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ABSTRACT

The hagiographic representation of William Penn as a benevolent colonizer has been challenged in recent years as historians and anthropologists have built more subtle and complete understandings of colonialism and its impact on the native people of the Delaware River Valley, the Lenape Indians. But a general idea that Pennsylvania possessed a special relationship with the native people it colonized remains. And Penn himself enjoys a reputation for fairness, justice, and cross-cultural communication. This thesis revises that reputation and the uniqueness of Pennsylvania’s early relationship with the Lenape.

I argue that Penn’s conduct was not unique or unprecedented and that the Lenape might not have perceived Pennsylvania’s practices as fair or just. Examining the Dutch and Swedish colonies on the Delaware River that preceded Pennsylvania, I argue in Chapter One that many of the understandings and practices for which Penn would become famous were begun by the Lenape, Dutch, and Swedish. Most importantly, the colonists and the Lenape sachems developed a practice of easing significant conflict through a rhetoric of brotherhood and mutual understanding. In Chapter Two, I describe the beginnings of Quaker settlement during the 1670s and the inheritance of cross-cultural communication practices from Dutch and Swedish interpreters still living on the Delaware. Penn inherited these interpreters and their relationships with Lenape sachems, a factor that was essential to the acceptance of his new colony. The Lenape seem to have miscalculated—indeed they could not have known how quickly Pennsylvania settlements would expand. For approximately fifty years before Quakers began arriving in large numbers during the 1670s, colonial settlement had been light, only a few hundred people. Though perhaps surprised, Lenape leaders resisted Pennsylvania’s expansion in the 1680s and 1690s, and a few even threatened violence and declared they would no longer consider themselves in “brotherhood” with William Penn. Penn displayed a willingness to use juridical force against Lenape dissenters.

A coda chapter argues that the story of Pennsylvania’s benevolent and special relationship with the Lenape originated with Penn himself. It was later promoted by eighteenth-century Pennsylvania Governors seeking close relations with Iroquois and Conestoga Indians. It was not a Lenape tradition until later decades, long after the struggle to maintain control of ancestral homeland on the Delaware River had been lost.
FRIENDLY MEETINGS: THE ART OF CONQUEST AND THE MYTHICAL ORIGINS OF PENNSYLVANIA, ca. 1620-1771
On an autumn day in 1682, the legend goes, William Penn, the founding proprietor of Pennsylvania, met the leaders of the Delaware River Valley’s indigenous residents—the sachems of the Lenape—to settle a unique treaty of peace and amity. This legend was vividly recorded in Benjamin West’s 1772 painting of the meeting, *William Penn’s Treaty with the Indians*, which portrays, according to its creator, the hopeful image of “savages brought into harmony and peace by justice and benevolence.” But the trepidation West portrayed on the faces of some of the sachems suggests an ambiguity that belies the image of harmony and echoes William Penn’s instructions to his colonial representatives, which sometimes seem tinged with a concern that he might not “Winn” the sachems’ “Love & Friendship.”

When they met Penn in an open field between the forest and the river, the sachems were, according to the legend, initially wary. But the sachems are said to have lost their fear in the diffuse mid-morning light that made soft shadows on the ground around the proprietor and his unarmed company. They stepped from under an “elm tree of prodigious size,” which shaded several other Lenape people and a group of huts at the

---

edge of the forest, and stood or sat before Penn and his entourage. The Quakers were “all dressed in the plain habit of [their] sect.” Gathering beside “each other under [the tree’s] widely-spreading branches,” several Lenape sachems, including one woman, examined Penn. In front of Penn, “spread upon the ground,” were “various articles of merchandise, intended as presents to the Indians,” and the new Quaker proprietor “held in his hand a roll of parchment, containing the confirmation of the treaty of purchase and amity.”

This story of Pennsylvania’s founding enjoyed widespread prestige as historical fact throughout the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth. But historians now regard the painting as West’s own allegorical statement about Pennsylvania’s history, and they generally concur that the large treaty meeting may never have occurred. This skepticism has not often been extended to the reputation of Penn himself, however. Most authors identify Penn’s treatment of the Lenapes as “exemplary,” “kind,” “benevolent,” or “altruistic”—even when they admit that Penn also sought profit or condescended to the indigenous people. His policies are praised through quotations of his writings, such as the 1681 “Letter to the Kings of the Indians,” through references to his practice of buying Indian land, and through the contrasting example of James Logan’s less scrupulous land exchanges with Lenapes and Susquehannocks in the 1730s.

---

2 The quotations are from Thomas Clarkson, Memiors of the Public and Private Life of William Penn (London, 1813), 339-40 and Thomas F. Gordon, The History of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1829), 75. Gordon’s account relies on Clarkson, whose description of the meeting was the first in print. Clarkson conferred with Benjamin West about the meeting, and his description reads like a description of West’s painting. See Helmut von Erffa and Allen Staley, The Paintings of Benjamin West (New Haven, 1986), 207.

The interpretation of Penn as a benevolent leader is a myth—something less than accurate and something more than a fiction. Its origins are in Penn's benignly worded pacifist ideology of assimilation, and it has overshadowed the tensions Penn created and the resistance of a number of sachems who were dissatisfied with Penn and his colony. One historian has noted that Penn “has been ill served by the hagiographers who elevated him to sainthood and thus diminished his humanity,” but Penn’s elevation began with his own rhetoric of kindness and benevolence. Two other writers have observed that Penn “never supposed that they [the Lenape] could become integral members of his Christian community,” and that he failed to understand that the Lenape recognized “no conception of exclusive land ownership.” He was lucky to arrive while the Lenape were “demoralized” and the Iroquois Five Nations were ascendant among indigenous people.4

But the Lenape were not demoralized when they met Penn. The history of the seventeenth century in the Delaware Valley had taught some of the sachems that colonial expansion was manageable. Penn orchestrated a huge “real estate development” that

