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My thesis studies the multiple social roles of an early nineteenth-century tavern in Louisa County, Virginia. Elisha Jackson's tavern and store served the local community from approximately 1810 to 1845. Services included the tavern and store, post office, blacksmith shop, plank-sawing operation, and a tanyard. I have examined the 1816 daybook and property taxes closely to discover the breadth of influence the tavern had in the lives of the local inhabitants. The myriad purposes the tavern complex provided to its rural neighborhood made it a focus of local economic, social, and political activity and made its owner an important figure in the community. In the early nineteenth century when a liberal democratic ethos replaced the hierarchical social order of the eighteenth century, a new class of men assumed prominence next to the declining gentry. Entrepreneurs like Jackson were on the rise. After 1865 their dominance of the local economy and social order was complete.
ELISHA JACKSON'S TAVERN: A RURAL NODE OF POWER
INTRODUCTION

The wagon of Mr. King, a travelling showman, was tossed and jostled by the potholes and stumps on the Louisa road. Relief came into view in the shape of a small village on the roadside. A large brick building surrounded by several dependencies, and a large wooden frame house fronting the road promised refreshment and, perhaps, an audience. He drove into the compound greeted by the sounds of busy activity - a hammer clanging on an anvil, and shouts from the tavern. A black hostler, a slave, welcomed him and saw to his horse. Mr. King walked into the bar room and looked around. Displayed prominently on the wall to his left at eye level were the rates of the tavern, surrounded by various advertisements for runaway slaves and upcoming auctions. He observed the clientele: simple farmers, dressed plainly in Virginia cloth. The neighborhood regulars in turn regarded him. By the make of his wagon he clearly was not from these parts, they judged. King ordered a gill of whiskey "for the good of the house." When the proprietor, Elisha Jackson, asked him his name to record in his daybook, King replied, "Mr. Showman." Local interest suddenly rose; they begged him to give a performance, for news of his act had preceded him on the road. Soon the
tavern was swarming with the men, women, and children of the neighborhood. "How fortunate to stop here," King thought to himself, "and lucrative. . . ."

Late on a Saturday in mid September, 1816, William Poindexter, a State Senator and the Commonwealth's prosecutor for Louisa County, walked into Jackson's Tavern. Business at the county court had kept him away from the tavern all week. John Richardson, a local farmer, offered him some brandy from his cruet. They soon finished Richardson's cruet, and Poindexter bought the next round. Jackson and Richardson acquainted Poindexter with the gossip of the neighborhood, and Poindexter concluded that all was well. In turn Poindexter related the recent occurrences at the courthouse, drinking another convivial glass of whiskey with his constituents who might help him in the next State election. . . .

Nelson Crenshaw, a propertyless laborer, ordered his fourth half pint of whiskey on a Monday afternoon in April. The credit he had earned working for Jackson since the previous Tuesday dissipated from his whiskey glass. He drew twelve and a half cents a day, and Jackson had docked him half of Saturday's wages for whiskey. Still, that did not stop him from having a convivial drink with Mr. Poindexter and Peter Winn, a free black. When the work and credit for whiskey dried up here, he would just hit the road again. . . .

Elisha Jackson's Tavern in eastern Louisa County was an important institution in the lives of these three men and
scores of others like them. Serving a core clientele from the local community and transient elements such as travellers, wagoners, and other itinerant workingmen, the tavern of early nineteenth-century rural Virginia was a nexus between the local economy and larger markets in Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Baltimore. The tavern's importance as a hub of communication and socializing equaled its significance as an economic center for the community. In a sparsely settled landscape with few towns, villages like the one around Jackson's Tavern, (which also included a post office, general merchandise store, blacksmith shop, tanyard, and a nearby church), played a crucial role in the everyday life of rural society. To a similar extent, the responsibility of local government fell upon such public places for minor administrative needs and the maintenance of social order. With his economic, social, and political influence the local tavern keeper became a powerful figure in his community.

In eighteenth-century Virginia the ordinary, or tavern, was an important place of assembly for the entire male community. Along with the county courthouse and the parish church, the tavern was a fundamental institution of the community. The taverns frequented by both the gentry and the lower social orders furnished a stage for the local gentry to display a paternalistic liberality, reinforcing their social standing while providing a forum in which small planters and gentry could socialize at a common level. Assembly at these
colonial taverns was intermittent, but taverns were the scene of a variety of activities and business: gaming, drinking, borrowing, lending, buying, and selling. Taverns were an important link in the communication network, places where news could be read aloud to a predominantly illiterate population. All of these activities went on under the patronage of the local gentry, whose domination of local affairs furthered the community's ties of deference to themselves. Alongside the county court, the militia field, and the parish vestry, the local tavern was a site where the colonial gentry displayed and wielded their oligarchic power.  

The American Revolution undermined the social order of the eighteenth century. The deferential, paternalistic, organic order which the gentry ruled was slowly overturned during the first few decades of the early Republic by a liberal, individualistic, entrepreneurial political economy. At the same time the landed gentry of Virginia retreated from public life and leadership to their plantations. Self-made men became the models of citizenship in the increasingly

democratic Republic. No longer able or willing to rely upon the leadership of the gentry, society found new leaders. On the local level in Piedmont Virginia, the crossroads tavern keeper/entrepreneur seized local economic power and concomitant social and political power for himself. These backcountry tavern keepers and merchants were conversant in the languages of both the old moral economy and the new capitalist marketplace. In the process of leading the rural countryside into the modern commercial market, the local tavern keeper secured significant power and influence in his neighborhood.

My thesis examines the prominence of a local tavern keeper in early nineteenth-century Louisa County, Virginia. Elisha Jackson kept a tavern from 1810 to 1845 on the Louisa Road in eastern Louisa County. Nine daybooks, three ledgers, a blacksmith shop book, and a Post Office account book have survived. I have focused my research on the 1816 daybook and the ledgers spanning the years 1811 - 1814 and 1813 - 1816.


Traveller's Rest Day Books. Manuscripts and Rare Books Department, Swem Library, College of William and Mary.
I entered every transaction of 1816 into a relational database and searched court records, property and land tax records, and genealogical records for information on Elisha Jackson and his customers. My research has revealed that Elisha Jackson wielded great economic, political, and social influence within the neighborhood of his tavern. It was entrepreneurs like Jackson who assumed authority when the old families who had ruled Virginia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries retreated from public life.

Chapter I sets the scene: the physical, material, social, and economic environment of Louisa County. Chapter II describes the pervasive influence of the tavern keeper in the local economy's networks of credit, commerce, and finance. Chapter III discusses the society's reliance on the tavern for quasi-political control on the local level. Chapter IV discusses the role of the tavern in maintaining communication and buttressing the social order. In conclusion I summarize the scope of the local tavern keeper's political, economic, and social power in the early nineteenth century and how it increased after the Civil War.

4Paradox version 3.5, Borland International.
CHAPTER I

LOUISA COUNTY, VIRGINIA, IN THE EARLY NINETEENTH CENTURY

Louisa County is situated in the Virginia Piedmont about one hundred miles west of the Chesapeake Bay and fifty miles east of the crest of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Louisa’s 517 square miles border Hanover, Goochland, Fluvanna, Albemarle, Orange, and Spotsylvania counties. An abundance of rivers and streams have shaped a gently rolling terrain which is well-drained but difficult to travel across. The two primary rivers are the North Anna and the South Anna which bracket the county on its northern and southern borders. At their confluence these rivers form the Pamunkey river which drains into the York river. The rivers and streams of Louisa County are narrow, deep, and therefore unnavigable, yet they provide many excellent mill sites.5

Louisa County was, and remains to this day, predominantly a rural agricultural community. A New and Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia published in 1835 by Joseph Martin listed wheat, maize, and tobacco as the chief agricultural

products of the county. Farm families raised many other
garden crops for their own consumption. Vegetable gardens
included beans, cucumbers, greens, onions, potatoes, peas, and
turnips. Apple and peach orchards, huckleberries, plums, and
watermelons provided families with fruit. Some households
grew small amounts of cotton and flax for homespun cloth.
Horses, mules, pigs, and cattle were common denizens of
Louisa's farmyards. Corn and wheat surpassed tobacco as the
most important cash crops in the mid-nineteenth century, and
they were in turn replaced by grass and dairy farming in the
late nineteenth century. Martin's Gazetteer attributed the
dip in tobacco cultivation to the soil "impoverishing
tendencies" of tobacco. A field could not support a tobacco
crop for more than two or three growing seasons. The large
investment in labor the "thirteen month crop" required also
led to its decline in Louisa County.6

From the earliest settlement of the county commentators
noted that the soil was only moderately fertile, due to its
very low organic content. Aggravating the condition of the
soil was the same poor husbandry bemoaned by Colonel John
Taylor of Caroline County in his contemporary treatise of

6Ibid., pp. 40 - 42. Joseph Martin, A New and
Comprehensive Gazetteer of Virginia, and the District of
Columbia (Charlottesville: Joseph Martin, Publisher; Moseley
& Tompkins, Printers, 1835), pp. 216 - 218. Hereafter cited
as Martin, Gazetteer. Crandall A. Shifflett, Patronage and
Poverty in the Tobacco South: Louisa County, Virginia, 1860 -
1900 (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1982),
p. 6. Hereafter cited as Shifflett, Patronage.
political economy, Arator. Over-cropping, over-grazing, poor ploughing, and scanty manuring made the soil "pitiably barren," noted Martin's Gazetteer. Travelling through the county in 1810, Thomas R. Joynes remarked that some of the lands in Louisa were "very poor;" however, he also observed some of the finest wheat lands in the upper part of the county, where the soil was richer in nutrients. Aside from these shortcomings, the soil was readily tilled, and coupled with the excellent drainage of the countryside, supported agriculture adequately.7

The material culture of rural Virginians in the first decade of the nineteenth century was still sparse and plain. The approximately 1,400 houses (excluding slave dwellings) scattered through Louisa County in 1835 were modest, one-story buildings predominantly of wood frame or log construction. Scarcely twenty homes in the county were made of brick. Most were built by local craftsmen using the vernacular building vocabulary of Middle Virginia described by Henry Glassie. A Loudon County farmer described his material life in spare terms:

Our furniture was limited. A cherry bureau in each of two bed rooms, a mirror . . . in the parlor and one in two bedrooms, a dozen "windsor" chairs, and my grandfather's book case and desk . . . were about the whole, with a cherry table in the parlor.

Like other rural Virginia counties, the 1815 tax list of Louisa County reveals spartan furnishing in local homes. Only about two dozen households in the county had any mahogany furniture; another two or three hundred households had pine chests of drawers. Carpets were virtually nonexistent, as were other amenities such as curtains, portraits, pianos, and silver. Local cabinetmakers in rural Virginia made much of the furniture in addition to plows, wagons, and coffins. Cabinetmaker shops stood at Louisa courthouse and Thompson's Cross Roads by 1835. Thrifty farmers made their own splint-bottomed chairs with slat backs out of white oak. Other kitchen utensils included earthen ware, iron pots, and brass kettles. The diet of rural Virginians was as plain as their furnishings; salt ham and corn bread were the staples of most tables. As the kitchen utensils reveal, boiled and fried dinners were common. Thirsty diners washed down mountains of greasy, starchy, and salty foods with rivers of whiskey. 8

Of the 1092 landowners in 1810, half owned less than 200 acres. These subsistence farmers owned only eighteen percent of the total acreage of the county. They raised corn mostly for their own consumption and infrequently a small crop of

tobacco for cash. These farmers often augmented their income by hiring themselves out to larger landowners as laborers or teamsters. Some were also skilled tradesmen. Thirty-two percent of the farms in Louisa ranged in size from 200 to 499 acres. These large farmers controlled thirty-one percent of the land and could devote more land to cash crops than the subsistence farmers below them. Large farmers often held a second occupation in addition to farming. They might moonlight as tradesmen, merchants, tavern keepers, surveyors, or builders. Elisha Jackson belonged to this group. Small planters, who owned 500 to 1,000 acres, owned only twelve percent of the individual farms and plantations, but twenty-eight percent of the land. These were general agricultural units, which supported a greater variety of crops, particularly the cash crops wheat and tobacco. The number and size of large plantations had dropped steadily since the late eighteenth century. Only five percent of the estates could be classed as such in 1810. Louisa County's largest plantation in 1810 was 3,300 acres, while the mean size for the top five percent was 1,400 acres. The top five percent of Louisa landholders, the large planters, owned twenty-three percent of the land. Marketing smaller farmers' crops augmented the raw economic strength of the large planters.9

Farmers and planters often seated themselves miles from

9The division of landholders into subsistence farmers, large farmers, small planters, and large planters comes from True, "Land Transactions," pp. 28, 43, 46 - 52.
their closest neighbors. There were approximately 340 miles of roads in Louisa in the nineteenth century ostensibly meant to keep neighbors in contact. Yet, as a petition from Louisa to the General Assembly read, the roads were "all most impassable" in the Fall and Winter. Many contemporary travel accounts bewail the condition of the roads in Virginia. In early March, 1815, William Richardson, travelling west of Richmond by carriage, had to disembark several times in one day and trudge through mud a foot deep when the horses stalled. William Richardson bought a horse when he reached Abingdon and "bid adieu to stages," which he considered "so uncertain a mode of travelling" in the Spring mud season. Even in fair weather the crude road system of Virginia posed challenges to the traveller. Adam Hodgson noted that the roads between Alexandria and Richmond were in places so narrow that trees rubbed against the sides of the carriage, and were "so beset with stumps of trees that it require[d] no common skill to effect a secure passage." Mud, stumps, holes, and bumps in the roads slowed travel to four or five miles per

10 Petition of December 2, 1812 (B2091), Louisa County Legislative Petitions 1812 - 1825, Virginia State Library and Archives.

hour and made night travel positively life-threatening.\textsuperscript{12} The county courts appointed citizens living adjacent to public thoroughfares as overseers to maintain the roads near their homes, but county residents frequently shirked this duty as numerous legislative petitions and grand jury presentments against Road Overseers show. This neglect of an already primitive road system resulted in the relative isolation of rural communities and the constriction of neighborhood networks.

