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ABSTRACT

The Southside is usually defined as the area of Virginia lying south of the James River and east of the Blue Ridge Mountains and has the reputation of being the Old Dominion's section that is most like the Deep South. This study is concerned with the piedmont portion of the Southside contained within the boundaries of the original Prince George County created in 1703. Based on an intensive use of the local records and assisted by a computer, this investigation details the process and pace of the extension of white settlement into the Southside in the half century following 1703.

The Southside had a very slow growth and expansion during the first third of the century. However, by about 1740 the population of the Southside began to increase at a very rapid rate. The process of taking up the land was marked by a common indifference to the requirements of the land patent laws and widespread squatting. The fact that the provincial government could not effectively enforce its land policy helped hasten the expansion of Virginia's burgeoning population into the Southside.

Early Southside society was highly mobile, especially the segment which had the least wealth. The locally oriented Southsiders had very little in material terms, and like other frontier societies was crude and at times vulgar. Economic development was accompanied by greater disparities in the distribution of wealth. The agencies of social control and local government were controlled by the local elite, but these more affluent residents seldom interfered in the lives of most Southsiders.

The rapid influx of settlers into the Southside after the 1730's oriented part of the area's economy to supplying their needs. Livestock and other staples like grain and timber products played an important role along with tobacco in both the local consumptive and export sectors of the economy. Slaves were quickly used to open up the Southside and non-residents played an important role in the development of the area because they usually held about one-third of the area's slave population. But the area's relatively late development meant that the Southside on the eve of the Revolution was just beginning to emerge as the Old Dominion's leading producer of tobacco, a distinction it holds to this day.

MICHAEL LEE NICHOLLS
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA
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ORIGINS OF THE VIRGINIA SOUTHSIDE, 1703-1753:

A SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC STUDY
CHAPTER I

APPROACHING THE SOUTHSIDE


The written history of early eighteenth-century Virginia, like the studies of other times and places, reveals the interests of her historians and reflects the most visible remains of the past. Thus, those individuals who occupied the elegant brick mansions built in the prosperous decades before 1760 caught the attention of early historians because the results of their literacy and the records of their social and political influence have survived. It is certainly true that the influence of this group was important and far exceeded their numbers, but the patterns of life of most of the people of Virginia still remain to be discovered and told. Even the scholar who does not laud the elite of the period has not revealed much about the structure of Virginia society or the life styles of its members below the top strata, because the sources that grudgingly disclose this type of information are tedious to read, and until fairly recently were not easily available. But since the extensive microfilming of the bound volumes of the county records,
usually the deeds, order books, and wills, the depositing of many other local records in the Virginia State Library, and the adoption of the computer as a methodological tool the basic problems, except for the tedium, have been largely eliminated. Coupled with these changes has been a realization by many historians that generalizations must be supported by all types of evidence, not just the literary survivals, and that intense local studies are needed to test and clarify previously accepted interpretations.

In the area of Early American history, historians such as Kenneth A. Lockridge, John Demos, Philip J. Greven, Jr., and John J. Waters, Jr., among others, have broadened our understanding of colonial New England through their intensive studies of community life, and opened new vistas of historical inquiry through the application of demographic and behavioral techniques and insights. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for Virginia. With the exception of the work currently being done by Darrett B. Rutman on Middlesex County, and by Robert A. Wheeler on Lancaster and Northumberland Counties not much research is underway on the social history of the early

eighteenth century for the Old Dominion.²

The reason for this is partially found in the difference in quality between the New England records, many of which have been published, and the local Virginia records which have been fortunate to have survived the negligence of county clerks, and the armies of evacuation and occupation. Furthermore, in the early years of the New England town, the area covered by the political and religious institutions were usually one and the same. By contrast, only one Virginia county has surviving records considered complete in which both the ecclesiastical and political records cover the same geographical area. This is Middlesex County which Professor Rutman is currently studying.

There is one section of considerable size in the Old Dominion which does have fairly complete local records and which is historically significant: the Southside. Roughly the area between the Atlantic Ocean, and the Blue Ridge Mountains south of the James River, the Southside defies any further refining of geographical defini-

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
Virginia Counties in 1749

Southside boundary
tion without producing a controversy. This lack of consensus among even Virginians allows one to define the area for one's own purposes, and therefore, this study has been limited to the area that evolved out of the original Prince George County created in 1703.

This definition of the Southside permits a study that follows the linear development of an original frontier county as it was subsequently subdivided without having to toil through an adjacent parent county's records worrying about antecedents and geographical locations. Geographically, for the purposes of this study, the Southside is synonymous with that area to the west of and including present day Prince George, Dinwiddie and Greensville Counties, south of the Appomattox River, and east of the Blue Ridge. The southern boundary is of course the Virginia-North Carolina line. Thus, this is primarily a study in the development of a section of the Virginia piedmont since only current Prince George County, and the eastern portions of Dinwiddie and Greensville Counties are in the tidewater. Today, the area is broken up into seventeen counties, but as the preceding map shows, there

---

3 In 1929, Landon C. Bell, a local historian of Lunenburg County, queried five prominent Virginians about a definition of what area ought to be included in the Southside. Almost all agreed that it was incapable of defining and each offered a somewhat different proposal. Landon C. Bell, Sunlight on the Southside (Philadelphia, 1931), 9-12.
were only four counties in the area in 1749. The area encompasses approximately eight thousand nine hundred square miles, or a region somewhat larger than the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Socially and culturally the Southside has been a unique section in Virginia. Parke House has probably best caught the flavor of the area in the title of his little book Below the James Lies Dixie. In his introduction, Mr. Rouse correctly identifies the section as the most conservative one in the Old Dominion, the sometime home of the Ku Klux Klan, the producer of fire-eaters, and the keeper of the spirit of the Confederacy. It is the area of Virginia where the problems raised by racial integration are most keenly felt and where the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant is still felt superior. The white populace is usually thought synonymous with the small tobacco farmer. 4

However, Mr. Rouse's description of the Southside and its historical significance as a result of this peculiar sectional identity is largely, it appears, a nineteenth-century phenomenon, and it is not the intent of this study to explain why the Southside became what it did in later time. Marc Bloch wisely pointed out that too often the "origins" of things are accepted as the cause when in reality a lot of water has passed down the hillside of history.

4Parke Rouse, Jr., Below the James Lies Dixie (Richmond, 1968) 10.
eroding the landscape, and making the ground much more immediate to its own time.⁵ An adequate study of the formation of the Southside's character would entail an investigation far beyond the scope of this one, and would need much more extensive records than what are available to the colonial historian.

However, the Southside does have an historical significance beyond what it was in the more recent past. It has frequently been contrasted with the other piedmont sections of Virginia, particularly the Rappahannock River valley, as an area of slower development in the early eighteenth century.⁶ Thus a study of the area's expansion would be most helpful in understanding the settlement process in Virginia, to assess the differences between the piedmont sections, and to determine the role of the large land speculator and the place of the common man in the westward movement. Beyond these approaches are the questions


⁶This is a practice that began with Governor William Gooch in 1728. See his letter to the Board of Trade, November 6, 1728, Colonial Office Group, Class 5, Volume 1321, foli. 106-107, Public Record Office (Virginia Colonial Records Project microfilm, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Va.). Hereafter cited as C. O. 5/1321. All of the Public Record Office materials cited in this dissertation are on microfilm at Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
that can be raised about the nature of the Southside's social structure, and the operations of its frontier economy. In addition, by looking at what the Southsider did in regard to taking up land, his geographical mobility, his role in the local government, and his degree of conformity to Virginian and royal policy and law a picture can be drawn of his attitudes and outlook.

This somewhat circuitous route to the Southsider is necessary because of the dearth of literary records for the region during the period. Outside of the literary works of William Byrd II, there are very few usable diaries or letters, and one is forced to rely upon the pertinent portions of the colony's records, and the willingness of the eighteenth-century county clerk to record the circumstances of an event as well as the occurrence itself.

Fortunately, the Land Patent Books have survived intact providing a basic source for the expansion of the area. In addition, the land deeds for the area are complete except for Prince George County before 1714 and after 1728. With the formation of Brunswick County in 1732, and Amelia County in 1735, the remaining area of the Southside is then covered with a complete run of deeds. Likewise, the order books and wills have survived for the same years that the deeds have with only a few minor exceptions. Supplementing these basic sources are survey books, sheriff's returns, orphan's accounts, and estate inventories. In some instances, there are substantial remains of the county
loose or docket papers. But most valuable for this study because they provide a workable focus are several different types of lists of Southside people. The heart of this study centers on the individuals who appeared on the following lists: a Quit Rent Roll for Prince George County in 1704 listing the county’s land owners; tithable lists for Amelia County in 1736 and 1749, and Lunenburg County in 1750 containing the names of all males sixteen years and older, and black females of like age; and a Poll taken for an election of Brunswick County’s burgesses in 1748 showing how each voter cast his votes. The Prince George and Brunswick lists contain only the names of whites, but the Amelia and Lunenburg lists are extremely valuable because they contain the names of all the slaves on the list. Altogether, 5,989 individuals, black and white, appear on these five lists.

Such a large number of people coupled with the large amount of little bits of information about them becomes close to overwhelming when sorting and collating the data. As a result, the use of an IBM 360 computer became necessary for sorting the information and totaling categories constructed to answer specific questions about Southside settlement and society. This required two similar but different programs, which were written in PL/1 language, to process the information gathered on the 3,813 land patents issued in the Southside between 1703 and 1753, and on the 4,658 tithables who are listed in Amelia County.
in 1749, and in Lunenburg County in 1750. In those two years, the two counties covered about 80 per cent of the Southside.

In the patent program, the information such as the date, size, type, and geographical location of the patent was coded, punched on cards, and run through the computer. The people program is a list of all white male tithables or those individuals responsible for tithables. Information was gathered on how the individual obtained land, if any; his origin; the number of tithes he was responsible for, black and white; his occupation or business; his military and political offices; his church office and denomination; and the geographical location of his land. The computer was then used to sort and correlate different categories to reveal patterns, trends and numerical occurrences.

To overcome the "snapshot" effect of using two lists from only two years in the computer program, comparisons from the other available lists in the area, and examples and illustrations from different years have been used. The resulting patterns are strong enough to suggest the realities of a given occurrence, but the gaps in the records, and the nature of the records themselves should give anyone pause before statistics and numbers are equated with absolute reality. For example, the gaps in the Prince George records give other more complete records, like the land patents, an undue bias when studying the means of taking up land in the Southside. But in the end, because
the computer can handle all of the information fed to it, the problem is not one of selectivity as much as it is a question of survival.

2. The Southside: 1703-1753.

The creation of Prince George County in 1703 permitted the former Charles City County residents who lived on the Southside to have their own county government, something they had desired for several years. By 1753 the settlers in the Southside were able to transact their legal business in five additional county courts: Brunswick County created in 1720 but not organized until 1732; Amelia County after 1734; Lunenburg County after 1745; and Dinwiddie and Halifax Counties beginning in 1752. In addition county courts were organized for Prince Edward and Bedford Counties in 1754. The creation of these counties reflects the rate of population growth in the Southside, and the Virginia Assembly's willingness to provide its frontier settlers with the convenience of a relatively nearby court./distilled

Paralleling the creation of the counties and their courts in the Southside was the Assembly's subdividing the area into parishes. When Prince George County was created

---

in 1703 there were four parishes within the area of the new county which dated from the earlier settlements of the seventeenth century along the banks of the James River and the lower reaches of the Appomattox River. Martin's Brandon, Bristol, Westover, and Weyanoke Parishes provided religious organization for the area's settlers until 1721 when the Southside portions of Westover and Weyanoke Parishes were absorbed into Martin's Brandon. In the previous year St. Andrew's Parish had been created to complement the new Brunswick County to the south of Prince George, but like the new county it appears that the vestry of the parish did not get organized until around 1732. In 1735 the residents of the new county of Amelia became parishioners of Raleigh Parish, and in 1742 a portion of Bristol Parish was cut off to form Bath Parish with a minor subsequent boundary adjustment in 1744. The new parish of Bath encompassed much of the area which later became Dinwiddie County. Cumberland Parish was formed along with Lunenburg County in 1746, and both were divided in 1752 to create Antrim Parish and Halifax County. Meanwhile, the more remote parishioners of Amelia County were provided with a new parish when Raleigh Parish was split and Nottoway Parish formed in 1748 in Amelia County.  

---

The spreading of white settlement into the Southside began slowly but gradually picked up momentum during the 1730's. Settlement south of the Blackwater Swamp in the Southside had occurred sporadically between the late seventeenth century and 1710 when the permissible area for settlement was then extended to the Nottoway River, a boundary lifted in 1714. These proscriptions were the result of an attempt to keep the area unsettled until the boundary between Virginia and North Carolina could be determined and to keep white and red men a healthy distance apart. 9

Coinciding with the full opening of the Southside to settlement after 1714 was Lieutenant Governor Alexander Spotswood's attempt to regulate the Indian trade and improve relations between Indians and whites. Much of the problem arose because of the Southside's proximity to North Carolina where bitter Indian-white fighting had occurred and because the Virginia trade with the Indians of the Carolina backcountry was centered in the Southside. The Assembly concurred with Spotswood's plans and created an Indian Company that was granted control of trade with the Indians. The Company had a monopoly of the trade, and any stockholder could trade with the Indians. A center

for the Company was created on the Meherrin River in what
was soon to be Brunswick County and called Fort Christiana.
Situated near a Sapponi Indian village, the fort was con­
structed under Spotswood's supervision and soon had a
school for the Indian children under the tutelage of
Charles Griffen. However, the law creating Spotwood's
scheme was vetoed in 1717 and the Indian Company collapsed
a few years later.10

The tributary Indians of the area remained for some
time, but the Meherrins were soon making a common Indian
complaint. In September, 1723 they addressed themselves
to the most onrable Gownor of Vergeny a pet­
shen from the me^ren Engens to your most on­
rable hiness and exelenc we pore engns have
kned for to complain to your most onrable hi­
ness for our Land is all taken from vs and the
English do say that they will come and tåke
our corn from us that wee have made in our corn
felds and wee cannot live at rest except your
most onrable hiness do order sum thing to the
contrary for wee are your most obtein subgetes
and will bee to his most ___ magasty and under
your most onrable com^ and in hope of sum relief
by your most onrable hiness11

Except for an occasional petition to the governor
by a white desiring abandoned Indian land, or a slight
clue resulting from inter-Indian affairs which were called

10For a discussion of the Virginia Indian trade and
policy during this period see W. Stitt Robinson, "Virginia
and the Cherokees, Indian Policy from Spotswood to Dinwiddie,"
in The Old Dominion: Essays for Thomas Perkins Abernethy, ed.
Darrett B. Rutman (Charlottesville, 1964) 21-40.

11Colonial Papers, Folder 31, Number 19. Virginia
State Library, Richmond, Virginia.
to the attention of the provincial government little is known about these Indians during the remaining years of the century. The local records indicate that a few Indians were held as slaves in the Southside during the period before 1753, but the remaining Indians in the area apparently moved away, were dispersed throughout the local population, or died.

The Indians of the Southside actually presented few obstacles to the white expansion into the area, and the provincial government after 1720 encouraged settlement by readily creating counties and parishes, exempting settlers in the Brunswick area from land patent costs and provincial taxes until 1728, and eliminating all taxes for those who would settle near the Roanoke River for ten years following 1738. However, it was not until the 1730's that the growing Virginia population began to move into the Southside in appreciable numbers, since the rest of the Virginia Piedmont lands were being taken up and settled. In 1755 the Southside's population had increased to an estimated thirty-nine thousand souls and the fingers of settlement were reaching toward the Blue Ridge.

For the most part, the surge of settlers into the Southside did not contain the most prominent members of

---

the Virginia aristocracy. In the more settled area along both sides of the James River lived important Virginia families who extended their economic interests into the more distant reaches of the Southside but who did not usually physically follow them. The Rolling, Byrd, Mayo, Cocke, Bland, Harrison, Kennon, Munford, and Randolph families took up Southside land during the half century between 1703 and 1753 and developed these tracts in various degrees. Overall, the most prominent of these families' individual members was William Byrd II of Westover who came to know the Southside as a result of his treks to draw the Virginia-North Carolina boundary in 1728 and a subsequent journey taken in 1733. Byrd procured the largest single Southside tract issued during the period (for 105,000 acres), and hatched several schemes to attract prospective foreign Protestants onto his Southside lands. His efforts failed, but by 1750 his heir, William Byrd III, did have sixty-two taxable slaves and three overseers or servants on the extensive tract of land along the Dan River.13

While these families were large and important land owners and developers in the Southside, the real brunt of settlement was borne by the anonymous hundreds who in

13Lunenbug County Tithable Lists, 1750, Clerk of Court's Office, Lunenbug Court House, Virginia. See Chapter IV, Note 31 for the extensive tracts taking up by many of these leading families in the Southside.
most cases left very little evidence of their Southside lives. In public importance there were a few families who did leave their imprint on their respective county’s histories by performing the onerous tasks associated with county and parish administration. In the early years of Prince George County members of the Hamlin, Eppes, Hall, Peterson, Poythress, and Stith families joined the Bollings, Munfords, Harrisons, and Elands who served on the county court and in other official capacities. By mid-century, as subsequent immigrants to the county and other local residents rose in prominence, others came to sit on the Prince George court including the Bannister, Jones, Ravenscroft, Penniston, Eldridge, Haynes, Boisseau, Walker, and Williams families. The justices appointed to the Brunswick Court following its organization in 1732 included such names as Wynne, Embry, Walton, King, Macklin, Fox, Duke, Lanier, Stith, Hagood, and Wilson. By the middle of the century the Parish, Edmunds, Edwards, Parham, and Simmons families also had members on the county court. But, while all of these names carried great weight on the local level and in a few surrounding counties, they did not represent the most respected and prominent families of the Old Dominion.14

The same situation prevailed in the remaining Southside counties created prior to 1753. Amelia County’s

14 The names of the individual county’s prominent families can be found throughout the respective county order books and the Exec. Journals of the Council, Vols. III-V.
most prominent leaders came from the Irby, Booker, Nash, Green, Tabb, Walker, Cocke, Ford, Jones, Terry, Clement, Cobbs, Watson, and Hall families. Lunenburg's leading citizens represented the Jefferson, Mitchell, Stokes, Cargill, Caldwell, Lawson, Dyer, Witton, Marrable, Bacon, and Martin families while Halifax County, created from Lunenburg in 1752 drew its first members for the court from the Wynne, Fontaine, Terry, Irby, Wade, Moore, and Walton families in the area. Similarly, Dinwiddie County's first justices reflected the same family names prominent in Prince George County which was divided in 1752 to form the new county of Dinwiddie.

Throughout the eighteenth century the Southside was an extremely rural area with no truly urban centers. The creation of a new county meant a new court house and a new focus for the residents' court day activities. But during this period the county seats never contained much more than a court house, a small building which served as the county clerk's office, and perhaps an ordinary and store or two. By the middle of the century exceptions to this heavily non-urban situation began to appear as the Southside began exporting increasing amounts of tobacco, and public warehouses and inspection sites became more important. In 1748 the Virginia Assembly created the towns of Petersburg and Blandford at and below the falls of the Appomattox River on the lands of Abraham Jones and William
Both of these villages quickly became centers of operations for a number of merchants, and in 1753 some residents of Dinwiddie County petitioned the Council to have the county court removed to Petersburg. However, the Council demurred, arguing that the court house should be placed on the land of Anthony Haynes which was judged to be a more "centrical" location after viewing a map of the county.

The dispersed rural population of the Southside had to depend heavily on the local tavern, court days, elections, and the church for activities outside of the family itself. Darrett Rutman has suggested that the volume of court cases appearing in the local records may indicate a venting of tensions or a means of "breaking the innate tedium of rural life." In addition the collection of people at court gave Virginians the opportunity to buy and sell, swap and steal items no longer wanted or needed.

The process of a Virginia election for the House of Burgesses has been ably captured in Charles S. Sydnor's Gentlemen Freeholders. One of the major sources used in his book, The Candidates, a play by Robert Munford of

---

15 Winfree, Laws of Virginia, 410-411.


17 Rutman, "Little Communities," 8.

what later became Mecklenburg County, is a product from the Southside. It humorously and at times almost lamentably describes the activities of the various candidates ranging from promising the impossible, to "swilling the planters with bumbo," and remembering the names of all the freeholders in the county. Between 1703 and 1753 Southside freeholders had opportunities to vote in several elections, and one poll listing how each voter cast his two votes has survived. This poll taken in Brunswick County in 1748 was recorded in the back pages of a deed book and has been overlooked or mislabeled ever since.  

There were 348 freeholders who voted in this election, with 8 individuals casting only one of their two votes. The pattern which immediately becomes evident is that the same individuals who voted for one candidate tended to cast their second vote for the same second candidate. There are some exceptions to this pattern of course, but it indicates that the candidates were pairing up to gain the support of each other's following, a practice noted by Sydnor to have been common.

The two winners of the election were Sterling Clack, the Brunswick Clerk of Court with 211 votes, and Drury Stith,

19 Brunswick County Deed Book 3, 510-518. This deed book is on microfilm in the Virginia State Library in Richmond, as are all other county records cited in this dissertation unless otherwise noted. See Appendix B for a reproduction of the Poll.

20 Sydnor, Gentlemen Freeholders, 45.
the County Surveyor and a Justice of the Peace with 206 votes. Two other justices, John Wall and Colonel (Nathaniel?) Edwards trailed with 135 and 124 votes respectively. John Willis, the County Lieutenant captured 9 votes, and Captain (Nicholas?) Edmunds received only 5. The twenty-one justices who voted did not set the pace by voting early but gave their votes at irregular intervals throughout the poll. Clark received the votes of 11 justices while his running mate, Drury Stith, won 12. Nine of the justices voted for each other, and both cast their remaining vote for Colonel Willis. John Wall had nine justices vote for him, and six of the seven justices who voted for Edwards were among the nine who had voted for Wall. Willis and Edmunds received only one vote each from a fellow justice. Thus, the justices themselves were fairly split over the election, but the winning candidates did receive slightly more support from their peers in the county court. There is no evidence to indicate any patterns among the voting by the more anonymous freeholders, but some families appear to have cast their votes in a block although there were a few mavericks in this pattern as well. If this poll is indicative of the other elections in the Southside, then it appears that political practices in the area generally conformed to practices in the rest of Virginia.
Organized religion in the Southside touched the lives of the residents in various ways. Taxes were laid on the tithables of the parish to support the Anglican Church, and estate inventories throughout the period reveal the presence of many standard devotional works. The Anglican ministers in the Southside found their duties laborious because of the widely scattered chapels in the frontier parishes. John Betty, who faithfully served the parishioners of St. Andrew's Parish in Brunswick County between 1733 and his death in 1751 was ordered by the vestry to

preach every Other Sabbath day at the Church all ready built in the parish afore sd and Equal­ly the Same at the place provided down Meherin by the Churchwardens till a Chapple be built in that part and then to preach in the SD Chapple in the same manner as in the house allready provided in the Stead thereof and further that the said rev d John Betty do once for every month in the year preach a Sermon at the house of John Thomasons of this parish for the Instructions of the Outer Inhabitance thereof. 21

After his death in 1751, Betty was replaced by George Purdie but John Wall, John Willis, Nathaniel Edwards and Henry Simmons had their opinion registered that "they did not think the Rev d Mr. George Purdie fit for a Minister of this parish & that they did not Accept of him for the

21The Vestry Book of St. Andrew’s Parish, 1732-1797, Virginia State Library, Richmond, microfilm, 2.
Complaints about Purdie were sent to Williamsburg in 1757, and Purdie resigned his position. However, he was permitted to continue serving until his death in 1760.22

Generally, the parish priests of the Southside enjoyed fairly long appointments. Alexander Finney of Martin's Brandon Parish served during the 1720's and 1730's, while George Robertson, the minister of Bristol Parish, held his office from at least 1720 until he died in 1740. His replacement, Robert Ferguson, also served until his death in 1749 and was in turn succeeded by Eleazer Robinson.23

The Cumberland Parish vestry in Lunenburg County apparently did not appoint a minister until 1748 when the vestrymen accepted John Brunskill the nominee of Governor William Gooch and Commissary William Dawson. However, the acceptance by the vestry of Brunskill was done after the vestrymen had made it clear that they could not be "compelled to entertain and receive any Minister other than such as may answer the end of his Ministerial Function," and they apparently felt that they were the


23 "Virginia in 1726," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XLVIII, 149; "A List of Counties, Parishes, and Present Ministers of Virginia, March 25, 1735," Ibid., LVIII, 405; Churchill Gibson Chamberlayne, The Vestry Book and Register of Bristol Parish, Virginia, 1720-1789 (Richmond, 1898) 1-153.
only ones who could judge on these matters. Brunskill lasted until 1750 when, for some reason he was replaced with another nominee of Commissary Dawson, George Purdie. Purdie remained until October, 1750 when he resigned to go abroad, but this priest who had a later protest lodged against him by members of St. Andrew's Parish vestry carried with warm recommendation and a bonus of two thousand pounds of tobacco with him when he left Lunenburg County. His successor was William Kay.

The records for Raleigh Parish, Amelia County have not survived for this period so very little is known about Anglicanism in that parish. John Ormsby served the parish during this period, and is the one minister who was accused of shirking his duties in the Southside during this time. In 1747 he was presented by the county grand jury for not preaching every Sunday.

While most Southsiders were Anglicans, or nominally so, there were also growing numbers of Presbyterians as Scotch-Irish settlers moved into the area from Pennsylvania. They established two settlements along the Buffalo River and Cub Creek in Amelia and Brunswick (later Lunenburg) Counties by the late 1730's but apparently did not

---

24 Landon C. Bell, Cumberland Parish, Lunenburg County, Virginia, 1748-1816, Vestry Book, 1746-1816 (Richmond, 1930) 329-341.

25 Amelia County Order Book 2, fol. 40.
have any formal or at least regular church organization until sometime later. Presbyterian ministers from Pennsylvania such as William Robinson and John Thomson, did minister to them from time to time. Within a few more years Presbyterians from Halifax, Amelia, Lunenburg, Prince Edward and the town of Petersburg petitioned the Hanover Presbytery for ministers.

The early records of Prince George County also reveal the existence of at least one Baptist congregation. In 1715 Robert Norden appeared before the Prince George court and took the required oaths of a dissenting preacher. He apparently preached to his congregation at the home of Mathew Marks who willed his home plantation to Norden in 1719. After this time the Prince George Baptists disappear from the records which have survived for the county.

By 1753 the Southside possessed a population that was growing rapidly as migrants from the other areas of Virginia streamed into the area. They were joined by immigrants who came from the Old Dominion's sister colonies to the north who brought some religious and ethnic diversity to the area. But all were mobile, unsettled, and

---

26 Herbert C. Bradshaw, "The Settlement of Prince Edward County," Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, LXII, 459, 464-466.


28 Prince George County Orders, 1714-1720, 20; Deeds etc., 1713-1728, 358-359.
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restless individuals whose presence in the Southside helped give shape to much of the social and economic character of the area in its early years of settlement.
CHAPTER II

THE EXPANSION OF THE SOUTHSIDE

Historians of eighteenth-century Virginia usually refer to the Southside in the context of the expansion of Virginia into the piedmont. For unlike the areas north of the James River Basin, the Southside attracted settlers at a much slower rate during the first third of the century. In comparing the Southside with the rest of the piedmont, these historians have posited a variety of factors to explain the different rates of expansion; namely, contrasts in topography, soil, and the role of land speculators. The expansion policy of the colony's royal government, and the growth rate of Virginia's population should be added to these explanations to help resolve the problem of the Southside's slower development.

The 1751 edition of the Fry-Jefferson Map clearly reveals the importance of Virginia's rivers in her expansion patterns.¹ The areas along the four major river

systems, the James, York, Rappahannock, and Potomac contain much detail about tidewater plantations, bridges, ferries, and tobacco warehouses. The information becomes less extensive as the rivers are followed to the northwest into the piedmont, but the importance of the rivers to the eighteenth-century Virginian is clear. In contrast to the rest of the map, the Southside even in the tidewater appears as a vast and empty space lacking settlement, with only the court houses and an infrequent family seat noted. At least for Fry and Jefferson, not much of importance had developed in the area.

Historians of Virginia have often noted the importance of the Old Dominion's rivers for the westward movement and have pointed out the difficulties of the Southside in this regard.\textsuperscript{2} It is not that the Southside does not have rivers, but rather they flow the wrong way. Three major river systems drain the Southside: the James, the Chowan, and the Roanoke. Only the Appomattox River, a tributary of the James, empties into Virginia waters. The Chowan system's rivers, the Blackwater River or Swamp in Prince George County, the Nottoway River which traces its way through the heart of the eastern

Southside, and the Meherrin River that cuts through Lunenburg and Brunswick Counties and on into the tidewater, all eventually converge just south of Virginia and flow into Albemarle Sound. Likewise, the Roanoke system, formed by the confluence of the Dan River from the southwestern reaches of the Southside and the Staunton River from the northern, angles down until it also reaches the Sound.\(^3\)

In addition to the problem of direction, the Southside's rivers were unnavigable. All major transportation ceased on the Appomattox at what became Petersburg, and no real effort to make the river passable for anything larger than canoes came until the middle of the eighteenth century.\(^4\) The Chowan system was navigable for vessels of some size for about fourteen miles into Virginia from North Carolina, but this did little to help the expansion of the area for the rivers above this point were like the Appomattox.\(^5\) The Roanoke was similarly defective. Thus historians have

\(^3\)Department of Conservation and Economic Development, Division of Water Resources, Notes on Surface Water in Virginia (Richmond, 1965) 14-18.
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well argued that the all but useless river system was a major factor in retarding the development of the Southside in the early eighteenth century. 6

In addition to the waterways of the area, eighteenth-century attitudes and policies regarding the land hold keys to understanding the rate of expansion. Topographically, the territory encompassed in this study changes as one moves from the tidewater area of Prince George County through the fall line district into the rolling piedmont and onto the Blue Ridge. Contemporary accounts of the area's topography are scarce but do provide some idea of the eighteenth-century man's view of the environment. In 1716 John Fontaine had accompanied Governor Alexander Spotswood to Fort Christiana on the Meherrin River, "the most outward settlement on this side of Virginia." He noted the grassy lowlands "called Savannas, which lie along the river side, much like unto our meadow lands in England; there is neither tree nor shrub that grows upon these plains, nothing but good grass." He went on to say that they were frequently flooded but that ditching could easily remedy the situation. 7

---


William Byrd II also noted the rich soils on river and creek bottoms when on his famous excursion to draw the boundary between Virginia and North Carolina in 1728. However, he also recorded that the grounds "seem'd subject to be every where overflow'd in a fresh," thus reducing their value. At the end of the century the rector of Martin's Brandon described Prince George County and its way of life. Along the waterways existed similar rich low grounds that produced good crops if drained. The higher lands had a light loamy soil. Across the county ran the dividing ridge between the James River and Blackwater Swamp, but the ridge itself was clayey, barren, and grew only "miserable oaks." South of the ridge, he reported, life was less healthy.

