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ABSTRACT

The religious conversion and secular education of the native Indian population was a stated goal of English colonization in Virginia. After aborted efforts early in the seventeenth century, an Indian school was finally established as part of the new College of William and Mary through funds from the estate of Robert Boyle for "pious and charitable uses."

The school, known as Brafferton for the English estate whose revenues provided its income, began fitfully with little definition of its direction or method. Its students, young boys, came first from local tributary Indians and later from more distant tribes, often as a result of treaty negotiation between Virginia's English government and the Indian nations. The school's masters were most often recruited from the College's graduating divinity students. They taught the rudiments of reading and writing in the English language, arithmetic, and the Anglican catechism. Few Indians attended the school, and little of permanence was accomplished there. The College rarely promoted the school unless prompted to do so by outsiders.

This thesis attempts to outline the history of the Brafferton school, placing it in the broader political and religious context of eighteenth-century Virginia.
"SO GOOD A WORK":

THE BRAFFERTON SCHOOL, 1691–1777
CHAPTER I

FOUNDATIONS

Wild as they are, accept them, so were we
To make them civil, will our honour bee,
And if good works be the effect of minds
That like good Angels be, let our designs
As we are Angli, make us Angels too
No better work can Church or statesmen doe.

From the first charters granted to the Virginia Company of London for colonization in North America, the "propagating of Christian religion to such people, as yet live in darkness" was proclaimed a primary object of English settlement in Virginia. Missionary activity was, of course, not the only reason for coming to Virginia, or even the most important of those reasons. The Virginia Company was, first and foremost, a business venture seeking to exploit the resources of the new world for economic profit. Colonial ventures had the support of the crown as a means of advancing the kingdom's political and military interests, but religious motivation is not to be discounted. The established church, by definition, was inseparable from the state; along with the depth of sincere conviction that inspired charitable donations from Englishmen who never crossed the Atlantic and impelled the missionary went a reassuring rationale for the displacement of native Americans by the English. (No harm would be done in taking Indian lands if, in so doing, the Indians could be brought to understanding and belief in the Christian God.) An unquestioned belief in the innate superiority of
their own culture and values led the English to the practice of cultural imperialism on a grand scale in North America, and that attitude underlay their dealings with native populations over two centuries.

A formal plan to effect the conversion of Virginia's Indians was promulgated barely ten years after the first permanent English settlement at Jamestown. In 1618 the Virginia Company ordered that ten thousand acres of land at Henrico, near the falls of the James River, be set aside for a college or university. King James I ordered the churches of England to take up a general collection for the "planting of a college for the training up of the Children of those Infidels in true Religion moral virtue and Civility and for other godly uses," and various individuals in Virginia made bequests and other promises of money in anticipation of the erection of the school. Missionary activity was conducted on an individual and informal basis, but before the college at Henrico could be built the colony was stunned by a bloody uprising of the Powhatan Confederacy led by Opechancanough in 1622.

The uprising did not cause the Virginia Company to give up its plan for a college, but the changes in Indian-white relations in the aftermath of the uprising made the immediate likelihood of its establishment remote. Short-lived attempts to revive Henrico College and to found an "East India Free School" in the period 1622-1625 came to naught for want of local support. Opechancanough's attack has been viewed as a desperate response to repeated English encroachments on Indian lands and the Indians' clear rejection of assimilation or adaptation. The colonists reacted with violence in retribution for the attack and built fortifications along the frontier. English expansion could not be contained, however, and the cycle of violence repeated itself in 1644.
The treaty signed with the Powhatan Confederacy in 1646 established a tributary relationship with the defeated Indians, and the Virginians' Indian policy of the subsequent period concentrated on land, trade, and exploration to the neglect of missionary or educational activity.

When efforts to found a college in Virginia were resumed in the 1680s, the impetus came from a desire to make available a more convenient and less expensive means of educating the colony's young white men than sending them back to England for schooling. The idea of founding a local college had the support of a group of the colony's most influential men, who moved the Virginia Assembly to have a proposal drawn and to send the Reverend James Blair to England to seek a charter from King William III. Once in England, Blair's cause advanced more slowly than hoped for, and word was anxiously awaited in Virginia. Delay after delay punctuated Blair's efforts to transact the "college business." The Queen was said to favor the idea of a college, but wished the proposal to be made directly to the King; the Archbishop of Canterbury, a powerful ally, was "frozen up at Lambeth" in the winter of 1691/92. The delays, though frustrating to those who so eagerly sought the college charter, were put to productive use by Blair.

Blair used the waiting time to gain additional financial and political support for the college. As he reported in letters to Francis Nicholson, "two accidents" occurring in the winter of 1691/92 brought Blair the information that eventually led to the promise of the Boyle bequest, which in turn led to the establishment of an Indian school at the new college. Robert Boyle (1627-1691), noted English chemist, had in his lifetime been an active member of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England (the "New England Company"). Boyle's will,
dated July 18, 1691, directed that the balance of his estate, following payment of debts and legacies, be placed under the control of his executors to be put to "pious and charitable uses." Using contacts already formed during his business in England, Blair arranged an audience with the Boyle executors to present the College's case. During the course of his interview, it was decided that an appropriate use for the money would be to foster missionary and educational efforts among the Indians of Virginia. Blair left with the promise of £200. Though the final settlement of the Boyle estate did not occur for several years thereafter, the promise of this money was to affect the proposal for the College in a material way: the draft charter approved by the Virginia Assembly was amended to include a statement of purpose regarding the propagation of the gospel among the Indians of Virginia. Though such phrasing had traditionally been a part of Virginian statements of high import, inexplicably it was omitted from the language of the Assembly's draft of the College charter. Acting on his own initiative, without instruction from the Assembly or the College's Virginia backers, Blair pragmatically chose to accommodate the wishes of the Boyle executors in order to assure a firm financial grounding for the College. In later years College officials, Blair chief among them, would cast jealous eyes toward the restricted-purpose legacy when it seemed that the Indian school was in better financial condition than the College itself. Each, however, was tied to the fortunes of the other.

Finally, in February 1693, William III and Mary granted a charter to "their majesties royall colledge." In founding the school which was to bear their names, the monarchs made financial arrangements which included money from Virginia quitrents, a penny per pound tax on
Maryland and Virginia tobacco exports (excepting those to England), and income-producing lands totalling twenty thousand acres on the Blackwater Swamp and Pamunkey Neck in Virginia. James Blair was named President of the College in recognition of his efforts on its behalf. Back in Virginia, the Assembly passed a law establishing the site of the College in Middle Plantation, and authorized the purchase of three hundred thirty acres of land from Thomas Ballard for £170.¹⁰

The next five years were busy ones for the College. On August 8, 1695, a foundation was laid for the first College building, and the front and north wings were completed in 1697. Henry Hartwell, James Blair, and Edward Chilton began their note-taking for the promotional tract The Present State of Virginia, and the College (not published until 1727, when the College entered a second phase of identity-seeking). All was not well, however. Blair's vigorous promotion of the College interest, so valuable in pursuit of the charter, led to charges of self-aggrandizement when plied at home, and Blair ran into political trouble with Governor Nicholson and many of the College's other influential supporters. Having run afoul of such persons, it was not long before word reached England and the Archbishop of Canterbury. A report from the church conference held at Lambeth late in December 1697 indicated that the Archbishop's concern was such that he had discussed the College's troubles with John Warr, one of the Boyle executors. The Archbishop had heard that the Governor of Virginia now discouraged the College, and he evidently cautioned Warr that the Boyle executors would do well to proceed cautiously.¹¹

Apparently that caution was written into the "Rules and Methods agreed upon for the Settlement of Mr. Boyle's Charity in Virginia," for
the resulting rules were fairly restrictive upon the College. [See Appendix A.] Boyle's executors were his eldest brother, Richard Boyle, first Earl of Burlington and second Earl of Cork; his friend, Henry Ashurst, son of a wealthy London merchant and treasurer of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England; and John Warr the younger, Boyle's servant. The executors used the balance of the estate to purchase Brafferton Manor, in Yorkshire, from Sir Samuel Gerrard for £5,400. It was established that the "Rents and profits of the said Mannor" would be used to support the Indian school at the College of William and Mary, subject to the deduction of £90 per year to be divided equally between Harvard College and the "company for propagating the gospel in New England."13

Having established the amount and manner of payment of monies from the estate income, the trustees charged the College to "keep at the said Colledge soe many Indian children in Sickness and health in Meat drink Washing Lodgeing Cloathes Medicines bookes and Educacon from the first beginning of Letters till they are ready to receive Orders... at the rate of fourteen pounds per Annum for every such Child...." Actual methods of instruction were left to the College to determine, subject "to the Visitacion or inspeccon" of the Rector and Governors of the College, and to the Boyle trustees by means of an annual report containing a "perticuler accompt." The school was to be "Subject to Such other Rules and Methods as shall from time to time hereafter be transmitted," and was to bear the name of "the Charity of the Honble. Robert Boyle of the City of London deceased."14

When five students spoke at William and Mary's first commencement in May 1699, their achievement was more symbolic than actual. The
College was more a grammar school than a college, and would be so for several years to come. Some have even attributed authorship of the speeches read that day to the college masters rather than the students. Similarly, though a superstructure of rules and methods for the Indian school had been created, it is impossible to date its actual foundation before 1700. James Blair's tract "A Proposition for encouraging Christian Education of Indians, Negroes & Mulattos," which appeared in 1699, was essentially a promotional tract for a school which did not yet exist. Blair described his efforts to have laws enacted for the encouragement of conversion education among Negroes and Indians in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in February 1699/1700. Concurrently, Blair was working to collect the subscriptions promised the College before its founding, and overseeing the completion of construction of the first college building in anticipation of the arrival of the first Indian students.

Governor Francis Nicholson was still an ally of Blair's at that time, and though his letters note that in 1700 the College consisted only of a President (Blair) and one Latin master, it is evident that he was involved in the early promotion and organization of the Indian school. Nicholson instructed local Indian traders to treat with the Indians to "procure" children for the school, at the same time expressing his vision of the conduct and underlying principles of the school. Nicholson proposed a school of nine to ten students in all, with perhaps three or four from "any one Great nation," about seven or eight years old. The students were to be taught "to read, write & all other arts & sciences, that the best Englishmen's sons do learn," and "to know their great Almighty God who is able to do every thing for them," so that they might
Nicholson promised that the students should "have very good usage & all upon free cost." Accommodations were promised to be ready by the summer of 1700, and were to include rooms at the College, "good, valuable clothes, books & learning" and care "both in health & sickness." The students' " Fathers or other relations or Friends" were to be welcome to visit and inspect the premises as often as they wished. Perhaps the most interesting and unique feature of Nicholson's plan was his provision to "let them have a careful Indian man of their own country to wait upon them & to serve them & to talk continually with them in their language that they do not forget, whilst they are amongst the English." 

Nicholson's expectations of the school and its students reflect a mixture of paternalism and cultural blindness typical of English attitudes toward Indians at that time. Implicit in his remarks is the assumption that the education being offered the Indians was both appropriate and desirable. The selling points he suggested— that the school was free, that the students might bring along their servants, and that the instruction would be in the same subjects "that the best Englishmen's sons do learn"— would seem to have been more appropriate to white Virginians of his own social and economic class. Finally, in assuming that the children educated in the school would return to teach and convert their kinsmen, Nicholson betrayed not the slightest doubt in the efficacy of the College's instruction, though no such program had ever been attempted in Virginia. William III of England wrote to Nicholson to further encourage the financial securing of the College, "so good and pious a Work." 

