie II: 1, 4; Woods,
\textit{Albemarle}, 284.
Table 3.4. Jefferson lands, tobacco yields, slaves, and overseers based on 1760 returns from the 1759 crop. John Harvie’s lists for 1760 are the most complete for any year of the plantation’s operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>land</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>1759 tobo</th>
<th>% of total yield</th>
<th>tobo/ acre(b)</th>
<th>slaves from quarter</th>
<th>Overseer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shadwell</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>4,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Fred Gillam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>11,111</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Joseph Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantops</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>10,444</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>II/IV?</td>
<td>Joseph Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portobello</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufton</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pouncey’s</td>
<td>(300)(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowdon</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>18,076</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Martin Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North River</td>
<td>est. 2,769</td>
<td>29,353</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>I-IV?</td>
<td>Joseph Dawson William Gooch Fred Gillam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: totals/averages 7,169 73,983 100 10.86\(d\)

\(a\) This list uses the names that TJ assigned to the properties, we do not know what PJ called them.

\(b\) Tobacco/acre is a raw estimate based on the total property acreage not counting non-cultivated or domestic uses.

\(c\) Pouncey’s is not included in acreage for tobacco because of reference to it being woodlot. FBB, 331.

\(d\) This figure is the average tobo/acre based on the four figures above and was used to estimate the acreage for the North River land based on its tobacco yield. The total land estimate was 7169 acres used for tobacco, or 7469 for all uses including Pouncey’s. Peter Jefferson paid rents on 7080 acres in Albemarle County in 1754 (PJAB, 22). Malone did not think Jefferson owned the North River land, an assessment that he supported with John Harvie’s record of a 1757 quitrent payment for 4375 acres that was a partial payment. Multiple payments for rents were spread over multiple years making it hard to isolate totals. Jefferson clearly had some ownership of the North River land as it produced forty percent of his 1759 tobacco crop. (JHAB I, see esp. 7, 19, 23, 34; Malone, 435).
worked on other lands. This suggests that at least some slaves moved from property to property with some regularity during certain seasons. Planting tobacco seedlings in hills took many hands over intensive work days, the plants demanded at least weekly attention during summer weeding, and long hours during the fall stripping. The overseers who produced the crops from the Shadwell tract, Fred Gillam, and from the other Rivanna River lands, Joseph Dawson, worked also on the North River crop, accompanied by another supervisor, William Gooch.  

In addition to overseers, other hired workers lived at or visited Shadwell. Jefferson operated a toll mill at Shadwell and a miller and his family lived there to run it and collect fees for grinding neighbors' grain. Various millers came, Mr. Robert Fry in 1757 and David Cook in 1758. The mill also brought craftsmen such as Francis Whilkill (also Whitehill), who did repair work on the mill, or Samuel Cobbs, who “work[ed] about the mill.” George Dunkin and John Dunkin did carpentry work, including work on a tobacco house. Not all of the hired tradespeople were white. A “Negroe Carpenter” lent by Captain Charles Lewis worked at Shadwell for seventeen days in 1759. Jefferson slaves may have joined these hired workers as skilled hands or as labor. Slaves also may have made barrels for the mill—a number of coopering tools appear in Peter’s inventory—but in some years barrels and casks were purchased or a cooper came to make barrels as

---

120 This apparent use of work crews tending tobacco on more than one piece of land has not been explored and brings up many questions about work and home life that may be very different from labor models usually used to discuss slave life in this period. See also chapter four.
needed. Visiting workers offered the slaves an opportunity to hone their own skills or to learn new ones, as well as to make contacts outside the plantation.

Peter Jefferson’s accounts reveal some of the smaller economic relationships between the plantation and the surrounding community. Women working in textile trades provided one source of supplies for Shadwell. They were paid in cash, exchange of goods, or credit. Eleanor Welsh knitted stockings for the Jefferson children, for which she received £1.1.3 in 1762 and 15 s. 9 d. in 1763. Another time an unnamed person was paid “1 pr. plaid hose...for making 3 shirts.” Peter and Eleanor Shepherd rented land from Peter Jefferson, and although Jefferson recorded the account as Peter Shepherd’s, it was Eleanor’s work that paid the rent. In the accounts she is referred to her simply as “his wife,” though she is called Nelly and Eleanor in other records (Figure 3.3).

Jefferson also acted as landlord and collected rent for various uses of his property. This regularly included the mill and also “the houses opposite to Albemarle Court House with 4 Acres of Land.” Richard Murray leased and operated an ordinary near the county courthouse and collected tolls at the ferry landing during the late 1750s and early 1760s. He paid Jefferson £4 per year. Jefferson received rental income and Murray received profits from the sale of food, drink, and ferriage. This investment in making a new county illustrates Peter’s ability to capitalize on his public role for personal gain. His public role as a justice and officer is explored in chapter six, but he helped form the local

---

121 Harvie I: 25, 27, 38; PJAB 20; Harvie II: 10.

122 Clothing for the Jefferson children is treated in chap. 2. Clothing for the slaves is treated in chaps. 4 and 5. Harvie I: 36. What Peter Shepherd did is unknown. Eleanor Shepherd still worked for the Jeffersons as late as 1778. There is no record of Peter Shepherd after 1763. Harvie II: 1, 3; MB 206, 470.
government in more ways than just deciding the law. The land he owned at the new county seat provided a necessary function of a courthouse town. Buildings on Jefferson’s land offered people who traveled to court – including justices – a place to stay, as well as the conveniences of food, not to mention alcohol, a ubiquitous part of court day in colonial Virginia. The well-heeled, like Jefferson, built the infrastructure on which the new county would grow.¹²³

A Provider of Services

The mill at Shadwell illustrates the influence that Peter Jefferson had locally as a purchaser of labor and services and as a provider of services. In many of these transactions, however, it is not the exchange of service that stands out, but the role of the planter as someone with available cash or who could extend credit for goods bought or work performed. Credit, however, was a double-edged sword. Peter Jefferson made available to people things that they needed, such as grain from the mill or their poll taxes paid. But this meant also that people were indebted to the planter, and it appears that some, like John Biswell, never escaped the debtor side of Jefferson’s ledger.

Wealthy planters in colonial Albemarle and elsewhere erected mills on their waterways. Mills provided income for the planters and a service to their neighbors, as well as jobs for slaves or hired labor as millers, carpenters, coopers, and those who transported the products. Neighbors could bring their grain crops to be ground for a price or a percentage of the grain, they could purchase storage for their grain from the coopers

¹²³ PJAB, 12. For discussion of all the aspects of a courthouse town, see Carl R. Lounsbury, *The Courthouses of Early Virginia: An Architectural History* (Charlottesville, Va., 2005), esp. chap. 6.
who worked alongside the mill, and they could avail themselves of the planter’s wharf, water frontage, or access to road transportation. Private investment by planters in things like mills, wharves, and roads provided infrastructure that contributed to the public welfare. The credit side of Jefferson’s ledger reveals one side of the story. Work on Jefferson’s mill at Shadwell in 1753 lined the pockets of carpenter John Biswell £5.5., for forty-two days of work there. Jupiter and Samson, slaves who worked with Biswell, received £1.5. each for their twenty days work there. Upkeep of the mill required hiring other skilled craftsmen. Two other carpenters, Francis Whilkill and Samuel Cobbs (who made Jefferson’s coffin) both worked on the mill in 1756 and again later. Whether or not they worked together is unclear. Whilkill received £5.6 for “26½ day work on the Mill @ 4/.” He returned in 1758 for “work repairing the mill,” for which he received £3.11.3. Jefferson paid Cobbs £10.4.4 for unspecified work on the mill in 1756 and paid his estate 15 s. for “Sund: Jobbs abt the Mill” in 1758.124

Robert Fry became the miller in 1756 at a salary of £5 per year. No doubt Fry owned a few tools of his own, but he lived in a house provided by Jefferson for the miller and his family and worked with Jefferson’s equipment. Jefferson’s investment in mill-related tools included 4 mill pecks, ½ bushel, ½ peck, and ¼ peck measures, valued at 7 s. 9 d. total. A pair of large marking irons, three hogsheads, 5 barrels, and 4 new bags

124 Six mills were road landmarks in Albemarle County by 1748. Rose mentions an additional eight mills before 1751. Jefferson’s mill was in operation before 1755, but that is the first date it is mentioned in his account book. County magistrates owned six of the fifteen early mills in the county, and a seventh was the property of John Carter who was Secretary of the colony. Nathaniel Mason Pawlett, *Albemarle County Road Orders 1744-1748* (Charlottesville, Va., 1975); Rose, *Diary*, index for mill. The payment to Cobbs’ estate included the sum for PJ’s coffin. PJAB 19, 21, 23, 30.
(£2.8.6 total) stood at the ready at the mill when the inventory was taken in 1757. Jefferson owned various tools that slaves or hired coopers used to make barrels, including narrow axes, a claw hammer, a broad ax, and wedges. Slaves may have lived near the mill during times of work there. Shadwell housed three pairs of cart wheels (2 of them old), six pairs of iron traces, eleven pairs of hames and collars, and 38 pound cart boxes for transporting (total value £8.18.11), although much of this was likely used within the plantation only. At the mill also were 3 old spades, 1 broad, and 1 grubbing hoe that may have been for the miller’s family’s own use for their garden. The inventory also lists 13 worsted cotton petticoats, valued at £4.17.6, on hand at the mill, listed with the new bags. These may have been part of a new shipment to Jefferson’s store kept elsewhere, or perhaps they were on hand to sell to farmers, who could come to Shadwell, mill their grain, and pick up something for their wives and daughters at home, all the while leaving yet more in Jefferson’s coffers.

Jefferson’s mill was a profitable venture and it served Shadwell’s own needs as well. In 1758 the mill made £36.5.5, after subtracting £4.17.6, the cost of feeding corn to hogs at Shadwell. The mill’s products served as a kind of currency for the Jeffersons. The Jeffersons settled their accounts with tailors John Bell and George Twynman in both cash and grain. Benjamin Sneed, who schooled several of the Jefferson children, received grain from the mill, as did Manus Burger, a smith, and Hierom Gaines, who took up a stray horse for the estate. Even other people with titles traded in corn. Captain John Grilles returned “To Cash Lent You to be paid in Corn @ 8/pBarrel.” While

125 PJAB 26; AlCWB 2: 41-47.
Jefferson usually entered the cash value of goods and services in his account books, very often the balance indicates that few actual pounds, shillings, or pence changed hands. Like elsewhere in the colonial world, any country’s silver coin also had value, such as the 1723 Spanish Real, cut to a one-quarter wedge that emerged from excavation of the yard area on the slope just south of the Jefferson house (Figure 3.4). In 1758 David Cook became the miller, to receive £6 wages, against which were charged 5 s. for a pair of shoes, his provision of meat and salt at £3.10., and his levy and poll tax for the year at 9 s.. If Cook did not use up the rest of his credit, he had a balance in his favor of £1.16. at the end of the year.126

Credit and Patronage

John Biswell’s relationship with Jefferson illustrates how Jefferson’s influence was greater than simply being able to hire labor. In 1743 Biswell came to St. James Parish (Goochland) as an orphan. The court bound him to Thomas McDaniel, a carpenter, for three years to learn his trade. Jefferson paid both Biswell and McDaniel for work on William Randolph’s Hall Creek plantation while Jefferson was guardian of Randolph’s estate. McDaniel performed unspecified carpentry work in 1746, and Biswell built a corn house in 1749. Biswell and McDaniel, like their employer, lived in Albemarle County following its division from Goochland in 1744. McDaniel did carpentry work there for Jefferson and transported tobacco for him. Biswell had an ongoing financial relationship with Jefferson.127

126 Harvie II: 9; PJAB 24; Harvie I: 26-27.

127 Goochland County Order Book 1741-1744, 246, in “Education and Research Database Material Record,” CWF; PJAB, 1, 4.
Whether Biswell needed money or Peter wanted to "sponsor" him and his trade, he was financially beholden to Jefferson. In his account book, Jefferson recorded Biswell's debts to him beginning in August 1752 and ending in November 1755. In a 1753 entry Jefferson recorded all of the money he owed Biswell for work. Jefferson's accounts with the carpenter Biswell reveal a range of transactions over four years. Some was cash value for services rendered: in all, Jefferson owed Biswell £49.7.5 for a long list of work that included such things as "Hewing sills for Dwelling House £1," building tobacco houses, "getting and nailing on 400 sap shingles," "moving the stable," and providing shoe thread. In 1753 Jefferson recorded that Biswell owed him "9 Bushels of wheat (Borrow\(^4\))," which Biswell returned as "9-1/2 bushels of wheat...(borrowed)" in 1755. Biswell's debts to Jefferson, however, were greater: Biswell owed Jefferson £28.1.9 more than his work, and Jefferson labeled Biswell's balance as "Accot to Settle" on a summary page of account book. The debts included "To 6½ Bushels flower from the Mill" at 10 s. in 1755; 4 s. cash lent in 1752; whip saw files, and two hogs. They also included a number of times when Jefferson paid accounts that Biswell had with other men. In a few entries Biswell owed Jefferson for a third party's patent fee or surveying fee, suggesting that Biswell occasionally acted as Jefferson's agent in collecting fees or carrying out surveyor's jobs. In August 1754 Jefferson paid Biswell to go to Winchester on some business that Jefferson had as executor of Joshua Fry's estate. Jefferson charged Fry's estate £2.12.6 for Biswell's travels.\(^{128}\) Did Biswell's livelihood depend on Jefferson's hiring of him?

\(^{128}\)Biswell's debts translate to roughly $775 current money. Biswell's debt to Jefferson was greater than the value of twenty-five percent of all Albemarle estates in the
Peter Jefferson’s ability to extend credit can be interpreted in a number of ways. Jefferson had the wherewithal to offer cash or goods and perhaps take a loss if loans were not repaid. To Biswell’s advantage, Jefferson’s patronage may have offered him the opportunity to perform work that he might have been unable to get on his own. This may have been a stepping stone for him to other jobs and enhanced skill as a craftsman. On the other hand, Biswell may have been “kept” by Jefferson, who could, because of Biswell’s indebtedness to him, require him to do work that he did not want to do. The types of accounts suggest that Jefferson assigned Biswell to handle money and important errands, so the indebtedness did not breed mistrust. Biswell later became a landowner in Albemarle County. Whether Jefferson provided opportunity or used his wealth to control those around him is a matter of interpretation. A debt and credit relationship could be a tool or a measure of servitude.\footnote{}}

Jefferson’s patronage went also to Francis West, a joiner. Jefferson engaged West for work at Tuckahoe and at Shadwell. The relationship began in January 1749/50 when Jefferson acknowledged a “Note of Hand” from West for £3.6.6. Upon cashing this note for him or giving him this credit, the two men entered into a series of exchanges,


\footnote{AICDB 3, 52. After four or five years as a teacher, Devereux Jarratt recalled, “My annual income...had been very small, yet, by frugality, I had saved enough to procure me a small poney and a saddle. I began also to get some credit in a store, and having prospect of getting 13l. at the end of that year, entered to go in debt for a tolerable suit of cloathes.” Jarratt, \textit{Life}, 23. To Jarratt, credit was something he had worked hard to earn and could use to better himself.}
according to their respective areas of expertise. Jefferson sold West fifty acres of land for £9.3.8 and delivered the “Plot & Certificate” to him in September. Jefferson also sold West 632 pounds of pork for £4.5. In return West made for Jefferson a substantial list of furniture worth £13.11.6. (see chap. 1). Still, West owed Jefferson £3.11.8 when their balances were figured. Jefferson also paid West to do some work for Randolph’s Tuckahoe estate, work that included mending 3 tables (7 s. 6 d.) and for getting two shoe knives, for which he was paid one shilling three d.. West moved on and appears again in what had been southwestern Albemarle County doing both joinery and carpentry work for Nicholas Cabell at his plantation Liberty Hall. West’s work for Cabell included mending furniture, installing lath, flooring, roofing, dormers, and interior trim, fixing doors and locks, and getting a loom and warping box. The appraised value of West’s work shows that it was good, and his range of abilities shows he was skilled in various media and flexible enough to work at different jobs. His family lived with him while he worked for Cabell, and perhaps he lived on the land purchased from Jefferson in 1750. Of course there is no telling what West’s fortunes would have been had Peter Jefferson not hired him. The opportunity for showing his craft and the connections that Jefferson provided suggest that West was able to build on his credit and capitalize on his 

130 West’s debt to Jefferson is roughly the equivalent of $96 in current money, about an eighth of the debt owed Jefferson by John Biswell, see above. Biswell’s debt was greater than the value of four estates (two percent, n=165) listed in the colonial probate records. AICWB 1; AICWB 2. PJAB, 3, 14. Liberty Hall is in what is now Nelson County, formed from the part of Albemarle that became Amherst County, then Nelson. Cabell Papers, Box 1, 1727-1776, Acc. #5084, ViU. It is possible that PJ could offer living quarters at Tuckahoe or Shadwell to someone like West for the duration of his work there. At Monticello, TJ made available a house on Mulberry Row for hired craftsmen during the 1790s work on that house. Previously, the same building housed slaves.
relationship with the planter. As a joiner, West’s finer skills may have brought him more autonomy than Biswell had.

The Effect of the Planter on the Local Economy

The hiring power of people like Jefferson may have brought people like West to remote areas. Joiners, tailors, dance masters and music teachers needed income from other sources or a critical mass of patrons who could support their art. Many of these practitioners were itinerant, but still they needed clients. The material and social worlds of Shadwell support the argument for a socio-economic rather than a diffusion idea about the spread of culture; that is, the money of rich planters caused culture to spread. People did not have to live near a metropolis to be involved in trade in fashionable goods and services. The Jeffersons provided access to goods and services that others around them would not otherwise have. They exposed their neighbors to manners – both through the material realm and through whom they hired. They also provided work to other people, such as overseers and seamstresses, thereby helping create an economy for the local middling sort. Lois Carr and Lorena Walsh observe that diversification in agriculture encouraged home industries that were largely the domain of women. At Shadwell this result played out in two ways. The first was the adaptation for Jane Jefferson about what tasks she had to inform her slaves and family to do each day – producing slave clothing was not their chore. The second was the growth of household industry for women whose husbands worked for Peter Jefferson, the wives of overseers and smaller planters. Their household craft supported and was supported by Shadwell’s prosperity.

The Jeffersons contributed to the local infrastructure and no doubt helped sustain the inland ports that grew along Chesapeake tributaries during the middle of the century. The Jeffersons’ tobacco traveled by water and land to inland ports before heading across the Atlantic. Familiar watermen and carters transported the weed from plantation to port (Figure 3.5). The crop and the overseer represented Peter Jefferson to the agents at the inspection warehouses. The crop collected there represented Virginia to her tobacco patrons overseas. Peter may well have accompanied his agents to the warehouses at various times, but his credit on the inspectors’ books was what mattered. Tobacco connected the Jeffersons down the James River to the warehouses at the falls: Byrd’s warehouse at Westham, Shocoe’s at Richmond. Tobacco also connected them to associates along the South Anna, Pamunkey, and York River corridor. Business with Cruchfields, Pages, and Meriwether’s warehouses on those rivers meant that families along this route would recognize the Jeffersons’ reputation. Credit at multiple warehouses also meant that the Jeffersons could respond to different markets for their crop and choose which inspectors and rates they preferred for a given crop (Table 3.5).\footnote{For a discussion of tobacco ports, see Malcolm H. Harris, “The Port Towns of the Pamunkey,” \textit{WMQ}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Ser. Vol. 23, No. 4. (Oct., 1943), pp. 493-516; for Shadwell crop figures and transportation, see Harvie II: esp. 7; PJAB 11, 15, 18, 22.}
weight          | overseer      | land     | inspected at
---------------|---------------|----------|---------------------
18,076         | Martin Dawson| Snowdon  | Byrds Warehouse     
10,444         | Joseph Dawson| Shocoes  |                    
11,111         | Joseph Dawson| Crutchfields|                
5,385          | Joseph Dawson| Shadwell | Crutchfields       
29,353         | Joseph Dawson| North River| Shocoes         

Table 3.5. 1760 tobacco returns showing production and sales of crop grown in 1759.

Associations: Friends, Family, and Peers

The Jeffersons certainly had a variety of economic relationships with people who performed skilled and unskilled labor. Beyond that, the social codes of Virginia’s gentry required that Peter Jefferson and his peers respond to certain legal--and financial--responsibilities to each other.\(^{133}\) Some of the business in which Peter Jefferson and his associates involved themselves was business, that is, commercial enterprise. But other contracts reveal obligations to family and friends that included such roles as executorship of estates, guardianship of minor children, and guiding each other’s estates through appraisal for probate court. One of the ways the Jeffersons, their family, and their friends maintained their power was through public obligations that defined and preserved their estates and their families’ positions in the community. These personal public obligations generated documents such as wills and account books that reveal a wealth of details about property and about the social and legal networks that connected family and friend.

\(^{133}\) This same scenario took place across social strata, but I am interested here in exploring how the Jeffersons’ legal obligations reveal the connections among their peers.
The recording of wills and deeds was a legal function of county governments. Many people in colonial Virginia wrote wills to control how their property would be dispersed following their death. But many people also used their wills to designate who would maintain their property and manage their estates for minor children. The county court could designate neighbors and peers to these roles if someone died intestate, but for those in positions of power, protection of property preserved family authority from generation to generation. At the simplest level, a person writing a will designated as his or her executor a trusted family member or friend whose job it was to carry out the terms of the will. But often, as in the case of Peter Jefferson’s will, executorship combined with the on-going guardianship of an estate and guardianship of minor children. In the event of a challenge to the will or a charge of debt against an estate, the executor was responsible for proving to the county court that the terms of the will were carried out. An executor could also be held responsible for debts of the estate. Thus, the executor often kept an account book for the guarded estate and sometimes the account book became part of the court records.

Peter Jefferson wrote his will and signed it July 13, 1757, a little more than a month before he died. In his will he assembled a legal team of five high-powered men to serve as “Execrs. of this my last will & Testament & Guardian to all my Children.” Three other men, not necessarily peers, witnessed Jefferson’s signing of the will. At the October court, following Jefferson’s death, one of the executors presented the will to the court where the witnesses swore to its authenticity. Then, at the November court, the three executors who lived locally “made Oath According to Law[.] Certificate was granted them for
Obtaining a Probat thereof in due Form giving security.” They also hired the men who appraised the estate and made an inventory of Peter’s moveable goods.\textsuperscript{134}

The witnesses to all these procedures were acquaintances. John Bell, Edwin Hickman, and Samuel Cobbs, were all people who lived near Shadwell and had business there. Bell, a tailor, and Cobbs, the carpenter, were tradesmen. Hickman owned land adjacent to Shadwell and served as a county justice. The executors, however, were on an entirely different social scale and were people with a vested interest in the Jeffersons’ ongoing welfare.

Thus did Peter Jefferson choose his legal team: “Finally I do appoint Constitue (sic) & Ordain The Honorable Peter Randolph Esq., Thomas Turpin the Elder, John Nicholas, Doctor Thomas Walker, & John Harvie Execrs. of this my last will & Testament & Guardian to all my Children.” The demography of this small group is impressive. All were large land and slave owners. They were all burgesses, except Turpin, though he held office in three counties. John Nicholas could oversee Jefferson’s interests from the local court, where he was clerk, to the highest reaches of colonial government, where his brother, Robert Carter Nicholas, was treasurer. Walker and Turpin were partners with Jefferson in the Loyal Land Company, and Nicholas and Harvie were investors with Jefferson in the speculative town of Beverley. Harvie also had a partnership with Jefferson for land “wherewith is immagined to be a Vein of Copper Oar.” Randolph and Jefferson’s accounts represent well over £1000 of charges between the two, including the purchase by Jefferson of slaves from Randolph. Two of the executors were family: Randolph was

\textsuperscript{134} AICWB 2: 32-34. See chap. 1 for the appraisers and their relationship to Jefferson.
Jane's first cousin and Turpin was Jefferson's brother-in-law. Nicholas, Walker, and Harvie lived in Albemarle, but Randolph lived at Chatsworth in Henrico County, and, although he surveyed for Albemarle, Turpin's primary residence was in Cumberland County. Four of the five executors—except Harvie—are represented on the Fry-Jefferson Map. In standing for Peter Jefferson following his death, any one of these men could command the attention and protection of Virginia's legal system, as well as secure Jefferson's heirs among their peers throughout Virginia.  

The executors promised to Peter Jefferson legal representation, guidance, and access to a network of relationships that paved the way for the young Jeffersons to take their places among the gentry. One of the first acts of the five executors was in November 1757 when they stood for the estate to complete a land transaction begun by Peter Jefferson. The local executors, Harvie, Nicholas, and Walker, involved themselves at different times in the day-to-day business of the Jeffersons' plantations and expenditures. Harvie and Walker lived near Shadwell and Nicholas lived near Snowdon. The two who lived farther offered the young Jeffersons haven from home, and, no doubt, lessons in the protocol of visiting. Other help, in the form of visits and advising shows how the older men guided the young.

The famous letter in which young Thomas Jefferson wrote to guardian John Harvie asking to attend the College of William and Mary was written after a visit at the

---

135 I added the commas in the excerpt from PJ's will. AICWB 2: 32-34; PJAB 14, 16.

136 AICDB 2, 1758-1761 (Reel 1), 20-22. Turpin leased his house in Richmond to Thomas Jefferson when the government moved from Williamsburg during the
house of another guardian, Peter Randolph. The letter reveals a number of the concerns an executor might have.

Shadwell, Jan. 14, 1760.

Sir –

I was at Colo. Peter Randolph’s about a Fortnight ago, and my Schooling falling into Discourse, he said he thought it would be to my Advantage to go to the College, and was desirous I should go, as indeed I am myself for several Reasons. In the first place as long as I stay at the Mountain, the Loss of one fourth of my Time is inevitable, by Company’s coming here and detaining me from School. And likewise my Absence will in a great Measure, put a Stop to so much Company, and by that Means lessen the Expenses of the Estate in House-Keeping. And on the other Hand by going to the College, I shall get a more universal Acquaintance, which may hereafter be serviceable to me; and I suppose I can pursue my Studies in the Greek and Latin as well as there as here, and likewise learn something of the Mathematics. I shall be glad of your opinion.

Randolph and Jefferson discussed his schooling and his future plans, and probably, the formal mechanism for getting money to fund those plans, which was writing to John Harvie, the keeper of the estate accounts. Randolph helped Jefferson realize that lost time and housekeeping created debts, and Jefferson used these to appeal to Harvie’s sense of economy. By “a more universal Acquaintance,” Jefferson may have meant getting to Revolution. MB 495, n. 72. For more details about Harvie and Nicholas with plantation management, see chap. 4.
know people or academic subjects: either interpretation has validity in the context of these two men. It is tempting to imagine as part of their discussion that Randolph referred to Williamsburg cousins Sir John or Beverley or Peyton, only to have the young Jefferson admit he had not met them since he was very young. Or the elder may have discovered lapses in the ability of the younger’s schoolmasters. Either way, the system worked and the older men guided their young charge to the place that was waiting for him.  

Executors’ records provided estates with legal tools. Some accounts by John Harvie and Thomas Walker survive, and the other executors may have kept similar records. In effect the estate became three separate corporations with three different tasks: maintaining the plantation, protecting the livelihood of Jefferson’s widow Jane, and preserving the separate inheritance of each child. The accounts kept by Peter Jefferson’s executors came back into play during the 1790s when Nicholas and the heirs of Jefferson and Walker sought to resolve some outstanding debts of Peter Jefferson that were magnified by the Revolution. The commitment of guardians and executors transcended generations. The status of friendship as expressed by the trust one person put in another in summoning the friend to service for one’s estate was called to witness by Thomas Walker, unfortunately in a deposition against his once friend. He twice invoked executorship as evidence of their families’ former trusting relationship. “My father was one of his fathers exr & his own guardian & advanced money for his education,” and “All

137 Papers I: 3. I propose that Randolph Jefferson’s boarding with his uncle Charles Lewis was engineered to impart this same set of practical lessons to the younger. See chap. 7.
this time I held him first named in my will, as exct. Ignorant of every thing which had
passed.”\textsuperscript{138} Clearly a relationship that had executorship at its foundation was understood
to be almost intractable.

Just as Jefferson secured the power and prestige of peers through his will, Peter
Jefferson’s friends and family relied on him. Most famously, he was guardian of William
Randolph’s young children and moved the entire Jefferson family to Tuckahoe to
complete his charge from his friend and Jane’s cousin. But Peter appeared in other
Randolph family wills too. Isham Randolph named his wife Jane Randolph as executor.
As guardian to his children he named Peter Jefferson, along with Isham’s brothers
William and Richard Randolph, and nephews William, Jr. and Beverley Randolph. The
estate of Shadwell kept company with Chatsworth, Curles, Tuckahoe, and Tazewell Hall
or Turkey Island in promising refuge to Isham’s heirs. Peter’s own father Thomas
Jefferson (II) named his son Peter sole executor of his will.\textsuperscript{139}

Friends also called on Peter Jefferson to protect their estates. Joshua Fry named
Jefferson an executor of his estate. In this role Jefferson made entries in his own account
book as part of the public accounting of Fry’s estate. Jefferson helped widow Mary Fry

\textsuperscript{138} In 1805 Walker claimed that Jefferson made improper advances toward Mrs.
Walker about 1768 when they were all close friends. Walker’s deposition was a
contribution to James Callender’s politically-motivated essays against Jefferson
beginning in 1802. LC, 155:27117-27121, as reprinted in Malone, 449. See also chap. 7
on the debt of the 1790s.

\textsuperscript{139} It is not clear to me whether the Beverley Randolph who Isham invokes is the
one at Tazewell Hall in Williamsburg or the one at Turkey Island. Either created the
same effect. Goochland County Deed Book 4, 110-111.
organize payment of taxes and collect outstanding surveyors fees and tobacco notes. Peter Jefferson, John Harvie, and John Nicholas gave bond to the court for Anne Rose for securities in administering her husband Robert Rose’s estate.

Peter and his friends also stood for each other in legal and financial circumstances beyond estates. On September 16, 1735, Peter Jefferson recorded in court that William Randolph had power of attorney “to attend to all business.” This may have been before a surveying expedition that would put Jefferson in harm’s way—it was during the years of active land acquisition by Jefferson—and Jefferson was not yet married with family to look after his business interests.

The executor-kept account books that arose from these arrangements often provide close detail of a plantation’s workings for a few years. The account book was evidence of public duty—the executor’s job was to help settle debts owed by and to the deceased—and some of the accounts kept by executors or executrices are the only record surviving about certain estates because the accounts became part of the court records. People who understood their own daily business did not necessarily keep books or those books have disappeared with the passage of time and generations. But accounts kept for estates other than one’s own have survived; in fact, the keeping of another’s estate often prompted the closer accounting of one’s own. Peter Jefferson may have kept a plantation account book for his years before becoming William Randolph’s executor, but what survives is the account book he compiled during those years and following. Randolph’s

\[140\] PJAB, 18

\[141\] Goochland Wills and Deeds, 1728-1736, 142; Rose, 339.
accounts for Tuckahoe do not survive, but Jefferson’s pages for Tuckahoe tell us the names of overseers, plantations, mills, and offer some insight into the maintenance of Randolph’s plantation. Jefferson may have kept more careful accounts for Shadwell during those years to more closely monitor his own estate while he was away from it. Jefferson’s account book, in general, deals with larger and commercial debts and contractual relationships. It is very different from John Harvie’s accounting of Shadwell following Peter’s death. Harvie’s records provide a closer watch on crop yields, maintenance of people in the quarters, and small purchases than during Jefferson’s years.¹⁴²

Friends and Colleagues

Many of Peter Jefferson’s friends were other office-holders and educated professionals. Among them were planters, surveyors, doctors, and clergy. They were people who traveled, purchased land and consumer goods, and read books. Their horizons were broad. The surveying fraternity shared the bonds that field work brought, but also the intellectual problems of triangulation, mathematical calculation, and monetary speculation that connected them to others who were not of the profession. Jefferson and Fry worked with William Mayo, who had worked with William Byrd on his expedition along Virginia’s boundary; indeed, Mayo is credited with giving Jefferson his training as a surveyor. Joshua Fry acknowledged the surveyors’ bond that he and Jefferson had when he named Jefferson an executor of his estate and bequeathed to “my

¹⁴² Randolph’s accounts in PJ’s book are PJAB, 1-9, 59-61. Harvie I and II are the accounts he kept for Shadwell. The daily memoranda of expenditure that Peter’s son would maintain included a vast array of information that did not concern most planters, see MB.
friend Col: Jefferson my surveying instruments.” These may have included “1 sett of surveyors Instruments L3.10.” and “1 case of surveyors pocket Instruments 1.11.” listed among Fry’s possessions (Figure 1.5). Their circle also included Robert Rose, for whom surveying was a part-time but active interest. In fact, when the Rev. Rose died he was not out ministering to his flock, but surveying Beverley Town with another friend, William Cabell.143

There is no record that Peter Jefferson traveled overseas, but he traveled widely in the colonies. He spanned Virginia, at least from the Virginia – North Carolina Line, to the headwaters of the Potomac, to what he considered the branches of the Mississippi. He also spent time with many people who traveled abroad and certainly may have himself. His wife Jane was born in London to her Virginia-born, ocean-crossing, father Isham Randolph and her English mother Jane Rogers. Peter’s older brother Thomas (1700-1723) died aboard Randolph’s ship The Williamsburg en route to Virginia from England. John Harvie was from Scotland, Fry was English-born and Oxford educated, and Fry’s wife was one of Virginia’s French Huguenot immigrants.144

The Jefferson circle included college professors and college presidents as well as authors of history books and maps. Fry taught mathematics at William and Mary before getting the college’s approval for working on the map of Virginia with Jefferson. Jane

143 AICWB 2: 17 (will), 59 (inventory); Byrd, Dividing Line; Rose, Diary, 321 n. 90, 335. For more on the intellectual affinity of surveyors, see Hughes, Surveyors and Statesmen, esp. 161-162.

144 On Fry, see George W. Frye, Colonel Joshua Fry of Virginia and Some of His Descendants and Allied Families (Cincinnati, 1966), 40. On PJ’s brother Thomas, see “Jefferson Family,” Tyler’s Quarterly (7: 1925-26), 122. On Isham and Jane Randolph’s family, see chap. 1, 2.
Randolph’s cousin was the Reverend William Stith, president of the College and author of the 1747 History of the First Discovery and Settlement of Virginia. Peter’s father-in-law hosted botanists John Bartram and Peter Collinson and supplied them with specimens and information on their travels through Virginia. Isham may even have sent Collinson to visit Peter Jefferson at Shadwell in the fall of 1738. Jefferson friends included also medical doctors Thomas Walker, George Gilmer, and Arthur Hopkins.145

The Jeffersons also kept company with numerous clergymen, including Anglican ministers educated in Scotland, such as Rose, Douglas, and Maury, and in England, such as Stith. Jefferson’s relationship with clergy was beyond his role as vestryman; the clergy, too, fall into the category of educated professionals. The clergy owned books, read in languages other than English, and often taught the planters’ children. The clergy also needed the good graces of their politically powerful parishioners. As expected, Peter Jefferson served on the vestry in the parishes in which he resided. The established church played an administrative role in the civic culture and was charged with taking care of the poor and collecting tithes for maintenance of church property. As such, serving on the church vestry was a public role, rather than one having to do with religious conviction.

145 Stith was married to another of Jane’s first cousins, Judith Randolph of Tuckahoe (sister of PJ’s friend William). Both Stith’s father John, and Stith’s brother-in-law Rev. William Dawson served as College president. William Stith, The History of the First Discovery and Settlement of Virginia: Being an Essay Towards a General History of this Colony (1747. Reprint edition Spartanburg, S.C., 1965). Stith’s cousin-once-removed wrote that Stith “had no taste in style. He is inelegant...and his details often too minute to be tolerable, even to a native of the country.” TJ, Notes on Virginia, 177. Collinson describes a journey to “A Gentlemen’s house where my good friend Isham recommended me.” The distance and placement of the house suggest strongly this could be Jefferson. See Berkeley and Berkeley, ed., The Correspondence of John Bartram 1734-1777, 102-3. See also chap. 2.
The dozen vestrymen chosen to make decisions for the parish did not necessarily attend every service. A comment by the Reverend Devereux Jarratt in Bath Parish in 1763 reveals just that when he exclaimed that at his first Sunday preaching at Butterwood church, "Three or four of the vestry were then present." The vestry's job was administrative, not necessarily as spiritual leaders of the flock. The closest church to Shadwell was Mountain Chapel, built in the periphery of St. James Parish in what would become Fredericksville Parish after 1744. The parish boundaries changed around them: Peter served the old St. James Northam Vestry, but Thomas served Fredericksville.146

During some of the years that the Jeffereons resided at Tuckahoe, Peter served on the vestry of St. James Northam, where his life was already intertwined with some of his fellow vestrymen. Jefferson's friend William Randolph had been on the vestry and had been a burgess for Goochland County from 1742 to 1744. Two other vestrymen served as burgesses and two were married to Randolphs. Vestryman Arthur Hopkins was a physician and among the richest men in Albemarle County when he died. He had witnessed Peter and Jane Jefferson's marriage bond in 1739. Jefferson, Hopkins, and Lewis all had residences in Albemarle County and left the vestry when they removed from Goochland County; they all became leaders in the new county. In 1750 Jefferson was among the vestry who hired William Douglas as minister. Jefferson later arranged for his son Thomas to attend Douglas's Latin school and to board with him during the

146 Twelve was the usual number of vestrymen, although fewer generally came to meeting, even for the first service of a newly hired minister. Jarratt, Life, 45. Mountain Chapel likely later became Walker's Church, near Thomas Walker's. On the location of Mountain Chapel, see Meade, Old Churches, II, 30; Rose, Diary, 33, 215 n. 376; Benjamin B Weisiger III, abstractor and compiler, Goochland County Virginia Wills and Deeds 1736-1742..., 1984, np. [Deed Book #3], 39.
school year, which he did from 1752 to 1754 and maybe until 1757. Peter and Jane Jefferson's own children are not listed in Douglas's registry of baptisms, but Douglas baptized Peter and Jane's grandchildren who lived in that parish.\footnote{147}

The Reverend James Maury, who became rector of Fredericksville Parish in 1754, is best known as the teacher of Thomas Jefferson, but the link between Peter and Maury extended back to at least 1748. Maury belonged to the Loyal Company, one of forty investors along with Thomas Walker, Peter Jefferson, and Joshua Fry. Maury married the niece of Thomas Walker, Peter's associate in various land speculation schemes, and Maury's daughter married one of Joshua Fry's sons. Thus, Maury's place among these surveyors was as family, friend, fellow investor, and professional, in short, that of a peer. Maury became Thomas Jefferson's teacher in 1758. The class included Dabney Carr, John Walker, and James, Jr. and Matthew Maury, as well as James Madison, who later became bishop of Virginia. Clergy like Maury became important links in the cultural web of these young Virginians, but their personal relationships could be real and lasting. Thomas admired Maury's library and called him "a correct Classical scholar." Their

friendship included the young Jefferson standing as a baptismal sponsor for Maury’s son Abraham.  

Peter Jefferson also had a social relationship with Robert Rose. Their bond may have been professional, perhaps as pastor to flock, but they also shared interests as fellow surveyors, planters, readers, and Virginians. Jefferson did not live in St. Anne’s Parish where Rose preached in the southern part of Albemarle, but he may have been concerned with the welfare of the parish as part of the county’s general situation. Rose certainly shared an intellectual bond with surveyors and occasionally accompanied them on expeditions. He came to Virginia from England at the behest of Alexander Spotswood at Germanna, where he served as minister and as bookkeeper for the retired lieutenant governor. He performed the services of a doctor in the community and held substantial land and slaves. Rose was a fellow investor in the towns that Peter Jefferson surveyed. Rose bought four lots in the speculative Beverly Town (or Westham). But his interest was in more than mere investment: on March 7, 1750, Rose rode to Joshua Fry’s “to make Him a visit and lay down Tye River in ye Map of Virginia.” It is not known if Jefferson was with them for this work that took them into the following day. Jefferson may have been with his wife at Tuckahoe; Jane gave birth to a stillborn son there on March ninth.

---


149 When he died Rose owned 103 slaves, more than anyone else who lived in colonial Albemarle County; however, Rose’s slaves lived on plantations in Essex Co. and Orange Co. Sixty-two of his people lived in Albemarle, on seven different quarters.
Rose also experimented with refining equipment that benefited the agricultural enterprise in which they all invested. He is credited with inventing the tobacco canoe or “bateaux” that was used to transport hogsheads over the sometimes shallow drafts of the upper James River. After mid-century, both tobacco warehouses and ports of call for slave ships moved up the James to the head of deep-water navigation at Richmond. Above this settlement water levels were less predictable. Carrying hogsheads by land was also problematic. A single hogshead could be rolled using a horse or two, hitched directly to the great barrel turned on its side. This was inefficient but effective if roads were in decent repair and not too muddy, a losing proposition during April when most planters delivered their crops for inspection. A single hogshead could also be carried in a wagon, again, using two or more draft animals. Life in the upper regions required some adaptation and Rose made some. He took the design of an Indian canoe, increased its length from sixteen to fifty or sixty feet, its width to four or five feet, and lashed two together for stability. This arrangement could carry up to nine hogsheads, lashed sideways across the gunwales. Rose’s canoes first embarked in March 1748. James Maury commented, “For this great improvement in inland navigation, we mountaineers are indebted to the late Reverend and ingenious Mr. Rose.”

Neither Rose nor Jefferson was passive in his agricultural pursuits. They experimented, developed, and invested, transforming the back country into part of the vibrant economic system of the colony.

PJ, with 60 slaves, was second. AlCWB 2: pages inserted in back numbered 1-2. See also chap. 4. Rose, Diary, 98, see also 321, 335; Jefferson Family, Bible.

150 Rose, Diary, 53, 250-252, n. 545, n. 547.
Rose and Jefferson inhabited the same landscape. Rose dined with Jefferson at Shadwell, at Viewmont with Joshua Fry and John Harvie and Rose’s brother John. Rose and Jefferson traveled together from Fry’s to Tuckahoe, staying en route with John Bourke one night and Arthur Hopkins the next. He lodged with Jefferson, Fry, and William Stith at Albemarle Courthouse after a vestry meeting there. It is unclear whether the other men attended the vestry meeting or if they were at the courthouse on other business. John Harvie, an executor of Peter Jefferson’s estate, stood as a witness to Robert Rose’s will, and Harvie and Jefferson, along with John Nicholas and Anne Rose, provided the bond that allowed Anne to obtain a probate of her husband’s estate. Peter Jefferson and Rose shared books, in at least one case, a volume of Enlightenment inquiry. Their common interests were practical, social, and intellectual, and many of their exchanges had to do with the men’s active investment in the commonweal.¹⁵¹

Peter Jefferson also had social and family ties with the Reverend William Stith. Jane Jefferson was William Stith’s first cousin. Both Jefferson and Stith were named executors of William Randolph’s estate and guardians to Randolph’s son. Stith had been master of the Grammar School at the College of William and Mary before moving to Henrico Parish as its pastor. Stith speculated in land with Jefferson’s colleague William Mayo. In 1752 he moved back to the College to serve as president. There he replaced the Reverend William Dawson, who was also his brother-in-law. Like Peter, Stith tackled the intellectual problem of how to envision the whole of Virginia. Stith’s

¹⁵¹ Rose records many visits with Joshua Fry and their friendship may have dated from when they both lived in Essex County, Virginia, previously. See Rose, Diary, 33, 60, 83, 92, and Kimball, Road to Glory, 23-24. On borrowed books, see Rose, Diary, 1, 112; also Chapter 1.
contribution was his 1747 book, *The History of the First Discovery and Settlement of Virginia.*

The Jeffersons' family and friends took them outside of the Established church as well. Brother-in-law Charles Lewis and his family were among the dissenters of Albemarle County. The Lewises hosted visiting ministers that local Presbyterians requested from the nearby Presbytery of Hanover (County). The Lewises were among those of various faiths signing the "Petition of Dissenters in Albemarle and Amherst Counties" that they submitted to the new government of the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1776 seeking no state support of any religion. Joshua Fry's wife was Huguenot and their son Henry became a Baptist, whose Evangelical fervor even drove him to convert the ballroom in his house to a room for preaching.

The sons of prominent planters took their places almost without pause. In the person of young Thomas Mann Randolph, a Tuckahoe representative came back to the St. James Northam vestry in December 1763, soon after Randolph reached his majority. In 1767 young Thomas Jefferson joined the vestry of Fredericksville Parish, taking the place of John Harvie. Harvie and fellow vestryman Thomas Walker had both been executors of Peter's will and guardians and advisors to young Thomas. Seeing their

---

152 Goochland County, Virginia, Wills, 1742-1749, p. 73.

charge take this important local office followed through on their duties to his father's
estate. Fredericksville Parish served Albemarle County north of the Rivanna River.

Almost immediately following the Shadwell fire, when Thomas Jefferson moved across
the river to Monticello, he appeared on the vestry of St. Anne's, the parish serving
Albemarle south of the Rivanna. One gets the sense that young planters come of age
bore early entitlement to this office. The planters may have hired and befriended the
clergy because the clergy were learned and had access to books and could teach some of
the skills the planters' children needed. But the clergy also needed the planters.
Influential planters could determine the fortunes of the local clergy by supporting them or
denying their bids for rehire, especially after the 1763 Parson's Cause case that gave
authority over the clergy to the Virginia Assembly instead of the Bishop of London. The
local glebe (the land given over to the church for the minister's use) represented a basic
public commitment to the minister and the largess of the vestry.154

154 TJ served the St. Anne's vestry 1772-1785. Rosalie Edith Davis,
Fredericksville Parish Vestry Book 1742-1787 (Manchester, Mo., 1978); Meade,
Old Churches, 50. Specifications for glebe houses suggest the minimum acceptable standards
for men of professional standing. The 1748 act for support of the clergy required that
every parish provide glebe lands of at least two hundred acres, with a "mansion and other
convenient out-houses," including "kitchen, barn, stable, dairy, meat house, corn house,
and garden, well-pailed, or inclosed with mudwalls, and with other conveniences as they
shall think fit." (Henings VI: 88-89). References to mid-century glebe houses reveal that
the houses often had amenities such as plastered walls, brick chimneys, multiple glazed
windows, and floor plans that acknowledged the growing need for separate social spaces.
The vestry paid for houses that acknowledged the social rituals they shared. Susan A.
Kern, "Virginia's Frontier Housing: Architectural, Documentary, and Archaeological
Evidence for the Mid-Eighteenth Century," Paper presented at the Vernacular
Peter Jefferson’s many business and personal alliances provide an interesting map of how one person or family’s associations connect them across a range of social and geographic settings. Peter Jefferson’s status and influence in his personal, professional, business, and family relationships describe a man charged with extensive power and responsibility. The capital investments of Peter Jefferson and his peers affected and generally benefited the larger community of free laborers and small landowners around them, while also establishing the economic systems that would encourage slavery as labor for the old system of tobacco and the growing diversified crops to come.

In discussing Peter Jefferson’s many connections, we slip inexorably from the private to the public domain. His range of power through public office was ever-widening, yet the circle of associates included many of the same friends and relations no matter how high in office he rose. Peter Jefferson’s friends were almost all planters and slave owners. They understood how to use their connections to protect their self-interest. In short, they were men of intellect and action, whose wealth, coupled with their system for supporting each other, made possible the liberality they enjoyed. Although they were alike in being men of property, the wealthiest were Virginia-born from a few familiar families – their connections were invaluable. Other colleagues were foreign-born and brought the fruits of their formal educations to the group. They were related to each other in many ways -- by blood and marriage, through their many roles as public servants, and their private arrangements with each other. In short, beyond company kept as a burgess or plantation owner, Jefferson involved himself with people whose skills and intellect contributed to the welfare of the Jeffersons and to the growth of the colony. We will meet them again in chapter six.
This close reading of plantation activities reveals the range of Peter Jefferson’s business transactions across social strata. It shows how his wealth influenced the lives of many people, from giving them opportunities for work on his plantation, to access to consumer goods, or a place to grind and ship their corn. Historians such as T.H. Breen in *Tobacco Culture* have analyzed the debt relationship of wealthy planters to their overseas merchants. This study shows that planters like Peter Jefferson extended credit to people of all economic levels around him. Not only was there a whole other structure of debt among poorer Virginians, but the wealthy planters controlled that debt and hence the people who owed it. Entire households were involved in the economic relationship with the planter. This study shows women’s contributions to their household economies as their handwork supplied people like Jefferson. In fact, though his account book records debts in £.s.d., often the currency actually exchanged was sewing or corn or another product or service. People like the Jeffersons provided the economic opportunity and infrastructure that made it possible for others to move to newly settled areas.

This study also points to a use of slave labor that has not been explored. If slaves and overseers were tending tobacco crops on more than one piece of land and moving between them regularly, then their home lives were less regular than previously imagined.

That the Jeffersons associated with wealthy, influential Virginians is no surprise. It was in the interest of the gentry to look after each other’s estates and heirs. The social and geographic range of Peter Jefferson’s legal team suggests that the Jeffersons carefully calculated how various friends and family could best serve them after Peter’s death. The
geographic range over which they maintained close ties seems great and once again paints a picture of how powerful the gentry were, even somewhere remote.
Rivanna River
Shadwell 31 slaves north side of river
Monticello 10 slaves south side of river
5 slaves (location undetermined)
7 slaves (location undetermined)

Fluvanna River
Snowdon 7 slaves

Figure 3.1 Albemarle County: Jefferson plantation land and quarter sites.
Figure 3.2. Agricultural implements (from left): narrow hoe, broad hoe, grubbing hoe, spade, narrow spade, narrow axe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr.</th>
<th>Cr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To his Rent for the Present year</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To cash pd. his Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By his Wifes work for making 46 Shirts &amp; Shifts out of Dam }</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sisyrdf[?] Linen @ 8 Each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Do for 15 Small Do</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Do. for 10 Do. delivered when returned</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Do. for making 8 Cotton Frocks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Do. for 6 Frocks + 1 little Jacket &amp; Breeches when returned to Cash</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pd. for making 13 mens &amp; 12 Suits of Wos. Wollen Cloths @ 1/3</td>
<td>1.11.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To cutting out the Linen Cloths</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To paid Peter Shepherd</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.3. Account of Jefferson Estate with Peter Shepherd, 1761, showing Eleanor Shepherd’s contribution to her family’s economy. JHAB II: 1.
Figure 3.4. 1723 Spanish Real, cut into one-quarter. SW557B, drawing by Amy E. Grey. Monticello/Thomas Jefferson Foundation.
Figure 3.5. Tobacco warehouses on the James River and South Anna, Pamunkey, and York River corridors. The Jeffersons' tobacco moved through all these inspection stations.
CHAPTER 4
SLAVEHOLDING AND FIELDWORK

In 1757, Phillis, an enslaved black woman who was probably in her mid forties, passed from one owner to another for at least the third time in her life. Peter Jefferson, her second owner, died in August that year and Phillis may or may not have known that she was now part of an estate that would eventually be divided. Phillis was not one of the eight slaves chosen by Peter Jefferson in his will to attend one of his children. Instead she was among the anonymous slaves “not herein otherwise disposed of.” She may have known that, until the master’s fourteen-year-old son turned twenty-one, she would likely continue to do the same work in the same place, with little change in her daily life. Or she may have heard that estates under the watch of executors who also had their own plantations to operate may not be the most predictable of places. As we shall see, she and two of her children had once been part of an estate whose fortunes were unsettled, and they would later hear of the death of a slave who was part of their same estate.

Peter Jefferson purchased Phillis and her two children, Dinah and Goliah, from Jefferson’s father’s estate in 1732. Phillis, Dinah, and Goliah rejoined fellow slaves Farding and Pompey, who Jefferson inherited when his father died the year before. It is likely that these slaves, and the rest of Peter Jefferson’s growing slave community, lived on property at Fine Creek in Goochland County. A few years later, they all moved
further west on the north branch of the James River to a piece of land that Jefferson would name Shadwell, where Jefferson’s own family would grow. Peter spread his sixty slaves across four sites at Shadwell and more land he owned on the Fluvanna River, twenty miles to the south. By 1757 Phillis lived with nine other fieldhands, including her now-adult son: it is likely they lived on the south side of the Rivanna River on land that would later be named Monticello. Phillis and Goliah shared work, if not walls, with Toby and Juno, and their children, Toby, Nanny, and Orange, and with Gill and Fany, whose first child would be born in 1760. Another adult woman Lucey also lived there. Phillis’s daughter Dinah lived on another Shadwell quarter site with other field hands.

When Peter Jefferson died in 1757, the lives of this group probably were little changed, although they passed into the ownership of Jefferson’s estate and its control by executors. Perhaps one of the strangest events of that year was when the estate appraisers came. The appraisers listed the slaves by name and perhaps announced the value assigned to each person standing there, exposed to this blunt face of chattel slavery and reminders of their mortality in the appraiser’s judgment of their age and the promise of their physical ability. The appraisers called forth the three men, then the two boys, the four women, then the girl. Phillis and the senior Toby shared either age or infirmity in 1757. Appraisers valued Phillis at £20 that year, when the average value of adult women on the plantation was £35. Toby was valued at £25, when the average value of an adult male was almost £44. In fact, Toby had the lowest valuation of any adult male on the plantation. His age is unknown, but he must have been at least 25, as he had been

155 AICWB 2: 32-34.
appraised as an adult in 1753 and had fathered two children by then.\textsuperscript{156} His valuation in 1757 suggests that he may have been much older or suffered an injury that limited his ability to labor; it also highlights how many questions the documents leave us about these people.

These slaves continued to work year-round from their small quarter, which also housed the tools of their daily tasks: tending tobacco, clearing timber, feeding their group. Phillis and Toby may have been the household members who stayed near the house to help with children, maintain tools, or otherwise support the more physical labors of their families who lived with them and nearby. Like all families, the slave families changed. Toby, Juno, Toby, Jr., and Nanny came to Shadwell in 1755 from nearby Orange County. Their son Orange was born at Shadwell between 1755 and 1757. Another daughter named Luna was born to them in 1758. Gill and Fany brought four children, Ned, Suckey, Frankey, and Gil, Jr., to the household between 1760 and 1769. Changes from the outside came during the 1760s when Thomas Jefferson’s claims to his patrimony shifted the center of his plantation from the north (Shadwell) side to the south (Monticello) side of the Rivanna River.

Peter Jefferson had spread his slaves over five quarter sites. When sons Thomas and Randolph divided the slaves, roughly half of the slaves from each quarter went with each son. Goliah, Toby and Juno and their son Toby, and Gill and Fany and their new family members lived on land now called Monticello. Nanny, Orange, and Lucey

\textsuperscript{156} Phillis’s age is based on the assumption that she was about 16 years of age when her first child was born, and that two years passed before the birth of her second child. See chap. 2 on fertility. Orange Co. Deed Book 2, 181-183.
remained there or at Shadwell until their owners moved them to the lands that would become Randolph's on the Fluvanna River. Phillis had seen friends and kin come and go in her life. Sometime before 1757, Phillis saw her old companions from Fine Creek, Farding and Pompey, die or leave the plantation; they did not appear in Peter Jefferson's inventory. Phillis herself may have died before 1774. She was not in the lists kept by Thomas Jefferson when he came into ownership of his Shadwell legacy. If she lived, she changed hands again and became part of Randolph's Snowdon plantation in 1776. Phillis would have been in her mid-sixties by then, very old indeed by any eighteenth-century standards.\footnote{AICWB 2: 45; FB, 5; PJAB, 17. The evidence for which slaves Randolph inherited is primarily negative. There are no known surviving farm rolls by RJ if in fact he made any. A few of RJ's slaves are mentioned by name in correspondence with TJ. If a slave is not on TJ's 1774 slave list, I have presumed that slave went to Randolph, unless that slave, like Phillis, was older and may well have died before then. See esp. FB, 5-21. On}

Phillis experienced many changes in her world, sometimes because her owners moved her, sometimes because people moved around her. While her work was primarily as an agricultural laborer, she probably also saw changes from the ubiquity of tobacco to the emergence of a grain economy. She may have spent her entire life on parts of plantations that were remote from public life, but she still may have recognized that when she moved to Shadwell it was remote from everything and that she was part of a growing and changing world. She would be part of the planter's efforts to remake the land to serve his commercial enterprise. Phillis helped turn forest into field, saw ancient Indian fields become farmland, watched as men built roads and wharfs to move crops. Documents and material evidence from Shadwell attest to some of the changes that slaves
there experienced over the course of their lives. The slaves' work may have been almost the same day in and day out for years. Then the Jeffersons divided land, slaves, and remade long-standing patterns of work, social relationships, and even family. Historians, of necessity, have had to characterize broadly the general nature of fieldwork on a tobacco plantation or in other work, but the close view of the Shadwell slaves offers the opportunity to talk about how much slaves' lives changed and how their owners' actions affected them in concrete ways.

The patterns of work and housing that the Jeffersons established reflect a range of slave experiences. By 1757 the home quarter at Shadwell reflected the practices of established plantations such as were found in tidewater; but the field quarters suggest practices of gang housing that was more often found in newly settled areas in mid-century Virginia. Additionally, the home quarter site of the plantation became a field quarter following the final dispersal of the Shadwell estate in the 1770s, and the use of the houses and landscape changed to reflect later-eighteenth-century ideas about keeping slaves.

The Jeffersons' slaves occupied a world that we can explore through lists of slave names, the material organization of the plantation, and the labor systems of the plantation and surrounding county. The names of slaves who lived at Shadwell, from Peter Jefferson’s probate inventory, a deed of Jane Jefferson to her son Thomas, the plantation account books, and Thomas Jefferson’s later records, all contribute to “slave lists” for the plantation. Although the Jeffersons’ papers give names to almost all of the Shadwell old age, see Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves*, 60-63.
slaves, it is nearly impossible to get anything close to individual biographies for any of them. The slave population was a growing and changing thing, much like the plantation itself. Again, we begin with a moment in time, the "snapshot" of Shadwell made after Peter Jefferson's death in 1757, when his moveable goods were inventoried and appraised for probate (Figure 4.1). With the sixty slaves listed then, and the suggestion from material goods of slave housing and work, it becomes possible to move both backward and forward in time to describe the slaves' lives there. Overall, the story is one of growth until the Jefferson children began to disperse their father's estate in the 1760s. What we know about the social organization of the Shadwell slave community comes to us primarily from documents left by these slaves' owners and does not tell us whether that organization was generated by the slaves or by those who owned them—or some of each.158

Peter Jefferson was the second-largest slaveholder in colonial Albemarle County. His probate inventory recorded sixty slaves on his plantation lands in 1757. The

158 For the purposes of this study I use Shadwell as a synonym for the entire agricultural enterprise of Peter Jefferson. Where I am referring to the plot of 400 acres on the Rivanna River I will use Shadwell tract or otherwise make it clear that I am talking about just that land, since PJ used a quarter farm system and thought about his land holdings as somewhat independent entities. The same goes for Monticello: the term refers to Thomas Jefferson's entire plantation, or just the home quarter within his or his father's larger plantation system. Although it is anachronistic to do so, I have used the TJ-era farm names to refer to those same tracts when they were under his father's ownership. There is little record of how PJ referred to his land, and using the familiar TJ names is the way to write them that is clearest.