Table 1 shows the population of Louisa County in 1810, 1820, and 1830. The population density was 21 persons per square mile in 1810, 25 persons per square mile in 1820, and rose to 29 persons per square mile by 1830. From 1810 to 1830 the population of the county increased, with the number of free blacks rising fastest, followed by slaves, and whites. This trend was reversed

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Year & Whites & Blacks & Freemen & Total \\
\hline
1810 & 5,253 & 6,430 & 157 & 11,840 \\
1820 & 5,967 & 7,560 & 219 & 13,746 \\
1830 & 6,468 & 9,382 & 301 & 16,151 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{POPULATION OF LOUISA COUNTY 1810 - 1830}
\end{table}

and the slave population declined four percent. The loss was due to the emigration of planters and their slaves to more fertile lands in the South and West.13

Neighborhood communication networks in early nineteenth-century rural Virginia were still predominantly oral rather than written and relied upon face-to-face contact. They were limited to the distance a man could conveniently travel by foot or horse to conduct his daily business.14 Louisa County was too large an area to serve as the basic unit of the early nineteenth-century community. Rather, jurisdictions like Louisa County were composed of many decentralized, rural nodes of social and economic activity. All informal and some formal aspects of economic and social exchange were decentralized; Louisa County possessed about a dozen taverns, twenty stores, thirty-five mills and twenty-five churches in 1835.15 Evidence indicates that the radius of these rural, decentralized nodes was about five to ten miles, which is the distance a man could travel by foot or by horse in a couple of hours. John Shelton of Louisa County felt it would be infinitely more convenient to ride the eight miles to Goochland Courthouse instead of the twenty-eight miles to


Louisa Courthouse to conduct official business since it required "great exertion to ride the distance [to Louisa Courthouse] and accomplish in one day even a single object" of business.\textsuperscript{16} Although the county courthouse was an important center of official administrative business, most of the business of everyday life was conducted at tiny villages composed of only a handful of buildings centered around a tavern, a mercantile store, a mill or a church.

Riding through the Virginia countryside in the early 1820s, Adam Hodgson described the distribution of these rural villages:

\begin{quote}
Every ten or fifteen miles you come either to a little village, composed of a few frame houses, with an extensive substantial house, whose respectable appearance, rather than any sign, demonstrates it to be a tavern, (as the inns are called,) or to a single house appropriated to that purpose, and standing alone in the woods.\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

Several factors determined the spacing between rural villages. The primary influence was the neighborhood's need for a convenient center of local exchange and socializing, but it was also a function of the distance travellers and stagecoaches could travel before horses had to be changed or rested. A Virginia law which forbade tavern keepers from selling more than five dollar's worth of alcohol per year to a customer living within twenty miles of the tavern suggests

\textsuperscript{16}Affidavit of John Shelton in "Louisa and Hanover County Legislative Petitions," December 8, 1819, Oversize (7377 7378 7344-A), Virginia State Library and Archives.

\textsuperscript{17}Hodgson, \textit{Letters}, pp. 20 - 21.
an expectation that nineteenth-century Virginians could recognize anyone who lived up to twenty miles distant. This was the outermost limit of the face-to-face community. 

Travelling was slow and arduous, so travellers sought to break up their trips with several stops at taverns. Thomas R. Joynes left the widow Williamson's Tavern in Hanover County at five a.m., April 28, 1810, and arrived at Gardner's Crossroads ten miles away in Louisa County at seven a.m. After an hour-long breakfast Joynes rode another sixteen miles to Louisa Court House which he reached at noon. Joynes dined for an hour before embarking on the last twenty-six mile leg of his trip to Colonel Branham's house, which he reached at seven p.m. Joynes rode an exhausting twelve hours that day to cover fifty-two miles.

A Geographical description of the United States by John Melish listed no principal town in Louisa County in 1816. Louisa Courthouse was no more than an overgrown village for most of the nineteenth century and was not chartered by the Virginia legislature until 1873. Besides the courthouse


20John Melish, A Geographical description of the United States, with the contiguous British and Spanish possessions, intended as an accompaniment to Melish's map of these countries (Philadelphia: [John Melish], 1816; Louisville:
and jail, it possessed a church, two taverns, four stores, a silversmith, a blacksmith, two carriage makers, two tailors, a shoemaker, a cabinetmaker, a saddler, a milliner, two lawyers' offices, and a physician's office in 1835. But remote residents of the county like John Shelton sought closer alternatives for their daily business. The various services and functions provided by towns in more densely populated regions were taken up by the town's rural counterpart: the tavern, store, mill, or church. Often several of these institutions were located in the same vicinity, providing a variety of services to the neighborhood. Cuckooville boasted a post office, tavern, flour mill, store, boot and shoe factory, blacksmith, and church. Dabney's Mills possessed a post office, saw mill, tavern, tanner and currier, tailor, and blacksmith. Thompson's Cross Roads featured a post office, two cabinetmaker's shops, a boot and shoe factory, two dwelling houses, and a church.\footnote{1} Elisha Jackson's hamlet included many similar enterprises: a post office, tavern, store, blacksmith, sawing operation, and tanyard. The Fork Meeting House stood a short distance down the Louisa road. Jackson's Tavern lay on one of the main East-West arteries through Louisa County, the Louisa road, which passed through

Louisa Courthouse about sixteen miles to the West and led to Richmond thirty-seven miles to the Southeast. A plat record from an 1845 deed (figure 1) locates the tavern and the Fork Meeting House with crude pictures.\textsuperscript{22}

Jackson's Tavern enterprise must have resembled a small village. A "substantial" two and a half story brick building, and a two story wood frame building facing the road (figure 2)\textsuperscript{23} were the main structures on the property. Several other buildings surrounded the brick and wood frame houses: slave quarters, blacksmith shop, tanyard, stables, sheds, barns, and pens. A saw pit with wooden planks piled next to it occupied a portion of the yard. Pastures and fields cultivated by Jackson surrounded these structures.

The frame building lodged the guests, and according to tradition, the bar was in this building. It had four large rooms on each floor with large halls running the length of the house. The bar, a public room, and a luggage room were probably on the ground floor. Lodging rooms were on the second floor.

Tradition suggests that guests had their meals in the basement of the brick house (figure 4). The general store and post office were located in this building as well. This assumption is plausible because the threat of fire would have


\textsuperscript{23}Figure 3 is from Evelina Magruder, "Hope's Tavern," \textit{Historical American Buildings Survey}. 
Figure 1

1845 Plat of the Tavern Tract
In Licking County Court September the 8th 1825

A deed from John Jackson, Sarah, his wife, Patrick Jackson, Benjamin Jackson, William Mallory, senior, to James B. Cozy, John B. Mallory, was acknowledged in Court by William Mallory, junior, to be his act and deed. Being a true copy of the acknowledgment of Sarah Jackson, wife of John Jackson, Patrick Jackson, Benjamin Jackson, by the said justices of the peace of this county, it

The said certificate and plat are hereby ordered to be recorded as to them, together with the said certificate and plat agreed

Jas. John Hardin, C. L.
Figure 2

HABS Report Photograph of the Tavern
2. NAME
Nathan Hope

4. ORIGINAL OWNER
C. Antony

STYLE
early 1800

ARCHITECT

BUILDER

5. TO BE FILLED IN BY THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

INDEX NO.
NEGATIVE FILE

PUBLISHED PHOTOS
PUBLISHED DWGS.

6. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE & DESCRIPTION
Proprietor of tavern lived in brick house, travelers accommodated in frame house, meals served in basement of brick house. Interior details of note, so did not check inside.

7. PHYSICAL CONDITION OF STRUCTURE (OTHER)

EXTERIOR

IN DANGER
POOR

REPAIR
RESTORE
RECONSTRUCT

INTERIOR

8. VAL. TO
NATION
STATE
COMMUNITY
OTHER

QUALITY
VERY HIGH
HIGH
NOTABLE
MENTION

9. POSSIBLE USE

10. NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITIONS

ZONED
CLASS

11. AVAILABLE FILES
MEASURED DRAWINGS
OLD PHOTOS
OTHER
FIELD REPORTS
RESEARCH REPORTS

12. OPEN TO PUBLIC
FEE
CONTROL BY

13. REFERENCES: AUTHOR, TITLE AND PAGES

H.P.A. Records
Mrs. Lee Carpenter

Evelina Magruder
Box 577, Charlottesville, Va.

14. NAME, ADDRESS AND TITLE OF RECORDER

DATE

4. (cont.) CONSTRUCTION: One house brick, one frame, both w/metal roofs

LOCATION
6 miles SE of Cuckoo on Route 13 - north side of highway.

PHOTOGRAPHS
Figure 3

Photograph of the Brick Building
made the brick building a more desirable location for these facilities. Insurers provided cheaper policies to merchants whose buildings were made of brick or stone. The English basement had two rooms, a small kitchen with large brick fireplace and bread oven and a larger dining area. A fireplace in the dining area kept the guests warm. The main floor had the classic hall and parlor arrangement. Two doors on the raised front porch opened onto the main floor. One door led to the main hall of the house, while the other opened onto the parlor, where it is said the post office was located. Jackson, his wife, five daughters, and two sons resided in the rest of the building.24

From a bird's-eye view in the early nineteenth century Louisa County resembled a patchwork quilt. Forests, tobacco fields, wheat fields, corn fields, and fallow fields were interspersed over the hilly terrain. Remote farm houses often with several outbuildings stood in the open fields far from their neighbors. A farmer and his plow team paced back and forth over an open field that dwarfed the solitary man.

24 Nancy S. Pate, "Hope's Tavern," in Works Progress Administration of Virginia, Historical Inventory, sponsored by Virginia Conservation Commission, 1936. C. E. D. Burtis, "The Mat Hope House (Wood)," in Works Progress Administration of Virginia, Historical Inventory, sponsored by Virginia Conservation Commission, 1937. "Hope's Tavern," Louisa County Historical Magazine 19 (Fall 1988): 99 - 102. Elisha Jackson was born in 1788 and married Sarah Swift. They had at least four daughters and one son, perhaps three sons. Jackson bought the tavern property around 1810 and sold it in 1845. The framehouse burned in the late 1960s, but the brick building has been recently restored.
Narrow, twisting streams ran over the land's surface, occasionally widening into a pond at a mill dam, and then returning to their random course. Dirt roads twisted and turned along the ridges of hills, avoiding swamps and deep valleys. Wherever two meandering roads met, several buildings stood around the intersection: a plain white church, a small store or shop, and a red brick tavern. Louisa Courthouse was hardly distinguishable from Gardner's Cross Roads, Thompson's Cross Roads, Cuckooville, Dabney's Mills, or Jacksons. At certain times of year slow-moving trains of wagons appeared on the roads. Concentrated activity could not be seen anywhere except at the crossroads, where wagon trains slowed to a stop, farmers wandered in alone, and travellers sojourned. Horse, wagon and foot traffic converged on the crossroads taverns, the pulse points of rural Piedmont Virginia.
CHAPTER II
THE ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF JACKSON'S TAVERN

The roads which meandered through the countryside of the Piedmont were vital to regional commerce. Having no navigable rivers and no railroad prior to 1838 the inhabitants of Louisa County depended entirely upon the often impassable roads for transporting crops and goods to and from the markets in Richmond, Fredericksburg, and Baltimore. Rural mercantile enterprises like Jackson's store and tavern were an important connection between rural consumers and outside markets. The taverns and stores which dotted the crossroads were crucial to the local economy, translating local crops and manufactures into consumer goods. The concentration of cash and credit at the neighborhood tavern also made it an important financial institution in a cash-poor economy. Wagoners, peddlers, and itinerant professionals depended upon rural stores and taverns when traveling through the backcountry. Taverns provided essential services for travelling workingmen: food, drink, fodder, lodging, and a place to advertise their wares or services. The tavern keeper was at the center of a cash nexus where he translated the use value of crops and manufactures into a marketable cash value. Possessing large amounts of
cash and the debts of his customers, the tavern keeper was indeed a formidable economic authority in his neighborhood. The crossroads tavern and store was an indispensable component of the local economy.

Situated at the falls of the James, Richmond was at an advantageous hub of water-borne traffic from the East and road traffic from the West. It connected a large hinterland, including Louisa County, to the Atlantic commercial world. The principal commodities which the back country supplied to the Richmond market were coal, tobacco, and wheat. In return, Richmond provided the back country with finished goods from all over the Atlantic rim. Though small in comparison to its sibling cities in the Northeast, (Richmond had only 14,348 inhabitants in 1817), it could still provide the hinterland with a wide variety of goods and services. Richmond had three banks in 1817: the Bank of Virginia, the Farmer's Bank of Virginia, and a branch of the Bank of the United States.

Advertisements in the *Richmond Inquirer* reveal the enormous volume and variety of goods sold by Richmond merchants in this period. Store owners accepted payment in cash, "town acceptances," and even "barter for country produce." Apparently these merchants often discounted "foreign" currency from Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia or Cape Fear, since accepting foreign currency at par was a sales pitch of several advertisers. Direct invitations to "country merchants" by a few advertisers suggests that their business
behavior was predictable. David and William Kyle's advertisement hints at the purchasing behavior of country merchants:

Country merchants will find it their interest to give us a call. Those wishing to purchase in smaller quantities are particularly invited to call and make themselves acquainted with our prices - as they will find them liberal.