All three commentators on the Southside's topography believed the lowlands to be rich, but the higher grounds seem to have been more preferred, at least until erosion or soil depletion rendered the high grounds unprofitable. The land law of 1710 provided that patentees had first claim on unpatented adjoining low grounds, indicating

---
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that the higher ground was preferred and taken up first.\textsuperscript{10} Byrd's concern over flooding may have reflected a view that it was more profitable in the long run to stay high and dry, than to take the chance of losing the crops on the richer bottom lands.

Soil fertility was more commonly judged by the vegetation it grew than by its location. The sure sign of fertile soil was a good stand of hardwood trees of ample size, and Byrd found plenty of these in his perambulations about the Southside. Beech-nut, white oak, walnut, and locust trees, "certain proofs of a fruitful Soil," grew in great abundance and were frequently used as boundary markers in patent surveys.\textsuperscript{11} However, in spite of the apparent fertility of the soil to observers like Byrd, the ground grew the cheaper Oronoco tobacco instead of the higher grade sweet-scented variety grown along the James, York, and Rappahannock Rivers. Since it seems that sweet-scented and Oronoco were actually the same variety of tobacco, environmental conditions such as soil types may have been the determining factor in the kind of tobacco produced.\textsuperscript{12} This difference between the Southside and the

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{10}]Hening, Statutes Vol. III, 580-582.
\item[\textsuperscript{11}]Byrd, Histories of the Dividing Line, ed. Boyd 166. These are the hardwood trees that show up frequently in patent descriptions.
\item[\textsuperscript{12}]Melvin Herndon, Tobacco in Colonial Virginia (Williamsburg, 1957) 19-22.
\end{itemize}
Bappahannock valley may have repelled settlers from the Southside as Leonidas Dodson has suggested, and drawn them into richer soil areas.\(^{13}\)

The restrictions imposed by the royal government on western expansion also contributed to the Southside's slower rate of expansion. Before the end of the seventeenth century, settlement south of the Blackwater Swamp was proscribed in an attempt to keep white and red men apart. This ban, although to a great extent ignored, was not lifted until 1702, reimposed after instructions from the crown in 1706, and not removed again until 1710 when settlement was allowed to extend as far as the Nottoway River. The Nottoway became the new limit, not because of the presence of Indians but because of the conflicting claims of Virginia and North Carolina, which rendered an individual's land title worthless until the dispute could be settled.\(^{14}\) This last ban was removed in 1714 and from this time on, the Southside settler had no political barriers to westward expansion in Virginia until 1763.\(^{15}\)

Instead of political road blocks, the prospective settler enjoyed an economic advantage after 1720. In that year, Governor Spotswood asked the Assembly to create two

\(^{13}\)Leonidas Dodson, *Alexander Spotswood, Governor of Colonial Virginia 1710-1722* (Philadelphia, 1932) 243, fn. 64.


\(^{15}\)Ibid. 374.
piedmont frontier counties, Brunswick in the Southside, and Spotsylvania in the Rappahannock River valley. The Assembly complied and exempted the piedmont pioneers from the usual colony levies for ten years from May 1, 1721. The government also petitioned the crown to allow the lands in the two new counties to be taken up without having to procure the normal treasury rights or to prove head rights.16 Reviewing the policy, the Privy Council in England finally agreed to the free land provision, but limited it to seven years and to tracts of one thousand acres or less.17

However, it soon became apparent that settlers were not rushing into the Southside to take advantage of the free land-no tax policy. Although Spotsylvania was soon to be organized, the governor and council decided not to issue writs of election for the House of Burgesses in either county in March 1722 because they were "yet so thinly inhabited that there are neither Courts nor officers of Justice erected in either of them...."18 Spotsylvania was organized that year but the settlement of Brunswick lagged so much that it was not organized until 1732, remaining under the jurisdiction of Prince George County until that year. When it was finally organized, portions of Surry and Isle of Wight Counties were added to increase

16Hening, Statutes Vol. IV, 78.
18Ibid., 9.
the number of tithables and more evenly distribute the tax load.19

When the free land provision expired in 1728, Governor William Gooch wrote to the Board of Trade and commented on the diverging rates of expansion between the two counties of Brunswick and Spotsylvania. Gooch noted that Spotsylvania speculators had taken up large tracts without

... his Majesty's Approbation; yet I am credibly informed that without taking up those large Tracts upon which great improvements were necessary to be made, those Counties would not have been settled so speedily as they would have been, and much of that Land which has been seated in small Parcels would in all probability have remained to this day desolate, as may be seen in the County of Brunswick, which having but few great Tracts taken up in it by men of Substance, hath advanced very little in the number of its Inhabitants in proportion to the other County, Spotsylvania, where the greatest Tracts have been granted & possessed, and thereby given encouragement to the meaner Sort of People to seat themselves as it were under the Shade and Protection of the Greater.20

It is not known whether or not the governor's credible informer was a large land speculator in Spotsylvania, but the description of the differing rates of taking up the land was correct. The first 32 patents issued as Spotsylvania patents in 1722-1723 averaged 5,811 acres for a total of 185,947 acres of land. By contrast,  

Brunswick had only one patent issued before 1724 and it was for 2,811 acres to Robert Munford and John Anderson. Even this single patent was far above the average size for the piedmont Southside. While Spotsylvania had 185,947 acres taken up in two years, the whole of the Southside, or Prince George County at the time, had only 84,949 acres in 230 patents taken up from 1705 to 1723. The average size of these Southside patents was only 369 acres. Between 1724 and 1728 when the free land provision expired, there were 280 patents issued in Brunswick County. Only 2 were larger than 1,000 acres and 188 or almost 68 percent of the patents contained less than 405 acres. There was a clear difference between the rates of taking up land, and the size of the land tracts in the two counties, lending credence to Gooch's contention. And it has been pointed out that one of the largest of the Spotsylvania speculators was former Governor Alexander Spotswood, whose influence could have attracted people into the Rappahannock area.

Yet, in spite of unusable rivers, the presence of less desirable soil, the smaller size of patents issued, the absence of large land speculators, and the early restrictions to expansion, Southside settlement slowly

---

gathered momentum until by the 1740's land was being taken up and the population growing at a very high rate. There are several ways to plot this expansion and its pace: (1) geographically, (2) through county formation, (3) the rate of patenting land, and (4) in the growth of tithable population.

In 1703, when Prince George County became a reality, settlement barely extended more than fifteen miles to the south of the James River, or roughly not more than about forty miles, as the crow flies, from Williamsburg. In 1716, as noted above, John Fontaine reported that Fort Christiana, eighty miles from Williamsburg, on the Meherrin River was the farthest outpost of white civilization on the Southside, and it was distant from other white settlers. By 1728, settlement had extended as far south as the Great Creek, just west of where the Roanoke River leaves Virginia, and where the Trading Path to the Catawbas crossed the Roanoke River, a point about one hundred miles from the capital. By this time farther north, settlement was groping up the Appomattox River valley area. Surveys were being made up Deep, Flat, and Namozeen Creeks with some regularity, and tracts were surveyed on the Little Nottoway River.

---

25 Prince George County Deeds, etc. Part 3, 1025-1026.
In a little over a decade the pace began to quicken. While Scotch-Irish settled along Cub and Buffalo Creeks, native Virginians pushed out beyond the Roanoke and Staunton Rivers and up their tributaries.²⁶ By 1750, settlement was in the afternoon shadow of the Blue Ridge itself, for settlers from the Valley of Virginia had added a new direction to the pioneer movement by coming south through the Staunton River and Maggoty Creek gaps in the mountains and on into the Southside.²⁷ By the middle of the century there was still a lot of vacant land in the area, but the remotest settlers were now over 175 miles from the seat of royal authority, a distance which adversely affected the ability of the Royal government to enforce land policy and maintain control over the actions of its citizens.

The pattern of county formation is also a useful index to expansion. Chart 1 below shows the process of carving up the Southside into counties. As can be seen, the formation of the counties roughly reflects the rapid growth and expansion of the 1740's after an initially slow start for the first third of the century.²⁸


A more precise index to the rate of expansion in the area is the frequency at which land was patented. By plotting the numerical distribution of patents over time, the hectic activity and growth of the 1740's is revealed.
Table 1
Numerical Distribution of Patents Over Five Year Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Patents</th>
<th>% of Patents</th>
<th>% of New Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1703-08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708-13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714-18</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719-23</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724-28</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729-33</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734-38</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739-43</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744-48</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749-54</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table 1 was constructed from Land Patent Books 9-32. The percentage of acreage reflects only the amount that had never been patented before. Some patents did contain land that had been previously patented, but this was excluded to determine the real rate of taking up unpatented land.

Table 1 above does this in five year time segments for the fifty year period. Only 17 patents were issued in the first ten years after Prince George County was created, but in the 1720's the rate accelerated. The big jump in the number of patents between 1724 and 1728 is explained when one remembers that this was the period of free land in Brunswick County. It is not surprising that several individuals rushed in at the last moment to take advantage of the situation. Of the 493 patents issued during that five years, 280 were in Brunswick, and 181 of the 280 were issued in 1727 and 1728.\(^{29}\) Without the free
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land provision even fewer individuals would have been attract-
ed to the Southside during this period.

With the expiration of the free land proviso, the rate of patenting the land dropped to a more "normal level" followed by a steady increase. But in the 1744 to 1748 period another spectacular rise accounted for more than one quarter of the patents and land issued in the area during the half century. Taking the last ten years together, almost one half of the patents and land were issued in one-fifth of the time period. By this time, the Southside was rapidly becoming the last remaining frontier area of the piedmont, and was providing a home, temporary for some, for Virginia's rapidly growing population.

Graph 1 plots the population growth of Virginia from 1690 to 1760. The uneven rate of growth can be seen in the differing percentages of absolute numerical growth in a decade. The biggest proportionate increase occurred between 1730 and 1740 when the population jumped from 114,000 to 180,440. After a comparative lull in the 1740's, the rate of growth climbed sharply again in the next decade with the increment (c. 108,693) almost equaling Virginia's total population (c. 114,000) in 1730. With such a high growth rate, and with the rest of piedmont Virginia and the Valley becoming settled by eighteenth-century standards, it was only a matter of time before the burgeoning popu-
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Table 2
Southside Tithables 1703-1755

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Prince George</th>
<th>Brun_wick</th>
<th>Amelia</th>
<th>Lunenburg</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1705</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1715</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1716</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1717</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td></td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1733</td>
<td></td>
<td>776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td></td>
<td>859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td></td>
<td>969</td>
<td>588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736</td>
<td></td>
<td>962</td>
<td>671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1737</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1738</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>4,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>4,642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>1,185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1742</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1746</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1747</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1748</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,323</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>3,735</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>13,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table 2 was constructed from a variety of sources because of the gaps in the Prince George records. The figure for 1703 is found in C.O. 5/1313:246; 1704 in C.O. 5/1314: 110-111; 1705 in C.O. 5/1340: 61-62; 1714 in C.O. 5/1317: 129-130; 1715 to 1720 in Prince George Orders, 1714-1720; 1724 in C.O.
5/1319: 220; 1726 in C. 0. 5/1320: 54-56; 1729 in C. 0. 5/1322: 128; and 1733-1739 in Prince George Minutes, 1737-1740. The Brunswick figures for 1732-1741 are from Order Books 1 and 2. The data for 1742-1750 is found in the Vestry Book of St. Andrew's Parish, on microfilm at the Virginia State Library in Richmond. The Amelia figures are from Amelia Order Books 1 and 2, and the Lunenburg tithes from Order Books 1 and 2 except that the Amelia totals for 1736 and 1749 and the Lunenburg figure for 1750 are taken from the actual tithable lists. The total figures for 1755 are found in C. 0. 5/1328: 190-191. The new counties in existence by that time were combined with the figure for the parent county to maintain conformity in the Table.

Plotting the growth of the Southside's population for the same period is a problem because of the gaps in the Prince George County records, and not always knowing the ratio between blacks and whites in the area so that estimates of the population can be constructed from the tithable figures. However, enough has survived which reveals the early slow growth of the Southside and the rapidly accelerating growth of the 1740's. In the county Order Books were recorded the number of tithables in the county each year when the county levy was drawn up and assessed. By using this source of information, it is possible to gauge population growth roughly.

Table 2 above breaks down the tithable population by county and gives totals for the area when known. As the Prince George figures reveal, the fifteen years from 1703 to 1718 saw an increment of only 68 tithables in the
area. By 1739 there were 4,642 tithables in the Southside, and the area's numbers swelled to 13,219 tithables by 1755. The eighteenth-century rule of thumb for determining the total population from the tithable figures was to multiply the number of white tithes, or white males sixteen and above, by four, and the black tithes, or both males and females sixteen and above by two. The 1755 county figures contain a racial breakdown showing 6,601 white tithes and 6,618 black tithables in the Southside for a rough population total of 39,640 or slightly less than 14 per cent of the Old Dominion's total population. Unfortunately, this is the only year that the returns are broken down into racial categories so that a total population figure for the Southside can be estimated with some assurance only for 1755.

The records reveal several patterns in the origins of the Southsider of the middle of the eighteenth century, and in the settlement of the area which conform to patterns discovered elsewhere in American frontier history. The evidence for the origins of both resident and nonresident tithepayers in Amelia in 1749, Lunenburg in 1750, and the Brunswick voters of 1748 is spotty, but 186 of the 899 Amelia tithepayers, 88 of the 1,068 Lunenburg tithepayers, and 36 of the 348 Brunswick voters left record of their

origin. When these are totaled and distributed on a map, a pattern does emerge, but it is heavily weighted, of course, in favor of Amelia. As the following map shows, the Eastern Shore and Dismal Swamp counties produced no recorded settlers directly for the Southside. The Northern Neck contributed a handful, and the Middle Neck counties sent thirty-one. Of the lower Peninsula, Surry and Isle of Wight Counties, Surry propelled the most settlers into the Southside, especially into Brunswick County. Prince George County sent her former settlers into all areas of the Southside, and Amelia, Lunenburg, and Brunswick traded an occasional settler, with Amelia residents moving to the southwest into Lunenburg. However, it was the middle Virginia counties of Henrico, Goochland, and Hanover which contributed the largest number by far to Amelia and Lunenburg. Thus it appears that many, if not most of the Southsiders had their origins in the counties closest to the Southside itself. The overall direction of movement was to the southwest with the eastern tidewater Southside counties from Isle of Wight east producing only a minimal amount of people for the region. The Valley of Virginia is unrepresented, largely because the information on origins is usually found in the deeds, and few were recorded by this time from the far western reaches of Lunenburg. Thus the older northwesterly movement up the major rivers turned ninety degrees left to reach the last remaining piedmont frontier.
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Virginia Counties in 1749

Virginia Sources of Southside
White Population c. 1730-50

Sources: Amelia County Tithables, 1749 (manuscripts, Virginia State Library, Richmond); Lunenburg County Tithables, 1750 (manuscripts, Lunenburg Court House, Va.); Brunswick County Poll for Burgesses, 1748, Brunswick County Deed Book 3, 510-518; Prince George County Deeds etc., 1713-1728; Orders, 1714-1720; Minute Book, 1737-1740; Amelia County Deed Books 1-5, 1734-1757; Order Books 1-3.
While the largest number of settlers had their previous homes elsewhere in Virginia, other colonies and countries contributed population to the Southside as well. North Carolina's role seems to have been more of a receiver than a contributor to Virginia's population. Only three of the above number of individuals originated in North Carolina. With the exception of Pennsylvania, the other mainland colonies also contributed little or nothing to the swelling numbers in the Southside. Although it is impossible to determine their numbers, large collections of Scotch-Irish came down the Valley or across Virginia from the tidewater whose origins were in Pennsylvania. Many continued moving through the Southside and on into the Carolina backcountry, but those who remained tended to settle in groups where Presbyterian services could easily be held.\textsuperscript{31} A minimal number came from the island colonies of Great Britain, as well. One Southside individual, Thomas Bowery, came from the Island of St. Christopher and set up a rather large operation employing 14

slaves of tithable age on 1,993 acres. Another Amelia resident from the islands was the Raleigh Parish priest, John Ormsby from Bermuda.

Few of the individuals who claimed their importation or head rights in the county courts during the first half of the century appear on any of the lists used in this study. However, many did give their place of origin when presenting their claim to the fifty acres granted them for immigrating to Virginia. Of the majority who did give their previous home's location, thirty-seven came from England, Scotland, or Wales, and sixteen from Ireland. John Blackwelder and his family of five claimed to have come to Brunswick County in 1746 from the "Marquis of Durlock" in Germany via Pennsylvania. Three others, Peter and Scher Torian, and Silvester G'anane were probably Swiss settlers who survived William Byrd II's attempts to get them settled on his huge Southside holdings. Thus, while heavily British in stock, there were representatives

32 Amelia County Deed Book 2, 342-346. Amelia County Tithables, 1749.

of a few other nationalities and backgrounds in the Southside. 34

In addition to the patterns of migration into the Southside, the records also reveal patterns of settlement and economic interest. Because of the absence of annual tithable lists, it is always difficult to determine whether or not an actual settlement was made on a piece of land purchased or patented by someone who was not originally a resident of the area. But, an outsider's interest in the Southside's lands usually contributed eventually to a pattern of settlement, either because he himself moved into the Southside, sent relatives to the area, or sold the land to another nearby non-Southsider.

The land patents contain a description of the tract's boundaries, and if there were adjacent tracts that had been taken up, the owners' names were usually given. An analysis of the 3,813 patents issued in the Southside between 1703 and 1753 revealed that 271 or 7.1 per cent of the patents were taken up by individuals who had neighboring landowners with the same surname. 35 It is quite possible that sons-in-law, or other relatives with different


surnames held contiguous tracts as well. Another possibility is that kinsmen settled in the same neighborhood but held non-contiguous lands. In the absence of marriage and parish vital records, and without research into non-contiguous landholding which is unfeasible at present, a definite judgement on the kinship factor in settlement is not possible. But there are clues in addition to the land patent information that suggest that kinship did influence settlement. For example, in 1736 Edward Booker of Amelia sold Edmund Booker of Essex four hundred acres for £69. Edmund was also to move to Amelia as part of the condition of sale. The land tract he purchased was bounded by two other holdings of the first Booker, and by Richard Booker's mill. Apparently Edward was trying to create a family nucleus in Amelia along Nibbs Creek.  

Land ownership by nonresidents of a Southside county also contributed to family groupings in specific areas. For example, James Anderson Sr., of Surry had patented and purchased land along the Little Nottoway River and Whetstone Creek. Then, in March 1744, he gave and sold a total of 750 acres to James Jr., Thomas, and Jordan Anderson, who were recorded as residents of Amelia. There is no record through 1750 of the recipients disposing of the tracts in any way, and so it appears that for a time at

---

36 Amelia County Deed Book 1, 20-21.
least, the site chosen by one member of a family provided a center for the other members.37

The geographical proximity of settlers before they moved into the Southside also had some effect on where some people settled. Between November 1742 and December 1744, four different individuals purchased five tracts of land on nearby creeks in north-central Brunswick County. All four were from Richmond County, and the purchases were all made from different individuals. Two of the four bought adjoining tracts in Brunswick, but the other tracts do not appear to have been close together. There are no other recorded transactions by Richmonders between 1732 and 1749, though some unrecorded purchases may have occurred.38 Likewise, in Amelia County between June 1742 and November 1744, five people from King and Queen County, two of them with the same last name, bought land on West Creek and the Cellar Fork, two of the branches of Deep Creek.39 Elsewhere in the county, along Stocks and Flat Creeks and the Appomattox River, the Andersons and William Meredith,

37 Amelia County Deed Book 2, 34-42. For other examples see Ibid., 452-461, and Brunswick County Deed Book 2, 144-147, and 283-284.


39 Amelia County Deed Book 1, 396-403, 424-425, Deed Book 2, 59-61, 107-108. The five purchasers were Richard and Thomas Applin, Edmund Byne, Elisha Estes, and John Hardy.
also from King and Queen, took up land. In addition, a handful of other individuals from the same county were purchasing scattered Amelia tracts. Similar instances can be found throughout the records, but not to the extent that whole communities together moved to the Southside from elsewhere in Virginia.

Nonresident land speculators may have had an influence on the direction their neighbors took when deciding to move. Non-Southsiders were continually picking up Southside tracts by patent or purchase and apparently found it convenient to dispose of them to fellow members of their county or of counties nearby the speculators' homes. For example, a speculator in Goochland in need of money might sell his Southside land to an acquaintance from nearby King and Queen, thus orienting the new purchaser towards the Southside. There are many instances of this practice in the deed books where parties are both non-residents of the Southside at the time the deed was transacted.

Settlers moved into the Southside and settled where they did because of kinship ties, the presence of former county neighbors, and the activities of nonresident land speculators. There were many other individuals who also

---

40 Amelia County Deed Book 1, 100-102, 181-182, 273-275, Deed Book 2, 120-124.
41 Brunswick County Deed Book 1, 475-476, Deed Book 2, 357-360, 530-532. Lunenburg County Deed Book 1, 426-429.
moved into the Southside who do not conform or who have not left evidence of conforming to these patterns. It could well be that they were attracted to the Southside because there were no relatives or former neighbors there and saw the area as an asylum from former ties. In any case, they came into the Southside in ever increasing numbers after the 1730's. With the Southside rapidly becoming the last remaining frontier section of the Virginia piedmont, both Virginians and immigrants to the Old Dominion crossed the unnavigable rivers, trekked over the less desirable soil, found only a few large land speculators, ignored royal land policies, and settled for various lengths of time in the Southside.
CHAPTER III

TAKING UP THE LAND

The expansion of Virginia, whether in the Southside or in other areas, was not to be some haphazard affair. The crown desired an orderly, systematic settlement paced by a fairly even distribution of land to prevent the concentration of the land in a few hands. Royal policy considered large scale holdings as inimical to settlement, thus causing a reduction in the crown revenues through the loss of the quitrents: for it was known that the collection of the quitrents on large undeveloped tracts was very difficult when the owner was not in residence and where there were no goods to seize for nonpayment. Even less affluent individuals who could not develop smaller tracts were not to enjoy the abundance of land in the new world but were to be allowed to take up only what could be used efficiently.¹

To implement this policy of controlled expansion, the crown at various times imposed westward or outer limits

¹Manning Curles Voorhis, "The Land Grant Policy of Colonial Virginia," (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of History, University of Virginia, 1940), Chapters III-V. Dodson, Alexander Spotswood 133-135. For the various legal forms of the land patents see Fairfax Harrison, Virginia Land Grants: A Study of Conveyancing in Relation to Colonial Politics (Richmond, 1925) 7-59.
to the spread of settlement. By the 1680's, settlement had been proscribed on the far side of the Blackwater River or Swamp in the Southside, and above the Pamunkey Neck in New Kent County. There were additional boundaries elsewhere aimed at controlling expansion and keeping white and red men apart, but as in all unenforceable regulations, the enterprising Virginian pushed beyond these legal limitations and became colonial "sooners." By the 1690's individuals were illegally taking up land and settling outside of the bounds in anticipation of the legal opening of the area and were soon petitioning to have their actions declared legal.²

Coupled with the pressure for continued expansion came further illegal action on the part of the Virginian to acquire additional lands. During the seventeenth century the only way to take up unclaimed lands was through the headright system. Since each importation or headright entitled the claimant to only fifty acres, it was rather difficult to amass large tracts of unclaimed land. As a result a practice developed of selling and buying these headrights to facilitate the issuance of large patents. However, the limitations inherent in the system led to abuses such as the practice of presenting the same or false claims at different county courts. In addition, ship

²EXEC. JOURNALS OF COUNCIL VOL. 1, 94, 126, 364,
captains entered claims for themselves and their crews after arriving in Virginia, and importation rights were also illegally claimed on imported slaves. 3

In response to these needs, and to the fact that the lands on the far side of the Blackwater and Pamunkey Neck were being taken up without importation rights, Governor Francis Nicholson found a solution by initiating the open sale of rights to fifty acres of land without requiring any pretext of immigration. The new policy at least provided some funds for the treasury, but it did not restrict the accumulation of land by speculators and others. 4

In 1705 the option to purchase land at the rate of five shillings sterling was codified. 5 Roughly coinciding with the new policy was a confused one of allowing settlement beyond the earlier bounds with the exception, before 1714, of the area south of the Nottoway River which was contested with North Carolina. 6 These two developments

3 Voorhis, "Land Grant Policy," 65-68.
4 Exec. Journals of Council Vol. I, 457. Treasury rights were being sold as early as 1692, although apparently illegally. See Voorhis, "Land Grant Policy," 68-69. This new provision was granted within the context of the Pamunkey Neck and Blackwater situation, and the intent may have been to restrict the new policy to these areas, although this is not at all clear.
in land policy, of allowing outright purchase of the crown's lands and what amounted to unlimited expansion within the bounds of the colony led to the eventual demise of the original policy of controlled expansion and the decline of the limited acquisition of land by an individual.

The land law of 1705 did impose some restrictions on the amount of land that could be taken up. No one could take up more than five hundred acres in one tract who did not have at least five tithable servants or slaves. Others who had more than five tithables could take up amounts in excess of five hundred acres at the rate of two hundred acres per additional tithable up to a total of four thousand acres in one tract (excepting those tracts for which entries had already been made in excess of that amount before passage of the act.) However, by 1708 the Council was complaining that "the restraining the takeing up Land only to small tracts will be very prejudicial to her Maj'tys interest for if only small parcels such as 100, 200 or 500 acres be to be taken up it will follow that good Land only will be patented...." This protest was provoked by the notification from the Privy Council in England that the land law of 1705 had been disallowed and that if land were to be granted, it would have to be done according to the

more restrictive instructions to the royal governor. Since Governor Edward Nott had died and his replacement Robert Hunter had been captured by the French, the acting governor, Edmund Jennings, and the Council in the end did nothing except protest until Governor Alexander Spotswood arrived in 1710.9

The tenure of Alexander Spotswood from 1710 to 1722 brought a variety of attempts to procure a land law more in conformity with the governor's instructions. But in the end Spotswood's capitulation to the Virginians' view favoring a loose land policy added impetus to the steadily failing royal land policy. Fresh and eager to follow his instructions, the new governor had attacked the land question with vigor and had succeeded in obtaining a land law in 1710 requiring patentees to plant and seat their land and pay the quitrents or face forfeiture if anyone desired the land and was willing to take the case to the General Court.10 To make these conditions more plain and exact, Spotswood issued a proclamation declaring that seating and planting meant that three acres of every fifty granted had to be developed. In addition, anyone wishing over four hundred acres had to petition the governor in council before the larger amount would be granted. The latter provision, of course, was designed to prevent the engrossing

---

of lands and to limit these larger tracts to those individuals who had the means to develop the land.\textsuperscript{11} The other side of the coin, however, provided that land holders had first claim on adjacent unpatented low lands as well as any amounts of land within the patent bounds in excess of the stated amount of acreage in the patent.\textsuperscript{12}

The land issue was resurrected again in 1712-1713 when the Board of Trade asked Spotswood to procure specific legislation to bring Virginia law into greater conformity with royal policy.\textsuperscript{13} This time the requirement to seat and plant three acres of every fifty granted was included in the law itself, but a wide variety of activities were deemed acceptable as "seating and planting." The raising of various numbers of livestock, the draining of marshes, and other similar activities redeemed the land, and in addition, the three-in-fifty clause was made to apply only to the arable land within the tract. To implement this concession, county surveyors were to estimate and record the proportion of tillable land in each tract they surveyed for a prospective patentee.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{12}Hening, \textit{Statutes} Vol. III, 517-535.


\textsuperscript{14}Hening, \textit{Statutes} Vol. IV, 37-42.
In 1717 Spotswood also tried to tighten up the system and help provide for increased revenues from the quitrents by issuing a proclamation requiring individuals to return their surveys by the next meeting of the General Court after the survey had been completed. They were then given six more months to have a patent issued on that survey, and if these provisions were not met then the survey was to become void. This was necessary because one did not have to pay quitrents until the patent had actually been issued and many individuals were holding land just by survey, thus depriving the crown of rightful revenue.\(^\text{15}\)

The final development in land law during Spotswood's administration came in 1720 after the governor himself had acquired a taste for Virginia land. The seating and planting requirements were now to be met by even more broadly defined activities and any monies spent on improvements on a tract could also be counted at the rate of ten pounds currency per fifty acres.\(^\text{16}\) It should be remembered that these new allowances were permitted by the same session of the General Assembly that created Spotsylvania and Brunswick Counties and exempted new land holders there from taxes and the normal costs of patenting land for what turned out to be seven years.\(^\text{17}\)


\(^{17}\) See Chapter II above.
By the end of Spotswood's tenure as governor, the requirements and limitations for obtaining land through the patent process had been formulated to the point where only a few more changes would be made before the Revolution. Since these new provisions were mostly applied to the Valley and trans-allegheny regions, they need not concern us now.

In summary, if an individual wished to acquire land from the crown in the period following 1720, he had to do the following. First, he had to prove his or others' importation or purchase treasury rights at the rate of five shillings sterling per fifty acres. With this proof of right, he had the county surveyor lay out his selected tract if he wished less than four hundred acres, but if the amount were a larger quantity the patentee would first have to obtain permission from the governor-in-council before the survey could be made. If this permission were given, the survey had to be made and returned by the next meeting of the General Court and a patent issued within six months after the survey was returned. At the most an individual had about one year after the survey was made to obtain his patent. With the patent now in hand, the new owner had to develop within three years in various and sundry ways three acres of every fifty granted that was arable land and had to begin perpetually paying the quit-rents of two shillings sterling per hundred acres per year.
If he failed to develop the land to the extent required or did not pay the quitrents for three successive years, the land would technically lapse to the crown and could be patented again by a claimant in the General Court. ¹⁸

In reality, the crown's land policy of controlled expansion, the limiting of land holdings, and a desire to raise a revenue from the sale and settlement of the lands was dependent upon two basic factors: the success of the governor in controlling the dispensing of large tracts and the availability of the land. As land became scarcer, more pressure would be exerted upon the patentee to see that his title remained good. However, at least until the 1750's, neither of these conditions were apparently met in regard to the Southside, and until 1763 there were no remaining legal boundaries to the spread of settlement.