PJ, and later, TJ used a quarter farm system where the plantation was divided into smaller agricultural units that each had domestic facilities - houses and work areas - for both the slave and hired people who lived and worked that piece of land. I use the word quarter here as both quarter group - the five distinct groups of people within the plantation labor population, and as a particular site where workers were quartered.
aggregate picture of these slaves, that is, their statistical measurement as a group, allows comparison to recent work on other slaves in the Piedmont. Only three slaveholders owned more than fifty slaves. Of 170 decedents whose estates were inventoried, one half owned slaves. Of those 85 slave owners, 58 percent owned five or fewer individuals.

The holdings of the three men with the most slaves, Robert Rose (62), Peter Jefferson (60), and Joshua Fry (51), comprised 22 percent of all slaves on Albemarle estates. In terms of estate value, these men represented the top 4 percent of slave owners, or the top 2 percent of all decedents during the colonial period. The thirty-one slaves on just the home quarter at Shadwell outnumbered the slave holdings of 90 percent of Albemarle slave owners; only five slave owners held more than twenty-seven slaves. Just the size of the Shadwell slave population afforded its members opportunities that few other slaves in the surrounding area had, such as friends and family--even extended family--close at hand. The size of the Jeffersons' slave population compared with tidewater plantations rather than those in the Piedmont, where estates with over thirty slaves were uncommon in the eighteenth century; most Piedmont slaves lived on plantations with ten or fewer slaves.159

---

159 The number of slave owners is based on probate inventories and represents only those slave owners who died during the colonial period and whose estates were ordered into probate by the court. The number of estates (n=170) and slave holders (n=85) differs from the number of inventories used in wealth calculations in chapter 1 (n=165) because the wealth figures use only inventories in which the goods were assigned monetary values. Slave holding figures include a number of estates that listed slaves but that did not have appraised values assigned to the slaves or other goods. Rose owned 62 slaves in Albemarle Co. and another 41 in other counties (total 103). A few other slave holders owned slaves in more than one county. Since my purpose here is to explore the experience of the Shadwell slaves, I am using only the Albemarle Co. figures in the statistics in this chapter, see AICWB 1 and AICWB 2.
When he died, Peter Jefferson’s investment in slaves equaled £1,805, a sum that of itself would make Peter merely the second instead of the wealthiest person in colonial Albemarle County. Measured in slaves alone, Peter was worth more than ninety-nine percent of decedents in the county. Peter’s slaves comprised 76 percent of the value of his estate worth just over £2,399. The sixty slaves ranged in value from about £8 to £57.10., with an average value of £30.1. The male slave Sawney was the most valuable slave at £57.10, but female slaves totaled more than males. Females equaled a total of £944.10. or 52 percent of the value of all slaves, and males equaled £858.10. or 48 percent of the total value of slaves.1

In 1757 the Shadwell slaves ranged in age from newborn, in the case of five infants listed with their mothers, to at least one superannuated woman, Phillis. Age and a

In Albemarle Co. 76 percent of slaves lived with 10 or fewer cohorts. Morgan and Nicholls find that the disparity between most measures of slave life in the Piedmont and the tidewater evened out toward the end of the eighteenth century. The Shadwell figures suggest that slaves on larger plantations had greater stability earlier. See A1CWB 1 and A1CWB 2. For Piedmont statistics see Morgan and Nicholls, “Slaves in Piedmont Virginia,” 238-241.

160 The figure £1,805 is obtained by adding the values of all 60 slaves listed in the inventory: subtotals £1,522 for Shadwell and £283 for Snowdon. The subtotal for the Shadwell slaves in the inventory is listed as £1,537, which is off by £15 from the above figure. The discrepancy may be a math error on the part of the recorder or due to a miswritten figure when the inventory was copied into the county will book. For the statistics of slave values within the group I have used the corrected figure of £1,805. In wealth statistics for the county I have used the written inventory total of £2,399.0.5. The statistical difference is negligible. See chap. 1 for wealth statistics on colonial Albemarle. N=165, counting estates that were inventoried and for which values were assigned during the colonial period. A1CWB 1 and A1CWB 2.

The lowest individual value at Shadwell was £8, assigned to the child Bellow (or Bella); however, five infants were assigned a value with their mothers and not an individual value. A1CWB 2: 41-48.
slave's value were closely associated (Figure 4.2). An individual's age, sex, and health affected his or her value, as seen by estate appraisers, who considered the skills a slave had, the labor they had the potential to perform, or the healthy children they might bear.

In 1757 one-fourth of the Shadwell slaves, or 15, were adult males, and just over 28 percent (17) were adult women (Figure 4.3). Nine boys made up the lowest percentage, 15 percent, while 19 girls made up the highest at 31.5 percent. Overall, females outnumbered males 60 percent to 40 percent, offering males exceptionally good chances for creating a family within the Shadwell community. Among adults, this ratio was 1.13 women for each man or 88 men per hundred women, a fairly close ratio, but still to the advantage of the men in terms of finding a partner. The ratio of adult women to men was closer to the parity found in tidewater and older counties than to the more newly established counties of the southside Piedmont. The 32 adults outnumbered the 28 children. In the abstract that meant that each child had 1.14 adults to learn from, while each adult woman could count 1.65 children. That figure is also closer to tidewater than Piedmont proportions. Based on the number of woman-child relationships that can be determined, families predominated at Shadwell. In general, the adult population of women was of child-bearing age. Five women had infants listed with them in 1757. Most of the Shadwell slaves lived in households that had at least two generations within them; at least one had three generations.161

161 Piedmont counties tended to have higher ratios of women to men. In older counties Morgan and Nicholls found ratios about even (Orange and Prince Edward) and over 150 (Goochland), while in new counties ratios were higher, circa 1757: 115 (Amelia Co.), 140 (Chesterfield and Spotsylvania), and more than 150 (Lunenburg). Fewer than 2 to 1 children to women were found in the tidewater vs. over 2 to 1 westward. See Morgan
Twenty-eight children lived at Shadwell in 1757, and as many as fifteen of them were probably born in the 1750s. During the decade following Peter Jefferson's death, slave women at Shadwell gave birth to at least ten children. Women in labor received extra fortification in the form of spirits and sweeteners. Sometimes a local midwife attended births; sometimes other slaves must have aided. One midwife was Jane Hammock, but she is mentioned by name only in 1762. In 1758 midwives came four times and earned 10 s. each visit. A midwife aided one birth in 1760, and in that year two slaves in labor were given a quart of brandy accompanied by a pound of sugar each. Another gave birth with the addition of only a pint of brandy. Others may have had molasses. The treatment of slave and free women in childbirth may have differed little as the same midwives sometimes visited both populations.¹⁶²

The fertility patterns of seven slave women born in the first half of the eighteenth century show that slaves at Shadwell had the benefits of a relatively healthy, stable environment (Table 4.1). The seven women produced a total of forty-three children, an average of six births per woman. Two had four children each, one woman had nine. The number of years each woman bore children ranged between nine and twenty-four, for an average of just over seventeen childbearing years. These women gave birth on average every 33.9 months, but the normalized average of five of the seven is 20.9 months. These slaves all became Thomas Jefferson's upon the division of the Shadwell estate.

¹⁶² Mrs. Gaines, a midwife hired by TJ in the 1770s, helped deliver babies for TJ's wife Martha and for Nell, a slave. MB, 447, 468; Harvie I: 5, 26, 36, 37; PJAB, 10.
Except for Sall, they were all field hands, although Bellinda and Cate may have had other occupations during the Shadwell years because they lived on the home quarter site with skilled workers. Birth intervals among slaves reflect the patterns of a natural fertility population, that is, one in which lactation and conception were not artificially interrupted. Lactation, hard work, and diet all affected a woman’s ability to bear children. The slave birth patterns contrast with those of Jane, whose fertility was affected by her means to have a wet nurse for her babies.\footnote{These seven women all became the property of TJ, which is why there are records of their lives after Shadwell. They may not be representative of the entire Shadwell population including the slaves that went to RJ, but there are not records that continue RJ’s slaves’s history. The average of 20.9 months between births throws out the figures for Sall and Nell since they are so far from the other averages. Studies of natural fertility populations find an average duration of postpartum amenorrhea (the period during which ovulation is suppressed) at 20.10 months. Standard deviation = 7.22, n=20. Beverly I. Strassmann and John H. Warner, “Predictors of Fecundability and Conception Waits Among the Dogon of Mali.” American Journal Of Physical Anthropology 105 (1998), 171, 176. Kulikoff found that white women in the second half of the eighteenth century had an average of 6.9 children and had a birth about every 30 months. Morgan found that on average, slaves gave birth every 28 months and were about 18 years old at first conception. Kulikoff, Tobacco and Slaves, 57, table 2, 60; Morgan, Slave Counterpoint, 89, table 21, 92. See also chap. 2.}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates*</th>
<th>No. of children</th>
<th>Age range of reproductive years, if known</th>
<th>No. of fertile years</th>
<th>Avg months between pregnancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sall (the Elder)</td>
<td>c.1725-1797</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16-40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fany</td>
<td>1736-1802</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24-33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juno</td>
<td>Bef. 1735-1801</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nell</td>
<td>Bef. 1741-1819</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cate</td>
<td>1747-aft. 1819</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29-48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellinda</td>
<td>1739-1808</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18-38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moll</td>
<td>1749-1811</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19-37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Jefferson</td>
<td>1720-1776</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19-35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Birth records of eight women from Shadwell. AlCWB 2: 45, 47; FB 21, 22, 28; Files LCS; Jefferson Family, Bible; Harvie II: 10.

*Dates are approximate. Dates of Juno and Nell are based on an assumption that they were at least 16 years old at the birth of their first child.

bNumber of births recorded. There may have been other children who died or other pregnancies not recorded.

cJuno was excused from labor due to age or infirmity by 1774.

dCate’s age seems high, but multiple TJ documents record the dates of her and her children’s births.

Sall’s fertility suggests that one of her roles may have been the Jefferson babies’ wet nurse. Sall bore children over twenty-four of her seventy-two years, but the intervals between pregnancies were long, on average 41 months or 3.4 years. Her pregnancies coincide roughly with Jane’s and the impact of nursing Jefferson children in the intervals between her own children may have extended her amenorrhea (Table 4.2). The Jeffersons gave preferential treatment to Sall and her children (more in chapter 5). There

---

164 This coincidence may also reflect the travel schedules of their husbands, as it is likely
is no similar explanation for Nell’s extended number of months between pregnancies, but the slave lists reveal only children who were alive when a census was taken. Nell’s fertility may have been suppressed because of hard labor, extended nursing, or other natural causes—or she may have had children who did not survive infancy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sall’s births</th>
<th>Jane’s births</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Nan</td>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Cate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>Peter Field (died)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son (died)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Sall</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Scott Randolph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Comparison of birth dates of Sall and Jane.

Although much of what can be said about the Jeffersons’ slaves echoes patterns established in the tidewater, the quarter established on the Fluvanna River lands reflects practices of Piedmont slave holding. At Snowdon, Jefferson moved fairly young slaves to new land to establish crops and families there. Peter purchased the bulk of the Fluvanna River lands in the 1750s and moved three men and three women there. The first child was born to this group in 1757 and others would produce children in coming years: they were at the early stages of their reproductive lives. Peter purchased some of that Sawney, PJ’s valet was the father of Sall’s children.
these slaves recently and it is possible that some were African. The mid-eighteenth century saw the center of Virginia’s African population shift from tidewater to west of the fall line and with it dealers moved slave sales to the upper James River. In the 1750s, between a third and two-thirds of all slaves were African in some areas of the Piedmont. The names of the Snowdon group are more “outlandish” than other Shadwell slaves and may well reflect African origins. There is also a suggestion from the distribution of space and cooking implements that the Snowdon quarter housed the slaves in dormitory-style arrangements, another pattern that tended toward the formative stages of settlement, when planters housed unrelated adults together.165

The inventory list does not tell the whole story, however; the slave population was always changing. Four slaves mentioned in Peter Jefferson’s account book either died or, in one case, were sold before Peter’s death; Farding and Pompey, the slaves Peter inherited, were two of these. A slave named Jupiter, who worked on the Shadwell mill in 1753, disappeared from the record. Presumably, Farding, Pompey, and Jupiter all died before 1757. In 1751 Peter sold a man named Jack to a Mr. Charles Clarke, and a man named Robin ran away from Snowdon in 1751. The slave Sandy was not listed in Peter’s inventory, possibly because he had been leased out in 1757. Until the mid-1760s, the biggest changes to slaves’s lives were probably the effects of their own dynamic families: people grew, married, and had children. Sixteen children appeared new in the records

165 Morgan and Nicholls find that “planters singled out young slaves when they opened up quarters further west.” Morgan and Nicholls report 1755 figures for the percentage of adult slaves who were African as 59 percent in Amelia Co. and 37 percent in Chesterfield Co. “Slaves in Piedmont Virginia,” 215-217; Table IV, 220, 224. Morgan, Slave Counterpoint, 104-5.
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between 1757 and 1770. The marriages of three Jefferson daughters, who then claimed their patrimony and moved themselves and their slaves away, affected the slave community. In 1760 Mary took Nan to Fairfields, in Goochland County; five years later Martha took Rachel to Spring Forest, also in Goochland; and in 1769 Lucy took Cachina and Phebe to nearby Buck Island. Bigger changes came after the mid-1760s, when Thomas refocused the center of his plantation activities on Monticello and began to move large numbers of slaves between his properties. Slaves may have moved to Randolph’s Snowdon concurrently with Thomas’s restructuring of land and labor, although Randolph would not legally claim his land until 1776.\footnote{On Farding and Pompey, see Henrico Co. Records, 1725-37, 293. On Jupiter, see PJAB, 19. Jack cost £45.3, and Clarke still owed PJ 21.14.7¼, when PJ died. Clark may have lived in the vicinity of Tuckahoe as PJ purchased from Clarke small manufactured items such as basins, pins, brushes, shirt buttons, and beeswax, some of it for the Randolph family at Tuckahoe. PJ also paid Clarke “By drawing one Map of Virginia 1½ pistole,” and for making beer. PJAB, 15, 51, 54. On Robin, see VG, Hunter, November 7, 1751, no. 45. TJ’s undated accts. 1764-1775 include the entry, “To hire for Sandy from my father’s death 1757 to Dec. 31, 1762 5-1/2 years @ £18,” Papers I: 33. Thus, Sandy was owned by PJ in 1757, but leased by whom? TJ was a minor and not in a legal position to lease a slave, unless one of the executors arranged it. TJ contracted to clear land for his famous home on the top of Monticello Mountain in 1768 but did not move there until November 1770. Some of PJ’s slaves already lived on the land that would be called Monticello. TJ’s 1774 slave lists show slaves at Monticello and Shadwell (and elsewhere), but it is not known when he moved people to quarters higher on Monticello Mountain where he would build his house. Some of RJ’s slaves moved from Shadwell to Snowdon by 1770. See FB, 5-21; GB, esp. 12.}

**Slaves Beyond the Plantation**

The people who worked at Shadwell as enslaved laborers had lives before and after coming to the place that defined them for the purposes of this study. Many of the Jefferson slaves had their own connections beyond the plantation, places where kin,
friends, or even immediate family lived (Figure 4.4). They knew plantation and town landscapes other than Shadwell. The slaves who lived and worked at Shadwell experienced varying degrees of mobility abroad. Some had connections just as their masters did because they traveled with the Jefferson family in their movements around Virginia. Others had family and friends on plantations both near and far from Shadwell. Many shared in the visits of travelers or workers who spent time at the plantation. The slaves' material world reflects some of these cross-Virginia connections. Yet for some of the slaves, there is no evidence that they ever traveled beyond the plantation bounds, even remaining at "home" when the land passed from one generation to the next.

A few slaves came to Shadwell from other Virginia plantations, either through inheritance or purchase. Farding and Pompey came to Peter Jefferson by 1731. They lived on the Henrico or Goochland lands of Thomas Jefferson II until Peter acquired them, and maybe for some years following. If they lived as long as 1737, they surely moved to Shadwell with Peter Jefferson's household. Co-worker and probable kinswoman Phillis and her children Dinah and Goliah joined them in 1732, when Peter purchased this family at his father's estate sale in Goochland County. Both Peter and Jane Jefferson's later attempts to keep slave families intact suggest that either Farding or Pompey may have been the husband of Phillis and father of Dinah and Goliah. The absence of Farding and Pompey from any of the 1750s documents suggests their deaths by then. Phillis, Dinah, and Goliah lived at Shadwell, and Goliah at least remained at Shadwell and Monticello during Thomas Jefferson's ownership. Dinah moved to

16-18; MB, xlv-xlvi, 177.
Randolph's Buckingham County plantation, with other slaves from Shadwell. Phillis may have died by then.

Peter Jefferson purchased Toby and Juno and their children Nanney and Toby Jr. at an Orange County estate sale in 1755. Previously, they lived among thirty-one slaves on the estate of Edward Spencer. Toby and Juno had their third child at Shadwell and named him Orange, perhaps after the adult "Orange," with whom the parents lived at Spencer's. The young child became a link to the friend or family member who the parents wanted to remember or even invoke in the next generation.\textsuperscript{167}

A number of the Shadwell slaves may have been African. Seven slaves bore names that suggest African origin: Goliah, Gill, Crummel, Quash, Sanco, two Bellows.\textsuperscript{168} A number of classical and heroic names, the sort usually chosen by owners and not slaves, may indicate that another nine slaves were recent immigrants or children of recent immigrants. This list includes: Hercules, Samson, Nimrod, Syphax, Jupiter, Caesar, Cloe, Juno, and Phebe. Squire and Myrtilla might also fall into this historical category. Using classical names was not limited to African immigrants, however. Belinda and Squire had children born at Shadwell named Val and Minerva, but their other children had English names such as Suckey, Charlotte, and Sarah. Orange bore a name often assigned to Africans because of light skin color, but he was born in Virginia. Fourteen slaves had Old Testament names that their parents may have heard in church or

\textsuperscript{167} Orange Co. Deed Book 2, 181-183.

\textsuperscript{168} Of course we are at the mercy of the estate appraisers and recorders who may have meant Goliath in place of Goliah, and Bella, not Bellow, etc.
meetings and chose for their children, although planters often chose some of these names for their slaves. Adam and Eve, for instance were names sometimes given to the first slaves unloaded from a new cargo. Other Old Testament names at Shadwell included: Nimrod, Samson, Caesar, Jesse, Hannah, Lydia, Peter, Leah, Rachel, Dinah, Phillis, and Phil. Other names had English origins or were diminutives of familiar names, such as Sucky, Jammy, or Sall. The Shadwell slave community had no obvious felicity for naming their children after their white owners, the only coincidental name being Peter, a common name at that.  

Workers who came to Shadwell brought slaves a chance to develop skills as well as to hear news from abroad. Carpenters, coopers, blacksmiths, tailors, and shoemakers all entered the plantation, and evidence of all these skills except blacksmithing showed up.

169 Although Samson, Nimrod, and Caesar are Biblical names, they are heroic in nature and rarely used to name white Virginians.

The boy Orange may have been named for another slave that his parents knew, but the elder Orange may have been named for his skin color or Orange Co. where he lived.


Just as many slaves were known by diminutives, members of the Jefferson family were known to their slaves by diminutives or nicknames also. A diminutive form of a name was necessarily demeaning to someone, even someone held in bondage. Genovese makes the point that what might seem like a diminutive form to us was in fact the person's name, such as "Sukey." Genovese, Roll, Jordan, Roll, 448. See also Isaac Jefferson, chap. 1.

TJ's slave Madison Hemmings reported that Dolley Madison promised his mother a gift for naming her child Madison (her mother never received the gift). Madison Hemmings, in Pike County [Ohio] Republican, Mar. 3, 1873, reprinted as "Memoirs of Madison Hemmings," in Annette Gordon-Reed, Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings: An American Controversy (Charlottesville, 1997), 245, 247. Other observations on naming...
among the slaves at Shadwell. Jupiter and Samson did carpentry work on the mill with John Biswell for twenty days in 1753. Sawney hired out to shoemaker Joseph Bolling for six months, long enough to practice on a lot of shoes or pass his trade to someone else. Sandy, who ran away, took his shoemaking tools with him and, as the runaway notice recognized, “will probably endeavour to get employment that way.” The ad also noted that Sandy could do “coarse carpenters work,” and could ride a horse, acknowledgment that skills were identifying features, just as skin color, clothing, and speech patterns.

Slaves with skills were well aware of the need for their craft abilities. Other skilled craft work came from women who sewed, knitted, and wove for the slaves and the Jeffersons, but it is unclear if any of these women came to work on the plantation or simply sent batches of items they produced in their homes. Nevertheless, a slave interested in these techniques could study the garments brought to her. Other visitors included rollers and watermen who carried tobacco and other crops to warehouses and who probably had many colorful stories of life traveling along the James and other rivers. The slave Phill became known as a wagoner at Monticello, and he may have had this same task during his Shadwell years, carting goods between plantations and warehouses, making the acquaintance of many people along the way. Midwives and doctors visited the slaves and the Jeffersons; doctors may have been accompanied by their own slaves. The teachers who visited the Jefferson children for reading and writing and for dancing and music no

can be found in Genovese, Roll, Jordan, Roll, 447-449; Sobel, The World They Made Together, 156-160.
doubt made an impression on any slaves within earshot, and when the Jeffersons hosted traveling bands of Indians, the entire plantation community could not help but notice.\textsuperscript{170}

Slaves from elsewhere also visited the plantation. “Capt. Charles Lewis’s negro carpenter” had skills that allowed him to travel and perform work at Shadwell. Since the Lewises were family and visited with the Jeffersons often, the Shadwell slaves -- especially those on the home quarter -- probably knew all the attendants of the Lewis family. Some Lewis slaves and some Shadwell slaves may have become family after Lucy and Randolph married Lewis children. The Jeffersons had many well-heeled visitors who likely traveled with a slave or two. Robert Rose, Joshua Fry, John Harvie, Thomas Walker, and most gentry friends of the Jeffersons probably had slaves who knew someone at Shadwell and vice versa. The slaves of William Randolph of Tuckahoe may have formed very close relationships with the Jefferson slaves who joined the family there for seven years. Slaves no doubt packed and drove wagons for the Tuckahoe move, and some returned to Shadwell to work alongside those who never left. A slave may have driven the carriage the Jefferson women rode in to Tuckahoe, and at least one slave rode along on horseback, carrying young Thomas on his or her lap. When Peter Jefferson traveled home during the family’s years away, no doubt there were reunions for slaves, and when the whole family returned in 1753 slave families were mended. The slave Jack remained in the Tuckahoe vicinity, sold to a Mr. Charles Clark there. It may be that Jack had family in that area and sympathetic owners who could arrange his stay. Regardless,

\textsuperscript{170} PJAB, 19. Harvie I: 28, 36; Harvie II: 1. 7 Sept., 1769, printed from VG (Purdie & Dixon), 14 Sep. 1769, reprinted in Papers 1: 33
he became yet another associate that the Shadwell slaves had somewhere else in Virginia. As the Jefferson children grew and claimed slaves as their own, the web of family and acquaintances for this group of slaves once again expanded to include more plantations where kin and colleagues could be found.\textsuperscript{171}

The Material World of the Field Slaves at Shadwell

In many ways, the material world inhabited by the Shadwell slaves is inseparable from their social and working worlds. Each of these three realms offers information about the others. The documents imply that the social world was arranged very closely to the domestic setting of the slaves, although that may not have been the case in reality.

The Shadwell slaves had personal connections within and between their quarter sites. Peter Jefferson's attention to family did not stop with his own: the incidence of related individuals within each quarter shows that the Jeffersons recognized their slaves' families. Those families in many cases determined how the Jeffersons managed their bondspeople and shows in purchases, living and work arrangements, and distribution of slaves among Jefferson heirs. In some instances, slaves from different quarter areas

\textsuperscript{171} Harvie I: 25. Randall, \textit{Jefferson}, I: 11. PJAB, 15. More on this in chapter 6. The slaves at Monticello had a song that invoked Tuckahoe. As written, it is anachronistic to our period and may have come from slaves who knew Tuckahoe because of TJ's daughter's marriage to Thomas Mann Randolph of Tuckahoe. The song was called "Old Colonel Tom:" "While old Colonel Tom lived and prospered, There was nothing but joy at Tuckahoe./Now that old Colonel Tom is dead and gone,/No more joy for us at Tuckahoe." TJ's daughter Martha reported that this song was about her father-in-law, Thomas Mann Randolph Sr., who the Shadwell slaves knew only as a young man. Still the song may have been based on an earlier tradition. Elizabeth Langhorne, "Black Music and Tales from Jefferson's Monticello," \textit{Folklore and Folklife in Virginia}, I (1979), pp. 60-67, available on-line \url{http://faculty.virginia.edu/vafolk/ffv1a.htm#jefferson}, site accessed 12/16/04.
formed families and had children and the children stayed with the mother. In fact, in most cases the documents reveal only the maternal line. As adults, some siblings lived on different sites. In some cases unrelated adults lived together because their families lived on other quarters.\(^{172}\)

Both archaeological and documentary sources show that slaves belonging to wealthier masters generally fared better materially than other slaves, or indeed most poorer Virginians. Slaves suffered from their owners' economic accidents and benefited to some degree from their success. The archaeological record at Shadwell supports this observation and reveals a rich record of goods used on the home quarter, the slave-occupied portions of the plantation center. The material record also presents the contradictory evidence that slaves often had to make do or they chose their own methods of furnishing their lives, even when they had access to consumer goods.

Probate inventories offer only a skeletal image of what was in the slaves' environment, however. Generally when inventory appraisers visited slave houses, they listed only the moveable goods that belonged to the planter, including tools, fireplace equipment, and possibly some furniture. Slaves owned things too, and these do not appear in probate inventories but sometimes emerge in the archaeological record or may be inferred from what is known about how slaves lived. All of the slaves had blankets and clothes given regularly as part of the Jeffersons' duty as slave owners: these appear

\(^{172}\) In the Piedmont plantations he studied Kulikoff found that large numbers of unrelated men lived together and only 2/5 of women lived with their husbands. He also found that slaves tended to seek spouses outside their own quarters. Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves*, 371-374.
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in ration lists, not in inventories. Many slaves owned their own cooking tools, eating utensils, beds, chairs, or other furniture that was not part of the planter’s regular distribution. They made things for themselves and purchased or traded for items to enhance their personal comfort or entertainment. Slaves had garden plots to grow produce and kept livestock such as chickens, which they used for their own food or for currency. The slaves at Shadwell used and owned things that show access to a range of consumer goods and plantation-crafted items.

The slaves who worked at Shadwell lived at a time when slaves’ lives were changing as populations shifted from partially foreign to exclusively native-born. Thus they were at the end of the era when new slaves might arrive with reinforcement of African language, naming patterns, religions, songs, stories, games, methods of cookery, and craft traditions. Planters often gave to newly purchased slaves names in grand heroic European traditions - from antiquity or from the Old Testament. Planters did not always

---

173 Planters used the term peculium to refer to goods owned by a slave, including furniture, clothing, bedding, cookware, or even crops or livestock the slave raised. Peculium was a Roman law concept that acknowledged that people who were owned could also own things, and that those things did not belong to the master. One year, because he planted tobacco, TJ said his slaves should not grow tobacco “as the peculium,” since “there is no other way of drawing a line between what is theirs & mine.” FB, 269. TJ’s slaves received material incentives such as his offer that women could “earn” a crocus bed (a mattress covered in a coarse, burlap-like material) or a pot by marrying another slave within the plantation. GB, 540.

recognize and use African names. Virginia-born slaves were more likely to speak English, have familiar (to the planter) English names, and have friends and relations nearby. They lived at a time when planters were changing their ideas about how to properly keep slaves, moving them from dormitory-style arrangements to family-based units. They also lived at a time when tobacco culture was giving way to grains and mixed crops, altering work patterns, tools, and commerce systems. And they would experience a time when their owners were questioning government and ideas of freedom and slaves would receive a call to steal away - and some did. The Shadwell slaves retained a few vestiges of African traditions that reveal themselves in the material culture of the site, but they also used a variety of consumer goods that reflect the dominance of the British empire in the Atlantic world.174

The Jeffersons organized their slaves within quarters that roughly describe work details. We do not know how the Jeffersons referred to the groupings, but the primary division within the slave list is between the home quarter and outlying field quarters, three on the Rivanna River and one on the Fluvanna River. For the purposes of this study, I have followed the organizational system implied by the Jefferson documents. Both documents and archaeology enable us to treat the home-quarter residents as a distinct group within the whole (see chap. 5). Many of the home-quarter residents had specialized jobs. The home quarter was within the focus of the archaeology done at Shadwell in the 1990s, so there is a general picture of the material culture of that

---

174 The presence of the slaves themselves is evidence of the role of the Atlantic trade networks.
community. Workers on the home quarter performed field labor, but, unlike the outlying quarters, that was not the primary occupation of everyone there. Much less is known about the field quarters. Archaeologist excavated one site of an early quarter on present-day Monticello, but the locations of other field quarters remain unknown. The physical organization of the slaves partly explains plantation work patterns. The quarter system acknowledged and perhaps encouraged the people there to form families within the slave community, but many of the social relationships transcended the boundaries of the physical and labor systems.

Field Quarters

Phillis, who we met at the start of this chapter, lived in one of the field quarters along the Rivanna River. The field quarters were alike in some ways. The field slaves lived in small spaces they shared with their families and often with other unrelated people. The spaces where they slept and ate were also where they kept their tools. In every quarter, slaves had tools for working tobacco and for cooking. There was some

\[175\] The documentary evidence and the archaeological evidence for the five quarters are not parallel and any discussion of them necessarily involves talking around the many gaps in the information available for each site. The home quarter has the benefit of archaeological detail for part of the residential and work sites. But, although some occupations can be identified from the assemblage, there are only a few instances where a particular slave can be tied to a particular occupation. For the Snowdon plantation the 1757 inventory tells us which slaves and which tools were there, a nice correspondence of people and things, but that allows only a generalized picture of the place because the site remains unknown. There is strong evidence of which tools in the inventory and which slaves may have been on the farm that became Monticello, and there is some archaeology to round out that picture. Two other groups of people and two lists of tools are left floating, offering some suggestions of the bigger patterns of life, but infuriatingly brief in their detail.
difference between the other work they did at each quarter: some cleared timber, some plowed, some butchered animals.176

About half of Peter Jefferson’s slaves—twenty-nine—lived in field quarters, in groups of five to ten people (Figure 3.1, 4.5). The smallest of these groups, five, was most similar to the experience of enslaved people in colonial Albemarle: most slaves elsewhere never lived among a quarter or even plantation population larger than five.177

There were at least two families of mothers and children in each quarter, sometimes with the father present, sometimes the father lived in another group. There were families within each quarter group at Shadwell, as well as evidence that extended family was sometimes together. When Thomas and Randolph divided the field hands, some people from each quarter went with each brother; family was a greater determinant in dispersal than was the group identity of a work crew.

---

176 Historians tend to divide slave housing as either dormitory-style housing for workers of a single sex (also called gang housing), or single family housing. Historians often equate the shift from the first to the second type as a product of changes in labor systems because of the change from a tobacco-based to a grain-based economy. The ratio of people to spaces in the Shadwell field quarters suggest another variation. Many of the slaves lived as families, but shared the space with other unrelated individuals or with other families. The fact that family took precedence at Shadwell did not mean that families lived in their own spaces. There may have been some spaces reserved for unmarried adult men, but group houses most likely included families and members of both sexes. Kelso, Kingsmill, 28-30; Morgan, Slave Counterpoint, 104-109.

177 See above.
Table 4.3. Residents of Field Quarters, grouped by family where possible. (Quarter I is the Home Quarter, the subject of the next chapter.) AlCWB 2: 45, 48. *Bella was also written as Bellow.

The smallest quarter group had two women and three girls, and represented two families (see Group II, column 1, Table 4.3). Flora and her child Agey were listed together, and the other two girls, Moll and Ephey, were the children of either Flora or Sally, the other woman. The largest group had ten people, three men, two boys, four women, and one girl, in at least three family relationships, including one extended family (Group IV, column 3, Table 4.3). Two other groups, one on the Rivanna lands and one on the Fluvanna lands, had seven people each in 1757. The Rivanna group had two families from three men, two women, and two children, and also included people whose
families lived in other quarters (Group III, column 2, Table 4.3). Jack was the father of at least one child with Belinda, who lived on the home quarter. The other men, Squire and Harry, may have been the husbands of Dinah and Jenny, the women there. Girls Eady and Billsy belonged to one of these couples. Dinah was the sister of Goliah and daughter of Phillis, the older woman and her son listed who lived in the Monticello quarter (Group III). The Snowdon field quarter housed seven people, three men, three women, and one infant, a group that formed at least one family (Group V, column 4, Table 4.3).

The Jeffersons provided each field site with at least one domestic building that had built-in hearth equipment – pot hooks – for cooking (Table 4.4). With this arrangement, one person out of the household cooked for the group at most times. While there may have been other buildings on each site--even buildings with hearths that provided heat or the opportunity to cook with pots or pans set in the coals--the four pairs of pot hooks may very well designate the only hearths and thus the only heated spaces among these four sites. By focusing the daily meal around a single hearth, the Jeffersons streamlined the work routine for field hands and eliminated the distractions of preparing their own food. Despite the evidence that the Jeffersons supported the family life of their people, the group meals denied many slaves the satisfaction of feeding and providing for their families; the Jeffersons’ system reinforced the work group and not the family unit. Most of the time work crews ate single-pot meals that stewed most of the day over the fire. Slaves may well have owned their own cooking equipment and used their time off from field labor to cook for themselves and exercise family routines. The style of
cooking done for themselves may have differed little from their workaday fare, as stewing in pots set in coals reflects traditional African cooking methods.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site A</th>
<th>Site B</th>
<th>Site C Monticello</th>
<th>Snowdon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Oxyoke</td>
<td>1 Dutch Plow</td>
<td>4 broad hoes</td>
<td>98 lbs old Iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 falling axes</td>
<td>2 Plow hoes</td>
<td>6 Hilling hoes</td>
<td>6 Br* Hoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Grubbing hoes</td>
<td>1 old + cut saw</td>
<td>3 Narrow axes</td>
<td>5 Nar° axes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ft: Hoes</td>
<td>3 Grubbing hoes @</td>
<td>2 old chairs</td>
<td>3 Iron Wedges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Weeding hoes</td>
<td>1 Grindstone</td>
<td>4 Hilling hoes @</td>
<td>1 Grind stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Grind stone</td>
<td>2 tight casks</td>
<td>2 Narrow axes</td>
<td>3 Harrow Hoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 spade</td>
<td>1 p² stillyards &amp; Beef Rope</td>
<td>4 broad hoes</td>
<td>1 Plow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pot and hooks</td>
<td>3 Potts &amp; 2 p² pot hooks</td>
<td>1 p² Iron wedges</td>
<td>1 Iron Pot &amp; Hooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 M:</td>
<td>2 Tin pans @</td>
<td>1 + cut saw</td>
<td>1 I pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Handsaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Gun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 pots &amp; 1 p² pot hook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 tin pans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Dish &amp; plate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 frying pan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2[?] sifters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Grindstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Rawhides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Grindstone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4. Field Quarter contents as listed in 1757 inventory. (AICWB 2: 46-7.)

I have used pot hooks as the marker for field quarter buildings in the 1757 inventory. Pot hooks were the only architectural fitting in the inventory for the field sites. For general trends of slave diet and stewing, see Joanne Bowen, “Foodways in the 18th-Century Chesapeake,” *Archaeology of 18th-Century Virginia*, Reinhart. ed., 87-130; Diana C. Crader, "The Zooarchaeology of the Storehouse and the Dry Well at Monticello,” *American Antiquity*, XLIX (1984), 542-558; Crader, “Faunal Remains from Slave Quarter Sites at Monticello, Charlottesville, Virginia," *ArchaeoZoologia*, III (1989), 229-236; Crader, “Slave Diet at Monticello,” *American Antiquity*, LV (1990), 690-717; also Crader, unpublished reports in collections of Monticello Archaeology Department; Ferguson, *Uncommon Ground*, 93-107; Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, 137.
The locations of two field quarters remain unknown, but they were on one of the parcels of land along the Rivanna River, adjacent to Shadwell or Monticello. It is not known which of these sites the slaves from groups II or III inhabited. One field site had a single building, which also housed tools for working tobacco - grubbing, weeding, and other hoes - and also falling axes and an oxyoke for clearing land between the demands of tobacco (see Site A, column one, Table 4.4). A grindstone for maintaining tools and a spade for gardening suggest work that went on in or just around this small house. The spade may indicate that the slaves worked their own garden plots, or they may have had other plantation crops to tend. This house had a single pot and hooks for feeding the household. Another field quarter site may have had two houses or had a larger hearth for farm-related activities (see Site B, Table 4.4). The group that lived there had grubbing hoes for tobacco work but also tools for grain agriculture: a Dutch plow and two plow hoes. These slaves had a cross-cut saw for work with lumber and a grindstone for tool maintenance. They also may have butchered, as indicated by stillyards, "Beef Rope," and tight casks to hold liquids. Their household furniture included two pairs of pothooks, three pots, and two tin pans. If they rendered livestock, the pots and pans were part of plantation work and not just household fittings. There are no salting troughs listed as moveable items in the inventory. This building or one at the plantation kitchen may have included a built-in trough for curing meats.  

\[179\] It is tempting to put group II (five people who are women and children) with less cooking equipment at site A and group II (seven people) at site B. If the plow leans toward men's work, then the tools may suggest gender roles and confirm this, but people and tools may have moved around with the seasonality of work.
Monticello

The third field site was probably on the land that would come to be called Monticello. Ten slaves lived there (see Group IV, Table 4.3; and Site C, Table 4.4), overseen by Joseph Dawson. In 1753 a carpenter built “a Quarter 22 by 12 feet at Jos: Dawsons.” This spare description fits the example of slave housing that contained two separate living spaces entered into from the outside, what we call a duplex (Figure 4.6). Each half, 11 by 12 feet, was about the size of a small house for many Virginians.\(^{180}\)\(^{181}\) A central chimney provided heat to each side, although in this case only one side may have had a hearth. The single pair of pothooks as fireplace equipment indicates that a slave in one side of the house was thought of as the cook for the entire group. She had 2 pots, 2 tin pans, a frying pan, and a sifter to use in making their food. The other side of the house may have been warmed only by radiant heat from the rear wall of the chimney, or the second side may have had a hearth where occasional cooking was done right on the stones with unfixed equipment. This was the only field-slave house in which the appraisers counted furniture, “2 old chairs,” and ceramic dishes, “1 Dish & plate.” In the amenities indices by Carr and Walsh, these items fall into the category of convenience, the only amenities in the quarter inventories.\(^{181}\) But like the home quarter, these slaves

---

\(^{180}\) When TJ and RJ divided the slaves, six of this group formed the core of TJ’s Monticello slave force. Enough of the physical evidence at the site coincides with the documentary evidence about overseers (see chap. 3) that I feel I can discuss this group of people living at this place. PJAB, 19, for directions about quarter. See chap. 1 on house sizes.

\(^{181}\) Excavation here under the direction of Fraser Neiman uncovered evidence of a building occupied roughly 1750-1770, marked by a small cluster of cobbles of sandstone and greenstone and a few brick fragments, similar to hearth foundations found on other
probably owned some pans and dishes of their own, which rounded out the basic tools they were provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>family 1</th>
<th>Family 2</th>
<th>family 3</th>
<th>family 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phillis, mother</td>
<td>Toby, husband</td>
<td>Gill, husband</td>
<td>Lucy, relationship not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goliah, adult son</td>
<td>Juno, wife</td>
<td>Fany, wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nanny, daughter</td>
<td>(4 children not yet born)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toby, son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange, son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5. Quarter III slave list, by families, 1757. (AICWB 2: 45.)

The roughly even sex ratio within each quarter suggests that Shadwell slaves lived in family groups, although this may not fully describe their arrangements. Since slaves cooked communally for the larger group that occupied separate parts of one building, they may have had dormitory-style arrangements shared by family groups for sleeping.

In 1757 at least three family relationships existed among the ten people in quarter III: two couples, two parents with children, three generations (Table 4.5). At least some people here shared quarters with other unrelated adults – the family unit and the household were Monticello sites. The chimney was probably wood and the building frame or log construction. Derek Wheeler, Leslie McFaden, and Fraser D. Neiman. “The Early Farm Quarter at Monticello.” Paper presented at the Society for Historical Archaeology Annual Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, January 1999, 3.

Although pothooks has worked for my “marker” of the slave spaces in the inventory, this 3rd field quarter site may be contrary to that pattern. The inventory for this site repeats tools in two separate groups: 4 broad hoes, 6 hilling hoes, 3 narrow axes; then 4 hilling hoes, 2 narrow axes, 4 broad hoes, suggesting that the appraisers entered two different spaces when making their list. Multiple pots and pans and grindstones also support the idea that this site accommodated larger numbers who perhaps ate and worked separately at times. Cooking to feed this group may have gone on in only one of the spaces. If the second side was unheated it is possible that slaves crowded into one side to sleep during cold seasons, but the fireplace wall probably offered a fair degree of comfort during the winter, as well as discomfort during the summer. AICWB 2: 41-48. See chap. 1 for definitions of amenities and the class of objects listed under convenience.
not synonymous. Since the slave Phillis was elderly and Toby, Sr. was either elderly or infirm, the chairs provided by the Jeffereons enabled Phillis and Toby to undertake handwork at the house, including cooking and maintaining tools. They probably watched the small children while parents worked. Nanny was about six, Toby, Jr., about four, and Orange was about two. When the appraisers came, Juno may have been pregnant with another daughter, Luna, who was born in 1758. Housemates Fany and Gill expanded the group with their children by 1760.

Like the slaves at the other field sites, those at the third had a variety of hoes for tobacco culture. They had woodworking tools for clearing or rough carpentry, including narrow axes, iron wedges, a crosscut saw, and hand saw. They had two grindstones for sharpening their cutting implements. Three rawhides may have been in production or related to tool care, or may have been the product of hunting. These slaves kept a gun for pest control, hunting as one of their plantation jobs, or hunting for themselves as a way to supplement their rations. They made lead shot by their fireplace. The inventory did not include any harness fittings for draft animals, nor did it include any plows or harrows to indicate grain cultivation. The quarter was located just above a so-called Antient Field, a piece of land cleared since Indians used it. They had land aplenty for planting.\(^{182}\) When not tending tobacco, the slaves at the Monticello quarter harvested the forest for game, timber, and more new fields.

\(^{182}\) Evidence of firearms in slave houses has been found at Monticello, Mount Vernon, and other plantations in the Chesapeake. See also Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, 138-139. The shot comes from Neiman, "Shadwell Quarter." Antient Field was often the name given to Indian fields that planters found and used. For TJ references, see FB 45, 69.
The inventory does not list any spades for digging gardens, but the people here may very well have kept their own vegetable plots, perhaps with tools they made or owned themselves. Like people who lived across the river at Shadwell, they collected artifacts left behind by native Americans. During their leisure or work time, the people on this quarter smoked tobacco using European-made commercially sold pipes. They had other European ceramics for food preparation and storage, including plates and cups, forms not necessarily found in slave quarters and not required by people using African cooking methods that relied mostly on bowl shapes. They used wine bottles for drinking or storage. They had small delftware ointment pots and used either prepared medications mixed by an apothecary or reused the pots for their own salves. Oyster shell may indicate "imported" foods here. The archaeological record suggests that this field quarter was supplied fairly directly from the home plantation; they had access to the same commercial wares that people there used. Their material world shows they used more than the bare minimum that is often the image of slave-quarter supplies.

The length of time Joseph Dawson and the Quarter III slaves worked together suggests the potential for a stable life during that period. Dawson worked for the Jeffersons over at least nine years from 1753 to 1761 and may have been part of a family that worked for the Jeffersons even longer. In 1759, Dawson and the six or seven adult workers there produced 11,111 pounds (10 hogsheads) of tobacco on the thousand-acre

---

183 For artifacts see Neiman, "Shadwell Quarter." The interpretation of these artifacts is my own. More work needs to be done on establishing the relationship between this set of artifacts and those excavated at Shadwell. I thank Fraser Neiman for sharing preliminary data with me.
Monticello tract. In addition, they combined forces with other Jefferson slaves and overseers from the Rivanna area to work the piece of land called North River, where they produced 29,353 pounds of the crop. It is not clear from the records whether the North River land was always tended in this manner. If that were an annual occurrence, these hands and others moved with some consistency between quarters to tend crops in both places. Tobacco required regular attention and in 1759 the North River lands produced forty percent of that year's tobacco crop, credited to overseers Joseph Dawson, William Gooch, and Fred Gillam, all of whom worked other quarter farms too. If these slaves worked more than one farm, their toils meant lots of travel and little leisure during those years.¹⁸⁴

Snowdon

Because the Snowdon inventory was taken separately by Jefferson's associates in that part of the county, the slaves and the components of that plantation, the buildings, livestock, and tools were grouped together, giving Snowdon the most specific documentary detail of any field quarter in the Jeffersons' holdings. Seven slaves--three men (Crummel, Sanco, and Quash), three women (Betty, Bella, and Nell), and an infant (Bella), lived at Snowdon in 1757. At least one family formed among the six adults: Quash and Nell's baby Bella had been born that year. Crummel came from Peter Randolph, purchased by Peter Jefferson in October 1750. He may have lived at Shadwell before moving to Jefferson's Fluvanna River land. They lived in a single house where they

¹⁸⁴ Other Dawsons worked as overseers on other quarters. The relationships between Martin, Joseph, and John Dawson are not known.
shared a pair of pothooks and two pots and probably cooked and ate communally. Their house also sheltered their tools for tobacco—narrow hoes and broad hoes—and for grain—a plow, plowshares, and harrow hoes. The tool allotment matched the number of workers: six of each type of hoe for six adults, male and female counted together. The axes and wedges meant that slaves cleared land or chopped wood for fuel between crop work. They used the grindstone to keep their tools in working order. Additionally, "9 8 lbs old Iron" may indicate iron working at Snowdon, or else they stockpiled scrap to send to wherever else that work took place. There were no iron-working tools listed. Livestock at Snowdon included 91 hogs and 22 pigs, 34 head cattle, and 5 horses. These slaves must also have had garden tools for their own use, cooking implements of their own, and clothing and bedding. It is impossible to know to what degree the Snowdon slaves experienced the material culture of their wealthy owners as their colleagues at Monticello or Shadwell did.185

185 PJAB, 14. The demographics of this group suggest the pattern found by Morgan and Nicholls that recently imported slaves to the Piedmont in this period tended to be younger and reflected the fairly even sex ratio of slave cargoes. The presence of a single infant among these six men and women suggests that family formation may have been in its early stages here. Morgan and Nicholls, "Slaves in Piedmont Virginia," 220-221. PJ owned some land on the Fluvanna River prior to 1750. Malone uses 1754 for the purchase date of the Snowdon tract, however, the name Snowdon is on the 1751 map of Virginia. If TJ was correct in his autobiography that his father named the land for the family’s ancestral home in Wales, then PJ owned and named Snowdon before 1751. Malone, Jefferson, I: 437; Autobiography, 4.

There is no information about what other buildings or activities took place at Snowdon. There may not have been a plantation house until Randolph claimed his land there in 1776, but Martin Dawson lived on the property. Since there has been no archaeology at Snowdon, there are no specifics about how the members of this household augmented their diets and clothing beyond their ration as slaves at Shadwell and Monticello did. Quash lived at Monticello by 1770 where he had a garden and grew potatoes. MB, 212, 261. While the same impact of the home quarter material culture at

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The only references to slave punishments were at Snowdon, but the two incidents mentioned were representative of punishments used at the time and suggest that the Jeffersons treated and allowed their overseers to treat slaves according to what was commonly accepted among slave holders. The Jeffersons or their employees used both whipping and collaring to control the people who worked under them. In 1751 a runaway named Robin “had on his Neck when he went away an Iron Collar.” He may have been successful in his escape, since Peter Jefferson advertised as late as November for Robin, who had run away “May last,” and the record is silent on any further mention of him. Jefferson described Robin as a Negro man, small, with crooked legs, about thirty years of age, who “speaks pretty good English.” Robin took a gun when he ran. If slaves or free blacks with guns were commonplace around plantations, surely a slave in an iron collar carrying a gun would be an alarming sight; a slave being punished was not supposed to have access to weapons. Robin would need to get rid of the collar and use his English skills to work his way into obscurity. Robin may have had no particular training beyond agricultural work; none is mentioned in the advertisement. Jefferson noted that “Whoever brings him to me, shall be rewarded, according to Law.”

In 1759 the plantation at Snowdon produced 18,076 pounds of tobacco, equal to 24 percent of the total crop from all the Jefferson farms that year. Crummel, Quash, Sanco, Betty, Bellow, and Nell with overseer Martin Dawson picked, dried, and packed

Snowdon seems unlikely, archaeology has proven time and again that slaves’ lives were full of contradictions and what seem to us to be surprises.

186 VG, Hunter, November 7, 1751, no. 45. The whipping will be discussed below.
the crop into sixteen hogsheads that a visiting cooper made. In April 1760 Dawson arranged for the crop to be taken to Byrd’s Warehouse in Richmond. The hogsheads were both rolled and carried by water during their journey, which cost 16 s. 6 d. per hogshead, or £13.4 total. Tobacco factor Mr. McCaul purchased fourteen of sixteen hogsheads from Snowdon and Dawson claimed the other two as his share of the crop, 2,257 pounds. Dawson’s proceeds were £25.0.5. In 1760 slaves at Snowdon also had a hand in producing corn, cider, and livestock sold from the plantation.187

Distance from the home plantation had its problems, however. Sometime after 1764 when Thomas reached his majority, he began to redistribute the field slaves that he and Randolph were to divide according their father’s will. Quash, Nell, Bella, and Betty moved from Snowdon to Monticello. About twenty-one slaves moved from the Rivanna River lands to the Fluvanna River estate, land that Randolph would own when he turned twenty-one in 1776. For the most part, the brothers moved family groups, dividing the people from each of their father’s quarters according to relationships the slaves had established.188 Hannah and her daughter Fan were among ten slaves from the Shadwell home quarter who became Randolph’s, along with eleven from other field quarters. Hannah may have left siblings at Shadwell, but she moved with her thirteen-year-old daughter and probably others in their family. She may have done field work or domestic

---

187 Harvie I: JHAB II. See chap. 3 for the 1760 crop values.

188 Again, which slaves went to Randolph is based on negative evidence. TJ’s farm book tells us which slaves did NOT go to the younger brother. The numbers here reflect only the slaves in the 1757 list and do not account for children born or people dying in the interim.
work at Shadwell: she had lived in the somewhat privileged conditions of the home
quarter there. The field-quarter conditions at Snowdon were no doubt an adjustment for
her. During that decade the trusty Martin Dawson retired from the Jeffersons’ employ
and a man named Isaac Bates succeeded him as overseer there. In 1770 Bates whipped
Hannah to death. Thomas acted on his brother’s behalf and brought suit against the cruel
Bates.\textsuperscript{189}

A number of circumstances contributed to the conditions in which Bates’s
violence occurred. Snowdon was on the periphery of the Jeffersons’ attentions in 1770:
it was distant physically and its legal and administrative oversight was unsettled. Martin
Dawson’s long watch as overseer had ended. John Harvies’ close watch as executor was
over by 1765 and Harvie died in 1767. John Nicholas, another of Peter Jefferson’s
executors who lived on the Fluvanna River near Snowdon, may have been watching over
the estate there, and may even have introduced Bates to the Jeffersons. Thomas, now a
practicing lawyer, had not yet taken the reins as guardian of his younger siblings, but he
had begun redistributing the slaves that he and Randolph inherited. When the house at
Shadwell burned in February 1770, Thomas was focused on building his mountaintop
home as his mother and siblings were rebuilding at Shadwell. So it was that the slaves
were renegotiating their social and work roles among themselves and with a new overseer

\textsuperscript{189} The sum total of what is known about this episode is the record in TJ’s case book:
“The defendant IB, overseer for RJ, had ‘by a cruel whipping killed a negro woman
Hanah,’” and the dates of action in TJ’s memorandum book. In June 1770 TJ produced
alias capias, a second writ for the arrest of Bates. The suit was still being settled in
December that year. Case Book, No. 433, cited in MB, 177, n. 177, 200. See also chap. 7.
when Hanna was murdered. In November 1770, Jane gave Randolph a slave girl named Rachael, perhaps to make up for the economic loss Randolph suffered at the hand of Bates. Rachael, the daughter of Little Sall, may have been no older than two, perhaps too young to be frightened by the thought of taking the place of a murdered woman. Her mother, no doubt, was horrified. Whether Thomas’s suit was successful—in dispensing justice or in quelling the fears of the slave families—remains unknown. Life at Snowdon must have fallen back into the usual rhythms of plantation life. By 1787 thirty-one adult slaves lived at Snowdon, a figure that suggests that patterns of birth and death had resumed normally.190

Thomas and Randolph’s Division of Field and Other Slaves

Peter’s will directed that his “Slaves not otherwise disposed of to be equally divided between my two Sons Thomas and Randolph, at such Time as my Son Thomas shall attain

190 The last mention of Dawson in Harvies’s accounts was 1760, but the records are less than complete in the years following. Nicholas was clerk of court for Albemarle Co. from 1749-1792. In 1768 he hired the young TJ as a lawyer for Bates who was plaintiff in a case of undetermined nature against one John Cannon (both Bates and Cannon lived in Buckingham Co., which formed in 1761 from Albemarle). Nicholas, as PJ’s executor, may have hired Bates to oversee the Snowdon plantation. MB, 65.

Since we do not know exactly when Bates killed Hannah, we can only ask the question of whether slaves were moved from Shadwell’s home quarter because of the fire at the Jefferson’s house there. Such an abrupt move could have contributed to the overall unsettled conditions.

Rachael’s age is based on the estimate that she was born after her mother reached the age of 16. Her mother Little Sall was born in 1752. Harvie II: 10. Rachael may have stayed at Shadwell with her family until she was older, however, Little Sall died in an accident at Shadwell in 1774. MB, 370 n.13.

Most of what is known about Randolph’s plantation when he becomes master of it is because of letters and exchanges with his older brother, see Mayo, Brother. Netti Schreiner-Yantis and Florene Love, The Personal Property Tax Lists for the Year 1787 for Buckingham County, Virginia. (Genealogical Books in Print, Springfield, Va., 1987), See also chap. 7.
the Age of twenty one years.” Beginning in 1761, when Jane, Jr. reached her majority, the Jefferson children claimed their portions of the Shadwell slave population. In 1764, when Thomas reached majority, Randolph turned nine. Who made the judgments about which slaves went to which brother is not known, but the division acknowledged both the organization of the slaves within their work groups at Shadwell and the slaves’ own immediate families, that is, spouses and young children. Each brother received slaves from each of the five quarter divisions at Shadwell, thus they both received workers with a range of skills and experience (Table 4.6). It is also possible that part of the Jeffersons’ strategy was to move adult siblings to prevent inbreeding. The Jeffersons were well aware of the reproductive potential of their enslaved people and considered that part of their investment.

The movement of Randolph’s slaves to Snowdon took place during the 1760s, after Thomas reached majority and became financially responsible for his share of the plantation lands.191 Jane and minor children lived at Shadwell until 1776, but Jane and Thomas were careful to separate the accounts for their respective uses of land and labor there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Thomas</th>
<th>Randolph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Division of slaves from 1757 list to Thomas and Randolph. The figures include slaves bequeathed by Peter and deeded to them by Jane.

191 The bequests made by PJ of specific slaves to his children are covered in the next chapter. AICWB 2: 32-34. My estimate of the move to Snowdon date is based on the 1770 date that the Snowdon overseer murdered the slave Hannah, who had lived in quarter I at Shadwell in 1757. MB, 177. On TJ’s calculation of the financial return of reproductive women, see FB 43.
Slaves moved—or stayed—with some people they already knew well, but Jefferson marriages also meant that Shadwell slaves had to adjust their work and social habits around new people. Thomas’s slave holdings had increased to fifty-two individuals by the time he inherited slaves from his wife’s father. Randolph’s holdings increased to thirty-one people by 1787. The brothers, like their parents, were aware of families within their slave populations, but they could not always keep families together. The definition of family, however, meant only husbands and wives and young children—once children turned sixteen their ties to parents or siblings no longer guided the Jeffersons’ actions towards them.¹⁹²

Dramatic changes were in store for the slaves who remained in Thomas Jefferson’s holdings. Martha Wayles brought eight slaves with her when she married Thomas in 1772, but two years later Thomas inherited 135 slaves from his father-in-law John Wayles. For many slaves this meant redefined work roles and a new social landscape with new house servants, new skilled workers, and new interpersonal relationships to understand. Clearly, the positioning of the Hemings family as Monticello’s house servants meant that Thomas and Martha gave certain Wayles’ slaves preference in some situations, especially since Martha could then run the household with a familiar work force. Some slaves from Shadwell no doubt found themselves replaced by someone with equivalent skills from the Wayles’ estate, but others found widened horizons. Some found spouses. The farm laborer Hercules married Island Betty, a farm laborer from the Wayles estate. Jupiter found Suck; they both had skills to offer.¹⁹³

¹⁹² More on this in chap. 7.