Country merchants sought wholesale prices even when they bought goods in small amounts. In order to make a profit, a country merchant had to consider the costs of transportation and spoliation as well as the price paid to the city merchant. Thus rural storekeepers must have sought the cheapest bargains in town.\(^1\)

Most of the wheat and tobacco raised in Louisa County ended up in the Richmond and Fredericksburg markets. Farmers and planters living above the subsistence level had several alternatives for marketing their cash crops. Occasionally a large plantation owner would buy a small farmer's crop and shoulder the risk of the market price. Millers bought grain from local farmers as well, often deducting the cost of grinding and transporting the wheat from the price paid for

the crop. A handful of mercantile firms in Louisa were large enough to deal extensively in wheat, tobacco and corn. Tavern keepers and store keepers absorbed some of the produce from their neighborhood.

Only a fraction of a season's crop was handled by merchants, planters, and millers. The majority of farmers had to sell their crops themselves in the Fredericksburg or Richmond market. A farmer with a wagon and team could haul his crop to market himself, or send a trusted slave, thus saving on the high cost of shipment. Otherwise the farmer had to hire a wagoner to haul the crop to market. Farmers usually had to accept payment in goods (with a 200% markup) from Fredericksburg merchants, or a reduced price in cash. Richmond merchants were more willing to pay cash at better prices, but for selling the crops they charged a commission which ranged from two and a half to five percent.\textsuperscript{2} Cash was probably more desirable than goods, which could be purchased more readily from a local storekeeper. Cash could be used in capital investments, such as buying land and slaves. The average farmer was probably less saavy than a rural merchant at dealing in the city markets. Thus farmers welcomed local merchants who acted as intermediaries between backcountry customers and the capitalist marketplace.

Transporting goods by wagon was expensive, slow, and arduous. Between 1765 and 1812 a hogshead of tobacco could be

\textsuperscript{2}True, "Land Transactions," pp. 57 - 61.
hauled to Fredericksburg for twelve shillings (two dollars), and to Richmond for eighteen to twenty shillings (about three dollars). The price of hauling wheat to market was six to nine shillings (one to one and a half dollars) per bushel. Consequently, four to seven percent of the selling price of tobacco, and ten to thirteen percent of the selling price of wheat was expended on shipment. In the 1830s it cost thirty cents per ton/mile to transport goods from Trevilians in western Louisa County to Richmond by wagon. In comparison, the Louisa Railroad charged only fifteen cents per ton/mile for wheat.3

Wagoners spent many lonely hours on the road exposed to the elements. Oxcarts crawled at a pace of one and a half miles per hour, and horse teams traveled at best five miles per hour over the treacherous roads. The appearance of a roadside tavern was probably a welcome relief to tired wagoners. According to tradition, Jackson's tavern was a popular sojourn for wagoners.4 Wagoners often traveled together in trains of two to six wagons, and a dozen wagons moving in a close line down a road was not an unknown site. Teamsters might have rendezvoused at Jackson's Tavern on the


way to Richmond to fill with whiskey the stone quart bottles which many drivers kept in their wagon boxes. After a long day's journey, the weary riders sought the comfort of a tavern:

After the horses were cared for, the landlord gave us room on the floor for our beds, fire if needed, a table on which we could spread our supper, and a pot of coffee. In the morning we had coffee for breakfast, and we paid for the coffee and a small room rent, which was all the pay he got except for an occasional meal and the sale of some hay or feed when a wagoner was out, and the liquor he sold, of which many of the wagoners drank freely.5

These frugal travellers furnished most of their own needs, but always acknowledged their respect for the tavern keeper by buying whiskey "for the good of the house."

Wagoners also found carting jobs at Jackson's Tavern. Jackson entrusted Waddy Lipscomb with fifty dollars to purchase ten gallons of rum, five hogsheads of brandy, five magnums of wine, two loaves of sugar, and an ounce of nutmeg in Richmond. William Johnson hauled 1,535 pounds of merchandise from Richmond to Jackson's Tavern in February 1812 for $5.12. Richmond was not the only destination of wagoners departing from Jackson's Tavern. William Lowery received a $10.29 credit for "[his] part of the last load to Baltimore" in 1814. The language suggests that the load was divided between several wagoners. Wagoners also carted heavy goods from Jackson's Tavern to nearby farms and plantations. Jackson credited William Lowery's account another time for

5 Janney, Janney's Virginia, pp. 30 - 33.
"hauling in the neighborhood" for five months. In 1813 Robert Dabney paid a wagoner twenty-five cents to haul his plow to Jackson's blacksmith shop. Elizabeth Gooch hired out John Ryan on two occasions to haul thirty-two pounds of iron worked at Jackson's smithy to her residence. Jackson's own driver, wagon, and team hauled customers' bulky purchases such as barrels of fish and sacks of salt.

Holding a large amount of cash, notes, and debts in the tavern, Jackson could pay a wagoner cash or credit his account for services rendered to another customer with a tavern account. When William Johnson hauled forty bushels of wheat for Thomas Peers, Jackson credited Johnson's account $6.67 and debited Peers account the same amount. An anonymous wagoner bought a pint of whiskey on Colonel McKean's account at a stopover at Jackson's tavern. The wagoner was aware that his employer or master, Colonel McKeans, had an account at Jackson's tavern, so he stopped there to pick up a bottle of whiskey for the trip to Richmond. Teamsters might have expected free whiskey as a perquisite from their employers, another custom which involved Jackson as a third party in the many economic networks of the neighborhood.6

The "Honorable Fraternity of Moving Merchants," as one peddler described his colleagues, brought modern products to the inhabitants of the backcountry. Peddlers rode the court

61816 Daybook: 1/31/16, 2/5/16, 3/15/16, 4/19/16, 1/29/17. Ledgers A and B: 2/22/12, 9/16/12, 12/24/12, 5/14/15.
circuit, travelling from courthouse to courthouse as the various county courts held their monthly sessions and militia musters. They set up stands on the courthouse square and "Shewed their Raggs" and other wares to the festive courthouse crowd. Peddlers toured the Virginia hinterland in groups for company and safety and knew many of the fellow members of their "fraternity" by name. Virginia law required hawkers and peddlers to register with a county court and pay an exorbitant annual license fee of forty dollars, plus a twenty-five cent fee to the county clerk. (In comparison, a license to operate a retail store cost only fifteen dollars.) Peddlers also went from farmhouse to farmhouse hawking wares. "Travelling tinkers were not strangers," reminisced a man who grew up in rural Loudon County, "They would come at frequent intervals and mend the tinware and remould the broken pewter spoons." Peddlers travelled the Virginia backcountry court circuit year after year, building a clientele dispersed over a broad area.7

The Louisa County Minute Books identify several peddlers who registered in Louisa Court or produced licenses from other county courts from 1816 to 1821. In 1816 James Dennison paid his Hawkers and Peddlers Fee to the Lousia County court; the following year he produced a license from neighboring Goochland County court. Benajah Tuttle produced a license

from Goochland in 1816, and received his license from Louisa in 1818. Noah Payne produced licenses to the Louisa County court in 1818 and 1821 from the Goochland and Powhatan County courts respectively. Four peddlers hawked goods over a territory encompassing Louisa County and distant Northumberland and Fairfax counties. A swath of counties surrounding Louisa composed the market of about a dozen peddlers in 1816 - 1821: Orange, Albemarle, Fluvanna, Buckingham, Goochland, Cumberland, Powhatan, Amelia, Henrico, and the city of Fredericksburg. Unlike a tavern keeper with a geographically-fixed location and clientele, the peddler was constantly on the move seeking new customers and periodically revisiting old ones. Their "neighborhood" was the entire Piedmont region of Virginia. This aggressive, cosmopolitan class of traders brought foreign goods and notions into the parochial backcountry of Virginia.

A rich antebellum folklore about peddlers evidences a fear of the corrupting influences of highly mobile traders with no permanent stake in the local community. Peddlers weakened the networks of local exchange and credit in their competition with local storekeepers. Peddlers absorbed some of the cash circulating in the local economy and created their own credit networks with their customers when cash was scarce. Dishonest peddlers fenced stolen goods or hawked snake oil and wooden nutmegs.

The literature of the period portrays peddlers and tavern
keepers as bitter rivals. In his diary an anonymous peddler compared parsimonious tavern keepers to "harpies," the rapacious creatures of mythology. A Botetourt County tavern keeper, in turn, referred to some peddlers who had cheated him as "reptiles called Yankee peddlars." The swindle so enraged the tavern keeper that "he swore in vengeance no Yankee should ever step foot into his house." The epithet of "yankee" attached to peddlers the deep hatred Southerners had for meddling Northern abolitionists and yankee commercialism. The deep suspicion of "foreigners, artisans of various kinds, and itinerants" worked to the benefit of the entrenched local merchant. Playing on the fears of the local population, tavern keepers perpetuated stereotyped images of peddlers in order to undermine competition from them.8

The encounters between peddlers and tavern keepers were not always marked by intolerance. Peddlers often supplied goods and services the tavern keeper needed. Jackson might have purchased the tin tumblers he stocked from Tyrus Perkins or Sydney Corning, tin and pewter peddlers from Orange and Fairfax counties respectively. Living on the road, peddlers

depended upon taverns for food and lodging. Perhaps they purchased merchandise from storekeepers for resale, albeit far from the local store. Postrider Harris who delivered the mail to the Jackson Post Office on one occasion purchased 10 yards of "Erie Stripes" from Jackson. He probably moonlighted as a peddler to supplement his postal salary. As carrier of the mail he was a welcome visitor to the tavern, which might have made his solicitations more tolerable. Jealous of his own retail business, Jackson probably demanded to see the license of peddlers who entered his tavern and forbade peddlers to solicit to his customers what he himself could offer. The trunks of a peddler might remain locked up in a closet at the tavern keeper's behest for the duration of the peddler's stay. A tavern keeper could wield his local influence to the detriment or benefit of a peddler's success in the neighborhood. Itinerants relied upon the good will of the local tavern magnate for their comfort and success.⁹

The visit of a traveling showman caused great excitement in rural Virginia. Journeying between Staunton and Lexington in 1816 Francis Hall experienced the warm reception given to traveling showmen:

At Middlebrook, while my horse was feeding, several of the inhabitants collected round my wagon, and finding it of a fashion unusual in their country, concluded I could be no ordinary person, so they begged to know if I was not the showman, who had been exhibiting in the neighborhood, and whose fame ⁹

had preceded his arrival at this village. . .\textsuperscript{10}
The villagers may have mistaken Hall for the showman who performed at Jackson's Tavern in late May 1816. Itinerant performers would have been attracted to taverns such as Jackson's for several reasons. The tavern could provide the typical services a traveler required, such as food, fodder, and lodging. As a center of socializing and communication for the surrounding neighborhood, the tavern provided a ready audience and publicity through the local communication network. Lastly, in a society where cash was scarce, an astute showman would know that a cash-spending (or borrowing) audience could be found at the local tavern.

The showman, G. King, came to Jackson's Tavern on a Saturday, the busiest day in the week for the tavern. According to the daybook, King had at least twenty-five potential spectators, not including Jackson and his household and any customers who could pay King with their own cash. Customers with an account at Jackson's tavern could borrow the price of admission from Jackson if they did not have the cash to pay the showman. Customers borrowed $5.62 from Jackson for fourteen tickets to the performance. King charged twenty-five cents admission for children and fifty cents for adults. This seems to have been one of the rare occasions when women and children came to the tavern. As customers rushed home to retrieve family members, word probably spread quickly through

\textsuperscript{10}Hall, \textit{Travels} p. 365.
the neighborhood that "the showman" had arrived at Elisha Jackson's tavern. Martin Sharp borrowed $2.37 for tickets for five "grown people" and two children, (receiving a discount on the adults' tickets). William Sharp bought tickets for himself and his young son. King's show must have been quite a spectacle by contemporary standards considering the amount of money the Louisans were willing to pay for admission. In contrast, another showman who appeared at the tavern on a Friday in August charged only six cents for his act. Three out of the four customers in the tavern (according to the daybook) borrowed cash for this show. This was indeed cheap entertainment, the same price as a gill of whiskey.11

The tavern was the location of much dealing and trading which did not involve Jackson directly. Itinerant doctors, ministers, teachers, artists, cattle drivers, and others could advertise their goods or services, bringing ancillary business to Jackson. Two local doctors who frequented the tavern, Andrew Kean and William Merrideth, were undoubtedly well known in the neighborhood, but still could find patients in the tavern. Merrideth bought a set of weights and paper at the store, useful items for his practice, as well as whiskey - for refreshment between housecalls? Merrideth probably made his calls in the gig that Jackson's blacksmith shop repaired. Itinerant artists advertised and kept shop in taverns, drawing portraits or silhouettes until they exhausted the neighborhood

111816 Daybook: 5/18/16, 8/2/16.
of customers. The proprietor of a Harrisonburg tavern noted to a traveler how droves of hogs, oxen, horses, and slaves were herded great distances across Virginia and beyond, making occasional stops at his tavern. Peter Hall pastured twenty-six head of cattle at Jackson's Tavern for four days, perhaps soliciting and receiving offers for the cows during his stay. A later proprietor of Jackson's Tavern had frequent horse trades. The tavern could serve as a showcase for local artisans as well. The 1816 Daybook indicates that hatters and cobblers sold their wares to tavern customers. The crossroads tavern was a public market for the goods and services of local and foreign origin.\textsuperscript{12}

The traffic on the road was only a small portion of Jackson's business; the core of Elisha Jackson's clientele were local farmers. Jackson's tavern business was only a portion of a very diversified enterprise which served the local economy in several ways. It was a source of goods from distant markets as well as a marketplace for local produce. In a society with a limited supply of cash the tavern was an important source of loans and other financial transactions. In addition to the food, lodging, and alcohol provided by the tavern, Jackson offered an array of other goods and services at his mercantile complex.