What seemed to be a solid foundation for the school and the
College was undermined by local politics. Jealousies and rivalries divided the College's political and financial benefactors, and Blair's stewardship and personal motivation were called into question at every turn. Nicholson and Blair, at one time allies in the struggle to establish the College, became bitter enemies in a wider political power struggle within the Council, where Blair sat. Determined to erode Blair's power in one way or another, Nicholson withdrew his support from the College. Robert Beverley defended Blair's position, saying that Nicholson

Likewise gave himself Airs of encouraging the College: But he used this Pretext for so many By-Ends, that at last the Promoters of that good Work, grew weary of the Mockery....And in Truth he has been so far from advancing it that now after the Six Years of his Government, the Scholars are fewer than at his Arrival.21

Disappointment at the slow pace of the school's early years and the charge that Blair was using it as a mere vehicle for self-aggrandizement affected the small faculty, culminating in the resignation of grammar master Mungo Inglis. Inglis angrily charged that the College would never become more than a grammar school:

...was anything so much perverted from its primary & principal Design as this poor College has been by Mr. Blair, for to say nothing of his Demanding & Taking his Sallary yearly w[hi]ch if he can but Secure to himself he matters it not if it is never no more than a Grammar School; it has been his constant Tool to Turn & overturn Gov[erno]rs to Turn out one & bring in another, & to turn out the same again.22

Beverley reports that the College revenues were "behind-hand," which caused the faculty salaries to be in arrears, certainly another reason for Inglis's discomfiture. Another factor contributing to the slow start of the school was that classes had been held in a nearby school-
house before the completion of the first college building. The completed building, however, Robert Beverley called one of the two "most Magnificent of any in America."²³

It was a telling blow, then, when on October 29, 1705 the College suffered the first of several major fires in the colonial period. The building, including the College library and furniture, were "in a small time totally consumed." Though Queen Anne gave sums totalling £1,000 in the years 1708-1709 toward the rebuilding of the College, the College building as such was not reopened until 1716.²⁴ Classes are believed to have been conducted in the town of Williamsburg during the intervening years, but between the physical damage and its loss of political influence, the school fell into decline.
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CHAPTER II
DEFINING A SCHOOL

The period following the fire of 1705 was a bleak one for the College as a whole, but paradoxically one of growth for the Indian school. The Brafferton endowment, the source of income for the school, was free from the influence of local politics and more stable than the revenues of the College. With the arrival in Virginia of Alexander Spotswood as lieutenant-governor in 1710, the "Brafferton School" gained for a dozen years a powerful and interested friend.

Spotswood came to Virginia bearing orders to institute a royally-sponsored program of political and economic reforms, but he was to have little success in implementing them. The program, particularly as it respected tobacco inspection reforms, was widely perceived to benefit the crown at the expense of local monied (and politically influential) interests. Members of the Governor's Council led Virginia's immediate and well-organized opposition to the reforms. Spotswood's political power and initiative were consistently eroded by his defects of personality and want of political acumen.

The lieutenant-governor had other interests, however, and he turned to them increasingly as he was thwarted elsewhere. Virginia had been sporadically plagued by border troubles, the latest series in 1711 involving "commotions in North Carolina" between the Tuscaroras and Virginia's tributary Indians not long after Spotswood's arrival.
The need for government-enforced order, in combination with the lieuten­
tenant-governor's military background and land-acquisitiveness, led him to take particular interest in establishing order on the frontiers.

Accordingly, Spotswood began negotiations with the warring nations, first the neighboring tributaries and then the Tuscaroras, in an attempt to settle an English-enforced peace on the borders. The solution he proposed was an apparently unconscious return to a view of Indian culture, and the role the Virginian government might play in changing it to meet white aspirations, held a century before. Calling previous failures to convert the native peoples "a reproach to religion and politics," Spotswood seemed to place blame for the Indians' actions on their untutored, unchristian, uncivilized way of life, which—through education—the English government had in its power to change. If the Indians could be made over in an English image, their behavior might become more trustworthy and predictable. The problem, then, was to find a specific means of effecting the change.

Spotswood turned naturally to the College and its Indian school to be the preceptor of English culture and civility. The College's own definition of its role in Indian education was less clear, notwithstanding the rules established for it by the Boyle executors. Thinking it impractical or inconvenient to obtain students from among the local tributaries, the College had peopled its Indian school with prisoners of war purchased from remote tribes. This fact was known well enough by the tributaries to serve as a stumbling-block when Spotswood first proposed the sending of young boys to be students in the College and hostages for the good behavior of their elders as a condition of a treaty negotiated with the Tuscaroras in 1711. The Indians were said to have
feared that their children would be sold into slavery. As evidence of his good faith and as an additional incentive, Spotswood offered to remit the annual tribute due from the Indians, in exchange for the promise to send two of the "chief men's sons" from each tribe to the College. The conditions of the treaty were accepted, and in a short time students began arriving in Williamsburg.

By November 17, 1711, Spotswood could report that the son and cousin of the King of Nansemond, two sons of the Nottoways' chief men, and two boys from the Meherrins were attending the College, while a Chickahominy, the son of the Queen of Pamunkey, and another Pamunkey, the son of a chief man, were expected imminently, a total of nine new students. In fact, when the Pamunkey delegation arrived three days later, there were three prospective students, as well as an "attendant" sent with the Queen's son, "all clothed in the English manner with a great desire for their education in literature."

The College had thereby taken a new direction, imposed from outside, to renew its ties to the colonial government. No clear statement of reaction to the change in policy exists, but it is likely that it was received with mixed feelings in the College. The steady arrival of students bolstered at least one aspect of the College, though hardly the one the College most wished to promote. The prospect of closer ties to the government and the favorable reports to the Boyle trustees made possible by the influx of students would certainly have been welcomed; on the other hand, it was the College, not the Indian school, that James Blair wanted to emphasize. The increasing numbers of Indian students, and the attendant costs of keeping them, meant increasing demands upon the income of the Brafferton endowment. It seems likely
that it was the College's objection on the last point that led Spotswood to approach the Virginia Assembly with a request for additional funds for the Indian school to offset the expense of maintaining students above the number suggested by the school's trustees.

The Council voted unanimously "to encourage this good disposition of the Indians," but the Governor's plea for funds to "save souls as well as give security" fell on deaf ears in the Assembly. Spotswood reported that he could not "but be extremely concerned to find this design slighted by the House of Burgesses, and so violent an humour prevail amongst them for extirpating all the Indians." Spotswood told the Council of Trade that he had sent the Assembly into recess in the hope that being at home, closer to the frontier, the Burgesses would develop personal concern for the security of the borders and see the error of their penury. In May 1712, five months later, the Assembly had yet to be persuaded, though attendance at the school had swollen to fourteen, with six more expected.

Sensing the hopelessness of his political cause, Spotswood turned to the church. In similar letters written to the Bishop of London and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Spotswood argued that had it not been for a considerable sum in the bank before the College received its first Indian, it would not have been possible for the College to sustain the school as long as it had. In July 1712 the students numbered twenty-four--twenty resulting from the treaty and four "brought by the College years ago." The master's having overcome the "natural prejudice" of the entering students, the Indians were well cared for, and they and their parents seemed satisfied with their treatment. Still, funds were insufficient, and Spotswood hoped to
enlist the aid of the Anglicans' Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Thus the missionary aspect of the school was re-emphasized when expediency dictated.

Spotswood's reports to England were filled with glowing predictions of the salutary prospects of Indian conversion—the banishment of "savage customs" in a generation or two, resulting in "good subjects and neighbors." His efforts were rewarded with election to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts in 1713, but with decidedly uncooperative circumstances at home. By 1714 Spotswood had not been able to gain more than verbal expressions of support for the Brafferton school from the Assembly. No funds were forthcoming, and as Spotswood's political fortunes in other matters slipped, so did any chance of his winning local support for this measure. The Council of Trade and Plantations took a more generous view, at least figuratively, congratulating Spotswood's efforts and expressing the hope that "if due care be taken of them it may tend to the future advantage of Virginia."

The frustration of his political goals and the pull of personal ambition led Spotswood to turn his attention toward the west and a new venture. An exploring party later dubbed by Spotswood the "Knights of the Golden Horseshoe" first explored and later founded a military outpost on the banks of the Meherrin River, in what is now Brunswick County. Fort Christanna's purpose was twofold: it was, foremost, a trading company or "factory"; it was also envisioned as a haven for Virginia's tributary Indians, where English missionaries would have the opportunity of educating and converting them to the Christian religion. The fort's relationship with the neighboring Indians was established formally by treaty in 1714, when the Virginia Assembly enacted a law "for the
Better Regulation of the Indian Trade." The law set up the Virginia Indian Company, which was charged, among other things, with establishing and maintaining at the Company's expense an Indian school.  

Spotswood's involvement with the Indian school at Fort Christanna was direct: he patented an adjacent tract of land for the purpose of supporting the school, and in January 1714/15 engaged Charles Griffin as master at a salary of £50 per year. Griffin, an Englishman of "good family," had emigrated to North Carolina from the West Indies about 1705. He settled in Pasquotank Precinct, an area heavily populated by Quakers, though he himself was an Anglican. Griffin established a school and served as an Anglican lay reader in the ministerless parish. The school operated successfully, even attracting Quaker students though he led Anglican prayers daily. In 1708 Griffin relocated to St. Paul's Parish in Chowan Precinct to become clerk of the vestry and lay reader, and again organized a school. It was reported shortly thereafter, though, that Griffin had "fallen into the sin of fornication, and joined with the Quakers' [political] interest." His "fall" brought what seemed to have been a promising career to an abrupt close, and Griffin appears to have left North Carolina for Virginia. Griffin's name disappeared from the record until 1714/15, when his past experience as a schoolteacher attracted the attention of Spotswood. Pleased with his choice, Spotswood reported to the Bishop of London that "ye Person I have pitch'd on for this Employ'm't is heartily inclined to the Service, and the fittest I could have found."  

By June 1715 Griffin's students numbered seventy boys and girls "most susceptible of learning." Indeed, by October of that
year, Spotswood could report that the "great part" of Griffin's students had learned to say the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed, and that both parents and children "seem[ed] much delighted with the hopes of their being made Christians and taught to read," though he had also to report the death of one student, "the Queen of [the Saponi] Nation, a Girl of about ten years of age and of a very promising disposition." Spotswood added that he "had promised to be her God-father when she should be Christened." Griffin, too, described his progress and announced to the Bishop of London the expected arrival of additional students in the coming spring. Calling his missionary effort "this great and good work," Griffin lamented the lack of attention given to the endeavor and the bad influence of certain professed Christians upon the Indians.

By nearly every English account, the school continued in 1716 to be a successful venture. Spotswood reported to the Bishop of London how "inclinable ye Indians [were] to have their children instructed," and their general satisfaction was further attested to by Charles Griffin (hardly an unbiased observer). The Indians had also another reason for satisfaction: the Virginia Indian Company had agreed to grant more favorable exchange rates in return for participation in the school, supplemented by a "bounty" of a cow and a calf given by Spotswood to each of the "Great Men" of the tribe. The Council of Trade and Plantations commended the "publike service" resulting from the undertaking, demurring only at the practice of segregation within the settlement. The French, it was reported, had achieved great success by "living amongst the Indians and intermarrying with them...one great reason of the Canada and Eastern Indians adhering so steadily to the interest of the French." By early 1717, even the minor objection
that the Christanna school was peopled only by Saponies was answered by
the arrival of eleven children from the Catawbas and other southern or
"western Indians," who had been promised a year earlier.  