¹⁹³ FB 5, 15. TJ moved Hercules, Betty and their two children to Poplar Forest in 1790.
Orange’s story illustrates a range of slave experiences and how many times the world changed around Orange and his family. Orange was born on the land called Monticello where he lived with his family, Toby and Juno, and his siblings, Nanney, Toby, and Luna. His family’s house was on the edge of the woods of Monticello Mountain, just above the tobacco fields where they worked. By 1774, when Orange was about twenty, his family no longer lived together. His father and mother were too old to labor in the field and their new owner Thomas Jefferson put them to retirement at Shadwell and Monticello, respectively. Orange’s brother Toby was a field hand at Monticello, where he shared quarters with his mother Juno and sister Luna. The elder Toby lived at Shadwell with slaves who had lived there all their lives. Slaves of Peter and Jane Jefferson not yet dispersed probably lived at Shadwell, and Nanney and Orange were among them. Orange’s family may have been rearranged in 1774 because Thomas needed to accommodate the Wayles’ slaves among his plantations. Among the Wayles’ slaves who moved to Monticello was a woman named Dinah and she and Orange married. But by 1776 Randolph Jefferson moved Orange to Snowdon, twenty miles south of Monticello. In the coming years, despite the distance, Orange and Dinah had three children, Orange, Sally, and Lucy. When Thomas needed to settle some debts in 1792, he thought of selling Dinah and her family. He first wrote his brother, “As her husband lives with you I should chuse to sell her in your neighborhood so as to unite her with him.” Eventually Thomas sold Orange’s family to a planter in western Albemarle County. Thomas’s description of Dinah tells something of her career as a skilled but enslaved worker: “Dinah is a fine house wench of the best disposition

MB, n. 145, n. 286.
in the world ... tho' she has worked out ever since I went to Europe.” It is not known
whether Dinah went to housework or field work for her new owner. What is clear, however,
is that Orange had to travel farther to see her and their children.

The aggregate picture of the lives of field slaves usually conjures up images of
physical remoteness from other slaves and from planters, and images of a rough-hewn
life of near-subsistence. While the documentary record from Shadwell suggests a simple
physical setting oriented toward work, archaeology offers information that the material
world of the Jeffersons’ field hands was much more complex, in some cases determined
by proximity to the home quarter. The documents about this group of people also let us
see the numerous changes to slaves’ situations over the course of their lives. Their
households and their neighborhood could change. Their place within whatever social
structure they created among themselves could be altered. And of course their
relationships to owners and overseers depended on the good fortunes and good will of
those individuals. The home quarter at Shadwell offers yet a closer view of the lives of
Jefferson slaves, and continues their story in the next chapter.

194 TJ’s notes indicate that Luna (b. 1758), was among those in 1774 “discharged from
labor on acct. of age or infirmity,” but there is no record of what her infirmity may have
been (FB 5). TJ listed Toby with other adults Moll and Betty, and five children (FB 6).
Dinah was born in 1761. Her children were Orange, b. 1777; Sally, b. 1780; and Lucy, b.
unknown; Brother, 17; FBB, 24, 28. Her purchaser was James Kinsolving, who lived
near Mechum’s River, farther away from Orange’s home on the Fluvanna. Brother, 17-18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hercullus [Hercules]</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Sally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Flora her Child Agey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syphax</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Moll a Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawney</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10. Ephe a Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phill</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Goliah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrod</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Tobey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10. Gill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Toby a boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squire a boy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10. Orrange a boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J ammey</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Philis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10. Juno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10. Lucey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sall</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nanney a Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah &amp; her Child Fan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Squir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cachina &amp; her C Lydia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtilla and her C Fany</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10. Harry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellinda &amp; her C Suckey</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Dinah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Jenny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Eady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patt</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Billey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cate</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10. 1 Negro Fellow Crummel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>[?] 1 Negro Quash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sall a Girl</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10. 1 Negro Sanco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 Negro Wench betty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phebe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 Negro Bellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10. 1 Negro Child Bellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1. Slaves and values listed in Peter Jefferson’s inventory. AlCWB 2: 45, 47.
Figure 4.2. Plot of age versus value for Shadwell slaves. Ages for slaves appear in a few documents, such as the 1760 account wherein Jane Jefferson established her sixth portion of the slaves. Harvie II: 10.
Figure 4.3. Ratios of male/female slaves at Shadwell based on 1757 slave list. ACWB 2: 45, 47.
Figure 4.4. Map of plantations where Shadwell slaves had connections.

1. Snowdon, Albemarle County. Crummel, Quash, Sanco, Betty, Bellow, Nell, and Bellow lived here when PJ or his estate owned the plantation. When Thomas and Randolph divided their father’s slaves some of these slaves moved to Monticello; some remained at Snowdon, joined by other Shadwell slaves that Randolph inherited.

2. Buck Island, Albemarle County. Shadwell slaves had opportunity for close contact with the Lewis family slaves at Buck Island, including a “negro carpenter” there and a midwife. Additionally, both Lucy and Randolph married Lewis children, so many of the slaves from both families may have become cohorts.

3. Dungeness, Goochland County. It is not known which slaves may have come from Jane’s father’s estate.

4. Fine Creek, Goochland County. Former home of Pompey, Farding, Phillis, Dinah, Goliath

5. Tuckahoe, Goochland County. Slaves who accompanied the Jeffersons to Tuckahoe on travels or when the family lived there knew this plantation and its slaves. Slave Jack sold to Mr. Charles Clarke near Tuckahoe, 1751.

6. Orange County, home of Edward Spencer (exact location undetermined). Toby, Juno, Toby, Jr., and Nanny came from this plantation in 1755. Toby and Juno’s son Orange may have been named for an Orange who was a slave at Spencer’s.

6a. Fredericksburg. They may have lived in Fredericksburg previously when Spencer lived there.

7. Williamsburg. Sawney, Peter’s servant traveled with him to Williamsburg and may have also accompanied young Thomas there. Jupiter became Thomas’s attendant by 1769 and traveled here also.
Figure 4.5. Constellation of family connections between quarters at Shadwell.
Figure 4.6. Thomas Jefferson design for a duplex slave house at Monticello, c. 1778 (not built). Thomas’s design shows a neat neo-classical façade with a central doorway that gives way to two rooms, each heated by a corner fireplace in the single, central chimney. Thomas noted that this plan was to serve two separate families. The illusion of private compartments is undone by the door that unceremoniously enters both spaces at once. Thomas’s plan at 17’ x 34’ was larger than the quarter designated for Joseph Dawson’s that was 22’ x 12’ (rooms were 289 and 139 square feet, outside dimension, respectively). (Monticello: stone house (slave quarters), recto, September 1770, by Thomas Jefferson. N38; K16 [electronic edition]. Thomas Jefferson Papers: An Electronic Archive. Boston, Mass.: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2003. http://www.thomasjeffersonpapers.org/. Accessed March 31, 2005.)
CHAPTER 5

THE HOME QUARTER: MATERIAL CULTURE AND STATUS

In the summer of 1757, Sall watched someone she had known all her life die. Her feelings must have been mixed. The man who died owned her, her children, and likely her husband. The man wrote a will in which he legally transferred ownership of her black children to his white children. Her children would move to other plantations as their new owners reached majority. Ironically, within the plantation system that she knew, she and her children were being honored for their reliable work on behalf of their owners. Her owner gave her and her children positions as personal attendants to wealthy planter children and this meant that they would live in better material comfort than many Virginians, regardless of their skin color or condition of servitude. It also meant that they had status, albeit at the top of an underclass of enslaved people.

Sall also had a physically intimate relationship with her owner's family: his children had probably suckled at her breasts as babes. She had practically lived in his house, nursing his children, often at his wife's side. Her own children grew because of her skill with small children, despite having to spend long hours away from her own. She taught her children how to be near and yet remain distant from this family they would know so well. Her son Jupiter would spend most of the next forty-three years at the side of the planter's son born in the same year—1743—as the slave. Like his mother, Jupiter had an often intimate relationship with his owner, spending some of his years as the
planter's valet. When Jupiter died, the planter mourned the death of his lifelong companion and his comments reflected both his caring and frustration with, his disapproval and respect for this person who was so much a part of his world - but whom he never sought to free.195

Bequeathing

A few months before he died in the summer of 1757, Peter Jefferson wrote his will. The choices he made in the disposition of slaves reveal how he thought about them and their future relationships with his family. He knew his slaves well. He calculated what types of slaves various members of his family needed to fulfill their individual charges. He made three different types of bequests of slaves in his will. First, Jane should choose her "sixth part of my Slaves," which she could then dispose of by deed or will "amongst & to such & so many of my Children as she shall think fit." Then Peter named a specific slave who would go to each daughter, with the provision that "if it shall happen that any of the slaves bequeathed to my Daughters as aforesd. die before they come to the possession of my said Daughters respectively then it is my Will that such & so many Females slaves of near the same age be set apart out of my Estate & Given to such Daugter or Daugters." Peter then chose individual slaves by name to go to his sons and specified that "all my Slaves not herein otherwise disposed of to be equally divided between my two Sons Thomas and Randolph, at such Time as my Son Thomas shall attain the Age of twenty one years."196 Field hands were among the "slaves not herein otherwise disposed." Every slave


196 Peter also carefully outlined that if Jane failed to write a deed or will for her
whom Peter named lived on the home quarter of the plantation. Most of Jane's choices for her sixth of Peter's estate and the various slaves that Jane deeded to family members during her lifetime also lived on the home quarter. The Jeffersons' disbursement of their slaves begins a compelling story about the dynamics of plantation society on the home quarter and the value placed on particular slave families (Figure 5.1).

The plantation management and the social obligations of the Jefferson family affected the people they owned. The lives of the Jefferson family and their slaves were inextricably linked; every change in the lives of the Jefferson family influenced the lives of their slaves. The ages and legal status of the Jeffersons, changes in numbers through birth and death or marital status, and their good or bad fortunes affected the fortunes of the people who served them, depended on them, and fulfilled duties in their own personal and family lives as they could. Training for these roles—for both the servant and the master—began early.

Peter bequeathed by name nine slaves, all of whom lived on the home quarter of the plantation. His choices of the slaves he left to each of his children reveal Jefferson's strategy for establishing the next generation of slaves and masters. Peter gave each Jefferson child, with two exceptions, a slave of the same sex who was slightly younger than her or himself. Each of these pairs then grew up together, one learning skills of domination, the other learning those of service. As Peter's son later observed: "the whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on slaves, or if a daughter died while unmarried, those slaves became part of the estate to be divided by Thomas and Randolph. AICWB 2, 32-34."
the other.” Lessons learned in childhood were deeply held and part of a slave-holding society. “The parent storms, the child looks on [and] puts on the same airs in the circle of smaller slaves, gives a loose to his worst of passions, and thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot be but stamped by it with odious peculiarities.” Some lessons in servitude were subtler. In 1762 a special order for "Clothing for the Childrens Slaves" suggests that those slave children were well on their way to differential treatment and performed specialized roles in the plantation community at early ages. Their future was part of their material landscape: their clothing and living arrangements advertised their roles and their future relationships, and the set of behaviors they and their child-masters had to learn.

Peter intended that, upon reaching their majority, each of his daughters would inherit a female slave just younger than herself. The eldest daughter Jane, at seventeen when her father died, was given the choice of Chloe, who was about three in 1757, or Patt, who was about ten. Jane eventually chose Patt who remained at Shadwell with her subsequent family until the unmarried Jane died there in 1765. Mary Jefferson, at sixteen, inherited Nan, Sall's daughter, who was about twelve. Daughter Elizabeth who was thirteen, inherited Cate who was between eight and ten years old. Eleven-year-old Martha inherited seven-year-old Rachel. In one exception to the pattern, daughter Lucy received a young slave girl and the girl's mother also. Five-year-old Lucy inherited Catchina and her child Phebe. Phebe was two or three years old, while Catchina, possibly already trained as a house or personal servant, was also the mother of at least

197 Quotation from TJ, Notes on Virginia, 162. The separate charge for clothing also kept accounts from PJ’s and JJ’s estates separate. See chap. 6.
one daughter younger than Phebe. Anne Scott, at the age of two, inherited a girl named Eve, who was about the same age. Anne Scott's twin brother Randolph inherited two-year-old Peter, the son of Myrtilla.198

This strategy differed for Thomas Jefferson, who, at the age of fourteen was left a skilled adult male named Sawney, who was already trained in the ways of servitude. Sawney's job was to now teach his new young master his role in their newly intimate relationship. Sawney attained the highest valuation of any slave in Peter Jefferson's probate, £57.10. Sawney may have performed as a personal attendant to Peter Jefferson and had both the knowledge and skill to help young Thomas navigate new waters as Shadwell's master. Perhaps one test for a young Virginia gentleman was sorting out his strategies for domination over men like Sawney, who were both older and probably wiser but not fortunate enough to have been born free, white, and wealthy in colonial Virginia.

For Sawney, who certainly knew young Thomas as a boy, the task was to develop new strategies for ever so subtly training this young man, who in some ways was probably his ward as well as his master. Sawney needed to help the young Jefferson learn to be a master. If Sawney was the servant who traveled with Peter on his duties as a magistrate or burgess, Sawney knew his way around the local landscape and more distant places such as Williamsburg. Part of Sawney's value was his knowledge of things like shops where his master's wig could be repaired or someone who could tailor a new coat for him. His role was to grease the wheels that made his master seem a master of all things. There is no record of when Sawney died, but his name does not appear on slave lists that Thomas began keeping in 1774. By 1764 Jupiter became the trusted servant of

198 AI CWB 2, 32-34.
Thomas, one from whom he borrowed money and sent on distant errands: a servant, it seems, who could be as an extra arm. Perhaps this relationship was acknowledged in 1771 when Thomas planned a burial ground at Monticello and included a place in a family temple for "the grave of a favorite and faithful servant."\(^{199}\)

Peter's bequests also clearly favored certain families of slaves. Children often followed in their parents' professions, and slaves who earned rewards for being smart and obedient trained their children to do likewise. A slave born to parents who lived on the home quarter and had special skills was more likely than children of field hands to grow up to learn a skill and occupy a privileged place in the plantation community. Peter's assignments drew from three slave families: those of Sall the Elder, Cachina, and Myrtilla. It is entirely possible that these women were siblings or otherwise related.

Jane's attention to slave families followed Peter's lead.

Jane claimed her sixth portion of Peter's slaves in January 1760. She chose eleven individuals, who included older slaves and one who had been born very recently (Figure 5.2). Like the slaves who Peter named in his bequests, all but two of Jane's choices lived at the home quarter and likely had domestic or craft skills and otherwise had close contact with the Jeffersons. Jane's list emphasized family relations; the eleven slaves represented only four or five families, possibly fewer if there were sibling relationships between parents. Jane's claim also included the loan of three slaves to her

\(^{199}\) The average value of adult male slaves was just less than £44, see above. Jupiter was born at Shadwell in the same year as TJ, 1743. His mother was likely Sall (the Elder). It is possible that Sawney was Jupiter's father and that Jupiter carried on a family profession. MB, see index for Jupiter. Jupiter is the subject of a substantial portion of recent work on Monticello slaves, see Lucia Stanton, *Free Some Day*, esp. 19-27. On the graveyard, see GB, 25.
“to allow the Children were not divided.” She specified “Myrtilla aged abt. 25 years Valued at £50 Phil 19 year old £45 Jupiter 16 year old £45,” as slaves who needed to stay at Shadwell because their family was there. The Jeffsorys encouraged slave families and valued the guidance a slave parent gave to his or her own children. The Jeffsorys also sought to pass on to their own children certain sets of skills and certain temperaments in their bondspeople. Clearly, Sall’s family carried the traits that slave owners desired.

The enslaved workers chosen by name by Peter and Jane Jeffsor to give to their children all had something in common in that they lived on the home quarter at Shadwell. They had an experience as slaves very different from the field hands at Shadwell and from most slaves in the Piedmont. Their position gave them a certain rank within the Shadwell community, and probably across the region where they lived, among both black and white neighbors. They were from a few select families, whose progeny no doubt would continue to hold status positions within their social circles, wherever they may be.

The status that Peter and Jane bestowed on certain of their slaves—even on two year olds—set those slaves on a trajectory that would ultimately send them to work in big houses on other plantations along the James River corridor, distant from home and kin.

---

200 Jane’s “sixth” was very close to both that portion of PJ’s slaves in £, as well as in number of individuals, if one counts children born between 1757 and 1760 - there were at least five. PJ’s slaves in the inventory totaled £1820, one-sixth of that is £303. The inventory listed 60 slaves; one-sixth equals 10. Jane’s sixth was valued £355 or 11 individuals, but clearly included new births in the mention of Lucinda, Sall’s daughter. TJ’s farm book names at least four more slaves born during this period. These three all went to Thomas eventually. See FB; Harvie II, 10.
Living Arrangements

The home quarter was part of the domestic center of the plantation, the area that included the Jeffersons' house, kitchen, and other outbuildings, arranged within concentric boundaries in a ten-acre square. This was the part of the plantation that the Jeffersons constructed to impress their guests. Many of the slaves who worked there were part of the formal face of the plantation and of plantation life in the Old Dominion. Some of their roles were public, and although the public moments may have been infrequent and brief, they were very important in determining whether a slave continued to work around the planter's family or whether they worked "out." At Shadwell the slaves who lived at the plantation center had varying degrees of contact with the material goods that wealthy white Virginians thought were important. In some ways the material richness of their everyday lives gave these people an unusual experience for slaves. Yet in many ways, they were never far from experiencing the worst that slavery had to offer. The material record at Shadwell presents contradictions and adds much complexity to the story of how slaves lived in the eighteenth century.

Slaves on the home quarter lived near the Jeffersons' house in at least two areas: the plantation kitchen, a little more than a hundred feet east of the house; and an area of slave houses about two hundred feet east of the Jeffersons' house (Figure 5.3). Some may have slept in the Jeffersons' house along with whoever they attended there. One of the most explicit statements a planter made about the social structure on his plantation lay in how he located and controlled the movements of his enslaved people within the plantation landscape. The relationship of the buildings in size, finish, and proximity immediately reflected the underlying social status of the people who used and inhabited
the buildings. The physical structure of the plantation helped train both slave and free workers, visitors, and family members about the established hierarchies of colonial Virginia society.

Excavations on the kitchen area reveal both work and personal activities for the cook and her family. Excavation of quarters on the east end of the ten-acre plantation core uncovered the remnants of at least two buildings that continued the axial arrangement of the plantation laid out by Jefferson. There may have been four houses on this site, housing many of the thirty-one slaves who lived here. The quarter site on the plantation core, separated by a fence away from the main plantation house, describes a community with its own local center. The yard between the buildings here witnessed a range of activities including cooking and eating, craft work, social activities such as pipe smoking and playing games, and spiritual or medicinal rituals. Archaeology shows that all of the people who lived on the home quarter, whether they lived in the kitchen buildings or in the slave houses, shared many activities and, despite their separate living areas, were part of the same community.

The thirty-one people who lived on the home quarter in 1757 comprised the largest grouping of slaves within the Jefferson plantation holdings. The six men, six women, seven boys, and twelve girls had training as house servants, personal attendants, and in other skills. Many of the children in this group grew up learning to wait on the Jefferson children and wore the better clothes that such a job demanded. This group included all of the slaves Peter Jefferson bequeathed by name to his children and all but one of the slaves claimed by Jane Jefferson as her sixth portion of her husband’s estate. These slaves were the most highly valued by the Jeffersons and they had the greatest
monetary value of any slaves on the plantation. These slaves also seem prominent to the historian because the Jeffersons mentioned them by name in various roles. For instance, Sawney received notice as Peter’s, then Thomas’s, attendant, a role in which young Jupiter followed. Samson and the older Jupiter worked on the mill. Mothers were a reference point for their children who were called “Nan Sall’s daughter,” or “Peter Myrtilla’s son,” for instance. It is likely that they were prominent within the larger African-American community as well.201

Five of the six women in this group claimed at least one child at home: the remaining children were theirs also. Some of the women must have had husbands at home, but at least one did not. Bellinda married Squire from Quarter IV. Only Nan, the adult daughter of Sall, cannot be linked directly to children of her own, but she may have just reached adulthood. All six of the adult women were of childbearing age. The paternal relationships are less clear. Four of the men may have been husbands and fathers to the women and children of the home quarter, but at least two had wives across the plantation. Phill married Moll, who lived in Quarter II, and many years later Hercules married a slave called Island Betty, whom Thomas inherited in 1774.202 The Shadwell quarter system housed slave families together. For the women, this meant some chance

201 AICWB 2: 32-34. Recent work that traces former slaves into their careers as freed men and women finds that people who had positions of prestige within the plantation often became the civic, business, and religious leaders in communities of free blacks. While this is a nineteenth-century model it may show that a person’s innate intelligence and ability to perform skilled and dependable work served them both in and out of slavery and would have been recognized and put to use by slave owners. See for instance, Stanton, 'Those Who Labor for My Happiness,' 170-171.

202 See fig. 4.6; also FB 30.
to raise their children and have some assurance of a husband at home. For at least one older woman, the fieldhand Phyllis, this meant living with her son's family, although there is no way of knowing whether this meant greater comfort or more babysitting.

Women who were slaves at Shadwell shared living space with their children and sometimes their husbands, and sometimes with other adult slave women and their families. Some dwelt in single-family houses, some in houses with multiple families or unrelated adults. Some lived in buildings that we would recognize as a house, others lived in workspaces such as the kitchen. All had close neighbors, like it or not.

Plantation Kitchen: Hearth and Home

Among the home-quarter slaves were the cooks. They lived in the frame plantation kitchen buildings and probably moved between their own workspace there, the Jeffersons' house, and the slave houses farther to the east. There is no indication which of the slaves was trained in cookery and so no telling which family or families lived in this building. The main kitchen housed "1 bed and covering" that may have accommodated a single person or a whole family (Figure 5.4). The bed in the main kitchen room stood between "4 potts & 3 pr pot hooks" and "2 old Tables." Two old chairs listed there offered some comfort for the cook during both work and leisure hours, although the surrounding dishes, andirons, tubs, pails, copper kettles, and pot racks were constant reminders of work. Two beds accommodated people in a separate storeroom or wood shed, where they slept amid meal bags, a cask, two barrels, tight casks, old lumber, and a cleaver. The main kitchen had a broad open hearth with "1 P' Large Kitchen Handlrons," and pothooks, pot racks, and spits. This room was designed for food preparation for the planters' family and guests, but also provided space for food.
preparation and domestic activities for the cook’s own family (Figure 5.5). The cook’s
chamber pots attest to her personal needs being met in the building where she worked. A
small clay-walled cellar (about 2’x3’) beneath the floor may have served either the
cook’s professional or personal duties, storing root crops or family items. The building
had windows to offer some light and relief from heat or smoke. The cooking,
childrearing, and beds may have been shared by other related or unrelated adults; either
arrangement was within the bounds of the system. If children were small, they spent the
day underfoot while their mother worked, or they went nearby to someone who watched
young children for the community. They may well have shared the company of kinfolk
while their mother worked.

The cook performed a variety of skilled and unskilled labor for the Jeffersons.
She maintained tools that describe a variety of cooking styles including pans for savory
and sweet baking, spits for roasting, pans for braising and grilling, pots for stewing,

\[^{203}\] I have made the conclusion that the buildings here were frame based on PJ’s
attention to their orientation in the landscape and the high quantity of wrought nails in the
vicinity of the kitchen. There were, however, no physical remains of the walls or
foundations to indicate the size of the buildings. Additionally, a high quantity of window
glass suggests that the buildings were decently appointed. See Kern, Report on Shadwell.

Unfortunately, even though there is a concentration of evidence for the home
quarter it is still impossible to put most individuals in specific roles and in specific places.
I have made the assumption that the cook was female, based on the most likely
use of labor resources. It is possible, however, that the cook was male like Thomas
Jefferson chose to maintain at Monticello. The adult females in 1757 were Sall, Hannah,
Cachina, Myrtilla, and Bellinda. It is tempting to assign group II (Table 4.3) to the
kitchen because group II was comprised of two women and three girls and archaeological
evidence shows the kitchen to be a female-dominated space (more on this below). But
the correspondence of field hands and tools agues for group II (Sally, Flora, Agye, Moll,
and Ephey) to remain in the field slave category. AlCWB 2: 43.

Two latch plates (SW 15 and SW 94) for boxes or other locked containers may
have served similar purposes, either to protect kitchen stores from wandering, or giving
the cook and her family a place to secure their possessions.
dishes and pans for baking, pans for frying, a grid iron for broiling, and irons for toasting. She prepared food that simmered or roasted without much attention, and she used tools that required constant monitoring. She had iron implements for use at the fireplace, but also smaller bone-handled utensils for dressing or serving food, or for her own dining. She also preserved food and processed food for storage, as well as managed stocks of food using milk pans, jugs, jars, bottles, and casks. The open hearth, with its three pairs of pothooks, pot racks, and spits allowed cooking over flame, near flame, or right in coals. She or an assistant turned the spit if there was no clock reel to do that job. A separate oven for baking would have been part of the brick structure of the chimney and would not show up in the inventory, but was likely a feature of the kitchen. The cook, or perhaps a younger slave under her direction, brought wood and kept the fires the right size for various jobs, carried water to heat in great copper kettles, washed dishes in the tubs and pails, swept, and carried produce in and trash out. The tablecloth and brushes were for hygiene and food preparation. The cook may well have visited the vegetable garden to supply the kitchen, or others may have brought to her what the Jeffersons directed. She had a cleaver for dispatching fowl and chopping large cuts of meat and probably game. She handled fishhooks from catch and processed dairy. She probably helped salt, smoke, and preserve meats, perhaps under the direction of Jane Jefferson, and helped store wine and brew beer. A second building next door had a brick-lined cellar and may have served as a smokehouse or dairy.  

List of tools is from AICWB 2: 43; for the uses of them see Mary Randolph, *The Virginia House-wife*, ed. Karen Hess (Columbia, South Carolina: 1984). Archaeology recovered a wide variety of utilitarian food preparation and storage vessels, as well as iron implements and cookware. The kitchen area was excavated in the 1940s.
The material culture of the Jeffersons indicates that their cooks needed to be versed in distinctly Anglo-Virginian manners of food preparation; it is likely that the domestic slaves and kitchen workers were people who had been in Virginia for some time or had been born there. Although the 1757 inventory lists the better wares with the contents of the Jefferson house, the kitchen area contained the archaeological remains of numerous tablewares, glass stemware, and eating utensils, evidence of the everyday circulation of dishes from kitchen to table to scullery. The slave cook and others who worked in the kitchen had firsthand experience with a full range of the ceramic wares available in the British-Atlantic consumer world. They handled English-made white salt glazed stoneware, which was fashionable at mid-century, delftware from England and Holland, stoneware and earthenware from various European manufactures such as the Rhineland and England, and Chinese porcelain that passed through European ports before making its way across the Atlantic. The kitchen staff also had to learn when to serve on ceramic or pewter, when to prepare for a table set with silver, and the difference between 1940s and 1950s, but the record of those excavations is not stratigraphic; that is, the entire assemblage for the area falls into the plowzone level. See introduction for discussion of plowzone sites. Because of the complete excavation of this area in the 1950s and its subsequent rebuilding with modern materials as part of the 1960s site interpretation, there was no opportunity for soil analysis or other analysis of the brick-lined cellar that might have indicated its use. Kern, *Report on Shadwell*.

At Monticello the path between the kitchen and the vegetable garden is direct. PJ's landscape seems as if it too would have made such work connections clear, although archaeological testing did not turn up garden evidence on the sunny south slope of the ridge below the kitchen. The lack of positive evidence for the garden in this location does not confirm that it was not here.

For the role of women and slaves in processing pork, see Clinton, *Plantation Mistress*, esp. 16, 23-24; artifacts are listed in Kern, *Report on Shadwell*; Mary Randolph included an array of recipes for curing, salting, or preserving meats, vegetables, and fruit, Randolph, *Virginia House-wife*. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
a coffee pot, a tea pot, a chocolate pot, and a cream pot. The slave cook and related staff probably knew more about how to use and to care for silver, pewter, and porcelain wares than most Virginians of any color who still ate from wooden plates and bowls using only a spoon.\textsuperscript{205}

Food

Slave women prepared food for their families, from both rations and what they caught, grew, or borrowed. The women who lived and worked in the plantation kitchen probably ate the best grade of food of any slaves because, in addition to their ration, they no doubt tasted and ate extra from what they prepared for the Jefferson household. But they may have caught bites only when they were finished meeting the demands of those dining in the big house, whether they served a small family meal or a great dinner. The wares associated with the Jefferson’s dining room indicate that the Jeffersons practiced an elite style of dining that could involve multiple courses and fine seasonings prepared with sophisticated cooking tools and methods. Some foods were finished at the parlor

\textsuperscript{205} There are no plants of specifically African origin listed in the early pages of TJ’s Garden Book, although it is entirely possible that slaves grew these in their own gardens and some found their way into the Jeffersons’ food. The style in which the cook prepared certain foods may well have reflected her African heritage. See Hess, in Randolph, \textit{Virginia House-wife}, xxix - xxxi.

Many of the tablewares and utensils appeared in the inventory with the contents of the Jefferson dwelling house, however; suggesting that there, and not the kitchen, was their appropriate place when not in use (Kern, \textit{Report on Shadwell}, 81, appendices 2, 3).

The more precious wares probably never left the Jefferson house parlor, or left there to be washed in the kitchen only under the direct supervision of a Jefferson or a most trusted house servant. At Monticello, for instance, Martha Jefferson Randolph wrote to her father about things she had to lock up when a responsible person was not in residence and TJ’s butler Burwell had a key roll in storing wine in various vessels in the wine cellar there. Martha Jefferson Randolph to TJ, January 16, 1791, Ellen Wayles Randolph to Thomas Jefferson, October 20, 1808, in \textit{Family Letters}, 68, 352-353. See also chap. 1.
hearth on the way to the dining room, and some were seasoned at the table. The cooks who worked there knew a style of food preparation very different from the one-pot type of meal that was probably the staple at the quarter sites. The cooks had to calculate preparation times (though there was no clock in the inventory) and how to move the dishes from the kitchen buildings to the main house. They may have had to tend dishes in the house parlor for the servers to take to the dining room across the passage, closely watched by Jane Jefferson, her older daughters, or a slave acting as butler. Their work involved great performances between bouts of the mundane. They needed to process beef, lamb, pork, poultry, fish and game, and maybe catch some of it. The plantation garden included vegetables to be cooked, such as peas, asparagus, broccoli, and cauliflower; eaten raw, such as lettuce, radish, cucumber, and berries; and others that were preserved, such as peas, cucumbers, berries and other fruits, and nuts. They hauled water, chopped wood, washed pots and dishes, and protected their own small children from knives, flame, and other harm. They may also have had to cook separate food for other slaves who worked in the house or when all hands were in the fields.206

The cook occupied a position that put her at an advantage over others in the slave community, but she was also required to work closely with the Jeffersons. The needs of Jeffersons no doubt limited her ability to socialize with other slaves, but her access to regulated foodstuffs gave her a special privilege. She needed to work with the mistress of the house -- either Jane or one of the daughters as mistress-in-training -- who carried the keys to locked storerooms for spices or better cuts of meat. She worked according to the

206 On Shadwell gardens, see GB, 4-6, 12. TJ assigned one or two slave women to cook for the entire work group during the wheat harvest. FB 46.
Jeffersons’ and their guests’ meal schedules, with occasional time off. She probably spent some of her time in the Jeffersons’ house, finishing or transferring food to vessels over the parlor fire, unless she directed other slaves to do so. The cook had currency in the scraps and leftovers from foods that were seasoned and cooked with different implements than those that most slaves had. She may have had the opportunity to use these extras as social or economic leverage in her exchanges with other slaves who might otherwise resent her position. She could invoke a celebration or trade with sugar, or cinnamon, a beef roast, or a pork chop that offered a dramatic break from a cornmeal and salted meat diet, or she might have the ability to alert others to unlocked storerooms so they could choose for themselves occasionally.207 She needed to be trusted by the

207 TJ’s granddaughters comment on “carrying the keys.” Martha Jefferson Randolph to TJ, Jan. 16, 1791, in Family Letters, 68; Mary Jefferson Randolph to Virginia Jefferson Randolph, Dec. 27, 1821, Trist Papers, University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill.

Robert Rose wrote of bringing home some company and ate “a Batchelour’s Dinner, my Wife & Daughter being gone.” Whether he got out the food they ate, or summoned a slave to do so, they had a different type of meal than would have been planned had the women been home; Rose’s slaves did not plan the meal. Rose, Diary, 32. See also chap. 6.

Archaeological evidence from Mulberry Row at Monticello illustrates that slaves who lived close to or who had a family connection in the plantation kitchen acquired better cuts of meat than what historians generally expect to find in slave quarters based on documentary evidence. Historians have interpreted in a number of ways the slaves’ acquisition of controlled goods, such as meat that was reserved for planters. Slaves’ interest and success in augmenting their diets may be evidence of individual and group creativity in using all available resources, including cast-offs from the big house or kitchen. It may also be evidence of “resistance” to the slave system, and indeed there are accounts that slaves impertinently questioned whether eating their master’s pig, for instance, was stealing, since the pig nourished the worker, thereby strengthening the master’s investment. See faunal (animal bone) analyses by Diana Crader of the Monticello archaeological assemblage in the reports by Kelso, and Kelso and Sanford. They are summarized in Kelso, Archaeology at Monticello, 68-70, 93-97. See also Bowen, “Foodways in the 18th-Century Chesapeake.” On slave morality and the difference between stealing and taking, see Genovese, Roll, Jordan, Roll, 602-603. The
Jeffersons and included in the broader slave community --- her skills and her access gave her the tools to do both.

The cook also called the kitchen building home and the site revealed a number of artifacts related to personal use or small family domestic activity (as opposed to the larger domestic activity of the plantation). Like the main quarter site, artifacts here included colonoware, a few Indian objects, and many buttons mixed amongst the general kitchen and domestic refuse. These items in common with the rest of the home quarter site I discuss below.

**Plantation Quarter: House and Yard**

Other slaves lived in a group of small houses located on the eastern edge of the ten-acre domestic center of the plantation. At least two houses stood there, and likely two more, providing sleeping arrangements for family groups (Figure 5.5). While the layout of the buildings at Shadwell -- including these slave houses -- reflected Peter Jefferson's formal arrangement of plantation elements, the slaves' daily use of the space reflected their own needs and desires. The Jeffersons' attention to slave families supports the archaeological evidence that these buildings housed families, as opposed to single-sex dormitory-style living arrangements that have been the model for discussing slavery this region in this period.\(^{208}\)

---

1940s and 1950s excavations in the area of the Shadwell kitchen did not save bone material in a way that could be analyzed except in plowzone distribution studies. See Kern, *Report on Shadwell*, 31-32.

\(^{208}\) A common query posed by archaeologists is whether artifacts relating to particular groups of people reflect native or adapted versions of their culture. There are a few sites and contemporary references where slave houses reflected African building practices or ornamentation. While there is no archaeological evidence of ornamentation
One slave house (called building I here), left prominent archaeological remains: a large (6-1/2' square) clay-walled cellar pit; a pit marking a hearth area just east of the cellar; and two large postholes flanking the hearth pit that were post supports for the chimney (Figure 5.5). This building was likely frame, at least 10' deep by 12' long -- the minimum size of a room that would extend from the hearth area past the cellar. The building had glazed windows, and artifact distributions show that the building opened to the south. The cellar reached about 3-1/2 to 4' below modern grade and was large enough to serve a variety of storage needs. The cellar dated to at least 1737, based on the mean ceramic date of the cellar fill. The single large cellar in the building was a product of family life and displays the results of close and trusting occupants. Artifacts from sealed layers of the features associated with building I, including the chimney structure and cellar, indicate that it was built before the mid-eighteenth century. There are no features that suggest later repairs or alterations to the building—-at least not to any substructure.209

for the buildings that housed slaves at Shadwell, the evidence of their orientation suggests that these quarters were a product of Peter Jefferson's Anglo-Virginian ideas about buildings and the plantation landscape. However, the use of the living space provided an opportunity for self-expression by the slaves who lived there. See, for instance, Genovese, Roll, Jordan, Roll, 529-530; Kelso, Kingsmill, 27-28; Morgan, Slave Counterpoint, 118-120.

209 The archaeological details of the features related to this building are: the large clay-walled cellar (SW99, SW351E-R) measures roughly 6-1/2' square and reaches about 3-1/2 to 4' below modern grade. About 8' east of the east side of the cellar, an oblong feature (SW362F, H) (2x5') was the pit for the hearth, and the two large post holes just north and south (SW327J, K and SW364M, N, respectively) of this pit mark post supports for a chimney structure. Roland Robbins excavated most of the cellar in 1955 as a single deposit -- that is, he did not record the stratigraphic and hence chronological deposition of artifacts in the feature. A few early layers survived the 1950s work and were recorded stratigraphically. For specific details, see Kern, Report on Shadwell;
A second building (building II) is marked only by a small sill of brick rubble between two postholes that indicate a doorway (Figure 5.5). The only artifacts from the feature were wrought nails, wine bottle glass, and a tooth. The alignment of this feature coincides with the major axes of the other plantation buildings and landscape. But like all the other buildings at Shadwell, there is no footprint to indicate any other details of its dimensions.\textsuperscript{210} Like building I, distribution studies show that the front of building II was toward the yard area between the two buildings, to the west of building II. The building had glazed windows. Based on the Jeffersons' attention to the location and orientation of the components of their plantation, building II, was most likely the same frame


The building may have measured as long as 18'-20' on the exterior if there were reasonable space for flooring on all sides of the large cellar pit and the 4-1/2' deep chimney structure is included in the overall length. It is possible that the building was log construction, but the quantity of wrought nails suggests otherwise, though there were not as many nails around buildings I and II as there were around the kitchen buildings.

Recent work by Garret Fesler has recognized the relationship between type and number of sub-floor pits and slave housing practices. At the Utopia site in James City County, earlier plantation housing put people in single-sex dormitory-style arrangements, and in these buildings archaeologists discovered many small sub-floor pits that served the separate storage needs of individuals. Later period family housing revealed that slaves used only one or sometimes two larger pits that served the group. Personal communication, 2004.

The south chimney support postmold contains a single wire nail that confirms the building's destruction by the nineteenth century and probably reflects the gradual filling of the postmold by plowing. See Kern, \textit{Report on Shadwell}.

\textsuperscript{210} The sill was excavated in 1991 as SW 341E. The postholes were about a foot in diameter, and their centers were about 3' apart. The postholes were filled with brick rubble to a depth of about 1.25'. The rubble sill was slightly more than a half foot wide, and extended to a depth of only .2', much shallower than the postholes. The rubble from the sill seemed to cap the postholes, and the three parts appeared as one distinct feature on the surface. There were no postmolds evident in the fill, but the fill was rubbly.
construction and finish as building I.\textsuperscript{211}

The yard around and between these two buildings served as space for raising food, cooking food, and as auxiliary living space. The artifacts here testify to an array of domestic activities across the area. Though the Jeffersons dictated the buildings and their placement in the landscape, a few features indicate that the slaves used their allotted space in ways that fall outside the carefully constructed plantation plan. Two features in the yard of this building provide information about slave diet and social use of the space. Just off the southeast corner of building I six, small post features form an almost circular enclosure that could have kept small livestock such as poultry or protected garden plants. Just beyond the enclosure, further southeast, was a pit for cooking or smoking fish and meats (see below).\textsuperscript{212} The yard provided space for raising food and functioned as auxiliary domestic space. It may have been the center of the local community within this small plantation compound, a community that had some degree of autonomy behind a fence that separated them from their white overseers.

\textsuperscript{211} It is possible that building II was log, and Mulberry Row at Monticello certainly shows that even the most planned plantation landscape could display a variety of materials and construction methods. There were fewer nails around building II, as shown in the distribution maps, although the distributions of window glass show pretty consistent patterns around each of the buildings on the quarter and the kitchen area. See Kern, \textit{Report on Shadwell}.

\textsuperscript{212} These posts were features SW364F, G, H, J, L, P. Enclosures such as this are associated with a number of slave sites. Their interpretation is best illustrated by the reconstruction of a quarter by the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation at Carter’s Grove, see Edward A. Chappell, “Reconstructed Slave Quarter at Carter’s Grove,” in Charles Brownell, Calder Loth, William Rasmussen, and Richard Wilson, \textit{The Making of Virginia Architecture} (Richmond: Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, 1992), 432-433; Walsh, \textit{Calabar to Carter’s Grove}, 181-182. The cooking pit was feature SW330H, J.
A split-rail fence enclosed the quarter buildings and their yard, and separated them from the center of the plantation where the Jeffersons' house and the kitchen building stood. Locating the slaves on the physical landscape of the plantation offers some clues as to the freedoms and limitations of their movements around that space. A fence is a multivalent object. It can be both a permeable barrier -- something that provides access -- and a shield -- a defense from noise and activity or people that might be intrusive. This fence was not a palisade or security wall for humans --- it is unlikely that it served to imprison enslaved adults. Rather, it may have offered slaves a bit of security and aided their efforts to raise poultry and garden crops and keep roving animals at bay.\textsuperscript{213} It may have offered those who resided within a degree of privacy away from the plantation center, providing the opportunity to be out from under the watchful eyes of others. On the other hand, it may have been a constant reminder to those whom it enclosed that people in the big house wanted to keep them separate, and not have the rustic elements of the plantation quarter intrude upon the refined elegance of the Jeffersons' house. The fence was recognized as a barrier, both sides served to separate people and activities.

The fenceline persisted --- there was archaeological evidence of four periods of repair to the fence. Its purpose must have persisted as well, even when there was no longer a plantation house at Shadwell to be the center of things. Just north of the quarter

\textsuperscript{213} The fence described as part of the landscape plan here barred only the western side of the quarter area. Excavations north, south, and west of the activity yard did not uncover fences, but many kinds of enclosures do not leave archaeological footprints. In fact, evidence for split-rail fences is rare. The one at Shadwell left its mark because of the pairs of staves that locked each intersection of rails in place.
buildings was a trash pit that straddled the fenceline. That trash lay on both sides suggests that people on both sides of this boundary recognized it and dumped along it. Its location also indicates that the quarter and the kitchen residents thought of the area north of their houses as the back — or at least less important than the south face. Just outside the doors of the slave houses was a gate in the fence through which a path led to the kitchen and to the porch of the house where the slaves’ owners and taskmasters lived. The people who lived on the quarter were connected to the center of the plantation by this path. They followed it to report for work and it carried them home again. They used it to visit their friends in the kitchen, who may have peered along the path for glimpses of what was going on among their families in the quarter. The slaves who lived on the home quarter, both in the kitchen and the quarter site, shared a common material culture; their domestic lives were similar. Probably much of their world was the product of shared labor and shared culture. The fence in their midst did not limit exchange between the slaves in the kitchen and those on the quarter; rather, the fence offered some degree of privacy or autonomy that allowed the people who lived there to sustain a community.

Food

Artifacts from the home quarter describe a variety of domestic activities and much of the activity centered on food. There are no lists that tell us what theJeffersons gave their people as their regular ration. In general, planters gave their slaves a portion of cornmeal and a portion of salted meat a week, and occasionally salted fish. But artifacts from the site offer information about cooking styles, if not what was cooked, and suggest food-related activities that provide some further insight into diet and the activities of

---

slaves in their homes. The Jeffersons provided at least one pot and pothooks for each slave quarter, so one member of the group prepared food that might simmer all day and be ready when everyone came in from working. Three of the field quarters each had a single pair of pothooks and one quarter site had two pothooks; they all had at least one pot. The single cooking apparatus that Jefferson supplied served all the residents of each field quarter. The home quarter residents had at least four sets of pothooks in their possible four buildings, in addition to the fixed hearth equipment in the nearby plantation kitchen. The home quarter residents had both a workday and living arrangements that were different from the field hands. On the home quarter, meals did not serve the entire group but each of five households fed themselves.215

The inhabitants of the quarter site cooked in cast iron cooking pots. Some pots had cast legs to allow the cook to place the pot right in the coals; one skillet had legs attached with brass rivets. A pot hook served with hearth equipment for stewing in an iron pot over the fire. Some scraps of iron pans suggest baking or other cooking methods. Slaves may have earned or purchased this cookware themselves. Colono pots from the site also suggest stewing directly in a fire, although these pots may have served other purposes as well (see medicine, below). The pit near building I shows that smoking

215 On slave rations, see FB 163; Morgan, Slave Counterpoint, 134-145. Generally, an archaeologist would save bone and other animal material and have a faunal analyst or faunal archaeologist assess the type of animals, grades of meats, and butchering or even cooking methods indicated by the collection. Most of the kitchen area and part of the quarter site (the cellar of building I) were excavated in the 1950s work of Roland Robbins. The bone material was kept without regard to stratigraphy and some degraded in storage. In short, faunal analysis was not done with the material recovered in the 1950s as there was no way of knowing how complete the sample was or even if there was a dateable context for the assemblage. It may still be possible to survey the collection to get a general statement about diet. On pothooks, see AlCWB 2: 41-48.
fish or meats was one of the cooking methods used on this site. The slaves fished and they had oysters. They had spades for keeping gardens. They had a small pen for keeping poultry. The artifacts show that slaves ate foods much more various than what is suggested generally in documents about slave rations. \textsuperscript{216}

Slaves in building I moved some of their food preparation from their fireplace to a cooking or smoking pit outside their house (Figure 1.6, 5.5). In this act they mirrored the actions of the planters in removing cooking heat and smells from the house, as well as proved ways to use their allotted space as they wished. The pit was roughly circular, about two and a half feet in diameter and would have reached about eighteen to twenty-four inches below the yard surface. The fill in the pit mixed soils and charcoal and a small number of artifacts that attest to the historic-era provenience of this feature, including bits of brick, pieces of a Staffordshire slipware pan and other vessel, a fragment of window glass, and a wrought t-headed nail. Bone fragments and fish scale indicate some of the foods cooked here. The bottom of the pit was flat and on it sat a roundish, flat rock that was about nine inches in diameter and two inches thick that served as a platform for the foods and smoking materials. The rock was embedded in a layer of charcoal that contained burnt corncobs. Although it was clearly associated with building I, it may also reflect an invitation to the neighbors to be social or take advantage of the

\textsuperscript{216} See SW339A. At Monticello TJ used incentives of an extra pot or a crocus bed (a mattress covered with the coarse fabric called crocus) to slaves who married at "home," and he rewarded craftsmen with suits, "of red or blue." It is possible PJ and JJ used similar incentives. TJ to Jeremiah Goodman, Jan. 6, 1815, GB, 540; Jefferson, "Memoirs," 23.
communal environment to help watch the pot while everyone was busy with other tasks.\textsuperscript{217}

The residents of Shadwell’s home quarter had a range of European ceramics that most slaves did not possess. Most of the ware types that occur in association with the Jefferson dwelling house also appeared in the quarter area, with heavier concentrations of utilitarian wares on the quarter site. Ceramic vessels from across the quarter site indicate food preparation, preservation, or storage there. Larger vessels of both glazed and unglazed earthenware and salt glazed stoneware may have served all of these purposes. Earthenware pans, mostly Staffordshire slipware, red bodied ware with lead glaze, or Buckley ware, functioned as food preparation vessels or milk pans. Stoneware bottles and glass wine bottles represent high frequency use of storage containers in this area. Thus, the people who lived there had alternatives well beyond a standard weekly ration. They put up stores of food or used foods that had been preserved. While they might not have enjoyed quite the same access to foods as the plantation cook, they still had opportunities far beyond the expected slave fare.\textsuperscript{218}

Ceramic tablewares from the home quarter site reflect the forms and wares available at Shadwell in the eighteenth century—almost all the ceramic types used at Shadwell passed through the home quarter, from the most utilitarian to the finest goods. Since the Jeffersons acquired almost the full range of ceramic wares available in Virginia

\textsuperscript{217} The cooking pit was SW330H, J. Surface diameter and depth are estimates because the feature only appeared below plowzone. See Kern, \textit{Report on Shadwell} and field notes.

\textsuperscript{218} See Kern, \textit{Report on Shadwell}, especially Appendix 2: Statistical Tables of Materials by Site.
in the middle of the eighteenth century, the home quarter site can be said to reflect the breadth of the ceramic market in the colony. But there is no way to know which of the goods may have been second hand and which might have been purchased or earned by slaves directly. Slaves on the home quarter at Shadwell used plates and bowls, tea wares and table forks. Access to goods separated house slaves from field slaves, and house slaves for rich folks from all poorer folks - white, black, slave, or free. Slaves belonging to wealthy people experienced a different range of material goods than most people in the eighteenth century, but the interpretation of consumer goods as hand me downs is a "problem" of plantation archaeology.219 Fashion is limited by time and at some point in their lives, fashionable goods become merely useful objects.

---

219 Bill Kelso called findings on slave quarters at Kingsmill and Monticello a "representative sampling of whatever the owner had on hand," see Kelso, Archaeology at Monticello, 88-100; Kingsmill, quotation on 205; Monticello Archaeology Collections; Lorena Walsh proposes that an internal slave economy for goods emerged just prior to rather than after the Revolution in older tidewater areas. Shadwell evidence supports the chronology and extends the region, like much of the Shadwell evidence for white folks. Slaves at Shadwell experienced a world of goods more like that at Carter's Grove in tidewater than most small plantations and farms in the Piedmont. Walsh, Calabar to Carters Grove, 182-186, 307, n. 17.

The consumption of ceramics by slave and free members of plantation communities has been explored in different ways by archaeologists, who focus variously on the attributes of objects, the status of objects, or the relations of the people who use the objects. On ceramics as status in nineteenth-century Georgia, see William Hampton Adams and Sarah Jane Boling, "Status and Ceramics for Planters and Slaves on Three Georgia Coastal Plantations.," Approaches to Material Culture Research for Historical Archaeologists, compiled by George L. Miller, Olive R. Jones, Lester A. Ross, and Teresita Majewski (California, Pa.: Society for Historical Archaeology, 1991), 59-86. Charles E. Orser Jr. proposes a relation-based analysis in "Artifacts, Networks, and Plantations: Toward a Further Understanding of the Social Aspects of Material Culture," in Historical Archaeology and the Study of American Culture, ed. Lu Ann De Cunzo and Bernard L. Herman (Winterthur: Henry Francis Du Pont Winterthur Museum, Inc., 1996), 233-256.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Access to second or third hand goods does not necessarily mean that the behaviors implied by these objects in their initial consumption stand, and the possible interpretations are many. Wares without intrinsic value, that is, not made of silver or pewter or a material that could be recast, still had a value because of their usefulness and because of their fashion. For instance, we assume that the Jeffersons invested very consciously in a new and high style teapot because the teapot’s fashionable status held a return for the Jeffersons. The teapot was worth its expense because it played a role in reinforcing the social prestige of Peter and Jane. In a world where social prestige was currency, owners who displayed status goods perceived a financial return from them. When the teapot’s design was not at the height of fashion it was no longer a positive statement about its owner’s taste and current ability to acquire goods. Yet, it may still have been important to that owner as an object with sentimental value or even as a vessel to serve tea or to hold another liquid. The Shadwell collection represents a well-off couple at an advanced stage in their lifecycle; Peter and Jane’s ages afforded them time to acquire things and replace things broken or lost. A younger couple, an unmarried person, or a poorer person may not acquire or replace possessions that mark once in a lifetime events such as marriage.

When the initial owner discarded an item - to replace it with a more fashionable pot or because it was worn or chipped - the receiver may not have cared at all that the teapot was once fashionable and held in high regard. It may have become merely a useful vessel. However, because of the limited firsthand access of slaves to markets or because a slave might want to display certain privilege within the plantation community, the hand-me-down may still have been a status good, but within an altered scale. A
chipped teapot may be more teapot than most laborers ever owned, or, the teapot may illustrate within the slave community the personal relationship that a particular servant had with the master or mistress. The teapot may still bear a return as a status object, but it cannot - and should not - be measured on the same social scale as when it was first acquired.\(^{220}\)

The goods moved from Jefferson house to quarter a number of ways. There is evidence that slaves at Shadwell gave familiar objects new meaning by reworking them. Shadwell slaves made a number of gaming pieces or markers out of fragments of ceramic and shell (more below). Additionally, when the Jefferson house burned, the contents were presumably scattered. Then, there is good evidence that the site was cleaned up following the fire. Jane’s post-fire house included au courant purchases instead of replacing exactly what was lost to the fire. So in 1770, there was a window of opportunity for status goods to move across the site. Some of the goods on the slave quarter may have been hand-me-downs, some salvage, some refuse.\(^{221}\)

\(^{220}\) Authors who have considered the meaning of objects in the waning years of their fashion include Cary Carson, "The Consumer Revolution;" Herman, "Multiple Materials;" Martin, "The Role of Pewter as Missing Artifact." Barbara Carson considers the varied scales of new consumer goods in *Ambitious Appetites*. Sidney W. Mintz probes the fashions behind certain foods, in *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York, Viking, 1985, esp. 121-122.


\(^{221}\) Two stories an archaeologist must consider are how an object was used in the past, and then how it got to the place where it was found.
Medicine Spiritual and Physical

Someone in the slave community used and prepared medicine -- perhaps she or he was a healer. Evidence of medicinal preparations in both the kitchen site and the quarter area and along the fence line in between suggest that slaves managed medicines themselves and helped others in the community. Someone in the household of the Shadwell cook---very possibly the cook herself---lent a hand in healing, preparing, or working with others to manufacture remedies in the kitchen. The variety of artifacts with medicinal applications occurs on both the kitchen site and the quarter site and allows a discussion of healing in the broadest possible sense in a mid-eighteenth-century Virginia context (Figure 5.6). The artifacts reveal ideas about healing that represent a number of different cultural traditions. The kitchen housed a caudal cup of white saltglaze stoneware for serving soft foods to an ailing person, an Anglo idea in an English vessel, but an idea not out of place in many parts of the world. Across the slave-inhabited area of the plantation were numerous delft salve pots and different size drug jars of stoneware and earthenware. The Jeffersons purchased these European-made jars with ointment compounded by a doctor or pharmacist and gave the preparations to their slaves. Alternatively, the Jeffersons may have used the prepared ointments and passed the pots on to their slaves for re-use, but in this case fragments of jars should also have appeared in the materials related to the Jefferson house and they did not. The making of salves of local plant matter or animal fat was a tradition in European, African, and native American cultures. Knowledge and opinion of what ingredients soothed what conditions differentiated the practices. Glass vials and bottles fall into the same patterns of use as...
the drug jars; the vessel form implies keeping healing substances, what that substance was could differ from user to user, even within the same cultural group.222

The ointment pots, drug jars, and pharmaceutical vials illustrate the presence of "professional" medicine at Shadwell. Occasionally the Jeffersons or an overseer called someone recognized as a doctor to treat members of the plantation community. Dr. Thomas Walker treated Peter Jefferson. Arthur Hopkins visited as a physician. Midwives Jane Hammock and Mrs. Lewis helped slave women deliver their babies. One practice that was applied to both the Anglo and the African Virginians was the use of sugar and alcohol such as brandy during childbirth to ease labor, although this may not have been the Africans' first choice of medicaments. In 1754 Dr. William Wills treated the twenty-four-year-old Samson. Dr. George Gilmer visited the plantation to treat slaves and may also have treated Jane or other family members: in 1772 he visited a boy with a leg injury. Peter Jefferson kept fleams and sundry medicine vials in the same strong

222 Archaeologists found pots made for drugs and salve at Shadwell on the kitchen area, the quarter site, and the quarter site at Monticello. See Kern, *Report on Shadwell*; Neiman, "Shadwell Quarter." I suggest these pots may have come from Williamsburg because the Pasteur & Galt Apothecary there kept stocks of English delft salve pots that they used for the medications they mixed and sold. It is possible that doctors in the Piedmont also had stocks of pots for mixing preparations for their patients, although these doctors may have purchased theirs from a commercial apothecary such as the Pasteur & Galt or may even have purchased patent medicines made abroad. By 1780 George Gilmer sold medicine in Charlottesville (see chap. 2). I thank Robin Kipps, Supervisor of the Pasteur & Galt Apothecary at Colonial Williamsburg for sharing her knowledge of the drug jar trade with me. Delftware apothecary jars were made in Holland but most that appear on Anglo sites were made in and around London. Noël Hume, *Guide to Artifacts*, 203.

Glass pharmaceutical containers appear in the same area as the delft: in the Shadwell kitchen and quarter, and the Monticello quarter. A single piece of glass also came from the Jefferson house, the only medicinally-related artifact from that site. See chap. 2; Kern, *Report on Shadwell*; Neiman, "Shadwell Quarter."
house where he kept his militia weapons. He may have used them on the plantation or they may have been reserved for military and surveying expeditions. There is only a single vial in connection with the Jefferson house but if the habit was to pass empty vessels to slaves, then pots may not have stayed in the house for long.

Knowledge about medicine and healing could be learned from books, from working with or watching doctors, or from remembering remedies practiced at home. In the eighteenth century, there was not necessarily a lot of difference between what was called professional and what was called folk practice. Slaves at Monticello practiced traditional medicine that their master referred to as poison, but healing was an inexact art and not so far removed from ideas about faith and spirituality. The women in the slave community no doubt passed their knowledge about nursing babies and tending small children from woman to woman. Nursing babies and helping women in childbirth was one of the skills women in early America almost had to practice. The women who could offer concrete solutions to problems such as diaper rash and postpartum pain also could make prayers and invoke faith in those people they tried to heal. The other artifacts that relate to medicinal practices at Shadwell reflect the spiritual side of healing and non-European uses.