With only five saw mills serving Louisa County in the early nineteenth century, Jackson found a demand for plank wood at his tavern complex. His plank sawing operation was powered by the labor of his slaves and hired local men instead of water. The blacksmith shop was the only local source for a number of items essential in rural Virginia: "If we needed a screw and nut, or a staple or rivet, we had to go to the blacksmith and have it made; or a hammer or a hatchet, they too must come from the blacksmith shop. . ."

Smooth operation of a farm required that the hoes, plows, scythes, and rakes be in good repair, making the blacksmith a crucial member of rural society. At Jackson's blacksmith shop a customer could have his horse shod or a plow repaired while he tippled with his friends in the tavern. The most frequently sold items in the store were gunpowder, shot, and plow lines. All of these items were essential to a farmer's survival. Farmers supplemented their diet with protein from game animals and shot the squirrels and crows which plagued their corn fields. Farmers had to replace plow lines promptly in order to till their fields and sow their crops. The shelves of Jackson's store contained a host of sundries from almanacs to whet stones, marbles to shaving boxes, and nails to painting supplies. Offering these indispensable goods and services surely made Jackson popular in his community.

Jackson sold an enormous variety of goods in his store.

Janney, Janney's Virginia, p. 83.
The mounting flood of consumer goods produced in the early nineteenth century spilled into the backcountry through local stores. After ammunition and plow lines, dishware was the most common type of item purchased in the store. Customers slowly adopted modern foodways when they bought sets of plates, cups, and saucers. Some kitchenware sold in the store were important to the preparation and preservation of food while others were more decorative and less essential. Jackson sold an array of basic foodstuffs: sugar, molasses, salt, flour, fish, cheese, beef, and fodder for horses. Exotic foods like nutmeg, allspice, ginger, coffee, and tea were less familiar to the diets and behavior of rural Louisans. Customers purchased many pounds of coffee and several coffee pots from Jackson who was unwittingly promoting his customers' addiction to coffee. Sugar was always bought with coffee, probably because the Louisans' palates were unaccustomed to the extreme bitterness of this beverage. Despite its foreign taste, rural customers like Isabella Mitchell of Louisa drank coffee with her young son "as it was her habit to do on evenings and mornings," because the ritual of coffee drinking was a badge of social distinction.  

Locally manufactured homespun, "domestic" cloth, leather, and shoe thread were displayed alongside imported cloth manufactured in New England and British factories: cambrics, India cottons, calicos, ribbon, and "erie stripes." These

14Louisa County Minute Book 1815 - 1818, 6/10/16.
imported fabrics created vast social distinctions between the farmers dressed in homespun and their neighbors who dressed in fancy, city clothes. Consumers of imported fabrics were not just the affluent, but poorer sorts like wagoner William Lowery. Lowery purchased two and a half yards of "Erie Stripes," and one and a quarter yards of "India Cotton" in June of 1816. The following January he outfitted himself entirely at Jackson's store with "half of piece Linnen, Pantaloons, Waistcoat pattern, Buttons, 2 handkerchief, thread, 2 balls ditto, [and a] Yard Flannel." Although he occupied the lower stratum of his community, his greater exposure to the Richmond market through his wagonning trips made him even more susceptible to the influences of the consumer market. The clothing purchased at Jackson's store became an emblem of affluence for the wearer, or an emblem of urbanity in Lowery's case. Jackson was modernizing not only the bodies and domestic interiors of his neighbors, but their social behaviors and attitudes as well.

One of Jackson's ledgers reveals that over one hundred people held accounts at the store in 1812 and 1813. Virginia law required all merchants and account keepers to close out their books annually. A customer could close his annual account by cash or barter payment, a bond or promissory note, or by mortgaging real or personal property. Jackson also

15 1816 Daybook, 6/4/16, 1/13/17.

accepted payment in agricultural products, home manufactures, and labor.

Farmers usually did not trade their cash crops at the tavern, but brought in secondary crops with less intrinsic market value. Customers hauled hundreds of pounds of fodder to the tavern, from as little as 161 to 1,044 pounds at a time. Oats by the bushel were another common commodity of trade. Fodder and oats were in great demand at the tavern to feed customers' and Jackson's horses and cattle. Considering that Jackson owned only about two hundred acres in 1816, he probably could not meet his own needs for fodder. The cider Jackson served in the tavern was of local produce. Ambrose Madison sold Jackson fifty-four gallons in 1813, and Martin and Jiles Sharp sold him ninety-eight gallons in 1816. Other orchard owners brought apples and vinegar to the tavern. Animal protein in the form of beef, shad, bacon, eggs, and lamb trickled into the tavern in small quantities, probably because farmer's rarely had a surplus of meat products to trade. The only significant cash crops bartered at the tavern were corn and wheat; tobacco was not traded at the tavern. The corn and wheat Jackson received might have been shipped to Richmond for cash, but it also could have been consumed by Jackson's household or the tavern's customers.

Personal property and home manufactures were bartered at the tavern as well. Poor households had to muster whatever income they could to pay their debts to Jackson. Linsey
Richardson traded Jackson half a dozen chairs for four dollars to settle his account. Richardson might have been cannibalizing his estate to pay off his debts. Other odd items were also traded at the tavern, such as a grindstone, a razor strap, hats, and even a "jaccoat". Apparently, some customers were reduced to giving the shirts off their backs for a glass of whiskey. Home manufactures, made by women, invalids, and able-bodied men in the winter when agricultural work was scarce, were traded at the tavern. Nancy Britton received approximately five dollars credit for weaving in 1812. Edmund B. and C. W. Duncan traded six pounds of butter for credit that went in part to slake Edmund's thirst for whiskey. Dick Gentry paid off fifty cents worth of his tippling debts in 1815 with nineteen brooms. Making brooms was an occupation taken up by invalid slaves, since farmers usually grew enough broom corn to make their own brooms. Instead of making cloth, butter, and brooms to serve their households' needs, the Brittons, Duncans, and Gentrys directed their household production to paying off debts accrued at Jackson's tavern and store. In this manner Jackson's business contributed to the slow shift of the relations of production from kinship ties to the marketplace. 17

Others sold the sweat of their brows to Jackson for cash or credit. Jackson hired local men in need of work for twelve to forty-two cents a day. These were probably poor farmers or migrant, landless laborers who sought to supplement their incomes. Some might have worked for Jackson out of desperation, having no other means to pay him. Labor around the tavern included haying, sawing plank, and working on the well. While working for Jackson, they often received a discounted price on their whiskey. This might have encouraged Nelson Crenshaw to drink much of his earnings; Jackson docked him half of a Saturday's wages for whiskey. Jackson may have served whiskey on the Sabbath, but his day laborers did not work on Sundays. He was also a demanding employer; when Barrows Diggs worked for two and a half days in the hayfield, Jackson paid him for only one day, and "his 2 boys one day each," having done "little better." Working side by side with Jackson's slaves, these men must have been keenly aware of their economic and social dependence on Jackson.18

Many of the transactions that took place at Jackson's Tavern were based upon the use value of the goods or services traded, while others were based upon an exchange value. The use value of a commodity in a traditional economy was determined by the utility of the commodity to those who produce or use it. Householders had control over production

and determination of a "just" price in a traditional economy. In a commercial economy the exchange value of a commodity is determined by an abstract process of the marketplace and transactions are made in the medium of money. Jackson and his customers probably agreed upon a value for the goods the customers brought to the tavern based upon their potential use in the tavern itself. Market forces determined the value of many of the goods and services Jackson offered, such as sugar, coffee, cloth, and iron. The prices of meals, alcohol, fodder, and lodging, which were regulated by the county courts, occupied a value system between the traditional and the commercial worlds. The court's determination of prices probably took into account market values as well as community consensus on a "just" price. The local store inhabited two worlds. Jackson had one foot in the old system of reciprocal exchange and the other in the modern commercial world. 19

The crossroads tavern and store was an important center of trade in its neighborhood, linking the traditional local exchange network to the capitalist marketplace. Through the local tavern or store keeper the backcountry made the slow transition to a capitalist economy. Jackson was articulate in both the local exchange network based on use value and the capitalist marketplace based on exchange value. The surplus

crops, home manufactures, or labor a farmer traded with Jackson were assigned a cash value that abstracted the transaction but in terms of reckoning that were familiar to the farmer. Although the United States established the decimal dollar system in 1792, early nineteenth-century farmers still thought in terms of shillings and pence when they conducted their daily business. Rural Americans continued to use the old British terminology for Spanish silver dollars, or "pieces of eight," because they continued to circulate widely in the United States as legal tender until 1854. Even when expressed in United States dollars and cents, items were priced in denominations of a dollar equivalent to the traditional fractions of a "piece of eight:" 6\(\frac{1}{2}\), 12\(\frac{1}{2}\), 18\(\frac{1}{2}\), 25, 37\(\frac{1}{2}\), 50, 62\(\frac{1}{2}\), and 75 cents. To a rural Virginian 6\(\frac{1}{2}\) cents was a "fip" and 12\(\frac{1}{2}\) cents was "nine pence." The tavern prices set by the Louisa County court reflect this mentality (table 2). Throughout Jackson's 1816 daybook items are listed in shillings and pence in the left column, and converted to decimal dollars and cents in the right column:

"to cruet whisky @ 9 [pence] .12\(\frac{1}{2}\)"

"to 2 gallons grain 2/ fodder 1/6 .58"

The left column was, in effect, the public side of the ledger, while the right column was for Jackson's private record keeping. In his face-to-face contact with customers Jackson used the fractional nomenclature familiar to his customers. As a businessman with direct connections to the Richmond
Table 2. Louisa County Tavern Rates, 14 October 1816

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price in Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Brandy pr Gill</td>
<td>.18 3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West India Rum pr Gill</td>
<td>.12 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy or Whiskey pr Gill</td>
<td>.6 1/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punch or Flip made of West India Rum or French Brandy pr Quart</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cider pr Quart 1st Rate</td>
<td>.12 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Rate</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging per night</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toddy per Quart</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter pr quart or Bottle</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Wine pr quart</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medaria wine pr quart</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon Ditto</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenerisse Ditto</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats per gallon</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn per gallon</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a stand of hay or fodder</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for horse per night</td>
<td>.12 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasturage for horse per night</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a warm dinner, with Toddy</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without toddy ditto</td>
<td>.37 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto for servant</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner for servant</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

market Jackson recorded transactions in the right column of the ledger in United States dollars.

Commodities whose prices were not regulated by the county court were reckoned in dollars and cents on both sides of the daybook. For example, left-side entries for iron, sugar, and coffee are expressed in cents per pound:

"to 3 lb & half Iron @ 8 cts       .28"

"to 10 lbs sugar @ 22 cts         2.20"

"to 1 lb coffee @ 30 cts          .30"

Furthermore, these prices are expressed in decimal fractions of a dollar, not fips and nine pence. Given the opportunity
to set his own prices, Jackson followed the decimal system of reckoning used by city merchants and bankers, influencing his customers in turn.\textsuperscript{20}

Local exchange networks included informal negotiations of borrowing and lending. The "borrowing system" was not aimed at making a profit, but at maintaining a sufficiency and creating a network of mutual reliance. Lenders and borrowers did not rely upon written records of each transaction, rather they used an oral record of account that was held in memory. A farmer in need went to a neighbor who possessed what he needed: flour, labor, or tools, which were considered communal property.\textsuperscript{21} Jackson, on the other hand, recorded items he loaned to his customers in his daybook, making the borrower officially accountable for the loan. This extra obligation Jackson placed on his customers violated the honor of the borrower's memory, and redefined the traditional relationship between borrower and lender. Jackson wrote "Jug lent" under the names of several customers who had purchased


whiskey or molasses from him. Another customer borrowed two pounds of shot, and Jackson jotted beneath Timothy T. Swift's name: "decanter lent, mug for oysters d[itt]o." Jackson even recorded the two pounds of sugar he loaned to his mother! Rather than making a reciprocal trade, Jackson wanted his jugs, mugs, and decanters returned, and cash from his mother. Jackson introduced his customers and his mother to the alienation of the marketplace. He replaced communal rapport with the cold obligations of vendor and client.

Jackson's influence in the local exchange network spread beyond his own business dealings. Customers struck their own deals among themselves in the tavern: trading, selling, and hiring goods and labor. Often one or both parties of a bargain were indebted to Jackson. By debiting the borrower and crediting the lender in his ledger Jackson manipulated transactions between customers. For "mickering 2 p[airs of] pantaloons" for William Lowery, Jackson credited Nancy Chisholme eighty-three cents and charged William Lowery eighty-three cents. In this fashion Jackson coordinated a cash exchange between two customers that otherwise might have been settled in a traditional, reciprocal exchange of goods or services. Jackson also involved himself in cash sales between customers. Jackson loaned John Swift two dollars "to buy a hat of Bennet," another customer. Some cash loans are simply

221816 Daybook, 2/20/16, 4/13/16, 6/22/16, 6/23/16, 9/17/16, 10/1/16, 12/15/16.
recorded as "Cash lent to pay Capt Johnson," or "Cash lent to pay Mr King." Jackson even paid $14.44 in taxes owed by Robert T. Isbell, Higgason King, and Samuel Baker, or the $3.18 which Samuel Waldrope owed to the sheriff.