Other forces were at work, however. The borders, which had
enjoyed a temporary respite from conflict following the treaty of
1713/14, were once again the scene of attacks in the night by "a party
of Senequas and Tasks" upon Indians living within the Christanna compound;
the dissolute lives and bad influence of the fort's white inhabitants
(which had been repeatedly complained of by churchmen) exacerbated the
inter-Indian disputes.  
Spotswood's relationship with the Assembly, never an easy one, was of no help when he appealed for funds or other
support for the fort community. In 1717 the Assembly, acting on orders
from England, dissolved the Virginia Indian Company and abrogated the
Indian treaties by repealing the Act for Regulating the Indian Trade.
The recent border troubles and the Assembly's inability (or its unwill­
ingness) to defend the outpost were cited as reasons for the action.  

Though Spotswood was able to win lukewarm support from his Council in
opposing the abrupt dismissal of the school and the resident Indians,
the Assembly could not be swayed. Later, an embittered Spotswood named
James Blair and [Philip] Ludwell the "Chief Engineers of Faction" in
this and other disputes he had had. Perhaps there was justification
in Spotswood's charge as it concerned Blair: the College, rebuilt after
the 1705 fire, finally reopened in 1716. It is generally presumed that
the college continued informally in the town of Williamsburg in the
interim; from the lack of evidence it seems probable that there was
little or no activity in the College's Indian school. As the College
reopened, perhaps James Blair sought a way to fill it by removing one
source of competition.

Despite a later reconciliation with Blair and Ludwell, Spotswood's interest in educating and converting the Indians of Virginia waned. He continued to prod the Assembly to pay the Virginia Indian Company's expenses for the closing of the Christanna school, without success and with increasing irritation. He succeeded in bringing Charles Griffin from Christanna to William and Mary, but apparently without the great numbers of students or the same reported success that Griffin had had at the outpost.

In the early 1720s the College's Indian school again faced a challenge to its sense of purpose and direction. The preceding decade had been one of slight activity, due in part to competition from the school at Christanna, but due also to a seeming lack of effort on the part of the College. With the closing of the Indian school at Christanna and the transfer of its master to Williamsburg, attention was once again focused on the efforts of the College. Operating the Indian school at the College had not been without its problems. Limited success in converting students to Christianity and the unpredictable demands and support from the colonial government were compounded by purely physical problems. Noise, crowding, and confusion were caused by common use of facilities by Indian, grammar, and college students; lack of supervision and even illness were attributed to the practice of boarding the Indian students elsewhere in town. The low level of activity in the preceding decade paradoxically inspired a means of addressing some of the school's problems: unspent income from the Boyle trust had been allowed to accumulate, and was channelled into the construction of a building for the Indian school. Contemporary observers put the cost of construction
at £500. The expense of the project thereby served as excuse for the penury of the earlier years and as promise of greater attention to the aims of the school in the future.

The building, which came to be known as the Brafferton (for the estate which provided its income, despite the intention of the trustees to have the school known as the Charity of the Honorable Robert Boyle, etc.), was completed in 1723 or 1724. Few records relating directly to the building's construction survive, but it can be dated by its description in Hugh Jones' *Present State of Virginia* (published in 1724), and supported to a lesser degree by the presence of a dated brick (1723) near the doorway of the south exterior wall. Architectural historians have attributed the building's design to Henry Cary, Jr. based on comparisons with known Cary structures and evidence of the architect-builder's other activities in the period. The building's formal, symmetrical outline and detailing convey through style a sense of hierarchy and authority appropriate to a public structure. It is a two-story Georgian-style brick building, laid in Flemish bond with glazed headers. Its exterior dimensions are 52' wide, 48' deep, and 52'/48' high. The hipped roof angles up sharply at a 45° pitch, and is pierced by gabled dormers. The chimneys are placed in the ridgepole, thus making possible the interior placement of corner chimneys in three of the smaller rooms, one of the earliest such examples in Virginia. The interior floor plan consists of one large and two smaller rooms on the first two floors, with central hall and stairs. Much of the original detailing is lost because the building was ransacked and its woodwork ripped out when the College yard was occupied by Union troops during the Civil War. [See Figures I and II.]
FIGURE I

The Brafferton. North Elevation.

From Marcus Whiffen, The Public Buildings of Williamsburg (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg, 1958)
Reproduced by permission.
FIGURE II

The Brafferton. Ground floor plan.

From Marcus Whiffen, The Public Buildings of Williamsburg
(Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg, 1958)
Reproduced by permission.
Conclusions regarding the use of the rooms are largely inferential. In 1732 College president William Dawson wrote to the Bishop of London that "We have a very convenient room for a library over the Indian school." [Emphasis mine.] Since a substantial sum of money was to have been expended toward books for the proposed library, it seems likely that the large upstairs room was meant to be the library room, and that the large room beneath was literally the classroom. The Indian master resided in the building, where he could keep close watch over his charges. Hugh Jones speaks of the building as "an apartment for the Indian boys and their master." Professors at the College at that time were allotted two rooms each. The Indian master's quarters could well have been one or both of the two smaller rooms on either the first or second floor; the Indians in all likelihood resided on the third floor, under the roof. The building was the scene of other activity over the years of the Indian school's operation. John Blair's diary entry for July 10, 1751 records a "Fine Entert' of music at Braffert'n."  

The completion of a building, however impressive, could not long distract attention from serious questions concerning the school's existence and purpose. The school's direction, having been determined by Spotswood's intervention, was all too easily abdicated by College officials when the Lieutenant-Governor turned his attention toward the frontier. When circumstances brought Spotswood's attention and Indian students back to the College, it was as if the fundamental questions of purpose were to be decided anew. Ironically the impetus came again from outside the College: two observers' commentaries, published in 1724, raised questions about the goals, methods, and result of the
school's instruction.

The first, William Byrd, lamented in his History of the Dividing Line

the bad success Mr. Boyle's Charity has hitherto had towards converting any of these poor Heathens to Christianity. Many children of our Neighbouring Indians have been brought up in the College of William and Mary. They have been taught to read and write, and have been carefully instructed in the Principles of the Christian Religion, till they came to be men. Yet after they return'd home, instead of civilizeing and converting the rest, they have immediately Relapt into Infidelity and Barbarism themselves.

And some of them too have made the worst use of the Knowledge they acquir'd among the English, by employing it against their Benefactors. Besides, as they unhappily forget all the good they learn, and remember the Ill, they are apt to be more vicious and disorderly than the rest of their Countrymen.

Byrd's own idea of successful conversion of the Indians involved means which would necessarily increase their dependence upon the English, and an implicit demand that they surrender their "Indianness" in favor of white cultural values. Byrd's cultural chauvinism was founded in his belief in the ultimate desirability and appeal of European culture over Indian. He believed the Indians fully capable of learning, notwithstanding their "idleness." He proposed Griffin's method of instruction at Christanna as the successful alternative to the methods employed in Williamsburg. Charles Griffin, a "Man of good Family... Innocence...and Sweet[ness] of...Temper" had found the "Secret of mixing Pleasure with instruction" with the result that he was both well-loved by his students and an effective teacher until circumstances forced his removal to Williamsburg. Byrd was not at all confident of the prospects for Indian instruction at the College, even under the tutelage of the experienced Griffin. He concluded that the best hope for con-
version of the native population lay in intermarriage and the disappear-
ance of their troublesome cultural distinctiveness. 37

Hugh Jones, writing in his Present State of Virginia, contributed a more extended and balanced analysis. Though never rejecting the idea of his own superiority as a white Englishman, Jones argued that a successful method of instruction would have to take into account the students' cultural idiosyncracies, and that goals should be adjusted accordingly:

One main cause, why the gospel is not propagated with better success among the infidels, and why it is not more strictly followed by such Europeans as inhabit the American Plantations, is the little right knowledge that superintendents of the church have of them, from imperfect accounts and false information; for before we can entertain any tolerable idea of the tenents, and inclinations of any people; it is requisite we should know something of their original, temper, and government; for want of which much cost and labour have been in vain expended, and many pious designs and projects frustrated.

And as the progress of religion, so for the same causes, and in the same manner, is the improvement of arts, sciences, and trade, much retarded. 38

Jones' remarks were based upon his own observations of Indians at the College and elsewhere, and those of Charles Griffin, whom he met at Fort Christanna in 1717. Though Jones recited a fairly standard litany of English complaints against the Indians—that they were savages, idolators, prone to abuse of liquor and to laziness in their failure to put by for "futurity," difficult to persuade and "obstinate" when it came to receiving new customs—he also showed grudging admiration for their shrewdness in trading and took note of Griffin's students' demonstrated ability to learn to read and recite and their particular talent for drawing. 39

Why, then, had the English had such an overwhelming lack of
success in their conversion efforts? "Chiefly because [the Indians] can live with less labour, and more pleasure and plenty, as Indians," Jones wrote. If that were the case, it is a wonder that the English had had any success. Nevertheless, Jones had faith that "by degrees, after proper methods...rightly studied and managed" the process of conversion might be effected, and the students eventually put to trades, or to sea, and upon their return to their own nations others might be converted. Jones presented both sides of the eighteenth-century philosophical argument concerning the merits of baptising blacks and Indians: on one hand, the charge that it would be a source of false pride and poor servants, and in fact a "prostitution" of the sacrament; on the other, a Christian master's imperative, and source of better behavior for any who were to live among Christians. Jones concluded halfheartedly that the merits of better conduct and moral good, "properly managed," outweighed the disadvantages, and provided a specific critique and program for the Indian school at William and Mary.

Students had, in the past, been difficult to obtain. The want of "proper necessaries and due care" taken with them had resulted in illness and even death, and the survivors had generally returned home having fallen into "the worst practices of vile nominal Christians, which they add to their own Indian manners and notions." The few who lived among the English as servants "loitered or idled away their time in laziness and mischief." Jones proposed that more care be taken with the Indian students, both during and after their attendance at the school. He also proposed to add to the school's endowment by attracting additional donations, and to reduce the size of the school
so that those students the school might attract would be properly cared for. As a course of study, Jones called for instruction in religion and other subjects "as their genius most aptly may require," with the appointment of four ushers, or "servitors," to assist in the instruction of the younger boys. When found qualified, the students were to be sent to England to be bound out to ships' captains or to tradesmen, and later brought back to Virginia to be "sent out missionaries among their own country-folks."\(^{40}\)

Neither Jones nor Byrd had particularly lofty aims for the Indian school; in sum, they wished its pupils to become better behaved. This they proposed to achieve by a more carefully organized program designed to take advantage of the students' native skills and abilities. Significantly, both highlighted the ill effect of the College's inattention and indifference toward its Indian students. But what of the effects of the training proposed by Jones and Byrd? Jones presupposed the willingness of ships' captains and English tradesmen to have Indian boys working among them, and one wonders of what usefulness that training would be once the young men were returned to Virginia to become missionaries. Byrd's proposal was even more extreme, for after several generations of intermarriage, there would be no Indians.