Colonoware vessels, often categorized as cookware, also had medicinal applications that speak entirely of slave culture. Slaves made the pots—now called

---

223 PJAB 9, 17, 23. This is probably the same Mrs. Eliza. Lewis, who also sewed clothes for Shadwell slaves. Harvie I: 36, 41; Harvie II: 2. Dr. George Gilmer’s Feebook 1767, 1771-1775, Gilmer-Skipwith Papers, ViU, Mss 6145. AlCWB 2: 43.

colonoware—by taking local clays and tempering materials, shaping vessels by hand, and firing them directly in an open fire or hearth. The product was a coarse-fired earthenware that revealed the cultural traditions of the maker and the distinction of local materials. These pots were a direct product of African craft or creole methods developed by Africans during their American slavery. Their function may have been to make African-style foods, practice traditional medicine, or represent to their owners a spiritual connection. Sixteen fragments of colonoware vessels were found on the kitchen and slave quarter area at Shadwell (Figure 5.7). They fall into five distinctly different vessels or types of material. Many of the pieces reflect the deep red color of local clays. The sandy buff color of one larger bowl indicates its production in the tidewater region from materials there. This may have been a treasured personal object, brought long ago from a family home on another plantation. Unless it was “just” a bowl, it is unlikely it played a role in food preparation for the Jeffersons. If this bowl served as cookware, then the cook and her family at least occasionally preferred their own food, prepared their own way, despite the fact that the specialized cooking utensils of another culture surrounded them. This redundancy makes the presence of the colonoware even more important. While a colonoware bowl may have held a substance, it also served as a vessel for a spirit. Archaeologists have uncovered evidence elsewhere that slaves made colono pots to carry messages between spirits and people on earth. The treatment of a pot in both its making and its disposal provided the ritual relationship between the people and the spirits. The colonoware may have been among the most important things the slaves owned. Other
objects performed a similarly talismanic purpose, such as quartz crystal that was could be found locally, but much of which occurred in cultural deposits in the slave quarter.²²⁵

There is no evidence, except for some of their names, that the Shadwell slaves practiced a Christian religion like the Jeffersons, although it is likely they did. Many slaves kept spiritual practices such as those above while also finding usefulness in Christianity. The presence of one does not preclude the other. The degree of accommodation that many of these slaves showed to Anglo-Virginian ways suggests that activities relating the Jeffersons' church might be embraced as well. Many of these slaves knew the clergy who visited Shadwell, and knew the slaves who worked for those clergymen as well. Additionally, many of the Jeffersons' associates were dissenters from the Church of England. Dissenting religions were particularly popular with people who had less power than their gentry neighbors who formed the vestry of the Established

²²⁵ The name colonoware, or colono Indian ware, was given to coarse-fired earthenwares when archaeologists in the 1960s recognized that European forms had been hand made in locally-found materials. Observers assigned their manufacture to native Americans whose pot making traditions changed to reflect Anglo-Indian markets. The classic example is an Indian-made chamber pot – a European object made using native-American technology. During the following decades when archaeologist began to study slave sites, they debated whether planters bought rustic pots from Indians to give to slaves, or whether the pots indicated that slaves traded with Indians. Then in the 1980s archaeologists realized that many colono pots reflected African potting traditions, and likely were made by slaves, who fired local clay right in their hearths or in firepits. The discovery that many of the pots were incised with cosmograms tied them to African religious practices, perhaps as their sole purpose. Colonoware became rarer following the Revolution when slaves were more likely to be American born and their owners could more easily obtain inexpensive ceramics to give their slaves. For a summary of research on colonoware, see Leland Ferguson, Uncommon Ground, 6-7, Chap. 4, esp. 116-117; Barbara Heath, "Temper, Temper: Recent Scholarship on Colonoware in 18th-Century Virginia," in The Archaeology of 18th-Century Virginia, ed. Theodore R. Reinhart (Richmond: Archeological Society of Virginia, 1996), 149-175.
church. The Jeffersons had friends or family who were Presbyterian, Baptist, Huguenot, and more.226

The colono bowls and tobacco pipes were vessels to carry important substances and slaves made both types of vessels on-site, though most of the pipes were commercially made. Smoking tobacco in pipes reflects both African and native American healing practices. The quarter site had the highest concentration of tobacco pipes across the whole ridge and while their use may have been medicinal at times, I have considered them also with leisure activities (below). The distribution of tobacco pipes on the site also informs something about family life, gender, and use of space. The pipes show in heavy concentrations in the yard of the quarter site, and dramatically less activity in the kitchen area (Figure 5.6).227 While some women did smoke tobacco, it was primarily a male activity. The kitchen area was predominantly female during the working hours, and male slaves apparently did not or could not spend time there.

The distribution of tobacco pipes illustrates the use of kitchen space by non-smoking women, and the use of the quarter buildings and yard by men who did smoke.


227 Tobacco pipes made of kaolin clay had long stems that the smoker broke off in 1-1/2" to 2" segments as the stem became clogged or tattered by the user's teeth. The
which may tell us that the cook did not live with her husband or that her husband lived or socialized mainly in the quarter area when not at work. The fence obscured the view from the Jeffersons’ house to the quarter area, and that may have made the yard there a desirable place to be. The concentrations point to the area around and just south of the slave quarter houses as the focus of social activity where people smoked. Pipe stems have a distinct discard pattern; people disposed of stem pieces as they sat in one place and smoked. As the end of the pipe became soggy, it was broken off and dropped. This contrasts with the scatter of medicinal artifacts along the fenceline and to the east of Building I (Figure 5.6). If healing was the domain of women, their zones of activity were somewhat different from those of the men. People using ointment pots gathered closer to Building II, while smokers sat to the southwest. People may have given more thought to the disposal of items such as drug jars and not dropped them in the primary social space, or they may reflect a primary social space for women and families.

**Clothing and Dress**

Slaves at Shadwell wore linen in the summer and woolen in the winter. Some of their clothing came ready-made from factories in Europe, some came from women who sewed imported or country cloth to order in Albemarle County. A few of the slaves sewed their own clothes or had them tailored. The documents kept for the estate by John Harvie offer the best detail of the ration of clothing and blankets. Archaeology offers a few glimpses into sewing and personal ornamentation not available in the documents. The clothing rations reflect the standard by which wealthier planters kept their “people”

stem sections are what shows up archaeologically, with occasional pipe bowls.
or “negroes,” as they were called in the clothing lists. Many planters gave their people far less than the Jeffersons did.\footnote{These descriptions of clothes from the Shadwell account books rely heavily on the work of Linda Baumgarten, who defines all these items in her article and discusses the range of what planters distributed. See Baumgarten, “Clothes for the People: Slave Clothing in Early Virginia.” See also chapters 2 and 3. The Shadwell rations were very like the clothing rations that TJ made at Monticello. See FB, various.}

Except for a few references that differentiate house slaves, the Jeffersons distributed similar garments across the plantation as part of the annual ration (Figure 5.8). Specialized clothing may have been passed out only occasionally. Male slaves received two shirts and two suits of linen for summer, one woolen suit for winter, and a pair of cloth stockings each year. Their summer breeches were the coarse linen called crocus. Women received two linen shifts for summer, a woolen suit for winter, and a pair of cloth stockings. Children received small shirts or frocks in both winter and summer weights. There is no mention of pants or stockings for children or stays for women, and the spare use of color description suggests a palette of unbleached brown and natural. Except for the stockings neighboring women sewed all the above clothing (Figure 5.8). Purchased ready-made goods included knit wool Monmouth caps that went to men who worked outside in the cold, wool blankets, and the plaid (woven wool cloth) stockings. One shipment of blankets was noted as being “bought in the Country.” Fabric from came from England, collected there from all over the world and re-exported, according to trade laws. Imported fabric included brown Irish linen, cotton (a name for napped, woven
wool), plains (another woven woolen), osnaburg (coarse linen or hemp from Germany), and crocus (linen). Additional imported supplies included thread and shoe thread.\textsuperscript{229}

Most of their rationed clothing was made by local women, many of whom were wives of overseers or other hired workers.\textsuperscript{230} Some years the work was divided among five or more women who made multiple items of clothing, possibly to supply the quarter their own husband oversaw (Figure 5.8). Other years one or two people performed the work, sometimes one was paid for cutting the cloth, another for making. In 1761, Nelly Shepherd did the cutting as well as produced “46 Shirts & Shifts out of Dam[ask], 15 Small Do, 10 Do, 8 Cotton Frocks, 6 Frocks + 1 little Jacket & Breeches, 13 mens & 12 Suits of Wos. Wollen Cloths.”\textsuperscript{231} The items distributed were standard issue, single size, and advertised the wearer’s status as a laboring slave in their color, cut, and fabric.

Slaves at Shadwell sometimes wore shoes made at home, other shoes were purchased. In 1754, Peter Jefferson paid Alexander McCaul £4.6. for twenty pairs of “Negroes Shoes.” But Peter also owned shoemaking tools and fourteen lasts, had tanned

\textsuperscript{229} That Shadwell slave children received different weights of clothing was at variance of the oft-nakedness of slave children elsewhere. Monmouth caps were knitted wool caps without a wide brim, made in Monmouth, England. Blankets came from England, Scotland, or Wales, from factories that manufactured inexpensive woven woolen cloth. Plaid was a woven woolen cloth (unpatterned) that was sewn into stockings that were very different from fashionable knitted stockings. Many of these goods came directly to theJeffersons, shipped from merchants, such as Messers. Farrell & Co. of Bristol, the blankets bought in Virginia one year excepted. See Baumgarten, “Clothes for the People,” esp. “Glossary of Fabric and Clothing Terms,” esp. 45, 48, 50, 62-66; JHAB I; Harvie II: country quote is on p. 3.

\textsuperscript{230} See chap. 2 for evidence that the Jefferson women did not make the slave clothing, and many of these same local women sewing and knitting for the Jefferson children. See also chap. 3 on the business exchanges for the plantation.

\textsuperscript{231} Harvie II: 1, see also chap. 3.
leather and hide, and purchased shoe thread. Both Sawney and Sandy were trained as shoemakers, and shoe thread purchases indicate shoe making on the plantation in years before and after the 1754 purchase of shoes. Overseer Martin Dawson was supplied shoes and shoe leather by Jefferson in 1747, and other overseers were supplied shoes. It is unclear whether Peter purchased shoes for them and passed on the cost, or whether perhaps Sawney made shoes as part of the plantation enterprise. Shoe thread purchases continued in the years following Peter’s death. It was during this time that Sawney had the opportunity to practice his craft outside the plantation by working with Mr. Joseph Bolling, a shoemaker. Bolling hired Sawney for six months in 1759, perhaps to help make shoes, perhaps to train young apprentices. His value was high: the estate received 27s. 6 d. a month, for a nice sum of £8.5.232 Excavations on the home quarter produced a large iron needle and a large pair of shears nearby that may reflect the leather working of Sawney or Sandy.

Sawney and Sandy and other men and women who practiced trades may have had work clothes that differed slightly what the field hands wore. Leather aprons and leather breeches or fabric trousers signified skilled craftsmen, whether slave or free. Someone wore the leather caps that the estate purchased in 1759. The cook might have worn a waistcoat or aprons that signaled her position within the society. The house slaves differed more.233

232 PJAB 9, 11, 19, 22. Sawney’s hire was during the years that TJ boarded with the Rev. James Maury. Harvie I: 38, 45; Harvie II: 3.

233 Harvie II: 3.
The clothing lists mention only two slaves by name: Sawney and Chloe, but all the house servants received special clothing. Sawney’s role as personal attendant to the past and rising masters of Shadwell was no doubt why he dressed differently. There is not evidence for or against him wearing livery, but it is not unlikely. He received fabric instead of made clothes. He may have sewn a suit or coat himself or had a cohort work with him. His ration in terms of fabric was not out of the ordinary: in 1763, in addition to hose, he received four and half yards of cotton (woolen), and six yards of osnaburg. But the individualized cut and style of clothes tailored for him indicated his status on the plantation. Unfortunately -- while ceramic fragments can tell us the color of teapots and bowls -- there are no cloth scraps to give color to the dress of this man Sawney.

Others who worked in the house received different goods as well. One order included “to Mrs. Jefferson Cloths for Chloe,” who must have worked separately from others on the ration lists. In 1761, Eleanor Shepherd sewed “6 Frocks” for girls in the house. While the frocks may have been the same fabric as those sewn for the fieldhands, their companion suit of “1 little Jacket & Breeches” for a boy indicates that the house slaves dressed much more formally. The same year, Jane’s slaves would get “2 Cotton Suits & 3 Wos. Shifts.” Another year Jane covered her people using thirteen yards cotton, twenty and a half yards osnaburg, in addition to two men’s suits and one women’s woolen suit. The slaves of the minor Jefferson children also benefited from the higher status accorded house slaves. Their 1762 order “To Clothing for the Childrens Slaves” included “11½ Yds Ozna at 1/1, 7½ Yds Cotton at 2/6 1.11.2½; and 1/4 # thread

234 Harvie II: 1. On livery, see also Carson, Ambitious Appetites, 94-95, 192.
This purchase clothed Elizabeth's girl Cate, Martha's Rachel, Lucy's Cachina and Lydia, Anna Scott's Eve, Randolph's Peter, and possibly Sawney. These slave children grew up learning to wait on the Jefferson children. Part of their training was learning to wear the better clothes that such a job demanded.

On the quarter site and the kitchen area archaeological evidence of sewing as well as decorating with buttons, beads, and other ornament, reveals that slaves, mended, reused, and decorated their clothing, perhaps even that made for them by local women. They had a pair of small needlework scissors and straight pins. The large iron needle found nearby may have been used by women to do weaving, if it was not used for leather work. Buckles of brass and other metal alloys fixed clothes and shoes of slaves, and gilt, brass, and plain metal alloy buttons and hooks and eyes secured clothing or decorated it. A few beads of glass and shell were found in the general area of the quarter.

Work

All of the able-bodied slaves at Shadwell likely joined in agricultural work when demand was high, such as transplanting tobacco seedlings in the spring or bringing in wheat in the fall. Slaves on the home quarter worked tobacco with hilling hoes, broad hoes, and grubbing hoes; they prepared soil with a Dutch plow hoe, harrow hoes, and

---

235 There was no mention of any pants or breeches for male children in the field hand lists. Linda Baumgarten makes the point that most slave clothes used the same types of fabrics. Status was indicated by the cut, ornamentation, and style of garments. “Clothes for the People,” esp. 57-58. The clothing corresponds to the list of people who Jane kept as her sixth portion. It is possible that Jane’s clothing list represents only their house clothing – it is only one set -- and that they might have received other clothes for work outside the house from the regular distribution lists. Harvie I: 42; Harvie II: 1, 2.

236 See Heath, “Buttons, Beads and Buckles;” also chap. 1.
gardened with spades (Figure 5.9). Someone also tended orchard fruit and livestock. But many of the home quarter slaves had occupations other than laborers. Samson and Jupiter used their broad axes to dress lumber that had been cut from logs. They hired out to carpenter John Biswell who used their strength and expertise when he worked on the Shadwell mill in 1753. Jupiter and Samson each received £1.3. for twenty days work.

Sawney hired out to a local shoemaker and he and Sandy used the shoemaker’s tools and lasts kept in a barn and the large shears found on the home quarter site to make the tanned leather into work shoes. Phill was a wagoner and Sandy had skills as a horse jockey.

Sandy and others kept the harnesses and riding chairs and carriages in good order.

Thirteen of the twenty-two horses at Shadwell had names. These may have been the descendants of Thomas Jefferson II’s race horse, the horses that pulled the family carriages, and the trusted steed used by the militia colonel. Some slave who was a groom knew these horses better than the Jeffersons did and attended them accordingly. Peter Jefferson’s inventory includes tools for making and marking casks and hogsheads; carpentry tools and materials for building including window glass and lead, paint, putty, lime for plaster or mortar, and nails. Slaves at Shadwell witnessed or practiced the specialized trades that used these materials.

---

237 PJAB, 19. Sawney was hired out for six months in 1759, perhaps because his new young master was away at school and he would not be put to field work. Sandy was not included in PJ’s inventory so it is not known where Sandy lived, but since he was skilled he was likely on the home quarter. He sold grass seed to TJ in 1768. He ran away in 1769 and was sold to Colonel Charles Lewis in 1773. Harvie I: 28; MB, 79, n. 79.

There are many other skills we can reasonably expect to find on a plantation this size, such as ironworking, tinsmithing, or cart making. I have listed here only the trades indicated by the documents or the archaeological record. Skills relating to sewing are discussed with clothing, above; and skills relating to cooking are explored in the section on the plantation kitchen, above. See chap. 1 on TJ II’s horses.
Slaves did not have free access to the materials they used in their crafts and labor. Supplies of new goods were kept in storerooms, locked away. The Jeffersons regulated access to tanned leather, building materials such as hinges and nails, house paint, and cloth. The Jeffersons also kept supplies of new farm implements such as hoes out of general circulation. This may have been to preserve stock to sell to neighbors, and also to carefully manage the workers relationship to the tools issued to them. The number of tools listed with each quarter corresponds fairly closely to the number of working individuals on each site. If a worker -- a slave or an overseer -- lost or tried to sell tools, the shortage would be readily apparent to whomever one appealed for a replacement. When Sandy ran away in 1769, he had an opportunity to take his shoemaking tools with him: his skills had value, but he needed the tools too.238

The slaves who were part of the Jefferson household, the cook, the personal attendants, wet nurse and nurses to children all lived on the home quarter. They had to, their jobs were there. Sawney knew how to dress a man’s wig, brush a coat, and hang a sword belt. He could pack his master’s cases for attending the House of Burgesses or for hacking through the mountain woods following a chain. He also knew how to dress himself for the jobs he performed. Sawney’s counterpart, Jane’s maid, had similar skills, and eight other slaves grew up learning to wait on the Jefferson children and wore the better clothes that such a job demanded. An African slave nursed the Jefferson children and had particular skills in caring for babies. Other women fed small children, cleaned up their messes, and kept them from bothering their parents during important entertaining.

238 *Virginia Gazette* (Purdie and Dixon), 7 September 1769.
Proximity to the Jeffersons and their guests meant opportunity for making money. Slaves with skills could ply their trades and keep some of their earnings. Additionally, waiting on guests meant tips. Servants who attended to guests' horses, carriages, travel cases, and clothes commonly received monetary compensation from visitors. Thomas Jefferson called these 'vales,' the English word for gratuities given to servants. In a brief exchange with a visitor, a slave could make alliances and perhaps hear tidbits of news from the guest's plantation where the slave might have family or friends. The slaves' use of these alliances was another skill that could give these slaves an advantage other slaves did not have. However, these momentary alliances made over offers of and payments for service also demonstrated to everyone that the structure of plantation society was firmly in place. These relationships confirmed the power of the patriarch and the dependence of those people in bonds.

Leisure

Slaves on the home quarter devised a number of ways to spend their leisure time, the minutes a day or hours a week that their work was not solely for the benefit of the Jeffersons. The most prominent leisure activity to appear archaeologically was smoking tobacco. The quarter area held the highest concentration of tobacco pipes, suggesting that slaves smoked during their hours at their homes, in addition to whatever smoking they did while they worked. Most of the pipes were the familiar long kaolin ceramic pipes of European manufacture. Slaves may have purchased these with their own funds or received these as payment for certain tasks. Slaves also used pipes made from steatite,

---

239 Vales (or vails) was the English term for a gratuity given to a servant, especially at a private residence. TJ used both spellings. MB, 13 n. 623.
a soft, local stone that was easily worked and shaped. A “blank,” a pipe-shaped piece of steatite that was in production when it was discarded shows that making pipes was a hobby of someone here (Figure 5.10).240

Other recreational or socially important objects include gaming pieces or markers made from ceramic, shell, and stone (Figure 5.10). These small pieces of re-worked and polished shell and ceramic often served as markers for games such as mankala; however, such games often were not merely leisure but served important social functions by testing and establishing leaders among groups. One small piece of slate bears inscribed lines that may be writing practice or decoration. A large number of buttons indicates slaves' use of these objects for personal adornment or necessary clothing maintenance. The buttons occurred in quantity on both the kitchen site and the quarter site. The variety of craft tools, needles, pins, scissors, and shears suggest the slaves did handiwork for the Jefferson's or for themselves in their living quarters. Craft work for themselves could have included quilt making, jewelry making, or otherwise altering the materials they were given to make something of their own.241

Included among the artifacts in common between the main quarter and the kitchen area were many buttons, fragments of colonoware, and a few artifacts of American Indian origin. This last category of antiques speaks of collecting for the sake of remembering or

---

240 See SW363E.

curiosity. Someone who lived in the kitchen and on the quarter site brought home native American artifacts that he or she found or traded and kept. People who lived at Shadwell had contact with Indians who lived west of the mountains (present-day Tennessee), and perhaps even in Albemarle County. But the artifacts the slaves owned were not everyday currency among Indians in the eighteenth century. They were quartz projectile points, during a period when Indians carried European firearms. They were small stone tools, kept during an era when metals served to do those jobs. And they were brass and iron tinkling cones, badges of ethnicity that sometimes served to open doors and other times forced their closure. Like the material world of the slaves at Shadwell, this small group of artifacts illustrates local and non-local materials, ethnic traditions, and cross-cultural contact.\textsuperscript{242}

Changes

Only five of the people who lived at Shadwell in 1757 when it belonged to Peter Jefferson still lived there in 1777 when it was Thomas Jefferson's. By 1776, when Jane Jefferson died, Shadwell ceased to be the center of a plantation. Instead it became a satellite to the newer Monticello plantation. The benefits of the home quarter were no longer available to those slaves who remained at Shadwell; they now occupied the periphery. Archaeology shows the alterations in site use over the last part of the eighteenth century. The material culture of a quarter farm was indeed different from that on the home quarter. The plantation kitchen no longer augmented their daily fare, they no longer had the distractions of the big house - nor the material wealth of the big house - as part of their daily routine. They did not occupy and use the spaces and buildings in

\textsuperscript{242} The group of native American artifacts is explored at length in chap. 6.
the same way. Instead of work patterns that orbited around the Jeffersons' house and tidily retracted to the somewhat private domestic spaces of kitchen and quarter, the artifacts of daily living clustered broadly around the quarter and kitchen area, spilling slightly south over the ridge (Figure 5.11).

The use of each site seemed more superficial in the post-home quarter era. The large cellar at building I did not experience any new deep deposits. There were no structural changes to the buildings and no new buildings erected. The people worked in the field and slept in their houses, but perhaps new crops and new taskmasters ensured that they did not spend enough time in their houses to alter them. Despite the common activity now at the kitchen and the quarter, the fenceline in between remained, perhaps still keeping animals and gardens from active engagement with wildlife. The buildings and the landscape persisted, but they had grown old.

Analysis of the subsurface features in this area offers evidence of high activity levels during the home quarter period (Phase I), and almost no evidence of activity that penetrated below the surface dating distinctly to the quarter farm phase (Phase II). While the presence of only early artifacts in the subsurface features does not rule out their use or deposition during the quarter farm period, there is only a single feature that dates only to the second period. This feature, the southerly post chimney support on building I, contains a single cut nail in the postmold, suggesting a post-Phase II destruction date on the building. There is no evidence of new construction, at least not that survived the plow, to suggest any major alterations to the site during Phase II. The fairly high quantity of creamware and pearlware in the plowzone, and the drop in frequency of whiteware over the early areas of occupation, supports evidence of change in the material culture of
the plantation during the last quarter of the eighteenth century, yet the change does not appear in the subsurface record.

A few explanations are possible. The Phase I features represent the building and active use of the quarter site. In this period, it was the center of a small community within the larger plantation landscape, which used the yard area for domestic functions. The slaves in this small community may have cooked all their own food, and there is some evidence that they provisioned for themselves also. The Phase II quarter farm represents a different use of the larger plantation landscape, and a different definition of community. In Phase II, since the entire plantation population were laborers, some hired and some slave, perhaps the social boundaries that encouraged local community activity were erased during this time. The quarter farm slaves lived in the kitchen building and on the quarter site, and all of these slaves may have been part of the same community at meals and other times. A slave cook may have used the kitchen to feed the quarter farm work force, but her kitchen was no longer for the exclusive service of the Jeffersons so her space could be included for the slaves’ social use. The centers of local activity may have shifted to include a larger part of the plantation landscape.

Or, the quarter farm-era changes in agriculture and labor practices may not have allowed the slaves the same time for home life that life on a plantation seat may have afforded. Phase I appears to accommodate a full range of domestic activities, relating to food eating, preparation, and storage; clothing repair or manufacture and decoration; shelter; spiritual needs; and craft activity. The lack of Phase II alterations to the physical fabric of this area could suggest that the slave's use of their allotted living spaces turned
to a passive eating and sleeping schedule, rather than the active, full domestic life of the first inhabitants.

Yet another explanation may simply reflect the nature of survival in the archaeological record. The Shadwell slave quarters were most likely fairly impermanent frame structures. They left no footprint, save their cellar pits and heavy structural support members. They were not post-in-ground buildings, and may have been built on ground laid sills or piers, none of which survived the passing plow. It is also possible they were built of log. It is hard to imagine that these buildings were not in need of some repair during the quarter farm period, having stood for at least a quarter century already. If the nature of repairs were all on above-ground members, and if the inhabitants of the buildings had no need to dig cooking pits or storage pits of any depth, then their active uses of the site remain invisible to us, or at least indistinguishable in the mixed context of the plowzone. Regardless, there is good evidence that the slaves who occupied the quarter site during Phase II did not use the site in the same manner as it was used during Phase I.

Thomas Jefferson's ration lists suggest about seventeen slaves lived at Shadwell during most of Phase II. Artifact patterns suggest that the known slave quarters, including the kitchen building, served both the Phase I and Phase II plantations, but fell out of use or were removed about the turn of the nineteenth century. The archaeological date coincides with the documentary evidence that Thomas Jefferson removed his slaves to other plantations in the 1790s and leased the Shadwell lands to tenant farmers before giving Shadwell away altogether. The extensive plowing of the Shadwell ridge may have begun shortly after 1813 when Thomas Jefferson Randolph became owner of the land.
By the end of the eighteenth century the Jeffersons' plantation and the Shadwell quarter farm were gone. All domestic activity on the eighteenth-century part of the plantation virtually ceased as Thomas Jefferson moved his slaves to his other holdings and passed the land to his heirs. New farming activity used the land differently and for the next century the plow worked to cover up the remains of the earlier occupation. The surface distribution studies for whiteware, an early nineteenth-century ceramic show that tenant farmers occupied an area to the south west of where the Jeffersons' house and Jane Jefferson's house had stood, then this too was gone.

In a single cultural context the interpretation of objects—what they were and how they functioned—is usually straightforward. What motivated people from different times and places to choose certain objects and how they used them can have a range of possibilities. Sometimes the best an historian can do is pose multiple questions about how an object may have served. While this discussion of a fairly "rich" material environment might evoke thoughts of comfort and occasional leisure activity, the people who inhabited these sites were still held in slavery. They had high material wealth relative to many Virginians of any color, but this picture of their world is not meant to indicate complacency on their part—nor on mine—in considering their unfree state. If anything, the material evidence creates a more complex palette for painting a picture of their lives within bondage, suggestions of small freedoms in certain choices, while having no choices in many other things. Those who prospered within the rich environment of an enlightened patriarch such as Peter or Thomas Jefferson had little to complain about in
terms of physical comforts; they needed strategies for survival motivated by intangible ideals.

The slaves on the home quarter were aware of their condition despite their material “wealth.” Sandy chose to run away in the fall of 1769. The advertisement posted for his return reveals some of the benefits he had at home (Figure 5.12). He was well fed, “inclining to corpulence.” He had training in shoemaking that he hoped would give him work, but he also had other skills of carpentry and horsemanship. He communicated in ways that white owners called “artful and knavish,” which may be their way of acknowledging that he was clever. His owners had let him practice his skill enough on his own to realize that he was left handed. His propensity for swearing suggests both his connection to the culture of other tradesmen, and his unwillingness to abide by the codes of polite behavior that he surely learned at Shadwell. His unpleasantness when drunk revealed his underlying unhappiness. In his thirty-five years Sandy had learned enough about the world to know that his shoemaking tools, a horse, and his light complexion might enable his safe passage to freedom. Sandy’s flight did not last. He returned to Shadwell and Thomas Jefferson sold him to Charles Lewis at nearby Buck Island in 1773. The £100 value assigned to his person and his skills lined the pockets of Thomas Jefferson instead of his own.243

During the American Revolution, Governor Dunmore made an outright invitation to slaves to leave their masters. Harry, a long-time Shadwell resident, took this invitation in 1781 when Lord Cornwallis’s army moved through central Virginia. Harry was old

---

243 MB, 79; Papers: Vol. 1, 33; VG (Purdie & Dixon), 14 Sep. 1769, reprinted in Papers 1, 33.
enough to have been an adult when Peter Jefferson died. He moved from Peter’s ownership to Thomas’s ownership, probably with no change to where he lived or the field work he performed. Thomas recorded his fate simply, “joined enemy,” the last known note about Harry. He may have found new work with the now-alien British, he may have died of disease like so many other slaves who joined the army camps. He may have, in fact, found freedom.244

The slaves who lived on the home quarter had families of their own, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, sons, daughters, and parents there. But the purpose that brought them there was to be of service to the Jefferson family. Little Sail was born at Shadwell about 1752. Her mother was Sail, the mother of so many of the privileged slaves at Shadwell and that virtually ensured that Little Sail would also hold a position of status—at least to her owners and within the Jefferson slave community. Jane Jefferson kept Little Sail as part of her slave holdings; Sail did not have to move to another plantation to be part of a new community. Had she lived, she would have become Thomas’s and stayed at Shadwell with her mother, some of her siblings, and her own children, Cyrus and Rachel. But Little Sail died in the service of the Jefferson child Elizabeth, a grown woman who may have lacked the judgment that put her and Little Sail in harms’ way. They drowned together “while attempting to cross the Rivanna in a skiff” in the high water of the winter of 1774. Elizabeth was twenty-nine and Little Sail was

---

244 AICWB 2: 45; FB 6, 29. Another slave named Robin also ran away from TJ’s Shadwell, but he had not been a PJ slave. On other TJ slaves who joined the British, see Stanton, Free Some Day, 52-57.
twenty-two, although family traditions suggest that Elizabeth was mentally deficient. Little Sall may have been the adult but not the master in this situation.245

Just as the historian chooses different categories in which to analyze and ask questions of artifacts, so too should the historian with the people whose lives she seeks to tell about. The people who lived on the home quarter were members of different communities at different times. They lived at a center of African-American life on the plantation and probably a center of influence for African Americans in Albemarle County. They also moved in and out of the communities that their skills and jobs made them a part of: some were part of the Jefferson household, some were part of skilled local craftsmen, some trained other slaves, some, it appears, trained their masters. By defining their community in different ways we necessarily reposition relationships between people and the strategies that people used in negotiating those relationships take on new meaning.

Archeology offers a view that the slaves who served the planter’s household occupied a curious niche. Their lives were filled with fine material goods and house slaves learned the manners to use fine wares properly – that made their masters look

245 Sall’s name was recorded as Sall, “Little Sal,” and “Little Salley.” I have chosen to call her “Little Sall” to distinguish her from her mother as the Jefferson documents do. Cyrus was born 1772, and Rachel about 1768. Jane deeded Rachel to Randolph following the death of Randolph’s slave Hannah at Snowdon. FB 8-9; MB 462. See also chap. 4.

On Little Sall’s death, see MB 370-371, n. 370; TJ & JJ Acct. 1763-1778. See also chaps. 3 and 7. The Shadwell burial ground received Jefferson family members who died during the eighteenth century. It is entirely possible that slaves at Shadwell buried their dead on this spot too, or they may have had their own plot on yet another promontory above the river. See Kern, “Burial Ground at Shadwell.”
But the elite goods from the kitchen and home quarter sites belie the legal status of their users. Their small and even rustic house and cheek-by-jowl living conditions serve as reminders of the standard of living of most Virginians, slave or free. These conditions connect them to the other plantation slaves. Despite the pervasive material culture of their elite owners, the Shadwell slaves retained some markers of a community outside the one defined by their masters. The close view of this group of people who worked for the Jeffersons indeed adds complexity to the story of Virginians who lived in slavery — and also to the story of those who owned them and lived around them.
Mothers and known children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sall (the elder)</th>
<th>Hannah</th>
<th>Cachina</th>
<th>Myrtilla</th>
<th>Bellinda (Squire)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nan</td>
<td>Fan</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Fany</td>
<td>Suckey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phebe</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Squire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unassigned(^b) men</th>
<th>unassigned boys</th>
<th>unassigned girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hercules</td>
<td>Jammey</td>
<td>Cloe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Patt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syphax</td>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>Eve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawney (Sall?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phill (Moll)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nimrod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Nan was counted among the adult women, but she was also the daughter of Sall.

\(^b\)Unassigned means that I have not found direct evidence of which family a person belongs to.

Figure 5.1. Shadwell home quarter by family group, 1757. Names in boldface indicate slaves bequeathed by Peter to one of the children or by Jane when she claimed her portion of Peter’s estate. AICWB 2: 45.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Aged abt</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Squire</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>£60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sall</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cain[Lucinda?] her Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suckey her Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casar</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Salley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanny Myrtillas Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.2. List of slaves chosen by Jane Jefferson as her sixth portion of Peter Jefferson's estate. Harvie II: 10.
Figure 5.3. Archaeological Site Plan of Shadwell. Slaves occupied the kitchen area (at center), the quarter site (right), and worked on all parts of the plantation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 old Oznaburg tablecloth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Large &amp; 2 small Pewter Dishes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 P' Large Kitchen HandIrons</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 old D: Oven, Pewter dish, Pat: pans &amp;c @</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tubs &amp; 4 Pails</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two copper Kettles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Iron spits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 frying pans &amp; Grid Iron</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Iron pot racks</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pots &amp; 3 p' pot Hooks</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed &amp; Covering</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 old Tables</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 brushes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 old chairs &amp; 1 p' scissors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A meal bag, 2 bedsteads &amp; 2 barrels</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cleaver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 light cask</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old Lumber</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 cask</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 meal bags</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4. Kitchen inventory from 1757 probate record. Values are in shillings and pence. AlCWB 2: 43.
Figure 5.5. Archaeological site plan of cellars (above) and buildings (below) at kitchen site and home quarter site at Shadwell.
Figure 5.6. Map of articles related to medicine (above), including delft, stoneware, and earthenware drug jars or pots, glass vials, colonoware, and quartz crystal. Surface distribution of tobacco pipes.
Figure 5.7. Colonoware from Shadwell quarter site: five distinctly different clay and temper combinations. All but one reflect the red clay of the catoctin limestone ridge that Shadwell lies on and show on-site manufacture. The lighter, buff colored pieces in the upper right are from a larger vessel (approx. 8" diameter at the rim), of non-local material, perhaps from the sandier soils of Virginia's tidewater. (SW 10, 99A, 99C, 330A, 335A & C, 703G, 705G, 708A & Z, 724A, 725E, 728A, 755B).
<1762 Decr. Acct. of Negroes Cloths made for the Estate this year Viz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shirts</th>
<th>Suits</th>
<th>Wools</th>
<th>Wos</th>
<th>Childrens</th>
<th>Childrens Linen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Martha Harvie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelly Shepherd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28 .14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Spiers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0[?]</td>
<td>0[?]</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Gorge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letty Moore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paid for Cutting the Negroes Cloths to Mrs. Harvie .9.
Delivered to Mrs. Jefferson Cloths for Chloe & 8 yds Cotton 13 Ozna. 2 m. hose
Deld. to the Overseers Cloths for all the Negroes & 5 Blankets to yr. No. River

<1763 Novr. Accot. of Negroes Cloths delivered out for Jeffersons Estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shirts</th>
<th>Suits</th>
<th>Mens Wollen</th>
<th>Wos Wollen</th>
<th>Small Shirts</th>
<th>Frock hose</th>
<th>Cotton</th>
<th>Ozna</th>
<th>Thread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Mrs. Jefferson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 yds</td>
<td>20½ Ells</td>
<td>¼ #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the Qur. at Snodon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Matt: Moore</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9[3?]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Gooch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8[?]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. Gillespy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>¼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Sawney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.8. Clothing made 1762 and clothing delivered 1763 (spelling as written). (Harvie II: 1).
Figure 5.9. Grindstone (SW 776B). The grindstone was an ubiquitous object in the lives of field hands, whose maintenance of their metal tools was part of their almost daily work. During the wheat harvest at Monticello when all the workers together swept across the fields like a machine, Thomas Jefferson assigned a male slave to load a grindstone in a mule cart to move along with the cutters and cradlers and loaders to keep the cutting tools sharp and in repair. FB 46 ("machine"), 58.
Figure 5.10. Slave quarter area objects showing on-site production. Steatite (local soapstone) drilled and polished to be used as a tobacco pipe, approx. 4’ long (SW 363E), above. Gaming piece: shaped and polished fragment of shell, approx. 1 inch high (SW 732A), lower left. Gaming piece: shaped and polished fragment of porcelain, approx. ¾ inch high (SW 708A), lower right.
Phase I: Plantation center (white salt-glaze stoneware) Also substantial subsurface evidence of building, work, and domestic activities.

Phase IA: Jane Jefferson farm (creamware) Similar activity areas to phase I.

Phase II: Quarter farm (pearlware) Similar surface activity areas to phase I, but distinct lack of subsurface changes to buildings and landscape.

Phase III: Tenant farm-1800s (whiteware) 18th c. domestic landscape disappears to the plow. New 19th c. use in different area.

Figure 5.11. Surface distribution maps showing change in site use from middle of 18th century to early 19th century. Activity is primarily in a line east to west along the ridge during both the home plantation and quarter farm periods, with the heaviest concentration of wares on the slave quarter area. The quarter farm period saw heightened use of the area north of the kitchen and quarters. The slave quarters, kitchen buildings, fencelines, and probably Jane Jefferson's house disappeared by the nineteenth century. Tenants or farmers on the site in the early to mid 19th century lived to the southwest of where the Jeffersons lived.
RUN away from the subscriber
in Albemarle, a Mulatto slave called Sandy,
about 35 years of age, his stature is rather low,
inclining to corpulence, and his complexion light;
he is a shoemaker by trade, in which he uses his
left hand principally, can do coarse carpenters
work, and is something of a horse jockey; he is
greatly addicted to drink, and when drunk is infor-
tent and disorderly, in his conversation he swears
much, and in his behaviour is artful and knavish. He took with
him a white horse, much scarred with traces, of which it is ex-
pected he will endeavour to dispose; he also carried his shoe-
makers tools, and will probably endeavour to get employment that
way. Whoever conveys the said slave to me, in Albemarle, shall
have 40 s. reward, if taken up within the county, 41. if elsewhere
within the told day, and 101. if in any other colony, from
THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Figure 5.12. Run away advertisement for Sandy. VG (Purdie & Dixon), 14 Sep. 1769.
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THE COLONY'S BUSINESS: PETER JEFFERSON'S VANTAGE

In 1757 Albemarle County lost one of its prominent citizens. Peter Jefferson held almost every title and elected office available in the county and the colony. From staking out an early settlement, to sitting on the founding court, to bringing the first members of prominent white and black families to the region, Peter Jefferson affected this world. Jefferson was part of the elite culture that already dominated Virginia in so many ways, and his contributions to both that culture and colony continued from his location in the Piedmont. He prepared for his role as a public official growing up around other men who held these offices and reading books that helped him refine his practice. Success depended on Jefferson's association with other powerful people and families, but it also needed the support of legions of ordinary people – some of whom may not even have known they had a part in the story of someone like Jefferson.

A few artifacts from Shadwell illuminate Peter Jefferson's public roles and show how his activities required the participation of many people. The artifacts of Peter Jefferson's public life do not challenge the family hagiography that celebrated this master of land and horse, family and slave, wilderness and public office. The badges of Peter Jefferson's public service became relics in the year he died. The Peter Jefferson who wore a silver-hilted sword and carried a silver-hilted cutlass, who wore silver spurs to
prod his horses, and wielded pairs of brass-barreled pistols left the mortal world, leaving room for this Jefferson's more famous son and heirs to create the mythical Peter Jefferson. The progenitor of a United States president who could purchase a piece of land for a bowl of punch was unusual in some ways, yet in many other ways he was very much like other elite Virginians of his time. We have already met the planter and businessman. Here we meet the surveyor, elected official, and representative of the Virginia colony.

Historians know what men like Peter Jefferson did. We have their records from making laws, drawing maps, and keeping accounts. We know some of them from portraits, houses, gardens, letters, diaries, and even books they wrote. If material culture gives the historian an opportunity to find history and tell stories about people who had no voice in the official records, what do the artifacts of someone like Peter Jefferson tell us that we could not otherwise learn? What do they do other than help illustrate the images we have already? The material culture from Shadwell connects that place to many others, from European manufactories of consumer goods to Albemarle County, where slaves fashioned shoes or timbers for a millrace. Similarly, the objects that relate directly to Peter Jefferson's public roles connect him to people and places whose stories are less well known than his. That is the unique utility of his material culture. We can know him within a geographic and social range that puts other people and places in the same picture. Jefferson becomes part of a larger social and economic system. The material culture of elite men enables us to explore the other people--some nameless, some rich, some poor--who helped reinforce their prominence.
The most visible artifact of Peter Jefferson’s public business was the map of Virginia that he and Joshua Fry surveyed. Peter’s name is inextricably linked with that of Fry in what is probably Peter’s second greatest legacy (after his oldest son), officially called *A Map of the Inhabited Part of Virginia containing the whole Province of Maryland with Part of Pensilvania, New Jersey and North Carolina*. Most people then and now recognize its unofficial title, “The Fry-Jefferson Map of Virginia.” The pair, and numerous unnamed contributors, compiled the map from existing surveys and new work by Fry and Jefferson. The map is more than a document about Virginia’s land features and political boundaries. It claims knowledge about territory beyond Virginia’s bounds, some unseen by the mapmakers themselves, and it is a document of social connections and power.246

Peter is one of many surveyors whose professional name is linked with others. Surveying partnerships proved profitable and the “genealogy” of the successful eighteenth-century surveyors is a powerful reminder of the value of making the right associations in this period of Virginia’s expansion. The mapping projects also show how wide-ranging the surveyors’ travels were (figure 6.1). In 1737 Peter Jefferson worked

---

with Robert Brooke of Essex County on a map of the Rappahannock River. Almost a
decade later, in 1746, he worked with the son Robert Brooke on a map of the Northern
Neck. Thus Jefferson was no stranger to the upper peninsula regions of the Chesapeake.
The elder Brooke traveled with Alexander Spotswood and his Knights of the Golden
Horseshoe, and surveyed the Potomac headwaters with William Mayo, a neighbor of
Peter Jefferson's in Goochland County. The younger Brooke surveyed Mount Vernon
for the Washingtons. In 1746 Jefferson held the post of surveyor to Fry, who was
Virginia's commissioner, to draw a boundary between the claims of Virginia and Lord
Fairfax's proprietary grant for the land between the Rappahannock and Potomac Rivers.
The younger Brooke, Thomas Lewis, and Lunsford Lomax also served that expedition to
the mountains in northwest Virginia. By 1749 commissioners Fry and Jefferson
continued the Virginia-North Carolina dividing line, carrying west the boundary marked
by William Byrd and William Mayo and others twenty years earlier.247

247 Fry was the first surveyor of Albemarle Co. in 1744. PJ inherited that position
in 1754 (but had been county surveyor for Goochland in 1751). On the surveying
"dynasties," and the position of commissioner (who could act for the colonial
government and deputize surveyors), see Hughes, Surveyors, 21, chap. 8, esp. 90; Mary
M. Root, "Robert Brooke, Father and Son, Surveyors of Virginia," Professional Surveyor
24, no. 11 (November 2004). Fairfax Harrison, "The Northern Neck Maps of 1737-
1747," WMQ, 2nd ser. 4, no. 1 (Jan. 1924), 1-15. Silvio A. Bedini, "William Mayo (1684-
(November 2004). Thomas Lewis, The Fairfax Line: Thomas Lewis's Journal of 1746,
While there is speculation that Fry and PJ met in Albemarle County in their professional
roles, Fry worked closely at William and Mary under William Stith, who was Jane
Jefferson's first cousin and who was also married to another first cousin of Jane's, Judith
Randolph of Tuckahoe, sister of Peter's friend William.
PJ's drawing of the dividing line survives, see "Plan of the line between Virginia
and North Carolina as surveyed in 1728 and 1749," MS-38-628, UVA special collections.
Fry's expedition to the Ohio country as commander-in-chief of Virginia's forces also put
Two famous diaries of surveying expeditions, by William Byrd and by Thomas Lewis, define the various functions of commissioners, surveyors, chain carriers, as well as the widely varying sleeping and eating accommodations along the way. Surveying cast the learned adventurer into nature and among all kinds of “lesser sorts,” of European, African, and Indian extraction, many of whom seemed quite exotic to the Englishmen because of their living arrangements, accents, or diet. William Byrd supplied many uncharitable descriptions of North Carolinians, from the gentlemen commissioners to the householders along the way. Thomas Lewis rarely mentioned people outside the surveying party. In one instance, he and Colo. Jefferson “Went Down the River to Discover Some Inhabitants that we might get Some provision.” But the single “familey of poor Dutch people” could offer no supplies. Most of Lewis’s journal focused on the mechanics of marking the trail and on the challenges of moving the entourage. Jefferson often had to find and pay people for carrying the chain and bringing provisions; his job involved not only maps and instruments, but also dealing with people of all ranks.248

Peter Jefferson’s own wilderness exploits were the foundation of family lore, and even the family knew they compared to the adventures recorded by William Byrd. Sarah Randolph repeated stories she heard about her great grandfather when he continued the Virginia-North Carolina line. The expedition had to fend off wild beasts and sleep in

---

248 There is, however, almost no mention of slaves in the expedition journals. Lewis, *Fairfax Line*, 24; PJAB, 9. See also Byrd, *Dividing Line*. 
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trees for safety. Men fainted for lack of food and sometimes had to eat raw flesh. But in the story, Jefferson's courage never failed and they persevered and accomplished the task. Peter's self-reliance is echoed in Thomas Lewis's journal, where Jefferson rode out to engage with hunters they did not know or rode ahead to find a mark.249

It is easiest to imagine Peter Jefferson in the outdoors. The surveying fraternity shared the bonds that fieldwork brings, and many of the stories that tied these men together were backwoods exploits. Fry trusted Jefferson with both his family and his intellectual legacy when he named Jefferson as an executor for his estate and also bequeathed to Jefferson his mathematical and surveying instruments. Surveying connected famous men across Virginia. They were joined by others who also enjoyed the arts of surveying, such as Rev. Rose who joined Fry, Jefferson, and Cabell in the field and at the draughting table.250

Thomas Jefferson called his father's map "the first map of Virginia which had ever been made, that of Captain Smith being merely a conjectural sketch." Thomas used the Fry and Jefferson map as the template for the map in Notes on Virginia. The son added information to the map to extend it north and west, and made minor corrections.

249 Randolph, Domestic Life, 19, 20; Lewis, Fairfax Line, esp. 60, 61, 66, 68, 69.

250 ALCWB 2: 17; Rose, 98, 335 (see also chap. 3 of this diss.). In fact, TJ identified and helped the American Philosophical Society preserve Byrd's manuscript that became known as "The Secret History of the Line." See Maude H. Woodfin, "Thomas Jefferson and William Byrd's Manuscript Histories of the Dividing Line," WMQ 3d. Ser. 1, no. 4 (Oct., 1944), 363-373.
The surveyor made a lasting intellectual and political contribution through his map, as well as through a legacy of family stories.\textsuperscript{251}

Peter Jefferson held almost the full range of public office in colonial Virginia. The list of Jefferson's offices is in itself impressive. But equally important to our story is how these offices provided opportunity for social and business contacts, and how those contacts widened the geographic horizons within which the Jeffersons operated. For the wealthy, colonial Virginia was their oyster. Public office was a tool for maintaining the familiar structure of society; little did they want to change that. The vast lands beyond the legal boundaries of their own county was where change would happen and where they could profit from it. But true success in these endeavors needed more than the support of wealthy relatives; it needed a broader and deferential audience. One result of acting as county surveyor, collecting tithes, and paying bounties for wolf heads was that it ensured that local residents recognized Jefferson's name and position. He was their access to legal representation and remuneration. His prominence reinforced itself with his ability to pay neighbors for their skills and services that he could use on his plantation and that he could hire for such things as surveying parties and militia action.\textsuperscript{252}

\textsuperscript{251} Autobiography, 4; Malone, \textit{Fry & Jefferson Map}, 7-8.

\textsuperscript{252} See, for instance, Receipts, Pocket Plantation, 1750-1759, ViU, Acc # 2027, box 1, also chaps. 1 and 3.
Jefferson made and maintained connections beyond the plantation bounds and well beyond the county limits. Through surveying and political connections, Peter joined the ranks of large land speculators in this expansive period of Virginia's history. In addition to his developed plantations, Jefferson invested in land with mineral resources, in schemes to develop a port town on the James River, and in the Loyal Land Company of Virginia. While none of these plans came to full fruition, the last, at least, is famous in the story of Virginia's late-colonial identity.

Peter had a partnership with John Harvie and others for two hundred acres of land in Albemarle County, "wherewith is immagined to be a Vein of Copper Oar." Jefferson's will ended his family's involvement with this when he directed his executors to sell his interest in the land.253 Men like Jefferson, Harvie, Byrd, and others had enough education to identify naturally occurring mineral or plant resources such as copper, limestone, slate, pine pitch, and even ginseng and to explore the possibility of exploiting them, often by forming companies to pool wealth and reduce individual risk.

Peter was among a number of prominent Virginians who subscribed to lots in a speculative town on Beverley Randolph's Westham plantation, where Westham Creek joins the James River, just above Richmond. Various surveys of the town, called Beverley Town or Westham, survive, including two by Peter Jefferson. Beverley Randolph died in 1751 and he specified in his will "That part of Westham plantation to be laid off for a town, agreeable to my engagements with the subscribers, by my brother Peter, and that he sell and convey in fee simple to the subscribers." The plan was a basic

253 ALCWB 2: 32-34.
grid, with some curvilinear elements to accommodate the swamp made by Westham Creek in the middle of town and the James River along its southern edge. The survey specified "The Streets are three pole wide, each Lot contains Half an Acre, and is two chains twenty four Links square."\(^{254}\)

The goal of these towns was to collect the shipments coming from up stream and consolidate them for shipment down the James River; in 1750 Shocoes was the westernmost inspection point on the James. As part of thinking about the economic return, Jefferson reserved lot No. 57 on the James, "being the ferry lot." Perhaps Jefferson envisioned direct traffic from his ferry at Albemarle Courthouse to the one at Westham. In Albemarle County, Robert Rose helped "promote a Subscription for lots at Westham" and helped lay out lots with William Cabell. Seventy-eight individuals signed up for 115 of the 156 lots. Many of the subscribers were surveyors, magistrates, and burgesses, and many were from Albemarle, Goochland, and Henrico counties. Many of them were friends of Rose or Jefferson: the list echoes the social and political power of the James River corridor. Burgesses from Albemarle, Goochland, Henrico, Hanover, Caroline, and King and Queen counties invested, and many of them bought more than

\[^{254}\text{The 1751 plan at UVA was drawn by PJ (and owned by TJ). PJ drew the 1756 plan now at LOC, cited by Reps. Sarah Hughes cites a plan of Beverley Town drawn by William Cabell in 1751. Will of Beverley Randolph, Henrico Wills and Deeds, 1750-1767, 42. Lot description from PJ, Plat Of The Town Of Beverley, Henrico County, 1751 June 6, (Endorsed by T. J.) Edgehill-Randolph Papers, ViU. See also Hughes, Surveyor's, 135; John W. Reps, Tidewater Towns: City Planning in Colonial Virginia and Maryland (Williamsburg, Va., Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1972), 226-8; Rose, Diary, 61; 79; 266, n. 613; 298, n. 769.}\]
one lot. Their aim was to develop a town that would service their region’s needs, and if they personally profited, that was even better.255

Jefferson’s attentions along the James River corridor did not prevent him from being involved elsewhere. His investments with the Loyal Land Company describe yet another social circle from an entirely different geographic region of the greater Piedmont. Peter Jefferson and Thomas Walker were involved financially in numerous joint land ventures. In 1748 the two, with Thomas and David Meriwether obtained a grant for 10,000 acres of land on the New River. On July 12 that same year, forty combined investors including Walker and Jefferson formed the Loyal Company to administer and profit from a grant of 800,000 acres in southwestern Virginia. Their investment was part of the colonial enterprise of mapping and taming the wilderness to imprint the landscape with settlement of European (but not French) extraction.256 As in much of Virginia’s colonial project, individual investors would profit.

255 Lot owners from PJ, Plat of Beverley, ViU. For ferry lot, see FB, 32, 127. Rose, Diary, 61; 79; 266, n. 613; 298, n. 769. For Jefferson’s ferry lot in Albemarle Co., see JHAB I, 12, 43.

Nineteen men subscribed to more than one lot: 11 bought 2 lots, 2 bought 3 lots, 3 bought 4, 2 bought 5, and 1 bought 6; including PJ (4 lots), Fry (3), Cabell (6), Rose (4), Carter Braxton (burgess from King William Co., 5), Arthur Hopkins (burgess Goochland, 5), John Nicholas (2). I have included in the count of burgesses men who served also before or after the dates of Beverley Town. Curiously, Richard Randolph and William Stith were the only Randolphs on the list.

Some of the sales were carried out, as TJ recorded his father’s four lots in his land roles (FB, 32, 127). How much was actually developed is unclear.

256 The Loyal Land Company’s holdings were effectively negated by the Proclamation of 1763, by which the British government promised the Indians that Europeans would not settle west of the mountains. Loyal members were still settling their corporate business into the nineteenth century. Archibald Henderson, “Dr. Thomas Walker and the Loyal Company of Virginia,” Proceedings of the American Antiquarian
The investors, the family and friends of Thomas Walker, came from upper Albemarle County across Louisa and Orange Counties to Fredericksburg. The names include Walker, Meriwether, Gilmer, and Thornton. The Loyal Land Company lists and the Beverley Town lists are surprisingly distinct (Figure 6.2). Only three names appear on both rosters: Peter Jefferson, Joshua Fry, and John Harvie. Perhaps the two projects contrasted too much for most men. Developing infrastructure to tie their region into existing markets was a different process from looking outward to map and control distant and unseen lands. Perhaps men such as Jefferson, Fry, and Harvie were smart enough to spread their investments so that all risk was not tied to the same pool of resources. One wonders if the boundaries of the investors’ social circles were as distinct.

If you were to visit Shadwell as a friend of Peter Jefferson’s, you would be impressed with a familiar and reassuring formality. As you approached the house, a black slave, perhaps in working clothes, perhaps in livery, would come to take your horse or perhaps show your own servant to the stables. As you dismounted you would hear children’s voices, chickens, horses, and perhaps sawing on wood or hammering on metal or the sound of grindstones edging metal tools. You might notice the voices of black women and men singing as they worked, or hear more raucous laughter from beyond a fence across the yard. You would smell the wood fires that heated homes, and notice the

*Society*, New Series, 41 (1941), 87, 89. For comments about whose settlement should be on these vast lands, see Delf Norona, “Joshua Fry’s Report on the Back Settlements of Virginia (May 8, 1751),” VMHB 56, no. 1 (Jan. 1948), esp. 31-41.

257 Henderson, “Dr. Thomas Walker,” 87, 89; PJ, Plat of Beverley, ViU.
scent of roasting meat in the odors from the large chimney on the kitchen nearby. This was how plantations should sound, smell, and behave.

In the house you would be heartily entertained. A well-dressed black slave opened doors so you and your host walked into the house unencumbered, through the passage to the dining room. After many courses of food and good conversation, perhaps followed by music played by your host’s wife and children, you might leave the dining room for Peter’s office. In this slightly darker room (there was no fireplace, after all), you would navigate the perimeter of the room looking at the maps on the walls: the Virginia map drawn by your host; a map of London with tiny streets, alleyways, and public squares—a reminder of your hostess’s upbringing. Then you look over the maps of the world—the globe, flattened and divided into four, the oceans, continents, and uncharted places. You would notice the books, perhaps even handle them. On the desk, their brass fittings and finished wood gleaming in the candlelight, lie the drafting tools that your host used to measure and draw. You might have a discussion of the science that tools of surveying could invoke, such as the mathematics of measuring latitude, tracking the sun and stars, or figuring how far it was from Greenwich, England, to Albemarle Courthouse. You might even discuss how your host’s work that continued the dividing line at latitude 36 degrees 30 minutes between Virginia and North Carolina sowed political good or ill will, depending upon which side of the line your sympathies lay.258

Just as the plantation and its people presented a well-ordered world with Peter Jefferson

---

258 For summaries of the controversies over the Virginia-North Carolina line, see xxviii-xxxvi. See also Charles Royster, The Fabulous History of the Dismal Swamp Company: A Story of George Washington’s Times (New York, 1999), 258-262.
at its head, so too appeared that distant landscape controlled by transits and protractors, maps, and deeds. A finely engraved map can do that.

The house contained other images that invoked king and empire and informed a visitor instantly that the Jeffersons were English Virginians. The Jeffersons owned a few GR jugs, blue and gray stoneware jugs made in the German Rhineland, often called Rhenish stoneware or Westerwald. The jugs had incised patterns and the cipher of George II (Figure 6.3). A large cast iron fireback in one of the fireplaces in the house echoed the GR jugs with a design of the royal arms of Britain's monarchy. Westerwald jugs and other drinking containers with these decorations were readily available throughout the eighteenth century, with decorations other than royal ciphers for the American market after 1776.259

Peter also had objects that sent messages of power and control of a different sort, but his symbols of military office were not on display in the house. Jefferson did not use his arms as the governor in Williamsburg did, a fanfare of bayonets and rifles, hanging on all the walls to impress at first glance. Peter locked his weaponry in a safe room. Perhaps this indicates that Jefferson, unlike the governor, used his arms. No doubt, when he rode out bearing sword, cutlass, spurs, pistols, and guns, Jefferson was an impressive figure (fig. 6.4). There was no mistaking his importance for those on the receiving end of the message either. This presentation of his public role would impress any who saw it,

259 A fireback is a metal plate that fits in the back of a fireplace to reflect heat from the fire out into the room. Iron firebacks were often cast with the makers' or owners' initials or crest or other decorative element, such as the royal arms on this one. I have assumed that the GR at Shadwell was for George II, though potters used the same cipher during the reign of George I, see Noël Hume, Guide to Artifacts, 276-286.
from his own family and slaves, locals hired to carry the chain or asked to feed the expedition, backwoods squatters from continental Europe or the highlands, or native Americans. The medical supplies kept with the weapons---a case of fleams (lancets) for bleeding an ailing comrade---highlight the seriousness of these implements. Even if they were thought of merely as tools, it was an impressive show.260

Peter was one of twelve men who owned a sword in colonial Albemarle County; none of the other swords was silver. Like Jefferson, most sword owners kept their weapons out of the house. Fry’s “1 reper or small sword” and its hanger were in his office, a space separate from the domestic rooms of his house. Others kept theirs near their saddles and riding equipment or in spaces with non-domestic items such as woodworking tools. In a few inventories, the swords lay or hung among household items. In the listing of the estate of Capt. William Venable, his sword and belt followed a coffee mill and preceded a small desk. Bullet molds and a surveyor’s compass lay nearby, as did parts to a loom. Capt. Charles Lewis’s sword was among a “looking glass gilded,” and “15 queen china plates.” One small section of William Witt’s domestic scene was decorated thus: “1 pot & pot hooks...1 violin...1 whip saw and file...1 gun...1 pr of pistols holsters & sword...a parcel of wearing cloths.” Even if Witt’s possessions were in a closet or trunk, there was little distinction by function in their arrangement. It appears that unlike the governor, most people did not think of swords as trophies or decoration in early Virginia. A few owners brought them into the household, but most

often they were kept with tools (perhaps they were sharpened on the same grindstones),
or with riding equipment. Jefferson’s may have been secured because they were silver
and had intrinsic value in addition to their utility as weapons. His collection was worth
more than the books in his library.261

Peter Jefferson entertained in his official capacity, opening his home to his peers,
other Virginia gentry, and at least one Cherokee warrior, Ontassetè (Figure 6.5). Peter
Jefferson's public activities reflected the same frontier culture as his plantation, at once a
statement about belonging to the great tidewater traditions of Anglo-Virginians, yet
revealing cross-cultural contacts that suggested familiar exchange between colonists,
slaves, and Indians. But just as the documents often show only the activities of wealthy
white Virginians, so too follows the story of native American activity in the Virginia
Piedmont during this period. More than the most important warriors and chiefs passed
through the colony. The archaeological record leads to the story that includes the others.
At Shadwell excavators recovered a small quantity of native American artifacts in both
Anglo- and African-American contexts. These Indian materials, which occurred in both
the context of the main house and the slave quarters, suggest that the entire population of
Shadwell had contact with Indian peoples or had similar curiosity about bringing home
their artifacts. It was more than just Peter Jefferson and Ontassetè who made a
connection.