Past efforts at describing the expansion of Virginia have tended at times to be more theoretical than real because few individuals have bothered to inquire into the actual process of acquiring land. Outside of Manning C. Voorhis' dissertation on Virginia land policy, not much attention has been focused on the role of the land patent process in the eighteenth century which is so fundamental to an analysis of the Virginia frontier experience. Many

¹⁸See Appendix A for a synopsis of the land patent process in 1764. It is an enclosure from the Governor Francis Faquier correspondence kindly pointed out to me by George Reese of the University of Virginia.
historians take the cost of patenting the land at the base cost of five shillings sterling per fifty acres without realizing the added clerical and surveyor's fees which more than doubled the cost of the average size patent. Or, in attempting to build a case for "economic democracy" as the Browns have, one takes a quote from someone like Thomas Jefferson for the cost of patenting land and lets it go at that. But what if only a few of the less affluent individuals used the patent process to acquire their land? What if a small number of individuals picked up the best land and then resold it? What then happens to the theoretical possibility of taking up "cheap" land by patent? In the end, it is much better to know what did happen than what theoretically could have happened, if one is to discuss the economic availability of land and the actual workings of the expansion process in Virginia.

There were other ways besides the patent process by which a settler could acquire and accumulate land, but little is known about the relative importance of these various means for the settlement process. As everyone knows who has spent any time in the county records purchasing land was a common and frequent pastime of many a colonist, while others were the beneficiaries of inherited tracts, gifts, and marriage dowries of land. And, of course, one could always just "squat" on a tract until evicted or

19 Brown and Brown, Virginia 1705-1786, 12.
Table 3

Means of First Acquiring Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of First Acquiring Land</th>
<th>A. Resident White Tithes in Amelia County, 1749</th>
<th>B. Resident White Tithes in Lunenburg County, 1750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Tithes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Land Holders</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Holders</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Land</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Land Holders</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Tithes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Land Holders</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Holders</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Land</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Amelia County Tithables, 1749, and Lunenburg County Tithables, 1750. A search was made through all of the relevant remaining Southside records to determine how an individual on these tith lists originally acquired land. Because of the continual run of Land Patent Books, and the loss of the Prince George records after 1728 the evidence is weighted in favor of the patentee. The records consulted were: Land Patent Books, 9-32; Prince George County Deeds, etc., parts 1-3; Orders, 1714-1720; Amelia County Deed Books, 1-5, 1734-1757; Order Books 1-3, 1735-1755; Land Causes 1744-1763; Will Book 1, 1734-1761; Brunswick County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1, 1732-1740; Deed Books 2-3, 1740-1749; Order Books 1-3, 1732-1742, 1745-1749; Will Book 2, 1739-1785; Lunenburg County Deed Books 1-2, 1746-1752; Will Book 1, 1746-1762; Order Books 1-2, 1746-1752; Drury Stith's Survey Book, 1737-1770; Pittsylvania County Old Surveys, 1746-1782; Halifax County Surveys 1, 1751 (1746)-1901; Exec. Journals of Council Vols. III-V.
until ready to move or gain title.

Table 3 above is an analysis of the means by which resident white tithables in Amelia County in 1749 and in Lunenburg County in 1750 had acquired their first piece of land in the county. Legally, only those columns titled in Table 3 as "patent," "deed," "gift," and "bequest" reflect the number of individuals who actually held title to their land. The other people in the county as far as the records reveal did not have a legal title to land at the time the tithable lists were taken. There were a handful of lessees, and the records indicate that a number of settlers in the two counties were holding their land only on the basis of a survey or by an order in council which gave permission to survey a tract larger than four hundred acres. These surveys did give an individual a prior right to the land if it was the earliest survey made but nothing else.

The first thing that should be noted about the figures in Table 3 is that an almost even 50 per cent of the resident white tithables left record of holding land in one way or another in Amelia County while only 41.2 per cent of the resident white tithes in Lunenburg
met the same criteria in 1750. Amelia, which is the smaller and more developed county at the time, had been organized in 1735 and hence ample time had passed to allow stragglers to record deeds and to get to the clerk's office by 1749. On the other hand, Lunenburg in 1750 was a big, open county whose most distant reaches abutted the Blue Ridge from seventy-five to over one hundred miles from the county court house. For those individuals who came into the Southside from the Valley, it was quite an inconvenience to go to court and hence they are probably under-represented in the records.

Table 3 also reveals the rather low percentage of resident white tithes (22 per cent in Amelia and 15 per cent in Lunenburg) who had picked up their land originally by patent. When judged in the context of only the land holders, the patent process becomes the dominant means of originally taking up the land (i.e. 43 per cent in Amelia and 37.6 per cent in Lunenburg). However, even these figures seem rather low since the patent process was the cheapest way of obtaining land by purchase.

20 Land holding is here defined as having some claim to the land even though it is not with an actual title. Since there are no parish records of any extent in the Southside it is impossible to ascertain the ages of the tithables on these lists. All that is known is that they were at least sixteen years old. There were 130 of the 1,128 white males in Amelia, and 183 of the 1,339 white tithes in Lunenburg who had their tithes paid by someone with the same surname, apparently by their father.

21 The records show that only 5 of the 124 white tithes on Nicholas Haile's tithe list along the upper reaches of the Roanoke or Staunton River left any record of land title by 1750. Lunenburg Tithables, 1750.
There were several other individuals who did pick up land by patent but who had originally acquired their first land in other ways. Table 4 below shows that an additional 7 per cent of the Amelia resident white tithes and 4 per cent of the Lunenburg resident white tithes had used the patent process at some time before 1749 and 1750. When measured against only the land holders in the two counties the proportion of the patent users climbs to 58.6 per cent for Amelia, and 47.5 per cent for Lunenburg. When compared to the other lists analyzed in Table 4 a picture of the means of expansion emerges.

The Quitrent Roll for Prince George County in 1704, for example, was taken before royal land policy loosened and before large numbers of individuals were taking up land beyond the Blackwater and up the Appomattox. Settlement was largely restricted to the area within a few miles of the James and so there was less land to patent. The population of the area was not growing at a fast enough rate to create a tremendous demand for the land with the result that only a few (26 per cent) of the land owners on the list had picked up land by patent. By comparison, the Brunswick election poll for 1748, like the quitrent list for 1704, should contain only land owners. Brunswick, by 1748, was still a rough area even though its former western reaches had been lopped off two years earlier in
### Table 4
Users of the Patent Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>No. on List</th>
<th>No. of Patentees</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>% of Resident Land Holders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince George Co. Quitrent Roll 1704</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Co. Tithables 1736</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick Co. Burgess Poll 1748</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Co. Tithables 1749</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunenburg Co. Tithables 1750</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Prince George Quitrent Roll for 1704 can be found in Thomas J. Wertenbaker, The Planters of Colonial Virginia (Princeton, 1922) 187-191. This list was compared with the abstracts of land patents in Lindsay O. Duvall, Prince George County, Volume 1, Land Patents 1666-1719 (Irvington, Va., 1962) 1-47, for the patents issued in the Prince George area when it was still part of Charles City County. My own abstracts of Southside land patents from Land Patent Books 9-32 were checked against the Brunswick Poll for Burgess, 1748 in Brunswick County Deed Book 3, 510-518, and the two Amelia and single Lunenburg Tithable Lists.

1746 to form Lunenburg. But the difference between the proportion of patentees of Brunswick and Prince George is explained when it is remembered that Brunswick had a much...
younger society in terms of settlement; it was created after royal land policy had relaxed; and the county had free land available to settlers between 1721 and 1728. Amelia County in 1736 was just a year old and with plenty of land to patent. Fully 47 per cent of the white tithes had taken up land by patent. It is impossible to reconstruct the percentage of land holders in the area in 1736 since the parent county, Prince George, does not have any extant deeds after 1728. However, with such a high proportion of patentees in the total white population, the patent process must have been used quite extensively during its earliest frontier years. But by 1749, the situation in the county was changing. In contrast to the 47 per cent who patented land among tithables in 1736, only 29 per cent had by 1749 after the great growth of tithable population in that decade. By 1749 there were other options available for securing land in addition to the patent process used earlier.

By comparison to the other Southside counties, Lunenburg in 1750 was the great frontier county of the area. It had a lower proportion of patentees than did Amelia, whether measured against fellow tithables or land holders. But Lunenburg also had a sizable percentage of its land holders who had entered into the process of patent procurement but had not completed the process by 1750. This can be seen in Table 3 above under the headings
"survey," and "executive order." If these are taken into account, the percentage of patentees would rise quite sharply, assuming that they completed the process. By comparison, if one were to do the same for Amelia, the rise would not be so dramatic.

While the lists used in Table 4 above are not strictly comparable, they do provide some basis for understanding the use of the land patent in the expansion process. It appears that early in the settlement experience, such as in Amelia in 1736, Brunswick in 1748, or Lunenburg in 1750, the patent process was used to acquire land by a large proportion of the land holding settlers. However, as the settlement grew older more means of getting land became available, such as bequests, or gifts. Many individuals also chose to buy developed land. This appears to have been a conscious choice and not the result of unclaimed land becoming scarce. In 1704, for example, the Prince George land owners paid quitrents on 127,218½ acres of land. In the next 50 years, Virginians took up 1,877,500 additional new acres in the Southside in 3,723 patents. Ninety additional patents which contained land that had previously been patented were also issued in this period.22 Thus, by January 1, 1754, Virginians had patented the equivalent of

3,132 square miles of territory in an area that contained approximately 8,900 square miles. There was a tendency to list the size of the tracts as being somewhat smaller than they actually were, but in any case only a rough third of the land had been titled by the middle of the century. A certain portion of the land was for various reasons probably considered as unacceptable or undesirable because of contemporary cultural or economic attitudes toward the land, but there is no evidence to suggest that land was considered scarce in most of the Southside.

With all of the unclaimed land available for patenting, why did not more individuals take advantage of the patent process, since it was the cheapest way to purchase land? This is to be explained by examining the patent process itself. The individual desiring to take up the king's land had to go through a much more difficult and time consuming process than if he would purchase land from a local land owner. First, the county surveyor had to be employed so that rights to the land could be purchased and the plot surveyed. In addition to the base price of five shillings sterling or about £ 0.6.3 currency per fifty acres, the patentee had to pay the surveyor five hundred pounds of tobacco for every survey under one thousand acres and an additional thirty pounds of tobacco for every one hundred acres above one thousand.
This additional fee to the base cost of the land added about £ 2.10.0 currency to the cost of patenting land but also paid the surveyor for a plat of the tract. However, no fees or persuasion seems to have drawn the county surveyor away from his abode and into the countryside during the summer months, for the list of surveys that have survived seldom reveal any surveys made before October or after the middle of May, in any given year.23

After the survey was completed, the plat had to be taken to Williamsburg where the secretary of the colony drew up a patent. The plat was to have been returned to the capitol within six months of completion and a patent issued on the survey within six more months. This was the exception even though it was also the rule. Of the 541 surveys made in Prince George County between August 1710 and March 1727, 403 or about 75 per cent of them were turned into patents and can be found later in the patent books. Only 15 of the 403 surveys had a patent

23 For a synopsis of the patent process in 1764 see Appendix A. It is difficult to translate the various costs of the patent process into a single denominator because of the fluctuations in the exchange rate between sterling and currency and in the price of tobacco. The currency rates given above were calculated from Appendix A for the base cost of the land in currency. In the same laws establishing the surveyor's fees, other officials had their fees pro rated at ten pounds tobacco per shilling currency and this rate has been used to convert the surveyor's fee. See Hening, Statutes Vol. IV, 59, 341, 408, 422; Vol. V., 54, 344. The seasonal working habits of the surveyor can be found in Amelia Land Causes 1744-1763.
issued on them within a year's time. Most of the surveys (62 per cent) were turned into patents between one and four years after the survey had been made, and a number of people waited as long as ten to fourteen years before bothering to complete the patent process. One man William Bly had a survey made for 295 acres on Gravelly Run in February 1726. The survey was not issued as a patent until July 1751, when his son Thomas had it issued to himself almost twenty-five years later.24

There were advantages to operating in this illegal way. First, since the earliest survey gave one a better claim than individuals with subsequent surveys, it appears that in practice individuals would hold land only by survey, thus delaying the cost of completing the patent process. Second, and probably most importantly, since one did not have to pay quitrents or develop the land until after the patent was issued, one could enjoy the fruits of the land or hold it for speculation without paying the normal costs. This systematic disregard of the law could continue until pressure for the land increased to the point where individuals without land or desiring more would deviate from the apparently acceptable social norm and bring suit, since the crown had no way to enforce its policy effectively. It was this practice of delaying the

24 The Prince George County surveys are found in Deeds, etc. 749-766, 815-819, 1023-1026. William Bly's survey is on page 1026.
issuance of the patent which contributed to the overt re-
action Governor Robert Dinwiddie received when he tried
to implement his fee of a pistole for signing his name on
the patent. Too many Virginians were caught with unsigned
patents or surveys lodged in the secretary's office await-
ing a favorable sale or development.25

The only possibility for the enforcement and imple-
mentation of the crown's land policy resided in the person
of the governor-in-council. He had the power to reject
petitions for tracts of land larger than four hundred
acres, and it was the possibility of denial which forced
Virginians to devise ways of circumventing his control.

25Morton says, "When Dinwiddie came to Virginia
there were more than seventeen hundred patents for land
and about a thousand surveyors' certificates upon which
patents should have been issued, all waiting for the
Governor's signature. When the people applied for their
patents, the Governor put them off until after the ad-
journment of the Assembly in April 1752." Colonial Vir-
ginia Vol. II, 622. Dinwiddie's side of the story is
conveniently summarized in a letter to the Lords of Trade,
October 25, 1754. "Y'r L' ds are further of Opinion,
y't as no Fee sh'd be rec'd on Lands, y't the Survey and
Works were lodg'd in the Sec'ry's Office before the 22nd
of April 1752, or from Persons who had Orders for Land
before that Period. This my Lords, was the chief dis-
pute between the People and me. I asked no fee for their
Lands, but as they had possessed and occupied them for
many Years, in order to defraud His M'y of His Quit Rents,
I tho't it my Duty as one of the Stewards of y't Revenue,
to dem'd the Arrers of Quit Rents before I sealed and
Signed their Panents." R. A. Brock, ed., The Official
In effect, Dinwiddie felt that the Virginians had taken
land illegally and they should be made to pay for it.
See also pages 153-154.
While there appear to be only two recorded instances of rejection of petitions for land, this seems to be the result of the practice of not recording negative decisions rather than a lack of attempted control. The manipulations—discussed below—to which the Virginian patentee resorted support this conclusion.

Between 1703 and 1753 there were 3,813 patents issued in the Southside and 594 of these patents were for exactly 400 acres. Because of the variation in surveyor's instruments, an allowance of 4 acres above the multiple of 50 was allowed, so when the patents between 400 and 404 acres are included the number rises to 652 or slightly over 17 per cent of the patents issued. These figures would indicate that Virginians were trying to avoid red tape and the possible rejection of their petitions to take up large tracts of land while attempting to get as much land as possible.

While the above practice was merely subverting the spirit of the law, Virginians also resorted to outright disregard of the requirements of the law as well. When it became known to the government that crown policy aimed at restricting the aggregation of land was being ignored and violated, the Council of 1738 declared that:

---

26 Voorhis, "Land Grant Policy," 159.
Whereas notwithstanding the repeated Orders of the Government that no person not having Licence of this Board should be admitted to Enter for more than four hundred Acres of His Majesties Lands, Yet divers persons of small Substance in combination with the Surveyors have made Seperate Entries for large quantities of Land lying Contiguous to one Another without such Licence and frequently keep the same on foot for a long time to the Exclusion of other His Majesties Subjects who would take up and Cultivate the same, And whereas all such Entries made without the Orders of the Government are Illegal and Void It is therefore Ordered by the Governor by and with the Advice and Consent of His Majesties Council the several Surveyors within this Colony do Observe as a General Rule to Admit of no Entries for any greater quantity of His Maj's Lands lying Contiguous to One another then four Hundred Acres for any person whatsoever nor Survey any Entries already made for any greater quantity without the Licence of this Board for so doing as they will Answer their Contempt in a Matter which so much Concerns His Majesties Interest and the Improvement of this Country.

In short, not only were the Virginians patenting tracts of exactly four hundred acres to avoid getting the necessary permission, they were also laying out large tracts and then subdividing them into smaller tracts, a practice which also avoided the governor's permission and was openly illegal. But in spite of proclamations like the one above, the surveyors and patentees continued to lay out and divide large tracts or to make a series of contiguous surveys which totaled over four hundred acres. Again, this procedure seems to have been possible because

---


29 For examples of the continuing disregard of the Council's order see Amelia County Land Causes 1744-1763.
of the impossibility of enforcement without the cooperation of the surveyors, and because it was an accepted practice in eighteenth-century Virginia society.

With the patent in hand, the patentee could sell, devise, or do whatever he wanted to with the newly titled tract as long as he continuously paid the annual quitrents and made the minimal improvements necessary to save the land from lapsing. If he continued to hold the land and did not pay the quitrents or make improvements on the tract, the patent technically lapsed to the crown and could be re-patented by another. However, as long as good land was available it is likely that there would be few instances of people bringing suit or petitioning to re-patent lapsed land, and the records support this view. And if the seating requirements were met in the same way that the legal stipulations for patent surveys were met, then it would seem possible that a certain amount of either collusion or social disapproval would prevent individuals from seeking lands which had in reality lapsed. At any rate, of the 3,813 patents, only 62 were issued as re-patented lapsed land by 1753 with 6 of the patents re-patented by their original owners. There does not seem to have been any particular rush to re-patent the land, for well over half of the lapsed patents were not re-issued until nine years had passed since the original
Table 5

Size Distribution of Southside Land Patents 1703-1753

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>1-204</th>
<th>205-404</th>
<th>405-600</th>
<th>601-1,000</th>
<th>1,001-1,500</th>
<th>1,501-2,000</th>
<th>2,001-3,000</th>
<th>3,001-4,000</th>
<th>4,001 and up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Patents</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Patents</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of new Acreage</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table 5 is compiled from Land Patent Books 9-32. The Table reflects only the new acreage or land never before patented in the patents. Since 310 of the patents issued contained both new and previously patented land, the actual size of the patent was larger than represented in this Table. The previously patented land was excluded from the patent program so that a more accurate index of the rate of expansion could be known. There were also 90 patents, as can be seen in the Table, which contained entirely previously patented land and thus they would have no new acreage listed in them. An example of a patent of this type would be the re-patenting of a lapsed patent.
date of the patent. One individual in Prince George County, John Butler, waited fifty-four years before re-patenting the land issued to John Bonner in 1695.30

There were probably many, many more tracts of land which should have lapsed to the crown, but since the crown had no way of knowing this, it had to wait until action was initiated by the Virginian. In the end, the only means of enforcement and control the crown had in the patent process was over the question of size, and it has already been shown that this power little affected the whole process.

Table 5 above plots the distribution of the 3,813 Southside land patents according to size. Better than three-fourths of the patents contained less than 405 new acres. While these patents avoided the permission of the governor-in-council, they probably met the land needs of the smaller Southside farmer. However, these same patents contained only 42.2 per cent of the newly patented Southside acreage. By contrast, the 29 largest patents issued for more than 4,000 acres contained 16.5 per cent of the new acreage. The largest patent, by far, was William Byrd II's 1742 patent for 105,000 acres along the Dan River which accounted for more than one-third of the land taken up in amounts over 4,000 acres. There were only

### Table 6
Distribution of Southside Land Patents by County 1703-1753

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. Prince George County 1703-1753</th>
<th></th>
<th>B. Brunswick County 1720-1753</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acres</strong></td>
<td>1-204 205-404 405-600 601-1,000 1,001-1,500 1,501-2,000 2,001-3,000 3,001-4,000 4,001 and up</td>
<td><strong>All Old Land</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>All Old Land</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703-08</td>
<td>3 2 0 1 1 1 0 0 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709-13</td>
<td>2 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1714-18</td>
<td>40 28 4 0 1 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719-23</td>
<td>63 63 4 2 1 1 3 0 1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724-28</td>
<td>83 94 7 16 6 1 3 2 0</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729-33</td>
<td>40 90 2 18 6 5 2 0 3</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734-38</td>
<td>51 82 7 7 2 4 1 1 1</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739-43</td>
<td>37 56 6 8 2 0 1 1 0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744-48</td>
<td>97 93 9 11 7 6 1 1 0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749-53</td>
<td>44 25 0 4 2 0 0 0 14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>460 533 41 67 28 15 15 7 4</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68 120 41 49 1 1 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1724-28</td>
<td>7 17 12 8 1 3 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1729-33</td>
<td>37 42 15 9 3 3 1 0 1 6</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734-38</td>
<td>79 136 20 14 4 2 0 4</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744-48</td>
<td>113 223 28 18 7 4 3 2 3 12</td>
<td>413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749-53</td>
<td>22 59 7 4 2 2 1 0 8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>326 597 123 102 18 15 9 2 8 32</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 6—Continued

C. Amelia County 1735-1753

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>1-204</th>
<th>205-404</th>
<th>405-600</th>
<th>601-1,000</th>
<th>1,001-1,500</th>
<th>1,501-2,000</th>
<th>2,001-3,000</th>
<th>3,001-4,000</th>
<th>4,001 and up</th>
<th>All Old Land</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1734-38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1739-43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1744-48</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1749-53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Lunenburg County 1746-1753

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1746-48</th>
<th>1749-53</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,053 1,876 256 280 99 58 50 22 29 90 3,813

Note: Table 6 was constructed from Land Patent Books 9-32. Like Table 5 the size categories represent only the amount of land that had never been patented before. There were a very few patents which were issued in Halifax and Dinwiddie Counties after their creation in 1752. These patents have been included in the two parent counties, Lunenburg and Prince George, respectively.
of Virginia, the Southside did not have the spate of huge tracts issued to land companies and speculators in the Valley of Virginia or in the area beyond the mountains.

By 1753, as can be seen in Table 6 above, Prince George County had not had a patent over four thousand acres issued in it since 1738. On the other hand, individuals or groups picked up twelve of these large tracts in Lunenburg County between 1749 and 1753, revealing the still unsettled nature of much of the Southside.

The size distribution of the patents in the four counties in Table 6 cannot be equated with land distribution in the area since many individuals received more than one

---

31 Land Patent Books 9-32. The 29 largest patents issued in the Southside and the amount of acreage in the patents are as follows: John Allen, 5,025 acres; John Bolling, 5,000 acres; Lewis Burwell, 4,300 acres; William Byrd II, 105,000 acres; William Callaway, 4,500 acres; William Clinch, 5,300 acres; Samuel Cobbs, 8,036 acres; Abraham Cocke, 5,450 acres; John Coles, 5,600 acres; Lewis Delony, 6,400 acres; William Finney, 4,485 acres; Benjamin Harrison, Jr, 4,583 acres; Richard and William Kennon, 31,700 acres; 2 patents to Lunsford Lomax, Clement Read, Robert Jones and Nicholas Edmunds for 11,267 acres and 7,600 acres; William Maclin and John Wall, 4,174 acres; William Mayo, 6,778 acres; Robert Mumford, 4,633 acres; John Nicholds, 4,450 acres; two patents to John Ormsby for 4,054 and 6,920 acres; Isham Randolph, 6,000 acres; 3 patents to Richard Randolph for 4,747, 5,430, 10,300 acres; Clement Read, Robert Jones, Jr, Nicholas Edmunds, 16,650 acres; John Sadler and Joseph Richardson, 5,037 acres; Alexander Spaulding and John Lidderdale, 16,993 acres; Joseph Walton, 5,000 acres.

The 29 patents span the period from 1706 to 1753.
patent and others sold parts of their holdings at various times. Some in fact sold sections of the patent tract before the patent was actually issued, or so soon afterwards that it appears that they could have been doing so to finance the patent process.

When the patent process was completed, the patentee had paid a base price to the crown of about £ 0.6.3 currency for each right to fifty acres he wanted. The surveyor had been paid £ 2.10.0 for the survey and the colonial secretary had received £ 0.8.0 for writing out and recording the patent and an additional £ 0.2.6 for the parchment used. All together, for a patent of four hundred acres, the cost was approximately £ 4.5.6 currency. The patentee of a 400 acre patent received about $93\frac{1}{3}$ acres for every pound expended not including travel costs or engaging someone to go to Williamsburg for the necessary details. If the patent were larger than one thousand acres, the surveyor received additional fees, and extra costs were also entailed in petitioning the government, and if successful for entering their order in the auditor's office.

It is difficult to measure the relative cost of the patent for the eighteenth-century Virginian because so little is known about per capita income for the period. However, by putting together some generally accepted facts the cost can be put into perspective. It is generally agreed that one individual could annually raise roughly
one thousand pounds of marketable tobacco. Although tobacco prices fluctuated during the period, 2d, per pound was the average or dominant price for the period when most of the Southside's patents were issued.\textsuperscript{32} This would make the total cash value of a single man's tobacco crop £ 8.7.0. Looked at in this way, the cost of a four hundred acre patent would be roughly equivalent to about one-half of that man's tobacco crop, or more expensive than it seems at first glance. Even a two hundred acre patent would cost more than a third of the cash value of the crop.

The cost of a patent was, of course, relative to one's income, and in an economy geared towards producing an intensive labor crop like tobacco access to labor was a sure means of acquiring wealth. Thus an individual with four workers in addition to himself would find that the cost of a four hundred acre patent would be but a tithe portion of his income. But an individual with that amount of available labor was unusual in the Southside. Almost 68 per cent of the resident white tithe payers in Lunenburg in 1750 and 54 per cent of the like individuals in Amelia County in 1749 had recourse only to their own labor. In 1736, the proportion of Amelia resident white tithe

payers paying only for themselves had stood at 61 per cent. Thus for a majority of the Southside white tithepayers picking up an average size patent would be a considerable expense and other sources of evidence seem to bear this out. For example, 46.6 per cent of the individuals who picked up land by patent for their first tract of land paid only for themselves on the Lunenburg tithe list in 1750. To be in proportion, the percentage should have been roughly 68 per cent of the individuals who originally acquired their land by patent in Amelia County by 1749 who were paying only for themselves and the 54 per cent of the total tithepayers in the county who paid only for themselves. Thus while land to patent may have been relatively cheap for those with additional sources of labor, it was not necessarily so for many individuals in the Southside.

It was still possible to pick up land to patent upon proving one's importation and claiming the head right to fifty acres of land. In 1753 Governor Dinwiddie reported

---

33Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750. Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1736 and 1749. See Chapter 4 below for the distribution of labor among Southsiders.

34These figures were computed from the same sources cited in the Note to Table 3 above. It is impossible to know the exact number of tithables a man was responsible for when he acquired his patent, but the figures for Lunenburg should be fairly accurate since most of the settlers had come into the area shortly before the list was taken. The Amelia figures would underestimate the number of single tithable patentees.
that "few importation rights (tho' they are still valu'd) are now claimed, the Difficulty and Charge of proving them making it hardly worth their while."35 Between 1737 and 1750, sixty-six individuals proved their importation in the Amelia, Brunswick and Lunenburg County courts. Fifty of these sixty-six listed the year in which they had come to Virginia. What is striking is the long time that elapsed between the importation and the registering of the claim. Twelve of the 50, or 24 per cent made their claim within 6 years of their arrival. However, 64 per cent of the claims were made between 9 and 24 years and the remaining 12 per cent waited 30 years or longer.36

One of the claimants, John Henshelwood, came from London in 1741 and became an indentured servant to Edward Booker, Gent., of Amelia County. Henshelwood entered his claim in court in August 1745, apparently as his term of servitude was ending. He had struck his master earlier and had his indenture extended for one year from its expiration date in a January 1745 court decision.37 Thus one's servitude could for many explain the first few years

36 Amelia County Order Books 1-3; Brunswick County Order Books 1-3; Lunenburg County Order Books 1-2.
37 Amelia County Order Book 1, 227, 332.
of lag. There is no evidence of servitude, however, in the case of Duncomb Blew and his wife and three children who came from Great Britain in 1740. He entered his claims in March 1744 and received a land patent for 228 acres in September 1748. His survey was made in February 1745, almost a year after he claimed his rights. There is no evidence what the Blews did between their arrival and entering their claim. 38

There is slightly more evidence about one of the other claimants, Cornelius Keith. Keith came into Brunswick court in 1739 and claimed he had come into the colony thirty years before. In 1728, William Byrd II found Keith and his family living in abject poverty along the Roanoke River without a roof over their heads. In 1734, Keith was given one hundred acres of land by Robert Hix, Sr., for developing a tract for Hix, which Keith sold for £25 in February 1743 to Thomas Twitty. After this Keith disappears from the records without acquiring a patent or apparently obtaining any more land. In his case, the claim could easily have been endorsed over to someone else, a practice which frequently occurred. 39

---

38 Ibid. 264; Amelia Land Causes, 1744-1763, n.p.

39 Byrd, Histories of the Dividing Line ed. Boyd, 305 see below for a quotation of this description. Brunswick County Deed Book 1, 125; Deed Book 2, 236-237; Order Book 1, 240. Keith also ran a ferry over the Roanoke River around 1739.
With such a long wait on the part of Keith and the larger number of the claimants, it appears that making and proving the claim may have been as difficult and costly as Governor Dinwiddie reported, and only resorted to in peculiar situations. In addition, the remaining difficulties and inconvenience may have deterred others from taking out patents, for as Dinwiddie also noted, the land jobbers provided a service for "poor people that come from the other colonies to the north of us, and who can not bear the expense of coming down here to make their entries and other necessaries in taking up lands."\(^{40}\)

If an individual did not desire to go through the expense and inconvenience of the patent process he could always buy land, assuming that he had the money. As Table 3 above reveals, a sizable proportion of the Amelia and Lunenburg resident land holders originally acquired their land in this way. And, of course, an even larger number of residents also purchased land who had originally picked up land in other ways.

As Governor Dinwiddie noted, the most obvious advantage to purchasing land from an individual instead of the crown was convenience. The trip to Williamsburg and its expenses, plus the secretary's fees could be avoided

and time saved. However, the actual cost of the land purchased from an individual was much higher than the patent's base cost of £ 0.6.3 per fifty acres of land. Measured in terms of acres bought per pound expended, patented land's base price was 160 acres per pound. Barely was land available at this price from an individual.