---

promoted extensive European migration into the Delaware Valley and surprised the native residents in its scope.\(^5\)

William Penn’s promotion of European immigration into the Delaware Valley set in motion the demographic, economic, and social forces that lead to the Lenapes’ westward migration. In 1638, Swedish settlers were the first to make a relatively successful effort to colonize the Valley. They encountered a region of multiple Lenape homeland areas that centered on the Delaware and its tributary watersheds. Although they regarded both the west and east sides of the river as “New Sweden” (see fig. 2) because it better served their ambitions for inland trade and settlement, colonial immigration was relatively slight during the 1640s, 1650s, and 1660s. It was fairly easy for the Lenape to maintain their localized cultural geography against the scattered Dutch, English, and Swedish settlers during the second and third quarters of the seventeenth century.\(^6\) The Quaker settlement of the Delaware Valley, which began in the 1670s and culminated with the organization of Pennsylvania, was the historical moment in which Penn and others transformed a period of desultory exploration and settlement into a determined effort to possess the region both materially and symbolically.\(^7\)

Without the production of maps of the land and written descriptions of the native people’s culture to promote European confidence in emigration and trade, immigration


\(^6\) The use of the Delaware River as a political boundary appears to have begun with the English settlement of Pennsylvania. See Thomas Budd, Good Order Established ([Philadelphia], 1685), 32, for example. The first attempt at a comprehensive history of the region reflects this early perception: Robert Proud, The History of Pennsylvania...West-New-Jersey...Swedish and Dutch settlements on the Delaware..., 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 1797-1798).

might have been less successful. William Penn knew that immigrants wanted evidence of available land, trade opportunities, and friendly or manageable indigenous people. The images, texts, and maps describing the Valley and its inhabitants to potential emigrants are as important to understanding Penn’s success as careful study of the demographics of immigration or the perspective of the native people themselves. Before they could trade and before knowledge of land and people could be exchanged, the colonial and indigenous people needed to invent means for communicating with one another. They created an informal “language” that included such diverse elements as a pidgin dialect of Lenape, the firing of guns into the air, bodily gestures, and the exchange of gifts.8 Misunderstandings were endemic. When misunderstandings involved the definition of property, the combination of juridical power and the force of population supported the Pennsylvanians’ interpretation over the interpretations of Lenape sachems.

Penn used conciliatory statements and massive immigration to establish his authority on pacifist terms. The success of this cross-cultural discourse of speech, print, gesture, and trade objects between the Lenapes and the colonists was based on complimentary trade and political interests and limited by distinct social values and concepts of the land—enabled and limited by what could be termed society or culture.9 Words and objects acquired new connotations with shifts of cultural context. During the first three quarters of the seventeenth century the Lenapes and Europeans attempted to enforce understandings of property and authority that were quite distinct, but they lived in

---

cautious compromise because neither the Dutch, Lenape, or Swedish had the power to enforce their own perceptions of proper order. But after Penn's founding of Pennsylvania, cross-cultural compromise tended to serve a colonial expansion of proportions unknown in the Lenape's experience and to require adjustment to a European social order. Ironically, the pacifist Penn accomplished what the Swedish soldier Johan Printz had only dreamed of: Pennsylvania drove some Lenape bands from their ancestral homeland and forced others to conform, at least publicly, to European concepts of place and society.

The themes of competition, communication, and misunderstandings are partly drawn from Daniel K. Richter's *Ordeal of the Longhouse* and Richard White's *The Middle Ground*. Like other historians, Richter and White have argued or suggested that cross-cultural exchanges could change the meaning of objects and language. These books are part of an approach, one historian recently wrote, focusing on regional and continental "intercultural and intertribal relations" that "promises a big picture with a Native American cast." This essay uses these "big picture" interpretations to analyze how the Lenapes lost their ancestral homeland while the man who most effectively organized their dispersal gained praise as their great and benevolent friend.

---


I have included the entire text of Penn's "Letter to the Kings of the Indians" and two other documents that are often quoted as evidence of his benevolence as figures 5, 6, and 7. They provide an interesting counterpoint to my interpretation of his ideology and myth. Like the use of seventeenth-century maps as guides to places mentioned in the text, these documents are intended as an unobtrusive and entertaining way to suggest the tension between history, the documents, and the interpretation of the past.13

"Contemporary philosophers," claims a recent study of historical scholarship, "have reminded historians, as well as readers of histories, that there cannot be an exact correspondence between words and what is out there, between the conventions employed when speaking about the world itself and its contents."14 Documents are not windows into the past, and they are not voices from the past; they are interpretations of the past that, like myth, are something less than accurate and something more than fiction.15 The writing of history, therefore, is disciplined myth-making.16 Historical evidence frequently tells stories, but it does not tell historian's stories: historians create narratives and analysis through interpretive methods described under rubrics such as society or culture.