Thomas Jefferson invoked the presence of Ontassețë visiting Shadwell when he wrote to his friend John Adams in 1812. The letter reveals the Virginian's youthful fascination with Indians, as well as the views of the mature statesman who could no longer be romantic about native Americans.

So much in answer to your inquiries concerning Indians, a people with whom, in the early part of my life, I was very familiar, and acquired impressions of attachment and commiseration for them which never have been obliterated. Before the Revolution, they were in the habit of coming often and in great numbers to the seat of government, where I was very much with them. I knew much the great Ontassețë, the warrior and orator of the Cherokees; he was always the guest of my father, on his journeys to and from Williamsburg. I was in his camp when he made his great farewell oration to his people the evening before his departure for England. The moon was in full splendor, and to her he seemed to address himself in his prayers for his own safety on the voyage, and that of his people during his absence; his sounding voice, distinct articulation, animated action, and the solemn silence of his people at their several fires, filled me with awe and veneration, although I did not understand a word he uttered. That nation, consisting now of about 2,000 warriors, and the Creeks of about 3,000 are far advanced in civilization. They have good cabins, enclosed fields, large herds of cattle and hogs, spin and weave their own clothes of cotton, have smiths and other of the most necessary tradesmen, write and read, are on the increase in numbers, and a branch of Cherokees is now instituting a regular representative government. Some other tribes are advancing in the same line. On those who have made any progress, English seductions will have no effect. But the backward will yield, and be thrown further back. Those will relapse into barbarism and misery, lose numbers by war and want, and we shall be obliged to drive them with the beasts of the forest into the stony mountains. They will be conquered, however, in Canada. The possession of that country secures our women and children forever from the tomahawk and scalping knife, by removing those who excite them; and by this possession orders, I presume, are issued by this time; taking for granted that the doors of Congress will re-open with a declaration of war.

\[\text{L&B 13: 160-1.}\]
What was the cultural frontier of Virginia in the mid-eighteenth century? The location of Shadwell seems unlikely for settlement by the regions' Monacan Indians, but Cherokees passed between the Valley of Virginia and Williamsburg with some regularity. The origins of the Indian artifacts recovered at Shadwell provide few clues to explain their provenience in the historic context. Further archaeological and documentary evidence for Indian, white, and black contact in this period answers more questions about what kind of frontier this was.

Three models suggest ways to consider the arrival of the American Indian artifacts to Shadwell: 1) as archaeological evidence only, that is, as evidence of local Indian activities in the pre-contact story of the Piedmont; 2) as ethnohistorical evidence only, or, evidence of Indians' interactions with white settlers and their black slaves; 3) as evidence reflecting both pre-settlement conditions and settlement contact in the specific context of the site. The first part analyzes the finds within the general cultural patterns of the Piedmont, as determined by recent archaeological investigation of native sites. The second part examines the ethnohistorical texts that offer description of Indian, white, and black interaction during the middle part of the eighteenth century. The last part reassesses the questions that began this foray into the Piedmont of two and a half centuries ago, considering the Shadwell context in which both the archaeological and the ethnohistorical record could coexist.

Archaeology has not yet offered a complete picture of the native peoples of the Central Virginia Piedmont. Monacan Indians occupied the Piedmont region until the late seventeenth century when pressure from northern Indians forced their migration south. Many eventually moved to Pennsylvania, leaving a few people here and there in Virginia
and North Carolina. Indians settled along Virginia's rivers during the Late Archaic Period (2500 BCE - 1000 BCE), and established towns, trade, and craft production such as pottery-making during the Woodland Period (1000 BCE - 1600 CE). The Monacans built twelve known burial mounds in the region during their final era in the Piedmont and may have used the mounds for burial as late as the seventeenth century.263

The late 1730s to the 1770s coincides with the main settlement and occupation of the Shadwell site, and also represents an era when the colonial government and southern Indians allied to use the other against its own enemy, other Indians or other Europeans. Pressures from northern Indians and changing trade patterns in the colonies pushed the Cherokees and Catawbas in particular into the arms (figurative and military) of the British in Virginia. The connections that the Cherokees had with the colonial government suggest that this group had the biggest impact on the central Virginia Piedmont. Cherokees were active in Virginia, but the documents make clear that Indians of all nations appeared in Williamsburg or at western treaty meetings. The exchange between the various European immigrants and Indians from across much of the eastern seaboard describes a very complex cultural web in this period of Virginia history.

The dominant artifact pattern at Shadwell recalls the familiar objects and materials of gentry consumption in the middle of the eighteenth century. Despite the Eurocentric world that informed the family's consumer impulses and plantation landscape, Shadwell belied its frontier foundations. The road that took Jefferson's tobacco to market when the river was low carried Indians from the west to Williamsburg, just as it carried traders beyond the mountains. The presence of a small number of Indian artifacts in excavations at Shadwell, both from the main dwelling house and from slave-quarter contexts, prompts more questions of frontier contact. Though the land borders the Rivanna River, it sits well above the flood plain that characterizes other Late-Woodland homesites and is an unlikely location for settlement by Monacan Indians. Though a small amount of quartz flake was recovered, suggesting on-site working of the material, no archaeological features indicated pre-European occupation of this piece of land.264

---

264 On the Indian settlement patterns in the region, see Robert Steven Grumet, *Historic Contact: Indian People and Colonists in Today's Northeastern United States in the Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries*. Norman, Ok., Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1995, 292. See also, Gary H. Dunham, Debra L. Gold, and Jeffrey L. Hantman, “Collective Burial in Late Prehistoric Virginia: Excavation and Analysis of the Rapidan Mound,” *American Antiquity*, 68 (1), (Jan. 2003), 109-128. The ridge that bears the name Shadwell was thoroughly plowed throughout the nineteenth century, providing a mixed, or plowzone, context for all artifacts from the top layer of soil, from the surface to a depth of 7-12 inches. While intrasite distribution studies incorporate plowzone material to help determine areas of activity, only features extending below the plowzone can have solid historic or pre-historic proveniences. Deeper features include cellars, postholes, cooking pits, hearth pits, and middens. The possibility exists that prehistoric settlement was superficial and plowed away, but there is no regional evidence to support this thesis. Excavations between the Shadwell ridge and the Rivanna River, on sites of an historic-period burial ground and of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century mills, recovered no Indian material. See Ford, “A Profitable and Creditable Establishment,” Kern, “Shadwell Report,” Kern, “Shadwell Burial Ground.”
Did Shadwell's first European settlers and their African slaves collect Indian objects nearby? Did Indian travellers along the road trade or share objects with both the white and black communities at Shadwell? A brief analysis of the artifact assemblage begins to outline the proper question to ask. But archaeological evidence augmented with the historical record of Indian travel in Virginia in the eighteenth century paints a much more complex picture of the possibilities of Indian, black, and white cultural exchange in this frontier world. Looking at artifact patterns on other Piedmont Indian sites provides a framework for establishing the origins of these objects, while the documentary record suggests that there is no easy explanation of how the objects got from their producers to the places where archaeologists found them.

The Indian artifacts from Shadwell constitute a negligible percentage of the entire assemblage. The thirty-one objects are slightly less than one one-thousandth of the whole collection, numbering over 42,500 objects (Figures 6.6, 6.7). But because the artifact pattern of the dominant culture is so clearly defined on this site, the few objects that fall outside this pattern are easy to identify. The analytical tool of "removing" the dominant culture from the landscape and studying what remains suggests two cultural influences other than European at Shadwell: African or African-American slaves, and Native-Americans.

The Indian objects penetrated both the slave and free worlds at Shadwell, testimony that certain frontier experiences were common. The distribution of these thirty-one objects is fairly even across the major historic-period areas of occupation. Stone artifacts from the site include twenty-one projectile points and four other tools of
flaked material, and at least two ground stone tools. Metal objects include one brass tinkling cone and two of iron. A single piece of cord-impressed pottery represents definite Indian handiwork. The eleven sherds of colonoware may also represent Indian influences but have a closer correlation to pottery that was made by slaves on tidewater sites. The quartz scraper appeared from the cellar of the main dwelling house with other household objects, and four other pieces emerged near the house. The kitchen vicinity, a high-activity area of food production and storage and home for the slave cook, revealed five points and one iron cone. Around the slave-quarter site, excavators recovered the other seventeen stone objects, two of the metal cones, and the pot sherd. One point was in the contents of the root cellar, a place where a slave might keep a precious object.265

Excavation of other Piedmont Indian sites provides a regional context for most of the stone objects and the potsherd. Archaeologists of mound sites attributed to Monacans report similar quartz and quanzite points and tools, and these materials occur abundantly in the region. These archaeologists also recover Albemarle-type pottery from the mounds, testament to the last period of pre-contact, when Woodland Indians established towns, potting traditions, and ossuary burial practices. Similar potsherds can still be found in river wash and plowed fields in the greater Piedmont area. But artifact groups from Indian mounds also include small numbers of stone points and tools made of non-local, usually western, material, indicating that Indians traded across the mountains and

265 Classification of lithic material by Martin Gallivan, University of Virginia, report on file, 20 December 1994, Monticello Archaeology. Some archaeologists may still argue that colonoware has native American origins rather than African, and the low technology of the two types makes them undeniably similar; however, I have treated the colonoware with the slave quarter assemblages, see chaps. 4 and 5.
between tribes with some regularity. Of the twenty-six stone items from Shadwell, two
are of distinctly non-local material, varieties of chert or flint that occur west of the
mountains. Thus, the pottery and all of the stone objects, regardless of origin in
Piedmont or Shenandoah Valley Indian cultures, could have appeared at Shadwell in the
pre-historic period.

The brass and iron tinkling cones also bear Monacan associations and symbolize
the power held by the Monacans over other Virginia Indians because of Monacan
proximity to copper resources, the cause of strained relations between the Powhatans and
Monacans. If the presence of chert and flint tools at Shadwell represents Monacan
contact with western Indians, the metal cones represent contact to the east. The
evaluation of thirty-one Indian artifacts from this single site located between mountain
gaps and seaward rivers establishes a network of distant trade associations well before
European contact. So the possibility exists that when Peter Jefferson brought his
family and slaves to the Piedmont, they collected these curiosities during construction of
their buildings, tobacco planting, or walking along the Rivanna.

---

266 Bushnell, “The Indian Grave,” 106-116; Bushnell, _Five Monacan Towns_;
Hantman, "Between Powhatan and Quirank," 676-690; Jeffrey L. Hantman and Michael
J. Klein, “Middle and Late Woodland Archaeology in Piedmont Virginia,” in Middle and
Late Woodland Research in Virginia: A Synthesis, ed. Theodore R. Reinhart and Mary
Ellen N. Hodges (Richmond, Va., Archaeological Society of Virginia), 137-164.
C.G. Holland, Sandra D. Spieden, and David van Riojen, "The Rapidan Mound
Revisited: A Test Excavation of a Prehistoric Burial Mound," *Quarterly Bulletin of the
of the Ethnohistory and Archaeology of the Monacans," *Piedmont Archaeology: Recent

267 Hantman, 1990.
Thomas Jefferson had a life-long passion for collecting and researching the artifacts of other cultures. *Notes on Virginia*, published in 1787, contains Jefferson's catalog of Indian demographics, languages, and history. When, as president, he commissioned Virginians Meriwether Lewis and William Clark to find the Northwest Passage, he also charged them to send back to him cultural artifacts, natural specimens, and botanical samples for his further documentation of the North American continent. In *Notes on Virginia*, he recalled that "thirty years before" he followed a group of Indians to a mound on the Rivanna River, where he watched them mourn.²⁶⁸ Young Thomas Jefferson becomes a prime suspect for bringing home, and into the house, the artifacts of his native land's earlier inhabitants.

Yet the historic record provides another way to look at cultural contact on the frontier. Thomas Jefferson prompted the question of Indian and white social roles by describing the Indian warrior Ontassetè as a guest of his father at Shadwell. Overnight accommodations of the white in the Indian world and the Indian in the white world suggest that, like other behaviors, the degree of comfort and privacy offered depended on the relative status of the visitor and his host in their worlds and to each other. On occasion they camped together when travelling or passing through woodlands. Often, a party visiting the other's town on business pitched their own camp in the town or just outside its boundaries. When the meeting held high diplomatic value, the host offered a house in the town to the guest. Planters allowed passing Indians to camp on their land or

²⁶⁸ Jefferson, *Notes*, 100.
in an outbuilding, but little record remains of the sleeping arrangements made on
plantations for Indian guests who were friends of the planters.

En route from Big Island at Holston to Chote in 1761, Henry Timberlake and two
companions camped with seven or eight Cherokee hunters they happened upon. They
shared the Indians' dinner of venison "dipped in bears oil, which served for sauce."
Timberlake lay down to sleep next to an Indian on a large bearskin. He wrote that he
"believes his companions did the same." The Indians shared both their food and bedding
with the white woodland travelers. Though their camp included fewer than a dozen,
Timberlake was unsure of the accommodations given, or taken by, his interpreter and aide. Perhaps the Indians had their small shelters of skins on poles, obscuring
Timberlake's view of his mates' sleeping arrangements, or perhaps they were spread
through the woods. If Timberlake commented on sharing a bearskin because it was an
unusual situation, the close quarters with the Indians were not unusual enough to engage
his full attention to where the other white men slept.269

When they reached the Indian town, the chief Ostenaco gave Timberlake "a
general invitation to his house, while I resided in the country." Whether the chief's
language was symbolic or literal, the chief expected to offer an official emissary
accommodations equivalent to his own, if not his own. Timberlake smoked, ate, drank,
and celebrated with the Indians before seeking the quietude of King Kanagatucko's
hothouse, but he was surrounded by crowds of Indians at his bedside. All the smoking
and curious onlookers prevented much rest, but the bed provided little comfort for the

white man. It was "composed of a few boards, spread with bear-skins, without any other covering," though the house was too hot for Timberlake's own blanket.270

Timberlake's mission of goodwill to the Cherokees afforded him a level of accommodation that was not automatic for all business transactions in Indian territory. At the 1752 Treaty of Logg's Town, the commissioners sent by Lt. Gov. Dinwiddie, including Joshua Fry, Lunsford Lomax, and James Patton, halted three miles from Shonassim's Town for preliminary peace rituals, which involved dismounting, smoking the calumet, and firing salutes with a small group of Delaware Indians. The Virginians pitched their camp on the river bank, outside of town and upriver, and raised their colors. They later went to the town to be met by the co-chiefs, who "dressed after the English Fashion, had Silver Breast Plates and a great deal of Wampum." The governor's commission heard an address by the chiefs that began, "You have come a long journey and have sweated a great deal."271 The formality of the address echoed the literal and figurative limits placed on the Virginians' access to this Indian world. This was not a wholehearted embrace of brothers, but a strategically regulated state occasion involving both protocol and formal distance.

Indian visits to the white man mirrored the white experience in the Indian camps. High-level visits demanded the presidential suite, while passers-by were evaluated on a fairly personal level. A fairly large group of Indians -- Jonnhaty, an Iroquois, with twenty-two Onondagas, and seven Oneidas -- passed through the Valley of Virginia in

270Timberlake, 31, 35.

1742. They visited the Augusta County home of John McDowell, then camped nearby on a river for several days. Though the Indians' visit to McDowell was friendly, other residents of the Valley felt it necessary to escort the group on their trip south, provoking frontier violence caused by misunderstanding and reactive reasoning. Similar white reaction resulted in the death of ten Indians in Augusta County in 1765. John Anderson allowed Nockonowe and nine Cherokees to spend the night in his barn, where his neighbors ambushed them in the morning. Clearly, the hospitality of the trail offered by individuals did not represent how most backcountry residents felt about providing comfort to non-white travellers. Yet murdering guests was unusual enough that most references to Indian visits go into no great detail. What else McDowell provided for his guests is unknown.

It was not only the Valley residents who worried about Indians. Peter Fontaine, safely ensconced at Westover in Charles City County in 1757, reported:

Those of the Indians that call themselves our friends despise us, and in their march through our inhabited country, when going to our assistance, insult and annoy us. It is not above a month ago since a party of about a hundred and twenty Cherokees, in passing through Lunenburg, insulted people of all ranks.

---

The Fontaine family paid close attention to how the English, the French, and their Indian allies fared in the backwoods.\textsuperscript{273}

Plenty of records indicate that the Indians who came to town on business set up their own camps and established their separate cultural domain on a travelling scale. Ontassetè camped with other Cherokees in Williamsburg the night before he sailed for England to meet George II. Jefferson described listening to this great orator \textit{in his camp}, a place separate from the white world, even if the seventy or so Indians occupied the Palace Green. In 1751, when the Nottoways marched into town with a white flag for the Cherokees who had come to council, the two groups met "in the Market place...singing the Song of Peace." When the crowd became too great, the Indians went into the court house to meet. They exchanged wampum, heard orations, and smoked the peace pipe. They met later at "the Camp of the Cherrokees; where making a large Fire, they danced together round it."\textsuperscript{274} The Indian activities that day illustrate a range of cultural interactions of the Indian in the white realm. The Indians sat with the Executive Council in the Governor's Palace, meeting the white man on his ground. They then met other Indians and used a convenient English public building for their own business. But the Indians celebrated in places staked out as their own. The Indians used the public spaces of the capital again in 1777, when Cherokees came to town to talk about running a boundary to prevent encroachment on Indian land. Following the talk, "they favoured the


\textsuperscript{274} \textit{Virginia Gazette}, 16 August 1751.
public with a dance on the green in front of the palace, where a considerable number of
spectators, both male and female, were agreeably entertained." 275

All Indian visits to Williamsburg, however, were not remarkable enough to make
the news. The newspapers scarcely mentioned Indians at the College, and local Indians
selling wares and produce appear only occasionally in account books. Fees paid "To the
Indians for Earthen pans...0.2. 6.," and "To the Pamunkey Indians for Wild Fowl...1.1. 6.," for the Governor's Palace kitchen suggest that Indians doing business in
Williamsburg were neither unusual nor always of diplomatic importance. Clearly this
colonial capital saw a variety of Indians from many nations in Virginia and beyond.
Groups of Indians visiting Williamsburg on official business ranged in size from two
Cherokee deputies in August 1759 to a group of at least fifty-six, "King Blunt and thirty-
three Tuscaroroes, seven Meherrins, two Saponies, thirteen Nottoways," who offered to
join the English against the French in spring of 1757. An even larger gathering of
Indians returned from the wars in Ohio in May 1757. Newspapers reported about one-
hundred Catawbas from Fort Cumberland arrived with two Shawnese scalps, followed a
few days later by thirty Tuscaroras with another scalp. 276 No mention was made of where
these troops billeted.

275 *Virginia Gazette*, Dixon & Hunter, 30 May 1777.

But official records do note that the governor provided a house for the visit of the Cherokee emperor and empress and their son in 1752. The emperor's address to Governor Dinwiddie began with formal treaty language that echoed how the Indians greeted the English at Loggs Town; he said they "had come through many Briers, Thickets, and great Waters" for this meeting. After the official presentations, the governor gave orders to entertain the emperor's family and attendants "with all necessaries." They then "returned to the House appointed to receive them." While Dinwiddie clearly saw the protocol necessary for this visit of a head of state, he did not make the offer of "his house" that the Cherokee made to Timberlake in Tennessee. Perhaps the emperor's family lodged with one of Williamsburg's finest families, or perhaps they were given an adequate empty house equipped with government attendants and black slaves. The other Williamsburg residence that hosted an Indian belonged to Mr. Horrock, who invited Timberlake and Ostenaco (as Timberlake refers to Ontassetê) to "sup with him at the College." It was here that Ostenaco saw a picture of the king and asked to go to England.277

Timberlake tells us that the Cherokees left their finery at home, leaving "their trinkets behind," when they went to war. But descriptions of Indians visiting Williamsburg and London indicate that Indians dressed and painted themselves when on official business. White men traveling to Indian towns or camps were met by the chiefs wearing some combination of English dress, breast plates, and wampum. The colonial

---

277 Executive Journals vol. 5, 413-414; Timberlake, 112. See also "Treaty of Loggs Town," 154-155.
government gave fine suits of clothes to Indian chiefs and emperors and their families, who asked for "some Cloathes proper for people in their Station." In 1746, the Cherokees received "blew cloth for a Suit of Cloaths and six double Breasted Coats and of Scarlet for a Suit and Callico for gowns for a Woman and Two children." In 1752, Ammosossity returned to Tennessee with "a handsome Suit of Clothes for himself, his Empress and Son." Governor Dinwiddie sent "fine ruffled shirts" and plain shirts to the co-chiefs of the Six Nations Iroquois at the Loggs Town treaty. The Indians relinquished none of the important material symbols of their power, yet embraced the visual impact of a fine gentleman's coat.

The colonial government required Indians travelling east of the Blue Ridge to carry a passport, and Indians on official business were often escorted across Virginia at the expense of the state. The routes taken by Indian visitors to and from Williamsburg depended on their point of departure and destination as well as their escort. Staging for troops and supplies heading to Ohio in the 1750s took place in Winchester and Fredericksburg, suggesting travel routes north of Williamsburg and along the Rappahannock. Catawbas leaving the capital took the Jamestown ferry, traversing Southside Virginia for home.

Indians from the west, mostly Cherokees, passed through central Virginia. The usual route brought them from Tennessee, north into the Valley of Virginia, then east to

---


279 *Maryland Gazette*, 16 June 1757.
Williamsburg. Some travellers undoubtedly used mountain gaps to the south and crossed Lunenburg County on their journey. But numerous groups came to the seat of Augusta County at Staunton, passing east through the pass named "Wood's Gap" or "Jarham's Gap" by the white settlers. Col. James Patton of Augusta escorted Cherokees from his home near Staunton to Williamsburg and back in 1751. The colonial government paid Patton £50, and his expenses of £44.18.4½. An overly punctilious clerk recorded the tavern accounts for which he reimbursed Patton, which allows us to reconstruct just how much opportunity people in places like Shadwell had for interaction with such travelers.\(^\text{280}\)

Patton and an interpreter traveled with a number of Cherokee chiefs, one of whom may have been Attakullakulla, or the Little Carpenter, eight of their councillors, and about thirty attendants. They left Williamsburg in mid-August, following the Chickahominy River to New Kent Court House (Figure 6.8). From there, they followed the Pamunkey River northwest, stopping at Page's Warehouse at Hanover Town and Hanover Court House. The next leg of the journey probably followed the westward path of the South Anna River, along which they stopped at Thomas Lankford's and Winston's Ordinary. In Albemarle County, they stayed with Thomas Walker at his home Castle Hill. Following the Southwest Mountains to Secretary's Ford on the Rivanna, they passed over Peter Jefferson's land, perhaps stopping for refreshment or to greet old friends. They stayed at Ferrel's Ordinary before heading across the mountains via Woods Gap. Patton escorted them as far as Reed Creek where they parted, heading south to

\(^{280}\text{Calendar, 244.}\)
Tennessee. The accounts for the trip date its end on September 18, a journey of at least thirty days.281

Before the Revolution, they were in the habit of coming often and in great numbers to the seat of the government, where I was very much with them. About the time the Indians acculturated the Virginians, and vice versa, westward expansion again pressured the Indians' homes bordering Virginia. This time, they could not use the French menace to entreat the English. And with the Revolution over, the former colonists turned back to their march across America and the native Americans. Thomas Jefferson lamented their passing, but his new government took precedence in his affairs.

The Indians' impact on colonial society, measured through their visits and travels in Virginia, is evident in the language of newspaper accounts of these visits. The accounts of Indians in the Virginia Gazette reflected a growing awareness and interest in Indian activities during the late-colonial period. Earlier "stories" consisted of a sentence or two, with no specific names of individuals, though the Indians were always categorized by tribe. A 1752 story read, in its entirety, "This week arriv'd in Town the Emperor of the Cherokee Nation, with his empress, to renew the Treaty of Friendship with this Government." Longer stories referred to the Indians as "Emperor," "men and women," "warriors," but rarely used personal names, though the same text named the

281 Calendar, 244. From around 1746 to 1752, the Jefferson family resided at Tuckahoe, Goochland Country, where Peter Jefferson was ward of the Randolph children. Members of the Jefferson family occasionally returned to Shadwell, and slaves still worked the fields.
local theatre manager. Of the Gazettes surveyed, one news story about Indians in 1765 used the anglicized names "Little Carpenter" and "Great Doctor," but not until 1777 did any Indian names other than tribes appear in the colonial press. This same story, which mentioned "Oconostoto, the Little Carpenter, and the Pigeon," had an easy and friendly tone, referring to the Indians as "Forty Gentlemen and Ladies of the Cherokee nation."

Perhaps this change reflected the particular attitude of the different publishers of the Virginia Gazette over the years, or maybe the winds of war, but also the gradual ease of Virginians to some Indians during the short period in which they were compatriots.

Yet for all the commonalties between the Indians and the Virginians in this period, distinctions remained. Governor Dinwiddie offered his interpretation of Indian protocol to his commissioners to the Cherokee and Catawba treaty in 1755. He pointed out what the Indians expected in their peace ceremony, and advised them to express love, but not to promise any guns. The Indians needed equal coaching in their pursuit of diplomacy. Timberlake cautioned the Indians he escorted to London on how to act when meeting the king. He told Ostenaco not to offer the king his peace pipe nor to try to shake his hand. Everyone involved in these two exchanges understood the other culture just enough to fear catastrophe from a small breach of basic manners.

---

282 *Virginia Gazette*, 10 November 1752; *Virginia Gazette*, Dixon and Hunter, 30 May 1777.

283 Dinwiddie to Peter Randolph and William Byrd, in *Dinwiddie Papers* I: 303-304; Timberlake, 126.
I knew much the great Ontassetè, the warrior and orator of the Cherokees; he was always the guest of my father, on his journeys to and from Williamsburg. Most likely, if they slept in the Jeffersons' house and not outside, Ontassetè and some of his other warriors occupied the second downstairs chamber. The furniture in this room was almost as good as Peter and Jane's in the first chamber, though the fireplace was slightly smaller. If this room was the regular domain of some of the Jefferson children, they joined their brothers or sisters in one of the two heated bedrooms upstairs, making way for the guests. If the Jefferson's felt their visitors to be superior in status, then, in the English custom, Peter and Jane probably gave up their bed, the best in the house, to the best guest. Jefferson's old age memory of the Indian's visit implies some frequency of the event, and perhaps the second chamber always served as guest quarters. The Indians probably found the beds as strange and uncomfortable as Timberlake found theirs. The Cherokees had their own hierarchy and clearly understood the white man's. Housing the chief in the best building and relegating his attendants to the surrounding dependencies appealed to both the Indians' and the planters' sense of propriety.

The rest of Ontassetè's entourage probably slept in outbuildings or under the stars. Perhaps they joined the slave cook and her family in the kitchen building, other slave families in their small houses, or found room in the barns. In inclement weather when the Indians built their small shelters, perhaps the plantation yard was dotted with Indian huts, campfires, and bear skins. The slaves who brought the Indians food probably traded with them and danced with them or shared songs around the fires, exchanging glass beads for copper pieces, buttons for wampum. Perhaps a slave showed the Indians the strange piece of pottery she found by the river, but the Indians were more interested in the stew
roasting in the simple colono pot that she brought from the tidewater plantation where she was born. She may have shown them the white worked quartz from the plowed fields, and they may have given her an old chert arrowhead carried for good luck. The Indians' visit nearly doubled the population of the plantation for a few days. It surely was an event in the lives of all who resided there.

Thomas Jefferson, a small group of Indian artifacts, and the colonial records of Indian activities describe Ontassetè at Shadwell, dining in the best room, wearing a bright blue coat, drinking cider with Peter Jefferson, Fry, Walker, Lomax, Patton, and Timberlake. Ontassetè probably wore a European coat similar to Peter Jefferson's, though his adornment also included his tribal badges as a warrior. The reconstruction of Cherokee activities with their white counterparts in Virginia in this period clearly places the warrior and the surveyor in the same world, participating in many of the same rituals of colonial Virginia life and sharing much of the same material culture.

As the material culture of the famous men leads us to include more people in the discussion of how their world worked, we are also led to consider part of their material culture that is absent from the documents. Among Virginia's Indian neighbors, the protocol of visiting—in friendship or to carve out treaties—required the giving of gifts. Yet there are significantly few references to native-American produced objects in colonial probate inventories. There is nothing listed in any Jefferson inventories as Indian, but that does not mean they received no tokens for their hospitality beyond the old arrowheads found at Shadwell. Estate appraisers may have thought so little of native goods that they did not even mention them. Indians items could be included as the Jeffersons' "2 Drest skins & some pieces soll Leather" in a storeroom, or "2 raw hides &
some tann’d Leather” in an outbuilding, but more likely, at least for the latter, these entries refer to supplies for the shoemaker, and the inventory listed his tools nearby. These leather and skin references did not mention decoration or origin, and none of these leather goods was in the house. Yet in Peter’s office, in the passage, in hall or chamber, there must have been a skin, a headdress, a breast plate or pouch, a basket, or some other prizes of friendship. Albemarle County inventories include only six references to any item of native manufacture. Five people owned tomahawks, which were listed with other weapons or tools. John Driver owned “1 indian pot,” one of the few food vessels in his meager estate that totaled only £15 2s. 6d.. If the inventories are correct, only one slave who lived in colonial Albemarle County was an Indian. If Indian objects were not rare, they were common enough to remain unmentioned.\textsuperscript{284}

The ethnohistory of Indian, planter, and slave contact in the mid-eighteenth century blurs distinctions between the ethnicity of the material worlds of these three groups. Indians maintained parts of their own ornament, such as breastplates, paint, and wampum, even as they requested ruffled shirts and coats with brass buttons. Their own ornaments reflected their Indian-ness to the white world, and maybe their white counterparts expected them to look a certain way. Their requests for fine European clothes do not suggest a desire to become English; they recognized the coats and shirts as status symbols that would give them another diplomatic tool in the white world. Timberlake noted the Indians’ dress in his diary and said the “old people remember and praise ancient days, before they were acquainted with the whites, when they had but little

\textsuperscript{284} ALCWB 2: 43-4; 88, 111, 267-8, 320, 346, 351-52.
dress.” He commented that the Indians’ “dress is now become very much like the European; and indeed that of the men is greatly altered.” Timberlake noticed that the Indians preferred some forms of European dress and wore it at home, and that they were well aware that it changed their world. 285

Standard archaeological categorization of various objects recovered at Shadwell allows us to label certain pieces as English, African, or Native American, a distinction that may reflect only who made the objects. The evidence here indicates that these groups shared more objects that were the same than were different, yet these groups recognized the other’s ethnic identity. Contemporary descriptions of visiting Indians reveal only a few ornaments of native manufacture that would survive in the archaeological record as evidence of an Indian visit. Those same descriptions show many objects used by everyone in colonial Virginia.

The written record suggests that all these groups recognized status as an important part of identity. Each of these groups understood hierarchy within their own system and appealed to each other’s sense of rank as part of there interpersonal and diplomatic relations. The presence of brass buttons among slaves may indicate emulation of people who were free and wealthy, whether Indian or white. The lack of Indian trophies in household inventories may indicate the perceived worthlessness of these items in the English world. Even if status overshadowed ethnicity in this frontier environment—regardless of the fact that ethnicity often determined status—Indians used certain badges of their ethnic identity to reinforce their presence in the colonial world. Ethnic markers

285 Timbelake, 51.
may have been more useful when one traveled as a visitor in another world than within one’s own neighborhood.

The thirty-one Indian objects from Shadwell may have been relics of an earlier people at the time they were found and kept by slaves and planters there. The projectile points, stone tools, and tinklers were probably also relics of a past era to the Cherokees who carried guns and wore European clothes in the 1750s. Yet these same objects may have served well the Indians who visited Shadwell’s residents and sought to charm their hosts by exchanging some distinct cultural artifact. Just as the use and ownership of objects changed, the use of ethnicity as a marker could change too. A stone projectile point, obsolete in its technology, still had cultural currency in colonial Virginia.

Ontassetè and Peter Jefferson had many friends in common. Two of the commissioners who represented the crown at Loggs Town in 1751, Joshua Fry and Lunsford Lomax, were with Jefferson as part of the surveying crew that ran the Fairfax Line in 1747. Ontassetè and Patton camped at Walker’s; Walker lived near Jefferson and attended him as a physician in the last few months of his life. Dinwiddie wrote Jefferson in 1755 and 1756, charging him to send his militia to Patton’s aid in the Valley. The governor’s letters to Patton assured him that help was on the way. John Harvie, executor of Peter Jefferson’s estate, dined at Patton’s house in 1751, before joining a mutual friend of them all, the parson Rose. Though Ontassetè’s name emerges from the history books, remembered for his oratory and humanity, other Indians traveled all his paths with him, dined in forests and plantation homes with him, and sailed to London with him (Figure 6.9). Just as Peter Jefferson lived as one of many settlers along the Blue Ridge, Ontassetè was surely one of many remarkable natives who helped form the Virginia frontier. The
names of these few provide the tools to write the history of the rest whose names remain unknown.286

It is easier to list the business transactions in which Peter Jefferson involved himself than to describe the range of social relationships that grew alongside them. The impression of this part of Jefferson's world is almost as a men's club, a masculine place with highly specialized codes of interaction. The image of these powerful men, talking and drinking together at court day, about a member's table, or around a surveying-camp fire is partly from legends retold by Thomas Jefferson and his siblings to their family. The chronology of Peter Jefferson's life also supports these stories, especially the visits of Fry, Rose, and Ontassetè. The connections Jefferson had with other powerful men grew from exchanges made socially as well as in ledger books. Sarah Randolph reported the story told by Thomas Jefferson to one of his grandsons, who asked how the men of his father's day spent their time. Jefferson replied:

"My father had a devoted friend, to whose house he would go, dine, spend the night, dine with him again in the second day, and return to Shadwell in the evening. His friend, in the course of a day or two, returned the visit, and spent the same length of time at his house. This

286 Lewis, Fairfax Line; Calendar I, 239-241; Dinwiddie, letters to Peter Jefferson, 9 July 1755, and 5 May 1756, Dinwiddie Papers I, 95-96, and 405; Rose, 105.
occurred once every week; and thus, you see, they were together four days out of the seven.\textsuperscript{287}

This view is obviously romantic; the masculine bond, freely shared, with no interruptions from wives, children, or slaves, even the horses that brought them thus were subordinated to the idea of devoted male friendship.

The reality of these visits, in fact, involved the family and the whole apparatus of housekeeping -- the personal slaves, servers, cooks, and horse grooms, as well as the burdens of spending time away from one's other obligations. Robert Rose revealed as much when after church one day he "retumed with some Company and [ate] a Batchelour's Dinner, my Wife & Daughter being gone to Col. Beverley's."\textsuperscript{288} Dinner was not usual in the absence of his family. Possibly, it being Sunday and the family away, his house slaves had the day off and the men fixed their own food. At the least, Rose himself had to instruct the servants of the group's needs, and obviously this was novel to him. Rose also revealed that the women and children performed a similar visitation circuit. Sometimes Rose recorded meeting up with his wife and children on his visits to Joshua Fry or John Harvie.

The history of prominent white men has been known, recorded, and written. Lately, historians have also sought to tell the stories of women, slaves and free blacks, and ordinary people in early America. The lessons of social history, historical archaeology, and material culture studies have been instrumental in doing that. This

\textsuperscript{287} Randolph, \textit{Domestic Life}, 23-24. Unfortunately, the family history leaves open to speculation which friend was the focus of this regular circuit.
close reading of a particular place and the family there brings together the histories of those many groups to make one story, and the story begins to reveal how many other actors helped shape the image of a man like Peter Jefferson.

---

Rose, 32.
Figure 6.1. Peter Jefferson's surveying expeditions took him through the Northern Neck, into the northwest of Virginia and to the Virginia – North Carolina Dividing Line.

1. 1737 Jefferson worked with Robert Brooke of Essex County on a map of the Rappahannock River.

2. 1746 Jefferson worked with Robert Brooke Jr. on a map of the Northern Neck.

3. 1746 Jefferson was a surveyor to Fry, who was commissioner, to draw a boundary between the claims of Virginia and Lord Fairfax's proprietary grant for the land between the Rappahannock and Potomac Rivers.

4. 1749 Jefferson and Fry, as commissioners, continued the Virginia-North Carolina dividing line.
Figure 6.2. Diagram showing relative locations of investors in Beverley/Westham Town vs. Loyal Land Company investors. Peter Jefferson, Joshua Fry, and John Harvie of Albemarle County were the only men engaged with both projects.
Figure 6.3. Images of king and empire:

Above: Fragments of GR jug, blue and gray Rhenish stoneware jug with incised cipher of George II, (see catalog for list of fragments from multiple vessels; whole jug, courtesy Colonial Williamsburg Foundation).

Below: Fireback, cast iron, with Hanover family arms (SW 23, reconstruction by Amy E. Grey).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Gun @</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Gun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 P's Brass barrel'd pistols</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 P's Brass barrel'd pistols</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 silver Hilted sword</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 silver Hilted Cutlass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bayonet</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a p's files</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A parcel of sword belts &amp; Double Girth</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 silver Watch</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 p's silver spurs @</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Dozn Razors, a hone &amp; Case flemes</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.4. Peter Jefferson’s weapons, kept in a storeroom or strongroom at Shadwell. AICWB 2: 43.
Figure 6.5. Ontasseté or Austenaco, Cherokee man, Great Warrior, Commander in chief of the Cherokee Nation 1762, by Sir Joshua Reynolds?, from Royal Mag. London, copy in National Anthropological Archives, http://sirismm.si.edu/naa/baegn/gn_01063g.jpg (accessed March 31, 2005).
Figure 6.6. Native American finds.
Top: "Albemarle"-type cord-impresed pottery.
Center: Quartzite scraper (left), possibly worked greenstone.
Bottom: Projectile points.
Figure 6.7. Native American finds.
Top (l to r): tinkling cone, brass, rolled and pierced, capped after rolling, approx. 2” h. (SW 89); tinkling cones or projectile points, iron, rolled and pierced (SW 2E, SW 792A).
Bottom: projectile point, argillite (SW 732A). Drawings by Amy E. Grey.
Figure 6.8. Shadwell and the Piedmont neighborhood showing the route taken from Williamsburg to Tennessee by Colonel Patton and the Cherokees, August-September 1751.
CHAPTER 7
THE INTANGIBLE LEGACIES:
CREATING AND KEEPING FAMILY HISTORY

Peter and Jane Jefferson gave their children more than a comfortable home and financial legacies. They created and maintained professional, social, and family relationships that would continue to provide a network of support for their heirs. They established, through documents, stories, and naming patterns, connections to generations past that would preserve the intangible parts of their legacies for generations yet to come. Each generation of a family writes another chapter of the family history, like it or not. A family may choose to preserve and perpetuate the values and traditions of its ancestry, or it may reject those traditions and attempt to fashion itself anew. The Jeffersons clearly chose the former, connecting their past and their future through carefully staged presentation and by providing future generations with the knowledge about family that would further its members in the same worlds that their parents and grandparents had known.

This chapter is not meant to be hagiographic, taking at face value the words written by various family members and celebrating how warm and caring they were. Instead, I am taking the words as evidence of action. For instance, Thomas Jefferson wrote of his concern for Martha Carr when their sister Mary Bolling moved some distance away in 1787 (see below). He noted the relationship between his sisters, he
acknowledged that Martha might feel a loss, and he cared to write about it at all. These 
were not thoughts he had to express nor even feel, yet there is evidence here that he did 
both. Other historians have looked for evidence of what did not work in Thomas 
Jefferson's past: I am exploring what did work. This is not uncritical of the family 
letters and documents, but one valid use of them is to look at how they certify the bonds 
between their authors and their intended recipients.

We have already visited many of the ways that activities at Shadwell played a role 
in training family members for their roles as adults. In this chapter we explore how many 
of these same activities reveal ways in which the Jeffersons maintained their family 
traditions. We have explored the didactic qualities of the Jeffersons' material world that 
taught a lesson even to viewers who remained unaware that they were responding to the 
subtle messages of their surroundings. We have seen how the household skills of Jane 
Jefferson established her children for their lives as adults. We have witnessed the legal 
yoke of slavery that trained both servants and masters to their roles. We have measured 
the fruits of Peter Jefferson's alliances with family, friends, and associates. We will now 
visit the family as its members grow older, children marry, some die, and others step into 
roles as guardians of the family traditions. The legacies left are varied. They are as 
simple as a memory--a story told and retold--as complex an artifact as a family Bible 
bearing history in its birth and death records and in the symbolic value of its previous 
possession by an ancestor, or as genuine a declaration of devotion as when a brother takes 
in a widowed sister.
Daniel Blake Smith has called women the “guardians of the kin network”\textsuperscript{289} Jane Jefferson delineated many of the roles of such a guardian. Her kin, her family beyond Shadwell, provided a substantial portion of the social world that the young Jeffersons knew and her family produced both friends and marriage partners for her children. She wrote family history in the form of genealogical notations that would become part of the formal mechanism for passing history from one generation to another. Above all, she played a role in establishing a family whose members showed deep concern and affection for each other. The willingness of the next generation to continue to act as such guardians reflects the successes of Jane and Peter’s lessons. The Jefferson children watched their parents perform their public and private responsibilities to family and embraced these same roles when their time came.

**Preserving and Creating Legacies: Wills, Genealogy, and Family**

Peter and Jane Jefferson established legacies of property for their children. They gave their children slaves, land, money, and other items as they saw fair and fitting. For the children it was their passage to adulthood, upon marrying or reaching majority, that most often prompted the transfer of family wealth to them. The Jeffereisons arranged these transfers to benefit all parties and to smooth the transitions for those who took on new responsibilities.

Peter and Jane set in place exacting instructions for the dispersal of their estates after their deaths. Their attention to legal and equitable arrangements likely provided a number of intangible advantages to the Jefferson children. Peter’s will shows some of

\textsuperscript{289} Smith, *Inside the Great House*, 226.
these. First, Peter’s will maintained Jane and the family at Shadwell, providing continuity for both Jane and their children. Second, the legal details of his will ensured access for each heir to his or her money and property, with plenty of forethought about what if a bequeathed slave or an heir should die before the distribution. Third, the will contained provisions to exclude heirs who might challenge their own or a siblings’ right, quelling later protests and providing heirs with legal tools to resolve disputes. Peter’s will explicitly stated that educating all the children was a priority and suggested which lands could be sold if there was a shortage of funds for this primary goal. Rather than limiting and controlling Jane’s legal participation, Peter’s appointment of executors may have given her freedom from worrying about plantation finances and enabled her closer attention to family concerns. After he returned to Albemarle as an adult, Thomas took over as executor of the Shadwell estate and refined the legal arrangements between his mother and siblings, the occupants of Shadwell—and himself, the would-be legal owner of the plantation. The established legal mechanisms worked in settling the estates of Jane Jr., and Elizabeth, who left only siblings as heirs. The seven surviving siblings divided Jane, Jr.’s estate. Each of the siblings received £28.3.7-1/4, or one-seventh of the £200 legacy, or would upon reaching majority in the case of Anna Scott and Randolph. The family was still settling Elizabeth’s estate in 1790 when Thomas wrote to his brother to inform him he would receive £36.7.2 from Elizabeth’s estate.²⁹⁰

²⁹⁰ MB, 251. Jane, Jr.’s slave Betty, daughter of Patt, wound up with Thomas. The absence of Patt and her son Sancho in Thomas’s records suggest they may have gone to Randolph. FB, 6. This sum is not an exact division of the remnants of Elizabeth’s £200 but represents Elizabeth’s portion of sister Jane’s estate (£28.3.7-1/4) plus interest held by John Bolling, Charles Lewis, and Nicholas Lewis, a friend who helped administer

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Jane’s use of the estate following Peter’s death shows timely and careful attention to Peter’s wishes. She also took deliberate care in charging the estate for certain costs, such as those for clothing for the “children’s slaves.” What have been interpreted by historians as cold and legalistic exchanges between Jane and her son Thomas are in fact their attempts to ensure that individual fortunes remained intact while Peter’s estate underwrote the expenses of the minor children. Jane charged the estate for small things such as shoes, stockings, and tailoring for the children. Likewise, in his role as executor, Thomas charged the estate for personal items purchased for Lucy, Randolph, and Anna Scott, keeping their accounts separate from his own. Thomas made careful notes of leases for land and slaves from his mother during her days at Shadwell, and when he leased Elizabeth’s slave Cate from her.\textsuperscript{291}

In 1790, thirty-three years after Peter Jefferson’s death, Thomas defended his understanding of his father’s will “that all my Family live & be maintained & my Children Educated out of the Profits of my Estate” until each child came of age. In the postwar years when British creditors sought repayment of debts from their American colleagues, Thomas Walker and John Nicholas, two of Peter’s executors, were called on to help settle an outstanding balance on the elder Jefferson’s estate with the tobacco merchant Kippen and

\textsuperscript{291} John Dos Passos has been “credited” with the seed of the idea that Jane’s relationship with Thomas was “cold”. See also Chapter 2 for the biographical career of ideas about Jane Jefferson. Dos Passos, \textit{Head and Heart}, esp. 75. JHAB 1. TJ kept Fee Books for his siblings within what are now called collectively his Memorandum Books. MB, see index for each sibling. “Jane Jefferson’s slaves deeded to Thomas Jefferson, September 29, 1773,” FB, 8-9; MB, 300, 346, 462.
Company. Thomas Jefferson defended the charges and challenged Walker on the issue of “the maintenance of my sisters.” Thomas presented two methods of calculating the valid expenses of the children: 1) “a statement of what they were actually” that would require an impossible knowledge of the accounts of Kippen and Company; or 2) an estimate by year that could be averaged “for every age from 11. to 21. years.” Children under ten years of age were legally “infants.” “Maintenance” and “board” were separate expenses for the estate. By a 1760 agreement between Jane and the executors, she received money for board at the sum of £6 for the younger and £10 for the elder children. (Thomas suggested averaging this at £8 for his settlement with Walker.) Thomas reported that Walker had “confounded” the board of the sisters with “their cloathing &c.” Jane “never cloathed them; the estate did that from the beginning to the end.”

The seemingly petty accounts that Jane kept with executors John Harvie and then her son were part of the calculated mechanism for preserving individual fortunes.

Peter’s will prescribed equitable legacies to each daughter and to each son, with the exception of his desk and book case, books, and mathematical instruments to his son Thomas. Peter may have felt that his oldest son would need these items most when he took over as family patriarch, or maybe he recognized the interest his son had in the activities served by these objects. Randolph was not yet two when his father wrote the

---

will, so the decision to leave these objects to Thomas had nothing to do with any recognition that the younger son might not take to them.  

Jane’s will differed in that she made bequests only to her unmarried children. She acknowledged the specific needs of those family members in their present lives. To Anna Scott and Randolph she bequeathed slaves, and to Elizabeth, who lived at home, Jane gave items for personal comfort—clothes and a bed. On three other occasions Jane deeded slaves to family members. In 1766 she gave Fany to Mary Bolling, as the deed said, “In & of consideration of the Natural love & affection which I have and so bear unto my Daughter.” In 1770 she deeded Lucy to Jane Barbara Carr and Rachel to Randolph. While there is no easy explanation why Jane gave slaves to Mary or Jane Carr when she did, the explanation for the gift to Randolph may be clearer. Although Randolph was fifteen years old and not yet legal owner of the Fluvanna lands he inherited from his father, Snowdon remained an active plantation run by an overseer and the estate executors during Randolph’s minority. His mother’s deed of the girl Rachel in November 1770 may have been to replace Hannah, who the Snowdon overseer killed in 1770.

---

293 AICWB 2: 32-34.

294 Anna Scott and Randolph did not receive the slaves from Jane’s will, however. Jane wrote her will sometime between January 1, 1772 and September 29, 1773, the date she deeded those same slaves and others to Thomas in payment of a debt. “Jane Jefferson’s slaves deeded to Thomas Jefferson, September 29, 1773,” FB, 8-9. See also MB, 346. Elizabeth died before her mother and so did not receive her mother’s legacy either. Jane’s language in the deed to Mary may be fairly standard language in some deeds, it was not a legal requirement to include it. ACDB 4, 234. Fany had no immediate relation to Nan, who had gone with Mary in 1760, and I can find no special event in Mary’s life that warranted an unusually large gift, unless it was the birth of Jane.
Marriage: Preservation of Family and Social Tool

The marriage partners of the Jefferson children allow us to discuss a number of different strategies for maintaining status and creating and preserving kin networks and social opportunity. Marriage was just one marker of adulthood for the Jefferson children. Of the eight children who reached adulthood, two daughters never married and one married late, a son married late, and two siblings married siblings, who also were first cousins of the Jefferson children. Four of the Jefferson children---only one half---married in a timely fashion, but their ages at marriage are but one part of the story. Two Jefferson daughters, Jane, who died at twenty-six, and Elizabeth, who died at twenty-nine, never married. The youngest daughter, Anna Scott, married late, at the age of thirty-two. Three daughters married in what would have been considered “on time,” Mary at eighteen years of age, Martha at nineteen, and Lucy at sixteen. During the second half of the century women married by about age twenty-two, a figure that had risen in correlation to higher population density and scarcity of land. Of the sons, Thomas married at age twenty-eight and Randolph at twenty-four, at a time most men married in their mid-to-late twenties. Historians have reported a trend between later marriage age for males (such as later twenties) and higher population density, in other words, men married later when there was less nearby land available on which to establish

Bolling, a namesake for Jane Jefferson, in 1766. Jane’s namesake Jane Carr was four years old when the gift of Lucy was made.

Rachel was born about 1768, making her two in 1770. The deed may have transferred ownership without actually changing Rachel’s location for the time being, although Little Sall died in 1774. MB, 177. See also chaps. 4 and 5.
themselves. The two Jefferson boys, however, came into substantial improved lands, ready labor in the form of slaves, and a network of willing associates upon reaching their majority. The fact that they did not marry early cannot be tied to their financial situations.

Two daughters did not marry. The oldest daughter Jane, extolled by her famous brother as lively and witty, never married even though she came with a sizeable dowry of £200 and an estate valued at £114.15.3 in moveable goods. Her estate included three slaves but excluded clothing. She died at age twenty-six and the fashionable state of her wardrobe as listed in her inventory may indicate that she prepared for courtship and had every intention to marry. The value of Jane, Jr.’s estate alone made her wealthier than 55 percent of all decedents in Albemarle County in the colonial period (see chapter 1), and if her cash dowry was added, wealthier than 75 percent. On the other hand, Elizabeth, who had similar personal wealth, may not have been a candidate for a wife due to a mental deficiency, stories about which emerge in family lore.

The Jefferson children found their marriage partners both near and far within Virginia. The three youngest Jefferson children, Lucy, Anna Scott, and Randolph, married nearby, within the range of two to seven miles from home (Figure 7.1). Martha’s partner, Dabney Carr, came from about twenty miles abroad, but visited Shadwell often as a schoolmate of her brother. Mary’s husband, John Bolling, lived about thirty-five miles.

---

295 Kulikoff reports the average age at marriage for women during the second half of the eighteenth century to be 22.2 years. The range for men was from about 25 to 28 years of age, so TJ was on the outside edge of that range. Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves*, 50, 55, 60, especially Table 2.

296 AICWB 2: 227, 233. See chap. 2.
miles hence, and Thomas’s wife dwelt between one-hundred and one-hundred-twenty miles away, depending on whether she resided in Charles City County or Williamsburg when they courted. The associations between the families prior to the marriages reveal other trends. The two who married closest to home, Lucy and Randolph, married siblings who were first cousins of the Jeffersons. Randolph had boarded at the Lewis’ for schooling and thus knew his cousins well. Lucy shared the tutor Benjamin Sneed with her brother and their cousins, but did not board away from home. This was the closest kin to Shadwell, and Jane probably relied quite a bit on her sister Mary and her husband Charles Lewis for both social interaction and family support. The children who married farthest from home gained more status from their spouses than those who stayed close, although each of the children fared reasonably well. While the age of the children at first marriage might suggest some limitations to the Jefferson’s access to socializing events, the socially successful marriages that were distant argue that the Jefferson’s were able to travel, to entertain, and to connect in other ways with people of their own station. The marriages of the Jefferson children indicate strategies for maintaining their place and a general “success” of each match to the Jeffersons’ own status.297

297 These distant ranges are estimates using modern map distances overlaid on the 1751 Fry and Jefferson Map, not accounting for actual distance by foot or road. On schooling, see chap. 2. Kulikoff found the two-mile radius determined the most likely marriage pool among freeholders in Prince George, Maryland, Tobacco and Slaves, 253. In using words like “successful” to talk about these marriages, I am evaluating the partnerships formed with other families to examine the strategies for preserving and maintaining the Jefferson’s connections within Virginia society. Thus, I am gauging the social “value” of the partnership, not whether the pairing meant a companionate mate for the individual, nor whether the mate was free of violent or drunken affliction (as we shall see below), nor any of the other criteria that might make a marriage good or bad from other standpoints. In looking at the failure of a strategy, I am certainly not implying that the marriages were not good ones in the sense that the people were not moral or worthy.
The families of all but one of the children's spouses appeared in earlier exchanges with Peter Jefferson. Both John Bolling, who married Mary, and James Skelton, whose daughter-in-law would become Thomas's wife, subscribed to lots in the speculative town of Beverley that Peter Jefferson recorded in 1751. The families of Martha Wayles (Skelton) Jefferson had numerous opportunities for interaction with Peter. The Bolling and Lewis families also appeared in Peter's account book, and John Carr, father of Dabney Carr, settled an account with Peter's estate in 1760. John Bolling's father's estate, Cobbs, appears on the Fry-Jefferson Map and the elder Jefferson and elder Bolling were burgesses at the same time. Only Hastings Marks had no prior documented business with the senior Jeffersons but he knew other family associates such as the Lewises at Buck Island and family friend Tucker Woodson, and his brothers held offices in Albemarle County. He had some minor interaction with Thomas Jefferson.

---

298 The Wayles and Skelton family connections are many-tiered. Martha Wayles (Skelton) Jefferson was the daughter of John Wayles and Martha Eppes. Wayles married twice more, the third time to Elizabeth Lomax Skelton (daughter of Lunsford Lomax, PJ's surveying colleague), whose first husband was Reuben Skelton. Martha Wayles married Bathurst Skelton, her second stepmother's brother-in-law. Wayles was an executor of Peter Randolph's estate, and so was close friends with one of Jane's first cousins. PJ and Peter Randolph were friends and PJ had a professional connection to Martha's second stepmother through the Lomax family, and to her in-laws, so he likely knew John Wayles. On Beverley Town, see chap. 6.

299 PJAB, 9, 12, 17; JHAB II, 8. James Skelton and Isham Randolph served as magistrates together in Goochland County. "How a Murder was Punished in Colonial Days," Tylers Quarterly Historical & Genealogical Magazine VIII (1927), reprint 1967, 61.

Bolling served Henrico County 1742-1749 and Chesterfield County 1752-1757. In fact, the Bolling-Jefferson association extends past the generation that includes Peter and John, Sr. to Thomas Jefferson, John Bolling, and William Kennon, who all mustered with William Byrd in 1711. Wright and Tinling, Secret Diary of William Byrd, 410, 414, 486. Marks was a witness to Woodson's will, (AlCWB 2: 374); and had occasional business with Monticello during 1774 and years following (MB, 376, 378, ff).
The Jefferson children entered into adulthood with ready wealth and established places in society. Each Jefferson daughter entered the marriage market with a trained servant and a substantial dowry to add to the fortune of whatever husband she found, and was thus extremely desirable as a bride. The two sons brought land and slaves; both daughters and sons brought education and social skills to the matches they made. Both daughters and sons brought the prestige of their father’s public name and the many associates and relations of their father and their mother across Virginia. The children’s marriage partners brought other wealth and connections, although many of them already were within the web that the Jeffersons inhabited. Bolling, Carr, and the two Lewises came into their marriages already well known to the family. Their alliances within the family to other than their own spouse speak of good relationships based on an intellectual and social affinity within this broadening cohort.

Two sisters found husbands whose public profiles matched Peter Jefferson’s and almost Thomas’s. In 1760 Mary married John Bolling, Jr.. She was eighteen and he was twenty-three. There is no mention of where John and Mary courted, but their families clearly knew each other well. This was a triumphant match of families; both were children of burgesses; both came to the marriage with sizable fortunes. The Bollings and Mary’s Randolph grandparents had neighboring lands in Goochland County. Bolling received Mary’s portion of £200 and the slave Nan, valued at £55, from her father’s estate the year they were married. The younger Bolling established himself in Goochland County at Fairfield. He served on the vestry of St. James Northam, as a county magistrate, was elected to the House of Burgesses from Goochland County, and served in the House of Delegates in 1778. Bolling shared interests with Thomas and presumably
with Mary also, in the exchange of seeds and plants and breeding horses. They shared other associations: Bolling’s duty as vestryman put him in the company of Thomas’s close friend and cousin, Thomas Mann Randolph. 300

Martha’s marriage to Dabney Carr rivaled that of Mary and John Bolling as the most triumphant match in terms of the public standing of the spouse. Carr was the son of Major John Carr and his wife Barbara Overton Carr of nearby Louisa County. Before Dabney’s death at the age of thirty, he served as a burgess for Louisa County. His friendship with Thomas Jefferson is legendary. They studied together as boys and at college, shared books, and undertook the duties of similar public office. 301

Thomas himself did not marry until relatively late in his life. His youthful crushes on women in his own social circle had remained unfulfilled, and he engaged seriously in his work at the bar and with politics before marrying. Perhaps only a widow who may have become a worldlier woman would do at this point for the partner of the sophisticated Jefferson. Thomas was twenty-eight when he married the widow Martha Wayles Skelton; she was twenty-three. Her father, John Wayles, had been a lawyer and her first husband, Bathurst Skelton, a colleague of Thomas’s at the College. From her father, Thomas inherited extensive land holdings, 135 slaves, and substantial debt.