Jackson recorded twelve other debts between customers as assumpsits where he presumably acted as a guarantor. In law, an assumpsit is an informal promise or contract without seal. An expressed assumpsit is oral or written, and an implied assumpsit is a presumption of debt for goods or services rendered. All of the assumpsits in Jackson's 1816 daybook are for five dollars or less, and are recorded in dollars and cents with one exception. For instance, if Robert T. Isbell were to ask William Tate to haul his wheat crop to Richmond, it is presumed that Isbell promises to pay Tate even if it is not literally expressed. If these assumpsits represented oral agreements between customers, then Jackson had once again redefined traditional oral exchanges in the legalistic terms of the marketplace. As written contracts, these assumpsits reveal the quasi-legal role Jackson played as the guarantor or witness to the assumpsit. Both cases exhibit Jackson's pervasive intervention in the local exchange network.\\

A large amount of cash accumulated in Jackson's store. On June 1, 1816, he made a note in his daybook that he had $102.50 in cash. On August 3, 1816, there was fourteen dollars "in the bar" and forty-five dollars "in the House." Most of the cash was probably paper money from the Bank of Virginia, Farmers Bank of Virginia, State Bank of North Carolina, the chartered Banks of the District of Columbia, and the chartered Banks of the City of Baltimore, which the county court recorded as circulating in Louisa in 1817. Jackson makes specific references to Kentucky and Washington currency paid by customers, perhaps because he found them more difficult to circulate in Richmond. Controlling probably the most specie, paper money, and credit in the neighborhood, the tavern was an important financial center. Jackson made many cash loans to his customers in 1816, from as little as six cents to as much as twenty dollars. Commanding the cash nexus in his neighborhood gave Jackson great stature.

Customers approached Jackson at the Louisa court house and even in Richmond for cash loans, but most frequently came to the tavern to borrow money. Borrowers had to show a bit of deference to Jackson and the economic authority he held. Jackson must have rejected the appeals of some would-be borrowers because they were too great a risk. Others were loaned money with caution. When Higgason King came to the tavern to borrow five dollars, Jackson noted in his daybook that William Poindexter, the County Prosecutor, was present to
 witnss the transaction. Likewise, Robert T. Isbell witnessed Archer Swift's five dollar loan. By securing witnesses, particularly the County Prosecutor, for these potentially unsound loans, Jackson threatened his debtors with the force of law. Jackson's decisions probably had a strong influence on the opinions of other creditors in the neighborhood. Occupying a prominent position in both the cash and the local exchange network, Jackson held formidable power in the local economy.24

It was in Jackson's interest to know the solvency of the customers holding accounts at his tavern. Customers who had difficulty satisfying their debts were a risk to Jackson's business. Jackson required customers who could not settle their accounts in cash or a personal note at year's end to provide him with a chattel mortgage. On 18 April, 1814, Josephus Fox and Elisha Jackson entered into a bond for $22.50 that Fox owed Jackson, and "for all dealings that may take place between them now and the first day of January 1815." Fox mortgaged one negro girl named Anne, one bay horse, one cow, one yearling, two feather beds and furniture, one cupboard, one large walnut table, and interest in the tract of land where his mother lived. Upon default, Jackson's trustees could order the mortgaged property to be auctioned after advertising the sale for twenty days. Nimrod Chisholme's

credit must have been particularly bad. For a debt of only $6.88 and any future charges, he mortgaged his interest in a will, any inheritance from his father, three feather beds and furniture, six head of cattle, a bureau desk and bookcase, four tables, twenty-one chairs, his household and kitchen furniture, twenty head of hogs, and one horse. Although they might appear rapacious to a modern reader, mortgages such as this one extended credit to many who had limited cash or capital while they increased the authority of Jackson over his debtors.

Another recourse against delinquent customers was to sue them in court. According to a receipt for claims among lawyer Charles Dabney's papers, Jackson took at least six customers to court between 1819 and 1822 for outstanding debts with interest. This increased litigation on Jackson's part might have been caused by the Panic of 1819. Under pressure to meet his own debts to Richmond merchants, Jackson turned the screws on his customers to settle their accounts. Thus the local tavern keeper brought the crises of the capitalist marketplace to his backcountry neighbors.\(^{25}\)

The local tavern keeper exercised great authority over his neighborhood. Jackson stood at the important juncture of

the local market and the Richmond market and played a large role in the local networks of trade. With his large holdings of cash and debts, Jackson became a major creditor in his neighborhood. Peddlers, wagoners, laborers, consumers, and borrowers had to be in his good graces if they wished to benefit from the services of his tavern, the economic hub of the neighborhood. Those who transgressed could be denied warm meals, lodging, a place of business, cash, or credit to buy goods. Locally, at least, the tavern keeper was indeed a formidable economic authority.
CHAPTER III

THE TAVERN AS A POLITICAL NODE OF POWER

Lacking towns and cities, the inhabitants of Louisa County and other rural parts of Virginia in the early nineteenth century congregated in public places like the county court, the churchyard, the muster field, and the neighborhood tavern. The distance to the county seat made it difficult for outlying residents to conduct business at monthly or yearly court sessions. The inhabitants of southeastern Louisa County, just south of Jackson's tavern, and adjacent areas of Hanover County twice petitioned the state legislature for permission to join Goochland County. The petitioners complained:

few or none of us are exempt from the Obligation of frequent attendance at our respective Courthouses for particular purposes such as Court business regimental Musters and Courts of enquiry[.] the Election of our representatives & the inestimable privilege the right of suffrage we shall for ever hold among the greatest of human blessings but many of us are prevented from exercising it by our remoteness from our repetitive Court houses it being near thirty Miles from the dividing line of Hanover and Louisa Counties on the southside of the southanna river to either of their courthouses.¹

¹"Louisa County Legislative Petitions 1812 - 1825," December 2, 1812 (B2091), Virginia State Library and Archives. 9 of 81 signers were customers of Jackson in 1816.
Conducting private business transactions at monthly and yearly court sessions was also difficult. John Shelton grumbled that remote inhabitants of Louisa "generally remain at Home, at those annual periods of Elections, as they themselves declare - few except those compelled, or those whose views of popularity carry them there, and have money to spend or waste go" to Louisa courthouse.\(^2\) Only political aspirants and those able to afford overnight lodging and leaving their fields for more than a day went to the court house; the average citizen was effectively disenfranchised and cut off from business opportunities.

To remedy this situation rural residents conducted much official and semi-official business at the rural nodes of social and economic interaction. The county courts entrusted part of the maintenance of social order to churches, taverns, militia musters and patrols, and large planters. Of these four institutions, the local tavern had the lion's share of daily business. A large planter administrated and controlled large populations of slaves, but his influence did not extend beyond his plantation, unless he was a large creditor. Virginia militia musters "brought together a motley crowd, many of them of the baser sort, and they rarely passed without drunkenness and personal conflict."\(^3\) Musters of the

\(^2\)Affidavit of John Shelton in "Louisa and Hanover County Legislative Petitions," December 8, 1819, Oversize (7377 7378 7344-A), Virginia State Library and Archives.

\(^3\)Janney, Janney's Virginia, p. 90.
"Cornstalk" militia were infrequent, and patrols were meant to control the movement of slaves, not the behavior of the entire population. Church services occurred more frequently than militia musters, but they were neither universal or compulsory. Congregations dependent upon circuit-riding ministers met even less frequently and sometimes went for months without meeting. Furthermore, the disestablishment of the Anglican church in Virginia and the separation of church and state diminished the authority of religion in temporal affairs. However, churches remained strong influences on the behavior of local parishioners through official censure and ideology. Church congregations often found the behavior of tavern-goers immoral and asocial. On the other hand, since the tavern was a year-round center of local economic and social activity, it was a convenient choice for a petty administrative post and a center of social control. These rival institutions, the local church and the local tavern, became extensions of the county government.

The maintenance of order in this society depended upon the vigilance of its citizenry. Indictments were based upon the "informations" of individuals who bore testimony against their neighbors. The County Grand Jury then decided whether to act upon the "informations" presented to them. In Harrisonburg, Virginia, the exertions of the Grand Jury

effected a visible change on the township:

...a complete reformation had lately taken place through the agency, not of preachers, but of the Grand Jury, who had imposed upon themselves the duty of receiving informations in cases of quarrels, swearing, drunkenness, and other habits of low vice, and had put the laws into force with such good effect, that scarcely an oath was to be heard, or a drunken man seen in the township.\(^5\)

The testimony of neighbor against neighbor created an atmosphere of watchfulness and suspicion. Laws often provided rewards to informers for their testimony. For instance, the twenty dollar fine imposed on tavern keepers who allowed illegal gambling on their premises was awarded to the informer. Informers were officials, such as the sheriff, a constable, a magistrate, a member of a Grand Jury, or a neighbor. The Grand Jury of Louisa County charged Fontaine Duke with allowing unlawful gambling in his tavern based on the information provided by "James D. Turner, Farmer."\(^6\)

Whether avarice, revenge, self-righteousness, or civic-mindedness motivated Turner is unknown. William Poindexter, the County Prosecutor, testified against three men for unlawful gambling at Pulliam's tavern. The greater the distance to the county court, the less likely informations were brought against culprits. Petitioners lamented that the condition of local roads suffered because the overseers of the


roads felt "secure from being informed against" due to the difficulty of travelling to Louisa court house to testify. 7 To remedy this situation church members and tavern keepers became the monitors of society within their neighborhoods.

Louisa County had 1,450 Baptists, 1,340 Methodists, 140 Reformed Baptists or Campbellites, twenty Presbyterians, and ten Episcopalians in 1835. Twenty-five churches dotted the landscape, each serving a small neighborhood around a crossroads. Taverns and churches were infrequently found at the same crossroads, but they often served overlapping neighborhoods. The neighborhood surrounding Jackson's tavern was also served by the Fork Meeting House, which was open to the use of all denominations until 1819, when the Baptists assumed the maintenance of the dilapidated building. The churches of Louisa County were generally very modest buildings:

"These rural churches are of the plainest structure, usually framed of scantling, merely shingled and weatherboarded without ceiling or plastering on the inside, and costing from 150 to 450 dollars. . ."

This lack of finish or ornamentation was a reflection of the abstemious beliefs of the Evangelicals. The severe church structures contrasted with the buildings of their institutional rivals, the little commercial villages. According to a comprehensive study of land transactions in

7"Louisa County Legislative Petitions 1812 - 1825," December 2, 1812 (B2091), Virginia State Library and Archives.
Louisa County, the average worth of a tavern from 1765 to 1815 was £389, while church buildings averaged only £35. Jackson's brick house was one of only twenty in the county in 1835. The buildings on Jackson's land were valued at $1,500 in 1820. The interior of the brick house was plastered, and it is likely that the wood frame tavern was plastered as well. Even the physical appearances of the church and tavern expressed the disharmony between the two social institutions. The devotees of Mammon and Bacchus built very different edifices than the evangelical Christians.⁸

Led partly by its female members, the Baptist fellowship at Fork Meeting House monitored the spiritual and moral behavior of its members. The 1824 roster lists eleven men and twenty-eight women. Women experienced greater power in the church than in the rest of the public sphere, but men still dominated the proceedings. Minutes of meetings open with visiting males and the male members of Fork listed by name, but women and children are lumped together as "Fork by her members in general." However, women composed a large proportion of the membership, voted on issues brought before church meetings, and signed petitions questioning the moral

conduct of parishoners. In contrast, the tavern was an exclusively male institution. Thus the rivalry between tavern and church was split partially along gender lines.

One of the primary purposes of the neighborhood church was to maintain community order. Fork Baptist Church mimicked the manner in which the secular county government indicted and prosecuted county inhabitants. Members of the church provided testimony against their brethren, and the accused was called before an examining committee, much like the "informations" which were presented to the Grand Jury. A "select committee," (composed of locals who were also customers of Jackson's tavern) "was appointed for examing into the conduct of Amos the slave of Joel L Walton formerly the slave of A. Hogard" for a charge of adultery. Official notices of impeachment were drawn up and delivered to erring church members:

The following is a Copy of the notice delivered to Brother Harden Duke on the 18th day of July 1825. Brother Harden Duke, You are hereby notified that the following charges are alleged against you of misconduct, as a member of the Baptist Church called fork: first for having impeached the pastor of said Church of having Wilfully lyed before God and man, Secondly for refusing to be in subjection to the Government of the Church, having manifest a disposition of discontent to her proceedings. You are also notified that no impeachment will be taken up by the Church, unless the member impeached is legally notified at least ten days previously to our next meeting at which time the above cases is sit for the consideration of the Church. You are hereby requested by the Church to attend on the first Saturday . . . August next at the Fork meeting house to answer . . . [the] charges. Signed by order of the church. A Hogard.