---


How pragmatically can the idea of Lenape or European cultural and social identities be understood? That native people in northeastern North America perceived distinctions between themselves and Europeans is incontrovertible, but the notion of culture is merely a discourse that describes those distinctions in terms of subsistence strategies, kinship patterns, and symbolic meanings. Culture is a post-eighteenth century creation, and how well modern conceptions of culture fit specific seventeenth century native people's perceptions of group identity is an open question. Doubtlessly the people historians have come to call the Lenape valued a notion of autonomy and group identity, but a precise representation of how the Lenape defined it is not to be found through an analysis of archaeological and documentary evidence. Doubtlessly the Lenape valued their kin relations and their ancestry, but how or if kinship and ancestry motivated them is not truly knowable. If a Lenape sachem violates rules of matriliny or sells collective land rights as if they were his own does he cease to be Lenape or has he redefined his culture? If no Lenape women are described as sachems in European documents—documents that were created by male members of patriarchal societies—can we be sure that women never possessed such authority? These problems are fundamental to this essay not only because the Lenapes and colonists struggled over definitions of right social authority and material subsistence during the seventeenth century but also because they are puzzles that leave an ambiguity and tentativeness at the heart of this essay.
In the summer of 1634 a man on the western shore of Delaware Bay observed a ship and its scouting shallop sailing toward the Delaware River. According to Thomas Young, the English captain of the vessel, the man ran along the coastline calling to the shallop's crew. When the shallop landed, four other men came out of the woods, but only one was willing to go with the crew to the ship waiting in the bay. Young wrote that he "entertained" the unnamed Lenape man "courteously," giving him food and querying him about the bay. During the next two weeks, Young would tour the Delaware River all the way to the fall-line (see fig.3, up-river from "Kentkateck" marked as "4"). His journey was emblematic of the different priorities that the Lenape and European peoples applied to social relations, the land, and the river. But it also foreshadowed the tensions these different priorities created in later decades.

Attempting to acquire knowledge of the river, Young repeatedly asked the Lenape man how far inland the river extended.1 Answering through an unnamed interpreter, the man said that the Bay turned into a fresh-water river that ran far into the land but he had

---

never visited the head of it. Over the next several days as Young proceeded further up the river, Lenape men repeatedly came aboard, traded with him, and answered his questions about how far the river was navigable for his ship. A Lenape sachem accompanied by about fifty people told Young about the rocky falls further up river called Sankikan (see fig.3, west side of river just downstream of “4”) but he and the eldest of the three other sachems had never seen the head of the river. Finally, at the falls, in the region of Rankokes creek and Mattinicum Island, Young met Lenapes who could give him more detailed descriptions of its course.2

Although the people Young met had spent most of their lives within homeland areas and did not have full knowledge of the river’s extent, they were familiar with European vessels, which periodically visited the area on trading and exploration expeditions. When Henry Hudson sailed into the future New York Bay in 1609, Lenape and Mahican men and women of that region already possessed European goods.3 Not long before Young’s arrival a Dutch ship had visited the area and traded with the Lenape in the bay. The Dutch had built settlements and forts along the Delaware River in 1623, 1624, and 1632, but all had been destroyed by the Lenape or abandoned by the settlers.4 With this experience, the Lenapes knew to bring items for trade when they approached Young’s ship. What this trade meant to the Lenape is ambiguous, but at least one scholar has speculated from the seventeenth-century descriptions of trading practices that it was an integral part of alliance building. Indians in the Northeast woodlands traded in order to

get manufactured goods, and they traded in order to involve the Europeans in gift-exchanges that established bonds of alliance.5

Thomas Young was on a self-proclaimed adventure to discover and exploit uninhabited land. The information that Young gleaned from the sachems seized his imagination, becoming part of a plan to build a smaller vessel that could be launched above the falls “to find a way that leadeth into that Mediterranean Sea.” When a sachem invited him to come to his village for the purpose of alliance, Young first stopped to take “possesion of the countrey, for his Ma[jes]tie, and there sett up his Ma[jes]ties armes upon a tree.”6 He wrote that when he met with the Lenape sachems they asked for protection against the Susquehannocks and that he required them to accept the king of England’s authority in exchange. Young had an interpreter, but Young does not explain how the interpreter translated the condition of subjugation in exchange for military assistance.7

Young’s interpreter and the Lenape were probably communicating through a trade dialect of Lenape termed the “Delaware Jargon.”8 This Delaware Jargon was originally formed from Dutch encounters with the Lenape on the upper Delaware River between 1624 and 1626. Over the years English and Swedish colonists would make and remake the jargon, but it would remain a pidgin form of Delaware Valley Lenape. The jargon simplified gender forms, plurals, and Lenape grammar as well. It emphasized knowledge that was useful for trade such as weather, environment, time, trees, fruits, animals, and

7 Ibid., 41.
8 Goddard, “The Delaware Jargon,” in Hoffecker et al., eds., New Sweden in America, 137.
household goods and activities. It expressed concepts that were new to the Lenape through the creation of new compound words. One version of the Delaware Jargon created terms for “God the father,” “God the son,” and “God the Holy Ghost” through various combinations of Lenape words for “spirit,” “father,” “son,” and the name for a dance. Young’s requirement of subjection was probably translated using the Lenape word “sachem,” which describes hereditary and non-hereditary political and spiritual leaders. Since the English monarch was not kin, he would have been welcomed to the rights of a non-hereditary sachem. Such sachems could be deposed, and their continued power rested on the consent of the community. It is possible that the sachems accepted Young’s conditions in order to gain a military ally when they were weak and freshly defeated by the Susquehannocks, only to throw off the yoke again when opportunity or need arose. But the point was never tested. Young sailed back down the Delaware River and out into the ocean within weeks of his first appearance.

The means of communication, however, were tested. The two groups were able to communicate well enough to exchange gifts and promises and to establish an ad hoc partnership that served the needs of both the explorer as well as those of the beleaguered Lenapes. But communication was also mutual misunderstanding. Sachems were not monarchs, and rivers were not solely pathways. Young regarded the land as an open territory full of potential subjects ready to be claimed in the name of England. The river was for him a passage to be navigated, a tool for the furtherance of “his Ma[jes]ties” glory, the discovery of “that Mediterranean Sea,” and the acquisition of information enabling the “exploitation” of whatever commodities he might find. By contrast, the

Lenape not only used the river for food and transportation but also lived in its presence. Far from nomadic, most of the Lenapes in Young’s account did not know the river’s source, and those who lived by the bay appeared unfamiliar with the falls. It was the European adventurer who appeared nomadic, wandering into the bay in the wake of other vessels and then drifting back out again some weeks later. When the Swedish settled in the Valley, they recorded the names of sachems and learned or gave names to the places they thought significant. Like Young, they asserted monarchical authority, but, unlike Young their residence enabled them to experience the consequences of miscommunications with the Lenape.¹⁰