301 Almost every TJ biographer includes a brief biography of Dabney Carr who was so important to the young Jefferson. See Malone, *Virginian*, various; or Marie Kimball, esp. 45-47, and various.
Thomas’s wedding is the only one about which we know something of the festivities. His marriage to Martha took place at her father’s house, The Forest, in Charles City County. Other Jefferson children’s weddings were likely also held at the home of the bride. The Jeffersons used the standard Anglican orders of ceremony for other rites such as funerals and, with the possible exception of the Presbyterian Lewises, they all probably married using the Anglican service. Thomas paid the Rev. William Coutts, rector of Martin’s Brandon Parish, for officiating at his wedding, he paid a fiddler, and he made handsome tips to a long list of servants at Martha’s father’s home.302

Two siblings married within the same family, but whether this represents a triumph or failure of social engagement is a matter of speculation. While it may indicate the seizing of social opportunity, it may also illustrate the limited field from which to choose. Lucy married her cousin Charles Lilburne Lewis in 1769 and took her inheritance, which included slaves Catchina and her daughter Phebe. They lived at Monteagle, part of Lewis’s father’s Buck Island estate, about five miles from Shadwell. Buck Island was the home of Mary Randolph and Charles Lewis, Jr., sister and brother-in-law of Jane Randolph Jefferson. Lucy’s husband was the brother of the woman who would eventually marry Lucy’s brother Randolph. The fact that the Lewis family was

302 For other historians on TJ’s courtship of Rebecca Burwell and Martha Wayles Skelton, see Malone, 80-86 155-160, Marie Kimball, 66-72, 174-177.
On the slaves and debts inherited by TJ from his father-in-law, see Stanton, Free Some Day. Malone, 161-165, 441-445. On the inherited debt see, Steven Harold Hochman, Thomas Jefferson: A Personal Financial Biography. Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1987. TJ also paid the same fee to the rector of Westover Parish, the indebted William Davis, who was legally entitled to payment for a marriage in his jurisdiction. Recent scholarship suggests that Davis was not at The Forest and played no role in TJ’s marriage. MB, 285, n.285.
Presbyterian did not seem to matter to the Established church Jeffersons. The proximity of Buck Island created close ties between the families there and at Shadwell. Marriage to cousins was a strategy for strengthening kin networks and keeping wealth within a family. The marriages of these two younger Jeffersons to their cousins occurred in 1769 and 1780, a time when there were more rather than fewer local opportunities for marriage outside the family: the population of Albemarle had almost doubled between Peter Jefferson’s death and 1782. Yet, with an aging mother, unstable crop prices, and a very busy brother instead of a father as their social representative beyond the home, perhaps the pool of worthy suitors seemed smaller to the youngest children.

The last sibling to marry was Anna Scott, Randolph’s twin. Anna Scott’s husband, Hastings Marks, lived about seven miles from Shadwell, close to Thomas’s Monticello holdings. Although Hastings did not hold public office members of his family did. His brothers served as magistrates and sheriff, brother John was on the county’s central committee formed in 1775 to discuss the revolution, and Hastings and his brother John served in the Albemarle militia. Marks was also a family friend of the Lewises at Buck Island. Anna Scott and Hastings never had children (though Anna Scott’s mother bore her last children at age thirty-five). Thomas was in Paris in 1787 when Hastings and Anna Scott married. It took some time for the news to reach him, but when it did he wrote separate letters to the newlyweds offering wishes of joy and happiness and promising his support of their lives together. His letter to Hastings was

303 MB 144, 438. Kulikoff reports that first cousin marriage in Prince George County, Maryland, exceeded one half of all consanguineous marriages, which themselves counted for almost one third of all marriages in the period 1760-1790. Tobacco and Slaves, 252-255, especially Table 29. For population change estimates see chap. 1.
also a formal introduction, since the two had only a passing acquaintance. Thomas claimed to "have good sense" of Marks's "good merit" from their neighborhood associates. In his letter to Hastings he also noted that Mr. Lewis had taken care of the business of seeing that Anna Scott's fortune was transferred to her husband.304

Martha Carr's letter to her brother informing him of Anna Scott's marriage contained cautions about Hastings, however. Anna Scott had lingered at the Lewises and married without consulting her sister Carr with whom she had been living. Martha described Marks's life as "very Irregular" with "little or no fortune," but noted that he was "very capable of book keeping and has been of late extremely industrious." Martha added, "I find compassion added to my tenderness for her," as evidently the younger sister was nervous about invoking the older's disapproval.305 Anna Scott's late marriage to a neighbor of unimpressive financial standing may be the clearest statement that family strategies for marrying well were not in place when she came of age. Her mother died the year she turned twenty-one and her brothers and brothers-in-law were busy with political and military occupations.

The quality of the marriages themselves was something of which the Jefferson siblings were quite aware. Despite earlier indications of a warm relationship between

304 On the Marks brothers, see Woods, 364, 365, 375, 379. Some of TJ's letters suggest that Hastings Marks's brothers were not viewed as upstanding citizens, or else they came to occupy a political camp opposite that of TJ's, but TJ cast no aspersions on Hastings. See for instance, TJ to David Jameson, April 16, 1781, Papers, 5:468-69. TJ to Mrs. Anna Scott Marks, July 12, 1788; and TJ to Hastings Marks, July 12, 1788, Randolph, Domestic Life, 135-136.

305 Martha J. Carr to TJ, December 3, 1787, from Papers, 15:639-40, cited in Merrill, 77.
brothers-in-law John Bolling and Thomas Jefferson, by the late 1790s Bolling’s drinking problem became the topic of letters between family members. All hoped that John would treat Mary well enough and that Mary would bear the trials of an intemperate husband with patience. There were no comments that Bolling was physically abusive. Thomas used the occasion of Mary’s complaints to offer what he called a “sermon” to his daughter on the duties of husbands and wives, stressing that “harmony in the marriage state is the very first object to be aimed at.” The implication followed that Mary needed to learn to “leave [John] in quiet possession” of his views if she did not share those same views. Toleration was her wifely duty, according to her brother. The reservations that Martha may have had about Hastings Marks as Anna Scott’s husband never resurfaced as a topic in family letters – at least not among those that still exist. But the many letters between Thomas and members of Lucy’s family indicate that all the Jefferson’s were aware of the inability of Charles Lilburne Lewis to be financially responsible or instill such principals in his sons. On the other hand, in 1770 Thomas wrote of the household happiness of Dabney Carr, five years into his marriage with Martha. “He speaks, thinks, and dreams of nothing but his young son. This friend of ours...in a very small house, with a table, half a dozen chairs, and one or two servants, is the happiest man in the universe.” Thomas admired Carr’s situation and also his nature, which included the ability to take “every incident in life [and] render it a source of pleasure.”

concerned themselves greatly when a sibling or sibling’s spouse died: they offered company, accommodations, and words of heartfelt support.

Death and Remembrance

In 1771 Thomas wrote plans for a graveyard at the back of his memorandum book. In this emotionally wrought piece he composed an epitaph for his sister Jane who had died six years before at the age of twenty-six. Jane was a favorite of Thomas’s and his sister colored his perceptions of the world well past her death and into his final years. He recalled her singing voice—even in “extreme old age” he said “often in church some sacred air which her sweet voice had made familiar to him in youth recalled to him sweet visions of his sister.” Thomas passed stories about her to his daughters and his grandchildren and even their children heard of the delightful Jane who was “the pride and ornament of her house.” The powerful bonds between this brother and sister transcended time. In his life Thomas Jefferson composed three epitaphs of this scale, for his sister Jane, his boyhood friend and brother-in-law Dabney Carr, and for his own wife Martha Jefferson.

Thomas envisioned a graveyard as part of his plans for his own house and grounds at Monticello. This act of establishing a burial ground and thinking about his favorite sister’s place in it connected the old home and the new, just as it connected the living and the dead. Thomas noted that his brother-in-law John Bolling had planted cedar trees at Shadwell near the grave of one of his children there, and cedars figure

307 See MB, 245-50; also cited in, GB, 25-27. The Victorian sentiment of Sarah Randolph overshadows TJ’s messages about his sister, but the heart of the stories passed on nonetheless. Randolph, Domestic Life, 34, 38-39.
prominently in Thomas’s later plans for the Monticello burial ground. The timing of Thomas Jefferson’s thoughts about a burial ground are intriguing. Entered following a legal account December 21, 1771, they are on the eve of his marriage, January 1, 1772, a mere ten days later. Perhaps the excitement about changing his household brought on this reverie about the home he was creating and the people in his childhood home who were important to him. His companion Jane would never meet his companion Martha.

The Jeffersons regarded the formality of funerals as part of their duty to both the living and the dead. They established a family burial ground at Shadwell for the immediate and extended family’s use there. Of the burial ground at Monticello Thomas specified, “one half to the use of my own family; the other of strangers, servants &c.” The family burial ground at Shadwell occupies a small knoll southwest of the main house, now planted in cedars, with many unmarked graves and others marked with fieldstones. On his 1799 survey of farm fields at Shadwell, Thomas labeled the graveyard area “cedars” and indicated that it was not part of the cultivated land there (Figure 1.3). Burials that likely occurred at Shadwell include Peter Jefferson, an unnamed Bolling child, Jane Jr., Dabney Carr, Elizabeth and the slave called Little Sall who died with her, and other slaves and colleagues who died while at Shadwell and whose names are lost to time. There are no gravestones with inscriptions for anyone who was buried at Shadwell.308

308 MB, 246. Limited archaeological research on the burial ground at Shadwell revealed a number of unmarked nineteenth-century burials, and others marked with fieldstones, and a single early twentieth-century burial with fieldstones marking the head and foot. There was evidence of earlier use, but those burials were not excavated. See Kern, “Report on a Burial Ground at Shadwell.” See also chaps. 2 and 5 on Elizabeth’s and Little Sall’s deaths.
We have already visited Peter Jefferson's funeral and how it required participation from the various parts of the Jefferson's social world. Fewer details are available regarding other family funerals. There are no records of Isham Randolph's funeral—he was buried at Turkey Island—but his epitaph remains. Isham was remembered as a gentleman, “steady of heart” to “justice probity & honour” and “meriting an universal esteem.” There is no record of where the family buried Jane Rogers Randolph. The Shadwell generation left no stone epitaphs until Thomas developed his Monticello burial ground. To the memory of a lost child, John and Mary Bolling planted trees, investing also in improving the landscape of the Shadwell burial ground. There is no record of Jane Jr.'s cause of death, burial, or funeral in 1765, only her brother's idealized memorial six years later. He wrote in Latin, “Ah, Joanna, best of all girls. Ah, torn away from the bloom of vigorous age. May the earth be light upon you. Farewell, forever and ever.” Perhaps he always wished to improve upon the circumstances of the Shadwell burial ground. Jane's inscription echoes an epitaph written by the poet William Shenstone, and literary sources remained an important source for other memorials Thomas composed.309

309 Peter’s funeral embodied the traditions of public funerals in Virginia, see chap. 6. The Rev. Peter Fontaine, who also died in 1757 requested the opposite. He wrote that his “will and desire is to have no public funeral, but that my corpse may be accompanied to the ground by a few of my nearest neighbors, that no liquors be given to make any of the company drunk,” which he called “the great scandal of the Christian religion.” He requested that “none of my family go in mourning for me.” Peter Fontaine, “Extracts from his last Will,” in Fontaine, Memoirs of a Huguenot Family, 354-355. VMHB XIV, 3 (1907), 226.

On Jane Jr.'s epitaph, see MB, 245-250, quotation translation, 247, 247n. Douglas Wilson notes the likeness of TJ's verse to one by Shenstone. Although TJ did not include Shenstone in his Literary Commonplace Book (LCB), this book was his source for other epitaphs. In his LCB he copied pieces of text that appealed to him for
Thomas's ideas for a burial ground would be put to use two years after his sister Jane's death. Thomas began his graveyard at Monticello in May 1773 upon the death of Dabney Carr. Carr died while he and Martha were visiting Shadwell. Thomas returned from Williamsburg and moved Carr's body to the mountaintop according to their boyhood pact that whoever survived would bury the other beneath their favorite oak tree on Monticello mountain. Thomas invested great emotional content in the inscription for Carr's grave marker, which reads:

Here lie the remains of Dabney Carr  
Son of John and Barbara Carr of Louis County, Va.  
Intemarried July 20, 1765, with Martha Jefferson,  
Daughter of Peter and Jane Randolph Jefferson  
Born October 26, 1743 — Died May 16, 1773, at Charlottesville, Va.  

Lamented Shade!  
Whom every gift of heaven profusely blest,  
A temper winning mild, nor pity softer,  
Nor was truth more bright; Constant in doing  
Well, he neither sought nor shunned applause,  
No bashful merit sighed near him neglected;  
Sympathising he wiped off the tear from sorrow's clouded eye  
And with kindly hand taught her heart to smile.  
To his virtue, good sense, learning and friendship,  
This stone is dedicated by Thomas Jefferson,  
Who of all men loved him most.310

their literary, poetical, or moral lesson. See Wilson, *Jefferson's Literary Commonplace Book*, 9, 12, 12n.

310 The story of TJ disintering his friend's body in honor of their "boyhood pact" is repeated in the earliest TJ biographies. GB, 40-43, Randall, *Jefferson I*: 83; Randolph, *Domestic Life*, 45. TJ draft notes Mallet’s *Excursion* as the source for Carr’s inscription. As reprinted in Randolph, *Domestic Life*, 47. Douglas Wilson notes TJ’s inclusion of poetry by Mallet, Pope, and Ossian as the sources for the verses he chose for memorials. Wilson, LCB, 9, 132-3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Thomas’s draft also included directions for a copper plate to be fixed to a tree at the foot of Carr’s grave that would read:

Still shall thy grave with rising flowers be dressed  
And the green turf lie lightly on thy breast;  
There shall the morn her earliest tears bestow,  
There the first roses of the year shall blow,  
While angels with their silver wings o’ershade  
The ground now sacred by thy reliques made.\(^\text{311}\)

Except for a sermon by the Rev. Charles Clay, there is no mention of whether Carr’s funeral included public fanfare or the dispensing of drink to kin, slaves, and visitors. It is also unclear whether Clay spoke at Carr’s interment at Shadwell or at Monticello.

The Jeffersons expected formal preaching at their funerals and likely followed the protocol of the Anglican “Order for the Burial of the Dead.” Family associations with the preachers were as important as church associations in the hiring of ministers for these occasions. James Maury spoke at Peter Jefferson’s funeral. Thomas paid Clay for “[preaching] Mr. Carr’s funeral Sermon.” Clay was rector of St. Anne’s Parish in Albemarle and a lifelong friend of Thomas’s. The family chose him over Rev. William Douglas, the rector of Carr’s home parish St. James Northam, who had baptized Carr’s children there. Mr. Clay also preached at the funerals of Elizabeth in 1774 and Jane in 1776, although Elizabeth and Jane lived in Fredericksville Parish, not Clay’s St. Anne’s. Jane, like Dabney, was laid to rest at Monticello, in Clay’s parish. There is no record to suggest that Elizabeth was buried other than at Shadwell, even though Thomas had begun his Monticello graveyard the year before her death. Thomas took on the paternal role of arranging funerals for his nearby family members. When Martha Jefferson Carr died at

\(^{311}\) As reprinted in Randolph, Domestic Life, 47.
Monticello in 1811, Thomas hired Charles Wingfield to officiate at the funeral. Wingfield was related by marriage to the Jeffersons. As he lay dying, Thomas thought he heard someone mention the Rev. Mr. Hatch, rector of the Episcopal Church Thomas attended. Thomas remarked “I have no objection to see him, as a kind and good neighbor,” which his grandson knew to mean that Thomas did not care to be attended by a clergyman. In the end, Hatch presided over Thomas’s burial.312

Thomas Jefferson began the Monticello graveyard to honor his companion Dabney Carr. Carr was joined by Jane Jefferson three years later. Jane died in the morning on March 31, 1776 and Thomas chose to bury her at Monticello rather than at Shadwell. Her son Thomas wrote to his friend William Randolph later that spring that his mother, also Randolph’s aunt, died “after an illness of not more than an hour. We suppose it to have been apoplectic.” To his mother’s memory, Thomas erected a stone inscribed:

“Jane Randolph, wife of Peter Jefferson. Born in London 1720 – Died at Monticello 1776.” Thomas distilled her life down to these simple and important bits of information. Her birth name was Randolph and she had been the wife of Peter Jefferson. She was born in London and she died at Monticello. Thus her identity as a wife and the name of her husband bonded her life to his. Her birth overseas—and in the capital of commerce and power—must have been important to her or to Thomas for him to decide it was one of the compelling parts of her identity, more important, in fact, than the month and day of

312 MB, 370-371. Douglas Register, 168. Wingfield was the brother-in-law of Martha’s and Thomas’s sister Lucy and brother Randolph, married to Elizabeth Lewis, sister of Charles Lilburne Lewis and Anne Jefferson Lewis. Wingfield also officiated at the burial of family friend William Mortimer Harrison who drowned in the Rivanna River in 1812 and was buried at Monticello. MB, 1279. Malone, 1: 498.
her birth and death. That she died at Monticello may mean she lived with her son during her final days, or that Thomas now considered Shadwell part of Monticello, or, that he considered his mother part of his Monticello family. Rev. Clay preached the half-hour sermon at her burial on the sixth of April in the Monticello graveyard, and Thomas joined two loved ones from his past to his future at Monticello.\[^{313}\]

Death was a time for family to support one another and the Jeffersons rose to this challenge. When Dabney Carr died, Thomas invited Martha and her children to live at Monticello, which they did from time to time. Martha Carr and Elizabeth Eppes (Martha Jefferson’s half sister) were with Thomas when Martha Jefferson died. Thomas’s sister figures prominently in the deathbed scene as the one strong enough to shepherd the inconsolable Thomas during his grief. “A moment before the closing scene, he was led from the room in a state of insensibility by his sister, Mrs. Carr, who, with great difficulty, got him into the library, where he fainted.” Martha Carr and Elizabeth Eppes

\[^{313}\]TJ to Wm. Randolph. C. June 1776, MB, 415, 415, n. 76. See also chap. 2. In his Farm Book, TJ certainly distinguished between the various farms and specified Shadwell and other outlying fields as distinct from Monticello in his census of slaves and crop rolls. Perhaps this identity was not as clear in TJ’s mind in 1773 when he used “Charlottesville” as the place of Dabney Carr’s death. See Carr’s epitaph, above.

There are no other details about Jane Jefferson’s funeral. Clay used a general funeral sermon during the years 1775 and 1776 at the funerals of Jane and at least seven others. The text of the sermon and those for whom he used it he listed in his notebook, now in the possession of the Virginia Historical Society. The sermon offers no personal details about Jane (or any of the others), only Clay’s take on scriptural references to Judgment Day. MSS 1C5795a12, copy in file of Monticello Research Department. The half-hour is roughly the time taken to read aloud the sermon, not accounting for whatever dramatic embellishments Clay may have added. On 11 Apr. 1777, TJ recorded: “Td. Mr. Clay for preaching my mother’s funeral sermon 40/.” MB, 444. See also chap. 2 for the physical relationships of the burials. The mourning ring TJ purchased in Philadelphia later that year may have been to commemorate Jane, MB, 422 (I thank Bill Barker for pointing out this reference).
“remained constantly with him for some weeks,” as did daughter Martha who wrote of her father’s reaction to his wife’s death. In addition to the sisters, the bedside was visited by a number of the Monticello house servants, people who may have known Martha Jefferson from the day she was born, whom she had grown up with, and who had come to the Jeffereons from John Wayles. The grief of the household seems to have eclipsed any record of Martha Jefferson’s funeral, which may have been as private as Thomas kept their correspondence.

Martha Carr died in the early fall 1811 of “a wasting complaint which has for two or three years been gaining upon her.” Thomas’s epitaph to his sister was in the form of a letter to Randolph. He wrote: “She had the happiness, and it is a great one, of seeing all her children become worthy and respectable members of society and enjoying the esteem of all.” Randolph replied that he was “extremely sorry to hear of My sisters death and Would of bin over but it was not raly in My power but it is What we may all expect to come to either later or sooner.” Martha Carr was probably closest of the surviving siblings to her brother Thomas, and he showed real interest in her and in the lives of her children. Thomas buried his sister with her husband Dabney and inscribed her grave stone simply, “Martha Jefferson, Wife of Dabney Carr, Born May 29, 1746 – Died Sept. 3, 1811.” Evidently her role as wife of her brother’s best friend was more important to

---

314 For the relationships of the Wayles and Eppes families, see Malone, I: Appendix I.D., 432-433. Edmund Bacon, a Monticello overseer, reported hearing that Betty Brown, Sally, Critta, and Betty Hemings, Nance, and Ursula were in the room. There may have been other house servants there also. Bacon himself was not yet employed by TJ when Martha Jefferson died, see Bear, Jefferson at Monticello, 99-100.
her identity, at least in her brother’s eyes, than where she was born, lived, or died, or the
children she bore.315

When Hastings Marks died in 1812, Thomas reported in a letter to Randolph, that
he “sent for our sister as soon as she could leave that neighborhood.” Anna Scott came to
Monticello but remained in “very low health...scarcely able to walk about the house.”
She lived at Monticello the rest of her life, well loved, despite occasional complaints
from great nieces and nephews that she meddled in their business. Shortly before his
death, Thomas added a codicil to his will recommending his daughter Martha look after
“my well-beloved sister, Anne Scott,” he added, “[I] trust confidently that from affection
to her, as well as for my sake, she will never let her want a comfort.” Martha Randolph
took her grandmother’s Bible and added, “A.S. died at Monticello,” and the date, and she
added the date to the record her father started in his Prayer Book.316 Anna Scott, the last
of the Shadwell generation, was not buried at Monticello, however, and perhaps joined
her husband at whatever family or church cemetery contained his grave.

Three other siblings were also buried elsewhere. When Mary Bolling died in
1804, she may have been buried with John at Chestnut Grove or one of the other family
plantations. Lucy died in Kentucky in 1810 and was buried on her son’s plantation there.

315 TJ to RJ, Sept. 6, 1811, Brother, 26; RJ to TJ, Oct. 6, 1811, Brother, 27.
“Inscriptions on Gravestones in the Monticello Graveyard,” in George Green
Shackelford, ed., Collected Papers to Commemorate Fifty Years of the Monticello
Association of the Descendants of Thomas Jefferson, Princeton: Monticello Association,
1965, 253. In contrast, the inscriptions on his own daughters’ gravestones included the
names of their parents, Thomas Jefferson and Martha Wayles, and the dates they married
their husbands. Martha’s also included that she died at Edgehill, her home. “Inscriptions
on Gravestones,” 252.

Her family reported to Thomas Jefferson of their “irreparable loss” of the “best of mothers, and sister. Her remains was entered the twenty eighth on a high emmenence, in view of that majestic river the Ohio.” Randolph’s death brought his twin sister Anna Scott and likely his brother to Snowdon for his final illness, death, and burial there in 1815. There are no other details about their funerals.

Thomas Jefferson, who composed epitaphs for friends and family, also designed his own burial marker and the inscription that was to go on it. He specified that his marker should “be of the coarse stone of which my columns are made, that no one might be tempted hereafter to destroy it for the value of the materials.” The simple forms would also deter vandals: “a plain die or cube of three feet without any mouldings, surmounted by an obelisk of six feet height, each of a single stone.” The obelisk would bear a listing of three of his triumphs, “not a word more.”

Here was buried
Thomas Jefferson,
Author of the Declaration of American Independence,
Of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom,
And Father of the University of Virginia.

The die would read: “Born April 2, 1743, O.S. – Died July 4, 1826.” Thomas used old-style dates on one other burial marker, that of his wife. Her gravestone read, “Martha Jefferson, Daughter of John Wayles and Martha Eppes, Born October 19th, 1748, O.S., Intermarried with Thomas Jefferson, January 1st, 1772,

317 Martha C. Lewis, Lucy B. Lewis, Ann M. Lewis (written by Charles L. Lewis) to T.J. September 17, 1810, Merrill, 218. Mayo speculates that Randolph was buried at Snowdon although there is no marked burial there. Brother, Introduction, 5.
Torn from him by death September 6th, 1782.” Specifying “O.S.” here is even more curious in that her October birth date was unaffected by the change made to the calendar in 1752. Thomas did not use old style for any of the other dates that fell before 1752, such as Dabney Carr’s, also in October, his sister Martha’s, in May of 1746, or his mother’s, where he put simply the year of her birth. Perhaps it was an attempt to evoke more history in the inscription of a date; perhaps it was Thomas’s attempt to summon eleven more days to his and his wife’s lives.

Family members Jefferson Randolph, Nicholas P. Trist, and Martha Jefferson Randolph, his servant Burwell, and possibly slaves Joe Fosset and John Hemings attended Thomas at his deathbed. Thomas requested that his burial be private, “without parade,” and his family made no public invitations. He was buried July 5, 1826, borne from his house by slaves, accompanied by family to the Monticello graveyard. A friend who visited Monticello on the fourth wrote to his wife nearby, “His remains will be buried tomorrow at 5 o’clock P.M. No invitations will be given, all coming will be welcome at the grave.” The Reverend Mr. Hatch performed the rites of the Episcopal Church at his interment, which was attended by students from the University of Virginia and many neighbors who came to pay their respects.

“Jane Jefferson – Her Booke”

In 1772, two years following the fire that destroyed the family home, Jane Jefferson inscribed the birth dates and locations for each of her children on the verso of

---


the title page of a Bible (Figure 7.2). On the facing page she wrote “Jane Jefferson Her Booke – Sept. 6th[1772]” (Figure 7.3). She followed a tradition of recording family history and inaugurated a book in which descendants would follow her example and ultimately invoke five generations - two centuries’ worth - of people to remember. She may have reconstructed the contents of a document that was lost in the house fire or she may have begun anew. Either way, she wanted to provide a record of her family for her descendants. She chose to write her family history in a Bible, an object that bears meaning as a religious document and that often becomes an important artifact in a family because of association with a previous owner or for inscriptions inside it. The treatment of the book by her heirs indicates that it was all of these things to them.320

Jane commenced the use of a Bible for her family record. Her husband and her son used other media, but with the same result: a working document that recorded and preserved the names of family members. Peter recorded the family of his friend and father-in-law Isham Randolph and his wife Jane Rogers on a sheet of paper. Thomas later bound his mother’s Bible, the genealogy his father wrote, and a family Prayer Book into a single volume that he kept at Monticello. He also had his own Prayer Book, in which he copied his mother’s genealogy and recorded his children with his wife Martha. All of these documents, Jane’s Bible, the paper Peter inscribed, and Thomas’s Prayer Book survive because first Thomas, then his daughter, then her heirs kept and curated

320 This section of this chapter is extracted from a longer exploration of Jane’s Bible, see Appendix III: “Jane Jefferson-Her Booke: Jefferson Family History and Bibliography,” which includes complete transcriptions of the Jeffersons’ notations. See also “Jefferson Family, Bible.”
them. They are meaningful to this story of the Jeffersons because of both their content and their treatment as artifacts.\textsuperscript{321}

What the family recorded and how they entered their family history in these books invokes questions about both dating the records and about the events that prompted various Jeffersons to make these records. The action of writing the dates important to a family is a way of recording past events, but it also insures that future generations will know the history: the act is for both the present and the future members of a family. The primary act of writing in these books states ownership, however temporary and fleeting it may be. Jane Jefferson wrote her name and the date in her Bible in 1772, four years before her death and the passing of the book to son Thomas. Thomas added his marks his mother’s book after he had it rebound. Thomas’s heirs added their names as they received the book.

Jane wrote her family history at one time: the handwriting, the ink, the pen are of a piece. Entries were not written as each child was born, or as two infant boys died. Jane inscribed the words “New Style” after Lucy’s 1752 birth date, further evidence that this was written by someone who was elderly in 1772 and still more familiar with what was by then “old style” to most people. Jane’s list of her children with Peter follows the formula he used in recording the children of Isham and Jane Randolph. Jane entered both the date and place of her children’s births. She had the first four at Shadwell, the next

\textsuperscript{321} The book has inscriptions by four generations of Jeffersons, and contains the family history of five generations, from Isham Randolph born in 1687 to Septimia Randolph Meikleham, who died in 1887.
four at Tuckahoe, and the twins at Shadwell. The only deaths Jane recorded here were
for the two boys born at Tuckahoe who died soon after birth. Below the list of Randolph
children, Peter wrote the birth and death dates for Isham, that Isham was 56 years old,
and the birth date for his mother-in-law Jane.322 Below her list Jane wrote the birth and
death dates for her husband and noted: “in the 50th: Year of his Age.” She wrote her
own birth date below that. On the next line Thomas then added the death date of his
oldest sister Jane, who had died in 1765. Randolph wrote the next line, recording
Elizabeth’s death in January 1773, and adding some awkward curlique-like scrawls after
his dutiful record, perhaps revealing his discomfort with this role.323 The penultimate
addition to the page was Thomas Jefferson recording his mother’s death, completing the

322 Jane Rogers Randolph died sometime between December 5, 1760, the date of
her will, and July 21, 1761, the date her will was proved in Goochland County court.

323 The date of Elizabeth’s death remains in question, but it is certainly not in
January 1773. Randolph is perhaps the source of his brother’s “error,” noted by
historians, of the discrepancy of Elizabeth Jefferson’s date of death. In his memorandum
books, Thomas reported that his sister “was found” February 24, 1774, but his Prayer
Book has the January 1, 1773 date because he copied it from his brother’s notation in
their mother’s Bible following his acquisition of the book after her death in 1776, MB,
370. (Malone noted the discrepancy, 430-431.) Perhaps the January 1 date is correct and
Randolph meant to write the year as “1774” but the turn of the year caused him to
miswrite it. Jane wrote her will that included a bequest to Elizabeth sometime between
Jan. 1, 1772 and Sept. 29, 1773, when she deeded slaves, including Little Sall, to her son
Thomas. So Little Sall and Elizabeth were still alive in the fall of 1773. The slaves that
Jane deeded to Thomas in September 1773 are all listed in the record he began January
14, 1774 as his Farm Book, except for Little Sall, FB, 7. This could be because Elizabeth
and Little Sall disappeared in January and their bodies were not found until late February,
or it could indicate that Thomas respected his sister’s need for Little Sall and thus did not
include her in his Farm Book list. The fact that Elizabeth was not buried until March 7,
1774, twelve days after she was “found,” may indicate an unusual circumstance. Perhaps
she and Little Sall had been missing for two months or perhaps the ground was too frozen
or the weather bad enough to prevent a burial. TJ recorded a flood on March 6, “higher
than the one which carried N.Lewis’s bridge away,” MB, 370.
line where his mother wrote her birth date. The very last entry was by Martha Jefferson Randolph, who added the tiny “A.S. died at Monticello July 8, 1828,” on the line with Anna Scott’s birth record.

Peter Jefferson gave Thomas a Prayer Book in 1753. Thomas began using the Prayer Book to register the important events of his own family in 1772 when daughter Martha was born. With her birth he began the record of his family on the recto of the blank flyleaf at the back of the book. He did not follow quite the same formula that his parents used and his entries were not written at one time. Each entry about Thomas and Martha’s children has an immediacy that no other pages have, and only the pages with the births of his daughter’s children come close. There are six separate lines that record the arrival dates and also the time each Jefferson child was born. Then, with the exception of Martha who outlived him, Jefferson recorded the deaths of his children and of their mother, including the time of day. Elsewhere in his Prayer Book, Jefferson recorded the page about his parents’ family in one sitting, just as his mother did in her Bible, and perhaps he even copied his page from hers. He did this on or just after March 31, 1776, the day his mother died. He later added the date of his youngest sister’s

324 This assessment is based on the appearance of the ink, pen weight, and hand on this page. The first four lines are the same and would date to on or after September 27, 1772 (1:00 a.m.) as TJ recorded his daughter’s birth. It is possible (but unlikely based on their temporal proximity) that scientific analysis of the ink’s composition and penetration into the paper could refine these entries as having been made separately, following Thomas and Martha’s marriage in January 1772, and following the birth of Martha later that year.

325 TJ did not record the day of the month or the time of death of Jane, who may have died while Jefferson was in Philadelphia in 1775. For Lucy, who died in 1784 while he was in France, he recorded only the year. The date of his mother’s death was the latest date of Thomas’s first campaign of writing on the page.
marriage in 1788 and perhaps he added the months and days to the years of his other
siblings' marriages as well, but Thomas never recorded dates of his brother Randolph's
two marriages in 1780 or 1809. Jefferson's daughter Martha added the dates of his and
Anna Scott's deaths in 1826 and 1828 respectively, but the deaths of Thomas's siblings
Mary (1804), Martha (1811), and Lucy (1810) were never recorded here. Anna Scott
lived at Monticello after the death of her husband late in 1811, thus her death was more
immediate to housemate Martha Randolph. Like that of his own parents' family,
Jefferson entered the pages about his wife Martha's family in one sitting too. He
established this book as the formal repository for the history of his and Martha's lives
together.

When his mother died, Thomas Jefferson recorded her date of death in her Bible,
completing the line that she began by recording her name and birthday. Her passing may
have put the book in his keeping and his acquisition of the book prompted him to then
copy her history of the family into his own Prayer Book as part of his own family record.
His list of their family differs from hers in a number of ways. Jane recorded the locations
of her children's births, and that it was Wednesday, August 17, 1757, when her husband
died. Thomas dropped the locations but added the marriage dates of his siblings, part of
their current instead of their past lives. When he wrote in her book, Thomas followed his
mother's example and added her date of death and recorded that March 31st, 1776, was a
Sunday, but he did not enter the day of the week in his own book's record. In his own
Prayer Book, Thomas recorded his own birthday as April 2, 1743, the old style calendar
date, but did not designate old and new style dates like his mother did. He did, however,
note that his birth date was old style on the page where he began the history of his life with wife Martha.

Thomas's Prayer Book was available to an early biographer of Thomas Jefferson, Henry S. Randall. Randall copied Jefferson's chart of the births, marriages, and deaths of his siblings in his 1858 publication. Randall's work is the closest record to a Jefferson family oral history: many of his stories came from interviews and correspondence with Jefferson's grandchildren. Randall mentions the Prayer Book again in his biography in the section on "Jefferson's Religious Views." Randall reported that when Jefferson attended the Episcopal Church "he always carried his prayer-book, and joined in the responses and prayers of the congregation." He added: "The well worn copy he carried in his pocket when he rode to church is in the possession of his youngest grandson --- the 15th Psalm copied on a blank leaf in his own hand, in a different version from the one we have seen him usually quoting." This is only approximately correct, but close enough to leave little doubt that Thomas's Prayer Book was used in its intended manner - as a Prayer Book, that is - enough to be witnessed by family members.326

There was another family Prayer Book at Shadwell, which Thomas later bound with Jane's Bible. The Shadwell Prayer Book is highly worn and well-thumbed. It is the only artifact that speaks of childhood in the Jefferson household. A young Randolph Jefferson used it for writing practice. It bears his repeated sentences and scribbles practicing script with a pen on various pages, including a sort of test inscribing

---

326 Randall, Jefferson I, 17; III, 555 and n. 555. The Prayer Book does contain an alternate version of two verses of a Psalm, copied into a margin by Thomas Jefferson, only it is the eighteenth and not the fifteenth Psalm with which Jefferson concerned himself.
"Randolph" and "Jefferson" near the top of the first page in the manner that other, older, family members showed their ownership of books. These are not the scribbles of a young child (Randolph was two when his father died), but may be the post-fire grammar exercises of a fourteen-year-old boy. This Prayer Book was in the Shadwell house during Randolph's later schoolboy days. In October 1771 at age sixteen he left for the College of William and Mary. Randolph's notes do not preclude the book from being at Shadwell prior to Peter Jefferson's death, but they do put its active presence in the household about the time of or just after the house fire.

Biographers of Thomas Jefferson have known from his own autobiography that he was born at Shadwell, in what is now Albemarle County, Virginia. The birthplaces of Jefferson's two older sisters and when the family moved to Shadwell, and later, to Tuckahoe and back to Shadwell, have been long-standing questions. When Randall cites Thomas's Prayer Book in his biography of Jefferson, he says nothing about the birthplaces of Jefferson's siblings. The University of Virginia acquired the Bible with Jane's inscriptions in 1954, so it was not available to Randall, or to Marie Kimball or Dumas Malone for their influential biographies of Thomas Jefferson; they too, cite Thomas's Prayer Book. In Thomas's own autobiography he wrote of his father: "He was

327 For the location and content of Randolph's notations, see Appendix III.

328 Randolph turned fifteen the October following the Shadwell fire. Philip Fithian remarked that Robert Carter's younger son and nephew at the age of fourteen read in English grammar. Hunter Dickinson Farish, ed., Journal and Letters of Philip Vickers Fithian: A Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion, 1773-1774 (Williamsburg, 1957; reprint, Charlottesville, 1968), 26. I thank Lou Powers for suggesting this as a source for determining the education levels of children at various ages.
the third or fourth settler, about the year 1737, of the part of the country in which I live.” Malone dismissed this date out of hand as being too early. Jane’s inscription tells us that she and Peter indeed moved to Shadwell by June 27, 1740 when Jane, Jr. was born there, and probably they moved some months before June to avoid traveling late in Jane’s pregnancy. Perhaps they came within days of their marriage on October 3, 1739. The family moved to Tuckahoe in time for Jane to give birth to Martha there, May 29, 1746. They returned to Shadwell following the birth of Lucy in October 1752. The activities in Peter Jefferson’s account book suggest that August 1753 marked their return home.329

Not only is this family information important, but the inscription casts new light upon Jane Jefferson and her role as a family historian and keeper of her children’s legacy. The historiography of Jane Randolph Jefferson has not included an image of a woman who carefully wrote out her family history and ensured her family’s legacies.330 Her son Thomas then became steward of her book and the history it held. He saw that it was rebound and maintained. He not only kept the book, he fulfilled the duty of completing the family history in it. Jane’s Bible and his Prayer Book were in his library on his death and about two months later his daughter Martha claimed them and continued their legacy as important family artifacts. It appears as if she then chose to ensure that the family

---

329 Randall, Jefferson I: 17. Malone noted “Jefferson’s statement...is approximately correct if applied to the Rivanna district; but the date which he give, about 1737, seems too early.” Malone, Jefferson I: n. 39, p. 18. October 3 to June 27 is a statistically perfect gestation period of 267 days. See Neiman, “Coincidence or Causal Connection?” 201. See also, PJAB.

330 The historiography of Jane Randolph Jefferson has not included an image of a woman who carefully wrote out her family history and ensured her family’s legacies. See chap. 2.
history remained in the family and spread through it as she dispersed the books among her heirs.

Jane’s Bible provides important information from the inscriptions, but the physical artifact offers a counterpoint to its particular history. Its rebinding, missing parts, and the condition of the four items within the volume all add to the historical information to be gained from it. One generation of this family used the paper in each part to record family history and to practice grammar and writing. Thomas Jefferson kept the books, bound them together, and used the information for his own history of the family. Two subsequent generations wrote their names in the volume and its 1861 owner clearly used it as a tool for religious instruction. Their descendants valued the book enough as an artifact, with Jefferson connections no less, to give it to the University of Virginia’s growing Jefferson collection. Jane Jefferson’s Booke provides new details about who in the Jefferson family were keepers of history, keepers of books, and keepers of its important legacy.

Kin Networks: Beyond Shadwell

In 1787 Thomas Jefferson wrote an affectionate and newsy letter to his sister Mary Bolling. He was in Paris responding to a letter that she wrote him with news about her family: he offered news of his daughters who were then in France, and remarked on aging and the importance of family. In this letter Thomas expressed a number of sentiments about his relationships with siblings. “As I grow older,” he wrote, “I love those most whom I loved first,” and, “we often write seldomest to those whom we love
most.” He lamented the news that Mary and John Bolling were moving to Chestnut Grove, “as it will prevent my seeing you as often as would be practicable at Lickinghole.” But Thomas took solace in the fact that Mary’s son Jack moved into his inheritance at Lickinghole with his new family and would still accommodate the family’s visits there. Thomas told Mary to extend his regard to “my nephews and nieces(sic) of your fire side.” He ended his letter, “be assured of the sincere love with which I am, dear sister, your affectionate brother, Th: Jefferson.”

There is ample evidence that the children of Peter and Jane Jefferson kept in close contact and regarded each other highly in the years after both elder Jeffersons were gone. Peter and Jane worked to build the Shadwell estate, the trained workforce, and the social and family relationships that the children inherited: that much we have already seen. The elder Jeffersons left not only a legacy of attention to legal details and knowledge of family history, but a tradition of involved and affectionate communication.

The middle of the eighteenth century—when Jane and Peter created and nurtured their family—saw the growth of kin-based networks in Virginia. These networks often functioned locally for poorer folks and provided farther-ranging connections for the elite. Kin networks provided opportunity and support within a group as parents to children, as siblings, and as cousins and more-distant relations. The Jeffersons show that responsibility among kin underpinned many of their family’s activities. Peter Jefferson appears to have had a fond relationship with his in-laws, Isham Randolph and Jane’s

---

331 TJ to Mary Jefferson Bolling, July 23, 1787, Papers 11, 612-613. This was some years before the letters noting John Bolling’s drinking excesses and the problems that caused.
Randolph cousins, for whom he served in various capacities as estate executor and
guardian to children. Jane and Peter revealed their duty to cousins when they removed
their entire family from Shadwell to Tuckahoe to help see the young Randolphs to
adulthood. For Jane that meant company while her husband was away on some of his
surveying expeditions: wives often stayed with relations when husbands were absent
from the plantation. Visiting served both social needs and strengthened the kin-based
web-building.\textsuperscript{332}

Visits among family also reveal something about its intergenerational
relationships. Peter and Jane Jefferson’s children spent time at Shadwell with their own
families during the years Jane still lived. The grandchildren of Mary and John Bolling
and the grandchildren of Martha and Dabney Carr visited Shadwell and their
grandmother there. Both Lucy and her husband Charles Lewis and Thomas and his wife
Martha Jefferson lived nearby when they began their families and likely brought them to
Shadwell also. There is not a record of Jane’s mother, Jane Rogers Randolph visiting
with her grandchildren at Shadwell or at Dungeness where she died in 1765; however,
Jane Randolph persisted in family lore as “stern and strict” and must have been known by
them. At least two of the Jefferson children returned to Shadwell during periods of
extreme difficulty in their lives. Mary and John Bolling buried a child at Shadwell and

\textsuperscript{332}In tracing the stabilization of the Chesapeake family after the precarious
mortality rates of the seventeenth century, Daniel Blake Smith notes that “an elaborate
cousinry developed, which offered important marital, economic, and — at least among the
elite—political opportunities.” Smith, however, presents evidence that men rarely had
strong ties to their in-laws. \textit{Inside the Great House}, see chapter 5, quotation 177, also
188, 190, 196. See also my chap. 3.
Martha and Dabney Carr were there when Dabney died in 1773. The record does not tell us that Mary returned home for help nursing her sick child, or that Martha and Dabney were there because of Dabney’s illness, but we know they were there. Peter and Jane established a family that would know its extended members: grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, and they relied on each other well into later years.

The Jefferson siblings also visited each other. Thomas called the 1787 news that Mary and John Bolling were leaving nearby Lickinghole to move to Chestnut Grove a “misfortune to myself.” He went on to say, “It is still a greater loss to my sister Carr.” Martha Carr, a widow living between Monticello and her own home in Goochland, relied on the companionship of this nearby sister more than Thomas did. Visits were news between the siblings and added social pressure to others to join in the visit. Thomas wrote to Randolph: “Our sister Marks arrived here last night and we shall be happy to see you also.” In May 1813 Randolph told Thomas to tell “My sister Marks” that “We shall be extreemly happy to see her hear” at Snowdon. In June Randolph wrote again and said that he and his wife expected Marks over the summer. Marks visited her twin again in April 1815, when she was well but he was “Extreemly Week...and Scarce able to Walk.” Her visit may have been to help Randolph and his wife during his illness. When Thomas returned from Paris in 1790, he worked his way home spending time with family and friends. His visits along the way included his siblings Martha at Spring Forest and Mary at Chestnut Grove, niece Jane Carr and Wilson Miles Cary, the Eppeses and

---

333 See also chap. 3. Ellen Wayles Coolidge Letterbook. “Extracts from the Diary of John Hartwell Cocke, of Bremo, Fluvanna County, Virginia,” as reprinted in GB, 637; GB, 41.
Skipwith families, and Thomas Mann Randolph at Tuckahoe. His re-acquaintance with
kin clearly was important enough to him to delay his arriving at his beloved Monticello
for a month after his ship landed at Norfolk. He could have made the journey in four to
six days. 334

Letters between the Jefferson siblings were filled with expressions of concern and
affection. Their letters contained both family news and business: they wanted to know
each others children and have theirs known. They shared their complaints about health
and aging, about raising children, and marveled at becoming grandparents. They made
substantive efforts to know one another’s children and grandchildren. In a 1789 letter
that Thomas wrote to Randolph, Thomas noted that his daughters asked to be
remembered to Randolph and his wife, and Thomas inquired about Randolph’s children,
including “my namesake.” Letters from his daughters told Thomas how his sisters fared.
Ellen Randolph’s letters to her grandfather included news about his sister’s
grandchildren. 335 Having their families know each other was important to the Jefferson
siblings.

Their families also knew each other’s in-laws, sometimes as neighbors,
sometimes through the affinal network these marriages established. Thomas’s daughter
Mary stayed with her maternal aunt and uncle Elizabeth and Francis Eppes while

TJ to RJ, Aug. 12, 1807; RJ to TJ, May 26, 1813; RJ to TJ, June 21, 1813; RJ to
TJ, April 2, 1815; Brother, 21, 42-43, 46, 57. TJ landed in Norfolk November 23 and
arrived at Monticello December 23. MB n. 748.

335 TJ to RJ, Jan. 11, 1789, Brother, 13-14. See Mary Jefferson Eppes to TJ,
March 20, 1798; May 27, 1798; Ellen Wayles Randolph to TJ, January 8, 1808, Family
Jefferson was in Paris in 1786. Visiting Eppington with Mary were her paternal aunts Martha Carr and Anna Scott Jefferson, and Martha’s daughter Polly Carr. Letters from Elizabeth Eppes to Thomas in Paris included news of Thomas’s sisters’ families. The Eppeses lived not far from Mary and John Bolling and the Eppes and Bolling family lines intertwined on numerous occasions. Thomas’s daughter Martha married within the Randolph family, which brought her in later years to Dungeness, the ancestral home of her grandmother.\(^{336}\)

After marriage and raising children, the Jefferson siblings stood for each other in matters legal, financial, and familial well into their later years. Just as Peter Jefferson had stood as a witness or executor for family and close friends such as Isham Randolph and William Randolph, the next generation of Jeffersons and their spouses did the same. Hastings Marks was a witness for in-laws Charles Lewis and Isham Lewis. Thomas Jefferson was executor of estates for his mother, Charles Lewis, Hastings Marks, and he administered Elizabeth’s as well. Jane’s 1766 deed of the slave Fany to daughter Mary Bolling was signed by her son-in-law Dabney Carr and family friend Patrick Henry, Jr.. Carr served as administrator of Jane, Jr.’s estate. Thomas wrote a letter supporting his brother-in-law Charles Lewis’s appointment to colonel of the county militia in 1781. Thomas wrote Randolph’s will in 1808.\(^{337}\) Thus, additions to the widening family circle served the public needs of its members in the same way that the immediate family had.


Support within the Jefferson family, however, meant more than a legal relationship. The longer-established siblings looked after those following. Young Thomas stayed with the Bollings on his way to Shadwell from Williamsburg over Christmas 1762. He wrote to his friend John Page of rats and leaky roofs there, and expressed his adolescent angst at being away from the gatherings of his cohorts in Williamsburg. Anna Scott married late, at thirty-three. In the years before her marriage, she lived with her sister Mary at the Bolling’s home in Goochland County. Anna Scott’s older brother made sure her accounts were in order on numerous occasions when he visited or saw their brother-in-law John Bolling. Forming associations that benefited the broad family network started young. The boyhood associations of Thomas offered social opportunities for his siblings, and in the case of Dabney and Martha, led to marriage. Family time with the Lewis cousins, conveniently nearby, served to provide two marriage partners.

Letters among family members show that the Jefferson siblings had great regard for each other during their early adult years and into old age. The filial responsibility shown by Thomas to his family at Shadwell went well beyond his role as executor of his mother’s estate. As a big brother he purchased personal items for his younger sisters, such as hair curls and stays for Lucy and Anna Scott. Into their later years they relied on their world-traveling brother to be their source of special items. He shopped for Lucy in Philadelphia in 1783. Before leaving for France in 1784, Thomas wrote to Anne Scott from Annapolis and invited her to “pass the hot season at Monticello” and noted that he
would send her accessories from Europe, which he included in a packet to their sister Martha the following November.\textsuperscript{338}

The Jefferson sisters and brothers inquired about each other when a spouse or child died. Thomas moved his sisters Martha and Anna Scott to Monticello during their widowhoods. Martha was with Thomas when his wife died and Thomas went to Chestnut Grove to visit Mary just after her husband died. Mary commented to her father that the death of Polly Archer (Martha Bolling) was “afflicting to Aunt Bolling.”\textsuperscript{339}

The Jefferson siblings inquired about each other’s well being whether they were near or far. They also wrote numerous letters to their children and about their children. They expressed love and affection, concern for happiness and education, and worried when children moved away. In 1792 following the marriage of her daughter Lucy to Richard Terrell, Martha wrote her brother Thomas about her “distress and Anxiety of mind” at the thought of being “separated (perhaps forever) from an Affectionate and dutyfull Child,” as the Terrells were moving to Kentucky. Thomas’s daughter Martha echoed her aunt’s concerns when she lamented to her father that “Aunt Carr will have

\textsuperscript{338} TJ charged most purchases for his siblings to their father’s estate. MB, 141, 352, 392, 480, 524.

\textsuperscript{339} Some letters between Thomas and his siblings are published in the Papers of Thomas Jefferson series. Others have not been found but were recorded in Thomas’s “Summary Journal of Letters.” Letters between the brothers are included in Thomas Jefferson and his Unknown Brother. Still others are in manuscript collections, such as “The Papers of the Carr and Terrell Families, 1735-1894” at UVA. See chap. 6. MB, 1020, 1272-1273. Mary Jefferson Eppes to TJ, May 27, 1798, Family Letters, 163-64.
only one of her children with her.” Lucy wrote her brother Thomas of her happiness with her family in 1807, during a brief hiatus in the saga of the Lewis family’s financial problems. When Lucy moved to Kentucky with her sons, Thomas’s granddaughter observed, “I went to see [Aunt Lewis] before she set off. She appeared to be very much pleased with the thoughts of Living with her children.”

Just as their Uncle Lewis had boarded and educated some of them, so too did Thomas for his nephews and nieces. Thomas raised and educated his sister Martha Carr’s children, incorporating them into the everyday activities of his own family. When daughter Martha Jefferson [Randolph] recounted her youth, their names were included out of hand. She recalled “the time and attention [Thomas Jefferson bestowed] on our education---our cousins the Carrs and myself.” Following his wife’s death, he took “his children and his wards the Carrs,” to be inoculated for small pox. His interest was not just in their schooling, however; he was involved and aware of more details of their lives. In 1782 he noted of his Carr nieces that “the girls, three in number, are now become marriageable and of course require to be clothed more expensively than at any earlier period.” In 1813 Thomas noted a spark of interest in James Lilburne, Randolph’s son, and offered to take him to live at Monticello to study. Randolph’s sons sought their uncle’s support in a suit against their stepmother in settling Randolph’s estate. Letters to

---

their uncle show that his investments in their education and well-being were fruitful: they included family news, news of their reading and schooling, and solicited his advice on many topics. In short, they recognized those things that Thomas taught them as important and responded to him with proof that his lessons took hold in their lives. Successive generations connected the living with their ancestors. Family noted that Jefferson Randolph (Thomas’s grandson) had the size and stature of Peter Jefferson. Jeff Randolph’s own mother worried that he had “enough of the Randolph character” to make her uneasy.341

After family, the topics that engaged the Jefferson children, as evidenced by their letters, were plants and books. The siblings all seemed to share a love of plants and gardening. Many of their letters and accounts accompany a seed or plant cutting, often invoking multiple generations and families in these exchanges. Anne Cary Randolph wrote to her grandfather about some Mignonett seed that her mother divided between “Mrs. Lewis Aunt Jane and herself,” thereby sharing a plant between Thomas’s sister Lucy Lewis, Thomas’s son-in-law’s sister, and Thomas’s own daughter Martha. Letters between Thomas and John Bolling discussed agriculture and horse bloodlines. Thomas

---

341 TJ’s own daughters do not seem to show any animosity toward their cousins who joined in their household. Martha’s son Thomas, however, authored the thesis that the Carr brothers were among the candidates for having fathered Sally Heming’s children. Lucia Stanton, “The Other End of the Telescope: Jefferson through the Eyes of His Slaves,” WMQ, 3d. Ser. LVII: 1 (January 2000), 140. Life, 382, 384. TJ to RJ May 25, 1813, Brother, 35-37. TJ to Overton Carr, March 16, 1782, Papers, 166-167, Peter Carr to TJ, December 10, 1787; Peter Carr to TJ, March 18, 1788, Papers 1: 166-67; 12: 414; 677. Malone, 1: 161. MJR did not specify which Randolph trait or which Randolph line worried her. Family Letters, 360.
and Randolph exchanged the products of their plantations and Thomas seemed to have an intimate working knowledge of Randolph's enterprise. The topics of correspondence between Thomas and Randolph remained domestic, however. The tone of Thomas's letters to his brother reveal a paternal relationship. Thomas offered Randolph all sorts of advice on many aspects of planting, on sheep dogs, and medical advice for the younger's various ailments.\(^{342}\)

The Jefferson siblings were also aware of each other's libraries. Thomas admired (and later inherited some of) Dabney Carr's books. Thomas's nephews solicited his advice on how to build their libraries. When Thomas was in Philadelphia and wished to acquire a copy of Catesby's *History of Carolina*, he knew that his brother-in-law John Bolling had a copy. Thomas asked his go-between, brother-in-law Francis Eppes, to induce Bolling to sell it, and suggested, "Perhaps you had better effect this by making the proposition to Mrs. Bolling. Of this your knowledge of the family will enable you to judge." Thomas included Francis Eppes and John Bolling in the distribution of his first printing of *Notes on Virginia*. Peter Carr solicited Thomas to purchase a Spanish dictionary for him in Paris, "as no such book is to be had, in any of the shops here."\(^{343}\)

\(^{342}\) Anne Cary Randolph to TJ, January 22, 1808, *Family Letters*, 323-324. GB, 22, 637; MB, 415, also, *Brother*. See also chap. 2 about botanical interests.


The expanded Jefferson family invested variously in the revolutionary activities that engaged the eldest son. Charles Lewis, Charles Lilburne Lewis, Randolph Jefferson, and Hastings Marks all served in the Albemarle Militia and all signed the Oath of Allegiance in Albemarle 1777. The father and son Charles Lewis signed the 1776 "Petition of Dissenters in Albemarle and Amherst Counties," a request by non-Anglicans against the reestablishment of the Episcopal Church: the Lewises were Presbyterians. In 1777 Thomas, his brother Randolph, and brother-in-law-to-be Hastings Marks were among the subscribers to voluntarily support a local clergyman in the Calvinistical Reformed church. Charles Lewis subscribed to the book of collected *American State Papers* in 1774, an effort at creating an archive of the nascent state. The Bolling's house Fairfield served to safeguard Jefferson's papers when they were removed from Richmond as the British army approached that city.344 There were no Loyalists among the Jefferson siblings.

Rarely did the older brother include the younger in news or philosophical discussions of state affairs that were the world Thomas inhabited, though other family members were occasionally privy to this information. In one letter to Randolph, Thomas acknowledged: "The occurrences of this part of the globe are of a nature to interest you so little that I have never made them the subject of a letter to you." He added that the time it took a letter to travel made news obsolete anyway. The statesman Jefferson

---

shared news of international events with his brother-in-law Francis Eppes and occasionally with his daughters who had traveled abroad with him.\textsuperscript{345}

Although two of the siblings or their spouses became somewhat estranged from the family at different times, it appears that duty was served when it was needed. Both John Bolling and Charles Lewis had relationships with the other siblings that seemed to begin warm and later turned cold. Bolling's was due to his drinking. Charles Lilburne Lewis died in 1831 in financial ruin, following a long tale of domestic problems and what his brother-in-law called "the shipwreck of the fortunes of his family." Although Thomas remained faithful in correspondence with his sister Lucy, his wariness of Lewis's financial duplicity was evident by 1792. The Lewises borrowed from Jefferson, from the Carrs, and other in-laws. When a Lewis grandson requested some financial assistance from Thomas, the dutiful uncle denied him money but offered to teach him surveying skills that would help him get a job—if he would come stay at Monticello for awhile.\textsuperscript{346}

The ties between the Jefferson children reveal a commitment to both their responsibility and their affection for each other. All this suggests the power of loving and engaged parents, who knew the importance of raising children who would maintain the family connections. Their parents showed them, through word and deed, that family, both immediate and near relations, enhanced the value of their own lives and careers. The act of recording and teaching about one’s family was not for the sake of taking credit

\textsuperscript{345} TJ to RJ, Jan. 11, 1789, Brother, 13-14. Papers, 6: 219-220.

\textsuperscript{346} Boynton Merrill’s study, Jefferson’s Nephews: A Frontier Tragedy, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1976, details the dramatic demise of the Charles Lewis family. See 74-75, 89, 183-184, quotation 184-85.
for one’s ancestry, so much as consciously building and expanding upon a resource that had real value for those who could keep it strong. Its strength proved itself many times in the post-Shadwell lives of the Jefferson family.

**Kin Networks, Part II**

As the Jeffersons cultivated their family trees along the James River basin, they also constructed a second girding of trees whose roots and branches intertwined with and underlay the first. Shadwell slaves moved with Jefferson children to new homes. They had ties to those who remained at Shadwell and some to previous homes. Their kin stretched along the same, and probably more, roads and waterways that connected the Jefferson family. The slaves who left with the Jefferson children had all occupied the home quarter at Shadwell, with the exception of the field hands who Thomas and Randolph divided. The members of the six or so families who lived together at Shadwell’s center supplied the Jeffersons with their personal attendants and house servants. They took these skills to their new households, where they negotiated their roles with whatever slaves belonged to their owner's spouse. Thomas and Randolph split the remainder of their father’s slaves after the initial distribution was completed. Each took about two dozen slaves to their respective plantations, where the slaves reestablished their work and family roles based on their new groupings.347 For the former slaves of

347 I give the number of slaves as about two dozen each because many of Peter’s slaves died or bore children between the 1757 inventory date and when they became property of Thomas (1764) or Randolph (1776). There is no exact count of how many slaves each son received upon reaching majority. Of course some of Thomas’s slaves stayed at Shadwell where they had been. See also chap. 4 and 5.
Peter Jefferson, the largest concentrations of kin and familiar faces were now on one of the brother's plantations.