The largest land speculator in terms of land ownership in the Southside was William Byrd II and his heirs. Between 1730 and 1744, and almost entirely by patents, Byrd took up more than 111,000 acres of Southside land around the Roanoke River and its tributaries. Byrd had tried to get a colony of Swiss settlers to purchase the land but had met failure in the attempt. He tried other sources of settlers offering to sell the land at £ 3 per hundred acres if tracts of 20,000 acres were purchased. If that could not be arranged, Byrd agreed to sell at the rate of £ 4 per hundred for tracts larger than 10,000 acres and £ 5 per hundred for tracts under that amount. Byrd died in 1744 and in 1747 his heirs and administrators began selling his Southside lands. By October 1750, 36 sales of land had been recorded, with all of the tracts except for 2 containing less than 600 acres. Only 2 of the tracts contained less than 200 acres. However, no

41 Byrd to Dr. Zwiffer, December 20, 1739, in Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. 36 (1928) 352.
matter what the size of the tract, Byrd's heirs sold the land, with few exceptions at the rate of twenty acres per pound or £ 5 per hundred acres. This was at a rate eight times higher than the base cost of patented land.42

Richard and William Kennon, a pair of large scale land owners, sold parts of their 1744 patent of 31,700 acres along Cub Creek in Lunenburg County beginning in late 1746. By October 1749 they had sold 3,963 acres in 10 transactions at an average price rate of 39 acres per pound. This was about twice as cheap as Byrd's sales, but still four times more expensive than patented land's base cost.43

However, most of the land transactions in the Southside occurred among the more common type of land holder and not the land speculators on the scale of Byrd and the Kennons. The clerk of the Amelia County court, Samuel Cobbs, is an example of an important local individual who steadily acquired land and then sold it. Beginning in 1732, Cobbs began picking up land by patent until by 1750 he had acquired 17,819 acres in 10 patents ranging from 200 to 8,036 acres in size. He also purchased 975 acres in

42The Byrd sales are scattered through Lunenburg County Deed Book 1, 116-248 and Deed Book 2, 114-166.

43For the Kennons' sales see Lunenburg County Deed Book 1, 95, 249-251, 254, 261-263, 270-274, 452-459.
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Acres</th>
<th>Price in Deed</th>
<th>Acres per £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>£ 16.13.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>17.00.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>32.12.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.05.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>50.00.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>50.00.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>27.00.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>180.00.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>15.00.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>24.00.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>26.17.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>12.00.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>10.00.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>10.00.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.00.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 5,922

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price in Deed</th>
<th>Acres per £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£ 572.08.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cobbs' land sales can be found in Amelia County Deed Book 1, 431-435, 520; Deed Book 2, 16-17, 77-79, 151-153, 286-288, 300-302, 317-320, 373-379, 529-530. The figure given for the average acres per pound is the average of the figures in the column. Actually, Cobbs sold his 5,922 acres at a total rate of 10.3 acres per pound.

3 transactions. However, he was continually selling the land he was obtaining. In the period from 1742 to 1748, Cobbs sold 5,922 acres in 15 transactions for the prices shown above in Table 7. His cheapest land sold for about 27½ acres per pound, the most expensive for

---

1.1 acres per pound, with the average of the selling rates at 16.4 acres per pound. However, when taking the total acreage sold and computing the acreage per pound ratio measured against the total amount received for the land, Cobbs was actually selling his land at an average of 10.3 acres per pound. This price was $15\frac{1}{2}$ times the base cost of patented land.

The prices for some of Samuel Cobbs' lands are so high that they surely were already developed to a certain degree or contained something of value beyond the land itself. However, one seldom finds any reason given in the deed of sale that would indicate why a particular piece of land, outside of the geographical location, was exceptionally valuable although hints are dropped. For example, Sterling Clack of Brunswick County sold 2 acres to Francis Willis, Esq. from Gloucester County in December 1746 for £40. This land cost so much, because it was "near the court house." There may have also been a structure on the property, but at any rate, Willis was proscribed from selling liquor on the premises—suggesting the commercial value of the site and indicating that Clack did not want any competition for the ordinary that he ran near the court house.\(^{45}\)

\(^{45}\)Brunswick County Deed Book 3, 243-245; Brunswick County Order Book 3, 115.
Table 8

Land Sales in Brunswick County
August 1746-August 1747

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Acres/£</th>
<th>Number of Sales</th>
<th>% of Sales</th>
<th>Acres Sold</th>
<th>% of Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>5,701</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2,527</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13,288</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The sales can be found in Brunswick County Deed Book 3, 205-340. Gifts and deeds which did not have either the amount of land or a price listed for the land were excluded.

Sterling Clack received an exceptionally high price for his two acres near the court house, but land was not as cheap in other areas of the Southside as some historians would have us believe. Table 8 above reveals the other transactions for land (excluding gifts and deeds which had no price entered in them) recorded in Brunswick County between August 1746 and August 1747. There were 54 such sales which transferred title to 13,288 acres of land in tracts ranging from 2 to 725 acres. Almost 63 per cent of the purchasers received less than 11 acres for every

---

46 Brown and Brown, *Virginia 1705-1786*, 16-19
pound expended, and only 4 individuals acquired land at a rate of over 20 acres per pound. Most of the land in Brunswick was at least twice as much as the prices land speculators like Byrd and the Kennons were charging, and at least sixteen times more costly than patented land. It appears that some individuals desired developed land at a higher price in preference to the cheaper and rougher land.

During the same year in Lunenburg County which was in its first year of existence after being cut off from Brunswick, there were fifty-nine tracts of land sold. Lunenburg was the most frontier county in the Southside but like Brunswick land most of its tracts also sold at a rate of twenty acres or less for every pound expended.

Table 9

Land Sales in Lunenburg County
August 1746-August 1747

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Acres/£</th>
<th>Number of Sales</th>
<th>% of Sales</th>
<th>Acres Sold</th>
<th>% of Acres Sold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>9,169½</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19,751½</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These deeds are from Lunenburg County Deed Book 1, 38-219. Gifts and deeds missing either information about the amount of land or its price have been deleted.
This comparison can be seen in Tables 8 and 9 above. However, unlike Brunswick which had almost half of its sales in the 6-10 acre per pound category, Lunenburg had almost half of its sales in the cheaper 16-20 acre per pound category. The heavier weighting of this category is not the result of individual sales by local people, but because 21 of the 27 transactions in this group were sales made by Byrd's heirs at the set rate of 20 acres per pound. If these sales are eliminated from the table, the percentages of the other categories rises significantly. For example, the 0-5 acre per pound category rises from 20.3 per cent to 31.6 per cent. The spread in the sizes of the tracts in Lunenburg is greater than Brunswick's. The smallest tract sold was 54 acres and the largest contained 1,000. Forty-six of the 59 tracts held 400 acres or less, and only 3 of the remaining tracts contained more than 600 acres. There was one tract which was sold at a "give away" price, but which could have in fact been a gift, although the normal statement about the "natural love and affection" is absent. The cost for this tract was five shillings "english" (sterling) for one hundred acres and this was less than the cost of patenting the land. However, the other tracts were certainly not given away and were sold at a rate far above the cost of patenting the same tracts and at a comparable level with Brunswick County land.
Table 10
Land Sales in Amelia County
August 1746-August 1747

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Acres/£</th>
<th>Number of Sales</th>
<th>% of Sales</th>
<th>Acres Sold</th>
<th>% of Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>10,313</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>4,752</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-up</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>22,328</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The deeds can be found in Amelia County Deed Book 2, 373-532. Gifts and deeds without information regarding acreage of price have been excluded.

During the same year in Amelia County, sixty-seven parcels of land changed hands by purchase, whose prices are shown in Table 10 above. Once again, close to 90 per cent of the sales sold for at least 20 acres per pound but of the 3 counties, Amelia had the highest percentage of sales in the first category of 0-5 acres per pound. The Amelia transactions also reflected a wider spread in the size of the tracts, ranging from one acre to two thousand acres. The single acre was sold for a mill site for £ 1.10.0, and the two thousand acres brought £ 115
or about one pound per seventeen acres. Only 9 of the 67 tracts were larger than 400 acres. Of the 3 tracts that sold for more than 50 acres per pound, it appears that one was a transfer of title from one individual who had patented a tract for another. The fee was the nominal five shillings currency that so frequently show up even in gifts. Likewise, another of the tracts was one that sold for five shillings for one hundred acres. However, the seller, George Marchbanks, had just given away three tracts to his three sisters in the preceding deeds and it is possible that this deed to Joseph Collins may have also been a gift to a brother-in-law. The last of the three tracts in question, contains no clues as to why 451 acres were sold by Richard Randolph of Henrico to John Watson, Jr. of Goochland for five shillings. However, since it is the same price as the normal consideration fee stated in deeds of lease, it could be that the deed of release was not recorded, or that this was also a gift.

The land sales found in Tables 8-10 above are from a single year, but the land prices charged throughout the

47 Amelia County Deed Book 2, 391
48 Ibid. 401-409
49 Ibid. 416-417
### Table 11
First Purchases of Lunenburb County Tithables 1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Acres/£</th>
<th>Number of Sales</th>
<th>% of Sales</th>
<th>Acres Sold</th>
<th>% of Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>6,780</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>9,095</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5,645</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>7,698 3/4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-up</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1,51^</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>37,022 3/4</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** These deeds were taken from Brunswick County Deeds, Wills, etc. 1; Deed Books 2-3; Lunenburg County Deed Books 1-2. There were 131 people who first acquired their land by purchase on the Lunenburg Tithable List for 1750, but 7 of the deeds were either damaged or did not state either acreage or price and have been excluded from the table.

Period do not vary to any great extent. Table 11 above is a compilation of the purchases made by individuals who appear on the Lunenburg tithe list for 1750 and who purchased land as their first means of picking up land. Of the 131 individuals who fall into this category (see Table 3 above), 7 had deeds which were either damaged or did not state either the amount of land sold or its price. But the purchase cost of the land in the remaining 124 deeds, transacted between 1732 and 1750 is very close to the prices paid in the year (August 1746-August 1747) selected above.
Land was a little cheaper, but 82 per cent of the buyers still received 20 acres or less for every pound expended. Although a great majority of the deeds were entered in the 1740's and 3 of the 7 deeds that were damaged or did not state acreage or cost were recorded in the 1730's, the earlier deeds also conform to the pattern shown in the table. Thus, land prices or property purchases were about the same whether or not one was acquiring land for the first time or making additional purchases such as some of the transactions in Tables 8-10. In the end, what is especially interesting about the high prices paid by some of the original purchasers is that they were apparently picking up not just any tract of land but rather pieces of property which had been developed, in many cases to a high degree. This practice and its implications in terms of the operations of the local Southside economy will be discussed further in Chapter Five below.

The prices paid for land in the Southside in 1746-1747 were fairly high, but appear to be the same as in other years. In the more settled area of Amelia land was more expensive than in Brunswick, which in turn had higher priced land than Lunenburg. But no matter where one settled in the Southside, land could but rarely be purchased for less than a pound for twenty acres, whether from a large land speculator or a private individual. The going rate for land, then, was at a minimum of eight times the base cost of patented land.
If a man had little or no money but a willingness to work, it appears that he could gain land by performing certain requirements. For example, the Cornelius Keith mentioned earlier, was given one hundred acres by Robert Hix, Sr. "for and in consideration of Seating and cultivating part of a certain tract of Land" in 1734. The amount of "Seating and cultivating" may have been minimal, or Keith may have done a lot of work since William Byrd II saw him while returning from surveying the Dividing Line.

To Byrd,

...Cornelius Keith ...liv'd rather in a Penn than a House, with his Wife and 6 Children. I never beheld such a Scene of Poverty in this happy part of the World. The Hovel they lay in had no Roof to cover those wretches from the Injurys of the Weather; but when it rain'd, or was colder than Ordinary, the whole Family took refuge in a Fodder Stack. The poor man had rais'd a kind of a House but for want of Nails it remain'd uncover'd. I gave him a Note on Maj'r Mumford for Nails for that purpose and so make a whole Family happy at a very small Expence. The man can read & write very well, and by way of a Trade can make and set up Quernstones & yet is poorer than any Highland-Scot or Bog-trotting Irishman.

Likewise, John Cox was rewarded with one hundred acres in "Consideration of Sundry Work, Labour & Services done and performed by the said John Cox for the said Armistead Burwell in Saving and Improving a Tract of Land in the Said County of Lunenburg," in 1749. Cox also had

50 Brunswick County Deed Book 1, 125
to pay an additional five shillings. In the accompanying plat there is a mill dam shown, so perhaps Cox had constructed this or a mill for Burwell. However, neither Cox nor Burwell had yet petitioned the county court for permission to have a mill.  

There were also a handful of people from the two counties of Amelia and Lunenburg who left record of being lessees (see Table 3). Of the five instances on the tithable lists, only two have left record of the conditions of their lease. One of the others was mentioned in a will with no further information; one was a life lease of thirty acres to John McDuel from Richard Booker in Amelia County "whear the said John Macduel Famerli now lifs;" and the last was another life lease from Samuel Bently to John Bently for six acres in 1735.

The conditions for the other two leases were somewhat similar to each other. The two hundred acres that William Branton leased from William Echoles carried the stipulation that Branton had to plant an orchard, keep the plantation in good working order, and raise cattle on a halves basis with Echoles. Branton was to pay the quitrents, but the use of the timber was his for four years.

52 Lunenburg County Deed Book 1, 473-474.
53 Amelia County Will Book 1, 55. Will of William Stone.
54 Amelia County Deed Book 3, 212-213.
55 Amelia County Deed Book 1, 2-3.
Echoles agreed to furnish six cows and calves. If Branton returned the lease within four years, he had to return six cows and calves plus half of the increase. If he decided to stay longer, the livestock would be split evenly. However, for any cattle that Branton killed or sold in the four years, Echoles would remove a like amount. There was no mention of splitting any crops raised.  

In Lunenburg in 1748, William Wynne leased four hundred acres for life to John Burk along with the improvements on the tract. The lessor agreed to match as many cattle "with what the said Burk should bring thereon as should make him five Milch Cows that shall give milk...." Wynne and Burk were then to equally divide what was raised on the premises when both thought proper. There are hints of other tenants in the area, but the leases are few and seldom recorded.  

For a few fortunate individuals, land might become theirs without the expense of the patent process or the land purchase. Almost 14 per cent of the Amelia land holders had originally acquired land by gift or through inheritance by 1749. In the much younger society of Lunenburg however, only a little over 4 per cent had picked up their first piece of land in these ways. Some of the

56 Amelia County Deed Book 3, 7.  
57 Lunenburg County Deed Book 1, 380-381.
gifts came in the form of marriage dowries, and some souls would well argue that the long term price for that land was well in excess of any price paid for patented or purchased land! At any rate, getting land "free" was a way of acquiring land in the newly emerging area of the Southside.

Bequests of land in wills followed a variety of patterns. If an individual had a larger amount of property it was distributed among the several children including the daughters, though not evenly. The wife usually was given the use of the home plantation during her widowhood or the rest of her life if she did not remarry. In many cases, the home place then went to the oldest son, but there are instances where it was given to the youngest son. Apparently this was because the oldest son often was already establishing a settlement elsewhere on the father's or his own property. There were many cases where there was not enough land to go around. When this happened, specific sums were sometimes delegated to be spent on providing the landless with real estate, but the less fortunate received livestock or tools instead.58

58 Amelia County Will Book 1; Brunswick County Deeds, Wills, etc. 1; Will Book 2; Lunenburg County Will Book 1; Prince George County Deeds, etc. parts 1-3. For comparisons see Greven, Four Generations 130-133, 230ff; James William Deen, Jr., "Patterns of Virginia Testation: 1660-1719, A Study of the Wills of Four Tidewater Counties," (unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of History, University of Virginia, 1971); and C. Ray Keim, "Primogeniture and Entail in Colonial Virginia," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd Ser., XXV (1968), 545-586.
If one were really impecunious, disliked settled areas, or were willing to live outside the pale of the law it was possible, for a variety of reasons, to just squat on a piece of land. The possibilities for this lessened as an area became more settled and pressure for land increased. However, as long as this did not happen—and it did not for a great part of the Southside by the middle of the eighteenth century—or as long as society condoned such practices, the holding of untitled land or someone else's could continue. Suits for the ejectment of a squatter in the Southside have not been found either because no such suits occurred or because the docket papers have been destroyed or are in such disarray that they cannot be used systematically. However, it was to the patentee's advantage to have his tract developed to a certain extent to meet the seating requirements, and this could help explain the lack of ejectment suits.

Holding land only by survey was technically squatting and illegal. In the more settled area of Amelia in 1749, (see Table 3 above) only slightly more than 4 per cent of the land holders held their land in this way. But in the huge, far-reaching area of Lunenburg more than one quarter (28.2 per cent) of the land holders had only surveys to show for their claim. In addition, there were large percentages of the tithepayers in the western reaches of Lunenburg who left no record at all of any land holding. There were
too many of these people to conclude that they were merely tenants or servants paying their own tithe. In the area of Lunenburg which later became the top half of Franklin County and the bottom third of Bedford there were scattered 107 tithe payers among 124 white tithes. Only 5 had title to their land or left evidence of land ownership by 1750. While this is partially a result of the area's distance from the court house, the fact remains that there were an inordinately large number of individuals without land titles. It is surprising that the names appear on the list at all because of the remoteness of the area and the increased possibilities to disappear into the woods. Thus, it is possible that more individuals could have been missed. In the end, the conditions which made squatting possible and the willingness of the squatter to live beyond the pale of the law were important ingredients for the expansion process.

The large number of tithe paying individuals without title to land in the Southside partially helps to underscore the relatively high cost of land for the majority of the Southsiders who had no access to additional labor. Patenting land was made more expensive than the base price by the fees paid to the secretary and surveyor. For those

59 Lunenburg Tithable List, 1750. The list referred to is the list taken by Nicholas Haile.
who wished large tracts, the practice of breaking up large acreages into smaller surveys to avoid the expense and possible rejection of their petitioning the government added additional surveyor's fees. Since the surveyor himself made more money as a result of this practice, he apparently did little to stop it in the Southside. In addition to these costs, the inconvenience and expense of the trip to Williamsburg, as Governor Dinwiddie noted, probably help explain the fact that fewer people than would have been expected took up their land originally by patent, the cheapest way of obtaining land.

Taking up land by patent meant acquiring undeveloped land. The prices paid by many individuals for their first tract of Southside land would indicate that they desired a property which might have included a roof over their heads. On the other hand, less expensive land was available from large scale land speculators like Byrd who apparently did little development on his properties. Even so, Byrd was selling his land at eight times the base cost of patented lands. But buying from Byrd avoided the 120 mile trip, as the crow flies, from Byrd's tract on the Roanoke to Williamsburg that would have been necessary if the purchaser were to have patented the same land. Land was cheaper in the frontier areas, but it became more expensive within a few years after settlement.
It was possible to lease land, although the records are weak on this practice and it is hard to evaluate the role leasing played in the expansion process. Likewise, acquiring land through gift, dowry, or inheritance was a means which would increase in importance as the society became older, but which obviously was not that important in the frontier situation. What was more important was the opportunity to hold land in an illegal way. The large number of holders of surveys, executive orders, and apparent squatters in Lunenburg County in 1750 underscore this point. The fact that royal land policy was unenforceable and ignored by all strata of society allowed one to enjoy the fruits of the land and one's labor until the land could be taken up or left. The widespread participation in this practice indicates a willingness to live outside the law where possible, and suggests a contemptuous view of non-local authority. But this situation allowed the spreading of settlement to occur at the rate it did, and its importance for the expansion process should not be overlooked. In the end, the analysis of the process of expansion in the Southside reveals insights into the social and economic life of the area as well as the expansion of the area itself.
CHAPTER IV

SOUTHSIDE SOCIETY

The rapid growth and expansion of population in the Southside in the decades following 1730 certainly affected the area's society. The large numbers who moved into the area brought a constant stream of new faces to the Southside, while those who picked up and moved on, joining the individuals traversing the region to the Carolinas, disappeared—never or seldom to see the southern Virginia piedmont again. This unsettled society, common to many later frontier areas, also had traits similar to other newly settled regions. Life was far from genteel in the Southside whether measured in material or nonmaterial terms. But even though society was far from refined, there were social distinctions apparent from the beginning of settlement. Wealth was concentrated in a relatively few hands, although it did not approximate the concentration found in early American cities of the period or in more settled areas of the colonies.¹

The large territory encompassed in the Southside makes it possible to compare local developments within the area in cases where the records have survived. Measured in terms of their tithable population, the three counties created from Prince George County by 1750 all experienced high growth rates. Brunswick County averaged an annual increase in its tithables of 10.2 per cent between 1732 and 1750 (even when the 27.9 per cent loss in tithables to the new county of Lunenburg is taken into account). Amelia County's growth rate of tithables was slightly higher with an average annual increase of 11.1 per cent between 1735 and 1750 while Lunenburg County sustained an average annual increase of 13.8 per cent between 1746 and 1750.2 Thus for every ten taxable individuals annually, in these three Southside counties there was at least one additional tithable in the county by the following year during this early period of settlement.

Part of this rapid increase in the tithable population can be attributed to younger sons reaching the age of sixteen, the year they were first taxable. However, the actual number of new names on the tithable lists increased

---

2 These figures were calculated from the number of tithables given in the county order books and parish vestry books. See Table 2 in Chapter II above for the actual numerical increases.
more from migrations into the area than from individuals coming of taxable age. Moreover, the emigration of tithables created a situation which saw half of a county's taxable population disappear from the area in slightly over a decade, indicating that the yearly total of new arrivals in the county exceeded the annual absolute increase.

Because of the loss of tithable lists for most of the counties during this period, it is possible to analyze population turnover only in Amelia County. A comparison of the Amelia tithable lists for 1736 with the county's lists for 1749 produces some interesting results. There were 332 white male residents of tithable age in Amelia in 1736, but only 161 or 48.5 per cent reappear on the 1749 lists. At least 24 of the 171 who do not reappear had died but no record remains to explain what happened to the others. Of the remainder who do not reappear, some could have died without leaving a will or having their estate inventoried or they could have moved elsewhere. Besides the missing 171 individuals, there were an indeterminate number of persons who had passed through the county between 1736 and 1749. In general these figures reveal a high rate of population turnover—an unsettled people in the midst of the settlement process.

3Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1736 and 1749; Will Book 1. For comparison of other rates of population turnover, see Allan Kulikoff, "The Progress of Inequality in Revolutionary Boston," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd. Ser., XXVII (1971) 401-402, especially footnote 46.
There was a slightly greater propensity to move on for the individual with less property and fewer commitments to the area in material terms. Seventy of the 332 white male residents of tithable age in Amelia in 1736 had their tithe paid by someone other than themselves. These sons, servants, and overseers had a retention rate (that is, remained in the county) of only slightly over 41 per cent compared to an almost even 50 per cent among individuals who paid their own tithe. Only one of the nonpaying tithes is known to have died.

**TABLE 12**

Slaves Held by Mobile and Nonmobile Resident Tithables in Amelia County in 1736

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of slaves held</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonmobile</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(men on both lists: 1736 &amp; 1749)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Men on 1736 list only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This Table has been constructed from the Amelia County Tithable Lists for 1736 and 1749. The individuals who are known to have died have been removed from the total number of 332 white male resident tithables in the county in 1736.

Because of the important role of labor in a preindustrial and agricultural economy like the Southside's, the
distribution of tithable slaves reveals a rough but important index to an individual's economic position and his degree of participation in the development process. As Table 12 above indicates, those individuals with fewer or no slaves tended to be more mobile than those with more slaves. While there were certainly individuals with slaves who left or disappeared from the county, their total number of 20 is much less than the 52 slave holders who remained in the county during this period. The 20 who left held 54 slaves compared to the 154 tithable slaves owned by the 52 slave holders who remained. Among an host of other reasons, an individual's mobility appears to have been determined in part by the degree of economic commitment he had to the area.

The fact that one's commitment or involvement in the area decreased the likelihood of his leaving is further illustrated by the mobility rates of the Southside's Justices of the Peace. For example, ten justices were appointed to the Brunswick County court at its organization in 1732. In 1748, sixteen years later, eight were still in the county, one had become a justice of Lunenburgh when Brunswick was divided to form the new county in 1746, and one had disappeared from the records. When Amelia County was organized in 1735, eleven residents of the area were appointed as justices. Thirteen years later in 1749, three of the justices had died but eight remained to administer the county court along with other subsequent appointees.
Twelve people became justices at Lunenburg County's creation in 1746. Four years later ten were still sitting on the court, one had died, and one had disappeared from the records. Overall, excluding deaths, the justices had a retention rate of 93 per cent for the three counties with only 2 of 33 individuals apparently moving out of the area. Compared to the rest of the Southside's population, the county ruling elite was a very stable group. 4

The mobility of the white population also had its affect on the stability of the local black population as slave owners left with their holdings. In addition to the 54 slaves held by resident slave owners in Amelia in 1736 who had left the county, nonresident slave owners who also do not reappear on the 1749 tithable lists held an additional 64 slaves. These slaves most likely left with their owners too, although some could have been sold locally.

In regard to the nonmobile residents it is possible to compare the names of the 154 slaves held by county residents in 1736, and the names of the 67 slaves held by nonresidents of the county in that year with the names of the slaves held by these same individuals in 1749. One cannot

4 See Exec. Journals of Council, Vol. IV, 266 for the original appointments to the Brunswick Court; Amelia County Order Book 1, 1, 6, 16 for the Amelia appointments; and Lunenburg County Order Book 1, 1 for the latter county's original justices. These individuals were then followed through the records to see what happened to them for the time periods stated above.
be certain that the slave held by an individual in 1736 is the same slave who reappears on the 1749 list with the same owner even though the slave's name is the same. Taking the slave names at face value, however, there was a total retention rate of 54 per cent. The nonresidents had a higher retention rate of their slaves (61 per cent) than did the resident slave holders (51 per cent). Analysis of slave names as a guide to the slave's sex reveals that there was a higher proportional turnover among the males than the females whether the person was held by a resident or a nonresident. Among possible reasons for higher male slave turnover were harsher conditions which may have led to a higher death rate for them. In summary, the total tithable population, not just the white segment, was subject to fairly high turnovers which led to unsettled conditions for the Southside's society. 5

Historians of the later American frontier have argued that high rates of geographical mobility and population turnover had the effect of destroying localism and increasing the migrant's feelings of nationalism. This change came about as the mobile American left his familiar surroundings for an unfamiliar area with different customs, social and economic structures, and traditions. As Professor Billington has pointed out, the frontiersman's

5 Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1736 and 1749.
"emotional need for some attachment directed his devotion to the national government, for wherever he moved, this stood ready to provide for his needs." However, in the colonial period there was no national government to fill the identity vacuum of the mobile Virginian, and the colony government itself was not able to meet this emotional need of its people. In Virginia, the most significant form of government for the ordinary man was on the county level with attention being directed towards Williamsburg only when some need or problem could not be solved on the local level. This became more true for the Southsider as Williamsburg receded farther and farther from the outlying settlers, many of whom were only temporary sojourners in the area. This would imply a still prevalent localism which perhaps was made likely by the inability of the colonial government to enforce royal policy in such matters as the patenting of land, contrasted with the overall responsiveness of the county court in regard to such local needs as roads, bridges, ordinaries, and grist mills. In addition, the settlement patterns of the Southside may have reinforced localism by providing some sense of security and identity as newcomers settled locally, beside or near relatives and former neighbors.

6 Billington, America's Frontier Heritage, 194.

The longer one stayed in the area, the greater his commitment to the locale would be. As was shown above, the greater an individual's wealth and participation in the development process, the less likely he was to move on. Also, those people who held positions of local authority were demonstrably less mobile than the greater part of the Southside's population. Individuals in authority had the greater stake in the area. Whatever their feelings of paternalism, participation in the county governmental processes was partly induced by pragmatic and economic concern for their own and their locality's interests. Thus, the highly non-mobile residents who had been appointed to the county courts in the Southside held a disproportionate share of the area's wealth. For example, the 25 individuals who had been appointed justices in Lunenburg County by 1750 made up 2 per cent of the resident male tithepaying population. But this same 2 per cent held 19 per cent of the tithable slaves held by like individuals in the county. A similar distribution can be found in Amelia County in 1749 where the justices who made up 2.5 per cent of the resident white male tithe-paying population held 22 per cent of the tithable slaves held by residents.3

Quite possibly the mobility of part of the population made the less mobile portion even more conscious of local identity. For those individuals who served as sheriffs,

3Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750; Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1749.
and were served by sheriffs, it quickly became apparent that mobility could be induced by legal problems arising from debts and other differences with fellow Southsiders; the appearance of the sheriff on the scene could enhance one's desire to leave. The various sheriffs of Amelia County between 1735 and 1748 returned warrants for more than a third of the cases listed in the return book as "non est inventus" or "not found within my bailiwick."\(^9\) Mobility could thus become a deterent to the effective enforcement of the law or the collection of debts, a situation which was aggravated by the Southside's proximity to the North Carolina line. The records of Brunswick and Lunenburg Counties, the Southside counties closest to North Carolina, as well as Amelia's and Prince George's, are full of notations such as "absconded so that the processes of the law cannot be served against him."\(^10\) In the light of these unsettled conditions, the more affluent, involved, and less mobile Southsiders no doubt felt their localism even more strongly.

II

The economic structure of the Southside's society can be discovered through an analysis of the tithable

\(^9\)Amelia County Sheriff's Returns. These are found at the end of Amelia County Order Book 1.

\(^10\)See any of the Southside Court Order Books for this notation and others meaning the same thing.
lists, probate, and land records. They reveal that a large proportion of the Southsiders because of conditions of servitude or slavery occupied the lower stratas of society and held a very small portion of the area's wealth. But even the remaining members of the area's population had relatively little in terms of material possessions. What wealth did exist, however, was inequitably distributed among the Southside residents.

The tithables who made up the Southside's taxable population were a variegated collection of white males and black slaves of both sexes sixteen years and older. (Free white females were not taxed). In addition, there were a handful of Indians, both free and slave, who appeared on the tithable lists. For 1736 Amelia County's tithables can be broken down into the following categories. There were 332 white male tithables totaling 49.5 per cent of the tithable population of 671. Seventy, or 21 per cent of these white tithables, however, had their tithe paid by someone other than themselves, indicating that they were sons, servants, bound orphans, or overseers. Twenty-six of these 70 non-selfpaying tithes had the same last name as the individual paying the tax while the remaining 44 or 63 per cent did not. The latter figure would indicate that about 13 per cent of the white tithable population were servants, bound orphans, overseers, or hired help of one type or another. The black tithable population, from an analysis of the slaves' names, appears to have been
heavily male in this early year of the county. Of the
338 slaves on the list, 229 or almost 68 per cent appear
to have male names while 98 had female names. The sex of
only twelve of the slaves could not be determined from
their name. The 1736 tithable lists show that Amelia's
slave system developed rapidly, for in this early year of
the county's history about 41 per cent of the total male
tithable population of Amelia was black.\textsuperscript{11}

By 1749, with the county becoming more developed, the
composition of Amelia's tithable population had changed,
although the proportion of white to black was roughly the
same. In 1749 the total tithable population had grown to
2,539 with 1,128 or 44.4 per cent of these listed as white
tithables. With the growth in population came a parallel
increase in the number of non-selfpaying tithes, for 328 or
29 per cent of the white tithables fell into this category
with 134 or 41 per cent of the latter number apparently
being sons of tithepayers. The white servant or hired
work segment numbered 194 or 17 per cent of the white
tithables, an increase of about 4 per cent over the pro-
portion present in 1736. The tithable black population
of the county was also shifting. Black males now totaled
856 or 61 per cent of the black tithables, a proportional

\textsuperscript{11}Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1736.
decline of about 8 per cent from 1736. The sex of 12 of
the slaves could not be determined, but 543 appear to have
been females. The ratio between white and black males of
tithable age also shifted, with blacks now making up 43
per cent of the tithable male population, an increase of
slightly over 2 per cent.12

Thus, the composition of Amelia's tithable population
shifted as the area became more developed. A higher pro-
portion of non-selfpaying white tithables appeared on the
rolls in the latter year, and the percentage of black males
compared to white males and black females to black males
also increased. Development brought older families with
more tithable sons as well as conditions which began to
level the previously overall unequal sex distribution among
slaves. These proportions indicate a fairly high reliance
upon slave labor in the county's early years with a heavy
use of male slaves to do the rugged pioneering work.