The College's "official" response to its critics, such as it was, can be found in its Statutes, enacted in 1727 in anticipation of the transfer of governing authority from the temporary trustees named in the College charter to the permanent arrangement of Visitors, President, and faculty. The preface of the Statutes hearkens back to the language of the College charter in directing that the third purpose of the College, after educating the youth of Virginia and supplying
that the Indians of America should be instructed in the Christian Religion, and that some of the Indian Youth are well-behaved and well-inclined, being first well prepared in the Divinity School, may be sent out to preach the Gospel to their Countrymen in their Own Tongue, after they have duly been put in Orders of Deacons and Priests.\(^41\)

The section of the Statutes specifically establishing "The Indian School" took no direct notice of the curricular suggestions offered by Byrd or Jones, but in fact retains the same generalities for which the existing program had been criticized:

There is but One Master in this School, who is to teach the Indians Boys to read, and write, and vulgar Arithmetick. And especially he is to teach them thoroughly the Catechism and the Principles of the Christian Religion. For a Yearly Salary, let him have Forty or Fifty Pounds Sterling, according to the Ability of that School, appointed by the Honourable Robert Boyle, or to be further appointed by other Benefactors. And in the same School the Master may be permitted to teach other Scholars from the Town, for which he is to take the usual Wages of Twenty Shillings a Year.\(^42\)

In fairness, the programs outlined in the Statutes for the College's other schools were no less vague; in those schools, however, one could argue that the basis for common understanding of principle and method was greater and less description was necessary. In any case, the Transfer to the President and Masters was effected on August 15, 1729. It would remain for the Indian masters appointed under the College's new independent governing body to fill out the design with actions, based upon whatever skills or knowledge of precedent they brought to the office.
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CHAPTER III

MATURITY

The College's Transfer, concluded on August 15, 1729, stood as evidence and symbol of the institution's independence and maturity. In it the College was called upon to assume the responsibilities of maturity: control and direction from within, and sole accountability for its actions. The inclination of local political figures to insert themselves in College affairs subsided for the time being, and the Brafferton school, so often a tool of reigning political fancy, was again under the sole direction of the College. Thus left to make its own way, the College assumed its responsibilities. The long tenure of James Blair as President and of several of the masters helped the College settle into a routine of activity based upon experience. The Brafferton school simply operated, with little or no apparent reflection upon its meaning, direction, or method.

The first person elected to the chair of Indian master after the conclusion of the Transfer was John Fox, a 23-year old student at the College, who had previously served as usher in the grammar school. When Fox took the oath de fideli administracione and signed the faculty minute book on November 6, 1729, he was still an unordained divinity student. He had, perhaps, the benefit of his own observation of the conduct of the Indian school under previous masters as well as his experience as grammar usher to guide him, but was hardly a seasoned
preceptor. Rather, his appointment was the first in a line that came
to be common practice at the College: a talented student was chosen
first to be grammar usher, and then promoted to Indian master as a
vacancy occurred. The practice, in effect the equivalent of a fellow­
ship, enabled the student to remain at the College with a small stipend
while preparing for ordination and assignment to ministry in a regular
parish.

Fox continued his studies, and when he prepared for ordina­
tion in 1731, he travelled to England with letters of reference from
James Blair, William Dawson (at that time professor of moral philos­
ophy), and William Gooch, Lieutenant-Governor of Virginia. The three
were unanimous in their praise of Fox, "a sober, grave, studious young
man, and very exemplary in his life and conversation...."¹ Blair even
went so far as to request for Fox the Bishop of London's assistance
toward the "great expense" of trans-Atlantic travel and his living
expenses while in London. Fox departed sometime after June 10, 1731,
and was back in Williamsburg by March 28, 1732 when he attended a
meeting of the President and Masters of the College; on July 31, 1732
he participated in the laying of the foundation of the President's
house.² Though his stay in London was short, Fox did not fail to
impress the Bishop. The Fulham Palace correspondence over the next
five years continued to make inquiries concerning Fox's progress;
letters from Blair and Gooch give the impression that the Bishop badg­
ered them concerning Fox's progress, why he remained at the Brafferton
school so long after his return, and why he had not been appointed to
a parish. Blair could only demur that Fox had

the good opinion of every Body; but tho' he might have
had his choice of any thing that has fallen here, since he was put into orders, he is not as yet inclinable to leave the College, and to take a parish; he labours under an Unaccountable natural bashfulness, which very much disheartens him; I hope he will get over it in time.³

Fox himself assured the Bishop that he had "had many offers made to [him] of some of the best Livings here...lately."⁴ In 1737, Fox finally accepted the ministry of Ware Parish in Gloucester County, and resigned his post as Indian master on June 15.⁵ Fox married Isabel Booth of Gloucester shortly thereafter; perhaps that explains the timing of his resignation. Beyond his very evident satisfaction in his position at the College, Fox left behind no reflection on his tenure. Hugh Grove, who visited Williamsburg in 1732, remarked that the Brafferton students were learning
to read, write, and Gable their prayers twice a day, and [they] may be bound to trades, but most return to their old way of Life and Carry more Vices away with them than [their] fellows ever know. They have sometimes 7 or 8 at a time, but They can now get very few to Live there....⁶

Grove's remarks are indicative of a period of relative quiet, and fairly typical accomplishment in the Brafferton school.

Quiet times for John Fox and his Indian students resulted in the continuing accumulation of funds from the Boyle trust at a time when the College, never on firm financial ground, was particularly hard put. The faculty minutes complain of the steady diminution of the College revenues through "vast frauds" in the system of collecting the one-penny tax on tobacco that was the heart of the College's endowment income. In addition, there was the increased expense of maintaining the full faculty mandated by the Statutes, and the College had undertaken the construction of a chapel in 1729 and the President's
house in 1732. Even so, the College was "not compleat," wrote William Dawson, "for Want of the most Useful and Ornamental Furniture, Books."7

Under these circumstances the Brafferton income (which by the College's accounting amounted to £500) loomed an ever-growing source of temptation. In 1732 Blair and the faculty put forward a proposal to the managers of the Boyle trust, the Bishop of London and the Earl of Burlington, whereby money from the fund would be used to buy books for the College library. The plan was perfect in its self-serving character: it begins with a recitation of the College's good works:

We have been so good husbands of our share of that revenue, that tho' we have built an handsome house for the Indian School with other good conveniencies for the Lodging of the Master and Scholars and have defrayed all the other charges incident to that pious undertaking, in the constant cloathing and boarding the Indian scholars and paying the Master's salary; yet we have now in bank upon that fund about 500 lb.8 ignoring the fact that their "good husbandry" owed more to lassitude and neglect in encouraging the activities of the school than to careful management of the fund.

The one thing wanting in the undertaking, according to the College officials, was a library,

indeed the most necessary thing that is now wanted towards the finishing their education and fitting them for what was always intended, the being put in orders and sent out Pastours to preach in their own Country language and instruct and convert their own people. As we do not live in an age of miracles, it is not to be doubted that Indian scholars will want the help of many books to qualifie them to become good Pastours and Teachers as well as others, and the fund alloted for their education being able to supply them, what reason can be given why part of it may not be employed that way?9

An age of miracles indeed—that "Indian scholars" could be fostered by the rudimentary level of teaching in the Brafferton school, notwith-
standing the exaggerated claim in another section of the proposal that the College had furnished "Masters and Professors to teach them latine, Greek and Hebrew, and Philosophy, Mathematicks and Divinity." As for the funding, "What can be more reasonable than that since their fund is able to do it, and ours is not able, that they should contribute their share towards so necessary means Education?"

Anticipating the most obvious objection to the plan, the faculty met it head-on:

Some perhaps will be apt to object that by this means we think to make a considerable addition to the College Library at their expense; and if it were so there would be no great harm in it, since the College Library is to be a common Library to them and to us. But the case will really be much better on their side; for whatever books are bought with their money shall be not only deposited in distinct press marked with the name of Boyle or Brafferton, and at their own house, being within the College; but every particular book shall have that inscription on the back of it; so that altho' as to use we shall have the benefit of their books, as they shall of ours, yet really the property shall not be altered; every one shall know his own.

It is likely, however, that only the students of the College, and not those of the grammar or Indian schools had attained the level of education requisite to make much use of the library, and rules for the use of the library would have further circumscribed access to the books.

With obsequious modesty, the faculty sought the advice of the Bishop of London in the actual selection of books, except for the suggestion that the philosophical and theological works of Robert Boyle, the works encouraged by him, and the books written by the Bishop himself would "be thought no improper Part of this Collection." The faculty marshalled other arguments to defend against other possible
objections, noting that there was available "a very convenient Room for a Library over the Indian school," probably the large room on the west side of the second floor, and took notice of the promises others (including the Archbishop of Canterbury) had made to add to the Library, and the faculty's plan to hang a portrait of Boyle (a gift promised by Lord Burlington) in the library room. The proposal, along with a letter of credit on Alderman Perry of London for an amount up to £300, drafted in anticipation of the Boyle trustees' approval, was hand-carried to England by John Randolph, an alumnus of the College who was travelling to London on business of the Virginia Assembly.  

There the story ends. There is no clear record of the Trustees' reaction to the proposal, though it seems likely that it was accepted. Boyle's portrait was received from Lord Burlington, whose acquiescence to the library plan was necessary; the Fulham Papers contain no damning letters from the Bishop of London. There are no later attempts by the College to cast the proposal into a different or more pleasing form, and there are a number of references to other (later) gifts to the College library in correspondence and the college records. The idea of marking library books according to the source of their benefaction was repeated when, two years later, the Virginia Assembly appropriated funds for books from a liquor tax, conditional upon their being marked as "the gift of the General Assembly in Virginia." Finally, James Blair's 1743 gravestone inscription makes reference to the "well-varied library" of the College as one of his accomplishments in life.  

When John Fox resigned his position as Indian master in 1737 to take on the ministry of Ware Parish in Gloucester, the College faculty turned again, as they had with Fox, to the ranks of their
own students to fill the vacancy. Robert Barret, the nominee, was the son of Charles Barret and Mary Chiswell of Louisa County, and had been educated at the College during the same thirteen years that Fox was resident there, though it is likely that Barret was by some years Fox's junior. Barret had become usher to the grammar school, where by Fox's account he served with "Faith, Diligence, and Industry." Barret was elected Indian master on June 15, 1737, "entered office" on June 24, and on June 28, 1737 subscribed his assent to the oath. Barret did not wait so long as Fox to undertake the trip to England for ordination, leaving less than two months after his appointment to the Brafferton chair, and not returning to Virginia for nearly a year thereafter. He was detained on his return voyage by virtue of an appointment to a chaplaincy on a British man-of-war captained by Sir Yelverton Payton. In fact, Barret never returned to the College. Instead, he became minister to St. Martin's Parish in Hanover County, where he served for many years.

The man chosen to fill Barret's place on the faculty was Thomas Dawson (1715–1761), younger brother of William Dawson, professor of moral philosophy at the College. Thomas Dawson was born in England, and had begun his education at St. Bees School and Queen's College, Oxford, before emigrating to Virginia. He entered the College of William and Mary in 1735, and studied divinity under his brother and under Joshua Fry, professor of mathematics. The younger Dawson, "having given long proof of his good behaviour" was unanimously elected to fill Robert Barret's place as grammar usher when Barret became Indian master. A year later, on June 26, 1738, Dawson succeeded Barret again, this time as master of the Indian school.
Dawson assumed his duties immediately, and, as custom and the College statutes permitted, took in outside students, among them Robert Carter, Jr. Dawson prepared for, and made his passage to England for ordination in the summer of 1740 bearing letters from his brother and from James Blair praising his "pious, sober and honest Behavior," "Soundness of Doctrine," and his promise of "good Service to Religion." Blair frankly stated the unlikelihood of Dawson's finding a vacant parish upon his return, but reassured the Bishop that the Indian school would be "good provision for him till a better falls." Indeed, Dawson remained in the position of Indian master for seventeen years. He assisted Blair at Bruton Parish in Williamsburg, and upon the latter's death in 1743, was named his successor as rector to the parish. Upon the death of William Dawson in 1752, Thomas Dawson became Bishop's Commissary to Virginia. He was by then the senior member of the College faculty, finally resigning as Indian master in 1755 to become the fourth president of the College. As president, Dawson was beset by a variety of problems, both personal and professional, some of his own making and others not; his term could hardly be considered a successful one.