The slaves who accompanied Jefferson children to new places brought, in their person, a bit of home with them. Thus Mary, Thomas, Martha, Lucy, Anna Scott, and Randolph took to their new homes someone who had known them their entire lives. Nan and Fany, Jupiter, Rachel, Cachina and daughters Phebe and Lydia, Eve, and Peter helped their masters with the novelty of setting up housekeeping. The slaves reinforced continuity between households in their most basic performance of mundane tasks. The slaves also served the widening family network. Each was known on the plantation of the others, able to carry messages and property, money, and other slaves. The Jefferson children knew each other's slaves by name and the slaves, in turn, knew the paths between and within each plantation. Isaac Jefferson, the slave of Thomas's whose memoirs were recorded, spoke with a casual familiarity about his owner's siblings: the siblings were part of his world.348

When visitors to plantations tipped servants there—for looking after baggage, carriages and horses, tending guest rooms, and for other errands—they contributed to the idea that any planter was a master and any slave a servant. Thomas's accounts noted tips for "servants," to whom he sometimes referred as "valets," and he often used the individual slaves' names. These transactions greased the wheels of the master-servant dynamic between the visitor and a slave he or she did not own. They formalized the patriarchal relationship between a planter who expected to appear dignified in

---

348 Sawney, the servant bequeathed from Peter, must have died before 1765 when Thomas first recorded Jupiter as his attendant. Isaac Jefferson, Memoirs.
appearance—such as in the precision of his dress and livery—and a servant who could make that happen. Both traveler and slave benefited from cultivating a good relationship during visits, especially among family members who might visit often.\footnote{349}

When Mary left Shadwell for her life with John Bolling at Fairfield, Nan, a slave, went with her. Nan was about eighteen, the same age as Mary, bequeathed to Mary by Peter Jefferson in his will. Nan brought her skills as a personal servant, her value as property, and her training to be subservient within a large population of other slaves who were family or simply neighbors. Nan left behind her kin network that included her mother Old Sall and younger siblings. She would need to build new friendships and new alliances among the slaves and free people at her new home, and no doubt she offered a comforting continuity to the new mistress of Fairfield. After moving away, Nan may have accompanied the Bollings on their visits to Shadwell, where she could embrace her family and friends. Six years after her removal to Fairfield, Fany, another slave from “home,” joined her. Fany was about nine years old and left her mother Myrtilla and brother Peter at Shadwell. Nan and Fany were not immediately related, but their mothers and siblings were among the slaves who stayed at Shadwell when Jane claimed her sixth portion in 1760. Both Nan and Fany came from the group of highly valued home-quarter slaves and their mothers may well have been related.\footnote{350}

\footnote{349} See TJ visits, for instance MB, 151, 257, 285, 479, and various.

\footnote{350} Nan’s siblings were Lucinda, and possibly Caesar and Little Sall. Her brother Simon was born in 1765.

Peter left Shadwell as part of Randolph’s retinue. Nan’s mother Sall was among the 11 slaves that Jane claimed. Myrtilla, Fany’s mother, was among those kept “to not divide the children.” AlCWB 2: 32-34; JHAB I, 3; Harvie II, 10.
The kith and kin of the slaves linked the plantations. Nan and Fany went to the Bollings in Goochland County. Nan’s mother and sisters stayed at Monticello. Fany left her mother at Monticello and her brother Peter went to Snowdon. Both Orange and Squire, who grew up at Shadwell and moved to Snowdon with Randolph, performed errands between Monticello and Snowdon, transporting seed, dogs, letters, cash, and other items between the two plantations. Orange’s parents, Juno and Toby, and his siblings, Toby and Luna, belonged to Thomas. Orange’s wife Dinah and their children Sally and Lucy also belonged to Thomas. When Thomas sought to sell some slaves to pay off debts in 1792, he first offered Randolph the chance to find a buyer for Dinah and her family “in your neighborhood so as to unite her with [her husband].” Squire escorted Randolph’s slave (simply referred to as “the girl” by the Jefferson men) who went to Monticello in 1813 to learn how to operate a spinning Jenny from Thomas’s skilled labor there. Siblings of Squire lived at Monticello, and childhood friends of both Orange and Squire lived there. The bonds that connected the slaves between the plantations were not lost on their owners. Letters between Thomas and Randolph often named which slave was carrying missives between the two brothers. The most trustworthy slaves such as Randolph’s Orange and Squire could partake of social opportunities on their errands abroad. They also enhanced the many ways the Jefferson kin networks supported the planter family’s ongoing enterprises.

351 The immediate family of the other Jefferson daughters’ slaves is unclear, but they all left behind close friends and relatives, if not immediate family, when they left Shadwell. Quotation from TJ to RJ, Sept 25, 1792, Brother, 17. Squire’s mother may have been Peter’s slave Belinda, in which case her other children Val, Lucy, Charlotte, Minerva, Sarah, Iris, and Jeremiah were among his family. See also chaps. 4 and 5.
Leaving Shadwell could present an array of new experiences to a slave. The slaves undoubtedly understood whether or not they were leaving for a good home. John Bolling had not yet begun to drink when Nan and Fany left for Fairfield and the Bolling wealth promised some degree of material comfort. Bolling's other slaves, thirty-one in number in 1786, likely offered the possibility of spouses and friends. On the other hand, it is easy to imagine the horror that Rachel's family faced when Jane Jefferson deeded her to Randolph, knowing she was replacing a slave who had been murdered by an overseer and would live twenty miles away. But some slaves came back. When Anna Scott moved to Monticello in her later years, her slaves moved there also. Her slave Nance moved back to a home she had known: Thomas chose her from his own slaves when he paid Anna Scott's marriage portion. Anna Scott's slaves entered Thomas Jefferson's farm roles and he arranged their care and their work.\(^ \text{352} \)

The slaves who remained at Shadwell in the era after all the Jeffereons left saw a different world from that they had known. By 1776, when Jane Jefferson died, Shadwell ceased to be the center of a plantation and became a satellite to the Monticello plantation. The benefits of the home quarter were no longer available to those slaves who remained at Shadwell; they now occupied the periphery. The plantation kitchen no longer augmented their daily fare and there was no big house to distract them from their daily routine. Those who left Shadwell came to know new plantations where they forged new social alliances. But just as the Jefferson children maintained connections between their

homes and families, there were opportunities for slaves to also keep in contact among the
distant landscapes that descended from Shadwell.

Jane and Peter Jefferson created many legacies within their Shadwell household. In addition to material goods, land, and slaves, the parents gave their children a long list of intangible legacies. The family connections that the Jeffersons created made a lasting impression on the younger Jeffersons. There is undeniable evidence that the Jefferson children learned to care for, support, and love one another, in addition to the intellectual interests they shared. They learned to maintain family rituals that were important and to keep family history. The intertwined lives of the Jefferson children and the people they owned also served to enhance the family connections of the Jeffersons. The familiarity of the slaves with their owners' families and with each other's plantations was part of what made the planters' lifestyle possible. That it also enabled kin networks among slaves was part of what made plantation culture work. The Jeffersons and their slaves spread across Virginia, as their parents' generation had, taking their turn at replicating the cultural patterns they knew so well. The American Revolution, however, brought many changes to Virginia's social and economic structure that would change the possibility of that plantation culture ever flowering as fully again.
Figure 7.1. Locations and distance to where Jefferson siblings likely met their marriage partners and homes after marriage with spouses and slave families who moved from Shadwell.

1. 35 miles to Bolling home. Mary and John Bolling and Nan and Fany, Fairfields, Goochland Co., then Chestnut Grove, Chesterfield Co., est. 60 miles.

2. 100-120 miles to Wayles home and Williamsburg. Thomas and Martha Wayles Skelton Jefferson, with Sawney, Jupiter, and others. Lived at Monticello, across river from Shadwell.

3. 20-40 miles to the Carr home. Martha and Dabney Carr, with Rachel, Spring Forest, Goochland Co.

4. 5 miles to Lewis family home. Lucy and Charles Lewis, with Catchina and Phebe, Monteagle, Albemarle Co., about 5 miles.

5. 7 miles to Marks' home. Anna Scott and Hastings Marks, with Eve?, then TJ's Nance.

6. 5 miles to Lewis family home. Randolph and Anna Jefferson Lewis, with Peter, Rachel, and others, to Snowdon, 20 miles away.
Figure 7.2. Jane Jefferson's list of the family of Peter Jefferson and Jane Randolph. Jefferson Family, Bible, Verso of title page, A1. Photo by author. ViU.
Figure 7.3. Jane Jefferson's signature and date. “Jefferson Family, Bible,” A2 recto. Photo by author. ViU.
CONCLUSION

The fire that burned their house and most of their belongings in 1770 occurred at a time when the household was undergoing changes. Five of the Jefferson children had reached their majority and three had married. All of the adult Jefferson children lived at Shadwell at some time, bringing their professions or their families into the house. Despite the house fire, deaths of children, and loss of the patriarch to their family enterprise, Peter and Jane Jefferson were successful in their efforts to construct and preserve the socio-economic place of their family and to ensure that their many legacies would find suitable guardians.

There were concrete changes in the world as Shadwell burned and its senior generation died. The transformation from colony to nation brought alterations to the political and economic landscape. The structure of society shifted and a lifestyle built on extended credit became nearly impossible. Taste was more likely to be a function of merchants located in cities than stemming from a recognizable culture spread among families in country seats. In Virginia, many plantation seats became ghosts of their former selves as depleted soil pushed investment into other businesses and other kinds of agriculture.

The story of the Jeffersons in Albemarle County is almost synonymous with the history of the county. They were part of its very foundation. In the seventy-year period
between 1700 and 1770, the taxable population of the Piedmont multiplied twenty-nine
times.\textsuperscript{353} But the period of Virginia's expansion ended about the time that Jeffersons
stopped living at Shadwell. In fact, studies of consumer goods toward the end of the
eighteenth century suggest that the Jeffersons at Shadwell had occupied a unique
position. According to broader statistics, "In the more recently settled piedmont and
backcountry... fashion trends and social desires were more muted." Data from
Albemarle County probate inventories showed that at the end of the eighteenth century
people's taste in goods reflected their provincial location.\textsuperscript{354}

This study began with the question of how the frontier affected the Jeffersons'
ability to maintain their elite style of living. Beyond the first chapter, the question
became how did these people with vast economic, political, and social capital affect the
nascent landscape and everyone around them. The frontier experience, no matter how
defined, was different for people of different economic or social groups. People with
little means were limited in their access to goods, and more markedly so in rural areas.
Wealthy people like the Jeffersons maintained their access to goods, and people who
interacted with them were exposed to these goods and even given the opportunity to
obtain them through their relationship to the Jeffersons. Thus, the slaves who lived on
the home quarter of the Jefferson's plantation experienced a greater degree of material
wealth than did most poor people of any color in Virginia.

\textsuperscript{353} Kulikoff, \textit{Tobacco and Slaves}, 52.

\textsuperscript{354} Martin, "The Role of Pewter as Missing Artifact," 178.
The material culture of this plantation, from the highest-style silver teapot to a slave-produced tobacco pipe of local stone offers the opportunity to explore the myriad connections of people across eighteenth-century Virginia and beyond. Objects tell stories of production and use, of movement from place of manufacture to place of use, of leisure and work activities, of cultural practice and identity. All of these allow us to tell a richer story about the users of these things from long ago. This history is not of the material objects so much as about how those objects reveal different aspects of the lives of the people who used them.

Culture can be defined as a totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns characteristic of a community or population. As such, culture gets portrayed in idealized and abstract terms. But material culture often presents the realities of everyday life, the broken pieces and discards that archaeologists recover. The material culture of Shadwell supports both the idealized version of the various cultures examined here, as well as makes each of them more complex in their connections and dependencies on other cultures. There are normal and unsurprising activities represented here, as well as evidence that is contradictory and challenging to expected patterns. As a whole, Shadwell fits a model of eighteenth-century plantation culture, with many strata of society employed in making the model work. But some of the cultures that make up the whole seem larger and more complex than definitions as mere subcultures allow.

An object is the means to explore the multiple cultural associations that various people and groups of people had at Shadwell. Some interactions defined one group as dependent on another, while other objects provide evidence of dynamic cultural identity.
Historians can do a disservice to their subjects when they too quickly categorize the objects and people they study. An enslaved woman who worked in the Jeffersons’ house could be a chambermaid and seamstress in the big house, then a cook, mother, wife, sister, and friend to those at home. The story of her life is richer if we explore the many categories she fit, instead of limiting our discussion to one role. Many of the people, objects, and actions in the past become wonderfully complex when their multivalent whole is explored: objects have different values in the hands of their makers, their owners, and their users.

The influence and relationships within the nascent local community also add texture to how we imagine the frontier. By any definition, the transition from frontier to settled society is an elusive process. Evidence from Shadwell shows that various conditions coexisted: the process was different for different people and at different times. The very wealthy had access to goods, could diversify their market shares, and had tools to perpetuate the social structure they preferred through their dominance in establishing the legal system and important connections. Many people around them, however, who had less financial and social support, had a different experience.

Tobacco may have offered a golden age for interaction and patronage between white trades people and planters, which ended when wheat required different specialization within the plantation work force. With the full-scale investment in grain crops, work systems on plantations changed. Slaves had more time away from fields during the yearly cycle of planting and harvest instead of the intensive constancy of tobacco. Smart planters capitalized on the change by training slaves in trades such as
nail-making, carpentry, and joinery for men, and weaving and spinning for women. With slaves performing more of these skills, there was less of a market for the hired laborer from outside the plantation, unless he or she had a particular level of artistry. This kind of hiring occurred at Monticello during the 1790s when Jefferson needed blacksmiths to do ornamental ironwork and house carpenters who could figure complex framing and ornamental woodwork. Of course, when these hired white craftsmen were finished, Jefferson’s own slaves had new sets of skills. Shadwell and Monticello contrast in how hired labor and slave labor were used; Thomas Jefferson’s diversified and skilled slave workforce performed many of the jobs that Peter Jefferson hired locals to do. The plantation was the economic and the social organization of Virginia: when the nature of the economy changed, so too did the social structure.

The large and small connections the Jeffereons maintained show their overwhelming influence upon nearly everyone with whom they came in contact in early Albemarle County and beyond. They were a model of gentry power. The Jeffereons had undeniable influence on local trade and colony-wide commerce and on the agricultural economy and ecology of the region. Their slaves formed a significant portion and locus of the regional African-American community, which, like their owners, had significant connections across the colony. The Jeffereons’ tastes and desires required goods and services that would have been unavailable to most Virginians, and the Jeffereons’ presence in the Piedmont served nearly as its own critical mass to ensure that family members had the things they wanted. People made livings as joiners, tailors, and seamstresses because the Jeffereons’ needed people with their skills. There were carters
and boatmen to haul crops and goods because the Jeffersons had crops going out and goods coming in. African-Americans practiced refined English cooking, housekeeping standards, and elevated manners because the Jeffersons needed these things. The Jeffersons were not the only planters with money and influence in the region, but the close look at their world shows the powerful impact they — and others like them — had.

Looking closely at the Jeffersons' material culture and economic connections enables us to see just how many people and places the Jeffersons relied on to make their home, plantation, and public world work. Their presentation as consumers of fashion, as people who could entertain, and as a family whose influence would continue needed the work and skills of slaves, neighbors, relatives, and friends. An important office-holder, surveyor, and planter such as Peter Jefferson required the efforts of many people. His plantation depended on his good relationship with slaves, hired workers, and local suppliers. His office-holding needed the good will of a broader group of freeholders who recognized what he could do for them. His surveying needed not only appointments from the colonial government but a pool of people to draw upon for joining expeditions. While his economic sense, ability to triangulate, or draft a mountain range describe a successful man, he could not have been successful in colonial Virginia without the good will of the community. Peter and Jane could read their children books and teach them to use a fork, but they also needed to communicate with the range of people around them: the material culture of Shadwell provides a lens through which to view an unusually full picture of social relationships across mid-eighteenth century Virginia.
THOMAS JEFFERSON REVISITED

Thomas Jefferson’s early years have been called the lacuna of Jefferson studies. New excavations at Shadwell contributed to the reassessment of the material culture of the plantation, which now illuminates the family’s life there. The volume of records and writing that Thomas kept once again displays its seemingly infinite value as familiar documents are tapped for new light they might shed on old subjects. This study of Shadwell, all the Jefferson siblings and relations, and all the slaves working there is weighted by the accounts kept by Thomas Jefferson because his records provide invaluable details about late eighteenth-century life.355

Thomas Jefferson’s records inform much of this story, but it would be unfair to compare anyone to him. In this study of his family, he becomes one of many talented, well-trained gentry youth – instead of the exception. By making him part of the pattern, the other family members become actors instead of mere backdrops for their famous son and brother. In fact, the only biographical attention paid to any of Jefferson’s siblings was the book Thomas Jefferson and his Unknown Brother, in which the younger was compared to the older, with the assessment that Randolph sadly lacked his older brother’s competence. However, Randolph held local titles and offices and his children married

well. He hardly compared poorly among other Virginia gentry. Had he been someone else’s brother, he might have at least gotten his name in the title of the only book about him.

Jefferson studies began almost immediately after his death in 1826. George Tucker’s *Life of Thomas Jefferson* was first, in 1837, followed in 1858 by Henry S. Randall’s *The Life of Thomas Jefferson*. Sarah N. Randolph added family and home to the political and public story with *The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson* in 1871. The interest in Jefferson by biographers during the nineteenth century caused the family to examine their stories, as well as their attics and trunks for memorabilia. Jefferson’s heirs made some new discoveries about their ancestry during this period; in fact, they expressed surprise at some of the revelations of their research. Randall recounts the heirs opening a trunk of papers at Edgehill (home of grandson Thomas Jefferson Randolph). They discovered then that Peter Jefferson had been a colonel and a burgess. That had not been part of the family lore; in fact, they wondered if Thomas Jefferson knew these things about his father. Of course he did, but the younger Jefferson preferred not to take credit for elected offices and left them out of family stories and epitaphs.356

Until now, the sparse lines in Thomas Jefferson’s autobiography about his early years have stood out among the few tidbits of information about Jane and Peter Jefferson and their Shadwell home. Jefferson wrote the autobiography for his family, not as a celebratory public document. Some of Thomas’s comments have been taken as gospel, others have been dismissed. This study of Shadwell requires reflecting upon Thomas’s

own words yet again. The word *neglected* that Thomas used to describe his father’s education has been quoted by almost every biographer, yet in the context of colonial Virginia, Peter performed as well as any other gentry and better than most. Thomas may have been comparing his father to his own experience or reinforcing the distinction between academic and home learning for some younger family member who was recalcitrant about school. Peter was among many gentry, even burgesses, whose schooling took place at home or with a tutor. Peter was no more self-made than Thomas, though Thomas cultivated stories about his father as the heroic ancestor. The stories of Thomas’s lost friendship with Dabney Carr echo the idealized masculine world that Thomas preferred to present in his tales about Peter Jefferson.³⁵⁷

Granddaughter Ellen reported that Jefferson’s “affections were cultivated in the midst of an attached and united family,” yet the family relationships have been questioned over and over. Jefferson’s letter, in which he wrote: “As I grow older, I love those most whom I loved first,” and, “we often write seldomest to those whom we love most,” has been quoted often by historians writing about Thomas’s family relationships – those with his wife, daughters, and grandchildren. It has not, however, been used to argue evidence of a warm relationship with his own siblings, even though the letter was written to his sister Mary.

Thomas Jefferson must also be reconsidered in light of what have been taken to be denigrating views about genealogy and his mother’s family. As shown in Chapter 6, Thomas invested time and effort in copying and maintaining records of early family (even those of his wife’s first husband). Current events when Jefferson was writing his

³⁵⁷ Autobiography, 3. See chap. 1 on burgesses.
Autobiography were more likely the source for his cautionary comments about ancestor worship. During the early nineteenth century, when Jefferson retired from public service, he found himself still under the scrutiny of political enemies. Among them was his own cousin, John Randolph of Roanoke, who accused Jefferson of mishandling money during his presidency and blamed Jefferson for what Randolph thought was an unfortunate leveling of the social order following the revolution. The dispute between John Randolph and Thomas Jefferson was public and bitter. Earlier in Jefferson’s life, however, upon his marriage, he queried a friend about acquiring a family coat of arms and acknowledged that ancestry might be useful. He commented with ease that his father’s family came from Wales and that there were Jeffersons in Virginia for at least a century. His denial of the importance of tracing ancestry was accompanied by a response that indicates he had done so, and did protest too much. 358

The Randolph connections, John notwithstanding, served the Jeffersons well. They were the same family – not different ones. Thomas’s mother, grandfather, sons-in-law, and grandchildren, bore the name. Any speculation about Jefferson’s seeming dismissal of this association needs to look toward the years following the revolution, all the way to when Jefferson wrote his Autobiography. There is no compelling event in his early years to make association with Randolphs anything but fruitful.

The books and maps at Shadwell defined connections between Virginia, London, and the world. The book collections tied English law, letters, and landscape to ancient and classical times, and asserted the on-going correctness of a liberal republican view of man’s place in nature and society. Richard Beale Davis identified the Whig strain in the

history and belles lettres read by colonial Virginians; indeed, Addison's publications were self-proclaimed voices of liberal Whig political views. The intellectual landscape at Shadwell shows that the Jeffersons' lives were filled with a degree of certainty about legal rights, accepted behaviors, and social position. This sense of entitlement helped them move through the world with assurance. But stories from Shadwell also taught its family to hold the world in wonder. To find fascination at the horticultural magic of the vegetable and fruit garden, to imagine faraway and unknown lands from books and maps, and to marvel at the strength of men hacking through wildernesses in order to tame them for the public weal. Jefferson displayed both sides of this upbringing many times in ways that seem both positive and negative today. Jefferson had the ability, for instance, to marvel at the cultural practices of American Indians, even inviting them to sit for portraits when they visited him during his presidency. He could document their identity and artifacts, then turn to discuss their extermination because the land-use practices of his culture were at odds with that of various natives.359

There is evidence for intellectual influence on the Jefferson children from both their mother and their father. Jane's family enjoyed the company of botanists and horticulture, Peter kept company with mathematicians. Both parents read and wrote. Jane's influences have been ignored for the sake of historiographical fashion. It is time for the potential of her abilities to be restored. Shadwell was Thomas Jefferson's patrimony, a deed to real property. But his real legacy was far greater and came from both parents. This study of the Jeffersons reveals the active role of Peter and Jane Jefferson in showing their children the strong social and family connections that would

359 See letter to John Adams, above, p. 320.
ensure them of every advantage they needed during their adult lives. They came to the counter with pre-approved credit and they came to the table without question of their belonging. Doors stood open to them across Virginia, and probably well beyond; slaves at plantations along the James and York Rivers readily accepted their tips and showed them into familiar dining rooms.

This study adds a tangible connection to the early years of Thomas Jefferson and his boyhood home. Even historians who do not specialize in material culture have been swayed by the visual impact of Tuckahoe or Westover and other standing eighteenth-century buildings used by contemporaries of Peter and Jane Jefferson. It has been hard to imagine the Jeffersons in these houses as peers without an equally impressive home of their own. Shadwell was that home.
APPENDIX I:

ISSUES,

METHODS OF INTERPRETATION,

AND SOURCES

What began as an investigation to locate the birthplace of Thomas Jefferson produced a collection of artifacts, documents, and questions that enable much more than the descriptive material to erect a monument to a famous man. Instead they lead to an exploration of a specific place and time and reveal an opportunity to describe not only the cultures of the many people who lived and worked there two hundred and fifty years ago, but also to explore the relationships between those people.

This study of Shadwell draws upon a variety of sources and methodologies, including material culture, social history, microhistory, consumer theory, decorative arts, and vernacular architecture. Along the way I have had lessons in bibliographic history, horticulture and agriculture, silver and furniture, social and cultural anthropology. No single theory or methodology drives this study: I have borrowed from many “types” of history as well as from other disciplines where a particular document or artifact warrants a certain type of question. I have not been afraid to consider an artifact or a document in more than one way when I feel that the questions I can ask by doing so will be fruitful. In some cases I let the artifact drive the questions that I can ask of it, in other cases I bring my own or other historians’ questions to the fore. I do not have the same types of
documents or artifacts available for very many years or moments in the lives of the people I study here, so comparisons are often inferred -- contrasts can be drawn, but perhaps not quantified.

Material Culture

One can assume nothing in particular about the first master of Shadwell from the inventory list (Dumas Malone, 1948).360

Buildings and artifacts can be powerful sources for history, even for those who may not have the tools to properly decipher them. The tentativeness on the part of historians to interpret the documentary information about Shadwell for what it was is partly blamed on the lack of satisfying description of that place in three-dimensions. Without the tools to reconstruct the spaces that the Jeffersons and their slaves inhabited, it has been easier for historians to turn to standing buildings such as Tuckahoe or Monticello and assume that buildings gone were inferior to them.

Objects—whether discovered in the ground or listed in a document---can reveal much about the lives of individuals. The material culture that this study relies on is as integral to this story as any written source. In some cases the material remains are the only evidence of a particular activity. The material things ground the study in the particulars. We can infer that slaves on any eighteenth-century Virginia plantation hoed weeds from tobacco fields, for instance. Slaves at Shadwell used a variety of narrow hoes, wide hoes, weeding hoes, grubbing hoes, harrow hoes, and hilling hoes that helped them perform different tasks at different times of the year. Not only does this

information help us color their daily lives and understand the seasonality of their tasks, but the fact that they lived cheek by jowl with each other and with these tools helps us understand the landscape they inhabited. They worked with these objects during the day and took them home to their quarters to clean and maintain them and store them until their next use – the next day or the next season. They lifted and carried these tools, kept their small children from them and taught their older children how to use them. The physical properties and uses of objects can describe particular events, and can suggest meaning or significance in the life of a past person that the historian, looking only at documents, could not otherwise consider. Material culture theory provides the methods not simply for cataloguing types of objects, but investing those objects with meaning within the culture of their makers and users, that is, within a specific time and place. As time and place change, so too does the relationship between a person and an object.

One of the terms used to evaluate the relationship between this family and their material circumstances is social expectations. This means the ways in which an object infers a certain use that implies a standard of behavior, whether or not that behavior actually occurred at Shadwell. An easy example of this would be that a teapot and set of teacups describe a tea party, an act that requires proper training and a measure of gentle manners. It is entirely possible that in the frontier days of Albemarle County, the Jeffersons had their own tea parties with no one from beyond their immediate family. The tea set implies that they acknowledged, or expected, that the taking of tea was done according to a set of prescribed customs somewhere and that the Jeffersons held this standard for themselves. Quite possibly, certain things sat on a shelf and were not used, even by the Jeffersons; that is, they had potential but not realized social value, although
many details of the various tea wares suggest this is not the case with this particular set of objects. The objects at Shadwell imply a menu of social expectations, or events that they could have served such as partaking of ritual beverages, including tea, coffee, punch; formal dining, including various courses, serving, and eating utensils; music and dance skills that facilitated public performance at social events. The objects imply a level of training in social graces that serve to advertise who the Jeffersons were and what they wanted from their house, their things, and, more importantly, who they wanted as their peers.

It is impossible to separate the history of the people who lived at Shadwell from the history of the things they used – the buildings and landscape they inhabited, their tools, cookware, utensils, furniture. These things inform us about the people, and talking about the people requires discussing their physical surroundings. The things owned by the Jeffersons tell us of their actions – things they did everyday or occasionally, choices they made in purchasing and displaying objects. And these objects tell us something of their aspirations – how these objects reflected people’s awareness of fashionability, of taste. Certain objects were necessities but even necessities can illustrate that the things people surrounded themselves with reflected motivation to be seen by others in a particular way.

The objects in this history not only give more depth to the information we would otherwise have about these people, they are an integral part of these people’s experience in their world. The most detailed documents relating to Shadwell—the probate inventories and wills—have been known to scholars and have been available in the public domain of the Albemarle County Court Records. The account books, at the Huntington
Library and Massachusetts Historical Society, have also been available, but more remotely, although all these sources were included in the various projects in the middle decades of the twentieth century to microfilm Jefferson documents. Certain objects in these documents have been used to illustrate points about Thomas Jefferson's boyhood, but no one has done a systematic reading or analysis of this entire collection until now. This raises the value of these object-laden documents for interpreting the history of Shadwell. They are not merely lists, but bearers of significant cultural content. The material world represents a value system. The legal system is a tool for perpetuating it, and a family is both the vehicle and the purpose for its cultivation.

Sources: Field Research and Archaeological Collections

The material culture used in this study derives from the entire archaeological collection relating to Shadwell. This includes the notes and the few surviving artifacts from the 1940s work of Fiske Kimball, the 1950s excavations and reports of Paul J.F. Schumacher and Roland Robbins, and the 1990s work by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation (now Thomas Jefferson Foundation) under the direction of William Kelso, Barbara Heath, and Susan Kern. The artifact database lists over 42,000 objects recovered on the site not including material measured by weight or volume such as window glass, mortar, or scrap metals. The reports contain statistical summaries, drawings, and descriptions of the collected artifacts, as well as the records of what methodologies were used to recover and catalog them. The reports also detail artifacts that remain in the ground: the footprints of buildings, hearths, fence posts, and trash pits that were dutifully recorded and interpreted in field notes and reports. This study does
not reiterate all the findings from the reports, and often reinterprets the material presented in the reports.361

Ideally, archaeologists find objects frozen at a moment in time, sealed in a dateable layer with little question about who used them or when they arrived at their resting place. Despite the sheer quantity of artifacts from Shadwell, it is a less-than-ideal site. Much of the archaeological assemblage occurred in the plowzone layer, an undatable context. The use of Shadwell changed over time, from plantation center, to quarter farm, to farm field, then to farm again. Throughout the nineteenth century, the ridge was plowed, which means that only artifacts and features lying deeper than a plow share —about ten to twelve inches— survived intact; that is, in the location where they fell at the end of their period of use. Artifacts in the plowzone have been wrested from their


Artifacts and reports from earlier excavations at Shadwell contributed both positive and negative evidence to this interpretation of the site. These include Fiske Kimball's cross-trenching operations in 1943, see Kimball, "In Search of Jefferson's Birthplace," and Kimball Papers, Philadelphia Museum of Art. For the brief excavations under the auspices of the National Park Service, see Paul J.F Schumacher, "1954 Archeological Exploration at Shadwell: Report on a Field Investigation made in May 1954 and Conclusions Drawn from this" (Ms. TJMF, 1954); and Schumacher, "Field Notes: Archeological Exploration, Shadwell Property, Charlottesville, VA., May 10 - June 4, 1954" (ms. TJMF, 1954). On later excavations for a private foundation called the Thomas Jefferson Birthplace Memorial Park Commission (TJB MPC), see, Roland W. Robbins, "Field Notes" (ms. on file TJMF, 1955); "Journal-Shadwell 1955" (ms. on file TJMF, 1955); and "Report on 1955 Archaeological Exploration at Shadwell, Birthplace of Thomas Jefferson" (ms. on file TJMF, 1955). For a brief time during 1961-1962, the TJB MPC operated a small visitor's center at Shadwell and their interpretation of a dwelling house stood over what is described as the kitchen area in this study. See TJBMPC, Papers, VIU. The TJF purchased the property in 1963 and moved the former visitors center off the site in 1967. Shadwell has been grazing land since.
contexts and mixed with objects from all periods of activity on the site, although farm
field use did not introduce new layers of domestic artifacts to the site.

Studies of plowing show that artifacts tend to churn fairly closely to their original
context and that statistical analysis across a site offers the opportunity to isolate general
areas of activity based on artifacts in the plowzone. Thus, even after plowing it is
possible to separate how people performed different activities in the front, back, and side
yards of a house, for instance, based on the distribution of artifacts across the site.362 The
excavators from the 1940s and 1950s at Shadwell did not record their finds
stratigraphically, which means they did not note soil changes or vertical artifact contexts
that inform the conclusions about chronology on which archaeologists now rely. But
artifacts from the earlier excavations make up the bulk of the statistical data for certain
parts of the Shadwell site, such as the kitchen area that was almost completely excavated
in 1955. Some very important and unique artifacts also occurred in the plowzone, where
they do not contribute statistically and where the archaeologist must speculate about their
most likely historical context. An example of this would be the brass fragment of an
eighteenth-century sundial of the type carried by a surveyor (see chapters 1 and 6). We
can surmise that this object belonged to the famous surveyor who lived on the site in the
eighteenth century, but the lack of specific archaeological context means that could be
considered an open question.

362 Archaeologist Julia A. King has performed extensive tests of the effect of
plowing on artifact distribution. See Julia A. King and Henry M. Miller. “A View from
the Midden: An Analysis of Midden Distribution and Composition at the van Sweringen
Site, St. Mary's City, Maryland,” *Historical Archaeology* 21, no. 2 (1987): 37-59.
The material goods also include those objects that no longer exist in three dimensions but are listed in the documents, such as maps, plows, chairs, and tables. Some objects do not occur in the documents but their existence is implied according the customary usage for other objects or activities that are mentioned. Both direct and indirect references to objects and their various usages will be considered. The archaeological record brings to light certain failings of the documentary record, and vice versa. For instance, there is no mention in the inventories or accounts of delftware, yet it occurs on the site in significant quantity. No single source for information gives the whole picture.

I have tried to consider each object in as many ways as I could. For instance, a book contains reading material and may provide reading practice for the school-age child but information for the adult reader. A book requires storage space of a particular size. Its presence in a house may prompt different kinds of reactions from those who encounter it. Its readers may see an opportunity for obtaining information. Its viewers may be impressed that the owner can afford a book or knows how to read. Its owners may see a happy investment that displays status, another object gathering dust, or a tool for enriching the well being of self and family. And the book's content may arouse another level of reactions whether it sells patriotism or evangelical zeal, mathematical sciences or maps of exotic places.

Sources: Statistics

The artifacts exist as individual objects, but also as part of an aggregate. The statistical relationships between the objects often provide more information than an object considered singly. To work with this collection as a statistical group I have
created a number of different databases to consider the objects in different ways. Obvious questions come from the values given to the objects in their appraisal. Where do the Jeffersons invest the most money (in slaves and silver coffee pots), and what receives the least investment (a more difficult question to answer)? But the dispersal and proximity of objects also reveals much about the everyday world at Shadwell. I have found at times that the category I assigned to a particular object directed how I thought about it, and I have tried to exercise the databases by examining the same object in multiple ways. Categorizing and coding objects is both revealing and limiting and should never be canonical. Objects served different purposes and had different meanings depending upon who used them and when. The historian must try to imagine the many and multivalent purposes of things.

Similarly, the statistical manipulation of the basic census data for Shadwell provides insight that considering just Randolph Jefferson or the slave girl Agey individually would not provide. The ratios of men to women and women to children provide information about the basic opportunities for "normal" social and familial relations among both blacks and whites at Shadwell. These figures also provide ways to compare slave life at Shadwell with slave life elsewhere in the Piedmont or in tidewater, Virginia. The statistics are a tool, but they are also a way of thinking about and expanding the ways in which people and things can be considered. Comparison of historical data from across Virginia suggests that wealthier Anglo planters in the Piedmont were little different from their compatriots back east, and that Shadwell fits into patterns of slave life in other parts of the Piedmont. But the answers and questions are more complex than that.
The Value of Things and How to Measure Wealth

Measuring and comparing wealth in early America has its own challenges. Even laws defining what property was to be included in probate inventories varied from place to place. In some counties inventories included land, some did not. Some included stored agricultural products, food, and drink and clothing, some did not. Albemarle County, Virginia, inventories do not include land, and Peter Jefferson’s inventory does not include food or clothing, however, Jane’s includes tea, and Jane Jr.’s includes clothing. Chesapeake historians Lois Carr and Lorena Walsh have devised indices to measure and compare wealth and amenities and their work informs chapter one, in particular. Wealth is represented in a number of ways in the Shadwell records and artifact collections, and no single means of comparison satisfies all our questions. Without comparative information, however, monetary values from two hundred years ago can seem meaningless. In some instances, I compare objects within the estate because it offers a means for understanding the relative weight of investment by the Jeffersons. In some cases, I evaluate the Jeffersons’ expenditures against other estates in Albemarle County. In a few instances, I have used conversion tables to translate sums to today’s money.363

Comparisons within the Jeffersons’ own investments are revealing. Peter Jefferson’s probate inventory reflects the expenditures of a planter. By far his biggest

363 On biases in probate records, see Gloria L. Main “The Correction of Biases in Colonial American Probate Records.” Historical Methods Newsletter, 8: no. 1 (Dec. 1974), esp. 10. See also Carr and Walsh, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behaviors," 59-166; also chaps. 1 and 2.
investment was in labor, that is, in slaves (table 1). His next biggest expenditure was in livestock, followed by furniture then things related to foodways, including fireplace equipage, cookwares, and dining utensils and ceramics. Slaves were the first forty-eight most valuable possessions of Peter Jefferson. They occupy fifty-five of the first sixty-two places when the itemized list is sorted by value (five infants are listed with their mothers). The single most valuable object, at number forty-nine in ranking, was the silver coffee and tea service, valued at £17.10, a value that was one third of the most highly valued slave, Sawney, at £57.10. The best bed and furniture, the one with harateen upholstery in the parlor, was valued at £12. A sorrel mare named Diamond and a dark bay four-year-old horse, both valued at £10, each equaled the investment in PJ's cherry tree desk and book case at £10, and "1 Dozen Table spoons" also at £10. A bed and furniture with curtains in an upstairs chamber valued at £9, was the only other object valued at more than the smallest value assigned to a slave. The smallest value assigned to an individual slave was £8, for the child Bellon (or Bella), who lived at Snowdon.364

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category</th>
<th>total appraised value</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>labor, all slaves</td>
<td>£1,820</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>livestock</td>
<td>£285 6s. 9d.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furniture</td>
<td>£127 15s. 6d.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foodways</td>
<td>£94 0s. 11d.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tools</td>
<td>£43 17s. 2d.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (arms, building supplies, misc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>£2,399 0s. 5d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table App. I.1. Relative investment of Peter Jefferson, as listed in probate inventory.

Values for intangible investments, such as education, also become more meaningful when compared to physical property. The boys took their schooling out of the house, but the daughters learned at home. Benjamin Sneed instructed Martha in 1757 and 1758, when she was about ten to twelve. Lucy schooled with him from 1762 to 1764 when she was ten to twelve. Sneed also taught Jefferson children in 1761, but they were unnamed in the account. Peter's estate paid £6 a year for Randolph to board with his cousins, where Sneed tutored him and the Lewis children. Sneed received £1.10 a year for teaching Randolph, £1 for each year teaching Martha, and 13 s. 4 d. for eight months teaching Lucy. In both 1759 and 1760 James Maury received £20 for schooling and board of Thomas Jefferson. Thus a year's education with a schoolmaster such as Sneed was worth about the same as twenty-two pigs or a pair of harrateen window curtains. Randolph's board could have replaced a bed and furniture, a moderately priced horse, "seven cows and steers," a set of surveyor and mathematical instruments, or two copper kettles. The annual expense for Thomas' education and board with Maury, on the other hand, was equivalent to the value of the elderly field hand Phillis, or the young slave girl, Eve who was destined to be a lady's maid. Of the items listed in Peter Jefferson's inventory, only slaves cost more than Thomas's annual education expense.

When the Jeffersons are compared within a number of existing statistical studies they hold their place consistently. Jack Greene's study of the Virginia House of Burgesses in the half century prior to the Revolution offers a number of points for

---

365 For schooling years and costs, see Harvie I. For values of goods at Shadwell, see AlCWB 2, 41-48; Phillis was likely at least 43 years old when she was valued at £20 in 1757.
comparing Peter Jefferson's standing. While Greene did not include the elder Jefferson (he did include the younger Jefferson) in the list of 110 members who “dominated the proceedings of the house” based on their positions on important committees, Peter would have fared favorably among the elite 110 in terms of wealth and number of slaves owned. Peter’s 7,250 acres of land put him in the lower third, who owned less than 10,000 acres of land; however, if Jefferson’s speculative land figures are included, he joins the upper three-quarters of burgesses who owned over 10,000 acres. The top third of burgesses owned over fifty slaves, as did Jefferson. Over two-fifths of the men speculated in western lands in addition to being lawyers or planters or merchants. Just over half of this elite group of elite had no university-level education and Greene speculates that they were probably “at least as well educated as any men in the colony.” Like Peter, almost every burgess held office at the county or parish level: over four-fifths as justices, over half were vestrymen, nearly two-fifths served as militia officers. They were Anglicans and being from the right families helped. The house began to draw leaders from the Piedmont in the late 1740s, right about the time Jefferson took office, but he did not rise to the same prominence as his predecessor Joshua Fry, nor to that of his son who succeeded him.366

Peter Jefferson also embraced all the qualities that Charles Sydnor found to describe gentry office holders. The justices and their families made up just less than 2 percent of the white population, but they paid 8.6 percent of the land taxes in their counties (8 county study), and 12.4 percent of taxes on slaves. Thus their number was

less than their economic representation, or, as might be conversely stated, their economic holdings outweighed their population distribution. They owned on average 903 acres of land, eight horses, twenty-five slaves, and one in seven owned a carriage. Sydnor notes an almost synonymous roster of gentlemen and nominees for political office.367

Sources: Documents

A number of documents offer information about the material or social world at Shadwell. Colonial Shadwell is reflected in three probate inventories. These inventories are lists of moveable property made by court-appointed appraisers as a legal record of an individual’s wealth for the purposes of settling claims of debt against an estate following a person’s death. One of the most important documents to this project is the probate inventory of Peter Jefferson’s estate taken after his death in 1757 that lists his moveable goods, over 1450 individual people, objects, and animals. These inventories are like snapshots: they provide a static image at a given moment. They are wonderfully detailed and maddeningly brief. Their contents and even their organization offer clues about physical landscape at Shadwell. Peter’s inventory provides the most comprehensive census of Shadwell slaves and indicates something of their labor and social organization at Shadwell in this single year. The slave list is the baseline for the statistical analysis of the slave population. The year 1757 is the entry into many of these chapters because the


Engrossment, or the unequal ratio of population to economic influence and landholding, is explored as in Ayres, “Albemarle Co.,” esp. 11-20, 55, Appendix I.C.
inventory taken that year provides a benchmark against which to take measure of all the other Shadwell documents.368

Inventories were also made for Jane Jefferson Jr., in 1768, and Jane Jefferson Sr., in 1776. Jane Sr.'s inventory mentions the same range of household goods that her husband's did, but Jane Jr.'s has a wholly different concern because she was unmarried without a household of her own. The purposes of these records of property and the intent of the appraisers are part of their contribution to this story. Close reading of these documents sheds light not only on their subjects, but also on the legal and social systems that required the documents' creation in the first place.

The inventories also omit important types of data. Peter's inventory, for instance, mentions nothing to do with music, though the children played instruments, and it says nothing about spinning or weaving, work that the later inventories indicate the Jefferson women performed. Were these objects omitted because they were seen as owned by someone else in the household, or were they only acquired in the decade following Peter's death? Other sources such as archaeology and family history need to inform us about material goods that were not in the inventories.

Another element of power that came from wealth was having an audience that received the messages that wealth sent and recognized them for what they were. There were at least two parties that created the inventory that allows us to reconstruct the material world at Shadwell. First were the Jeffersons and their acquisition of all the listed

368 This study works from fresh transcriptions of all the Shadwell-era documents. Early transcriptions (c. 1940s) on file at UVA are woefully inadequate and have misled many historians who have used them.
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property. Second were the appraisers who recognized and labeled the objects for the court. Six men signed the inventory, three at Shadwell and three at Snowdon, the Jeffersons' land in southern Albemarle County. The Shadwell appraisers included two peers, Charles Lewis, Jr., Jane's brother-in-law and a close family member who had an intimate knowledge of the Jeffersons' mode of living. Additionally, if he did not know, he could easily ask his sister-in-law and her children who was the owner the harpsichord or violin or dressing table. It is likely that appraiser John Henderson also recognized the accouterments of fine living. Henderson was county sheriff and magistrate and his brother married Lewis's daughter Elizabeth. Thomas Smith, the third appraiser, owned land nearby and had business with Peter Jefferson, including selling him supplies of powder and shot in 1755. The Snowdon appraisers were neighbors in the Fluvanna River area. John Lewis was a magistrate and had a license to operate an ordinary in the county. Richard Murray was a neighbor and leased Jefferson's land “opposite the courthouse” to run an ordinary there. John Watkins lived nearby. Most of these men served as appraisers on other estates, and among them they had particular knowledge that let them value a wine glass, a cooking pot in a slave quarter, or a man or woman who worked in the field.

The appraisers at Shadwell needed to evaluate fine household goods and a wide range of plantation equipment, as well as slaves and livestock. The second group needed only to recognize farm tools and livestock, in addition to listing the slaves. The only big difference between the lists they made was in how they discussed the people owned by

---

369 AICBO 1746-1748 (Reel 46), 316; AlCWB 2: 77; Harvie I, 12; PJAB, 10, 21; Woods, Albemarle, 227. On carrying out the role of an appraiser, see Rose, Diary, 53.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
the Jeffersons. At Shadwell the slaves were called by name, sometimes with the qualifier child, girl, or boy attached. They were simply "Phebe," "Juno," or "Orrange a boy." At Snowdon the appraisers added labels to count each person and qualify their race. Thus, they became "1 Negro Fellow Crummel," or "1 Negro Wench Betty," or "1 Negro Child Bellow." Otherwise, the values and nomenclature for tools corresponds closely.370

The inventories provide a static view of wealth and investment. Account books allow some glimpse into how the Jeffersons acquired and used their money over time, although the account books are silent about most household items. Peter Jefferson kept an account book in which he recorded plantation-related and professional expenses covering the years 1744 through his death, with additions until 1759. The executor of Peter's estate, John Harvie, recorded accounts for Shadwell in two separate books that span the years 1757-1765, years when Jane's role in making decisions about family expenditures is undeniable.

Peter and Jane also wrote wills that offer a different type of information than the inventories provide; they signal intent. Peter's will specified how his money and land should be divided and that he wished to pass certain slaves and certain objects to specific children, as well as what should be provided for his wife Jane following his death. Jane's will is brief and concerns the disposition of slaves and clothing. The only document in Jane's hand is her Bible that she put to record family history.

370 The use of the word "Negro" for labeling slaves was quite ordinary in wills and inventories, though it is tempting to suggest that the difference in language here indicate some different way of thinking about race among the two groups of appraisers. Still, the names of the Snowdon slaves suggest possible African origins and they may
There are few miscellaneous personal or legal documents from all but one of the Jefferson children that provide references to people or things that once were at Shadwell. The exception, of course, is Thomas Jefferson, whose voluminous memoranda allow an epilogue to the post-Peter and Jane lives of a number of their former slaves. Different Monticello-era documents provide other details. These include Jefferson’s Garden Book, Farm Book, and other plantation records.

Peter Jefferson also left a professional legacy, drawn in maps and recorded in surveying notes and accounts. These bear some implications for the material world at Shadwell, but, more importantly, they give a sense of time spent traveling and working, and of contacts made with other professionals and people in far away places. They offer a worldview, first-hand testimony about the Jeffersons’ horizons. Additionally, Thomas Jefferson’s surveys and agricultural prescriptions for the Shadwell lands when they served as a quarter farm in the larger Monticello plantation system provide concrete description of the plantation land.

Sources: Family History

Family history of the Jeffersons comes to us from four major sources. Thomas Jefferson’s own autobiography supplies brief and well-tempered thoughts about his family, and his memorandum books and other papers provide additional details. His granddaughter Ellen Wayles (Randolph) Coolidge, kept a letterbook, in which some of her letters to Jefferson’s 1858 biographer Henry S. Randall appear. In these letters she responded to Randall’s queries and the letters occasionally contain information that have been recent arrivals. This is explored further in chap. 4. AIWCW 2, 41-48, citations on 47.
Randall did not include in the published volumes, or corrections she made to what he wrote. Her knowledge of family history is further represented in Randall’s work. Henry S. Randall attributed “not far from one-third” of the material in _The Life of Thomas Jefferson_ to descendants of Thomas Jefferson who supplied first hand recollections, stories heard from their parents—Jefferson’s two daughters, and family papers, correspondence, and records. In fact, Randall’s requests to the family for information occasioned their “discovery” of a box of family papers that included Peter Jefferson’s Account Book and other documents that had been stored away.

In 1871, another descendant, great granddaughter Sarah N. Randolph published her book, _The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson_, in which she strove to present a more private Jefferson than Randall had presented. Sarah Randolph had access to Thomas Jefferson’s family letters and private papers that had not been available to Randall. Randolph credited her father, Thomas Jefferson Randolph, with teaching her to venerate her great grandfather. It was from her father that many of her stories came. The testimony of Thomas Jefferson’s grandchildren filtered through nineteenth-century sources bears the quality of oral history: it is light and static as reported, hazy in its specificity. But these stories have utility and I have revisited many of them. The material culture of Shadwell supports some of the family stories that previously have been dismissed.

---


373 Randolph, _Domestic Life_, vii-viii.
People

This study discusses many Jeffertsons. In general, their first names identify them here: Peter, Jane, Thomas, Elizabeth, etc., to avoid the multi-worded qualifiers that not doing so would require. In certain instances when there are multiple persons of the same name (there are three slave women named Sall or Sally and three Martha Jeffertsons, for instance). I cannot apologize for family naming traditions, but I can apologize for the need in some sections to use what may seem like less-than respectful use of familiar names. Treating everyone with an even hand, male, female, slave, or free is limited by the sparse surviving details about each person’s life. First names work, instead of adding layers of qualifiers to the historical record, except when there is little choice for the sake of clarity. Thus, Martha the sister, Martha the wife, and Martha the daughter, are clear when the subject is Thomas. Jane Jr., was the legal moniker of the daughter of Peter and Jane Jefferson, because of this, sometimes Jane Sr. works best for the mother. The Jeffertsons defined some slaves according to age or family relationships, such as “Nan, Salls Daughter,” “Big Sall,” or “Sall the elder” (all the same Sall), but occasionally it is clearer to use Sall I, Sall II, and Sally III for the generations of Salls.

Documents shed light only onto moments in the lives of these people. The challenge of the biographer is how to tie together the many facets of a life to describe a person in their many-varied modes. Jane Jefferson, for instance, was not simply Thomas Jefferson’s mother or Peter Jefferson’s wife. She was a person who traveled, who read, who thought about how her children should be raised, who experienced loss and joy as a parent. Just as I have done with certain objects, I have explored the many roles each
person had, as well as explored the range of relationships between people at different points in their lives.

Although most documentary and archaeological events describe a single moment, they must be considered as part of a chronology. People and objects have different needs and uses whether it is night or day, winter or summer, time to plant, celebrate a birthday, or travel to court day. People age, families grow, individuals die, and the family occupies space and requires different resources as these natural events occur. The needs of a two-year-old girl vary tremendously from those of a sixteen-year-old young lady, and a family of three lives differently than a family of ten. The progression of time is a source for history that requires both grounding in the particular and consideration of the general.

The treatment and interpretation of the Jeffersons and Shadwell by generations preceding mine color my history of this place, its people, the objects, and the documents pertaining to them. All history is revisionist and it is my job to use the tools before me in the ways that make sense to me. Sometimes that reinforces a previous generation's views, and sometimes it contradicts long-standing assumptions. My aim, in revisiting Dumas Malone, or Marie or Fiske Kimball, or even Thomas Jefferson's own words, is not to reduce the value of their work for what it was, but to use the familiar interpretation to re-examine what we can know about it. There is new evidence from artifacts and from documents, too. There are new ways of thinking about the past. Part of the reason that I can reconsider the evidence is that it was considered in the first place. But interpretation is not the only thing that changes. What can be learned from objects and documents changes with time. The care or lack thereof given to artifacts or documents enhances or
limits how much we can learn from them. Standards for storage and cataloging of objects change, the financial wherewithal of caretakers changes, and the views of people about what is important to save and preserve changes. These all color the evidence I have and how I can work with it. Likewise, the last three decades have seen intensive investigation by historians into the Chesapeake world, its crops, its people, and its material culture. Studies now exist of early American architecture, bookbinding, of ceramics, of slave life, of women’s roles that offer fresh ideas and afford me the luxury of asking new questions because others have answered the questions from the first round.

I have not tried to revisit all the biographical information about Thomas Jefferson, but have done so where a detail sheds new light on how the Jefferson family lived. Most of the documents I cite have been used many times in Jefferson biographies. Some previous interpretations bear retelling. Some quotations, oft-used to describe Thomas Jefferson, now supply information about the material or social world of the entire Jefferson family, where they had been used previously only to tell the story of one.

This study reassesses many of the myths surrounding the early Jeffersons. Some can be addressed directly based on material evidence or close rereading of documents coupled with new information. Some of the foundation myths remain just that. Their utility served the purposes of generations previous to explain this history in a way that made sense to them. The uses of these stories are an important part of the history and historiography of the Jefferson family and have helped fuel the Jefferson industry. In almost every chapter I address both scholarly and popular assumptions about the early Jeffersons. In every chapter there is something new to tell.
In this study, we come to Shadwell through its material culture – the artifacts recovered archaeologically and through documents. Though some aspects of material culture can be measured through statistical summaries, a greater value of the material goods is that they allow us to explore the particulars to this site to describe the colors, textures, and even sometimes the smells or sounds of everyday life. By focusing so closely on one site and one group of people we can see the changes to their lives as other lives changed around them. The details allow us to examine the constantly intertwining lives of a planter family, the people they owned, and the people who lived and worked near them. The artifacts offer the opportunity to give a voice and role in history to people who were not fortunate enough to make sure their own stories got heard. The stories of people who labored lies in the everyday – how they used that hoe or frying pan, what they carried and when. Their tools for work become our tools for telling the stories they may have shared only with each other, maybe even silently, as they picked up and put down in a quotidian existence. It would be possible to work comparatively between Shadwell and the collected knowledge about Chesapeake plantations using a single group of artifacts, just the ceramics, for instance, or a group of people, just the slaves, for instance. But it would be impossible to explore the births and deaths of people and how their families grew and changed, and how the exceptional and the mundane affected them. By examining all of these things in a single place, we can explore the intricacy and the contradictions of past lives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Cherry tree desk and book case</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapins History of Engd 2 vol &amp; 2 vol of the Continuation thereof</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomons state tryals 26/ Laws of Virg 7/6</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oglvies Discription of america</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Quarto bible w Book of Common Prayer</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelsons office of a Justice 15/ Scriveners guide 2 vol 8/</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The present state of great Britain 3/ the Lond &amp; Country brewer 3/</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trents Astronomey 5/ a secret Hist of Queen Anns Ministers 1/8</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzers huclander 2/6 Virginia Justice 3/6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansons Voyage round the World 4/ a Large Prayer book 8/1</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop of sodor &amp; mans Instructions for indians</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three old Books</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spect. IX Volumes Tattler 5 Vol Gaurd 2 Vol Addis Works 3 Vol @ 4/6</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps of the 4 Quarters of the World</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A map of the city London 4/ Dº of Virginia 7/6</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four old maps</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A set of survey. &amp; other ma Instruments</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Walnut desk &amp; Bookcase</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two 5 feet black Walnut Tables</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One four feet Dº 30/, Dº one 3-1/2 feet @ 26</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one tea Table 26/</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven black walnut chairs @ 12/, 10 Dº at 10/, 1 Dº brok a 7/6</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two arm Chairs @ 14/, Dº 1 Closs stool chair @ 18/</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Large Looking Glass Cherry tree frame &amp; Candlesticks</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Japan Plate Oven @ 32/6, pair Handirons @ 12/6, 1 pair of fire tongs @ 3/6
3 Large china bowls crack @ 10/6, 3 small D° whole @ 10/6
A set coffee cups 17/6, 1 China teapot broken @ 1/6
8 China cups & saucers @ 15/2, a sugar Dish milk pots &
Six saucers & 4 Glass teacups @ 2/6, A parcel of white stone tea Ware @ 3/6
Two Water Jugs 7/6, 5 stone plates @ 1/4, 1 bowl & 2 Plates 3/6
1 Black teapot @ 1/6, A parcel of Wine &ca Glasses 13/6
A Cruet stand 65, 1 Dozen Table spoons @ L10
A silver spoop spoon @ 21/6, six old silver spoons @ 12/6
One silver punch Ladle @ 15/6, 2 silver salts 45/6
Eight tea spoons strainer & tong 40/6, 2 old tea spoons 4/6
One silver coffee pot teapot & milk pot
Two Wooden salvers & punch Ladles 3/6, 1p' money scales 10
3 Dozn Plate plates @ 70/6, 1 Dozn soup 24/6
Two Hair Brushes 6/6, three old Pewter Plates 1/6
sixteen Glasses 6/8, three Large Deep dishes 18/6
4 Candle mouds 6/6, three pewter Bassons & 1 Porringer &ca 8/6
1 Gall° Tea cittle 7/6, 1 D° small @ 4/6, 5 brass cansticks, 2 pr snuf° 5/6
1 Bell mettle mortar & pestle 4/6, 1 Bell mettle & 1 Coper scallet 12/6
1 Warming & 1 Bed Pan 26/6, 1 Plate basket 6/6
1 pair scales and weights 7/6, 22 tin canisters 33/6, 1 Teacheast 12/6
Two oval black walnut Tables 35/6, 1 square Tea Table 7/6
Two Chairs 19/6, 4 Hairteen chairs 50/6, 1 Chest drawers 60/6
Two Dressing Glasses 35/6, 1 square Tea Table 20/6
1 Hairteen bed & furneture 1/6, one bed and furneture 16/6
A pair Handirons & shovell 26/6, 1 hair broom 1/8
22 knifes & 17 forks & knife box 12/6
3 old chest 22/6, 3 old chairs 6/6
1 Pair Hairteen Window curtains 20/6, 2 Dressing Tables 25/6
1 Bed 15..10, 1 D° & bedstead 70/6, 1 old bed &
A Pair Handirons @ 7/6, two cloth baksits & 1 old D° 10/6
1 sieve 1/6, 1 Hammock 6/6, 1 Hair cyder bag 1/6
A tea board 2/6, 1 Walnut oval table 10/6, 1 D° 12/6, 1 square D° 12/6
An old desk 26/6, a Comb trace 5/6
5 Walnut chair 25/6, 1 arm D° 7/6
A black Leather trunk 10/6, 2 Boxes 2/6
1 bed and furniture w' Curtains [L9], 1 Bed &ca 16/6
1 P° Handirons 18/6, 1 p° Wag[?] stiliard 1/6, 1 hand bell 5/6
2 Basketts & Cloth 4/6, 3 old Chairs 3/6
1 scrubing brush & 2 Hair brooms 5/6, 1 Square Table 2/6
A Bed bedst° & Covering
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A Pair Handirons & firetongs 18/3, - 3 old chists & box 20/
2 Earthen Jars 20/4, 4 carry boys 21/6
a parcel of butter potts Jars Bottle Jugs &ca
A parcel of old tubs case &ca 21/6, 2 old funnels 1/8
3 Pails 6/, 1 box 6/, 1 old pewter dish, 3 old tin pans 2/6
2 old Chists & Table 10/9, 2 Grid irons toaster toaster & [...] 7/
1 Iron chafling dish & 3 brass D° 4/, 3 box Irons & Heaters 10/
A pair bellows /6, a parcel patterners /6, 1 Brand irons & still. 14/
A sifter & meal bags 4/, 15 Q° bottles 3/9
4 Damask T Cloths
1 old Ozn° tablecloth 1/6, 3 Large & 2 small Pewter Dishes 15/9
1 P° Large Kitchen Handirons 30/7
1 old D: Oven, Pewter dish, Pat: pans &c @ 6/
4 Tubs & 4 Pails 16/, two copper Kittles L6..10
2 Iron Spits 9/, 2 frying pans & Grid Iron 4/6
2 Iron pott rakes 22/6, 4 potts & 3 P° pot Hooks 55/3
1 bed & Covering 45/, 2 old Tables 3/6, 2 brushes 1/[0?]
2 old chairs & 1 P° sisars 2/
A meal bag, 2 beds. & 2 barrels 11/6
1 Cleaver 1/6, 10 light cask 25/, old Lumber 2/6
1 cask 5/, 4 meal bags 11/6
2 p° Oznabrigs 238 Ells @
1 pc° 23 yards 3/4 Irish Linnen @1/
2 p° 38 yd° D° @ 13 4/1/2
1 p° 22 yd° 7/8 D°@ 16 4/1/2
6 yd° 14/4 D° @ 2/2
18 1/2 yd° of stript cotton @ 1/3
2 Dozn & 3 P° yarn hose 14
8-3/4 yrd° of stript sanskin @ 18 4/1/2
1 p° men shoes 6/, 1 P° D:chan pumps 8/6
97 Yd° Cotton @ 14-1/2
1 Cask Nails P° Invoice
3 Dozn & one broad hoes @ 25/
2 Dozn & 1 narrow @ 20/
2 P° mens shoes @ 5/6

Advance on the above Good being at first cost 75 pct
1 Gun @ 50/, 1 D° 25/ L3. 15.
1 P° Brass barrel'd pistols 15/, 1 P° D° 35/ 2. 10.
1 silver Hilted sword L3, 1 D° Cuttlass L3 6.
1 baynet 3/, a p° files 7/6 10. 6
A parcel of sword belts & Double Girth 6/ 6.
1 silver Watch L5, 1 p° silver spurs @ 30/ 6. 10.
1/2 Dozn Razors, a whon & Case flames [fleams?] 10/ [?]