By comparison, Lunenburg County in 1750, four years
after its creation from Brunswick County, contained 2,119
tithables. Lunenburg, the largest and most frontier county
of the Southside at the time, had 1,339 white tithables
and only 780 black tithables. The white males who paid
their own tithe totaled 1,012 with an additional 183 indi-
viduals whose tithe was paid by a person with the same

12 Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1749.
surname. The proportion of nonrelated tithables (or those individuals who appear to have been servants or overseers, etc.) stood at 11 per cent of the white tithable population, a lower proportion than in Amelia County in 1736 or 1749. Lunenburg's black tithable population was also in a much lower ratio than Amelia's, partially because of the newness of the area, and partially as a result of dissimilar population movements into the respective counties. Many of the individuals in the far western reaches of Lunenburg entered the Southside from other sparsely settled Virginia Piedmont counties, or came down the Valley, where slaves were few, from Pennsylvania. Thus their access to slaves was limited, in comparison to Amelia settlers whose proximity to the Tidewater counties and ports would have made slaves geographically more available. In addition, those on the Lunenburg frontier were usually that less affluent type of individual who was more mobile than the relatively immobile, more materially endowed planter. Of the 780 slaves who were in Lunenburg, 56 per cent of them appear to have been males. This is a lower percentage than found in Amelia, but it is partially a result of not being able to determine or estimate the sex of at least 10 per cent of the slaves present. In all likelihood the percentage of Lunenburg slave males was higher and would conform more closely to the Amelia pattern. But unlike Amelia, white males in Lunenburg heavily outnumbered black males because
of the much lower proportion of slaves in the total tithable population. In summary, the tithable lists reveal that a sizable proportion of Amelia's and Lunenburg's tithable population were not economically independent. Excluding the people who appear to have been tithable sons, 60.8 per cent of Amelia County's total tithable population in 1736 occupied a social rank as a servant, hired help, or slave. By 1749 the proportion of these individuals had grown to 63.2 per cent. In Lunenburg County the proportion of the tithable population who occupied these social and economic rankings totaled 43.6 per cent in 1750.

The white Southsider, whether he paid his own tithe or not, possessed few material comforts and necessities, and the amenities that did exist were not equitably distributed. Measured by the valuations made of an individual's personal property estate after his death, far more than half of these personal property inventories were worth less than £75 currency. Almost three-fourths of the 140 estates appraised in Prince George County between 1714 and 1728 were valued at less than £75, while 63 per cent of the 88 estates in Amelia County between 1736 and 1753 contained less than £75 worth of personal property. Of the 120 estates appraised in Brunswick County between 1733 and 1753, 69 per cent totaled less than £75 as did 73 per cent of

13Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750.
Chart 2

Distribution of Evaluated Inventoried Wealth

Note: These curves represent only the estates evaluated by the appraisers. They are constructed from the following records:
Prince George County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1714-1728; Brunswick County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1732-1740; Will Book 2; Amelia County Will Book 1; Lunenburg County Will Book 1. The greater the distance from the hypotenuse, the greater the inequality of distribution.
the 44 estates evaluated in Lunenburg County between 1746 and 1753. At the other end of the spectrum Prince George County had no estate valued over £650, Brunswick County over £960, or Lunenburg County over £405. However, Amelia County did have four deceased residents with estates valued over £1,000, with the largest estate reaching slightly over £1,805. There were of course, non-residents with property in the Southside counties whose total wealth far exceeded these relatively low figures.¹⁴

Even with a rather low ceiling on the top estates' value the wealth in the various counties was not equally distributed among the residents. Plotting the distribution of the wealth represented in the above 392 inventories with valuation reveals the inequalities as shown in the Lorenz curve in Chart 2 above. The top 10 per cent of the deceased individuals in the four counties held 45 per cent of the appraised wealth in Prince George County, 45 per cent in Brunswick County, 60 per cent in Amelia County, and 40 per cent in Lunenburg County. Overall, the least developed county, Lunenburg, had its personal property wealth most equally distributed while Amelia County consistently had

¹⁴Prince George County Deeds, etc., 1714-1728; Brunswick County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1732-1740 and Will Book 2; Amelia County Will Book 1; Lunenburg County Will Book 1. Compared to the Chesapeake area studies by Aubrey C. Land, the Southsider's holdings appear to have been less in ratable value. See Land's article "Economic Base and Social Structure: The Northern Chesapeake in the Eighteenth Century," Journal of Economic History, XXV (December 1965) 639-654.
Chart 3
Distribution of Tithable Slaves

- --- Amelia County - 1736
- --- Amelia County - 1749
- --- Lunenburg County - 1750

Percentage of Resident Male Tithepayers

Note: Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1736 and 1749; Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750.
its wealth most inequitably distributed among its residents.

There are problems inherent in using estate valuations to describe the distribution of wealth, for some individuals had already divided up their estates among their relatives and friends while others did not have their estates valued at all. The valuations did include slaves but not realty. If possible, other indexes to wealth should be used to supplement the estate inventories.

A revealing index to a person's economic position in an agricultural area like the Southside is his control of labor. Plotting the distribution of tithable slaves among the tithepaying populations of Amelia and Lunenburg produces a pattern diverging from the one constructed on the basis of estate inventories. A comparison of Amelia County's slave distribution in 1736 with Amelia's in 1749 and Lunenburg's in 1750 indicates that as the county or area became more developed, slave labor became more evenly distributed as more slaves were brought into the area. Lunenburg, in contrast to its more equitable position in terms of the distribution of estate wealth had the least equitable distribution of slaves. This can be seen in the Lorenze curve in Chart 3 above.

Sons, servants, overseers, and even orphans or bastard children of tithable age were valuable additions to the labor supply available to the Southsider. However, adding
these individuals to the labor pool along with the slaves does not markedly alter the picture as can be seen in Chart 4 below. Chart 4 also shows that 61 per cent of the tithepayers in Amelia County in 1736 had no other sources of tithable labor besides themselves for whom they were responsible on the tithable lists. This proportion had fallen to 54 per cent by 1749. The difference is to be explained in part by the higher proportion of sons available to heads of Amelia families in the latter year for 12 per cent of the Amelia tithepaying fathers had tithable sons in 1749 whereas only 8 per cent had paid for taxable sons in 1736. The increased presence of larger numbers of slaves in the county also meant a larger number of overseers present as well. Lunenburg County in 1750 had 68 per cent of its tithepaying males without additional sources of labor, and at the same time, Lunenburg had the highest percentage of families with tithable sons, 14 per cent. The divergencies in these figures result from the increasingly widespread use of slaves in the more developed economic status of Amelia in 1749 as compared with the same county earlier and Lunenburg County in 1750.15

Looking at Chart 3 above and Chart 4 below from the perspective of the richest 10 per cent of the tithepaying population (measured by their control of labor) yields a

15Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1736 and 1749; Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750.
Chart 4

Distribution of Tithables Among Selfpaying Resident Tithepayers
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Note: Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1736 and 1749; Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750.
different view. For example, the slaves held by the top
tenth of the resident tithepayers represented 67 per cent
of the slaves held by resident tithepayers in Amelia in
1736, 57 per cent in Amelia in 1749, and 77 per cent in
Lunenburg County in 1750. In terms of the total tithable
labor force available to resident tithepayers in the two
counties, excluding themselves, the top 10 per cent con­
trolled 59 per cent of the labor held by residents of
Amelia in 1736, 55 per cent in Amelia in 1749, and 62 per
cent in Lunenburg County in 1750. Control of labor, one
of the means of acquiring wealth, was thus concentrated in
relatively few hands in the two counties with the least
developed county, Lunenburg, having the least equitable
distribution. The latter was true because of the low
proportion of slaves present in the frontier county.

In spite of the heavy concentration of slaves, sons,
and servants in a few hands, it was possible to acquire
additional labor through the natural growth of the labor­
ing population if not by purchase or rental. A child's
labor was a valuable commodity to the parents, especially
after the mid-teens. And, of course, owning slaves
could mean additional sources of labor and wealth through
relatively inexpensive natural increase. The problem in
acquiring slaves by purchase was in the initial outlay for
the first slaves bought. Whether the labor was acquired by
purchase or other means, many individuals managed to
increase their slave holdings over the years. In Amelia County, for example, almost 44 per cent of those tithepaying individuals who are listed on both the 1736 and 1749 tithable lists increased their number of tithable slaves. Only 8 per cent saw a decrease in their tithable slave ownings, but 48 per cent saw no total change in their holdings over the thirteen year period. Almost half of those who did have their holdings increase realized an increment of only one or two slaves, and 81 per cent of those individuals who did not own additional tithable slaves by 1749 were not tithable slave owners in 1736. This would suggest that an increase in slave-holding was likely due to natural increase rather than purchase, and that increasing one's slave labor supply was most difficult for those without slaves. 16

Another sign of the distribution of wealth is the ownership and distribution of land. This index, however, is limited if knowledge of the per-acre valuation of the land is missing and, unfortunately, this type of land appraisal was not made until the 1780's. The Southside does have a Quitrent Roll for Prince George County in 1704 extant, and a like list for Lunenburg County's Cumberland Parish

16 Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1736 and 1749. Gerald W. Mullin, Jr. concluded that the wealthier planters staffed their quarters with the natural increase of their slaves, while the less wealthy were the individuals who bought slaves on the market. See Flight and Rebellion, Slave Resistance in Eighteenth Century Virginia (New York, 1972) 15.
that is complete for 1764. In addition, this study has attempted to establish the degree of land ownership in Amelia and Lunenburg Counties in 1749 and 1750 respectively.

In 1704 the Prince George County sheriff returned a quitrent list of 322 land owners. It is not possible to separate the nonresidents from the residents, and included in the total number of land owners were eight women. Altogether, quitrents were paid on 129,321 acres. There were 1,024 tithables in the county that year, so barring an exceptionally large number of nonresident landowners, it would appear that the proportion of landownership among the selfpaying white males would have been substantial. The top 10 per cent of the land owners did control about 38 per cent of the land, and those individuals who owned 400 acres or less (70 per cent of the land owners) held about 33 per cent of the land. This distribution produces the following Lorenze curve as can be seen in Chart 5 below.

A reconstruction of the proportion of land owners can be approximated from the records for Amelia County in 1749 and Lunenburg County in 1750. Based upon the various types of land records and the tithable lists, it appears that of the 800 selfpaying male resident tithables in Amelia in 1749, 534 or 67 per cent actually held title to

---

17 Wertenbaker, *The Planters of Colonial Virginia* 187-191
18 C. O. 5/1314; 110-111.
Chart 5

Distribution of Land

--- Prince George County - 1704

--- Lunenburg County, Cumberland Parish 1764

--- Lunenburg County, Cumberland Parish -1764 (resident male self-paying tithables only)

Percentage of Acreage
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Note: Wertenbaker, The Planters of Colonial Virginia, 187-191 contains the Prince George rent roll for 1704, while Bell, Sunlight on the Southside, 228-246 has the Cumberland Parish tax lists for 1764.
land. By contrast, Lunenburg County in 1750 had only 368 of 1,012 or 36 per cent of the selfpaying male resident tithables holding titled land. As was pointed out in Chapter III, the difference between the two counties can be explained by the greater prevalence of illegal land holding in Lunenburg County.

The only other complete quitrent rolls extant for the Southside are those for Cumberland Parish, Lunenburg County, which after 1765 would be all that was left of Lunenburg after the several divisions and subdivisions of the original county. Thus, Cumberland Parish in 1764 represents the most settled area of the original county. The 1764 quitrent list shows that 300 of 401, or 75 per cent of the resident white male tithepayers in the parish owned land or paid quitrents for land. When the nonresident and female land owners are included in the calculations, to make the comparison with Prince George County more explicit, the top tenth of the land owners held 37 per cent of the land with the bottom third of the land held by about 68 per cent of the land owners. Thus, as can be seen in Chart 5 above, Lunenburg

---

19 See the note to Table 3 in Chapter III above for the sources consulted in arriving at these figures. The differences in the percentages for owning titled land results from the fact that Table 3 is based upon the resident white tithable population, while the above figures are based on the resident selfpaying white tithables.

20 Bell, Sunlight on the Southside 228-246. Many of the lists published by Bell have since disappeared from the Lunenburg County Courthouse and a comparison of the lists that have survived with what was published reveals several errors. His lists should be used with caution.
land was distributed in a slightly more equitable way among its land owners than was Prince George's sixty years earlier.

A less equal curve is produced, of course, when the non-landed male selfpaying tithables of Cumberland Parish are included and the nonresident land owners and females are excluded along with their lands in the calculations. The results can be seen in Chart 5 above. The bottom third of the land held by residents encompassed around 73 per cent of the resident selfpaying tithables while 40 per cent of the land was held by the top tenth of the selfpaying tithables. If the nonresident and female land owners were to be reinserted into the calculations, the top 10 per cent held over 42 per cent of the Lunenburg land.

The Southside's wealth, measured by appraised personal property estate inventories, and the distribution and control of labor and land, was not equitably distributed. The richest tenth of the population consistently held four times their proportional share of the wealth while a large number of people held very little indeed. Some differences within this general pattern emerged as an area, like Amelia County, became more developed than others. Development did bring a wider distribution in slave owning, but also a growth in the proportion of non-slave dependent laborers within the tithable population. The individual who had less had the greater difficulty in acquiring more, while
the person with an economic base to begin with was more easily able to improve his economic position with the passage of time. What most Southsiders found in common was that most had very little in material wealth.

III

Too much stress can be placed upon economic indices as measures of the structure of a society, and thus it is wise to look at other measures, such as the distribution of political and religious offices, to make the picture more complete. The expansion of the rapidly growing population into the Southside meant that eventually new counties and parishes would be created to provide governmental control and convenience for the far flung settlers. The creation of each county and parish thus provided for a new slate of positions which had to be filled—an opportunity for acquiring new or higher political and religious office for some.

The formation and organization of a new county did not mean that all individuals appointed to positions would advance or that all of the positions would be open. For example, of the eleven justices appointed to the newly organized Amelia court in 1735-1736, six had been justices in the area before it had been cut off from Prince George County or in other nearby counties. Likewise, in Lunenburg, twenty-five individuals had been appointed to administer
that huge county in the four years following its organization in 1746. Nine of these individuals had been appointed justices elsewhere before Lunenburg was created. In addition, appointees were usually awarded maintenance of their previous status within the quorum of the justices by order of the governor in council. Thus, when a new commission was issued for Lunenburg in 1748, Field Jefferson was added "according to his Rank in Henrico Commission" and William Wynne "according to his place in Brunswick." What could and did happen for many of the justices was that their position improved because few of the older and more settled justices were on the fringe of the frontier when the new counties were created. But at the same time the presence of the men on the commission who had previously been appointed justices allowed for continuity and the perpetuation of established administrative procedures and practices.

Along with opportunities for upward mobility, the rapid expansion of the Southside brought an environment of human attitudes and actions which exploited both natural and human resources and created a society that was far from genteel. The names the early settlers gave to the
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21 These figures were gleaned from Amelia County Order Book 1; Lunenburg County Order Book 1; Brunswick County Order Books 1-3; Exec. Journals of Council Vols. III-V.

topographical features of the area suggest the challenging pioneer existence they faced in the earliest days of settlement. Terrible, Difficult, Panther, Wolf Trap, and Wild Cat Creeks give the flavor of Southside frontier settlement. Many of the waterways and topographical features were named after the early settlers themselves and others reflected the more prosaic side of their life, such as the Wart Mountain, Ising Glass, Wigg Island, Turnip and Turkey Egg creeks, branches, and runs. The Tickle Cunt Branch named in Peter Daniel's Brunswick County land patent in 1745 underscores a crudeness in the society not usually reflected in the public records. And the presence of a Fucking Creek in Lunenburg County, along which several of the county's leading families patented land, supports this as well. A creek with such a name was not common, and the secretary in Williamsburg who was writing out one of the patents along the creek emphasized the unusualness of the name by writing it in much larger letters than he had been using in the rest of the patent.

The coarseness of the society appears, too, in surviving slander cases which explicitly reveal the words to which the affronted took exception. For example, in the

---

23 Land Patent Book 22, 612. This creek also appears in Brunswick County Deed Book 2, 517-518.

Amelia County case of William Baldwin and Elizabeth, his wife, against Thomas Sullings, the defendant reportedly said "You Bat Crowder fucked Baldwyn's wife and I will prove it." In another Amelia case, a wife's wagging tongue got her into trouble for saying "You (Martha meaning) did pox John Burks (meaning that She gave him the foul desease)." Other suits were brought into court for calling individuals "rogues," "thieves," and "hogstealers," all very uncomplimentary terms for the eighteenth century.

Whenever slavery exists exploitation may be presumed. The frequent complaints of Southside servants for poor treatment or violations of contracts by the master, which will be discussed below, reveals the selfish actions of many Southsiders, especially those members of higher status. The acquisitive and illegal attempts on the part of the Southsider to obtain land through subverting the land laws (see Chapter III) were part of an exploitative environment which the crown and colony officials felt had to be controlled. However, the enforcement of these laws and the agencies of social control were largely confined to the local level where the effectiveness of these local institutions depended, in large part, upon the attitudes of the agencies' component members -- the same individuals in
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25 Amelia County Loose Papers, 1737-1757.
26 Ibid.
the Southside who were violating the land patent laws and taking advantage of servants and slaves. Authority, then, resided for practical purposes on the local level with social and legal control exerted according to the wishes of local officials. Potentially the Southside county courts could have been very oppressive, but in the early years of settlement the courts' members seemed interested in their own welfare and activities, spaced by an occasional pause of paternalistic concern.

The locus of power on the local level resided in the county court. The half dozen or so justices who sat at the monthly meetings of the court decided issues ranging from the ownership of a cow to cases involving corporal punishment. They arbitrated differences over debts, the location of roads, who should have a mill or tavern and decided what the annual county tax should be. They also had to clear all local petitions and statements of grievances before they could be sent on to the General Assembly. In short, the justices ran the county and had to answer to no local individual for what they did. Moreover, the justices decided who sat with them on the court, for additions to their numbers were made upon their own recommendation. In one case in Brunswick's early years the court refused to sit after the governor had issued a commission which had included individuals not approved by a majority of the justices. To avoid controversy, a new commission was
issued without the names of the objectionable nominees,\textsuperscript{27} whose geographical locations, according to the Brunswick court records, "were not convenient for the county and that the order for that Recommendation was not fairly obtained."\textsuperscript{28}

The chief law enforcement officer of the county, the sheriff, was also an appointee of the governor, but, again, only those recommended by the courts (from their own numbers) were appointed. The sheriff, in turn, appointed his own under or deputy sheriffs with the approval of the court. The sheriff's appointments were usually individuals with the same last name as those who sat on the court or who appear to have been related to the local individuals of prominence.\textsuperscript{29} The sheriff's term was usually for two years with his deputies serving at his pleasure.

Next in rank, and more numerous because of frequent turnovers in the position was the constable. This appointee of the court had a variety of duties including the viewing of tobacco fields to prevent the growing of "seconds" or second growth tobacco, enforcing game laws, serving warrants, summoning witnesses and coroners juries,
and administering whippings. The constable did receive various fees for his work, but the rewards probably did not actually pay for the necessary time and effort, though on occasion a constable might have been assisted by a headborough. 30 Like those people who held higher rank in office, the constables held more than their proportional share of the wealth. Of the twenty-five individuals who had served or were serving as constables in Amelia County by 1749, twenty-one held land and fifteen were slave owners. By comparison, in Lunenburg County by 1750 (where titled land and slave holding were less widespread) twenty-five individuals were or had been constables of whom sixteen held land and eight were slave owners. 31

The least of the positions, but one of importance, was the road surveyor or supervisor. There were over seventy of these individuals who had served or were serving in this capacity in Lunenburg in 1750, and nearly one hundred in Amelia by 1749. With the help of the male
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30 The constable’s duties can be determined from the fees he received, and the specific charges of responsibility for enforcing laws, a provision found in the laws themselves. See Hening, Statutes, Vol. V, 50, 62-63, 340. Headboroughs were appointed in Brunswick County. See Brunswick County Order Book 1, 56, 196.

31 Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1749; Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750. The appointments can be found in the order books, slave holdings in the tithable lists, and land ownership in the patent, deed and will books cited.
tithables in their area, these officials were required to clear and keep in repair the county roads and navigable streams and to construct simple bridges satisfactory to local needs. Unlike the preceding offices, however, these persons had no coercive powers apart from court backing. They could also not make any decision on the direction or distance of a road without a court order. Real power was thus confined in the hands of a few, even in mundane matters like the bending of a road.

The Anglican Church was another institution of social control and authority in eighteenth-century Virginia. Supported by taxes, the church had the responsibility not only for the spiritual welfare of its communicants but also for their social well being. It saw to the former through the ministrations of the parish priest and to the latter through the administrations of the parish vestry and their arm of moral enforcement, the churchwardens. Chosen from among the vestry, the churchwardens became agents of social control through their attempts to enforce the moral laws against adultery, bastardy, sodomy, swearing, and violations of the sabbath.

By the eighteenth century control of the church, like the county, had largely become a local affair. After its initial election by the householders and freeholders
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of the parish, the vestry was a self-perpetuating group unless ordered by the governor to be dissolved and a new election held. The vestry selected the parish priest and appointed the churchwardens, lay readers, sextons, and other local church officials. It decided where chapels of ease would be located and, like the county court, had the power to assess taxes on all tithables within the parish. Conversely, like the county court, it could also excuse an individual from paying parish taxes because of old age, infirmities, or inability to work.

The duties of the officers of the parish were made much easier because of the enforcement officers of the church were, by and large, the enforcement officers of the county. Thus, for all practical purposes, the parish and county governments were well integrated agencies staffed by individuals with similar backgrounds, outlooks and social rankings. For example, ten of the fifteen vestrymen for Lunenburg's Cumberland Parish were also justices of the peace and another was the clerk of court. The fifteen individuals collectively held over 10 per cent of all the tithable slaves held by the county's residents in 1750.³³

³³Lunenburg County Order Book 1, 1-2, 52; Tithable Lists, 1750.
of court also being a member of the vestry. These vestry-
men held 16 per cent of all the tithable slaves in Amelia
and 23 per cent of the slaves held by residents of the
county in 1749.34 In both Lunenburg and Amelia, the
vestrymen totalled less than 2 per cent of the resident
white adult male population.

For Prince George County it is possible to reconstruct
the vestries for Martin's Brandon and Bristol Parishes in
1721. Seven of the twelve vestrymen for Martin's Brandon
and five of the twelve members of the Bristol Parish
vestry had been appointed Prince George Justices. Bristol
Parish extended into contemporary Henrico County at the
time and several of the vestrymen from that area were also
Henrico justices.35 In Brunswick County's St. Andrew's
Parish, eight of eleven vestrymen elected in 1746 were
county justices and a ninth was the county clerk of court.36
In neither Prince George nor Brunswick is it possible
to determine the wealth of the vestrymen, but they were
probably very well to do like their colleagues in the other
three Southside parishes discussed previously.

34 Amelia County Order Book 2, foll. 141-142; Tithable
Lists, 1749.

35 Prince George County Orders, 1714-1720, 342, 353-
354. Chamberlayne, The Vestry Book and Register of Bristol
Parish, 1-6.

36 Brunswick County Order Book 3, 101, 105.
The economic and social elite of the Southside's counties controlled the positions of authority and social control in both the secular and religious spheres. Their role as arbiters for the public's welfare was no doubt eased by the presence of deferential attitudes on the part of the area's inhabitants and by the elite's rather lax attitude toward contemporary morals. Irregularities which were prosecuted were those, such as bastardy, which had a direct affect on the county or parish treasury or assault and battery cases which endangered life and limb.\(^{37}\)

A bastard child, unless the father was known and required to support the child, was a financial burden to the parish until the child was old enough to be bound out as an apprentice, usually in his early teens. To offset these costs, the mother was encouraged to name the father while in the pain of labor. However, only a few Southside fathers of "natural" children were named or prosecuted. Occasionally, a man would quietly pay the fine or post bond for the support of the child. On one occasion in Brunswick County in 1748 Abraham and John Phoenix were required to post bond for their good behavior towards John Kilcrease, and he to them. In addition, Kilcrease had to post bond to appear in court to answer

the charge of the churchwardens of "getting a Bastard child upon the Body of Barbary Phoenix." Apparently, the Phoenix family decided that something other than the public knowledge of the identity of the bastard's father was needed for their satisfaction. Kilcrease later appeared in court and posted "bond and security to the Churchwardens," apparently for the support of the child.38

The status of the bastards' mothers is hard to determine from the Southside's records. It has been noted that many of the Old Dominion's illegitimate children were born to servant women.39 This is also true of the Southside, but some of the women presented by the grand juries and churchwardens in the Southside were evidently not servants. One case was Margaret Shaw, a white servant woman. She was found guilty of giving birth to a mulatto bastard which compounded her crime. Fined £15 and forced to serve her master an additional year, she was threatened by the court, in accordance with colony law, to be sold for an additional five years if she did not pay the fine.40

Prince George County officials were apparently quite concerned about bastardy. Between 1715 and 1720, the county

38 Brunswick County Order Book 3, 310-311, 341.
39 Arthur P. Scott, Criminal Law in Colonial Virginia (Chicago, 1930) 281. This work is a good survey of the problem of handling criminals in Colonial Virginia and the patterns which resulted. It is also Flaherty's main source for his discussion of the enforcement of morals in Virginia, in his article cited above.
grand jury made sixteen presentments, of which fourteen were for bastardy. Later in the century other Southside counties had a lower proportion of bastardy cases brought into court. The Lunenburg County grand jury made no presentments for bastardy between 1746 and 1750, while the Brunswick grand jurors presented only eleven unwed mothers between 1732 and 1742 and 1745 and 1749. In Amelia County, only eight of the eighty individuals presented by the grand jury were accused of bastardy between 1735 and 1749, but during the same period the churchwardens presented eleven bastardy cases to the court for punishment. There were other individuals, especially in Brunswick County, who had their "natural" children bound out by the churchwardens or the court but who were not formally presented for bastardy in the surviving court records.

There were also attempts to conceal the birth of an illegitimate child or even to take its life. Jonathan Hoffard was fined fifty shillings by the Brunswick court for concealing the birth of a bastard in his home. In Amelia County in 1748 the case of Ann Bagsdale, accused of murdering her bastard child, was to be sent to the General
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41 Prince George Orders, 1714-1720.
42 Lunenburg County Order Book 1; Brunswick County Order Books 1-3; Amelia County Order Books 1-2.
43 Brunswick County Order Book 1, 276.
Court in Williamsburg for trial. However, her own health was so poor, perhaps from the difficulties of birth, that the county court had to delay her transportation.

When a bastard child died, there was good reason to assume that the mother was to blame. In Brunswick County, Martha and Margaret Rottenberry were accused of murdering an illegitimate baby, but were acquitted.

Buggery and sodomy were also offensive to the eighteenth century's moral and legal code. A buggery case, complete with the testimony of the witnesses, appears in the Southside records. George Marchbanks was brought before the Oyer and Terminer Court of Amelia County in 1746 accused of buggery with a mare. At this court sitting he was acquitted. For some unknown reason he was retried a few months later and his case sent to the General Court in Williamsburg. The results of his trial there are not known.

Adultery was hard to conceal, as in a Prince George case where Robert Burchet had turned "away his wife and by common fame lives in Adultery with Hannah Bedfield." However, adultery was of less financial concern to the
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44 Amelia County Order Book 2, fol. 73.
45 Brunswick County Order Book 1, 152.
46 Amelia County Order Book 2, fol. 7, 19-20.
47 Prince George County Orders, 1714-1720, 123.
parish or county than bastardy except when the deposed wife had to be supported by public charity. The Prince George court between 1715 and 1720 presented only one couple for living in adultery: the case of Robert Burchet and Hannah Redfield above. Amelia County grand jurors presented only one case and Lunenburg's none, but the Brunswick court found itself dealing with eight cases. In two of the Brunswick cases the males died before they could be prosecuted. One of these individuals, Epaphroditus Benton, appears in William Byrd's *History of the Dividing Line* as a sixty year old deer hunter who refused to ride a horse because he had once had a bad fall. In his secret *History*, Byrd was also careful to note that Benton or Bainton kept a concubine. The man was not presented by the grand jury until 1741, thirteen years after Byrd had met him while surveying the boundary between Virginia and North Carolina, and by this time the old man had just died. 48

The three counties of Amelia, Brunswick and Lunenburg all were bothered by individuals swearing, getting drunk, playing cards, and otherwise misbehaving. The Amelia grand jury presented twenty-three persons for not attending church, while Brunswick had to remind twenty-six individuals to attend. Amelia seems to have had problems

with individuals drinking on Sunday and, especially, with five men who sold liquor at church. Lunenburg and Brunswick had steady presentments for assault and battery charges. The courts usually required the guilty to post bond for his good behavior for one year and a day. However, not all of the presentments for moral and civil crimes were prosecuted. Many of the presented had the charges against them dismissed, or the court would order no further prosecution. There does not seem to have been any pattern of dismissal on the basis of social standing or rank. At times it appears that the court simply gave up trying to deal with an individual who never came to court to answer the charges against him. 49

While some individuals merely stayed away from court, others reacted in a less passive way to the orders of the court and the attempts of its officers to enforce them. In 1747 the Amelia sheriff tried to arrest two individuals. One, Francis Rice, "ran into the woods and hid himself" before the sheriff could take him while another, John Bird, "shut himself up in his house & could not be taken." 50 The same sheriff, George Walker, was also struck

49 This pattern appears throughout all of the Southside order books. Flaherty notes that the failure or desire to see morals enforced on the part of the justices helped set the tone for that local society. See Flaherty, "Law and the Enforcement of Morals in Early America," 223.