Drawing half of its capital from Swedish and half from Dutch sources, New Sweden’s investors organized the New Sweden Company in 1637 expecting to realize high profits. It was conceived by Dutch merchants, who advised the Swedish to colonize North America in order to accumulate capital resources in Sweden. The crown found the venture appealing as a means to finance its military, but there were other arguments for colonization. New Sweden would promote Christianity among the “wild” people. These interests, some of which competed with the ambitions of the Dutch and the English, necessitated the acquisition of exclusive title to the land from the Lenape. For eighteen years after the Swedish settled Fort Christina on the Minquas River in 1638 (see fig.3 “g” the “Christinakyl”), the New Netherland colony competed with New Sweden to secure title to the Delaware River Valley from the Lenape.¹¹

---

Mattawiraka, Mittotscheming, Peminaka, and Mahamen, all Lenape sachems, met
the first Swedish colonists when they landed. On board the Kalmar Nyckel the sachems
made their marks on a deed by which the Swedish claimed possession of most of the
Delaware River Valley. It was an opening exchange in a long argument between the
Dutch, Lenape, and Swedish about the meaning of land exchanges. On behalf of Queen
Christina and the New Sweden Company, Peter Minuit was buying one idea--that the
New Sweden Company and the Swedish crown possessed absolute and inalienable right
and sovereignty over the land and people--but the Lenape were selling another--the right
to settle in the immediate vicinity of the Minquas River for trade and crop-raising. The
Lenape were selling “use-rights” to limited areas of land. They welcomed and
encouraged both Dutch and Swedish settlements as trading centers, but the prerogatives
Europeans associated with the term sovereignty were associated with kin-groups by the
Lenape, not with the land or with a supra-familial state.

During the early 1640s, these competing interpretations of land-use and
ownership contributed to several crises between the New Sweden colonists and the
Lenape that often aggravated the competition between the Dutch and Swedish. One
sachem, Wickusi, claimed that the Swedes had “purchased” rights to land on the river
from sachems who did not own those rights. The Swedes met with him and satisfied his
claim, but the problem of different forms of ownership was not solved. In early 1648,
Mattawiraka, a sachem from Passyunck, touched off a crisis when he invited the Dutch to
settle on the Schuylkill River. Mattawiraka and another sachem named Wassiminetto had

12 “Affidavit of Four Men from the Key of Calmar” in Myers, ed., Narratives of Pennsylvania, 87-88.
13 On use-rights see Thomas, “In the Maelstrom of Change,” 133-44; William Cronon, Changes in the
become upset that the Swedish had settled on land they never intended for them to occupy. Andreas Hudde, a Dutch representative stationed at Fort Nassau since 1645 who wrote the only remaining documents about the incident, claimed that Matawiraka and Wasiminetto approached him while he was camped near the Schuylkill and asked why he did not build on the river as the Swedish had done. Fearing that the Swedes would gain control of the river, the best remaining route to the Susquehannocks, Hudde sent a scout to investigate. The sachems were right, and Hudde knew that when the Swedish controlled the Schuylkill they could block the Dutch from the fur trade with the Susquehannocks. Hudde built a trading station near the Swedish one.¹⁴

According to Hudde, the sachems took and planted the flag of the Prince of Orange and required him to fire three shots to notify the nearby Swedish of their presence. Hudde took these acts as “a sign of possession” because he wanted to believe that the Sachems were supporting his absolute claim over the Swedish government’s absolute claim. But although Dutch and Swedish documents portray the sachems as pawns of one or the other colonial power, I believe the sachems were using the settlers against each other, exploiting and even encouraging conflict in the defense and assertion of their own rights to the land. The Dutch, English, and Swedish had usually employed the firing of guns and the planting of coats of arms to signify full possession of entire regions. By using this ceremony to place one colony’s representatives directly beside another’s, the sachems reworked the ceremony to assert a different understanding of these transactions: they gave the Dutch the right to settle and trade on this limited portion of land. When the Swedish came to protest, the sachems took the opportunity to lecture them. Mattawiraka and Wassiminetto asked by what right the Swedes had settled

¹⁴ Johnson, New Sweden, 408; Johnson, ed., Instruction for Printz, 272.
Matticunum, the Schuylkill, and several other areas. According to Hudde, they asked how the Swedes could justify occupying the whole river on the basis of one small purchase when they had first arrived. They expressed wonder that the Swedish colonists attempted to prescribe laws for them and tell them what to do with their own possessions, people, and land. Finally, they reminded the Swedish representatives that the Dutch had been in the vicinity many years longer than they and had not taken any land from them.15

Although Queen Christina identified the Lenape not as subjects but as a “wild” people, she expected Johan Printz to convert them to Christianity and discipline them in the interest of order. When, in 1644, several Lenapes killed colonists in their homes as well as soldiers and watchmen at their posts, Printz attempted to intimidate the Lenape by telling them that many colonists were about to arrive from Sweden. When only one ship arrived carrying a handful of colonists, some young Lenape men attacked and killed a few colonists and soldiers near Tinnekock. The sachems made amends to Printz by presenting symbolic reparations in wampum and sued for peace, to which he agreed. But the Governor warned that if violence occurred again he would attack and kill every last Lenape. Printz observed that the Lenape did not trust him, but perhaps they simply did not believe his threats. Printz took no action when another colonist was killed in 1646. He needed the Lenapes’ trade in corn and tobacco, and he simply did not have the population or military strength to coerce Lenape subjection. In a frequently quoted passage, Printz describes his desire to have enough soldiers to exterminate the Lenapes. But these soldiers were never granted. Indeed, between 1648 and 1654, no ships arrived from Sweden at all.16