A spring bolt 2/6, 2 p° Table Hinges 2/, 1 p° HL D° 1/6 L 6.
2 Drest skins & some pieces soll Leather 19/
1 box sundry med.° Viols &ca @ 30/ 1. 10.
A parcel of Colours for house painting 10/ 10.

<44>
2 new frying pans 6/, a parcel of Harness Buckles 5/ 11.
2-1/2 sheets parch & 1/2 Dutch Royal paper 2. 9
1 old chair & Harness 45/, new C. harness four Horse 38/
A parcel shoe makers tools 10/, 14 Last 7/ 17.
2 raw hides & some tamnl'd Leather @ 20/ 1.
A Well chain & 4 p° Potthooks 26/9 1. 6. 9
nine old sickles/9, 85°° Lead @ 4°, 7 lib line @ 1 [?] 1. 6. 1
12 Pullies 2/, three Jugs Lyntseed Oyle @ 30/ 1. 12.
58 Feet Glass @ 9° 2. 3. 6
20 lib Putty 3° 5/, a parcel old Iron 20/7 1. 5. 7
3 Harrow hoe Eyes 3/, a parcel Carpet°° Tools 5/ 8.
A Dutch Plow hoe 7/6, a pick axe stone [bov:] 22/ 1. 9. 6
38 lib Cart Boxes 11. 1
A Cart and Whels L4, 6 p° Iron Traces 39/ 5. 19.
2 p° old Cart wheels 25/, 11 p° heems & Coll.°° 23/10 2. 8. 10
3 Hilling Hoes w° ax Eyes 11/3, 3 D° round Eyes 9/ 1. 0. 3
4 Narrow axes 17/, 1 Claw hammer 1/3 18. 3
1 broad ax 3/, 1 p° Wedges 3/ 6.
1 pair Large marking Irons 2/
1 Broad & 1 Grubing hoe 7. 6
3 old spades 2/, 4 mill peck 3/9 5. 9
1/2 bush: 1/2 peck & qu.° peck 4/ 4.
3 Hhd° 6/, 5 Barrils 4/6 10. 6
4 New bags 36/, 13 W° [or?] Cot: Peticots sup°° 44 yd°° 97/6 6. 13. 6
51 Hogs @ 6/ L15. 6.
10 Cows 2 steers & 2 Calves 15. 12.
3 young Cattle 45/, 8 small D° 32/ 3. 17.
11 Sheep @ 6 3. 6.
A roan Horse Named fidler 3.
A Dark bay Horse named Daubin 6.
A Dark Gray Horse Skeltoon 6.
A Dark Gray Horse called Harry 6. 10.
A sorrel mare Diamond 10. 10.
A Dark bay mare named Jewel 1.
A Dark bay Horse prince 5. 10.
A Gray Horse called Cupid 5.
A black mare broom 2. 10.
A Dark bay Horse 4 year old 10.
A Dark bay 3 year old colt called blaze 7.
A Gray mare Tepsie 5.
1 D° called Cherry 3.
A bay mare called Jenny Morris 1.
2 Mare colts 7.
A Dark bay mare & skuebald colt 3. 10.
A Dark Gray mare & Colt 3. 10.
A black Horse Colt 2.
A white Mare 1. 15.
Hercullus [Hercules] 35.
Samson 45.
Syphax 45.
Sawney 57. 10.
Phill 30.
Nimrod 45.
Jupiter 32. 10.
Cesar 30.
Squire a boy 27. 10.
Jammey 25.
Peter 17. 10.
Adam 15.
Jesse 17. 10.
Sall 40.
Hannah & her Child Fan 45.
Cachina & her C Lydia 40.
Myrtilia and her C Fany 47. 10.
Bellinda & her C Suckey 45.
Nan 35.
Cloe 15.
Patt 30.
Cate 27. 10.
Eve 20. [?] 22. 10.
Leah 25.
Phebe 16.
Rachel 27. 10.
Sally 37. 10.
Flora her Child Agey 47. 10.
Moll a Girl 27. 10.
Ephey a Girl 17. 10.
Goliah 50.
Tobey 25.
Gill 45.
Toby a boy 18.
Orrange a boy 13.
Phillis 20.
Juno 27. 10.
Fany 35.
Lucey 40.
Nanney a Girl 15.
Squir 50.
Jack 45.
Harry 35.
Dinah 35.
Jenny 30.
Eady 25.
Billey 25.

£ 1,537.

Seven cows and stears
2 Young Cattle
3 old sows & 18 Pigs
10 shotes
13 Cows @ 30/, 4 Large Steers @ 40/
13 Young Cattle at 18/, Eight year old @ 6/
36 old hogs @ 6/, & 31 pigs @ 1/
8 old cattle @ 26/, 9 year old @ 5/6
23 Hogs @ 4/, 11 pigs @ 1/3
2 sows & pigs 13/
2 Mare colts 1.5
19 Hogs 1.5..6/
1 Oxyoke 3/6, 2 fall: g axes 6/
3 Grubing hoes 7/6, 5 Ft: Hoes 12/
3 Weeding hoes 7/, a Grind stone 1/
1 spade 1/, 1 pot and hooks 5/6, 1 M:
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1 Dutch Plow 15/6, 2 Plough hoes 11/6
1 old + cut saw 6/
3 Grubing hoes 3/6, 1 Grindstone 1/
2 tight casks 5/, 1 p' stillyards & Beef Rope 17/
3 Potts & 2 p' pot hooks 15/6
2 Tin pans 1/6
4 broad hoes 7/9, 6 Hilling hoes 12/6
3 Narrow axes 7/6, 2 old chairs 2/6
4 Hilling hoes 6/6, 2 Narrow axes 9/
4 broad hoes 10/3, 1 p' Iron wedges 4/
1  + cut saw 12/6
1 Handsaw 3/, 1 Gun 21/6
2 potts & 1 p' pot hook
2 tin pans 2/6, 1 Dish & plate 3/6
1 frying pan 2/, 2 sifters 6d
1 Grindstone 2/6, 3 Rawhides 12/
1 Grindstone 1/

Pursuant to an order of Albemarle County Court dated the thirteenth day of October in the year seven hundred & fifty seven we Whose names are hereunto subscribed have appraised such part of the Estate of Peter Jefferson, Esq' dec'd as Lyes on the rivannah river & its branches as the same hath been produced to us by John Harvie Ex' as the same is inventoreyed on this & the six preceding pages in testemony whereof we have hereunto subscribed our names this sixth day of April Anno Domni seventeen hundred & fifty eight.

Chas Lewis Jur
John Henderson
Thomas Smith

This Inventory and appraisment of the Estate of Peter Jefferson Gent. decd was returned into Albemarle County Court the thirteenth day of April 1758 & Ordered to be recorded

Test. John Nicholas Cke

Jeffersons Inventory In obedience to an order of the Worshipful Court of Albemarle County to Appraise the Estate of Peter Jefferson dec'd being first sworn before Matthew Jordan Gent. one of his majestyes Justices for the said county have proceeded as followeth

1 Negro Fellow Crummel L50.
1 Negro Quash 55.
1 Negro Sanco 50.
1 Negro Wench betty 40.
1 Negro Bellow 40.
1 Negro Nell 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Negro Child Bellow</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Large Hogs @ 6/</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 small d° 4/</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 pigs 1/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 7. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Cows 30/</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 d° 26/</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 young Cattle 13/</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bull</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Yearlings 7/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Gray mare</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Black d°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 d° D°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 D° D°</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Gray Horse</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nar° Hoes 24/6, 98 lbs old Iron 15/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Br° Hoes 27/</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. 7. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Nar° axes 10/</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Iron Wedges 8/</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 8. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Grind stone 4/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Harrow Hoes 9/</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. 8. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Plough 7/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 plow shiere 12/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Iron Pott &amp; Hooks 10/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I pot 2/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>355.11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John Lewis
Richd Murrey
John Watkins

This Inventory & appriasment of the Estate of Peter Jefferson Gent deced was returned into Albemarle County Court the thirteenth day of april 1758 & ordered to be recorded

Test John Nicholas Clk

[Transcription by Susan A. Kern. Note: All totals for entries have been checked and entries on each line separated by commas accordingly. Format of original has been retained. All subtotals, punctuation, spelling and capitalization is as written, EXCEPT all commas dividing items on a line are mine. A question mark in the cash column indicates a problem with the entry totals for that line, [] indicate a question about a word or object]
APPENDIX II. b.:

INVENTORY OF THE

ESTATE OF JANE JEFFERSON, 1777

Albemarle County Will Book 2, 356.

Agreeable to an order of Albemarle Court we the Subscribers being first Sworn, have appraised the undermentioned Articles of the Estate of Mrs. Jane Jefferson dec'd to wit

1 feather bed £6, 1 do. & Pillow £6, 1 do. Virginia Tick Bolster & Pillow £4..10, 1 Chas Bed {32}, 2 Blankets 30/, 1 Rug 15/, 1 do. 45/, 1 Blankett 12/6, 1 Counterpin 15/, 1 do. 35/, 1 do. 15/, 1 pr. Sheets 25/, 2 Table Cloths 8/, 1 Oznabrig Sheet 10/, 1 do. 10/, a parcel of Spun Cotton 20/, a Small quantity of Sugar & Coffee, Sugar Box & Bag that held the Sugar 10/, 1 Baskett with Some Tae 2/6, 1 Chest 15/, 1 Table 10/, 1 do. 20/, 3 mattts 2/6, 3 Cherry Chairs & 1 frame £2.10/, 2 walnut Chairs & 1 Elbow do. 25/, 5 flat bottom Chairs 9/, 21 plates 44/, 9 Same old pewter 8/, 6 dishes 22/6, 4 Tin pans 7/6, 1 do. Can Vial and peper Box 2/, 3 Chamber potts 6, 1 Camb 2/6, 1 dutch oven 4/, 9 knives & Six forks 10/, 1 Tea kittle & Trivett 10/, 4 bottles & 3 jugs 6/, 1 Grid Iron flat Iron & c. 14/, 1 p' Scales 1/6, 2 pr. Tongs Shovel & poker 8/, 3 potts 2 pr. hooks 1 Ladle, 1 Spit and Rack 40/, 1 kittle 50/, 1 hackle 2/, 2 Brushes 2/, 1 Cotton Wheel 3/, 1 frying pan & flesh fork 4/, 2 old tables Pails Tubs & Box 9/, 1 Tea bord 2/6, a parcel of books 15/, 1 Large Bible 12/6, 1 Bag & Cotton 4/6, 1 Ax 2/6, 3 bedsteads & 2 Cords 13/6, 2 pr. hand Irons 17/6, 1 Looking glass 25/, 2 doz. Earthen plates & 1 bowl 10/, 4 Earthen dishes 7/6, a parcel China 15/, a Stand of Cruets 7/6, 1 Coffee pott Spice Mortar & Cork Screw 11/, a parcel of Old Silver 85/, 4 Candlemoulds 6/, 2 horn Tumblers 2/, 7 Turkeys 14/, 22 Sheep with 8 Lambs £12/2, 1 Cow & Calf £3, 1 Bull 50/, 1 heifer 35/.

John Moore Junr.
Henry Mullins
Nicholas Lewis

At Albermarle August Court 1777
This Inventory & c. was Returned to Court & Ordered to be Recorded.
Test. John Nicholas, Clerk

[Transcription by Johnathan Farris and Susan A. Kern. Note: Format of original has been retained. All punctuation, spelling and capitalization is as written.]
APPENDIX II. c.:  

INVENTORY OF THE  

ESTATE OF JANE JEFFERSON JR., 1768

Albemarle County Will Book 2, 227, 233.

[Albemarle County Will Book II, 227]

PRIVATE
An Inventory and Appraisement of the Estate of Jane Jefferson, Junior, dec'd.
A Negro wench named Pat..........................50/0/0
A Negro Girl named Betty..........................15 " "
A Negro Boy named Sancho.......................13 " "
A Bed and two Bed Quilts.........................6 " "
A Large Copper Kittle & Hook...................5 " "
A Large Earthen Jarr.............................5 " "
A Table.........................................." 12 "
A Tea Chest...................................." 15 "
A Pair of flat Irons................................" 5/9
An Old Saddle without a pad....................1/10/0
One Large Trunk.................................." 12/6
A Single Riding Chair............................15 " "
A Spinning Wheel & a pair of Cards..........." 8 "
Two small Old Trunks & a small Box..........." 2/6
Six Books........................................" 12 "
A Small work Basket & c.........................." 2 "

Pursuant to an Order of Albemarle Court we the Subscribers have appraised such of the Estate of Jane Jefferson Junior dec'd as was offered to us as above Witness our hands this 15th day of January 1768.

Nicholas Lewis
John Moore
Joel Terrell

[continued next page]
The following list of The wearing apparel belonging to the said dec'd which the
administrator was advised not to offer for appraisement but of which he thought himself
Pledged to Subjoin an Inventory to wit

One Lutestring Sack & Coat
One Lutestring Gown
One India Chints Sack with a Lutestring Petticoat
Two Chints Gowns, One white Callico sack & Coat
One Callico Sack, four Callico Gowns
One Virginia Cloth Gown with a pattern for another of Vir. Cloth
One Callimanco Quilt with one white Callico do.
Five Virginia Cloth Petticoats with one flannel do.
A Hat two pair of Stays a pair of white satten Shoes one do. of Callimanco
A Cardinal Three Linnen Aprons One Mulsin & one Gause do.
Five Pair of fine Cotten Stockings twelve Shiffs
Two Gold Rings. a pair of Silver Buckles. a pair of Gold Sleave Buttons

D. Carr, Admin.

At Albemarle February Court 1768
This Inventory & Appraisement of the Estate of Jane Jefferson Junr. were returned to Court & Ordered to be Recorded.

Test. Henry Fry

[Albemarle County Will Book 2, 233]

Page Pursuant to an order of Albemarle Court with the subscribers do Appraise the following articles in the Estate of Ms. Jane Jefferson decd. to wit

one large half worn portmantean Trunk .10.
one small trunk . 3.
one smelling bottle seal & a ring for keys . 2.6

Given under our hands this 21st day of May 1768
Nicholas Lewis Joel Terrell
At Albemarle August Court 1768

[Transcription by Johnathan Farris and Susan A. Kern. Note: Format of original has been retained. All punctuation, spelling and capitalization is as written.]
APPENDIX III:

"JANE JEFFERSON – HER BOOKE."

JEFFERSON FAMILY HISTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

In the Special Collections of Alderman Library at the University of Virginia, there is a book catalogued as “Jefferson Family, Bible” that bears inscriptions in the hands of Jane and Peter Jefferson, their sons Thomas and Randolph Jefferson, and Thomas’s daughter and granddaughter. The book contains important details about Peter and Jane Jefferson’s family that are available in no other source: Jane Jefferson recorded the birthplaces of all of her children in her Bible. At face value, the inscriptions in the book are hard to place in chronological order. But analysis of the physical aspects of the book - its bibliographic history - reveals that Thomas Jefferson bound into a single volume four pieces that had served separately as repositories for early family history. Not only does the book show Thomas Jefferson’s stewardship of his family’s legacy, it reveals the role of Jane Jefferson in preserving and maintaining the history of her family, and makes the book a much more meaningful artifact in the collection of early Jeffersonia.

“Jane’s Bible” must be compared with a second book, a more famous book, that served almost the same purpose as a bearer of family history, the book called “Thomas
Jefferson’s Prayer Book.” UVA acquired “Jane’s Bible” in 1954 but its arrival was eclipsed by the publication two years previously of a facsimile edition of a Prayer Book of Thomas Jefferson’s that lists the births and deaths of the members of his family. The 1952 publication has held sway among historians when citing information about Thomas Jefferson’s siblings. A close reading of these two books, both for the inscriptions they bear and the information they offer as artifacts sheds new light on Jefferson book collections and on multiple generations of Jefferson family history. Additionally, the treatment of these books by twentieth-century editors of facsimile and microfilm editions has affected their value to historians.

The two books and their parts are as follows:

“Jane’s Bible” is catalogued as “Jefferson Family, Bible, 1752-1861, Accession #4726, University of Virginia Library.” This volume contains three publications: the Book of Common Prayer, a Holy Bible, and a Concordance, and an added leaf of paper from elsewhere. These four items were bound together after their lives as separate volumes.

The second book, “Thomas’s Prayer Book,” has the alternate title of Jefferson’s Prayer Book, and is also catalogued by its formal designation, Church of England, The Book of Common Prayer ...with the Psalter or Psalms of David, UVA Special Collections call number A1752.C87. The volume contains a second publication also, A

---

374 Because the six publications in these two books bear similar titles and dates, I will use quotation marks around the names of the volumes to distinguish the volumes from the publications of the same name, thus: “Jane’s Bible” and “Thomas’s Prayer Book,” refer to the books catalogued at UVA as #4726, and A1752.C87, respectively.
New Version of the Psalms of David. These two publications are in their original binding: they were purchased as and remained a single volume.

In 1772, two years following the fire that destroyed the family home at Shadwell, in Albemarle County, Virginia, Jane Randolph Jefferson inscribed the birth dates and locations for each of her children with Peter Jefferson on the verso of the title page of a Bible (Figure 1). On the facing page she wrote “Jane Jefferson Her Booke – Sept. 6th{1772” (Figure 2). Knowing their birthplaces helps date the family’s movements to Shadwell and back and forth from their years at Tuckahoe, long-standing questions among Jefferson historians. The Bible with Jane’s inscription came to the University of Virginia in 1954 and has been available to scholars since. But when writing about the family of Thomas Jefferson most scholars cite “Thomas’s Prayer Book,” in which he recorded the birth dates, but not places, of his sisters and brothers, and also wrote the important dates for his own family with his wife Martha (figures 3 and 4). And what more authority could an historian want, than information in the hand of the great man himself? Thomas Jefferson’s chart of “Births, marriages and deaths of Peter & Jane Jefferson and of their children” was reproduced in the 1952 facsimile edition Thomas Jefferson.

---

375 In Thomas Jefferson’s autobiography he states that he was born at Shadwell. Biographers from Marie Kimball and Dumas Malone and since have speculated about when the family moved to Shadwell but could only say with certainty that it was prior to Thomas’s birth in 1743. Most recent historians cite Malone. Kimball, Jefferson the Road to Glory, 1743-1776 (New York, 1943), 18; Malone, Jefferson the Virginian (Boston, 1948), 17-18.
Jefferson's Prayer Book, edited by John Cook Wyllie, and has been the definitive source for information about Thomas Jefferson's brothers and sisters.

Historians have suggested that each of the volumes in question here - both Jane's book and Thomas's book - was the book listed in Peter Jefferson's 1757 probate inventory as "1 Quarto Bible wt Book of Common Prayer £1. 5." \(^{376}\) I propose that neither of these is that book. "Jane's Bible" contains Jane Jefferson's Bible, her own book in which she wrote her name and her history, and this is the book listed in her 1776 probate inventory as "1 Large Bible 12/6." \(^{377}\) The publications bound with Jane's Bible are other books from the early family collections. The book called "Thomas's Prayer Book" is not either of the books listed in his parents' inventories, but a volume given to the young Thomas by his father.

**The Books: "Jane's Bible"**

UVA acquired "Jane's Bible" in 1954, when Frances Louise Meikleham, a descendant of Martha Jefferson Randolph gave the book to the library. The book has inscriptions by four generations of Jeffersons, and contains the family history of five generations, from Isham Randolph born in 1687 to Septimia Randolph Meikleham, who died in 1887. Although catalogued as "Bible," this volume contains three publications: The Book of Common Prayer, a 1752 Oxford Bible, and a 1745 London Concordance that were rebound together in the late-eighteenth century, as well as a single leaf of paper

\(^{376}\) AICWB 2: 41-48.

\(^{377}\) AICWB 2: 356.
that was added when the books were rebound. All three books are missing pages and were re-bound following some damage to each of them.\textsuperscript{378} Jane Randolph Jefferson wrote in the Bible, and her sons Thomas and Randolph, and granddaughter Martha Jefferson Randolph added to her notations there. Sometime during his adolescence Randolph used the Prayer Book to practice his penmanship, and various parts of the book bear ownership marks by Jane, Thomas, Randolph, Martha Randolph, and Septimia Randolph. The inserted leaf has writing by Peter Jefferson. When the books were bound into this volume this leaf was tipped (glued) in on the front of the Ttt2 leaf, the signature with which the New Testament begins. The Concordance is missing pages but otherwise is in good condition with no manuscript notations and little evidence of use at all.

James Muir of Philadelphia bound this book sometime between 1786 and 1796.\textsuperscript{379} The cover is calf with tooling in predominantly vine and floral motifs, and the word "BIBLE" on the spine in gold on a red field. The book has polychrome marbleized endpaper and two ribbon markers, now pale blue with red edges. Thomas Jefferson made numerous payments to Muir for bindings in this period and the book shows other peculiarities of Thomas's book collections. The leaves in the book were all part of quarto

\textsuperscript{378} The books are listed here in their order, front to back, in this volume, as opposed to the customary order of Bible with Prayer Book following. The Prayer Book is missing its title page and thus has no imprint for date or publication. The first page is the A2 leaf. It is otherwise complete. The Bible is missing the last part of the Apocrypha, which, in this state, ends with the Sss leaf. The New Testament is not separately signed and picks up with page Ttt2. The Bible was printed by Thomas Baskett in Oxford in 1752. The Concordance lacks pages following the S alphabetical heading, the G3 leaf. The Concordance was printed by R. Ware in London in 1745.

\textsuperscript{379} I am indebted to Willman Spawn for his identification of this binding.
volumes but were cut smaller and the plates folded when the books were rebound, on some pages at the expense of printed or manuscript content. Millicent Sowerby observed that Thomas Jefferson had "utter disregard" for books as works of art and in her observations about his books at the Library of Congress she noted that he regularly cut down quarto editions by trimming margins and folding leaves to make more easily handled octavo volumes.380 After the book's rebinding someone pasted a clipping from a book or magazine on the inside of the front cover entitled "Verses written on the first leaf of a Bible."381 Of "Jane's Bible," some pages with manuscript, but not all, appear on the microfilm edition of The Thomas Jefferson Papers, University of Virginia Library. These include the family genealogy page, the inserted leaf, and some of those with Randolph's


381 On the inside of the front cover is glued a printed clipping (approximately 2 by 2-1/2 inches square):

Verses written on the first leaf of a Bible
BLEST is the man who, by temptation tried
If Wisdom makes this holy law his guide;
Serene and undisturb'd his moments flow;
What though adversity with pow'rful sway,
Cloud for a time the sunshine of his day,
And o'er his head, while life's horizon lours,
Affliction, darkling, all ther tempest pours;
Calm is his breast; with conscious virtue warm,
He hears, unmov'd, the fury of the storm;
Taught by these glowing precepts from on high,
Learns how to live, and having liv'd, to die.

Both Thomas Jefferson and his daughter Martha are candidates for having pasted in this verse, since it post-dates the binding.
writing. The page with “Jane Jefferson Her Booke,” and the leaf with Martha’s and Septimia’s names were not included on the microfilm.382

“The Thomas’s Prayer Book”

In 1951 UVA acquired the Book of Common Prayer that Wyllie published as Thomas Jefferson’s Prayer Book. This publication contained an introduction and bibliographical note by Wyllie and the facsimile of twelve pages of the octavo volume known to have belonged to both Peter and Thomas Jefferson and their descendants.383 Wyllie reproduced the title pages of the two publications in the volume and the pages with handwriting by Thomas Jefferson. He also included the first leaf, on which Peter Jefferson wrote his name and the date “30th April 1753,” and the note, “cost 6/6” in the front of the book (Figure 5). Thomas Jefferson wrote “Ex Libris Thomas Jefferson,” his standard way of marking books from his first library, called the Shadwell Library by scholars, on the title page of the Book of Common Prayer. He later erased this inscription and added his initials in cursive script, his “secret” marks, against the “I” and “T” signatures, the way he marked books from his second collection, the so-called Great Library.384 Various leaves contain dates for the marriages, births, and deaths in the

382 The Thomas Jefferson Papers, University of Virginia Library Main Series III, Reel 3, 1732-1790 (microfilm), University of Virginia Library, Microfilm Publications; 9.


384 The Shadwell Library represents the years 1757-1770, the Great Library, 1770-1815. For the libraries and Jefferson’s marking systems see James A. Bear, Jr., Thomas Jefferson’s Book-Marks (Charlottesville, Va., 1958).
families of Peter & Jane Jefferson, Thomas Jefferson and Martha Wayles, and their families and descendants.\footnote{385} Most of the genealogical information is in Thomas Jefferson’s hand with later additions by his daughters and heirs. Wyllie did not include all the pages with family inscriptions in the facsimile, but the microfilm Papers of Thomas Jefferson, University of Virginia Library contains pages with inscriptions by Jefferson’s daughter Martha and notes about her son Lewis Randolph and his family.

When Peter Jefferson purchased “Thomas’s Prayer Book” it was most likely already bound. The volume shows no evidence of rebinding, and although it contains two separate publications, they appear to have been purchased in this binding together. The book is bound in dark green or black Turkey or Morocco leather with gilt tooing and gilt-edged pages. It is in fairly good condition. Peter Jefferson noted the cost of 6/6 for the book, which is roughly the average cost of octavo prayer books recorded in the daybooks of the Virginia Gazette in the early 1750s.\footnote{386}

Documentary References to Bibles and Prayer Books

Peter Jefferson’s 1757 inventory lists "1 Quarto Bible wt Book of Common Prayer £1. 5." Generally this describes the two publications, the Bible and the Prayer

\footnote{385} Thomas Jefferson entered pages for the families of Martha Jefferson and Thomas Mann Randolph; Mary Jefferson and John Wayles Eppes; and Martha Wayles’ family, her mother Martha Eppes and Llewellin Eppes and then John Wayles, including notes about Martha Wayles’ first husband Bathurst Skelton.

\footnote{386} In Williamsburg Prayer Books ranged in price from three and a half shillings to twenty-two shillings for a folio. Most Prayer Books specified as “large” or “quarto” cost over eight shillings, while those of unspecified size (likely octavo editions) cost six to nine shillings when specified as “Turkey,” “gilt,” or both. Virginia Gazette Daybooks 1750-1752 and 1764 – 1766. Paul P. Hoffman, ed. University of Virginia Library, Microfilm Publications; 5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Wyllie asserts that "Thomas's Prayer Book" is the Prayer Book listed in Peter Jefferson's inventory. There are a number of reasons why that is unsatisfactory. "Thomas's Prayer Book" is (and always was) an octavo edition of a Prayer Book and does not contain a Bible, quarto or otherwise. Nor is it likely that a Prayer Book that cost 6/6 in 1753 be mistaken for a Bible and Prayer Book worth £1.5 just four years later. Although the 1752 publication date and the 1753 manuscript notation place this book in Peter Jefferson's hands during his lifetime, there is nothing to indicate when the book passed to Thomas. It may well have been out of Peter's hands before his death and therefore not listed in his probate inventory. One possibility is to consider the activities of the family around the time that Peter Jefferson dated the book. On October 10, 1752 Jane Jefferson gave birth to her eighth child Lucy at Tuckahoe. The next summer the Jeffereons moved back to Shadwell, except for Thomas, who stayed at Tuckahoe for schooling with the Reverend Mr. William Douglas. Might this have been a time for a father to hand his son an object that carried educational, familial, and religious

387 Booksellers, binders, and printers sold ready-bound Bibles, Prayer Books, and the combined Bible and Book of Common Prayer. Buyers with money and those concerned with the fashion of their libraries ordered their bindings custom made to their choice of books. A 1752 Oxford Bible, for instance, might be bound with a 1751 London Prayer Book depending on what the printer had and how available desired editions were to when the purchase was made. Thus, the publication dates of the books provide only a terminus post quem for the acquisition of those books. Bennie Brown has determined that Robert Wormeley Carter's Bible and Prayer Book was seven years old when he inscribed the date 1762 in it. Carter's quarto Bible was printed in Oxford by Thomas Baskett for Robert Baskett (undated); the Prayer Book was printed in London in 1756 by the same publishers. I thank Bennie Brown for sharing this information with me.
significance? On June 25, 1754, Peter Jefferson entered in his account book a debt to Douglas "By Books dd my Son £1.10.6." Most likely, these were schoolbooks, but book buying was established in these tender years (TJ was eleven). In his will, Peter Jefferson bequeathed his books to his oldest son, but still Peter's Bible may have been thought of as a household or family possession, and not merely as a book. Regardless of its meaning, there is no evidence that the Bible that was Peter Jefferson's survived the 1770 fire.

It is also unlikely that "Jane’s Bible" is the "Quarto Bible wt Book of Common Prayer" listed in Peter Jefferson’s inventory, even though "Jane’s Bible" is a quarto volume. James Bear proposed that "Jane’s Bible" was the book from the 1757 inventory and surmised that the now-missing title page from the Prayer Book portion might have borne the Ex Libris of Thomas Jefferson or that Thomas recognized the book as his mother’s and did not inscribe it in the manner he used for his early library. But the

---

388 I can find no studies that look at when in a young man’s life he becomes keeper of the family history and acquires the Bible and Prayer Book that also represent within his household the family’s association with the church. Generally, it appears that the eldest son inherited the father’s Bible, but in some cases it was a long time in coming. In the Sabine Hall library, there was a combined Bible and Book of Common Prayer that had a leather bookplate of Robert Wormeley Carter (eldest son of Landon Carter) with a manuscript date of 1762 – acquired when he was 28 years old. The younger Carter entered genealogy in the book beginning in 1778. Again, I thank Bennie Brown for sharing his observations on the Sabine Hall Library with me.

389 Account Book of Peter Jefferson, 1732-1759, Huntington Library, microfilm, 12.

390 See A1CW2 2: 32-34, for Peter Jefferson’s will.

391 Bear, Book-Marks, 7.
four items brought together as "Jane's Bible" appear to have had very distinct lives prior to their installation as a volume. Within its pages the inscriptions by family members suggest actions that post-date Peter Jefferson's death in 1757 and likely all post-date the Shadwell house fire in 1770.

The first of the three books, the Prayer Book, is highly worn and appears well-thumbed. A young Randolph Jefferson used it for writing practice. It bears his repeated sentences and scribbles practicing script with a pen on various pages, including a sort of test inscribing "Randolph" and "Jefferson" near the top of the first page in the manner that other, older, family members showed their ownership of books.\(^\text{392}\) These are not the

\(^{392}\) The location and content of Randolph's notations are as follows:
[On the first page "An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer..."]
Randolph Jefferson came home going
[in the gutter margin and partially obscured, 2 lines]
..... he is a lad ne... p— all good
[on the page with "The Thanksgiving of women after child-birth...." (included on microfilm edition)]
Randolph Jefferson he came home the first day of December and when he went down [or town?]
Randolph Jefferson
[On the page "A Commination, or denouncing of Gods anger...." (included on microfilm edition)]
Randolph Jefferson he came home the first of December
Randolph Jefferson he came the first of December
Also on the title page is the erased and partially obscured signature that appears to read "Tucker Woodson." This may be the Tucker Woodson who was deputy clerk of Albemarle County in the late 1760s and 1770s, the signature is similar to Woodson's in the Albemarle court records (Albemarle County Deed Book 5, 1768-1772, microfilm), but his relationship to this book has not been established. Tucker Woodson purchased unspecified goods at the sale of Jane Jefferson's estate in 1777, but otherwise dealings between him and the Jefferson family all relate to his position as clerk of court. James A. Bear, Jr., and Lucia C. Stanton, ed. Jefferson's Memorandum Books: Accounts, with Legal Records and Miscellany, 1767-1826 (Princeton, 1997), 438-9 (hereafter cited as Memorandum Books).
scribbles of a young child (Randolph was two when his father died), but may be the post-
fire grammar exercises of a fourteen-year-old boy. This Prayer Book was in the
Shadwell house during Randolph’s later schoolboy days. In October 1771 at age
sixteen he left for the College of William and Mary. Randolph’s notes do not preclude
the book from being at Shadwell prior to Peter Jefferson’s death, but they do put its
active presence in the household about the time of or just after the house fire. Perhaps a
Prayer Book was a gift to Randolph prior to his heading off to school. While it is
possible that the Prayer Book in “Jane’s Bible” had a previous life bound with a Bible,
the evidence suggests that it was not the Bible with it now.

The inscriptions in the Bible portion of “Jane’s Bible” bear a manuscript date of
September 6, 1772, preceded by “Jane Jefferson Her Booke.” The facing page is where
Jane listed the key information about her and Peter’s family [see Figure 1]. Jane wrote

393 Randolph turned fifteen the October following the Shadwell fire. Philip
Fithian remarked that Robert Carter’s younger son and nephew at the age of fourteen read
Fithian: A Plantation Tutor of the Old Dominion, 1773-1774 (Williamsburg, 1957;
reprint, Charlottesville, 1968), 26. I thank Lou Powers for suggesting this as a source for
determining the education levels of children.

394 The transcription is:
The Births & deaths of the sons and daughters of Peter Jefferson by Jane his wife
with whom he Intermarried in the year 1739;
Jane Born the 27th of June 1740: at Shadwell
Mary Born the 1st of October 1741: at do
Thomas Born the 2d of April 1743: at do
Elizabeth Born the 4th of Novemr 1744: at do
Martha Born the 29th of may. 1746
Peter Field Born the 16th of Octobr 1748
He died the 29th of Novr. the Same year
A Son Born the 9th of march 1750
He died the Same day at Tuckahoe

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
this family history at one time: the handwriting, the ink, the pen are of a piece. Entries were not written as each child was born, or as two infant boys died. Jane inscribed the words “New Style” after Lucy’s 1752 birth date, further evidence that this was written by someone who was elderly in 1772 and still more familiar with what was by then “old style” to most people. The Bible bears none of the schoolboy exercises by Randolph and the pages are not as worn as those of the Prayer Book, although, as mentioned above, they were heavily trimmed under Thomas Jefferson’s ownership. Following the Shadwell fire Thomas Jefferson reported “almost every book” lost. Clearly a few books and other objects survived, but Peter Jefferson’s quarto Bible and Prayer Book may have vanished in the 1770 fire. In the act of inscribing this book, Jane consciously reconstructed and reestablished the history of her family with Peter. Although the imprint of the book is 1752, twenty years prior to Jane’s use of the book, it does not mean

Lucy Born the 10th of October. 1752 } } New Stile
Randolph: &., Anna Scott, (Twins) }[e]A.S. died at Monticello
July 8th 1828 was Born the 1st. day of Octobr. 1755 } at Shadwell
Peter Jefferson born 29th February 1707 He died Wednesday 17th Aug:
1757. In the 50th: Year of his Age.
1776.
[c]Jane Jefferson junr. died the 1st day of October 1765 in the 26th Year of her Age.
[d]Elizabeth Jefferson died the 1 day of January 1773 in the 29 year of her age.


that the book was in their household that early. It may have been the quarto Bible on hand from whatever bookseller the family got it, or they may have sought an edition similar to what was lost. “Jane’s Bible” contains two handsome plates, a map of Palestine, with an engraving by J. Blundell, and a plan of Jerusalem. Perhaps these and other distinctive components of this 1752 Thomas Baskett Bible were sought by the family. In fact, Baskett published three editions of Bibles between 1750 and 1772, but only two of them in quarto. The other quarto Bible occurred in eight publication years during this period, but the edition of Jane’s Bible was published in quarto only once, in 1752.396

But Peter’s hand is in “Jane’s Bible” too, on the page tipped onto the front of the first signature of the New Testament (Figure 6). There is no question that this page was inserted. The laid and chain lines of the inserted leaf run perpendicular to those of the Bible pages. The page, unlike any others, bears a watermark of a posthorn in a shield above the English countermark initials GR. This Dutch-made paper was readily available in the British Empire at mid-century.397 On this page Peter inscribed “The Births & Deaths of the Sons and Daughters of Isham Randolph by Jane his Wife.” Peter recorded these dates sometime between 1742, the latest date listed (the year of Isham Randolph’s

---


death), and 1757, the year Peter himself died. This page too was trimmed during rebinding. For the very last date on the page, the birth date of Jane Rogers Randolph, the year 1698 was cut off and added back, the only different pen on this page.\textsuperscript{398}

While not conclusive evidence that they previously were independent of each other, the order as bound, the condition, and uses of the three publications and leaf in “Jane’s Bible” suggest that is the case. It appears that the parts came into Thomas Jefferson’s possession following his mother’s death. Since he already owned “Thomas’s Prayer Book” and had been recording his own family dates there, he had no need to do more than complete the note about his birth family in his mother’s book. The three books for guiding family religious education fit well together topically, and the page on which Peter Jefferson wrote down his wife’s genealogy matched the purposes to which Jane had already put her Bible. Thomas Jefferson had these three older family books and page bound, trimming the volume to the size he preferred, and adding the ownership marks that he favored in this period, the secret cursive initials of his 1770-1815 library.\textsuperscript{399}

The Inscriptions

Among them, these volumes illustrate a range of uses for family documents and the history they bear within generations and between them. Looking at what the family recorded and how they entered their family history in these books is instructive about both dating the records and about the events that prompted various Jeffersons to make

\textsuperscript{398} The rewritten “1698” is in an indeterminate hand, but not the older script of Peter or Jane Jefferson.

\textsuperscript{399} James Bear proposed that Jefferson used the cursive script initials to mark his books in the Great Library, 1770-1815, see Bear, \textit{Book-Marks}, 4.
these records. Clearly the action of writing the dates important to a family is a way of recording past events, but it also insures that future generations will know the history: the act is for both the present and the future members of a family. The primary act of writing in these books states ownership, however temporary and fleeting it may be. Jane Jefferson wrote her name and the date in her Bible in 1772, four years before her death and the passing of the book to son Thomas. Thomas added his secret marks to the rebound volume to show his ownership, but did not enter a date, although he did add to the record his mother began. Two months after her father’s death, Martha Jefferson Randolph wrote her name, “Monticello,” and the date in the volume, and added to the record begun by her grandmother and continued by her father. She then evidently passed the book to her daughter Septimia, who added her name, her family’s seat “Edgehill,” and the date below her mother’s. In “Thomas’s Prayer Book,” Peter Jefferson wrote his name and the date upon purchasing the book. Thomas Jefferson marked it with his early marks, and later erased these marks and added his secret marks. Martha Jefferson Randolph wrote her name, “Monticello,” and the date. It then bears the names of Martha’s son Lewis Randolph, Martha’s daughter Virginia, and Virginia’s daughter Martha.

The records written by Peter and Jane Jefferson use the same language and formula. The page in Peter’s hand is headed: “The Births & Deaths of the Sons and Daughter[s] of Isham Randolph by Jane his Wife. with whom he intermarried in Byshopsgate chur[ch?] in London the 25th. July 1717.” Jane wrote: “The Births & deaths of the sons and daughters of Peter Jefferson by Jane his wife with whom he
Intermarried in the year 1739.” Jane did not include the location of her marriage to Peter, but both Jane and Peter included the birthplaces of the children they listed. Isham and Jane had three children born in London: two in Shadwell Parish (the second one Jane), and one in Whitechapel Parish. The rest were born in Virginia. Their fourth child was born in Williamsburg, the fifth simply, Virginia. Number six was born at Turkey Island, and the last five at Dunginess, Isham and Jane’s own home.400 Jane’s list of her children with Peter follows suit. She had the first four at Shadwell: Jane, Mary, Thomas, and Elizabeth; the next four at Tuckahoe: Martha, Peter Field, a son, and Lucy; and the twins at Shadwell: Randolph and Anna Scott. The only deaths Jane recorded here were for the two boys born at Tuckahoe who died soon after birth. Below the list of Randolph children, Peter wrote the birth and death dates for Isham, that Isham was 56 years old,

400 The transcription is:
The Births & Deaths of the Sons and Daughter[s] of Isham Randolph by Jane his Wife. with whom he intermarried in Byshopsgate chur[ch?] in London the 25th. July 1717

Isham Born 10th. June 1718 in Shadwell parris[h] London. he Died 20th
June 1718
Jane Born Feby. 9th 1720. in Shadwell Parrish
Isham Born Augst. 18th. 1724. in Whitechapel Parrish - London.
Mary Born Octr. 15th. 1725. in Wmsburg. Virginia
Elizabeth. Born Virginia
Dorothea Born Novr. 24th. 1730. Dunginess Virginia
Thomas. Born March. 31st. 1732. at Do. Died 20th May 173[?]
Anne Born Feby. 5th. 1734/5. at Dunginess
Thomas Born. Augst. 13. 1736. at Dunginess
Died Novr. 2d 1742. in the 56th year of his Age
Jane his Wife Born 14th Augst. 1698
and the birth date for his mother-in-law Jane.\footnote{Jane Rogers Randolph died sometime between December 5, 1760, the date of her will, and July 21, 1761, the date her will was proved in Goochland County court.} Below her list Jane wrote the birth and death dates for her husband and noted: “in the 50th: Year of his Age.” She wrote her own birth date below that. On the next line it appears as if Thomas then added the death date of his oldest sister Jane, who had died in 1765. Randolph wrote the next line, recording Elizabeth’s death in January 1773, and adding some awkward curlicue-like scrawls after his dutiful record, perhaps revealing his discomfort with this role.\footnote{Randolph is perhaps the source of his brother’s “error,” noted by historians, of the discrepancy of Elizabeth Jefferson’s date of death. In his memorandum books, Thomas reported that his sister died February 24, 1774, but his Prayer Book has the January 1, 1773 date, copied from his mother’s Bible following her death. \textit{Memorandum Books}, 370. Malone noted the discrepancy also, 430-431.} The penultimate addition to the page was Thomas Jefferson recording his mother’s death, completing the line where his mother wrote her birth date. The very last entry was by Martha Jefferson Randolph, who added the tiny “A.S. died at Monticello July 8, 1828,” on the line with Anna Scott’s birth record.

Thomas Jefferson likely began using “Thomas’s Prayer Book” to register the important events of his own family in 1772 when daughter Martha was born.\footnote{This assessment is based on the appearance to the author’s eye of the ink, pen weight, and hand on this page. The first four lines appear to be the same and would date to on or after September 27, 1772 (1:00 a.m.) as TJ recorded his daughter’s birth. It is possible (but unlikely based on their temporal proximity) that scientific analysis of the ink’s composition and penetration into the paper could refine these entries as having been made separately, following Thomas and Martha’s marriage in January 1772, and following the birth of Martha later that year.} With her birth he began the record of his family on the recto of the blank flyleaf at the back of the
book (see Figure 4). He did not follow quite the same formula that his parents used and his page was not written at one time. Each entry about Thomas and Martha’s children has an immediacy that no other pages have, and only the pages with the births of his daughter’s children come close to. There are six separate lines that record the arrival dates and also the time each Jefferson child was born. Then, with the exception of Martha who outlived him, Jefferson recorded the deaths of his children and of their mother, including the time of day.\footnote{He did not record the day of the month or the time of death of Jane, who may have died while Jefferson was in Philadelphia in 1775. For Lucy, who died in 1784 while he was in France, he recorded only the year.} Elsewhere in the book, Jefferson recorded the page about his parents’ family in one sitting, just as his mother did in her Bible, and perhaps he even copied his page from hers. He did this on or just after March 31, 1776, the day his mother died.\footnote{Again, this assessment is based on the appearance of the ink, hand, and pen, with the date of his mother’s death as the latest date of Thomas’s first campaign of writing on the page. See also note 398.} He later added the date of his youngest sister’s marriage in 1788 and perhaps he added the months and days to the years of his other siblings’ marriages as well, but Thomas never recorded dates of his brother Randolph’s two marriages in 1780 or 1809. Jefferson’s daughter Martha added the dates of his and Anna Scott’s deaths in 1826 and 1828 respectively, but the deaths of Thomas’s siblings Mary (1817), Martha (1811), and Lucy (1810) were never recorded here. Anna Scott lived at Monticello after the death of her husband late in 1811 thus her death was more immediate to house mate Martha Randolph. Like that of his own parents’ family, Jefferson entered the pages about
his wife Martha’s family in one sitting too. He established this book as the formal repository for the history of his and Martha’s lives together.

When his mother died Thomas Jefferson recorded her date of death in her Bible, completing the line that she began by recording her name and birthday. Was her passing or his acquisition of the book what prompted him to then copy her history of the family into his own Prayer Book as part of his own family record? His list of their family differs from hers in a number of ways. Jane recorded the locations of her children’s births, and that it was Wednesday, August 17, 1757, when her husband died. Thomas dropped the locations but added the marriage dates of his siblings, part of their current instead of their past lives. When he wrote in her book Thomas followed his mother’s example and added her date of death and recorded that March 31st, 1776, was a Sunday, but he did not enter the day of the week in his own book’s record. In the “Thomas’s Prayer Book” list, Thomas recorded his own birthday as April 2, 1743, the old style calendar date, but did not designate old and new style dates like his mother did. He did, however, note that his birth date was old style on the page where he began the history of his life with wife Martha.

The Bible as an Artifact

The provenance of both of volumes is solid. Both remained with Jefferson descendants until acquired by UVA, the Prayer Book in 1951 and the Bible in 1954. Both books bear the inscription “Martha Randolph, Monticello” and the date “September
11, 1826” on the inside of the cover. Martha may have claimed the books to mark them as family artifacts rather than as mere library books, although matching descriptions in the Poor catalog of Jefferson’s library in 1829 have suggested to some historians that even these family documents went to the auction and then were purchased back by the family. The auction catalogue entries likely to be these two books are numbers “497, The Bible, Eng. 4to,” and “514, Common Prayer, Basket. Oxford, 1752, 8vo.” But it seems that Thomas Jefferson did not consider these volumes part of his library when he sold his library to congress in 1815, as these books clearly remained in his hands and around the house. Perhaps they were considered family possessions and not library property after Thomas Jefferson’s death as well. Martha passed “Jane’s Bible” to her daughter, who wrote “Septimia A.C, Randolph, Edgehill, Sept. 1836” in it. She passed “Thomas’s Prayer Book” to her son, and inscribed it “Lewis Randolph, Washington Mar.

406 Martha wrote the date “September” in the Prayer Book, and abbreviated “Sept.” in the Bible.

407 See Randall, n. 546 on the family purchase of a clock at the sale of Jefferson’s property. Wyllie proposes that “Thomas’s Prayer Book” was lot number 514 in the Poor auction, see Thomas Jefferson’s Prayer Book, n.p. Wyllie does not speculate on how the book returned to the family.

408 Catalogue. President Jefferson’s Library, (1829, facsimile from copy in Clements Library, Ypsilanti, 1944). These catalog items could also be other volumes from Jefferson’s vast collection of different editions of the same book.

409 Douglas L. Wilson, Jefferson’s Books (Lynchburg, Virginia, 1999). See pages 11-13 especially for Jefferson’s attention to including his entire library in his contract with Congress. Births of Thomas Jefferson’s grandchildren, recorded in his hand, date as late as 1818 and indicate the book stayed with Jefferson.
10th 18[incomplete].” Martha died October 10, 1836, but insured a place in the family for these two important books before she did. 410

“Thomas’s Prayer Book” was available to an early biographer of Thomas Jefferson, Henry S. Randall. Randall copied Jefferson’s chart of the births, marriages, and deaths of his siblings in his 1858 publication. 411 Randall’s work is the closest record to a Jefferson family oral history: many of his stories came from interviews and correspondence with Jefferson’s grandchildren. Randall mentions the Prayer Book again in his biography in the section on “Jefferson’s Religious Views.” Randall reported that when Jefferson attended the Episcopal Church “he always carried his prayer-book, and joined in the responses and prayers of the congregation.” He added: “The well worn copy he carried in his pocket when he rode to church is in the possession of his youngest grandson --- the 15th Psalm copied on a blank leaf in his own hand, in a different version

---

410 Martha may have written Lewis’ name in the book. A page with Lewis’ family history appears to have been written after he died in 1737, possibly by his sister, Virginia J. Trist, who wrote her name as a mark of ownership in the front of the book and may have gotten it upon her brother’s death. The next owner, Martha Jefferson Trist Burke added her name. Virginia Trist also completed the page begun by her grandfather listing the family of Thomas Mann and Martha Jefferson Randolph. Martha had added the date of her husband’s death, and her daughter, Virginia Trist added her mother’s date of death and then her brother’s death. Trist also clarified the history by adding: “Births all written in Thomas Jefferson’s hand. Thomas Mann Randolph’s death recorded by his wife, Martha Jefferson Randolph.” The rest of the story of these books in the hands of Thomas Jefferson’s descendants is left for another day. Staff at the Thomas Jefferson Foundation have done research on the disposition of his possessions among descendants: some of it is published in Susan R. Stein, The Worlds of Thomas Jefferson at Monticello (New York, 1993).

from the one we have seen him usually quoting."412 This is only approximately correct, but close enough to leave little doubt that "Thomas's Prayer Book" was used in its intended manner – as a Prayer Book, that is - enough to be witnessed by family members.413

The New Jefferson Facts

Biographers of Thomas Jefferson have known from his own autobiography that he was born at Shadwell, in what is now Albemarle County, Virginia. The birthplaces of Jefferson’s two older sisters and when the family moved to Shadwell, and later, to Tuckahoe and back to Shadwell, have been long-standing questions. When Randall cites the Prayer Book in his biography of Jefferson he says nothing about the birthplaces of Jefferson’s siblings.414 Since UVA acquired the Bible with Jane’s inscriptions in 1954 it was not available to Randall, nor to Marie Kimball or Dumas Malone for their influential biographies; they too, cite the Prayer Book. In Thomas’s own autobiography he wrote of his father: “He was the third or fourth settler, about the year 1737, of the part of the country in which I live.” Malone dismissed this date out of hand as being too early.415 Jane’s inscription tells us that she and Peter indeed moved to Shadwell by June 27, 1740

412 Randall III, 555 and n. 555.

413 The Prayer Book does contain an alternate version of two verses of a Psalm, copied into a margin by Thomas Jefferson, only it is the eighteenth and not the fifteenth Psalm with which Jefferson concerned himself.

414 Randall, I, 17.

415 Malone noted “Jefferson’s statement...is approximately correct if applied to the Rivanna district; but the date which he give, about 1737, seems too early.” Malone, n. 39, p. 18.
when Jane, Jr. was born there, and probably they moved some months before June to avoid traveling during Jane’s pregnancy. Perhaps they came within days of their marriage on October 3, 1739.\textsuperscript{416} The family moved to Tuckahoe in time for Jane to give birth to Martha there, May 29, 1746. They returned to Shadwell following the birth of Lucy in October 1752. The activities in Peter Jefferson’s account book suggest that August of 1753 marked their return home.\textsuperscript{417}

Not only is this family information important, but the inscription brings new light upon Jane Jefferson and her role as a family historian and keeper of her children’s legacy.\textsuperscript{418} Her son Thomas then became steward of this book and the history it held. He saw that it was rebound and maintained. He not only kept the book, he also fulfilled the duty of completing the family history in it. “Jane’s Bible” and “Thomas’s Prayer Book” were in his library on his death and about two months later his daughter Martha claimed them and continued their legacy as important family artifacts. It appears as if she then

\textsuperscript{416} October 3 to June 27 is a statistically perfect gestation period of 267 days. See Fraser D. Neiman, “Coincidence or Causal Connection?: The Relationship between Thomas Jefferson’s Visits to Monticello and Sally Heming’s Conceptions,” \textit{WMQ} 3rd Ser., LVII (2000), 201.

\textsuperscript{417} Account Book of Peter Jefferson.

\textsuperscript{418} The historiography of Jane Randolph Jefferson is a story in itself. Nineteenth-century biographers of her son portray her in warm terms, but various twentieth-century biographers of Thomas Jefferson have proposed that he did not have a good relationship with his mother. This view was in vogue in the 1950s and may partially explain why she was not included in the major document collections edited at that time. The general sexism that celebrated only patrilineage explains more. Jane has been accused of being the “frail” or weak link in the Jefferson gene pool and she has been the cold denial of a maternal figure that caused his straying to secret and forbidden passions and dome-shaped architectural features. The Jane Jefferson who carefully wrote out this history and ensured her family’s legacies has not been part of the picture.
chose to ensure that the family history remained in the family and spread through it as she dispersed the books among her heirs.

**Original Sources**

The treatment of these two books by twentieth-century editors of facsimile and microfilm editions has affected their value to historians. For scholars looking for paper touched by Thomas Jefferson’s hand, it has all been included. For scholars looking for the earlier or later activities that might help to put the actions of Thomas Jefferson in context, the published parts of these books are compromised as sources. This study strengthens the arguments that access to and preservation of original texts remains important to historians. The existing microfilm images from “Jane’s Bible” are incomplete, with no supporting editorial apparatus to indicate such. In their fascination with anything that passed through Thomas Jefferson’s hands, the editors left out the page with “Jane Jefferson Her Booke.” Although she is listed in the library catalog entry as an author, there is nothing to indicate which inscriptions in the book can be attributed to which authors, a list that includes Peter Jefferson, Jane Jefferson, Jane Jefferson, Jr., Randolph Jefferson, Thomas Jefferson, Martha Jefferson Randolph, and Septimia Randolph Meikleham.\(^{419}\) Also following suit are the facsimile edition and microfilm of

\(^{419}\)It is unlikely that Jane Jefferson, Jr., who died in 1765, wrote any of the inscriptions in this book. Thomas Jefferson wrote lovingly and affectionately of his older sister and perhaps this influenced the twentieth-century cataloguers or Jefferson descendants who suggested that the Bible may have been given by Peter Jefferson to his oldest daughter. Notes in the hand of John Cook Wyllie speculate that the book passed from Peter Jefferson to his daughter Jane, to her mother, then to son Thomas, and to son Randolph. Undated notes in the accessioning files from John Cook Wyllie to Frank Berkeley, Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia
"Thomas’s Prayer Book.” The facsimile includes the pages with writing by Thomas Jefferson and about his immediate family, but does not include the pages with the writing of his daughter and her heirs. Reliance on the reproductions alone would eliminate these as sources for the history of the nineteenth-century descendants of Thomas Jefferson, descendants whose stories supplied his earliest biographers such as Henry S. Randall and Sarah Randolph, herself a descendant. These same descendants kept these books and thus supplied the historian with both the artifact and the provenance to make it count, something that a "found" Bible or Prayer Book might not be able to do as convincingly.

"Jane’s Bible” provides important information from the inscriptions, yes, but the physical artifact offers a counterpoint to the history of this particular volume. Its rebinding, missing parts, and the condition of the four items within this volume all add to the historical information to be gained from it. One generation of this family used the paper in each part—or in the case of the Concordance did not use it---to record family history and practice grammar and writing. Thomas Jefferson kept the books and bound them together, and used the information as a source for his own history of the family. Two subsequent generations wrote their names in the volume and its 1861 owner clearly

Library. I thank Ann Southwell, Manuscripts Cataloger, for sending me copies of these notes.

Wyllie does tell the reader that he did not include family data in a hand other than Thomas Jefferson’s. Wyllie, Prayer Book, introduction (n.p.). The microfilm of “Thomas’s Prayer Book” includes three pages not in the facsimile.
used it as a tool for religious instruction. Their descendants valued the book enough as an artifact, with Jefferson connections no less, to give it to UVA. Additionally, if one were to catalog this book by the handwriting, without considering the evidence of the paper marks and rebinding, Peter Jefferson would appear to be the early author, followed by Jane and others, and the chain of ownership and use would indeed be muddled. In concert with the "Thomas’s Prayer Book," "Jane’s Bible" provides new details about who in the Jefferson family were keepers of history, keepers of books, and keepers of its important legacy.

\[421\]

The second front fly leaf bears pencil inscriptions on the recto that both appear to be the same hand and date, c. 1861, notes that indicate another generation using the book as an historical object and for religious practice:

"Printed in the Reign of George the Second in the year 1745."
[below this "1752" was erased]
"1861 May – Sunday after ascension Lesson
Jock 2d v. 20
Joel 3d v. 10 beat from plowshares into swords"
AII.1. Jane Jefferson's list of the family of Peter Jefferson and Jane Randolph.
AII.2. Jane Jefferson’s signature and date (partially obscured in gutter). “Jane’s Bible,”
A2 recto.
A II.3. Thomas Jefferson’s list of the family of Peter Jefferson and Jane Randolph, from “Thomas’s Prayer Book,” front flyleaf, 2 verso.
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