50 Amelia County Sheriff's Returns, bound in the end of Amelia County Order Book 1, 34.
by Charles Spradling while trying to do his duty.\textsuperscript{51} Constables complained of "contumacious" behavior towards them, and several people were required by Southside courts to post bond for their good behavior to the justices and the court after they insulted the officials with "disorderly, indecent, contemptuous" words and actions.\textsuperscript{52}

The individual who probably faced the least deferential attitudes and actions from the Southsider was the jailer. Hugh Boston, the Amelia jailer in 1740 informed the court that he was "afraid of bodily hurt" from John, Robert, and William Ferguson while currently guarding James Ferguson.\textsuperscript{53} At times the inmates could be unruly, and some made their escape. One collection of two men and four women in the Brunswick jail in 1748 broke up the jail and burnt it down. One of the men, William Middleton, apparently gained some experience in demolition since he was again in jail the following year for pulling down and burning a woman's house.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{51}Amelia County Order Book 2, fol. 105.

\textsuperscript{52}For examples, see Amelia County Order Book 2, foll. 60, 94, 124; Lunenburg County Order Book 1, 181, 267, 300; Brunswick County Order Book 2, 14.

\textsuperscript{53}Amelia County Order Book 1, 135.

\textsuperscript{54}Brunswick County Order Book 3, 410-411, 457.
There is little evidence to suggest a class bias in court prosecutions of Southsiders, and the rather low number of prosecutions in regard to the moral and civil codes suggests a lax attitude toward law enforcement. Whether or not the presentments of Southside grand juries were mostly of the lower classes, the court and its officers did serve as agencies of control over the servile classes, both white and black, in very obvious ways. This was especially true of the courts attempts to regulate and enforce the relationship between master and slave or servant and the servile individual's place in society.

For the white servile population the most common case brought into court was that of the runaway. Because of the shortage of labor and the investment made by the master in the servant, this was a serious offence to which the General Assembly periodically turned its attention. During the eighteenth century a battery of punishments for runaway servants were defined and refined by the Assembly. In 1705 the Assembly decreed that for every day the servant had been absent an additional day had to be served after the expiration of the indenture. In addition, the servant had to serve a month and a half for every hundred pounds of tobacco his master had expended for his reward and had to pay all the other charges spent in recapturing and returning him at the rate of one year's service for every eight hundred pounds of tobacco spent.
The master was to bring the runaway and his claims into
the next meeting of the county court where the justices
would judge and award penalties.\textsuperscript{55} In 1726 the Assembly
required that runaway servants who were wage earners
were to serve double time for their absence and were to
receive no wages for the extra time they had to serve.\textsuperscript{56}
The latter provision was renewed in 1748 when the burgesses
again directed their attention to the problem of runaways.
This time however, indentured servants were required to
serve double the time absent and all of the master's
costs were to be repaid at the rate of one and a half
month's service for every hundred pounds of tobacco ex­
pended. Again, the county court was to judge and allow
the penalties.\textsuperscript{57}

The Southside's county courts had ample opportunity
to deal with runaway servants. All of the county courts
found it necessary to lengthen the indentures of runaways.
One servant boy, John Mathews, who had been bound out in
1747 to Lewis Delony of Lunenburg County was taken up and
his reward claimed in the Brunswick County court held in
August, 1748. In the same month in Lunenburg court,

\textsuperscript{56}Ibid., Vol. IV, 175.
\textsuperscript{57}Ibid., Vol. V, 557.
Mathews was required by the court to serve two times the forty-nine days he had spent away from Delony's service. Another Lunenburg County servant, Robert Hamilton, held by Samuel Wilson apparently put his master to some expense in recapturing him. The court awarded Wilson fifteen months and twelve days additional service beyond the indenture for Hamilton's absence of fourteen days.\(^58\) There were two cases in Amelia County where the servant made the mistake of either striking or threatening their masters. In both cases the servants were required to serve an additional year beyond the time needed to defray court and other expenses entailed by the masters.\(^59\)

In addition to determining the amount of additional time the runaway servant was to serve, the court also granted rewards which were established by law to those individuals who captured runaway servants and slaves. The servants taken up in the Southside came from areas, or were held by masters living as far away as Westmoreland and Stafford Counties, Virginia, while one individual was fleeing a master of Charles County, Maryland when captured in Brunswick County in 1738.\(^60\)

\(^{58}\) Brunswick County Order Book 3, 446; Lunenburg County Order Book 1, 70, 226.

\(^{59}\) Amelia County Order Book 2, fol. 290, 297.

\(^{60}\) Amelia County Order Book 1, 56; Brunswick County Order Book 1, 213.
The enforcement of indentureships and labor contracts was not totally one sided, for the court also had the responsibility to see that the master fulfilled his obligations as well. The fact that the court, even though it was the bailiwick of the elite who potentially could have exploited their position, looked after the interests of the servants reveals the paternalistic side of its members. Action in these matters came only after a complaint had been entered in court by the misused servant, but overall, the Southside justices found it necessary to deal with more cases of servant's complaints than they did with runaway servants. For example, the Brunswick records reveal that the justices watched out for the welfare of several servants by requiring that the masters free them since their terms had been completed. The various courts also found it necessary to order that freedom dues be paid, and that masters answer charges of ill usage, beatings, poor clothing, and other violations. In a number of these cases, however, there is no record of the master appearing in subsequent courts to answer the charges, and in several other cases the suit was dropped because of nonprosecution on the part of the servant. The records do not reveal whether the situation had been corrected or whether the servant had been detained from reappearing in court to
press the charges. If the numerous charges by the servants were true, and the court found many to be so, it appears that some Southsiders were attempting to exploit their servants.

In addition to its role of regulating the responsibilities of both master and servant, the county court also attempted to control what they considered to be an undesirable segment of Virginia's population—undesirable because they were usually financial burdens to the parish or county—the idle, vagrant, and dissolute. If a person were considered to be such, he was placed in jail until his status could be determined. If the court decided that he was indeed such an undesirable, he would be warned out of the parish—as in the case of William Johnson of Amelia in April, 1745. If the unwanted were not a resident of the county, he was to be returned to the place of his last residence via the constables. Thus, Daniel Burton was sent back to Frederick County from Amelia, Margaret Smith to Prince William County from Lunenburg, and William Cooke to Henrico County from Brunswick.

While the court had the power and the opportunity to deal with the servile class of whites and the unwanted

---

61 For examples see Brunswick County Order Book 1, 27, 35, 52, 120, 156, 223.

62 Amelia County Order Book 1, fol. 312.

63 Ibid., fol. 332; Lunenburg County Order Book 1, 327; Brunswick County Order Book 3, 401.
individuals in a county, the relationship between a master and a slave was largely the concern of the master. As a result the more common nonsubmissive reactions on the part of the slave do not appear in the records. But when a slave committed a major crime or transgressed against someone other than his owner, the court became the agency of punishment and the reassertion of white control.

For example, John Dabney's slave Sampson was convicted by the Amelia court in February, 1744, for his second offense of hogstealing. As a result, Sampson was to spend two hours in the pillory with his ears nailed thereto and was then to be cut down by slitting his ears to free him. In the previous year, Hall and Tom, belonging to Benjamin Branch of Henrico County, were also accused of stealing hogs. They were found guilty by the Amelia Court, but since this was their first offense were only given thirty-nine lashes. However, Hall was accused by Charles Burk of hurting him, so he was to spend a year in jail unless his owner posted bond for his good behavior. There were similar cases in other Southside counties, but in only one case was a slave executed. This case also occurred in Amelia and arose when Will, belonging to John

\[64\] Amelia County Order Book 1, fol. 261.

\[65\] Ibid., fol. 233.
Hudgins, murdered Jack, also belonging to Hudgins. Will was found guilty and hanged. 66

Extant records reveal that no slaves were executed during this period in the Southside counties for crimes against whites, but neither were any acquitted. In several cases, the courts decided that the crime committed was not a capital offense, but that the accused was guilty enough to be punished, usually with thirty-nine lashes "well laid on" the bare back. Cesar, William Marshall's slave, was accused of committing rape on Elizabeth, Marshall's daughter. The court decided that a rape had not occurred, but the slave was whipped for attempting it. 67 Similarly, York and Moll, two of James Cocke's slaves, were accused of poisoning William Childrey "lately deceased." The court found them not guilty but at the same time declared that they were guilty enough to receive the usual thirty-nine lashes. 68 It would almost appear that, guilty or innocent, the court was using these cases as examples to the rest of the slaves and felt that it could not afford to allow one to go unpunished.

66 Amelia County Order Book 2, fol. 42. For other cases of slaves murdering slaves see Prince George County Minute Book, 1737-1740, 327, 367-369.

67 Amelia County Order Book 1, fol. 284.

68 Amelia County Order Book 2, fol. 25.
The court's powers extended even beyond the areas mentioned above. Along with the churchwardens, the court had jurisdiction in family matters. When it was decided by the Lunenburg justices in 1747 that Robert Gee "was not able to provide" for his son Phillip nor to "Instruct him in Christian Principles," they ordered that the churchwardens bind the lad out to Samuel Wynne. The same court also became involved in marital affairs when it required Jonathan Davis to post bond for his good behavior after his wife Margaret complained to the court that she feared bodily harm from him. In Brunswick County in 1741, the court agreed to hear a case when Mary Sutherland informed the court that her husband Alexander misused her and refused to support her. Mary capped her complaint by telling the justices that she was in danger of becoming a charge to the parish as a result of her husband's illtreatment—a charge that was sure to precipitate court action.

The county court, then, was the real center of authority and social control and was the institution most directly in contact with the Southside Virginian. Its duties and responsibilities were met with a general acquiescence by

---

69Lunenburg County Order Book 1, 204. For a similar case, see Amelia County Loose Papers, 1737-1757.

70Lunenburg County Order Book 1, 108.

71Brunswick County Order Book 2, 35.
most Southsiders, although a few individuals were recalcitrant. The court's greatest concern in enforcing the moral, civil and criminal codes seem to have stemmed from its concern for the economic well being of the parish and county--namely the level of taxation--as well as from its sense of responsibility for enforcing the law. However, the realities of a dispersed and crude frontier population made the court's attempts at enforcing the codes far from easy and may have provided excuses for a rather lax enforcement.

Since many of the justices were the same individuals who were circumventing colony law in regard to the patenting of the King's land, their own position regarding strict law enforcement was ambiguous. This may have also contributed to a lax administration which permitted the Southsider to live the life he chose without too much interference from even the local county government.

IV

Court records of violations of the criminal or moral law present a picture of deviance from social norms. Many more of the Southside's residents lived their lives in ways which seldom or never carried them to court or into the records. As a result the behavior and attitudes of a Southsider like Shiddrick Tribble who appears only on a Lunenburg tithable list, can never be reconstructed from the court records unless he left a deed, a will, or some
other instrument of record. Those who did have left evidence of the social environment in terms of the most basic unit of society, the family.

The family is an agency of social control through its socialization of the young, transmitting to its offspring the traditions and values of the community. The importance of the extended family in the Southside has already been noted as an influence on where one settled because it provided additional sources of labor and help beyond the pale of the household nuclear family unit. In the early days of settlement, too, the household and surrounding kin probably comprised the only individuals seen for long stretches of time. The family was also important, moreover, because the reading and writing a child was taught was largely a family affair. There were a few scattered schools and school masters in the Southside, but they seemed to have been supported by the more affluent.

72The role of the family in Early American society is coming under more scrutiny and historians are becoming more aware of its importance. For a summary of some investigations and suggestive insights, see David J. Rothman, "A Note on the Study of the Colonial Family," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d Ser., XXIII (1966) 627-634. The Autumn, 1971 issue of the Journal of Interdisciplinary History, II, is devoted to the study of the history of the family and should be consulted for some examples of the application of the theories of childhood to historical situations.

73For example, in a deed from John Turner of Amelia County to Richard Borum, one hundred acres of land was sold "except one house called the school House which house is reserved for a school to teach Samuel Cobbs and John Fergusons Children in if their occasion serve so to do." Amelia County Deed Book 1, 244-245. Cobbs was the clerk of court and John Ferguson owned four tithable slaves on the 1749 lists of tithes. The Brunswick County Orphans Book 1, 1740-1781 contains numerous accounts which include expenses for schooling.
Being able to sign one's name is not a guarantee of literacy, but it does indicate that an individual can form and identify letters. Between 1714 and 1728, there were 113 wills recorded in Prince George County. Four of the wills were damaged to the extent that it is impossible to decipher a signature, but 55 individuals did sign their name to their wills while 54 used a mark. It appears from this evidence that a sizable number could sign their name and no doubt could have taught their offspring to do so, too.

Though there were few local opportunities for formal education in the Southside during the first half of the century, the education needed to function in the Southside's early agricultural society was probably minimal. But as H. Peter Pudner had pointed out, Virginians of the period studied men as well as, or in place of, books and thus through oral learning acquired the education needed to survive and succeed in their society.

Beyond providing a rudimentary education, parents had other responsibilities in raising their children. Marriages had to be arranged and contracted, although the evidence for this emerges from the upper class experience rather than from the unaffluent anonymous segment of the

---

74 Prince George County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1714-1728.

population which had little need for such arrangements. Sons had to be prepared for adult life, either through teaching them a trade or training them on the home farm or plantation. Agricultural training most likely occurred as a byproduct of helping around the home place and was the training most sons received. A few gained craft skills from apprenticeship or the instruction of a talented father. Very few formal deeds of apprenticeship appear in the Southside's records, and the children who were bound out "to learn some handy era (sic) of trade" were the illegitimate or poor orphans who had no other means of support. The failure of parents to properly raise their children sometimes required the intervention of the local authorities, but these cases were few.

The wife's rank in the family and society was not equal to her husband's. The legal status of women did not necessarily reflect her real position in the home. Many families, because of a mother's dominating personality, could well have been matriarchal in psychology. The woman had few rights after marriage and could legally sue and be sued only through her husband. If a husband decided to alienate land which he had acquired through marriage the wife did have to agree to relinquish her dower rights to

---


77 Brunswick County Order Book 3, 252. The binding out of orphans appears frequently in the order books.
that property, a procedure which appears many times in the records. A woman was also allowed only one-third of her husband's estate unless he provided otherwise in his will. Many husbands provided for the maintenance of their surviving wife only for as long as she remained a widow. If she remarried, the original couple's children, or other designated individuals were to receive her share of the estate indicating a strong concern for the future and welfare of the children.\textsuperscript{78}

Concern for the well being of the Southsider's children is reflected in other ways. There are numerous deeds of gift conveying land and property by reason of the "natural love and affection" felt by a father for his children, especially his sons. The quoted phrase is certainly part of a legal convention, but the intent is there nonetheless. Some deeds also contained expressions of hope that the gift would allow the son to advance in the society.\textsuperscript{79} Some fathers expressly kept partial control over the land or its resources during their remaining days; for example, Robert Thompson of Henrico County reserved the right to keep livestock on a tract he gave to his son Peter in

\textsuperscript{78} Amelia County Will Book 1; Brunswick County Deeds, Wills, etc; Will Book 2; Prince George County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1714-1728; Lunenburg County Will Book 1.

\textsuperscript{79} Amelia County Deed Books 1-3; Brunswick County Deeds, Wills, etc.; Deed Books 2-3; Lunenburg County Deed Books 1-2; Prince George County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1714-1728.
Amelia County in 1748. Other fathers and relatives used gifts of land as a means of achieving social security as in the case of William West. He gave Ephraim West 150 acres because of his love towards him and in return for "good warm Clothing, Diet, and Lodging." Ephraim also received two slaves, seven cattle, three horses, and a hog. Something may have happened shortly after, however, for William made a similar arrangement with a Richard Dennis, possibly a relative, four years later in 1752. Other parents gave away the home plantation on condition of being cared for during the remainder of their lives or on the condition that the elders could continue to live there. In some cases the deed was made effective only after the deaths of the parents.

Relations between step-parents and children sometimes became a matter of public record. Michael Wall, Jr., had married Rebecca, the widow of John Chapman. This Brunswick couple then recorded a conditional deed with the four children which Rebecca brought with her from the first marriage. Benjamin Chapman was to receive two slaves when he turned fourteen while his brother John was to get three slaves at age fourteen and three more, plus the land where Wall and

---

80 Amelia County Deed Book 3, 136-139.
81 Amelia County Deed Book 2, 217-218; Deed Book 3, 265-266.
82 See for example, Amelia County Deed Book 1, 477-478; Brunswick County Deed Book 2, 168-170; Lunenburg County Deed Book 2, 138-139.
Bebecca were then living, after his mother's death. But
the two younger children, Mary and William Chapman were
treated differently. Mary was to receive two slaves at
age twenty-one but only if she chose her step-father to be
her legal guardian. William was promised three slaves at
age fourteen, again if he chose Wall as his guardian; if
he refused he was not to receive them until he reached
twenty-one. Family tensions may have been behind these
differential provisions.

Some historians have used probate records to discern
patterns of patriarchal authority in the early American
family. Philip J. Greven, Jr., for example, has argued that
Andover, Massachusetts, fathers retained land and property
—often until their death—to maintain control over their
sons. John Demos, however, has noted in his study of
Plymouth that, while he found much evidence to support
Greven's thesis, there were also many divergent cases.
Professor Demos' conclusion seems to fit the Southside
experience, for a great variety of patterns of partible
inheritance can be found in the probate records. Many of
the Southside wills, for instance, indicate that the older
sons have already been established or given their portion

---

83 Brunswick County Deed Book 3, 111-113.
84 Greven, Four Generations, 230ff.
85 Demos, A Little Commonwealth, 164-170.
of the estate and are to expect no more. In many cases where this occurred the youngest, or a younger son, was then given the home plantation, usually with the condition that he care for his mother during her natural life or widowhood. Differing patterns of inheritance resulted from the degree of wealth the father owned for if he had sufficient land all of the children, including the daughters, received land. But if not, the daughters were excluded along with the apparently younger sons, and instead occasionally received money to purchase land or other items such as livestock, furniture, etc. 86

The social environment in which these Southside families existed was one which was rapidly expanding and growing, especially after the 1730's. Numerous individuals moved into the Southside, and some of them moved on to other areas after a short sojourn. But no matter how many ultimately left, the new arrivals and the local growth in the population created an annual increase in the tithable population that was proportionately large. The wealth of these early Southsiders was not distributed equally; as an area developed it became even less so. Development also

86 These are my impressions from reading all the wills for the period in the Southside. The type of study undertaken by Professors Demos and Greven is not possible for the Southside because of the lack of parish registers, which are necessary to discern the ages of those named in the wills.
brought in larger numbers of slaves and a wider slave owning, as well as an increase in the number of white males who did not pay their own taxes and occupied the lower ranks in society. The increased number of slaves also meant an increase in the very lowest class of colonial Virginian society. Upward mobility as measured by the acquisition of slaves did occur for many people but was hardest to achieve by those who had the least to start with.

The expansion of the area, in terms of the creation of new counties, brought upward mobility for some individuals who took advantage of new opportunities, but from the earliest years of a county's existence, individuals with wealth and social status also dominated the positions of political and religious prominence. As a result, the agencies of social control were in the hands of a local elite. But the elite's lax enforcement or prosecution of the legal and moral codes, perhaps a partial result of their own participation in illegal land practices, blunted both their potential power and the possible alienation of the lower white classes. The difficulties faced by these elite officials which arose from the large areas to control, the geographical mobility of the inhabitants, and the elite's own preoccupations diminished the effectiveness of the local agencies of social control. Hence, many individuals were beyond the pale of the law
and were left to their own devices. The latter lived out their days in relative anonymity. In the bustling, vibrant, loose, eighteenth century Southside society the more fortunate forged ahead, leaving unmistakeable evidence of their success in the historical records.
CHAPTER V

THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF THE SOUTHSIDE

One of the prime concerns of many scholars in recent decades has been to decipher the components of economic development and growth. Desiring to sustain growth in the industrialized nations and to foster it in the "underdeveloped" and populated areas of the world, these scholars have hotly argued and debated the process. These studies contain helpful insights for the student of colonial America but have a limited use because the situations confronting these scholars are much different from those of early America. Two differences are obvious: the availability of present day technology, and today's masses of population.1

There have been a few scholars who have addressed themselves to the problems of economic development in situations somewhat similar to those found in the British North American colonies of the eighteenth century.

Douglass C. North, Robert E. Baldwin, Melville H. Watkins, and other economic historians have stressed the importance of export commodities for regional economic growth in newly settled areas. This approach has been applied to the early years of the Virginia experience by Professor Irene Hecht. But, Professor North has also pointed out that "it is conceivable that a region with a large influx of population and capital might simply 'feed upon itself' and thereby account for a substantial share of its growth." This appears to have been true of the Southside where rapid growth in its population created demands that fostered speculation in land and capital improvements, and oriented a portion of the economy toward fulfilling local needs. Tobacco certainly played an important role in the Southside economy, especially as the area became more developed, but its place in the export sector was complemented by grains, meats, and lumber products. There is no evidence to indicate which sector of the economy—consumptive or

---

export—led the economic growth of the Southside, but
local consumptive markets appear to have been most im­
portant for large numbers of the less affluent Southsiders.

There is a general lack of records for the Southside
during this period which provide indexes to "intensive"
growth, but the "extensive" economic growth of the area can
be traced in at least two different ways. First, the
county records indicate that after about 1730 the tithable
population of the Southside increased at about 10 per cent
each year. This continued high rate of increase was suf­
ficient to provoke comment in the Virginia Gazette in 1770,
but what is important here, is the fact that this high
rate of increase is measured in the laboring portion of
the population. Since one of the major problems impeding
economic development in a frontier area is the lack of
labor, these tithable figures provide an important index
to the changing ratio between labor and resources, and an
indication of at least potential economic growth.

3These terms are used by Douglass C. North in Growth
and Welfare in the American Past (Englewood Cliffs, 1966)
3-4 to distinguish between a per capita and a total increase
in goods and services.

4Purdie and Dixon's Virginia Gazette (Williamsburg),
Supplement, June 14, 1770. Joseph J. Spengler has defined
the laboring age of a population as falling between about
fifteen and sixty-four years, a definition very close to
what in practice was a Virginia tithable. See his "Demo­
graphic Factors and Early Modern Economic Development,"
Daedalus, XCVII (Spring, 1968) 438. The lack of labor on
the frontier is discussed in W. A. Mackintosh, "Some Aspects
of a Pioneer Economy," Canadian Journal of Economics and
The second way to measure "extensive" growth is in the actual expansion of the area, for which the rate of patenting land provides a rough index. It is interesting to note that the pace of patenting land quickened in a parallel way to the growth of the tithable population, again indicating the growing economic expansion of the Southside in the years following 1730.  

However, this extensive growth did not come without overcoming or avoiding certain impediments. For the person trying to sell land in Prince George County by advertising in the *Virginia Gazette*, the nearness of the tract to landings, tobacco warehouses, and shipping points like Cabin Point, Bolling's Point, or Appomattox Point on the James and Appomattox Rivers was a fact worth mentioning. However, in only one advertisement before 1753 for Southside land not in Prince George County was the distance to port facilities mentioned. In this case, Anthony Walke of Prince George County was trying to sell a tract of Lunenburg land sixty miles from Bollings Warehouse. Walke was quick to point out that the sixty miles was by "a good road." Thus, the transportation facilities, or the lack of them in the Southside, was a factor which had to be and was taken into account by prospective Southsiders.

---

5 See Tables 1 and 2 in Chapter II above.
6 *Virginia Gazette*, October 6, 1752.
The recognition of the difficulties of getting to market is also found in the attempts to have a legal port created on the Nottoway River just within the boundary of Virginia. As early as May, 1723, the frontier inhabitants of the Tidewater Southside had petitioned the governor and council to have a naval officer appointed for the site, but the officials refused until the boundary between Virginia and North Carolina could be settled. Apparently nothing was done for almost two decades for in May, 1742, the inhabitants of Brunswick County added their signatures to a petition from residents of Isle of Wight and Nansemond Counties again asking that a naval officer be appointed to serve the area. This time the council agreed. With the new port site Southsiders near the North Carolina line and the Tidewater could export their staples and import their needs without having to traverse the territory between themselves and the James River ports. But the opening of this Nottoway River port did not help the situation of the Southsiders living to the west in the far removed sections of Lunenburg County. For them, the distance to any port was equidistant.

The Southsiders who lived to the south and west of Prince George County had to face the problem of poor

---

transportation facilities in different ways. The necessity of having to carry themselves and their products over land required that the male tithables in the Southside spend additional time and labor building and repairing the extra roads, an activity required by law and directed by the county court. In addition, the Southside's citizens paid sizable taxes to provide bridges over the larger creeks and rivers which had to be replaced frequently because "freshets" continually washed them out.

In economic terms the building of these additional roads and bridges required increased social overhead expenditures and reduced the direct capital producing activities of the area's residents. These expenditures, however, were necessary for both the immediate and long term growth of the Southside's economy. The contractors who built the bridges did benefit from the situation and were able to diversify their own economic endeavors through these public contracts.

In the earliest years of settlement, the low number of taxable residents required that the tax burden of the county fall heavily on the few people who were there. It was also in these early years that the first bridges had

---

to be built, bounties had to be paid on the large number of wolves killed and claimed for reward, and court houses, chapels, and glebe houses had to be built and paid for. For instance, in the first eight years of the existence of Brunswick County and St. Andrew's Parish, the tithe-payers paid an average tax of fifty-seven pounds of tobacco for every tithable. But within just a few more years, after some of these initial improvement costs had been met, the average yearly tax fell to thirty-five pounds of tobacco. Likewise, in the earliest years of Lunenburg County, the combined county and parish tax load was fifty-three pounds of tobacco. There are no records for the parish taxes to add to the Amelia County tax base, but Amelia's county tax load was consistently lower than the taxes of the other Southside counties, perhaps because of the higher number of tithables in the county. In addition to the local taxes, Virginians also paid colony taxes at an average level of over eight pounds of tobacco per tithable between 1727 and 1752 as well as the quitrents due on the land. Overall, it would have paid to stay

---

9Brunswick County Order Books 1-2; The Vestry Book of St. Andrew's Parish.
10Lunenburg County Order Book 1; Landon C. Bell, Cumberland Parish (Richmond, 1930) 328-341.
11Amelia County Order Books, 1-2.
out of a new county for at least a decade after its creation to avoid the higher local taxes.

Although the county officials may have been lenient or negligent in prosecuting moral offenses, the collection of taxes was a different matter. The sheriff was responsible for collecting the total sum levied, and the difference had to come out of his own pocket. Motivated by this consideration, the sheriffs attempted to do their best, a situation which on one occasion in Brunswick County led to protest. In 1741, the local tithepayers petitioned the county court "to be relieved from the unrighteous oppression of the Sheriffs in the Collection of the Public Dues." The Brunswick court certified the petition and sent it on to the General Assembly. The fact that the Assembly at times exempted settlers from payment of colony taxes as an inducement to settle a frontier area, indicates the economic importance of taxation to the people of the time.

The rapid growth and expansion of the Southside's population brought an increased need for roads, bridges, and public buildings. The expansion also created an ever growing market for local land, products, and services.

13Brunswick County Order Book 2, 53.
It has already been pointed out that many of the South­siders acquired their first tract of land from the crown by patent but also that many immigrants and local residents purchased their first Southside tract from either a nonresident land speculator or a local land jobber. In addition, there were many others who also bought and sold land after their first acquisition. The frequency at which land turned over was not only due to the mobility of the Southsider but to the profit-making urge of the resident Southsiders themselves. Their activity and participation in the buying and selling of land made these transactions an important aspect of the area's local economy.

There appear to have been at least two broad types of land sales and speculation which occurred in the South­side. The first was the practice of selling undeveloped lands and appears to have been followed most heavily by the larger and nonresident land jobbers. William Byrd, II, the individual with the largest amount of Southside land, is a good example of this type of land speculator. After acquiring large tracts (for a total of over 111,000 acres) Byrd tried to attract large numbers of foreign Protestants to settle on his lands. His attempts failed, and he and his heirs were forced to sell to whoever came along. This situation forced the Byrds to sell

\[^{15}\text{See Table 3 in Chapter III above.}\]
their land at about twenty acres per pound in order to realize any financial return on the investment. As William Byrd II described it: "When any Purchasers come, let your first Inquiry be into their Character and ability to pay for the Land according to the terms....Those who bring Ready mony ought to have the best Land, to encourage Prompt Payment."17

William Byrd's means of disposing of his land seems to have been through the services of a land agent who allowed the prospective buyer to lay out, under direction, the land segment of his choice. Other land speculators were more structured in their attempts to sell land. Alexander Spaulding and John Lidderdale, two Williamsburg based merchants, received a patent for 16,993 acres in February, 1745, in what was soon to be Lunenburg County. These gentlemen took their tract along the Little Roanoke and Wards Fork and divided it up into numbered lots from which the buyer could choose. There appear to have been thirty-four of these lots handled by a land agent and merchant named Samuel Gordon. Five years after the issuance of the patent, the merchants had sold at least 3,547 acres or eight of the lots to five different purchasers.

16 Lunenburg County Deed Book 1, 116-248; Deed Book 2, 114-166.

17 Byrd to Mr. Wood, March 10, 1740/41. William Byrd Letter Book, Virginia Historical Society. I am indebted to Dr. Edward M. Riley for procuring a copy of this letter for me.
This land was sold at about twenty-four acres per pound, indicating that it was most likely not developed.  

The selling of undeveloped land was not confined to the nonresident land speculator for many Southside lands sold by residents were also virgin tracts. For example, Abraham Venable of Louisa County had sold 400 acres for £20 to Paul Pigg, Jr., of Amelia County in April, 1746. In September, perhaps to pay for needed improvements Pigg turned around and sold for £8 what appears to have been half of the tract to John Weatherford, who like Venable was also from Louisa County. In both deeds title was conveyed but with the qualification that it would not be good unless the tract was actually "seated" or developed as the law required. This tract, which was probably part of a double patent issued to Venable in 1743 for 5,400 acres had apparently not been developed and could have lapsed at any time, if someone would have petitioned for it. However, court cases and petitions cost money and did not help one's relations with his neighbors so it was simpler and cheaper to purchase the undeveloped land.

18 Land Patent Book 23, 786; Lunenburg County Deed Book 1, 180-185, 304-311; Deed Book 2, 357, 368.
The procedure followed by Pigg of buying a tract and then selling part of it almost immediately was common in the Southside and may have been a means of partly financing the actual purchase or paying for needed capital improvements on the new plantation. The same was true of individuals who patented land and then disposed of part of their new tract. Of the 405 land patents issued for realty in Amelia County between 1735 and 1744, 179 or 44 per cent of the patents had either been sold in toto or in part by mid-1749. Many portions of these lands were certain to have been undeveloped.