The church leadership expected firm loyalty as well as
adherence to their moral code. Samuel Peers was excommunicated from the Fork Meeting House Baptist fellowship in 1825 for "betting on shooting at a mark." He was also found guilty of contempt of church by "not attending the present meeting and answering the charges alleged against him."9

The elders and select committees presided over the monthly meetings of the church like justices and Grand Juries of the county court. Pastor Timothy T. Swift tyrannized the congregation and excommunicated those who threatened his authority. Deacon Harden Duke threw his impeachment proceedings into such "great disorder and confusion" that at the close the "Church and Conference arose without singing and prayer." Deacon Duke was excommunicated over a personal conflict with Pastor Swift. At the following meeting, Duke's son called for a new poll of the members, contending that his father was not excluded by a majority of the congregation. When the new vote had confirmed Deacon Duke's excommunication, Pastor Swift saw an opportunity to ferret out more dissenters. He produced and read a paper which had been "circulated to the prejudice of said Elder T. T. Swift's character." Six church members signed the paper calling for Pastor Swift to "clear up his character towards Harden Duke." Pastor Swift then

"required" the members to state their charges against him, which the church enquiry "found to be very diminutive in themselves." Pastor Swift cleared up the charges to the satisfaction of all the church except Elizabeth Duke, James F. Duke, and Harden L. Duke [son], who refusing to be in subjection to the Government of the church, and manifesting a disposition of considerable anger, did proceed to slander and treat the church with the utmost contempt. Who were forthwith excommunicated from the fellowship of the Fork Church.\(^\text{10}\)

Pastor Swift did not tolerate challenges to his authority within his congregation. Within the small geographic area around Fork Meeting House, Pastor Swift governed the Baptist fellowship with an iron fist. In the absence of a strong, central authority in Louisa County, petty despots like Pastor Swift held sway over their local communities.

A strong, organized temperance movement did not take shape in Virginia until the 1830's. Baptist Abner W. Clopton founded the Virginia Society for the Promotion of Temperance in the Spring of 1826. Initially Society members were ridiculed by their peers as misguided enthusiasts, but within a year their membership rose from a handful of individuals to eighty-four. The societies spread most widely among the Baptists, although membership was open to all congregations. Twenty-three Baptist ministers, one Presbyterian and one Episcopal minister, and forty-five heads of families joined Clopton's society in 1827. Five auxiliary societies sprang up

\(^{10}\)ibid., pp. 10 - 11.
around Virginia, including a North Anna Society and the North Anna Juvenile Temperance Society, perhaps enlisting the youth of Louisa County. The Fork Baptist Church expelled Jack Cross in 1832 for drunkenness. Antipathy towards drinking was certainly not universal in Louisa, even when the Temperance movement grew stronger. The thirteen Temperance societies in Louisa in 1835 boasted 1,200 members, but this figure represents less than a fifth of the 1830 white population, and only seven percent of the population when slaves and freemen are included. Unless these 1,200 members actually represent entire abstaining households, the proportion of Temperance Society members in the Louisa population was very small. But popular pressure was mounting for total abstinence. By 1841 the Albemarle and James River Baptist associations declared that trafficking in ardent spirits was inconsistent with the Christian character. Persons who persisted in selling alcohol after being "affectionately admonished" of their incorrect behavior were dealt with severely. Storekeepers selling alcohol could be excommunicated or boycotted. Perhaps such pressures led to Jackson's decision to sell his tavern in 1845."

The conflict between conservative religious values and popular tavern culture was as old as the evangelical movement

in Virginia. The victory of evangelical religion in the eighteenth century over popular behavior such as drinking, gambling, and dancing described by Rhys Isaacs was neither total or lasting. As the following anecdote illustrates, the battle between evangelicals and proponents of whiskey, women, and song was undecided in 1816. At a tavern in Lexington, Virginia, Francis Hall encountered a party of young men dancing and drinking in the public room. Walking into the parlour to escape the noise, Hall observed "a square erect figure, in a brimmed hat, and primitive suit of dark snuff-colour, pacing up and down with a sourness of aspect. . ."

This "saint" entered into a debate with a young Irishman over their antithetical credos. The Irishman argued: "Now for my soul, I cannot see any difference whether we jump about to the cat-gut, or sit still with our hands before us; the time is but spent one way as well as the other!" "The difference," retorted the "saint", "is that one can be done to the glory to God, and the other cannot." Evangelical sermons against drinking and dancing often fell on deaf or hostile ears, particularly in a tavern. Gambling, too, was extremely popular "among the Virginians of every class, trade, and denomination."  

In 1816, antagonism towards drinking was minimal. W. J.

Rorabaugh claims that the per capita consumption of alcohol in the first three decades of the nineteenth century was at its highest. Even Timothy T. Swift, who later became the pastor of Fork Meeting House, visited Jackson's tavern three times in 1816, and imbibed alcohol on two occasions. On a Sunday visit in December, Swift purchased approximately twenty ounces of whiskey and rum. A society affiliated with the Fork Meeting House, and of a very different nature from later Temperance societies, met regularly in Jackson's tavern or the Fork Meeting House. The Fork Meeting House Polemick Society convened every other Saturday in the dilapidated church building. This was the period when the church was still a Union Meeting House, and open to all denominations. These men seemed to have been devotees of Bacchus, for they purchased a half gallon of whiskey for each meeting. Their church affiliation shows that prior to the Temperance movement, the consumption of alcohol was widely accepted in society, and that there was possibly a contempt for organized religion in the neighborhood.

The laws of Virginia were very strict towards tavern keepers who fostered excessive drinking or allowed gaming in their taverns. The law called for the revocation of the license of any tavern keeper who would "suffer any person to tipple or drink more than is necessary, on the Lord's day, or on any other day set apart by public authority for religious worship. . . ." Drinking "more than is necessary" was
apparently drinking to intoxication, which could lead to absenteeism from church, or worse, disruption of the church service. Habitual public drunkenness was the target of a law which forbade tavern keepers from selling more than five dollars worth of alcohol for consumption in the tavern within one year to a person who resided within twenty miles of the tavern.\textsuperscript{13} Selling more than five dollars worth for home consumption was not forbidden, suggesting that private drunkenness was perceived as a lesser evil than public drunkenness.

This focus on public vice also appears in the regulations against gambling. The lawmakers believed that public gaming was "often attended with quarrels, disputes, and controversies, the impoverishment of many people and their families, and the ruin of the health, and corruption of the manners of youth."\textsuperscript{14} In their eyes, gaming was tearing apart the social fabric of Virginia. These laws aimed at preventing taverns from becoming dens of iniquity. On the other hand, the venerable traditions of convivial drinking and horse racing were considered orderly and sociable, because they brought distant neighbors together in an amicable atmosphere for socializing and fair contest. In contrast,


\textsuperscript{14}ibid., 1:108.
habitual drunks and "lewd and dissolute persons" who made a profession of gambling at cards or faro tables threatened public order. These laws formulated an ideal of the public tavern, where concordant, community-building activities could take place in a lawful, harmonious environment.

In order to obtain a tavern license, the petitioner had to secure a $150 bond in addition to paying a tax on the license, which was fixed at eighteen dollars from 1816 to at least 1831. The bond was forfeited upon any grievous offense by the tavern keeper. Furthermore, the county court evaluated the character of each petitioner. The operator of a tavern had to be "of good character, [and] not addicted to drunkeness or gaming," a model for his or her community. The county courts set the tavern rates for their jurisdictions, which the tavern keeper had to post within one month in a public entertaining room no more than six feet above the floor.15 This rule was meant to protect customers from unfair or arbitrary price setting by the tavern keeper. The tavern was a public space; the public rooms of the tavern were under the auspices of the county court. The tavern keeper was, in effect, a licensed official of the county government. By setting prices on alcohol, food, lodging, and fodder the institution of the neighborhood tavern was standardized for the entire county. Residents of any neighborhood could expect

the same service as any other county tavern provided. Without such uniformity of service, the tavern's institutional utility would decline.

The efficacy of these laws depended upon the diligence and compliance of local authority in enforcing them. Next to Saturday, Sunday was the busiest day of the week for Jackson's tavern. It is likely that customers drank more than was "necessary" on the Sabbath, and spent more than five dollars on alcohol in the tavern over one year. Apparently, the wide popularity of gambling in Virginia was shared by the local authorities in some counties. John Edwards Caldwell noted the irony that in Virginia, "where the laws against gaming are very strict, there are individuals of loose and idle habits, who pursue no other means of livelihood, and in general do not blush to avow their profession. Under the very eye of magistracy itself, gambling houses are winked at."  

Gambling in the taverns adjacent to the county courthouse was ignored by the gentlemen justices of the county. The Grand Jury of Louisa County made presentments against two of the county's justices for unlawful gaming in May 1817. Doctor Andrew Kean and James Michie were charged along with two other gentlemen with gambling at the home of Justice Michie. The

court acquitted all four men.\textsuperscript{17}

Like the church, the neighborhood tavern maintained social order through the watchfulness of its patrons and owner. The most frequent patron by far of Jackson's tavern was John Poindexter, the Louisa County prosecutor, who visited Jackson's tavern 115 times in 1816, or about once every three days. Poindexter probably sought informers and prosecution witnesses among the tavern's white male clientele and kept tabs with Jackson on any unusual behavior of his customers or suspicious characters in the neighborhood. Francis Hall, who travelled through Virginia in 1816 - 1817, noted the attentiveness of a Harrisonburg tavern keeper. Hall "entered into a lively gossip" with the tavern keeper who "acquainted [Hall] with whatever was worth knowing of the country."\textsuperscript{18} The tavern keeper probably learned much about Hall's plans and background as well.

Few locals or transients passing through the neighborhood of a tavern could escape the scrutiny of the local tavern keeper or one of his customers. Jackson himself gave sworn testimony against two Surveyors of the road near his tavern for neglecting their duty, perhaps by the request of his neighbors. Peddlers without a proper license could be sent to the county court. Poor, transient white men of Louisa County were treated with suspicion by their neighbors. John Ryan, a

\textsuperscript{17}Louisa County Law Orders Book 1809 - 1828, 5/19/17.

\textsuperscript{18}Hall, \textit{Travels}, pp. 355 - 356.
poor wagoner and customer of Jackson, was accused of stealing five chickens from another customer, George Anderson.

Having an intimate knowledge of his customers' habits and business, Jackson was an excellent choice for constable of his Hundred. The county court appointed Jackson constable in November of 1822, and by the following June Jackson had already accumulated $14.71 in expenses in the discharge of his duties. Rumors and gossip led to "informations," but did not have to result in legal action in order to be effective. Gossip, according to Bertram Wyatt-Brown, was the "first line of community defense against individual waywardness." It kept neighbors within the pale of acceptable behavior. By providing the county court with "informations" and trafficking in local gossip, the local tavern keeper held all the members of the local community in the grasp of proper social behavior.\(^{19}\)

One of the most important auxiliary functions of the neighborhood tavern was as a polling place. Elections for the state Legislature and the United States Congress were held at Jackson's Tavern under another proprietor in 1851. To this day the electoral district encompassing the tavern retains the name Jackson.\(^{20}\) It is possible that elections had been held


at the tavern under Jackson's proprietorship. The tavern provided two crucial ingredients of a successful early nineteenth-century election: crowds of enfranchised men and whiskey with which to treat them. County Prosecutor William Poindexter was also a State Senator from 1813 to 1817. Doubtless one of Poindexter's reasons for haunting the tavern was to cultivate relations with his constituency.

Quasi-official business of county government was conducted at Jackson's Tavern. Litigants often made out-of-court settlements in taverns or private homes. Upon the agreement of all parties in a suit, the case might be left to the judgment of a neutral arbitrator. The case of "Jackson vs Anderson & Lumsden," (between Elisha Jackson and two of his customers), was left to the final decision of Lancelot Minor and Stephen Farrar "to proceed exparto at Elisha Jackson's Tavern on either party's giving to the other ten days notice." Grantors and grantees often drew up their deeds in taverns and had the tavern keeper and his customers witness the deed. Nearly all of the witnesses to twenty-five deeds involving Jackson between 1814 and 1830 were customers of Jackson, indicating that the deeds were likely composed in Jackson's Tavern. Other customers probably finalized their deeds over a glass of whiskey in Jackson's Tavern.21

As a middleman between Richmond merchants and his

neighborhood Jackson had a vested interest in the upkeep of the roads. Public roads were maintained by statute labor, or the corvée system, which was often shirked by the court-appointed road surveyors. Jackson, however, in addition to providing his statutory labor, profited from the county's need for plank wood to build causeways over swampy terrain. Supplementing the output of the five saw mills in Louisa County, Jackson had a large sawing operation that ran on human power. Jackson paid several local men between 1814 and 1816 to saw plank for him: Nathaniel Tate and John Willis each sawed 93 feet, John Waddy sawed 367 feet at a penny per foot, Nathaniel Snelson supplied "7 plank 10 inches wide 16 feet long, and 1 plank 11 feet long, 10 inches wide," and Archibald Christmas added about 173 feet. Jackson also put his bondsman "Davy the Sawyer" to work at the saw pit. Jackson in turn sold lumber to the county, receiving $10,625 in one sale in 1819. Recognizing a community need for road repair materials, Jackson capitalized on the situation; his lumber-sawing enterprise became in effect a municipal maintenance yard.22

Government entrusted the administration of minor local affairs to an orderly neighborhood tavern, a logical extension of the tavern's social and economic importance. Further evidence of the public confidence the tavern enjoyed were the

positions of trust in which society placed tavern keeper Elisha Jackson. Jackson wore many hats. He was a postmaster, a constable, a road surveyor, and a school superintendent, but the court records listed him as "tavern keeper." Postmaster Jackson was of considerable importance in a rural society. The local community entrusted constable Jackson with policing the neighborhood. The socially and economically vital roads around Jackson's tavern were placed under his supervision. A society which was so concerned with preventing the "corruption of the manners of youth" in gambling dens entrusted a tavern keeper as superintendent of schools. This society saw no problem in placing its most precious members, its youth, under the care of a tavern keeper.23

23Louisa County Minute Book 1822 - 1826, pp. 6, 195, 346. Apparently the occupation of tavernkeeper was respectable (or lucrative) enough for county magistrates Duke Cosby and William Price to engage in that trade.
CHAPTER IV
THE TAVERN'S ROLE IN COMMUNICATION AND SOCIAL REIFICATION

As I have shown in the above chapters the neighborhood tavern served rural, decentralized communities as a petty administrative center and as a hub for local economic activity. No less important was the tavern's role in communication and socializing in a rural environment. The tavern was a regular visiting place for local farmers, where a man seeking company could be sure to find someone with whom to converse. As a social center, local inhabitants could learn the latest gossip or update their neighbors. The post office served as a communication link for the local community with the outside world, just as the tavern was a link with outside markets. Travellers also brought news to the tavern, and bills and posters hung on the tavern walls spread reports of local interest. Male society's obsession with competition found an outlet at the tavern. Continuous competition tested the participants' social standing. Taverngoers engaged in competitive sports, gambling, and fighting to determine who was that week's top dog. Even conversation had a competitive element to it. Male drinking parties reconstructed social lines especially along race and economic power. A wagoner,
farmer, or planter reaffirmed his social standing by the partners with whom he chose to share a cruet of whiskey. Thus the local inhabitants continually maintained and upheld their social order at the local tavern.