15 Johnson, ed., Instruction for Printz, 273.
16 Johnson, New Sweden, 375-76; Johnson, ed., Instruction for Printz, 78-80; Stellan Dahlgren and Hans
The Dutch were not resolved to take control of the Delaware, the Swedish were not supplied well enough to expand their claims, and the Lenape, wanting their trade with the colonists in order to facilitate trade and diplomatic ties with interior tribes, were not inclined to attack the colonial settlements. A long slow cross-cultural chess game of deeds, forts, and threats reached a climax in the early 1650s. In 1651, the Dutch met with the sachems Peminaka and Mattawiraka at Fort Nassau and convinced them to sell a tract of land on the eastern bank of the river. In exchange Peminaka received only the promise that they would give him food when he needed it and fix his gun when it broke. The Swedes responded by appealing to a Lenape woman named Notike, along with her son Kiapes, to challenge Peminaka’s right to give the land to the Dutch. According to Notike and her kin, Peminaka had been given the right to hunt on the lands south of the Schuylkill by Mittotscheming, Notike’s deceased husband. But Mittotscheming had not given Peminaka the right to sell those lands. The Swedish document further claimed that she confirmed Mittotscheming’s intention for no one other than the Swedes to occupy the land.

What the Swedish either misunderstood or misrepresented was that Notike and the other Lenape women exerted considerable influence within their communities. Although Notike was the only Lenape woman that surviving Swedish documents recognize as possessing a right to allocate land or the right to represent her lineage, scholars, inferring from eighteenth-century sources describing the social role of Lenape women, conclude that other women in the seventeenth century must also have possessed considerable influence over the allocation of community lands.

In order to appreciate the importance of women's position in Lenape society it is necessary to look back to the early 1630s and the Lenape's war with the Susquehannocks. When the Swedish arrived in the Delaware River Valley in 1638 to settle, the war between the Susquehannocks had ended and the Lenape were again living on both sides of the river. Details of the peace between the Susquehannocks and the Lenapes have not survived, but there is some evidence that the Lenapes made tributary gifts for the Susquehannocks and that there was some intermarriage that would have fostered kinship ties and thus the joint choosing of some sachems. Both the brokering of peace agreements and the choosing of future sachems were within the social role of a community's elder women and it is likely, therefore, that women negotiated the agreement. Lenape women also managed community horticultural food production, producing surplus corn and tobacco for trade with the colonists as well. As representatives of lineages, they had the right to control the distribution of these goods. A Lenape individual derived his or her identity and position from the matrilineage, and men inherited their sachemships through

19 Marshall Becker, "Lenape Population at the Time of European Contact: Estimating Native Numbers in the Lower Delaware Valley," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 133 (1989), 112-19 has claimed that the Lenape were not agriculturalists organized into settled villages. Rather, he argues that, at the time of contact, the Lenape were living in small foraging horticultural bands that grew corn in the summer but stored none of it. Becker claims that the most cited source, if not the only cited source to support the notion of Lenape agriculture is Lindestrom, Geographia, 253, but other seventeenth-century documents also discuss corn production: De Vries, "Korte Historiael," in Myers, ed., Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, 19, 21; Young, "Relation," ibid., 39; and Dahlgren and Norman, Rise and Fall, 207. However, this does not mean the Lenape were storing corn. They may have produced these surpluses yearly for trade. For scholars who have studied women and lineages see Goddard, "Delaware," in Hofecker, ed., New Sweden in America, 213-39; Schonenberger, Lenape Women, 164-68; Anthony F. C. Wallace, "Women, Land, and Society: Three Aspects of Aboriginal Delaware Life," Pennsylvania Archaeologist, 17 (1947), 1-35.
their mother's line, though men had the right to nominate successors. Thus, when the Swedish authors of Notike's statement translated her position as "widow" they separated her from that extended kin group that was the source of her social power within her community and associated her with a Swedish familial model in which women had no property rights or social powers beyond those granted by association with husbands. An excellent example of the superimposition of a Swedish familial model onto Lenape people is represented in Peter Lindestrom's painting of a Lenape family which he based on his experiences in the colony in 1654-1655. Lindestrom pictured the Lenape family as a one man, one woman, one child unit. The painting omits, whether for convenience or by design, the extended familial ties that defined the social lives of these three individuals (see fig.4).

Male sachems such as Mattawiraka, Mittotsheming, and Peminaka were leaders of matrilineal groups with women like Notike at their core. In her statement Notike implicitly acknowledged that Peminaka was associated with her lineage when she affirmed that Mittotscheming had granted him use rights in their land. Peminaka's rights, however, were limited to hunting. How closely the male sachems, Notike, and other female leaders in the Valley's Lenape communities followed matrilineal kinship rules is impossible to determine--especially in an era of new pressures from an aggressive and patriarchal colonial power. But even when men traded furs for agricultural implements such as hoes, they were trading objects of the male hunting sphere for objects of the

---

21 Weslager, Delaware, 63; Schonenberger, Lenape Women, 173.
22 Another example of the translation of the matrilineal Lenape lineage system into the Swedish is provided by the wordlists of Thomas Campanius Holm. Campanius's grandfather had been a minister in New Sweden and worked to convert Lenapes to Lutheranism. Working from his grandfather's notes Campanius translated both the Lenape "Rhenus" denoting a male person and "Renappi" denoting the Lenape people in general as "Man." Admittedly the list is an English translation of the Swedish, but the presence of two terms "brother-in-law" and "sister-in-law" for the Lenape "Dangus" suggests to me a translation of the
female horticultural sphere. Such trade may have supported or eroded women's power within the community. What is demonstrated in these incidents is the Swedish tendency to interpret Lenape women's roles within logic that they brought with them. Notions of patriarchy, like those of proprietary land ownership, were only two of the logical discourses through which communication could become miscommunication.