Thomas Dawson's long tenure as Indian master fortunately coincides with a period for which a variety of documentation is extant. College records, local tradesmen's accounts, personal papers, and the like report the names of students and visitors to the school, its place in the political sphere, and tantalizing small details of daily life and studies within the walls of Brafferton. The rules established by the first trustees of the Boyle estate allowed the expenditure of £14 per annum for the "Meat drink Washing Lodgeing Cloathes Medicines
Hugh Jones suggested that, in the early years at least, "abundance of [the Indian students] used to die, either through sickness, change of provision, and way of life; or as some will have it, often through want of proper necessaries and due care taken with them."

Though the English and the native peoples of America had learned a great deal about one another and from one another in the years since first contact, on an individual level the process of adjustment began anew with every entering student at the Brafferton school. Whites of the College community had the opportunity to learn first-hand of the behavior and capacities of their Indian neighbors, and surely the instructional methods of such long-term masters as John Fox and Thomas Dawson were modified by experience. The Indian students had to adjust to one another's company, as they sometimes came from different tribes, and to the patterns of daily life at the College as well as to the studies required of them. On a daily basis students encountered different languages, foods prepared and served in ways they were unaccustomed to, the requirement that they dress in the English fashion, and adjustment to living in the Brafferton house. Living inside, in close quarters with the other students, could only have exacerbated the effects of the Indian students' exposure to disease, familiar or unfamiliar.

From some time before 1736 through 1743, Indian students were treated for their various illnesses by Williamsburg apothecary Thomas Wharton, who recorded expenses against "Brafferton Estate" in his shop ledger. Those entries list the date, fee, and specific
medications employed. Wharton's accounts often named the persons receiving treatment: Jno. Ward, Stephen, Will, Scarborough, Tomkins, Thomas, and Thomson. These are presumed to be students of the Indian school rather than other College employees or students because other accounts existed for that purpose—master Thomas Dawson had a separate account, as did the College and other teachers and students. The monitoring of expenses by the Boyle trustees in England might also have served as a check against expenditures not directly related to the school.

Wharton rarely noted the specific illness or injury being treated, but it is possible to draw some inferences from the general pattern of care given to Brafferton students. There do not appear to have been an extraordinary number of medical incidents at the school—for the whole number or for any one student. Treatment may have been rendered in Wharton's shop or by preparations sent to the College; in a few cases (perhaps signifying more serious illness), the accounts list charges for "visits sent for." Initial treatments were often followed up several days later with a repeat of the procedure. Wharton's charges generally ranged between one and five shillings per medication, each patient receiving a combination of several medicines.

Wharton employed what appears to be a fairly standard variety of native and imported medicinal plants and preparations in the treatment of Indian students. These included rhubarb and jalap (both purgatives), treacle (an emetic), apple or other bark (used to treat diarrhea; bark of the cinchona tree was found to contain quinine), canary (a light sweet wine), and lotus. These were administered in the form of pills ("boles"), "pouder," "dipps," draughts or drops.
Wharton does not appear to have made use of the patent medicines available in England and the colonies. This may have been a matter of preference, or perhaps they were not medically indicated in the cases brought to his attention. Wharton did not employ bleeding, as did James and William Carter, who treated Brafferton students in 1765-1766. There is no indication of the performance of surgical or dental procedures on Brafferton students.²⁷

Wharton's clinical procedures may have differed from methods previously known to his Indian patients, especially as regards the interrelation between medicine and belief systems, but some of the preparations used in treatment (bark, for example) may have been familiar or even acquired by the English from earlier contact with Indians.²⁸ It is generally impossible to tell from the accounts what specific illnesses were treated. Use of "The Cheste mixture" suggests a respiratory ailment; liniment was probably applied to sore muscles; but the various blistering agents, purgatives, emetics, and anti-diarrheal treatments would have had much broader application in treatment than simple reaction to a symptom. European medical theory of the time posited the need to balance bodily "humors" or "temperaments" in order to maintain or restore health, thus a purge might have been indicated for more than its immediate laxative effect.²⁹

Efficacy of the medical treatments employed is similarly hard to judge. Dr. Wharton apparently enjoyed a good reputation in the Williamsburg community; his patients included many prominent citizens.³⁰ The psychological and cultural aspects of medical care are more difficult to assess, and are not today fully explored by the medical community. There is no evidence to indicate that any of the
Indian students died or suffered serious illness after Hugh Jones' 1724 remarks, but neither is there any evidence concerning the students' reactions to Wharton's "bedside manner" or the degree of their faith in the curative powers of European medicine.

As Dr. Wharton was called to minister to the bodies of the Indian students, the missionary charge of the Brafferton school invoked a ministry to the spirit. Nothing in the backgrounds of John Fox, Robert Barret, Thomas Dawson, or their successors suggests any specific training for teaching Indians, either in native languages or firsthand knowledge of Indian culture. Charles Griffin's successes in teaching his students at Fort Christanna to recite prayers and creeds were duly noted, but little is known of the mechanics of his instructional techniques. It is probable that the masters of the Brafferton school relied more heavily upon their training as churchmen for guidance in how best to effect the conversion of the "heathen" in their charge. The need for more specific training and a directed response did not escape the attention of the leaders of the Anglican church or English missionary societies, who also sought to return growing numbers of English protestant dissenters to orthodoxy.

One such response came from Thomas Wilson (1663-1755), Anglican Bishop of Sodor and Man—An Essay towards an Instruction for the Indians, first published in 1740 and passing through over twenty editions in the next hundred years. Originally written at the behest of James Oglethorpe as a tract to be used in the conversion of Indians in Georgia, the book received wider distribution through the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The S. P. G. and the Bishop of London sent several hundred copies of the work along
with other religious tracts to Virginia in 1743. The books arrived around the time of James Blair's death, and were acknowledged by his nephew John Blair before being forwarded to William Dawson, President of the College and brother of the Indian master, "to be distributed in the best manner we can." William Dawson described the book's use at the College as follows:

According to Dr. Wilson's desire, I gave a Copy of the Essay to each of our Scholars, whom we endeavour to train up in sound Principles; that from hence, as from a Fountain, the pure Streams of Religion may be derived to all Parts of the Country; that from hence may proceed many able Persons, fit to serve GOD both in Church and State. The rest will be distributed, as Opportunity offers, and Occasion requires....I employed our Youth; every Night last Lent, in reading audibly, distinctly, and solemnly so much of this excellent Work, as the Understandings of the Hearers, in general, were able to receive, and their Memories to retain. For beside the Scholars, there were near 40 white Servants, Indians, and Negroes, who constantly attended. And as many of these as can conveniently be present, daily resort unto the House of GOD.

Dawson's use of the word "scholars" clouds understanding of the passage, for though it must be read in its broadest meaning—students of the College—other records of the institution use the term more narrowly to denote scholarship students, among whom were the Brafferton pupils. Surely the Brafferton's students were among the attendees at Dawson's readings. William Dawson's interest in the book continued; in 1745 a letter of testimonial from Dawson was added to the volume's fifth edition, and Dawson corresponded with the author's son about a later edition of the book. Shortly after William Dawson's death in 1752, the College received a bill from the S. P. G. which listed "34 Indians Instructed" at £2.11.0.

Structurally, the book consists of twenty "dialogues" in
question-and-answer form between a hypothetical Indian questioner and an English missionary, each dialogue concluding with a prayer. Appended are "Select Scriptures and Prayers"—including "A Supplication on behalf of the Heathen World" from Matthew 9:36, a "Missionary's Prayer" from John 17:20, and "Private and Family Prayers, &c."—intended to encourage an individual's growth in faith. The dialogues offer a mixture of Anglican church history, basic Christian theology, explanations of specific sacraments, and behavioral requirements in a step-by-step model of the desired conversion process.

Wilson's Indian questioner asks searching, difficult, but appropriate questions about the nature of the Christian God; the missionary's answers vary in tone. To the most basic of questions, the responses are almost haughty:

Ind. Be pleas'd then to tell me what you know more than we do, concerning the God you worship; for we know and believe, that there must be some GREAT POWER above us, who made us, and does govern all things here below.

Miss. But we Christians know much more of that Great Power above, than you, in your present State of Ignorance, can possibly do....

Ind. May I ask you one thing?—Why did not that good Being, whom you call your God, make all this known to us as well as to you?

Miss. I must tell you once for all, that we poor Creatures ought not to expect, that the GREAT GOD should give us an Account of every thing he has thought fit to do....

Proper behavior is presented as including an attitude of submission and obedience toward one's "betters" and toward authority figures (such as teachers?), remaining attentive and awake in church, temperance, keeping one's hands from "Picking and Stealing," and the practice of honesty in trade:
Ind. May I not be true and just in my Dealings, and
yet make myself as good a Bargain as I can?

Miss. Only consider, that if the Person you deal with
makes himself and ill Bargain, out of Ignorance,
Necessity, or out of Fear, it is a wicked thing
to take Advantage of him; and tho' you may defend
it by Law, you cannot answer it to God.39

When asked to explain the bad conduct of some who professed to be
Christians (always a sore point among churchmen), the missionary
responds with greater humility. The offenders are not "true Chris-
tians"; good Christians were aware of the problem and were "grieved"
by it. But the missionary is at his best on occasions where his
responses attempt to cast Christian principles in terms culturally
meaningful to the listener. Thus the sacrifice of God's son is
explained as atonement, and misbehavior portrayed as inviting of
"God's curse." In one lyrical exchange, the missionary responds to
his questioner's doubts about the existence of a god who cannot be
seen with a question of his own—can you see the wind? Yet you hear
and feel its power, and it is known by its effects.40

One can surmise that the instructional process in a real
classroom did not proceed so readily, but Indians Instructed probably
represented the general style employed. The Anglican catechism,
also taught in the Brafferton school, used the same question-response
format to convey information and a model of piety and civility to
those receiving instruction. Both Indians Instructed and the cate-
chism presupposed the basic receptivity of the students to whom they
were directed; neither considered or made provision for the obdurate
ones who might learn to recite correctly, never accepting the truth
of the principles they mouthed. That problem was probably better
addressed on an individual basis in the schoolroom, where the expe-
rience, inclination, and perseverance of the teacher would have been of primary importance.

Patterns that developed in the operation of the Brafferton school from roughly 1730-1750 enabled the College to put its house in order, as it were, by taking steps to address problems complained of in the past. Following the Transfer, the College made regular appointments to the position of Indian master, and the incumbents (who came from the ranks of the College's divinity students) generally remained long enough to have the benefit of interaction with Indian students. Provisions for the physical care of the Brafferton students were also regularized as the building completed in 1724 was brought into use, and arrangements for medical care were made. Without the impetus of government action to bring students to the school, and as the populations of the local tributary tribes declined, the number of students in attendance at the Brafferton seems also to have declined. When external circumstances changed, and the government of Virginia once again interested itself in ways in which the school could be used to further the government's interest, the College was better prepared to accept Indian students than it had been in earlier times.
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CHAPTER IV
DISSOLUTION

Following the relatively quiet decades of the 1720s-1740s, the early 1750s began a new period of outside involvement in the conduct of the Brafferton school. Internal and external pressures upon the Virginia government again brought the issue of Indian policy to the forefront, and the College became once more a tool of that policy. Differing from its earlier experiences with the school under Spotswood, the government's interests in the later era were more exclusively secular, and the degree of its involvement more limited. Contributing to this shift in attitude, increasing distractions of the era diverted the attention of Church leaders from concentration on the school's missionary role. The Brafferton school and its pool of prospective students had changed also, and neither the College nor its students were as yielding as their predecessors had been. The College had assumed greater responsibility for its own direction at the time of the Transfer; the Indian students of the 1750s came from more distant tribes, at a time when the "French threat" made the English more solicitous of Indian goodwill, and allowed the Indians in turn to be somewhat more demanding of the English. It is a final irony, then, that the operation of the school was brought to an end by outside forces over which the College had no control.