The sun's movement across the sky was the early nineteenth-century Virginia farmer's clock, and the seasons dictated his annual patterns of activity. Farmers scratched a "noon mark" on the floor at the southern exposure which indicated noon when the noon-day shadow touched it. Adam Hodgson noted how universal reckoning by the sun was in daily activities:

If you ask what time it is, it either wants of so many hours of noon, or it is so much before, or so much after sun-down. Meals are regulated by the sun, even in families where there is a watch, or a time-piece, as it is called; and I have very often heard evening service announced at church, to begin at early candle-light.¹

Taverns usually served breakfast between sunrise and 8:30 in the morning and dinner about one hour past noon. Jackson's Tavern had no clock visible to all the patrons, but Jackson carried a pocket watch on his person. Considering that there were only ninety-five other pocket watch owners in Louisa in 1815, Jackson might have had a monopoly on clock time in his tavern. Or maybe his customers relied upon a noon mark in the tavern, and Jackson's watch was simply a dangling ornament to his waistcoat.

The rhythms of everyday life were punctuated by weekly activities:

and monthly rituals. The Louisa County court held session on the second Monday of each month, and the practicing Christians of Louisa County attended church on Sundays. Saturdays belonged to the local tavern:

On Saturday afternoon, at every country store you would find a number of neighboring farmers. They would work all week, and go to the store to make purchases and hear the news. They would spend the afternoon in gossip.²

Farm hands and day laborers gravitated towards the "grog-shop" on Saturday evenings as well. The Saturday visit to the tavern was as much a fixture of the calendar as Sunday services or Monday court. Thirty percent of the overall visits to Jackson's Tavern occurred on Saturdays. Jackson averaged 8.81 paying customers per day in 1816, while Saturdays averaged 17.35. Even more may have frequented the tavern not to make purchases but to enjoy the company, and so are not recorded in the daybooks. Oftentimes frugal visitors brought their own food and beverages, or hoped for a friend to treat them to alcohol. This voluntary association of white (and a few black) males became an institutionalized event in the weekly rhythm of rural life.³

The biweekly visit of the postrider was another event which drew the community into Jackson's Tavern. The post office at Jackson's was established in July 1812 and served the local community until January 3, 1916. According to

²Janney, Janney's Virginia, p. 30.
³ibid., pp. 78, 90.
tradition, the post office was located above the dining room in the brick house. Customers entered the post office either from the staircase rising from the dining room or more ceremoniously from the entrance on the raised porch of the brick building. The Jackson family's private rooms were also on this story of the "substantial" brick house, making the post office a privileged space. To the local inhabitants, the edifice of the brick post office was a physical manifestation of their communication with the outside world. Customers anticipated the arrival of their subscriptions to magazines and newspapers from Richmond, Philadelphia, and New York, including the Philadelphia Recorder, the New York Expositor, the Baptist Chronicle, and the Christian Sentinel. Jackson probably subscribed to a number of papers himself. A visitor to Gautier's Tavern in Martinsburgh praised the "excellent news-room, where the most respectable papers on the continent" were kept to attract travellers and undoubtedly the local farmers as well. Jackson might have kept a news room in the tavern building, where patrons could read or listen to someone read a newspaper aloud. Similarly, Joseph D. Swift bought the 1816 almanac at Jackson's store on Saturday, January 20, as well as two cruets of whiskey and a quart of cider from the tavern. He must have drawn a crowd reading excerpts from the almanac to the hard-drinking Saturday clique of farmers.4

The printed posters and handwritten notices covering the tavern walls brought local news to the attention of the clientele: auctions, sales, runaways, and upcoming events such as races. Early nineteenth-century Virginia was still a predominantly oral culture, and most local news spread by word of mouth. The tavern was the prerogative of the male-dominated public sphere, therefore tavern gossip and conversation must have reflected the values and concerns of its male constituency. Taverngoers could learn of a friend's harvest prospects, a rival's credit problems, or of a neighbor's pecadilloes. Whiskey emboldened speakers into fits of boasting and bragging. A Virginian noted his fellow citizens' propensity for liquor-inspired oration:

The tavern, especially, seems to be a very favorite haunt for these young Orators; whether it is that the long porch invites them by certain classical associations, from its resemblance to the schools of some among the ancient rhetoricians; or rather, as others suppose, that the bar-room contains some secret stimulants of eloquence, more sovereign than all the precepts of Quintillian. It is, indeed, very amusing to hear one of these talking Jacks (as you may call them), when it has been properly screwed up, seated by the fire, and unwinding itself in long discourses upon liberty, the rights of man, the freedom of the seas, general sufferage. . . And yet, really when it cocks its feet up against the mantle-piece, its favourite oratorical attitude, and lets out, as they call it, you can form no idea how eloquent it is.\(^5\)


\(^5\)Quoted in Hall, Travels, pp. 393 - 394.
This scene might have been enacted in Jackson's Tavern by some of the local men who organized a debating club called the "Fork Meeting House Polemick Society." They bought a half gallon of whiskey from Jackson for each meeting and an occasional quire of paper, perhaps for recording the minutes of their meeting. Jackson credited the Society for the purchases they made which might have been funded by membership dues. Jackson seems to have held the purse strings of the Society since he saw fit to loan David Richardson $4.84 cash of the Society's money at one meeting. The Society met on every other Saturday at the Fork Meeting House or perhaps in a private room of Jackson's Tavern. The Society might have been an exclusive club composed of the prominent men of the neighborhood which looked after the interests of its members, loaning them money from a pool and fomenting each other's business interests. Jackson had a leading position in this neighborhood cabal since he controlled its finances and it probably met in his tavern. Like the tavern keeper who bossed the Junto in Washington Irving's "Rip Van Winkle," Jackson dominated the political discourse in his neighborhood.6

The competitive spirit of male Virginian society found many outlets in the local tavern. Tests of skill and strength were very common amusements of taverngoers:

shooting at a mark with squirrel rifles; pitching

61816 Daybook: 8/10/16, 8/31/16, 9/14/16, 9/28/16, 10/25/16, 11/9/16, 11/30/16, 12/21/16, 1/11/17, 1/30/17, 2/22/17, 3/14/17, 3/28/17.
quoits, in which they used suitable flat stones; pitching cents (the old copper cents, nearly as large as a half dollar), and pitching half dollars or dollars . . . Pitching a bar, and throwing a sledge . . . were common, as were jumping, both standing and running: and hop, step and jump, or "half hammer." Wrestling was not uncommon, nor was a footrace.7

A farmer could earn a little cash by charging twelve and a half cents a shot at a turkey shoot. When young, drunken men congregated in this society, friendly competition often became violent. The sight of "at one time no less than eight [men] stripped to all but pantaloons to fight" at the Franklin County seat disgusted Ohioan Lucius Verus Bierce. An anonymous peddler noted in his diary that "Grog as usual had Great effect upon" a throng gathered at a quarter race "and created much Noise," but "no fighting for a Wonder." The people gathered at Bedford County court dashed his expectations of a Virginia crowd: "no fighting or Gouging, very few Drunken people." These fistfights often turned into bloody assaults. When Baswell Seargeant got the best of Mosby Desper in a fight at the Louisa Court House, James Desper intervened and assaulted Seargeant with a horse whip in one hand and a knife in the other. The court found Desper guilty of assault and battery. Two regular customers of the tavern were assaulted by a slave on Friday night, October 20, 1815. The court found Harry, a slave from Chesterfield County, guilty of stabbing Abner Burnley and Thomas Duke with

7Janney, Janney's Virginia, p. 90.
intention to kill. The minute book does not record where the assault occurred, but the two men might have found assistance at Jackson's Tavern. The assault was certainly the big news item in the tavern the next day.\(^8\)

Despite the condemnation of the Fork Baptist Church and the state government, gambling was quite popular among the general population. Shooting at a mark must have been quite common at Jackson's Tavern, considering the large amount of gunpowder and shot Jackson sold to his customers. Horse races occurred at the court house and elsewhere. A race at the courthouse arranged by John M. Price lasted three days in November 1825. The heats began on a Wednesday and finished on Friday. Races were held in late Fall and early Winter when agricultural activity was at a minimum and farmers' pockets bulged with cash from the recent harvest. The proprietor also selected a time in the week that would not interfere with Monday court, Sunday service, or the Saturday visit to the tavern. The "club money" won at Friday's race, as well as the many side bets placed by spectators, went in part to pay the tavern keepers who kept the whiskey and brandy flowing. Jackson credited the accounts of customers who won money from him in races and other bets. Abner Burnley's account received a credit "by half dollar you won on race," while Edmund Wash "won of me [Jackson]" twenty-five cents. "A gambling debt is

a debt of honour, but a debt due a tradesman is not," said William J. Grayson of North Carolina. According to Bertram Wyatt-Brown, the gaming debt stood above the limits placed by ties of deference and friendship. Wagerers were equals in the eyes of chance. Thus, high-ranking losers paid their gambling debts promptly in order to dissolve this relationship. Significantly, Jackson did not give Burnley or Wash the satisfaction of payment in cash for their gambling winnings. By paying Wash and Burnley in credit, Jackson reinforced the debtor/creditor relationship between himself and his gambling partners over the customary egalitarianism between gamblers. Clearly, Jackson's prominent social position as a financial creditor allowed him to escape the implicit equality of a gambling debt.9

The tavern was a microcosm of male society in early nineteenth-century rural Virginia. The tavern's clientele and labor force represented all of the elements of the public sphere dominated by white males. I was able to track landownership for roughly half of Jackson's customers in 1816. As tables 3 and 4 show10, the rate of landownership among the tavern clientele corresponds closely to the overall rates of


10The data in table 3 come from True, "Land Transactions," and the data in table 4 come from the 1815 and 1816 Land Tax records of Louisa County.
Table 3. Louisa County
Landownership in 1810

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Acres</th>
<th>Percentage of Landholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 199</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 499</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Customer Landownership in 1815 - 1816

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Acres</th>
<th>Number of Visits</th>
<th>Percent of Visits</th>
<th>Amount of Purchases</th>
<th>Percent of Purchases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 199</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$365.93</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 499</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$694.23</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$77.52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000+</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$31.67</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$1,169.35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(42% of all 2,768) (50% of all $2,343.94)

Ownership for all of Louisa County in 1810. Medium-sized farmers (200 - 499 acres) are in greater proportion in the tavern than in the whole county, and subsistence and the largest farmers are under-represented. However, subsistence farmers and landless tenants must be over-represented among the many visitors for whom no record of landholding can be found.

The tavern was a forum in which the society's different social groups could meet, however limited their interaction was otherwise. Slave laborers, free blacks, propertyless whites and subsistence farmers, large farmers, small planters and large planters all congregated in the local tavern.
Societal roles were reenacted in the tavern. The lowly slave hostler and the prominent gentleman justice conformed to an etiquette which defined, restricted, and expected certain patterns of behavior in the tavern.

The slaves who worked in the tavern had to endure the attitudes of both Jackson and his white customers. Jackson's slave crew grew considerably over time. In 1815 six slaves worked at the tavern, and by 1820 their number nearly doubled to eleven. By 1830 the slaves working in the tavern and its fields numbered nineteen. Traveller Adam Hodgson recorded that even at the better taverns "you see black slovenly-looking hovels round the yard, where the domestic Negroes live, and the young Black fry are crawling about the door." The younger slaves waited on the customers in the tavern with "the little ones under the orders of the elder." In summertime one or two slaves were employed in driving away the flies from patrons and their food.\footnote{Louisa County Land Tax 1815. National Archives, Records of the Bureau of the Census, Fourth Census (1820), Virginia, 17:54. National Archives, Records of the Bureau of the Census, Fifth Census (1830), Virginia, 6:43. Hodgson, Letters, 1:308 - 309.} The young women prepared food and tidied the tavern and lodgings, if we may assume that Jackson was concerned with cleanliness. The men worked in the fields, the blacksmith shop, drove, loaded and unloaded carts, sawed wood, or performed some of the other jobs necessary to keep the tavern running.