In 1654, New Sweden was at the height of its power in the Valley, having recently captured the Dutch Fort Casimir. A new governor, Johan Rising, had been sent to New Sweden with new supplies, settlers, and instructions that differed from those of former Governor Johan Printz. The new instructions omitted the requirement to Christianize the "wild people," because New Sweden's minister John Campanius had been unsuccessful. Although Campanius had learned the Delaware Jargon and translated a Lutheran catechism, he had succeeded mainly in teaching the Lenape the reasons why they disliked and found hypocrisy in the Christian religion. Printz had written in his reports about the failure of missionary efforts. The queen may have realized the futility of the effort. This was a defining moment in the history of European colonization of the Lenape; the Colonials still considered it important for the "wild people" to adopt Christianity, but they no longer had an explicit strategy for conversion. The Lenape were not going to become full citizens of New Sweden, and no future colonizer would seriously attempt christianization.

Lenape form of gender definition into a Swedish one. See Holm, *New Sweden*, 145-146.


But after many years of neglect, the Swedish crown wanted to take serious interest in its North American colony, and Rising, himself Sweden's most important mercantile theorist, wished to advance that aim. In 1654, Mattawiraka, Peminaka, Nachaman and several other sachems met with Rising and representatives of Queen Christina and the New Sweden Company on the island of Tinnekonk (Tennakonck, “x”, on Linestrom's map fig.3) in the Delaware River. The encounter demonstrates most clearly the complexities of mediating the relationship. The sachems apparently requested the meeting with the Swedish, in Governor Rising's words, to “come to a pact of friendship and alliance and... to present them with gifts.”

Rising's journal entries describing the meeting reflect his effort to follow the Queen of Sweden's instructions and keep peaceful relations with the Lenape. He gives minimal information and selects out all traces of conflict. Rising's entries state that his party traveled to Tinnekonk on June 16. The sachems arrived the following day, and, when they were all seated on the floor, Rising spoke on behalf of the Queen of Sweden and thanked them for their friendship. He distributed gifts and told them of his wish for their relationship to remain “friendly,” of his intention “to treat them well,” and his desire to “damage neither their people nor their plantations and possessions.” He writes that he urged the sachems to continue to preserve their friendship and asked if they would make a firm alliance with him. He asked them to confirm earlier Swedish deeds. To all this they allegedly answered “Yes.” According to Rising, Nachaman spoke in praise of the Swedish and chastised his oft-discontented fellow sachems. He reportedly said, “We see what good friends these are that bring us such gifts.” He promised they would maintain a “firmer friendship... which he extolled with words, images, gestures and grand airs, so that we had to marvel at the Indians.”

---

25 Dahlgren and Norman, *Rise and Fall*, 175.
They invited the Swedes to build a fort and houses at Passyunk, their largest village in the area. When the sachems informed Rising that disease had come with the most recent ship from Sweden and was threatening their people, Rising told them to learn faith in God and offered some food. His journal entry concludes abruptly with the comment that they liked the food and “sack” very much.26

Peter Lindestrom, a mathematician, cartographer, and military engineer, was also present at the meeting and wrote an account that contrasted with Rising’s by dramatically emphasizing points of conflict. Like Rising, Lindestrom had come to the Delaware to serve the “fatherland,” but he had also come to “see the world and gain experience.”27 Rising had mentioned only Nachaman by name, but Lindestrom named Mattawiraka, Peminaka, Nachaman, and seven other Lenape sachems. Lindestrom’s main interest, shared by Rising, was to demonstrate Swedish authority and Lenape acquiescence: the Swedes spoke first to the Lenape; they praised the Swedish queen and thanked the sachems on her behalf for remaining friendly to the colony; they reminded the sachems of several deeds they had to land along the Delaware and admonished them to keep those agreements inviolable. Speaking for the other sachems, Lindestrom reported that Nachaman praised the Swedish and their relationship. According to Lindestrom, the sachem said that in the past they had been as “one body and one heart during the time of Meschatz [i.e. “large stomach” their name for the rotund Governor Johan Printz]... so should they hereafter be as one head with us.” (Lindestrom regarded the sachem’s simile and gestures as comical). There is no indication that the Lenape accepted the Swedes’ claim to proprietary ownership of the Valley or to authority over them. The sachems were

26 ibid., 175, 177, 179.
27 Peter Lindestrom, Geographia Americae with An Account of the Delaware Indians, ed. and trans.
actually proposing a cooperative relationship and urged the Swedish to settle a few people at Passyunck to facilitate the resolution of future conflicts. Nachaman's metaphors of one heart, one head, and one body could describe many forms of cooperation. However, Lindestrom portrayed the Swedes as the prevailing authority and seemed to believe that the sachems recognized this authority.²⁸

But an interpreter’s malapropism that Lindestrom described merely as a curiosity reveals that the apparently smooth proceedings hid subtle clashes. Gregorious van Dyck was the interpreter at Mattinicum in 1654. Van Dyck was a soldier who had lived in the colony since coming over on the second expedition from Sweden to the Delaware in 1640. Printz had made him the Watchmaster at Fort Elfsborg in 1643, and Van Dyck had participated in an expedition to the Susquehannocks to establish trade in 1646. He had also been the interpreter at the meetings with Notike, Mattawiraka, and Peminaka in 1651. Toward the end of the Mattinicum meeting between the sachems and Rising, one sachem tried to explain to the Swedish that his community was suffering from diseases brought over on the last ship from Sweden. One phrase was translated, according to Lindestrom, to describe the arrival of the disease as seeming "like fire all around the ship." The sachem became angry when the Swedish discounted this statement as the result of ignorance about the effect of the salt water glistening in the sun as it sprayed from the ship. Lindestrom recorded the sachem’s answer to Van Dyck as “now, you are crazy, you old fool. Before you always used to say that I lied, but now you lie enough for anything. Have I and some [others] not seen that?” What was wrong with Van Dyck’s translation that the sachem considered him a liar? What were the conversations in which