Pressures upon the Virginia government derived from three
sources. First, the local English population sought to expand the limits of the frontier, which produced incursions upon Indian lands. Second, the home government in England sought to increase the level of trade with local Indians in opposition to the tribes' desires for greater control of that trade. Finally, the shifting European balance of power as played out in North America created a need for Virginia and the other English colonies to strengthen old alliances with friendly Indians and to create new alliances where possible to counteract the moves of the French and Spanish.

The traditional English response addressed these needs by holding treaty conferences and a number of informal meetings with Indian leaders or their representatives. Significant treaty conferences were held with the Six Nations in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in 1744, and at Logg's Town, Pennsylvania, in 1752; a three-way conference was held between the Catawbas, Cherokees, and English Virginians at Catawba-Town and Broad River, South Carolina, in 1756. Other meetings (principally with the Cherokees) took place in Williamsburg in 1752, 1754, and 1762.

The Lancaster treaty conference of 1744 was a failure from the point of view of its promotion of Indian education at William and Mary. In an exchange well-publicized in both the official minutes of the treaty and repeated in a letter from Benjamin Franklin to Peter Collinson in 1753, the English described the various benefits and attractions of the Brafferton school only to receive a polite refusal. The Indian representative replied that the Indians loved their children "too well to send them so great a Way," and asked to be excused because the Indians were "not inclined to give their Children Learning."\(^1\)
Franklin elaborated that the reasons had further been

[quote]
The little value Indians set on what we prize so highly under the name of Learning....that it was remembered some of their Youths had formerly been educated in that College, but it had been observed that for a long time after they returned to their Friends, they were absolutely good for nothing being neither acquainted with the true methods of killing deer, catching Beaver or surprizing an enemy.  
[2]

The rejection was concluded with an offer to take a dozen or two English children to Onondago to be educated in the Indian fashion to make "men" of them.

The Virginians received another rejection at Logg's Town in 1752 at a conference designed to extract a renewed commitment from the Six Nations to honor the Lancaster treaty and settle various issues regarding trade and border conflicts. The English treaty commissioners reminded the Indian representatives of their standing offer to educate children at the College, and offered to send a teacher among the Indians if the distance and travel to Williamsburg proved objectionable. In support of the "Advantage of and English Education," they cited instruction in world history—which would demonstrate, they said, the good-faith dealings of the English and, conversely, the cruelties of the French and Spanish toward Indians. The "Half King" heading the Indian delegation paused, then deferred his response until the Onondaga Council could be consulted.  
[3]

In fact, the Logg's Town treaty had no legal standing with the Six Nations, for it was never confirmed by them.  
[4]

A group of Cherokees from Choto arrived in Williamsburg in August 1751 having "Traveelled through Bushes and Bryers" to seek trade agreements and a confirmation of the friendship of the Virginia
government. There is also some indication that the Cherokees hoped to take advantage of the rivalry between Virginia and South Carolina, intimating that the "Path to Carolina [had been] Difficult and incommo­dious for Carrying on a Trade" due to the failure of the governor to live up to agreements, a charge hotly disputed by South Carolina Governor James Glen.

The Virginia Gazette reported a "private Conversation" between the Cherokee representatives and Council President Lewis Burwell (acting governor of Virginia at the time), during which Burwell raised the subject of the Brafferton school. Burwell cited the "Hap­piness and Advantages" of the Christian religion, inviting the Chero­kees to send children to the school that they might be "Partakers of the Same Happiness with the English." The Cherokees "heartily thank'd his Honour for this Instance of his Affection, and assured him, that his Offer was very agreeable to them, but that they could return no Answer without consulting their Emperor."

A year later a delegation composed of Ammoscossity of Great Tellico, "the Emperor of the Cherokees, his Empress, Son, two Generals, and other Attendants" arrived in Williamsburg to continue the trade talks of the previous year, and to complain about South Carolina's encouragement of the Creeks. While in town, the Cherokees were entertained by the Governor and Council in high style, attending a perform­ance of Othello and a pantomime show, but received little more than polite reassurance of the Virginians' friendship. No mention is made of the Brafferton school in the official record of the talks, but it seems likely that the subject was taken up, for Cherokee students were enrolled at the College by Lady Day (March 25) 1754.
The College bursar's ledger shows a charge of £100 "Due at Lady-Day 1754" for Indians Jno. Sampson, Chs. Murphey, Gid: Langston, Wm. Cooke, John Langston, Thos. Sampson, Wm. Squirrel, and John Montour. The same students are listed the following year, with charges totalling £90.12.6 apportioned among them. The College's Provisional List, published in 1941, dates their attendance from 1753-1755, deleting the names of William Cooke and John Langston in the final year. Perhaps Cooke and Langston were the runaways complained of by Governor Dinwiddie in a letter to the Cherokee leaders in 1756:

The Young Men that came here for Education at our College did not like Confinement, and, in Course, no Inclination to Learning. They were too old. If you sh'd think proper to send any, they sh'd not exceed the Age of 8 Years. Those that came here were well cloath'd and properly taken Care of, but they co'd not be reconcil'd to their Books; they went away of their own accord with't leave. If any come hereafter, about the above Age, I will cause proper Care to be taken of them.

But other students came to different ends. John Montour, whose name appears on the 1753-1755 list, was not one of the Cherokee students. His father was Andrew Montour, an interpreter and trader of mixed Indian and one-eighth French-Canadian descent. Andrew Montour was a participant in the Logg's Town treaty negotiations, and George Washington sought his aid at Fort Cumberland during the French and Indian War. Several of Governor Dinwiddie's letters of the period contain asides or postscripts requesting that news of the son's good health be relayed to the father. John Montour "commanded a company of Delaware Indians in the service of the Americans in 1782," and evidently learned to understand and write English, for a draft
Either John or Gideon Langston is likely to have been the grandfather of John Mercer Langston, the first black from Virginia elected to the United States House of Representatives.19

The subject of the Brafferton school came up again briefly in the course of treaty negotiations in 1756 between representatives of Virginia, the Cherokees, and the Catawbas. The Virginia commissioners Peter Randolph and William Byrd raised the subject as a diversionary tactic:

The Present indeed is not so large as we could wish, for the Reason already mentioned that the most material Articles, were not to be had in our Colony. To remove these Jealousies for the future we would fain have you send some of your Boys to Virginia, where we have a School erected for their Education. We promise you that all due Care shall be taken of them, both with Respect to their Cloaths and Learning. When they have come to be Men, they will be acquainted with the Manners and Customs of us both, and our Children will naturally place such Confidence in them as to employ them in settling any Disputes that may hereafter arise.20

The tactic was unsuccessful in that the Indians' response the next day returned to the subject at hand—the military alliance between themselves and the English against the French, and the proposed construction of forts along the frontier—and the school was not mentioned again.

The continued pressure of English encroachments on Indian lands along the frontier, miscellaneous border disputes, and the failure of the colonial governments to fulfill treaty agreements to build and staff forts strained relations between Indian and colonist. Open
hostilities flared during the Cherokee War of 1760-1761 and Dunmore's War in 1774.  

The Brafferton school figured in a minor way in one last treaty conference in 1775. Virginia's treaty commissioner, Dr. Thomas Walker, returned from meeting with the "Ohio indians" (including representatives of the Delawares, Shawnees, Senecas, Wiandots, and Tawaas) accompanied by "a young Indian (son of the famous Bawbee) to be educated at the college." Increasingly, however, the Virginia government viewed frontier issues in military and economic terms, and it had to deal with so-called "foreign Indians" who bargained from a position of greater strength than had the tributaries of Spotswood's era. Education was no longer seen as an efficient method of advancing the government's primary goals.

As the government's relationship with the Brafferton school changed with political circumstance, so the College's relationship with the Church of England and the English missionary societies was in transition. From the time of its foundation, the College had been an important symbol (and James Blair the embodiment) of the establishment and authority of the Church of England in Virginia. At mid-century, however, there were both internal and external challenges to this traditional structure of authority, further complicated by the personalities of the leaders involved.

By 1748 the leading figures in England and Virginia had changed. James Blair died in 1743; none of his successors enjoyed the concentration and effective use of power Blair had achieved as College President, Bishop's Commissary, and Councillor. The groundwork had been laid in the conditions of the College Transfer, but
was exacerbated by frictions in the College and Virginia Church that resulted in the division of the College presidency and the office of Bishop's Commissary between William Stith and Thomas Dawson. In 1748 the tradition of support and leadership from interested Bishops of London serving as Chancellors of the College was weakened by the succession of Thomas Sherlock to the positions formerly held by Edmund Gibson. The effect of Sherlock's disinterest in "the Plantations" was compounded by his weakening power to influence doctrine or politics at home or abroad. Without the instigation of the Bishop of London, similarly, the English missionary societies took few or no initiatives in support of Indian conversion at the Brafferton school or in Virginia generally.

What is amazing, then, is that the Brafferton school continued its work despite the lack of leadership from government and Church. The small but steady level of activity in the school that persisted from the 1750s until the American revolution, shown in the College bursar's accounts, is a testament to the maturity attained by the College in the 1730s and 1740s.

Following the College's well-established tradition, Emmanuel Jones was elevated from the position of usher of the grammar school to fill Thomas Dawson's place as Indian master when Dawson became President of the College in 1755. Jones was the son of the Rev. Emmanuel Jones (1688-1739), minister of Petsworth Parish in Gloucester County, Virginia. The younger Jones evidently attended William and Mary prior to his appointment as grammar usher, but did not pursue divinity studies leading to ordination. Upon his elevation to the faculty, Jones was listed only as A.B. Jones was appointed clerk to
the faculty meeting in 1756 and librarian of the College in 1761, both
perquisites which increased his income. He participated briefly in
the faculty's refusal to submit to the authority of the Visitors in
1757, but recanted almost immediately and regained his appointment as
Indian master, sitting for a time (with President Dawson) as the only
member of the College faculty. Jones was again involved in contro­
versy in 1776 when he was chastised for removing a cask of nails from
the College storehouse without first obtaining permission to borrow
them. When Jones resigned in 1777, he had held the title of Indian
master for twenty-two years, longer than any previous incumbent. 25

Despite the repeated refusals of Indian negotiators to make
attendance at the Brafferton school a condition of their agreements
with the English, the school maintained a small but consistent
enrollment from the early 1760s until its close in 1777. In addition
to the eight students' names recorded in 1753-1755, the College bursar's
ledgers show regular charges against "The Table" for the board of from
three to five Indian students charged to "Brafferton Manor." (See
Appendix 2.) The College charged the estate £12.10 per student per
year for board, a sum well in line with the fees charged other
students. 26

No differentiation is made in the accounts between food
purchased for the use of the Indian school and that bought for the
rest of the College community. Typical purchases (also listed under
"The Table") included beef, pork, and "Butchermeat"; lard, butter,
and cheese; sugar, vinegar, molasses, wheat, corn, hops, and "flower,"
and wine. 27 These purchases were supplemented by fresh produce from
the College's kitchen garden. The faculty minutes further directed
that three meals a day "be serv'd up in the cleanest, and neatest manner possible," requiring both fresh and salt meat for dinner, with puddings or pies twice weekly and on Sunday, and special provision for the sick. Many of the foods listed above would have been familiar to Indian students, though the specific styles of preparation and the schedule and manner of serving food differed.