Many individuals chose to dispose of land whose value had been increased through capital improvements, the second type of speculation. A man's labor may have been his most valuable asset in an economic situation like the early Southside's, and any clearing, fencing, building, or other improvements made on a tract quickly increased the selling price of the tract. The early deeds seldom if ever mentioned any of these improvements, but the price differential among some of the tracts is so great that improvements certainly must have been made on the higher priced tracts. Residents, nonresidents, and the Southside's sojourners all participated in this practice of capitalizing on their plantation improvements.

---

20 Land Patent Books 16-29; Amelia County Deed Books 1-3.
and they apparently found a ready market for this type of sale. The marketability of this land may have contributed to the mobility of the area's inhabitants as well as providing economic alternatives to growing staples for export. Tables 8-11 in Chapter III contain figures that indicate Southsiders bought land where improvements had been made.

The Amelia records also disclose the value of the improvements that were accepted as meeting the seating requirements for saving patented land and boosting the value of the land. In 1744, John Gilliam requested that the improvements made on his 934 acres on the heads of West Creek be valued. The court appointed four individuals who appraised the improvements as follows:21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5450 fence Bales in a fence</td>
<td>£ 9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Punchen House 22½ feet by 10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Home 20 feet by 16</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ditto 12 by 8</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 Apple Trees</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477 Dl Small in a Nursery</td>
<td>11.18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Pear Trees</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Cherry Trees</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Small Peach Trees in a Nursery</td>
<td>3.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mortar and Sweep</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Large Pewter Dishes</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Iron Pott 6/ 1 Gun 10/</td>
<td>16.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Hoes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000 Cornhills Containing abt 17 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Head of Neat Cattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sheep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following year an appraisement was made on the improvements accomplished on 1,053 acres of Edward Booker, Jr., along Deep Creek. Again buildings were valued along with

---

21 Amelia County Land Causes, 1744-1763.
seven and one half acres "Cultivated & Improved" with "Fencing." In another appraisement made in Amelia County in 1742, the improvements on David Crawford's plantation on Stocks Creek were returned as follows.

To foire hundred and Eighty panills in a fence...£20
To one House Eight foot Square................... 2
To one Logg House Twenty by Twelve............... 8
To one Dwelling House Twenty-two by Twelve..... 13.10
To Dary......................................... 1
To one Homeney Mortar & two pesills............... 1.10
To one Lumb and Worping box and Table and Ladon 6
To nine Thousand Cornholes........................ 70
To Five thousand Cornholes half grub............... 30
To Mare and Colt..................................... 10
To Two thousand Tob° hills.......................... 10
To Three thousand Tob° and Cotton hills........... 30.10
Ninety Apple Trees.................................. 3.10

£206.

Eleven head of Black Cattle not valued

It is unlikely that much more than fifteen or sixteen acres of Crawford's plantation had actually been cleared and put under cultivation. One estimate of land clearing requirements in terms of time and labor for a later period claims that at least thirteen man-days per acre were required even with the cheaper method of girdling trees, a practice adopted widely in the South. An advertisement for land to be sold in Lunenburg County appearing in the Virginia Gazette in 1751 described 325 acres, "about 20 of

---

22 Ibid.
23 Amelia County Order Book 1, fol. 217.
which are cleared, it having been seated many years ago."  
This would again indicate how long and hard was the task of settlement, and helps explain why some were willing to pay for such improvements.

The buying and selling of land in the Southside was an activity which kept the county clerks busy recording deeds. But in contrast to at least one New England town during the same period, land did not turn over as rapidly in the Southside. Charles S. Grant found that the original fifty-three lots in Kent, Connecticut, exchanged hands at an average of over four times each between 1738 and 1760.  

Kent's population-to-land ratio was much higher than the Southside's, but there are a few examples of frequent land turnovers appearing in the area's records. In 1739, John New, a Brunswick County carpenter, patented 186 acres along a little branch of Fountains Creek near the North Carolina line. In November, 1741, New sold the tract to two North Carolinians, William and Robert Southerland along with a gristmill and its accouterments. New received £45 from this transaction. The Southerlands, who by 1744 were residents of Brunswick, sold the 186 acres but apparently not the mill to Absolem Atkinson, a school master of Isle of Wight County for £30. He in

25 Virginia Gazette, August 3, 1751.

turn, traded the land to John Tooke of Brunswick, his cousin and a blacksmith by trade, in exchange for 200 acres. Both of the traded tracts were valued at £50 in the deeds recorded in July, 1745.27 Thus, within six years the tract had four different sets of owners. Another Brunswick tract, originally patented in 1718 had five different proprietors by 1738.28

While much of the Southside land remained in fewer hands, the frequency of turnover of many tracts reveals the importance of land sales in the local economy. It is not possible to quantitatively assess or measure the importance of these land sales and speculations in the economy of the locale, but many individuals participated in the practice and diversified their economic livelihood as a result.

Besides land speculation there were a number of other activities which individuals could follow which did diversify or provide the basis for their economic endeavors. The constant influx of new settlers into the Southside created markets for goods and services needed to set up a farm or plantation. Many of these immigrants to the Southside brought most of their needed supplies with them or purchased tracts which had already been developed with the

---

28Brunswick County Deed Book 1, 454-457.
rudiments of settlement. Those who did not follow this procedure found that trees for orchards had to be obtained and planted, wells dug or springs tapped, land cleared and some of it fenced, and basic shelters constructed. In addition, livestock had to be purchased in some cases along with seed grain and perhaps even tobacco seedlings.

Many of these needs could have been met by settling near relatives or former neighbors. But other Southsiders could have provided the same needs. Fruit trees for orchards, for example, had to be obtained, planted, and fenced from the livestock. The importance of fruit trees in providing fruit, drinks such as cider and brandy, and even forage for hogs is obvious, but one considered so necessary that lessees were required to plant and maintain an orchard to fulfill the conditions of their lease. From the list of improvements made by Ephraim Dickens on his tract, it would appear that this Amelia County planter had nothing but a house, some tools, and 434 fruit trees.29 There is no mention made of land cleared, fenced, or prepared for crops. There is a possibility that Dickens was a distiller, but on the other hand, he might have been a nurseryman supplying new arrivals with needed fruit trees. Even if he were a distiller, spirits found a ready market in the Southside, too.

29 Amelia County Deed Book 3, 7; Land Causes, 1744-1763.
Many other Southsiders supplemented their incomes by taking odd jobs or working at tasks other than or connected with the growing and exporting of staples. It was possible to get work carting tobacco to the warehouses, plowing fields, harvesting corn and wheat crops, and driving hogs and cattle from quarter to plantation or market. Other more unusual opportunities were also present. In Brunswick County, John Mason, Jr., had hired Thomas Jones to catch wild horses in two pens built by Mason. Jones was to tend the horses caught and the two men would split the number of horses between them or the proceeds from their sale. It also appears that a certain amount of bounty hunting resulted from the presence of runaway servants and slaves who traversed the Southside. Michael Wall, a prominent Brunswick County resident, had learned the whereabouts of a runaway mulatto named George Wynne belonging to Benjamin Harrison. Wall offered Arthur Jordan one pistole if he would capture Wynne, but Jordan took Wynne straight to Harrison and collected the larger reward of three pistoles and two hundred pounds of tobacco. Wall then sued Jordan in the Brunswick court and won his case.

30 Examples of these activities can be found in Brunswick County Will Book 3, 105-105; Will Book 2, 50; Amelia County Loose Papers, 1737-1757.

31 Brunswick County Order Book 1, 204.

32 Ibid., 351. There was a legal reward set by law but the owners of many runaway servants and slaves paid an additional bounty. The legal reward was claimed in the county court.
Other forms of economic activity were also present in the Southside. An occasional pedlar and Indian trader traversed the area. In the earlier years of the century trade with the Indians, both in Virginia and with the Catawbas to the South, was an ongoing activity. However, the spread of settlement and the development of a similar trade in the Carolinas reduced the role of the Virginian who crossed the Southside on the Trading Path.\textsuperscript{33} Some Southsiders speculated in a copper mine, and along the banks of the James Prince George residents built boats and sloops, but this was an aberration in the heavily agricultural economy of the section as was the infrequent bakery that produced ship biscuit.\textsuperscript{34}

In a young, frontier economy like the Southside's it would be natural to assume that many of the settlers ran mostly self-sustaining operations. However, the accounts of estates and the yearly returns of plantation life found in the orphan's records reveal the importance of the craftsman in the local economy, though this may have been a

\textsuperscript{33}Amelia County Deed Book 1, 540; Verner W. Crane, \textit{The Southern Frontier} 1670-1732 (Ann Arbor, 1929, reprinted in paperback 1959) 204-205; Stitt Robinson, "Virginia and the Cherokees, Indian Policy from Spotswood to Dinwiddie."

\textsuperscript{34}Brunswick County Deed Book 1, 196-209; Prince George County Deeds, Willis, etc., 1714-1728, 519-520; \textit{Virginia Gazette}, January 17, 1751. There is no evidence that the copper mine near the Roanoke River was ever worked during this period or even later.
luxury afforded by only the richer planter. The record of William Crawley's estate between 1738 and 1741 reveals a heavy reliance on craftsmen. Crawley's estate in 1738 included 3,773 acres in Amelia County and 761 acres in Prince George County on which quitrents were paid. In 1741, the administrator of the estate paid taxes on fourteen tithables, so there was no lack of labor. But in these same years wages were paid to a bricklayer, a sadler, two shoemakers, a blacksmith, two tailors, and at least two carpenters. In addition, another individual was paid for making six chairs, one other for repairing the dwellings, and one person for supplying the estate with 208 shads.\textsuperscript{35}

Most of the craftsmen in the Southside appear to have been whites who also dabbled in planting. There is also some evidence that slaves had been trained in crafts and trades. Slaves briefly appear in the records as millers, carpenters, sawyers, cooks, and blacksmiths.\textsuperscript{36}

What wages the Southsider gained from various activities is hard to discern. Daniel Vixon, a carpenter sent over to Amelia County by Christopher Smyth, a London Merchant, was paid £10 a year. Room and board does not

\textsuperscript{35}Amelia County Loose Papers, 1737-1757.

\textsuperscript{36}Brunswick County Deed Book 2, 375-376; \textit{Virginia Gazette} June 6, 1745; April 25, 1751.
appear to have been included in his wages. 37 Joseph Jennaway, a servant to Joseph Scott, agreed to relinquish any claims he had to freedom dues in exchange for leaving Scott's estate three months early. 38 Freedom dues at this time were set at £3.10 indicating that Jennaway and Scott's executors were willing to settle their bargain at the rate of about £1.3.4 per month, or the equivalent of being paid at £15.4.0 per year. 39 Slaves were hired out at about £5 annually but the lessee appears to have had to feed and clothe them. One Southsider was credited with £1.6.0 towards payment of a debt for thirteen days of work, while another received £1.8.5 for spending twenty-three days "in securing the last year's crop." 40 At this rate few individuals were going to get rich.

Because of the local importance of grain one of the more important and apparently profitable economic services which Southsiders depended upon was milling. Frequent applications for permission to build a mill and acquire additional land for a mill pond from a neighbor across

37 Amelia County Order Book 1,111.
38 Amelia County Order Book 2, fol. 120.
40 Amelia County Loose Papers, 1737-1757; Brunswick County Will Book 3, 104-105.
the creek through purchase and court order appear in the county order books. Most of these applications were granted, but a few were rejected because of their close proximity to existing mills. The people who applied for permission to have a mill tended to represent the more wealthy segment of the Southside's population. In the four years following Lunenburg's creation in 1746, twelve individuals who appear on the 1750 county tithable lists had been given permission to build a mill. Five of the twelve held appointive office of higher rank than a road surveyor, while eight of the twelve were tithable slave owners. In Amelia County there were thirteen people who had been given the right to construct a mill and who appeared on the county's tithable lists for 1749. Five of the thirteen held offices of higher rank than a road surveyor, and twelve of the thirteen were tithable slave owners. There is some evidence to indicate that a mill was worth about £40, so it took some capital and labor to be able to enter into the business.

Another economic activity controlled by the county court was keeping a tavern or ordinary. Entrepreneurs of this sort were required to renew their licenses

41 Lunenburg County Order Book 1-2; Tithable Lists, 1750.
42 Amelia County Order Books 1-2; Tithable Lists, 1749.
annually and were forced to sell within prices set by the court for drink, food, lodging, and fodder for livestock. At least twenty-six individuals had been licensed in Amelia County to operate an ordinary at sometime between 1735 and 1749, while twelve individuals were granted the privilege in Lunenburg County between 1746 and 1750. Twenty-two of the twenty-six Amelia tavern operators and seven of the twelve Lunenburg ordinary keepers owned tithable slaves, again indicating the relatively higher economic standing of these individuals.  

Most of the Southsiders, however, were planters or farmers who attempted to raise and produce their own needs and to sell their surplus and cash crops on various markets. What they did sell, in addition to land, labor, and capital improvements was a variety of crops and products. The growing of tobacco quickly broadened the market horizons of the Southsider and brought him into contact with nonresident merchants and factors, who in turn supplied him with the manufactured necessities of life.

The avenues of tobacco marketing for the Southside can be partly traced through the laws defining which tobacco warehouse notes were acceptable for payment of taxes and fees in the various Southside counties after 1730. Prince George County, of course, had several

---

43 Ibid.; Lunenburg County Order Books, 1-2; Tithable Lists, 1750.
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warehouses situated within its boundaries on the James and Appomattox Rivers. At different times during the first half of the century, Jordan's, Maycoxes, Bolling's, and Blandford served as warehousing and transhipment points. In addition, Cabin Point in Surry County, and Warwick and Bermuda Hundred on the James below Richmond also serviced Prince George Southsiders. Brunswick's residents were able to pay their taxes in tobacco notes from Lawrence's warehouse in Nansemond County after 1736, but after 1753 were not allowed to use any warehouse notes from sites below Gray's Creek on the James River in Surry County. The more western settlers of the Southside used Blandford notes beginning in 1753 as well as warehouse notes from Warwick, Shockoes, Rocky Ridge, and Osbornes in the Richmond area.

These economic dealings took Southsider and merchant into situations which forced the merchants to frequently appear in the county records as suitors. Theophilus Pugh, a wealthy merchant situated in Nansemond County, found it necessary to sue several Brunswick citizens as did Theophilus Field, a prominent Prince George based merchant whose economic outreach touched individuals in all four existing Southside counties before 1750. Pugh apparently sent many of his purchases to Bristol, while Alexander

\[44\] Hening, Statutes Vol. IV, 382, 480; Vol. VI, 552.
Spaulding and John Lidderdale, based in Williamsburg, dealt with London mercantile houses. Richard Witton worked out of Warwick before going to Lunenburg and taking an active role in both mercantile and political affairs there. Warwick was also the site of transactions between Alexander Speirs and Company of Glasgow and many Southsiders. Walter Campbell ran something of a mercantile operation in Brunswick County along with a tavern, while William Howson worked the Amelia and Prince George areas. Most of the local merchants and factors seem to have concentrated on Prince George County's river banks: Lewis Parham and Samuel Gordon in Blandford; Roger Atkinson and Robert Stobo in infant Petersburg; Thomas Eldridge, Hugh Miller, and James Murray in unspecified Prince George locations; and John Hood at Flowerdew Hundred. Southsiders also made transactions with James Crosbie of Williamsburg, Robert Tucker, who appears to have operated out of Norfolk, and John Person of Southampton County. There were several other merchants who appear in Southside suits whose location cannot be determined, such as George Bell, Mathew Wells, Anthony Haynes, David Hunter, and John Coupland.45

45 The names of these merchants have been collected from the suits appearing in the respective county order books. Their locations appear in the order books, deed books, and in advertisements in the Virginia Gazette.
Many other Southsiders were sued directly by non-Virginia based merchants or their representatives. Christopher Smyth, Humphrey Bell, Neil Buchanen, John Noor Head, and Thomas Hyan were the heads of mercantile houses centered in London who bought and sold with Southsiders. Glasgow also had its representatives. Andrew and Archibald Buchanen, Robert and James Donald, Andrew Cochran, John Luke, Thomas Yule or Yuell, and Alexander Speir and their companies were part of the growing importance of the Scottish merchants in the Virginia export economy by mid-century. However, the network of stores run by firms such as William Cuningham and Company in later years had not yet infiltrated the Southside in an organized and extensive fashion.\footnote{For the organization of the merchants and their market operations see James H. Soltow, The Economic Role of Williamsburg (Williamsburg, 1965), and Robert P. Thompson, "The Merchant in Virginia, 1700-1775," (unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1955).}

It is not possible to separate the Southside's contributions from the other Virginia regions exporting their staples through the Upper James Naval District, but from the evidence that exists in the Southside records it would only be a question of proportion not of commodity. The export figures for this naval district show that in addition to the large numbers of tobacco hogsheads sent to Glasgow, London, Bristol, and other lesser British ports,
a sizable and constant trade in foodstuffs and lumber products were sent to other ports of the British Empire and southern Europe. Boston to the North and Georgia to the South, along with ports in Madiera, Bermuda, Barbadoes, Antigua, and Teneriffe received ships laden with staple products. Wheat, corn, pease, flour, and biscuit were all exported along with barrels of pork, smaller quantities of beef, and tallow. In addition, hardly a ship left the district without a quantity of pipe and barrel or hogshead staves and "smart hoops." The Southsiders exchanged these goods and their tobacco for sundry manufactured goods, large quantities of salt, fish, oil, and some slaves.\footnote{For this early period, the export/import activities of the Upper James Naval District were occasionally published in the Virginia Gazette. See the issues for May 18, August 10, and December 14, 1739; January 18, 1740; July 4, 1745; January 9, May 29, July 3, 1746; and September 29, 1752. See for example, David Klingaman, "The Significance of Grain in the Development of the Tobacco Colonies," Journal of Economic History, XXIX (1969) 268-278; and James F. Shepherd, "Commodity Exports from the British North American Colonies to Overseas Areas, 1768-1772: Magnitudes and Patterns of Trade," Explorations in Economic History, VIII (1970) 5-76.}

This is the pattern usually associated with the Virginia export/import economy. The importance of foodstuffs in the export sector has rightly been asserted in recent years by economic historians who have devised formulas to determine the relative value of the various exports and their proportionate place in the economy.\footnote{For this early period, the export/import activities of the Upper James Naval District were occasionally published in the Virginia Gazette. See the issues for May 18, August 10, and December 14, 1739; January 18, 1740; July 4, 1745; January 9, May 29, July 3, 1746; and September 29, 1752. See for example, David Klingaman, "The Significance of Grain in the Development of the Tobacco Colonies," Journal of Economic History, XXIX (1969) 268-278; and James F. Shepherd, "Commodity Exports from the British North American Colonies to Overseas Areas, 1768-1772: Magnitudes and Patterns of Trade," Explorations in Economic History, VIII (1970) 5-76.}
However, with the exception of the established Prince George planters, and the emerging plantation enterprises of the more settled areas of Amelia, Brunswick, and occasionally Lunenburg, many of the Southside's residents were probably relatively uninvolved with the operations of the export economy, especially that of tobacco. In these early years of settlement, it appears that locally consumed and exported foodstuffs were the most important products of the local economy. This is not to say that tobacco was not a part of the local economy, but rather that the annual value of the corn crop alone frequently equalled or exceeded the value of the tobacco crop even on the larger plantations.

The evidence for this assertion is found in the estate accounts and orphan's accounts extant for the area and period, as well as the estate inventories which infrequently contained the valuations of the various staples grown on Southside plantations. The inventory of Samuel Tatum's estate taken in Prince George in 1715 listed his corn crop valued at £10, his tobacco crop at £2.10.0, and a crop of cotton at £1. Tatum used at least five Indians for labor, although none of the five appears to have been an adult male.49

In Brunswick County, the inventory of William Lucas, the owner of seven slaves, was returned in 1742. His crops

49 Prince George County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1714-1728, 70.
included 4,622 pounds of tobacco, 150 barrels of corn, and 12 bushels of wheat. At two pence per pound his tobacco crop would have been worth about £39. From the valuations of the period, corn was inventoried at between five and ten shillings per barrel. At seven shillings per barrel, Lucas' crop of corn would have been worth around £52. In Lunenburg County, an inventory returned in March, 1754 for the estate of John Brown who owned two slaves reported no tobacco at all. Instead, a variety of grains were listed including 30 barrels of corn, 10 bushels of wheat, 8 bushels of rye, and 5 bushels each of barley and oats. Brown also had 30 pounds of flax inventoried as part of the estate.

The annual returns of the accounts of orphan's estates contain more detailed information on local plantation life. Fortunately, some of these records have survived for a few plantations in Brunswick County. One of the more detailed sets is for the estate left by Daniel Hicks to his children, Thomas, Daniel, Benjamin, and Mary. When the father died, sometime between December, 1734 and April, 1735, he left a personal estate valued at £355.14.9, of which thirteen slaves accounted for £236. Beginning in 1741, the orphans' guardian began returning accounts of

---

50 Brunswick County Will Book 2, 46-47.
51 Lunenburg County Will Book 1, 116-117.
52 Brunswick County Will Book 1, 168-194-196.
the estate to the county court. In 1741, the tobacco crop was valued at £24.3.4 for 2,900 pounds of the weed. In the same year, seventy-five barrels of corn were sold valued at £18.15.0, but in addition, sixty barrels of corn were fed to the slaves valued at £15.\textsuperscript{53} It is not clear whether or not the corn the slaves consumed was purchased or grown on the Hicks estate. It seems unlikely that sixty barrels would have been purchased while seventy-five more barrels were sold, especially since the valuation per barrel was the same for both quantities.

In succeeding years the ratio between the value of the corn crop and the marketable tobacco varied in the Hicks estate returns. Both corn and tobacco crops soon lost importance, for by 1748 and 1749 the income the orphans received came solely from the rent of the plantation and the slaves.\textsuperscript{54} Other orphans in Brunswick County also gained a living from the leasing of their slaves. For instance, William Lucas, the orphan of John Lucas, had his estate credited with £22.3.10 for the hiring of his slaves between 1747 and 1751. During these same years, he also received £13.5.0 for 1,891 pounds of tobacco sold, £3.17.11 for the sale of 765 pounds of pork, £1.12.0 for corn sold, and £7.7.2 for the selling of beef. In 1745 the Lucas

\textsuperscript{53} Brunswick County Orphans Book 1, 7-9.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 27-29.
estate had received £18.14.1 for the sale of pork and beef, and only £2.17.11\(\frac{1}{2}\) for the sale of tobacco.\(^{55}\) In terms of its importance on the Southside plantation and its market operations, tobacco played an important but not dominant role. The production of other staples for both home consumption, local trade, and even exportation was an important part of the Southside’s economy as well.

The accounts of the orphans’ estates also reveal many other facets of the economic life of a Southside plantation. For the people who owned slaves, the clothing and feeding of them constituted a sizable part of the plantation’s annual expenditures. The Hicks estate account reveals that from £0.10.10 to £1.10.0 was spent annually on the clothing of each slave. In addition, a midwife had to be paid for assisting at least one of the female slaves every year to give birth. The costs of the Hicks plantation were also increased because the pork that was used “for raising of ye small Negro’s” added additional expenditures to the normal diet of corn provided the older slaves. Just how long this preferential treatment lasted is not possible to tell. Not including taxes, the Hicks estate spent at least £31.10.9 on its slaves out of a total expenditure of £58.1.11 between February, 1741 and February, 1742. The total value of the crops

\(^{55}\)Ibid., 16-17, 19.
Table 13

Tithable Slave Distribution Among Resident Tithepayers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Slaves Held</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Resident Owners</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Tithable Slaves in County</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Resident Slave Owners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Resident Tithepayers</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Amelia County 1749

B. Lunenburg County 1750

| No. of Resident Owners | 312 | 94 | 46 | 25 | 11 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1,012 |
| % of Tithable Slaves in County | 0 | 12.1 | 11.8 | 9.6 | 5.6 | 6.4 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 9.6 | 63.0 |
| % of Resident Slave Owners | 0 | 47.0 | 23.0 | 12.5 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 100.0 |
| % of Resident Tithepayers | 80.2 | 9.3 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.0 | .4 | .3 | .2 | .5 | 100.0 |

Note: Table 13 was constructed from Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1749, and Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750.
sold during this same period of time was £43.13.4. The administrator, George Hicks, made up the difference.  

The degree to which an individual could participate in the export economy was largely determined by the amount of labor he controlled. Table 13 above reveals that 62 per cent of the resident selfpaying tithables owned no tithable slaves in Amelia County in 1749, and that over one third of those who did held only one tithable slave. In Lunenburg County in 1750, 80 per cent of the resident selfpaying tithables owned no tithable slaves and almost one half of those who did own a tithable slave had only one. The opportunities for most individuals to participate heavily in the export economy were thus restricted. What was produced and exported tended to be in small quantities from the Southside.

What should also be noted about the slave distribution in Amelia and Lunenburg Counties is that nonresidents owned 31 per cent and 37 per cent of the tithable slaves in the two respective counties. This situation and the distribution of slaves among the nonresident slave owners can be seen in Table 14 below. What these figures indicate is that a sizable proportion of the economic development occurring in these two counties was controlled by outsiders. In terms of the total amount of labor controlled by nonresidents, the 101 nonresidents responsible for tithes in

---

56 Ibid., 7-9.
Table 1

Tithable Slave Distribution Among Nonresident Owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Slaves Held</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Owners</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Tithable Slaves in County</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Lunenburg County 1750

| No. of Owners | 12  | 15  | 4   | 8   | 3   | 1   | 2   | 0  | 8  | 53    |
| % of Tithable Slaves in County | 1.5 | 3.8 | 1.5 | 4.1 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 0  | 21.5| 36.9 |

Note: Table 1 was constructed from Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1749, and Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750.
Amelia County in 1749 held a total of 525 or 21 per cent of the 2,539 tithables present in the county. In Lunenburg County in 1750, nonresident tithepayers totaled 53. These people held 338 or 16 per cent of the 2,119 tithables present in the county. In addition, there were other nonresident land owners who were having their land developed by tenants who paid their own tithe, but the number of each cannot be determined from the tithable lists.

It should be noted that Indians as well as blacks were used as slaves in the Southside. The early records of Prince George County reveal the remnants of Indian slavery still in existence. As was noted above, Samuel Tatum of Prince George who died around 1715 had five Indians returned on the inventory list as part of his estate along with one old wench not specifically identified as an Indian. Collectively, the six were valued at £66. The "old lodging for Indians, blanket, and 2 hairy matchcoats" were valued at eight shillings so their quarters were not very substantial. None of the identified Indians were grown males, and this is the pattern in most of the other Prince George estates containing Indian slaves. In two of the Prince George estates where there was an adult

---

57 Amelia County Tithable Lists, 1749; Lunenburg County Tithable Lists, 1750.

58 Prince George County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1714-1728, 70.
Indian male slave included in the inventory, there were thirteen and sixteen other Negro slaves.\textsuperscript{59} This could mean that these two Indians were being used as overseers, though there is no specific evidence to support this.

By mid-century Indian slavery had largely disappeared from the Southside, but William Mays of Lunenburg County did will seven Indian slaves to his heirs in 1751.\textsuperscript{60}

Because the individuals who owned slaves also tended to be the ones who controlled the servant population, many of the remaining Southsiders probably ran semi-subsistence level operations.\textsuperscript{61} Even if they were involved

\textsuperscript{59}Ibid., 355, 823.

\textsuperscript{60}Lunenburg County Will Book 1, 39-41.

\textsuperscript{61}It is commonly accepted by many historians that a purely subsistence level operation rarely if ever existed on the frontier. However, this term has continued to be used with little care for definition. For an attempt to do so, see Clifton B. Wharton, Jr., "Subsistence Agriculture: Concepts and Scope," in Subsistence Agriculture and Economic Development ed. Clifton B. Wharton, Jr., (Chicago, 1969) 12-20. Wharton defines a subsistence level operation as one in which "the fruits of an individual or group productive effort are directed more toward meeting immediate consumptive needs of production, without any or few intermediaries or exchange (barter or monetary)." The line between a "semi-subsistence" and a "semi-commercial" operation is a thin one and is drawn by Wharton at the marketing of more or less than 50 per cent of an operation's production. If more than 50 per cent of an individual's produce is sold, he becomes more commercial and vice-versa. It is unlikely that many of the Southside plantations sold over half of their total produce, but almost everyone appears to have sold something from time to time.
in the tobacco and grain markets, many found themselves having to barter for needed supplies and goods with local merchants and neighbors. What they used for barter is another indication of the produce of the Southside farm and plantation. By 1739, Mathew Cabiness of Amelia County had gone into debt to Charles Irby by purchasing several household items, some nails, and a horse to the extent of £6.19.5. Cabiness' account was credited with £5.19.10 because he had given to Irby, £1.0.5, 429 pounds of pork, 11 pounds of tallow, 26 pounds of bacon, a raw buckskin, a mare, an iron kettle, 2 ells of oznabrigs, 3½ pints of rum, and "½ of a hundred of sugar." In addition, Cabiness had been credited with £0.3.6 in a "swap," and six shillings for "Taller." 62 In another Amelia County case William Marshall sued Lawrence Brown for payment for 300 pounds of beef, 327 pounds of pork, one peck of salt, and the lending of 10 shillings. Brown was credited with 10 shillings on the debt for 500 clapboards and "nailing on." In other cases wheat, peas, leather, oats, small parcels of tobacco, day labor, and even the labor of a father's son were credited to various accounts.63

As in many frontier agricultural areas, the raising of livestock held an important place in the Southside

62 Amelia County Loose Papers, 1737-1757.
63 Ibid.; Brunswick County Will Book 3, 104-105.
economy because it was not dependent upon access to additional sources of labor. In addition, livestock could provide their own transportation to market, a factor that certainly appealed to the Southsider. Only the most impecunious person or those few unassociated with agriculture did not have some type of animal. From the estate inventories returned to Southside courts it appears that almost everyone had at least a horse. The individual who had only a horse usually had an estate valued at less than £15, with an average of 8 per cent of the Southside inventories falling into a "horses only" category.64

Estate inventories also reveal the livestock preferences of the early Southsiders. Of the inventories which listed livestock as part of the estate, 90 per cent of the 146 inventories returned to the Brunswick County court between 1732 and 1753 contained cattle ranging in numbers from 1 to over 76. The mean size of the Brunswick herds where specific numbers were given in the inventory was 16. Between 1714 and 1728, 89 per cent of the Prince George inventories listed cattle. Prince George herds varied from a single cow to 56 with a mean herd size of 12, the lowest of the four Southside counties. Lunenburg County

64 The data for this statement and the following paragraphs was compiled from Prince George County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1714-1728; Brunswick County Deeds, Wills, etc., 1732-1740 and Will Books 2-3; Amelia County Will Book 1; and Lunenburg County Will Book 1.
records show that 83 per cent of its 47 inventories with livestock contained cattle in herds ranging from 3 to 53, and with a herd mean of 14 between 1746 and 1753. The mean size of Amelia cattle herds was also 14. Amelia herds varied between 2 and 85, but only 78 per cent of the county's 90 inventories reveal cattle on estates returned to court between 1735 and 1753. Overall, there were not the large cattle herds anywhere in the Southside that have been associated with southern frontier economies, but cattle raising was widespread, providing meat and daily products for home larders and a staple for export.