²⁸ Lindestrom, Geographia, 126-29 (the quotation is on 129).
Van Dyck had accused the sachem of lying? Van Dyck answered, in a somewhat condescending effort to correct his blunder, "You may indeed be right, I did not believe you to be so intelligent, I am in this matter not so wise." With this humble self-effacement Van Dyck relieved the tension of the exchange, but "wisdom" and "intelligence" were not necessarily the problem. At issue was the way in which the translation of terms and concepts transformed the meaning of statements. In this case the absurdity of the transformation appears to have created the impression of an error. In other cases shifted meanings in shifted contexts may not have been so readily apparent.

Recited deeds and gifts could simultaneously signify authority for the Swedish and tribute to the sachems, translated speech could simultaneously expose and hide meaning, and the meanings of commonplace objects could shift with the change of social context. At this meeting between Rising and the sachems, the sachems sat crouched on the floor, and the Swedish either stood or sat around a table. In the midst of the discussions, one sachem got up onto the table and sat directly in its center before finishing his speech. Lindestrom described the event as comical, as a sign of the sachem's uncivil manners. For the sachems, who were accustomed in their meetings to sit on an equal plane on the floor, the presence and use of this table, with its prescription of a certain type of sitting-behavior, may have represented an affront to their sense of protocol. The sachem in effect leveled the table and turned its flat top into another floor. By not reacting violently, the Swedish implicitly accepted the statement even if they privately took it as a sign of the sachem's inferiority. Neither side needed to understand the other to have come away satisfied with their performance.

The sachem appropriated the table for his own purposes, but the Swedish appropriated Lenape knowledge of the land for their own ends. There were three separate places called Tinnekonk along the Delaware River in the seventeenth century, and they were all geologically similar. All three were islands separated from the river bank by narrow creeks and swamps. The multiplicity of identical names for similar land forms probably reflects the fact that several Lenape bands along the river all shared a language but had distinct homeland areas. But the Swedes wished to administer the whole area as one unit, as “New Sweden.” Therefore, Lindestrom’s map distinguished these several places on his map by using different phonetic spellings of Tinnekonk. On his map he spelled the word as “Tamakonck,” “Tennakonck,” and “Tinnekonck” (see fig.3 sites “B,” “x,” and “11”).

In the midst of active communication, through both the translation of Lenape statements and the application of Lenape words on a map, the Swedish colonists attempted to attach their own connotations to indigenous terms. The same contest over meaning occurred in the translation of gender roles, such culture-specific objects as a table, and even the land. The series of conflicts over land exchanges during the 1640s and early 1650s indicate quite clearly that the Lenapes and Europeans did not regard the land as the same object. Both would use the land to grow crops and build shelters, but they had distinct social and cultural understandings of the land.

In the year following this meeting the Dutch sailed up the Delaware and into the Minquas River, besieged Fort Christina, and took over New Sweden, but many of the old colonists remained. The Swedish and Finnish population of New Sweden was about four hundred in 1655. Between 1655 and the early 1670s there was little new immigration into

---

the region of the Delaware River stretching north from the Minquas River to the Falls. The population of colonials remained small. The total Dutch, English, Finnish, and Swedish population of New Sweden probably did not exceed six or seven hundred in 1664, when the English conquered New Netherland. From 1655 to 1664—the whole period of Dutch "control" of the Delaware River—the area from Fort Christina northward (see map fig. 3) was administered by New Amsterdam, the area south by New Castle. The Dutch at New Castle did not allow Swedish settlers to re-locate to their administration zone, and thus the area north of Fort Christina remained a zone of predominantly Lenape and secondarily Swedish population. It is during this period that the number of Swedish and Dutch mediators, people who knew the Delaware Jargon and individual Lenapes in the manner of Gregorious van Dyck, multiplied.31

Men such as Peter Cock and Peter Rambo were yeoman farmers engaged in planting tobacco at the Schuylkill and Fort Christina plantations.32 Benjamin West in his painting of Penn's treaty portrayed two non-English and non-Quaker men actually performing the task of negotiations with the sachems.33 It seems likely to me that West intended to represent the Swedish and Dutch mediators who actually interpreted at the

---

33 Abrams, "Benjamin West’s Documentation of Colonial History," 73 calls these two figures "interesting indeed" because of their clothing but offers no hypothesis about their ethnicity or individual identities.
initial meetings between Pennsylvania Quakers and the Lenape. The Swedish interpreters’ understandings and misunderstandings of the Lenape—from pidgin dialects to perceptions of property—became the formative influence on Pennsylvania’s relationship with the local sachems. Lars Cock was the mediator at both of the original meetings between William Markham and the Lenape in 1682. One pair of scholars has observed that the second of these meetings probably occurred at Cock’s house. He was born in New Sweden in 1646, probably on the Schuylkill River where his father was one of eight tobacco farmers. By 1675 Lars had long-standing relationships with Lenape sachems around the future site of Philadelphia and was serving New York Governor Edmund Andros as an interpreter. Lars probably translated Penn’s letter “To the Kings of the Indians” for William Markham in 1681. Another important interpreter, Israel Helme, is first noted in records in the late 1650s. In 1659 and 1660 he was trading with the Lenape at their main village site of Passyunck (see “Passayungh” fig.3). The English colonial authorities turned to him for advice in 1671 when two Lenape men killed an English colonist at Mattinicum on the Delaware. In 1675 and 1677 the Swedish settlers recommended him as an interpreter for the newly arriving Quakers at Burlington, West Jersey, who sought to “buy” land from the Lenape. Israel mediated a 1679 land dispute between New York and the Delaware River Lenapes. During the 1680s he lived on the Jersey side of the Delaware, but at his death in 1701 he owned 100 acres on the west side of the river as well. There were many other interpreters. It was probably these men who