Several slaves are identified by name and trade in the
1816 daybook. Charles, Davy and Squire worked at ancillary jobs. Charles was the tavern's hostler, who cleaned the stables and groomed and fed the customers' horses. It appears that Davy and Squire worked in the blacksmith shop, since they are referred to as "Shop Davey" and "Squire the Smiter" on occasions; there is also a reference to "Davy the Sawyer," who could have been another individual. The white customers of the tavern expressed patronizing attitudes towards Davy and Squire by treating them to whiskey. Slaves and patrons often came into close contact. "Davy the Sawyer" might have worked in the saw pit with white day-laborers Archibald Christmas and Nathaniel Tate. Relations between the white and black laborers who were bonded to Elisha Jackson in varying degrees must have been tense.12

Aside from the many slaves sent to the tavern to purchase goods for their masters, seven free blacks appear in the 1816 Daybook. Elisha Jackson welcomed their business but Jackson's white patrons were ambivalent towards their presence. Free blacks, who made up less than two percent of Louisa County's population, had to petition the county court for permission to remain in the county. For example, the Louisa court allowed petitioner Billy Eve to stay in the county "in consideration of his general good character & of his industry & integrity." Duke Dickenson, Ned Edwards, Joseph Mead, Redcross Mead, and

Peter Winn came to the tavern regularly, averaging 13.2 visits in 1816, double the overall customer average for visitation. They benefitted from the financial services provided by the neighborhood tavern. They held accounts with Jackson and borrowed cash. Jackson even credited the personal note of Duke Dickenson towards his account, despite the fact that these men owned very little property. Joseph Mead was the only free black who owned land, a subsistence plot of eighty-one acres. He also had a horse and three cows. Redcross Mead lived nearby, probably with Joseph, having had a horse shod at Jackson's Tavern and having bartered corn there. Ned Edwards owned three horses and three head of cattle in 1816. He earned one dollar from the county in 1819 for carting while repairing the Cub Creek road, probably hauling some of the $10.63 in plank wood which Elisha Jackson supplied to the county. The other freemen owned no taxable property. They survived by farming rented land or selling their labor, as Peter Winn did by working for Jackson and for a customer identified only as Gooch. Two white men were indebted to Winn for twelve and a half cents, and for three dollars and thirty-one cents, which Jackson credited to Winn's account. Thus Winn and other free blacks were active in the neighborhood's credit network.\textsuperscript{13}

These freemen displayed enough industry and integrity by

\textsuperscript{13}Louisa County Minute Book 1815 - 1818: 6/10/16. Louisa County Minute Book 1818 - 1822: 6/14/19. Louisa County Personal Property Book 1815, Louisa County Land Tax Book 1816.
farming and laboring, even for the public weal, to gain permission to reside in the county, probably in the neighborhood of Jackson's Tavern. Jackson welcomed the business and labor of familiar free blacks, but was wary of strange blacks. The free blacks mentioned above were not labelled as such in the daybook, but simply by name. However, Jackson does identify some customers in the 1818 - 1819 daybook by the epithet "Black Man." "Cornelius Digges Black Man" and "James Digges Black Man" bartered hay, fodder, and corn for whiskey and sugar on December 22, 1818. Jackson might have suspected that the grain was stolen. It is difficult to discern from the tavern records the extent to which black and white patrons interacted. Whites frequently treated slaves to whiskey, but the evidence suggests that free blacks and whites rarely drank together.

Once in a while a free black bought a gill of whiskey or a tumbler of toddy. On one Saturday in April, 1816, Redcross Mead bought a gill of whiskey. In a patronizing fashion Jackson recorded him simply by his first name, "Redcross," in the daybook, just as he referred to his own slaves as "Charles," "Davy," or "Squire." The freemen bought most of their alcohol in quarts, half gallons, and gallons, which indicates that they did not drink their whiskey at the tavern. For instance, Duke Dickenson bought two gallons of whiskey on credit on December 22, 1816. It is more likely Dickenson and other free blacks purchased alcohol for a "frolic." Slave-
owners traditionally allowed their slaves a four-day holiday at Christmas at which slave-owners encouraged drunkenness and dissipation to relieve tensions among the slaves. Less formal slave gatherings occurred year-round on Saturday nights. Until well past midnight on a Saturday night, black slaves (and perhaps freemen) conducted their own socializing. At these "frolics" men and women passed around a "tickler" of whiskey. Unlike the tavern frequented by whites, black frolics were sexually integrated. Yet both blacks and whites relied upon the tavern keeper for their whiskey and their tumblers and ticklers. 14

Few women held accounts at Jackson's Tavern and even fewer went to the tavern themselves. In 1816 according to the daybook, only ten women had active accounts at the tavern. Of the twenty-one charges to their accounts, six were made by male proxies sent to the tavern by the women. The tavern environment was almost exclusively male, and aside from the female slaves who worked for the tavern keeper, only single women and widows ever set foot in a tavern. "The Widow Waldrope" was one such customer. When women purchased whiskey at the tavern it was in large quantities which suggests that women did not participate in the drinking rituals of the exclusive male tavern. One exception was Anney Going, who once bought eight cents worth or about half a pint of whiskey

at the tavern, the serving size generally purchased by male customers. However, Anney Going was exceptional in a society which proscribed women from frequenting taverns. Social networks in early nineteenth-century Virginia were segregated by gender as well as race. Men and women developed intense relationships among members of their own gender, but relations between the sexes were often distant. The exclusion of women from the tavern resulted in male behavior that reinforced the society's conceptions of masculinity.15

Both poor and wealthy farmers behaved with a frugality which frustrated tavern keepers. A tavern keeper in Harper's Ferry complained of the farmers "from whom he could extract nothing." Two farmers who had spent "very large sums at a neighbouring cattle fair" slept at his tavern. "They brought their bacon with them, requested permission to spread their blankets on the floor, and took two glasses of whiskey in the morning for the good of the house." Their bill came only to two pence. With so many non-paying visitors, it is no wonder that travellers were greeted sometimes with "an easy civility, sometimes with a repulsive frigidity, by a landlord who appear[ed] perfectly indifferent whether or not you [took]

 anything for the good of the house." Farmers ate few meals at the local tavern, except on special occasions. Out of nearly three thousand customer visits in 1816, only 221 meals were served at Jackson's Tavern, mostly dinners (129), the main meal of the day. Nearly half of all the dinners (62) were served on a Saturday, and forty-nine dinners were served to large groups of men eating together, such as the sixteen men who sat down to dinner on April 4, 1816. Large communal meals of five or more diners were an infrequent form of socialization and took place only six times in Jackson's Tavern in 1816. The most common social setting was the convivial drink, which often led to drunkenness. Farmers took their meals with their families except on special occasions; getting drunk with your buddies was reserved for the tavern.16

Whiskey was the beverage of choice in Jackson's Tavern. Brandy and cider were also popular, while wine and beer were nearly nonexistent. Jackson sold only one bottle of wine in all of 1816, a fact that reflects the social composition of his clientele. Whiskey was the common man's drink, while the gentry drank wine. Eight of Jackson's clients owned enough acreage to be classified as large planters, but they averaged less than four visits to the tavern in 1816, and only two percent of the visits of customers with property records.

Dudley Diggs, who owned 2,214 acres of land and thirty-four slaves, paid seventeen visits to Jackson's complex in 1816, but nearly every trip was to the blacksmith shop. Diggs' plantation must have been self-sufficient in everything but the services of the blacksmith. The only alcohol Diggs purchased was six and a half gallons on July 8, probably for his own household's and plantation's use.

Eleven Louisa County justices made appearances at the tavern in 1816 as well (one was also a planter). With the exception of Elisha Jackson's father John Jackson, who was a justice, these men averaged five visits to the tavern in 1816. William Nelson, who was appointed to the bench in early July of 1816, visited the tavern nineteen times in 1816 before his appointment, and then came to the tavern only six more times that year. His peers on the bench might have demanded of him an appearance of sobriety and disassociation from his former drinking mates. Planters or justices rarely appeared together at the tavern for social drinking. Occasionally they drank a cruet of whiskey at Jackson's Tavern or treated the company present to a quart of whiskey. Wealthy planters and gentlemen justices enjoyed the services of Jackson's store, blacksmith shop, and even borrowed cash from Jackson, but they shunned the company of the tavern bar. One of the courthouse taverns probably catered to the gentlemen justices and planters of Louisa, where they could sip wine and socialize with their peers. Given the erosion of influence of prominent families
in the early Republic and the absence of the gentry class from crossroads taverns, a new class of liberal, market-oriented men must have stepped into their places of prominence and influence in the neighborhood, men like Elisha Jackson.\textsuperscript{17}

Elisha Jackson's Tavern was a hub of communication and a social center for the neighborhood surrounding it. Jackson's Tavern was a center of oral and written communication. Jackson's post office linked his rural neighbors to the world outside Louisa. Postmaster Jackson provided the local farmers with mail, newspapers, and almanacs, as well as gossip from travellers and neighbors. Posters advertising runaways, estate sales, auctions, races, and government announcements hung on the walls. The taverngoers entered into heated discussion and arguments over the news revealed to them at the tavern. Whiskey ignited tempers, but orderly debate was not beyond the taverngoers who organized the Fork Meeting House Polemick Society. Debate was the only one form of competition in which the taverngoers engaged. Physical prowess was constantly asserted and challenged in target shooting, wrestling, and fighting. Along with gambling these sports defined and reinforced the social standing of the participants. Social standing regulated behavior in the tavern. Slaves in servile jobs showed more deference than skilled slaves such as the blacksmiths. The bulk of the customers, small and large farmers, associated freely together

\textsuperscript{17}1816 Daybook: 3/22/16, 7/8/16, 12/14/16.
over a convivial glass of whiskey or an occasional festive dinner. Planters and gentlemen justices held aloof of the common folk in the tavern, conducting their business in the store and blacksmith shop without engaging in much social drinking. The local tavern provided news and information on the world changing around the static, rural community served by the tavern. Social activities at the tavern - gossip, debate, competition, social drinking - tended to uphold the social order's status quo. The complex rituals of tavern social life were the means by which the local community could regulate itself.
CONCLUSION

Before the Temperance movement gained strong popular support in the mid-1830s, the tavern keeper/entrepreneur held the esteem and acceptance of the vast majority of society in Piedmont Virginia. Speaking specifically for ante-bellum Georgia, but with applicability to the whole South, George W. Paschal described the measures by which southern society judged men:

Men were honored for their intelligence, their virtues, and for those professions and occupations which, in every community, command influence. The clergy, the bar, the press, the physicians, the teachers, the merchants, the innkeepers, the millers and other avocations which brought men in contact with their neighbors, were the representative men, who controlled popular sentiment and gave direction to the public mind. The influence of these leaders was never measured by the number of slaves whom they owned, but by the strength of their minds and their adaptation to their callings.

While Paschal places tavern keepers below clergymen, lawyers, doctors, and teachers in his list of socially and politically influential vocations, tavern keepers certainly held more economic influence than all of these professions. In a rural county like Louisa, the tavern keeper's local authority often outstripped the influence of the others.

Tavern-keeping was a means of climbing the economic and
social ladder, providing the authority and capital for greater investments. Many tavern keepers turned to banking, planting, or politics in their late careers. The quasi-political authority of the tavern keeper/entrepreneur often translated into true political office. Most limited themselves to service, and power-holding, in their local communities. In many towns throughout the South storekeepers predominated on town councils, and every town council had at least one storekeeper on its roster. Jackson himself held many important appointments: postmaster, constable, and school superintendent.¹⁸

In the early nineteenth century the tavern keeper's considerable economic influence in the local community led to commensurate social and political power. Elisha Jackson stood at the center of his community's economic activity: he controlled the connection to outside markets; he imposed himself on and redefined the local exchange network; he commanded the cash nexus and was the center of a large credit network. Jackson also stood at the center of communication in his neighborhood and he held a virtual monopoly on information. He might have exercised control over the dissemination of information from his tavern, spreading gossip he deemed worthy and gagging news that might damage his interests. The neighborhood cabal, perhaps led by Jackson

through the Fork Meeting House Polemic Society, controlled political discourse around the tavern. Come election time, Jackson's Tavern was the sight of busy politicking by local candidates, who must have sought the proprietor's good graces. Early nineteenth-century tavern keepers in Piedmont Virginia like Jackson were the king makers of their communities.

The position of trust and authority held by the early nineteenth-century tavern keeper evolved into an even more oppressive office in the late nineteenth century. The local tavern and store's control over the local community became even more pronounced. In the Cotton South after the Civil War, merchants held territorial monopolies in which they exercised great economic, social, and political influence without serious competition. Fifty percent of the post offices in the Cotton South had only one store serving its neighborhood, and seventy percent had at most two stores. The average distance between stores remained the same; stores stood about five to ten miles apart. The basis of the new tavern keeper/entrepreneur's power was an even greater control of credit. The reservoir of available credit was held by a close network of patrons in Louisa County in the late nineteenth century. A single client might be tied to several creditors (creditors, suretors, and trustees) in the network, each of whom demanded deference from the client. Unlike in the early part of the century, these clients had no networks of support among themselves. Jackson at least had to operate
within the bounds of the local exchange and credit networks and was restricted to a certain extent by popular expectations of fairness. The borrowers of the late nineteenth century had fewer horizontal links and less expendable collateral in the form of personal property. Borrowers in the post war period depended upon storekeepers for the bare necessities of life: food, clothing, shelter, land, tools, draft animals, and medical treatment. Whereas Jackson placed few liens on his customers' crops, this practice became common in the late nineteenth century. Sharecroppers experienced a new form of slavery in debt peonage throughout the South, including Louisa County. The "orderly and useful house of entertainment" evolved from a communal center in the eighteenth century, to the castle of Jackson's personal fiefdom, to an oppressive structure which perpetuated the virtual enslavement of blacks in the late nineteenth century.19
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