The Brafferton students were clothed in the English fashion. The College bursar's accounts of 1763-1774 show frequent payments to Williamsburg tailor Robert Nicolson "for mak[ing] Indians Cloaths" and to James Taylor "for shoes for the Indians." A 1773 bill headed "Cloathing for the Ingen Boys" lists the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 Yards of Green Pleans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Doz. of Large buttsans</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-1/2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Doz. Small buttsans</td>
<td></td>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-1/2 yd. Osnabrugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-1/4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pear of Shoue buckels</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-1/2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Do. of Knie buckels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hatts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pare of Mens Stockings</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Pare of Womens Stockings</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-1/2d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pleans was plain cloth, a kind of flannel; oznabrugs and dowlas forms of coarse linen or cotton, the latter also applicable to calico. The curious listing of both men's and women's stockings on the bill might be accounted for by differences in size, or less likely, by the presence of decoration on one or the other.

Medical attention was provided in the period 1764-1777 by Williamsburg apothecaries William and James Carter. The College accounts list only visits and total charges; a surviving single bill
in the William and Mary College Papers provides the only significant
detail about treatments in the period, and next to nothing about the
specific illnesses being treated. This is typical of medical accounts
of the period. The Carters prescribed a variety of baths, purges,
powders, and "mixtures," and also employed bleeding and leeches upon
occasion. The unfortunate student Samson was the object of most of
the protracted series of visits in the fall of 1765, beginning with
the application of a dressing and ointment (cerate) to his leg. The
apparent failure to effect a cure led to a series of bleedings (some­
times with leeches), vomits, and "antifebrifuge" (fever-reducing)
powders. 33 The College employed a nurse, Phoebe Dwit (or Divit) to
attend to minor illnesses among the grammar and College students; it
is possible that her charges included an occasional Indian. 34

Other expenses charged against the Brafferton endowment
included the master's salary, "sundries," and charges for the repair
and upkeep of the building. The master's salary was established in
the College statutes at "Forty or Fifty Pounds Sterling, according
to the Ability of that School," and he was further permitted to
teach "other scholars from the Town" at the rate of twenty shillings
a year. 35 Emmanuel Jones' salaries in the years covered by the
Bursar's ledgers fall within the range specified, and he further
supplemented his income by gaining appointments as College librarian
and "Clerk to the Society," responsible for keeping the faculty
minutes. His salary account was charged for various personal expenses,
and reimbursed for "sundries"--stationery supplies, wood for the
Brafferton fireplaces, and the like.

The school building, forty years old by the early 1760s,
was in need of upkeep and occasional minor repairs. The Bursar's records show a number of small payments to the local contractors John Saunders and Mrs. Mary Wray for "work" and "repairs"; "Mrs. Wray's Glaziers" received one shilling sixpence in 1770. Saunders and Humphrey Harwood, "Bricklayr," collected fees totalling £150.16.1-1/2 in 1773-1774. No description of the work is given, but the size of the expenditures may serve to date the construction of the Brafferton kitchen adjacent to the main building. The kitchen building is not mentioned in surviving records before that date (or indeed after it); it is not depicted in the Bodleian plate of circa 1740. A structure of appropriate size and location is shown on the so-called "Frenchman's map" of Williamsburg in 1786, (See Figures III and IV.) Humphrey Harwood's charge for whitewashing two passages at "Mr. Brackin's or Brafeton" September 3, 1777 indicates that the grammar master had taken up residence in the building. The Rev. John Bracken was chosen to fill the place of Emmanuel Jones as librarian and clerk of the meeting upon the latter's resignation April 9, 1777. If any of the Indian students present in 1776 remained on at the school until its dissolution in 1777, it seems likely that they would have been placed under the care of the grammar master, and that in turn suggests a reason for Bracken's taking up residence in the Brafferton.

Income from the yearly rents and profits of Brafferton Manor in Yorkshire continued to support the school and the other beneficiaries named in the 1697 "Rules and Methods" established by the Boyle executors. In 1753, however, the directorship established by that document changed when Richard Boyle, third and last Earl of Burlington, died. This placed oversight of the fund solely under the
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purview of the Bishop of London. In a more immediate sense, income from the Manor was transmitted by a resident "collector" to the College's London exchange agent, who then applied the funds to the school's credit. On the other side of the Atlantic, the College bursar kept track of the funds through the "Profit and Loss" account, recording income as it was received and advancing money as needed to meet the Brafferton school's local obligations in the interim.

With control of the Manor's income thus dispersed, auditing to ensure that proper credit was received could prove exasperating to the College. Intimations of mishandling of the fund, first reported in 1758, were investigated by John Blair (who was appointed Bursar in 1760) over a two-year period with no conclusive result. Beilby Porteus, son of the long-time collector Robert Porteus, wrote to advise that William Hind, an "artfull, self-interested, litigious attorney" and "plausible designing Man," had seized control of the Manor. It was charged that Hind had done so by ingratiating himself with the elder Porteus, whose faculties were "impair'd by Age & infirmity," persuading him to resign in favor of Hind. Beilby Porteus asserted that this had not been his father's intention, and that Hind's takeover had resulted in great mischief in the operation of the Manor. Porteus proposed instead the appointment of his brother-in-law Edward Thompson of Helperby,

a Gentleman of 3 or 400 £ a year, who has no profession or private End to serve, lives contiguous to Brafferton, is remarkable for the strictest Integrity & Honour & does not desire the Stewardship for the profits of it, which are very inconsiderable, but merely to preserve himself from the Trouble of so injurious a Neighbour as Hind, or of any other Person, who may endeavour to disturb him in his retirement,
or his own brother, Edward Porteus of York. Beilby Porteus' argument seemingly proved convincing, for the faculty minutes record a unanimous resolution shortly thereafter that Edward Thompson be appointed "Steward of the Brafferton Estate."  

The question of accountability, once raised by the Porteus family, did not die easily. In October 1759 the College reaffirmed the authority given to its London agents, vesting in them "full Power to revoke all former Commissions granted to others, & to settle the Accounts due to the said Estate." Upon John Blair's appointment as bursar in February 1760, he undertook his own investigation of the accounts, reporting three months later:

I have perused all the Papers relative to the Brafferton Affair with as much Care and Attention as their Prolongity and Dullness would admit of: And I cannot but think upon the whole that not only Thompson the present Steward but his Predecessors too have customarily made greater advantages of that office, than they would have openly appear.

Blair could find no other reason for the competition that had existed between two relatively wealthy interests for an office paying £20 per year. Indeed, upon questioning by the Hanburys, the Porteus family had admitted to unreported profit-taking on sales of wood from Brafferton Manor during Robert Porteus' stewardship, which the sons defended as "Part of his usual Perquisites." In the end, Blair recommended that the choice of a steward be left to the Hanburys, believing that "[n]either of the Persons who [had] been tried [were] proper for that Trust," and that in any case the Hanburys were in a better position to know potential applicants for the office and to call them to accounts. Three years later Edward Thompson was replaced as steward by John Clough, who held the position until 1790.
The investigations and manipulations of the management of the Brafferton estate produced no significant effect upon income received by the College, as reported in the College bursar's accounts. The reaction of Beilby Porteus to the unseating of his choice as steward is less clear; if Porteus harbored any resentment toward the Hanburys or the College, it was not immediately made known. Porteus was not in a position to have had much influence over the decision at that time. The harvest of his ill-will, if indeed it was sown by the dismissal of Thompson, was not reaped until well after the effective demise of the fund as it concerned the College.

Ironically, though the College had over the years developed some degree of initiative and independence over political control of the Brafferton school, it was politics that brought the school to an end. Put simply, the endowment was an early casualty of the American Revolution: when the American colonies "fell into a state of rebellion," economic ties with England were severed. 46 The last payment to the College was recorded by the bursar on March 25, 1776, and without income the school soon ceased to function. The College advanced funds from other sources to support the Brafferton school for a short time, but was unable or unwilling to continue to do so. 47 The long-time master of the school, Emmanuel Jones, resigned in 1777 following a minor scandal over his misappropriation of nails belonging to the College. The College was nearly vacated as the Revolution progressed, the clergy distracted by disruptions in the Church of England occasioned by the war, and the seat of government was moved from Williamsburg to Richmond in 1780.

The idea of Indian education in Virginia was briefly revived
by Thomas Jefferson in his *Notes on the State of Virginia* (1785). The Brafferton school was included in his plan for the reorganization of the College, but in a form more reflective of Jefferson's intellectual curiosity than of the College's earlier efforts:

> The purposes of the Brafferton would be better answered by maintaining a perpetual mission among the Indian tribes, the object of which, besides instructing them in the principles of Christianity, as the founder requires, should be to collect their traditions, laws, customs, languages, and other circumstances which might lead to a discovery of their relation with one another, or descent from other nations. When these objects are accomplished with one tribe, the missionary might pass on to another.48

Jefferson's plan offered the possibility of a greater formal exchange of knowledge between Indians and Virginians than the College ever attempted, but the school was never revived after the Revolution.

The College brought suit in an English chancery court in 1790, in a vain attempt to regain the profits of the estate. The case was heard by Lord Chancellor Thurlow, and local barristers James Mansfield and John Mitford argued the case for the College. Testimony revealed that the annual profits from the estate had been "£300 per annum and upwards," and through the sale of lumber from the Manor and the accumulation of interest on the dormant fund, the balance mounted to £13,849.2.10. Mansfield and Mitford argued that the College was able and willing to meet the intention of the founders of the Brafferton school; that the College's existence as a corporation was preserved by the Treaty of Paris, and that there was no need to disturb the fund. Finally, the College's claim as a creditor for unreimbursed expenses was presented: "if they are no longer to be intrusted with this fund, yet they are creditors for so much, and ought to be satis-
fied for that debt." 

Then entered Beilby Porteus, elevated in 1787 to the station of Bishop of London, and thereby sole trustee of "The Charity of the Honourable Robert Boyle." Porteus' bill before the Court asked that "the disposition of this charity [be] taken away from the College, because emancipated from the controul of [the] Court; and for liberty to [devise] a new scheme for the future disposition of it...." The Court denied the Bishop's petition as it related to the case at hand, limiting his interest as Trustee to the "mode of administration of the charity," if misbehavior of the College were alleged. But the Court also found that the College had no legal standing to sue in British courts as a corporation under the Crown, nullifying both arguments presented on its behalf. Lord Chancellor Thurlow indicated some sympathy toward the College's claim as a creditor, but "did not know by what name to give them the costs."

The decision left one loophole to Bishop Porteus, through which he was given the opportunity to exact any lingering desire for revenge for the College's actions thirty years before:

"The corporation" referred to Harvard College's share of the fund, for certainly at that time the Cherokees could still be considered Virginia's "neighbouring infidels." Porteus' plan for the application of the trust achieved the end sought for in the bill in Chancery: proceeds
of the estate were permanently diverted toward "the conversion and religious instruction of the Negroes in the British West-India Islands." 52

The College kept the building built for the Brafferton school and used it for various purposes as need arose. Grammar master John Bracken took up residence there as early as 1777. The faculty minutes of December 31, 1782, predating the Court's final disposition of the fund, show a resolution "that the Brafferton's House be rented at the rate of £50 per Annum." The minutes of October 26, 1840 report that "the kitchen and smoke house of the Brafferton stood in great need of repairs." The building was damaged, as were other College buildings, during occupation of the campus by Union troops in the Civil War years. The building was restored to its present state in the course of the restoration undertaken by Colonial Williamsburg, and presently houses administrative offices.
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The Brafferton school was a conscious product of the efforts of English Virginia to modify the actions and beliefs of local and "foreign" Indians, but it was never simply a school for Indians. Throughout its existence the school was a product of the interaction of Indian and English groups, and also of the relations between Englishmen and between Indians. In addition to the Indian students and members of the College community most directly involved in the school, other parties concerned included the government of Virginia, Indians living outside Williamsburg, and the Anglican church. Each had an agenda of interests it hoped to advance through the school, and those interests overlapped and sometimes conflicted with one another. A group's ability to prevail at any time depended upon the skills and inclinations of the individuals involved, and any evaluation of the school as a whole must perforce consider those constituencies.