Hog raising was also widely spread throughout the Southside with Brunswick County again the leader among the four counties. At least 84 per cent of the Brunswick estates had some swine around the plantation with a mean size of the herd at 26, the largest in the Southside. In terms of participation in the raising of hogs, Prince George growers again came next with 81 per cent of the estates having hogs, but again the county also had the lowest mean herd size, 15. Amelia County had a 63 per cent level of hog raising with a mean herd size of 20, while Lunenburg County inventories listed hogs in only 57 per cent of the estates, but with a mean herd size of 24 which was second only to Brunswick. One Brunswick planter had the largest herd of hogs with 142, while the largest herds the other counties could boast was 110 in Amelia, 98 in Prince George, and 74 in Lunenburg.
Sheep were less numerous in the Southside than either cattle or hogs. Almost one half of the Prince George estates listing livestock contained sheep, but the mean size of the Prince George herds was only 7. Inventories in Brunswick indicated that about 42 per cent of the plantations there raised sheep in herds with a mean size of 8. Both Amelia and Lunenburg County sheep growers had herds with a mean of 9, but only 28 per cent and 23 per cent of the inventories in the two counties respectively, revealed the presence of sheep on the individual plantations. The greatest deterrent to sheep raising on the frontier was wolves. Lunenburg County paid bounties to its residents for over one hundred wolves annually in the earliest years of the county's history. In addition, the practice of letting the plantation stock run wild through the woods fending for themselves probably destroyed the quality of the wool grown by the sheep.

In the more settled areas of the Southside, ducks, geese, turkeys, and a few chickens were also present. No oxen were listed in the inventories, or at least none were differentiated from the cattle. One unusual situation appeared in Prince George where Robert Birchett had tamed some deer and was raising them in a pen.\(^{65}\)

\(^{65}\)Prince George County Minute Book, 1737-1740, 99.
The raising of livestock was a widespread activity in the Southside. It permitted some economic diversification within the life of the plantation, required only the most rudimentary transportation facilities, if any, to get the product to market, and needed very little labor. Southsiders, like other Virginians, also felt the raising of livestock required very little attention and followed the practice of fencing their crops in and their livestock out to fare the best they could. As a result, the county courts became especially important as courts of record by registering the marks and ear croppings on the livestock of its residents. Another result was that little improvement in the size and quality of the livestock could be expected, for controlled breeding was out of the question. In one Amelia County inventory, the combined weight of three butchered steers totalled only 884 pounds. At this rate, the exporting of beef in large quantities would have quickly dissipated most Southside herds.

The economic life of these early years in the Southside was not dominated by the production of tobacco. Instead, a wide variety of activities and economic endeavors were pursued by individuals who were "on the make." Speculation in land, capital improvements, and the expectation of a continued influx of settlers into the area gave Southsider

66 Amelia County Will Book 1, 92.
and nonresident alike, opportunities to dispose of land, rudimentary clearings, buildings, and commodities needed for settling on the Southside frontier. Milling, ordinary keeping, and ferrying were used by some to supplement incomes, while a very few individuals engaged in ship building and the mercantile activities connected with the import/export trade of the region.

A variety of odd jobs gave the less skilled individual a chance to diversify the sources of his income, and the Southside afforded a place for the craftsman, too. However, wages do not seem to have been especially high for this type of work. Most income was derived from the selling of locally produced staples. Corn and other grains held an important place in the Southside's local and export economy as did the more usual Virginia export commodity, tobacco. But the extent to which the Southsider could actually involve his economic activities in the export trade depended on his access to labor, a factor which seriously limited the participation of the Southsider. Much of the labor was controlled by nonresidents, who played an active role in the economic development of the area. The difficulties of transportation and the resulting higher social overhead expenditures also hindered the Southsiders' efforts to export his commodities.
However, the rapid influx of settlers into the Southside was just beginning to have its effects by mid-century. Roger Atkinson, a factor stationed in Petersburg, reported in 1769 that the number of tobacco hogsheads sent to Appomattox warehouses had increased from 500 to 10,000 in twenty years. Thus, the export sector was just beginning to grow in the Southside during these earlier years, and within a short time the Southside would become the Virginia stronghold of tobacco growing, a distinction it retains to this day.67

The local economic activities and orientation of many Southsiders probably reinforced their localism and limited their contacts with the outside world. The necessities of creating a viable settlement on the frontier occupied the hands of the Southsider and diverted any potential interest in colony or empire affairs, though this would soon change with the outbreak of the French and Indian War. The overall willingness of the Virginia Assembly to create new counties and parishes for the convenience of the frontiersmen eliminated a potential source of agitation which was not avoided in the Old Dominion's sister colonies to the South. When the Southsider did turn his attention to the Assembly, it was the result of what was considered a local

67 Thompson, "The Virginia Merchant," 34.
malpractice, the overzealous collection of taxes, or a reaction to having to haul his tobacco to remote warehouse inspection sites, where the produce of his labors fell victim to the whims of the inspector, a requirement felt by some of the poorer sort to discriminate against them. But again, the colony and crown seldom interfered with the Southsider, and the door was left open for exploitation and the development of the existing resources.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

Recent investigations into the societies of Early America have revealed an inner dynamic to the process of development and growth and observable long range trends. The results of these studies stand in contrast to previous works which largely approached the study of colonial society as if it were stable and even static. While reviewing some of these recent local studies of New England towns, James A. Henretta has suggested that early New England passed through three phases in the morphology of its society. The first of these is what he refers to as a "traditional" stage. It is characterized as patriarchal, hierarchal, and stable. The community is run by an elite, families are well controlled by the father, and there is little geographical mobility. This stage is gradually replaced by a second, expansive phase, with a decrease in patriarchal and elitist control and an increase in geographic mobility. The last stage of development in Henretta's scheme reveals a static society where population pressure has proven to be too great for the available resources and the growth and expansion of the society levels off and in some cases actually begins to decline. Following the findings of Charles Grant and
Kenneth Lockridge, Henretta suggests that the latter situation was emerging in New England towns by the time of the American revolution.  

Like many conceptualizations, Henretta's phases of development are broad and vague, but they do provide a rough standard by which the Southside's society can be compared. Like the early years of a New England town, the settlements along the south bank of the James and Appomattox Rivers at the turn of the eighteenth century appear to have been rather stable. It is not possible to judge the extent of patriarchal control, but the local reins of government were certainly held by an elite. This rather stable situation appears to have been the norm until around 1730 when ever larger numbers of immigrants moved into the area and pushed settlement into the more remote reaches of the Southside. This stage in the Southside's development was marked by high rates of geographic mobility, but unlike the similar period in the morphology of New England society, the elite maintained its control over the local agencies of government. This, of course, was partly the result of the different types of local government in the two areas and in the means by which the local officials were selected. By midcentury, the Southside still had a long way to go before

---

1Henretta, "The Morphology of New England Society."
it could be considered a static society. And here, the difference is partly to be found in the contrasting settlement patterns of the two areas. For all practical purposes, the original disposal of the land to individuals by the provincial government rather than to a collection of people who aimed at founding a town meant that the Southsider never faced the local control over the distribution of land that the resident of a New England town did. The open-ended Virginia frontier and the dispersed population within the more settled areas provided a potentially longer time before population growth would place pressure on existing resources, although the growing of tobacco and poor husbandry accelerated this trend even in the Southside.

Studies in the structure of colonial society and societal development have also uncovered other changes that accompany the maturing of a society. It has been argued that economic and social development brings or is reflected in the growing concentration of wealth into fewer hands and an increase in the proportion of the population which holds the least amount of wealth. It is not exactly a case of the rich getting richer and the poor becoming poorer, since many of the less affluent colonists did better their position. However, as Aubrey Land has noted, the poorer sort had
the longest and hardest steps to take to improve their economic and social status.\(^2\)

The Southside's wealth had been inequitably distributed from the very beginnings of settlement and this situation remained throughout the first half of the century. Economic development did bring some increases in the amounts of total wealth held by the wealthiest and in the numbers of dependent adult males in the tithable population. Although there are no property, tax, or other lists spaced far enough apart to judge the degree of change between the beginning and mid-century, preliminary research in available tax and property lists for the Southside counties in the 1780's appears to substantiate the findings of the studies mentioned above.

Another similarity between the Southside and other areas of early America exists in the localistic orientation of the early American. The recent emphasis on local, even microscopic analysis of segments of colonial society has carried with it the implicit presupposition that the local affairs and patterns of activity of the colonists were an important level of life. Even recent studies on the provincial level have emphasized the localistic orientation of

the early settlers. Patricia U. Bonomi, for example, has noted that localism was a prominent force in colonial New York because of the early failure of the provincial government to establish central control over the local institutions of government. In Virginia the Assembly constantly delegated powers and responsibilities to the county court, thereby increasing the latter's importance and focusing the Virginian's attention more and more on the local level of government. Along with the increasing importance of the county court, a situation developed at about the turn of the eighteenth century where the candidates for the House of Burgesses were finding it necessary to pay close attention to the local needs and demands of their constituents to get elected. The one notable exception to this localism was South Carolina, where the Assembly kept tight control of even the most mundane matters of local administration.3

In contrast to the early days of the New England town where social control and law enforcement were relatively easy because of the close proximity of the inhabitants, the dispersed population of the Southside and the huge counties that existed on the frontier placed serious disadvantages on local enforcement officials and created a

situation that allowed the Southsider to do much as he pleased. In addition, because the local officials themselves appear to have been interested in ignoring whatever legal requirements they could in terms of taking up land, there was little attempt on their part to enforce the unenforceable. This probably contributed to greater harmony in the local society between citizen and official, but the result was a willingness to subvert provincial authority and law which may have carried into later periods of the Southside's history and contributed to its distinct character.

The dispersed frontier society that existed in the Southside during this period also possessed characteristics common to other frontier societies. Life for many Southsiders was raw, rugged, elemental, and far from genteel in material terms. Cases of adultery and bastardy, assault and battery, swearing and drunkeness dot the area's records, and the names given by the Southsider to the topographical features around him also reveal the elemental nature of life on the Southside.

Southside society was also unstable after about 1730 because of the rapid influx of settlers which offset the loss

---

For a description of another frontier society see Richard Maxwell Brown, *The South Carolina Regulators* (Cambridge, 1963), Chapter II.
of tithables through death and immigration and caused an annual increase in the tithable population of about 10 percent each year. In 1703, there had been only 1,016 tithables in the Southside, but by 1755 the total had climbed to 13,219 or an estimated total population of about 39,000 people. The new arrivals in the Southside helped make the Southsider more mobile because the latter was then able to sell his land and improvements to the immigrant enabling the Southsider to become an immigrant. The constant influx of new settlers also helped orient the young economy toward meeting some of the needs facing the new arrivals. Staples such as corn, beef, pork, timber, and other products like fruit trees which could flourish on both the local and export level in addition to tobacco were grown and marketed in and from the area. The immigration into the area also created markets for land speculation, although this did not exist on the grandiose scale in the Southside that it did in some other areas of Virginia.

The Southside was the last section of the Virginia piedmont settled in the eighteenth century. Its relatively late settlement meant that the area could take full advantage of the burgeoning Virginia population which quickly moved into the region from nearby counties and elsewhere. The result of this rapid growth was a society that was willing and able to ignore the law when possible or deemed necessary, crude and elemental in life style, socially and
economically local in outlook, highly mobile, and with little pretense of frontier equality. The later but rapid development of the Southside also meant that the area was just coming into its own on the eve of the revolution. By that time it was quickly becoming the leading tobacco producing section of Virginia, thus basing much of its economic life on a staple which the rest of settled Virginia was abandoning. In terms of its economy then, the Southside's later development meant that it was the area most like old colonial Virginia. Perhaps in this and in the unstable, lawless, localistic, and rapidly growing society can be found the origins of the Virginia Southside.
APPENDIX A

This document is the most complete, yet concise contemporary description of the way land was taken up by the patent process. Not all of the fees listed below are applicable to the Southside situation because it lay east of the mountains. The document is to be found in C. 0. 5/113 fol. 194, endorsed at no. 13 in Lieutenant-Governor Francis Fauquier's correspondence of May 20, 1767. It was kindly pointed out to me by George H. Reese of the University of Virginia.

The Method and Expences attending the taking up, and settling of Lands in Virginia

Whoever inclines to take up any Quantity of Land not exceeding 400 Acres, may enter for the same with the Surveyor of the County, in which the Land lies, who can furnish Rights for the same; if a larger Quantity of Land is wanted, He must Petition the Governor and Council; for which Petition and the Order of Council consequent thereupon, the Clerk of the Virginia Currency 6/8 per oz.

Board has a fee of £ 10.9
For entering the Order of Council in the Auditor's Office £ 5.9
For 20 Rights at 5/ Sterling each is £5 Sterling or 6.5.0

Now, a Right is no more than a Certificate from the Officers of his Majesty's Revenue, signifying that A. B. hath paid 5/ Sterling as the Purchase Money for 50 Acres of his Majesty's Land. Upon producing the Order of Council and these Rights or Certificates to the Surveyor of the County in which the Land lies, He is obliged to survey as soon as
his prior Engagments in Business of this Sort will permit; for which he hath a Fee of 500 lb. Tobacco which by Law is settled at 4d per lb. in the Counties beyond the Mountains and comes to 1.11.3

After the Survey is finished, the party is obliged to carry a Platt of Land, within three Months to the Secretary's Office, in Order to obtain a Patent, the charge of which is to the Governor for the Great Seal 1.1.6

To the Secretary for making out the Patent on Parchment and recording the same in his office 10.6

Virginia Currency £10.4.9

If the Survey contains above 1000 Acres, the Surveyor's Fee is 30 lb. of Tobacco for every hundred Acres above that Quantity; and there is no other Difference between the Ex­ pense of paten(t)ing a large Tract of Land and the smallest, except in this Fee of the Surveyor, and in the Rights or Purchase Money of 5/ for each 50 Acres as above. The Patentee holds his 1000 Acres of Land in fee simple, from the date of his Patent, upon paying annually a Quit Rent to the King of 2/ Sterling for each hundred Acres: Yet there is a Clause in the Patent declaring the Land to be forfeited, and to revert to the King, in case the Quit-Rent shall remain unpaid for three years together. The Law likewise requires under pain of the like forfeiture, that three Acres of every 50 Acres shall within three Years after the Date of the Patent be cleared tended and worked or there shall be cleared and drained three Acres of Swamp, sunken Ground, or Marsh; or there shall be put and kept on the Land three Neat Cattle, or six Sheep or Goats for the Term of three Years; or if any Patentee or Proprietor shall within three Years, begin to work in digging any Stone Quarry, Coal, or other Mine, and continue the same for three Years; This shall save 100 Acres, or, three Acres cleared, fenced and kept for three Years for Pasture, saves 50 Acres; And for whatever sums of Money the Patentee shall expend in the building of Houses, Mills, or other Works, or in planting Trees, or making Quick-set Hedges or any other Improvements; for every five Pounds so expended he saves 50 Acres.
APPENDIX B

The following is a reproduction of the votes cast for candidates for the House of Burgesses in Brunswick County in 1748. It has been somewhat simplified. The original can be found in Brunswick County Deed Book 3, 510-518.

Burgesses a pole of their Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col° John Wall</th>
<th>Henry Ledbetter</th>
<th>John Steed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Brewer</td>
<td>James Upchurch</td>
<td>George Wyche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Wright</td>
<td>John Tooke</td>
<td>William Huff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Vincent</td>
<td>Henry Cooke</td>
<td>Valentine White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ogburn</td>
<td>John Vincent</td>
<td>Lawrence House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninian Mitchel</td>
<td>William Moseley</td>
<td>Charles Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Davis</td>
<td>John Betty</td>
<td>William Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Massie</td>
<td>William Wawmock</td>
<td>Daniel Cato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Harris</td>
<td>John Irby</td>
<td>William Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richd Ledbetter</td>
<td>William Wyches</td>
<td>Thomas Collier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Deloach</td>
<td>William Betty</td>
<td>William Ren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lizwel Sexton</td>
<td>John Jackson</td>
<td>George Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Carter</td>
<td>William McKnight</td>
<td>Timothy Rives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Powell</td>
<td>Nicholas Edmunds</td>
<td>John Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Jordan</td>
<td>George Walton</td>
<td>John Harwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Ezell</td>
<td>Eades Smith</td>
<td>James Lanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Peebles</td>
<td>Richard Hide</td>
<td>Peter Wyche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wise</td>
<td>James Jordan</td>
<td>Mattias Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Clark</td>
<td>Samuel Harwell</td>
<td>John Misheaux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Stuart</td>
<td>James Sexton</td>
<td>William Collier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Judkins</td>
<td>William House</td>
<td>Thomas Denton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Adams</td>
<td>John Cooker</td>
<td>Amos Horton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Burton</td>
<td>Thomas Vincent</td>
<td>William Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Clark</td>
<td>William White</td>
<td>Thomas Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomerlin</td>
<td>John Morgan</td>
<td>George Moseley?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lucas</td>
<td>William Johnson</td>
<td>Richd Ledbetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dunn</td>
<td>Joseph Hathcock</td>
<td>Edward Denton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Rives</td>
<td>Thomas Scizon</td>
<td>Nathaniel Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jeffris</td>
<td>George Rives</td>
<td>Benjamin Ivey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jacobs</td>
<td>William Lovsey</td>
<td>Thomas Clanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Douglas</td>
<td>Thomas Tatum</td>
<td>Aaron Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Massie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Jeffres</td>
<td>Joseph Massie</td>
<td>William Lovsey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fennal</td>
<td>Nathan Harris</td>
<td>Sam Cocke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerimiah Brown</td>
<td>Rich Ledbetter</td>
<td>Thomas Tatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Simms</td>
<td>Lizwell Sexton</td>
<td>George Wyche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Butts</td>
<td>Joseph Carter</td>
<td>William Huff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Sewel</td>
<td>Thomas Powell</td>
<td>Valentine White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Daniel</td>
<td>William Jordan</td>
<td>Lawrence House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lawrence</td>
<td>William Ezell</td>
<td>Charles Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Carrie</td>
<td>John Peebles</td>
<td>William Powel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>William Wise</td>
<td>Daniel Cato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brewer</td>
<td>Joshua Clark</td>
<td>William Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Barton</td>
<td>Charles Stuart</td>
<td>Thomas Collier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Rives</td>
<td>James Judkins</td>
<td>William Benn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walton</td>
<td>William Adams</td>
<td>Timothy Rives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Burnette</td>
<td>John Johnson</td>
<td>Peter Wycke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lunday</td>
<td>Nath Clark</td>
<td>Matt Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Mitchel</td>
<td>Thomas Tomlinson</td>
<td>William Ledbetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hicks</td>
<td>David Lucas</td>
<td>William Collier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Carril</td>
<td>John Dunn</td>
<td>Thos. Denton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Parham</td>
<td>Foster Rives</td>
<td>Amos Horton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Parks</td>
<td>Thomas Jefferies</td>
<td>William Smith (Little)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Williams</td>
<td>Thomas Jacobs</td>
<td>Thomas Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Collier</td>
<td>James Douglas</td>
<td>William Smith (again)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Morris</td>
<td>John Massie</td>
<td>Richard Ledbetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Fox</td>
<td>Henry Ledbetter</td>
<td>Edward Denton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Austin</td>
<td>James Upchurch</td>
<td>Nathaniel Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cato</td>
<td>John Tooke</td>
<td>Benjamin Ivey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daniel</td>
<td>Henry Cooke</td>
<td>Thomas Moseley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jackson</td>
<td>John Vinson</td>
<td>Aaron Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issac Collier</td>
<td>James Lanier</td>
<td>John Jefferies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ransom</td>
<td>William Pettaway</td>
<td>Jerimiah Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Whittington</td>
<td>John Betty</td>
<td>Ben Sewells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Clark</td>
<td>William Wawmock</td>
<td>Hugh Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Campbell</td>
<td>John Irby</td>
<td>Thomas Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell Brown</td>
<td>William Wycke</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wall Jr.</td>
<td>William Betty</td>
<td>William Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carril (sworn)</td>
<td>John Jackson</td>
<td>William Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wall Jr.</td>
<td>Geo Wallton</td>
<td>Thomas Reeves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Robinson</td>
<td>Eades Smith</td>
<td>John Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolem Atkinson</td>
<td>Rich Hide</td>
<td>Robert Lundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Goodrich</td>
<td>Edward Adams</td>
<td>Joseph Burnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lanier</td>
<td>James Jordan</td>
<td>William Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col Edwards</td>
<td>Samuel Harwell</td>
<td>James Parham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Brewer</td>
<td>James Sexton</td>
<td>Joseph Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Wright</td>
<td>William House</td>
<td>Thomas Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Vincent</td>
<td>John Cocker</td>
<td>Williams Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ogburn</td>
<td>Thomas Vincent</td>
<td>Thomas Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninian Mitchel</td>
<td>John Morgan</td>
<td>Nathaniel Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Davis</td>
<td>William Johnson</td>
<td>James Dupree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Hathcock</td>
<td>John Dupree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Reeves</td>
<td>John Cato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Dupree</td>
<td>Richd Hagood</td>
<td>Geo Cain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Austin</td>
<td>Randal Brasie</td>
<td>Aths Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard Farril</td>
<td>William Jones</td>
<td>John Duke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ransom</td>
<td>Augustine Hightower</td>
<td>Henry Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacct Peterson</td>
<td>Geo Tilman</td>
<td>David Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lucas</td>
<td>Stephen Caudle</td>
<td>John Steed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Yarburough</td>
<td>Mason Bishop</td>
<td>William Petty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benj Chapman Donaldson</td>
<td>Roger Reese (sworn)</td>
<td>William Handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Willis</td>
<td>Hubbard Quarles</td>
<td>William Wray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cooke</td>
<td>John Johnson</td>
<td>Benjamin Lanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Avant</td>
<td>John Avery</td>
<td>John Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hunt</td>
<td>William Brewer</td>
<td>Robert Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Clack</td>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>John Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwell Brown</td>
<td>Roger Reese (sworn)</td>
<td>Thomas Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carrell</td>
<td>Thomas Lanoir</td>
<td>John Handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolem Atkinson</td>
<td>William Lindsey</td>
<td>Charles Goulster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Scoggin</td>
<td>John Maclin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Green</td>
<td>William Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Deardan</td>
<td>Peter Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robt Dunkley</td>
<td>Isaac House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robt Cunnell</td>
<td>Geo Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hicks Jones</td>
<td>John Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry Bailey</td>
<td>John Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hugh Williams</td>
<td>Stephen Scizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Averice</td>
<td>Hinchy Mabry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Mosely</td>
<td>Richard Pepper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hezekiah Massie</td>
<td>Samuel Lanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owen Strange</td>
<td>John Mishau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Twitty</td>
<td>Charles King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>James Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tosias Floyd</td>
<td>William Ledbetter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Procter</td>
<td>George Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drury Malone (sworn)</td>
<td>Nathl Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geo Tilman, Jun.</td>
<td>Thomas Lloyd, Senr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francis Hagood</td>
<td>John Ingram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Hagood</td>
<td>Jesse Tatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Brooks</td>
<td>John Pettaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Birch</td>
<td>Jo: Mabry (sworn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Lambert</td>
<td>William Tilman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Proctor</td>
<td>Sampson Lanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sampson Caudle</td>
<td>Theof Blad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Gower</td>
<td>Richd Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Birch</td>
<td>William House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robt Gee</td>
<td>William Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Rigbie</td>
<td>Geo Mosely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francois Stainback</td>
<td>Thomas Clanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shep d Lanier</td>
<td>Thomas Mosely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curthbert Smith</td>
<td>Isaac Matthis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Stroud</td>
<td>John Fennel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William White</td>
<td>James Maclin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Crafts</td>
<td>John Ezell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward Hueland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| John Geo Pennington | John Burron | Hezekiah Massie |
| William Nance | William Duggar | Thomas Lloyd |
| William Bailey | John Rose | Lewelling Jones |
| Drury Robinson | John Robinson | Robert Christy |
| Daniel Taylor | Thomas Jackson | Thomas Bull |
| James Johnson | Charles Collier | Richard Hagood |
| Samuel Russell | George Stainback | Randall Brassie |
| John Johnson | William Robinson | William Jones |
| Peter Tatum | John Parker | Augustine Hightower |
| John Butts | William Eaton | George Tilman |
| Michael Young | John Douglas | Stephen Caulfield |
| Richard Russell | John Thornton | Mason Bishop |
| Thomas Jones | Henry Jackson | Hubbard Quarles |
| John Evans | Nathaniel Hicks | John Averie |
| Griffin Humphries | Henry Morris | William Brewer |
| George Clark | William Morris | William Smith |
| Richard Scogging | John Jackson | Roger Reece |
| John Moorton | David Walker | Abraham Burton |
| James Parrish | Hubbard Farril | Thomas Lanoir |
| William Scoggin | Jehue Peebles | William Lydssey |
| Rich't Burnett | John Collier | William Scogging |
| Edward Davis | Lewis Parham | William Green |
| Baxter Davis | James Moseley | Geo Dardin |
| Chris Tatum | Samuel Harwell | Bob't Cunnell |
| George Sims | Isaac Collier | Francis Lett |
| John Wall | William Pennington | Eix Jones |
| Rob't Reynolds | Samuel Cental | Henry Bailey |
| John Davis | Batt Peterson | Hugh Williams |
| Edward Robinson | John Jones | William Averice |
| Joseph Burnett | Thomas Johns | Hezekiah Massie |
| James Clack | Thomas Sadler | Owen Strange |
| Abraham Phenix | Charles Lucas | Thomas Twitty |
| Charles Matthis (sworn) | | |
| William Short | Benj C. Donaldson | William Smith |
| John Hagood | John Willis | John Sullivant |
| James Hicks | Nicholas Lanier | Jos Floyd |
| James Taply | Thomas Person | Thomas Proctor |
| John Johnson | William Samford | Drury Malone |
| William Williams | Sterling Clack | Geo Tilman |
| James Love | | Francis Hagood |
| James Parham | | Geo Hagood |
| John Edwards | Pole for Sterling Clack | Thomas Brooks |
| Thomas Hardway | William Wall | Richard Birch |
| Geo Scogging | Francis Deloah | William McKnight |
| Richard Yarburough | James Denman | Nicholas Edmunds |
| James Bennitt | Henry Embry | Sampson Caudle |
| William Edwards | John Moutry | John Lambert |
| Nicholas Lanier | Giles Kelley | Nicholas Proctor |
| Rob't Briggs | William McKenney | William Gower |
| Henry Simmons | William Maclin | John Birch |
| James McDaniel | | James Speed |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert Gee</th>
<th>Edward Hueland</th>
<th>John Parker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Bigbie</td>
<td>John Geo Pennington</td>
<td>William Eaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Stainback</td>
<td>William Nance</td>
<td>John Douglas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Adams</td>
<td>William Bailey</td>
<td>John Thornton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepard Lanier</td>
<td>Drury Robinson</td>
<td>Henry Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthbert Smith</td>
<td>Daniel Taylor</td>
<td>Henry Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stroud</td>
<td>James Johnson</td>
<td>William Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Crafts</td>
<td>Samuel Russell</td>
<td>John Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Scizon</td>
<td>John Johnson</td>
<td>David Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Cain</td>
<td>Peter Tatum</td>
<td>John Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanatious Robinson</td>
<td>Adam Sims</td>
<td>Jehue Peebles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Duke</td>
<td>Michael Young</td>
<td>John Collier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Jones</td>
<td>Richard Russell</td>
<td>Thomas Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sinclair</td>
<td>Thomas Jones</td>
<td>Lewis Parham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Cocke</td>
<td>Thomas Carril</td>
<td>James Moseley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Petty</td>
<td>John Evans</td>
<td>Hinchy Mabry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Randle</td>
<td>Griffin Humphris</td>
<td>Samuel Harwel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Wray</td>
<td>Geo Clark</td>
<td>William Pennington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Lanier</td>
<td>Richard Scogging</td>
<td>Samuel Coal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Moore</td>
<td>John Moreton</td>
<td>Baxt Petersen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hicks</td>
<td>James Parrish</td>
<td>John Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hicks</td>
<td>William Scogging</td>
<td>Thomas Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Harper</td>
<td>Edward Davis</td>
<td>Thomas Sadler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ray</td>
<td>Baxter Davis</td>
<td>William Whittington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harwell</td>
<td>Chris Tatum</td>
<td>John Yarbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dean</td>
<td>Geo Simms</td>
<td>Thomas Cock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Randle</td>
<td>John Wall</td>
<td>Nicho Lanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Goulster</td>
<td>Rob Reynolds</td>
<td>John Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Lanier</td>
<td>John Davis</td>
<td>Thomas Parson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Maclin</td>
<td>Edward Robinson</td>
<td>William Samford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Simmons</td>
<td>Abraham Phenix</td>
<td>John Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Read</td>
<td>James Clack</td>
<td>Drury Stith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac House</td>
<td>Charles Matthi</td>
<td>Edward Goodrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Clayton</td>
<td>William Short</td>
<td>Richd Lanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>John Bagood</td>
<td>John Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Tapley</td>
<td>Stephen Scizom</td>
<td>John Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinchy Mabry</td>
<td>Daniel Carril</td>
<td>Richard Pepper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>Samuel Lanier</td>
<td>William Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles King</td>
<td>James Love</td>
<td>James Cocke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Parham</td>
<td>Geo Wilson</td>
<td>John Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nath Harrison</td>
<td>Thomas Hardiway</td>
<td>Thomas Lloyd, Senr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo Scogging</td>
<td>John Ingram</td>
<td>Richd Yarbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Tatum</td>
<td>James Bennit</td>
<td>John Pettaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Edwards</td>
<td>Jo Mabry</td>
<td>Nicholas Lanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Tilman</td>
<td>Robt Briggs</td>
<td>Sam Lanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Simmons</td>
<td>Theod Eland</td>
<td>James McDaniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Swanson</td>
<td>John Burron</td>
<td>William Burron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William House</td>
<td>William Duggar</td>
<td>William Smith, Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith, Junior</td>
<td>John Rose</td>
<td>Isaac Matthi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Robinson</td>
<td>James Maclen</td>
<td>Thomas Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ezell</td>
<td>Geo Stainback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michael Wall Sherif

This 13th Day of June 1748 Michael Wall Sherif made Oath before me that this is a true copy taken for this County given under my hand this day above written. / John Willis
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