The government of English Virginia used the Brafferton school as a tool in the negotiation and maintenance of treaty relationships with its Indian neighbors. The English sought to secure their borders against violent attacks by Indians; to promote trade with friendly Indians (or those who could be rendered friendly); and to maintain or improve England's position in the European-colonial balance of power through alliances with Indians. In a more general sense, the English
hoped to remake the Indian character into an approximation of more familiar English values and behavior in the hope of making the Indians more tractable. Equality in a social sense was not considered.

Virginia's neighboring Indians sought to achieve many of the same goals, through negotiations that involved the Brafferton school, as did the English government, but from a 180° shift in perspective. Indians wished to secure their borders against the incursions of English land development. They hoped to gain security against attacks by other unfriendly Indian tribes through alliances with the English, and occasionally to play the various European interests off against one another to benefit Indian interests. Finally, Indians wished to encourage trade with Virginia, and surely saw the advantage of acquiring information about the English language and practices in order to ensure fair dealings. It should be emphasized that not one, but several Indian tribes were involved in the operation of the school, and that they acted separately, not monolithically.

The role of the Anglican church is somewhat entangled because of its close connections with the College and the government. The saving of souls is the obvious province of the church; hand-in-hand with the extension of the kingdom of its God went the extension of the influence of the Anglican church. As the bad example of white Christians was frequently lamented, perhaps the sight of Indian faithful may have served to discourage apostasy among the English.

It has been suggested that the College's founder and first president, James Blair, was interested in the Brafferton school only because of its handsome endowment, the prestige the endowment gave to the College in its difficult early years, and the opportunity the
Indian school provided to curry favor with prominent English churchmen who fancied missionary work as a pet project from their comfortable seats in England. Indeed, Blair was a calculating man, and the Brafferton school's early years were among its most troubled. The College never carefully defined its goals for the school or the specific methods by which those goals would be attained. But in other ways it is clear that, administratively, the Brafferton school came to be viewed and accepted as part of the general educational and religious mission of the College. The school was included in the College statutes enacted and revised several times over the course of the eighteenth century, supported financially in anticipation of receipts on the trust account, and regularly staffed until the time of the Revolution. The Indian master, though typically young at the time of appointment, held a somewhat favored position within the College and church administration, one which placed him in line for greater personal achievement as his career progressed.

In the early years, especially, the College had to be nudged or given a firm push into the performance of its obligations toward the Boyle trust, but as the College developed and matured so did its ability and inclination to assume responsibility for the conduct of the school without outside direction. There were incidents of malfeasance and perfidy (the library incident), when it seemed that the College was interested only in collecting the money due it from the Boyle estate, but also moments of unexpected insight (such as the decision to allow students to be accompanied by a fellow tribesman in order that they might maintain their native language skills).

Turning finally to the educational accomplishments of the
school, the great difficulty (to paraphrase Hugh Jones) is the "little right knowledge" we have of what actually transpired in the school. Even the meager accounts describing comparable activity in the New England colonies seem full by comparison. From available evidence, it appears that the number of students in the Brafferton school was small, never exceeding twenty-four at a time; they were all male, and ranged in age from perhaps seven to fifteen. Complaints from Robert Dinwiddie indicated that some of the students were "too old," and he suggested that in the future they not be above the age of eight. Students from various tribes were intermingled in the classroom and in their living arrangements. They ate, dressed, and were medicated in the English fashion. Classroom instruction, conducted in English, consisted of reading, writing, arithmetic, possibly Latin and Greek, and catechism in the Anglican religion. Some died, others ran away, and none are known to have returned to their homeland as Christian missionaries.

Though the Brafferton school was established many years later, its founders do not appear to have profited from the longer experience of New England's Puritan missionaries or the Jesuits in New France. On the surface, it seems that more was accomplished in New England than in Virginia: the "praying towns," Indian churches, missions, and published works in Indian dialects influenced far greater numbers, and by the eighteenth century many of New England's remaining Indians were Anglicized in language, dress, and living arrangements. But Harvard's seventeenth century efforts were no less disorganized than William and Mary's early years, and Eleazar Wheelock's harsh discipline at Dartmouth met with greater expressed disapproval from
his Indian students and their families than any reaction received at William and Mary from Brafferton scholars. Though Indians invited to send children to the College sometimes declined to do so, citing disinterest in an irrelevant curriculum, the parents of students in attendance there were reported to be well-satisfied with the care given to their children. In heightened contrast, the success of the Jesuit missionaries is attributable to their concentration on religious issues and their efforts to understand and apply elements of traditional Indian culture before condemning it.¹

The truth of Eleazar Wheelock's observation that "Few conceive aright of the Difficulty of Educating an Indian and turning him into an Englishman but those who undertake the Trial of it"² was certainly proven at William and Mary. The "good works" envisioned by the Brafferton's founders brought little credit to the College, and less accomplishment.
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APPENDIX A

1697

Present Rules and Methods settled and agreed on by us Richard Earle of Burlington and Henry Lord Bishop of London, for the disposition of the Rents and profits of the Mannor of Brafferton in the County of York towards the Propagating the Gospel in Virginia in pursuance of an Authority to us given in and by a Decree in the High Court of Chancery bearing date the Eighth day of August one thousand six hundred ninety five in a Cause wherein the Attorney Generall Dame Elizabeth Gerrard and Thomas Owen Esquire are Plaintiffs the said Richard Earle of Burlington Sir Henry Ashurst and John Warr are defendants:

(1) First All the yearly Rents and profits of the said Mannor of Brafferton as well those incurred due since the purchase thereof as which shall hereafter grow due (after the deduction thereof of ninety pounds a yeare to the Colledge for propagating the Gospel in New England and other necessary and incident charges) shall be by the present and future Receivers of the Rents thereof paid into the Hands of Micajah Perry of London Merchant Agent in London for the President and Masters of the Colledge of William and Mary in Virginia and to all future Agent or Agents in England for the said Colledge in Order to Transmittest the same to Virginia to the President and Masters of the said Colledge for the time being for the purposes hereafter mentioned and Such Agent or Agents Receipts or acquittances shall be sufficient discharges to such Receiver or Receivers for what shall be soe paid:

(2) Secondly all Summe and Summs of money already and that shall hereafter be received out of the said Mannor Subject to deductions aforesaid) shall be hereafter remitted to the President and Masters of the said Colledge for the time being.

(3) The said President and Masters and his and their Successors shall thereout expend soe much as shall be necessary towards fitting and furnishing Lodgeings and Roomes for such Indian Children as shall be hereafter brought into the said Colledge as alsoe for buying or procureing Such Children.

(4) The said President and Masters and his and their Successors shall keep att the said Colledge so many Indian Children in Sickness and health in Meat drink Washing Lodgeing Cloathes Medicines bookes and Educacon from the first beginning of Letters till they are ready to receive Orders and be thought Sufficient to be sent abroad to preach and Convert the Indians at the rate of fourteen pounds per Annum for every such Child, as the yearly income of the premisses (Subject to the deductions aforesaid) shall amount unto:

(5) That the care instruccon and Education of such Children as shall be hereafter placed in the said Colledge shall be left to the President and Masters thereof for the time being but yett subject therein (as they are for all their other Trusts to the Visitation or Inspecon of the Rector
(6) That the said President and Masters and his and their Successors shall once every yeare transmitt to the Earle of Burlington and the Lord Bishopp of London for the time being a particular accompt of what Summe or Summes of money they shall hereafter receive by vertue of these presents as alsoe lay out or expend on all or any the matters aforesaid and the occasion or occasions thereof as alsoe the number and names of the Indian Children that shall be hereafter brought into the said Colledge together with their Progresse or proficiency in their Studies and of all other matters relating thereto:

(7) That the laying out the money from time to time hereafter to be remitted as also the manner and Method of Educateing and instructing Such Children and all other matters Relating to this Charity or the Execution of it shall be Subject to Such other Rules and Methods as shall from time to time hereafter be transmitted to the sd. President and Masters and his and their Successors by the Earle of Burlington and the Lord Bishop of London for the time being and in default thereof to such Rules and Methods as the Rector and Governors of the said Colledge for the time being shall make or appoint but until such other and further Rules be made the Rules and direccons hereby given are to take place:

(8) And that the name of Benefactor may not be forgotten wee the sd. Earle of Burlington and Lord Bishop of London doe direct and appoint that the said Charity Shall be hereafter called the Charity of the Honble. Robert Boyle of the City of London deceased: In witnesse whereof wee have hereunto sett our hands and Seales the one and twentieth day of December Anno Dom one thousand six hundred ninety seaven:

Burlington
Small red wax seal

H. London
Small red wax seal

ENDORSED: Rules and Methods agreed on for the Settlement of Mr. Boyles Charity in Virginia.
### APPENDIX B

**BRAFFERTON SCHOOL ATTENDANCE—SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1711</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 Chickahominy; 2 Meherrins; 2 Nansemonds; 2 Nottoways; 3 Pamunkeys [Spotswood]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1712</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>plus 4 &quot;brought years ago&quot; [Spotswood]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>[Spotswood]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;in the past as many as 7 or 8 at a time; now can get very few&quot; [Hugh Grove]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1736-1742</td>
<td>min. 3</td>
<td>William Jefferies; Thomson; Jno. Ward [Wharton]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1743</td>
<td>min. 4</td>
<td>Scarborough; Stephen; Tomkins; Jno. Ward; &quot;Two Boys&quot; [Wharton]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1745</td>
<td>min. 1</td>
<td>Stephen [Wharton]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>William Cooke; Gideon Langston; John Langston; John Montour; Charles Murphy; John Sampson; Thomas Sampson; William Squirrel [W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>William Cooke; Gideon Langston; John Langston; John Montour; Charles Murphy; John Sampson; Thomas Sampson; William Squirrel [W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1768</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1769</td>
<td>min. 2</td>
<td>Robert Mush; George Sampson [W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>John Nettles [W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BRAFFERTON SCHOOL ATTENDANCE—SUMMARY

**Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1773</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1774</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mons. Baubee; George Sampson; Reuben Sampson [W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>James Gunn; Edmund Sampson [W&amp;M Bursar]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE ON SOURCES:**

The bracketed, underlined sources refer to the total in the "Number" column, and are cited more fully in the text, references to the text, and the bibliography. Names of students are occasionally mentioned in those sources, and are listed in *The History of the College of William and Mary From its Foundation, 1660, to 1874* (Richmond, 1874) and *A Provisional List of Alumni, Grammar School Students, Members of the Faculty, and Members of the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary in Virginia, From 1693 to 1888* (Richmond, 1941).
APPENDIX C

MASTERS OF THE BRAFFERTON SCHOOL

Christopher Jackson -1716
Christopher Smith 1716-1718?
Rev. Charles Griffin 1718-1720?
Richard Cocke 1728-1729
Rev. John Fox 1729-1737
Rev. Robert Barret 1737-1738
Rev. Thomas Dawson 1738-1755
Emmanuel Jones 1755-1777
Rev. John Bracken 1777-1779?
APPENDIX D

PRESIDENTS OF THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, 1693-1812

Rev. James Blair 1693-1743
Rev. William Dawson 1743-1752
Rev. William Stith 1752-1755
Rev. Thomas Dawson 1755-1761
Rev. William Yates 1761-1764
Rev. James Horrocks 1764-1771
Rev. John Camm 1771-1777
Rt. Rev. James Madison 1777-1812
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