---

taught William Penn what he knew of the Lenape language, a possibility which would account for Penn's belief that Lenape was a language poor in tenses and vocabulary. That these interpreters did not much sharpen or expand their understanding of the language is suggested by English vocabularies of the jargon.\textsuperscript{37}

--turning coats of arms into masses of immigrants--

Even while his representatives in the Delaware Valley were relying on Swedish and Dutch mediators to buy land and to establish friendly relations with the Lenapes, William Penn was writing a letter to the Indians characterizing their experience with the Swedes, Dutch, and non-Quaker English as one of injustice, bloodshed, and greed (fig.5). Basing his opinion on those of other Englishmen who had visited North America, Penn wrote to the Lenape sachems, "I am very Sensible of the unkindness and Injustice that hath been too much exercised toward you."1 The colonizing peoples of Europe had too often sought "to make great Advantages" of the Lenapes "rather then be examples of Justice and Goodness unto" them. Penn wrote that he had heard that these injustices had "caused great Grudgings and Animosities, sometimes to the shedding of blood." With this history of the Lenape as victims in mind, he expected that his warm regard would "Winn" them.2 But it is easy to misconstrue Penn's "warm regard" and "love," and thus overemphasize his conciliatory tone, deep purse, and pacifist beliefs. Penn was not at all

---

1 Myers, Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, 200: In 1681, Penn had no personal knowledge of America and conferred in April with "'Traders, Planters, and Shipmasters' " about the continent.
2 William Penn, "To the Kings of the Indians," August 18, 1681, in Dunn and Dunn, eds., The Papers of William Penn, 2: 128-29 (hereafter cited as PWP).
clear about who the Indian residents of the Valley were. He wrote his letter “To the Kings of the Indians” only after he had secured his charter, sold thousands of acres of Lenape land, dispatched the first boatloads of colonists, and had written Pennsylvania’s Frame of Government. Penn himself later claimed that he had only “followed the Bishop of London’s council” in “buying & not taking away the natives land.”

The Lenape were not as grudging against the Europeans as Penn believed. Forty-four years of experience with Dutch, English, Finnish, and Swedish settlers had given many sachems knowledge of European weapons and beliefs and may have taught them that colonization was likely to be a continuous but desultory and disorganized affair. Their response to Penn was consistent with their responses to these earlier colonists: they made strangers into symbolic “brothers” for the purposes of trade and alliance, attempted to maintain the integrity of their land base, and connected the arrival of the shiploads of colonists with the diseases that spread among them. But the sachems could not have hoped to remove—or reinterpret the impact of—the influx of immigrants after 1682.

The interpretation of Penn and early Pennsylvania that follows reassesses two facets of the “holy experiment” Penn himself advocated. Although, as is frequently noted, Penn never intended the military conquest of the Lenapes and Susquehannocks, he did plan to conquer their “barbarity” by “reducing” and “moralizing” their minds. But unlike the Swedish before him and unlike English and French colonists elsewhere in North America, Penn did not intend to missionize the Lenape. He expected instead that his settlers would “moralize” the Lenape through exemplary industry, civility, and propriety.

---

3 Penn thought that “the Susquehanna People” were “the true Owners.” See Penn’s “Additional Instructions to William Markham,” October 28, 1681, *PWP*, 2: 129; “The bishop” was Henry Compton: “Penn to The Committee of Trade,” August 14, 1683, *PWP*, 2: 435.

I will analyze Penn's expression and direction of these goals through his prescriptive and descriptive promotional writing, his plans for Pennsylvania, the social historical context he found when he arrived, the impact of his policies, and the dynamics of communication and power.

Since the fall of New Sweden, the Susquehannocks and the Iroquois to the north had rekindled old conflicts. The Susquehannocks, long in close, often tense, and sometimes violent relations with the Lenapes, were geographically hemmed-in by expansionist Iroquois neighbors on the north and west, Maryland to the south, and New York to the northeast. The Susquehannock sachems understood the strategic weakness of their position, and, as early as 1670, attempted to explain this problem to the Lenape sachems. In September, Israel Helme, Peter Cock, and Peter Rambo—all Swedish—attended a meeting of Lenape and Susquehannock sachems. According to their report, the Susquehannocks urged the Lenape not to "kill any more of the Christians." One sachem, they recalled, urged "that they must know that they are surrounded by Christians... if they went to war, where would they then get powder and ball?" The sachems' urgings were astute observations of the changing demography and political geography, and they foreshadowed new regional strategies for dealing with European immigration.

I could not find documentary evidence to show that, in the years after the fall of New Sweden, trade had slowed along with the land pressures of colonial immigration and competition. But this conclusion seems probable given that the Swedish settlements lost even the potential for official Swedish colonial support. And one scholar has suggested that the Lenapes probably shifted the focus of their trade to New Amstel and New

-----

Netherland during this lull in local trade. After 1664, when the Dutch lost New Netherland to the English, trade with New York (formerly New Amsterdam) and New Castle (formerly New Amstel) continued while settlements began to expand. If the Lenape were nervous about European expansion, they probably perceived the threat through observations of the Susquehannocks’ struggle and memory of their own competitive experiences with the Swedish and Dutch colonial governments. The English claimed in 1670 and 1671 that since 1664 the Lenapes and Susquehannocks had killed at least ten settlers and taken supplies from several others. But no general assaults upon settlements are known to have occurred in the Delaware Valley. And in 1675, Lenape sachems participated in two council meetings that reformed their relations with other native peoples and the English colonists. As a result of the first meeting, between the Lenapes, Susquehannocks, and the Iroquois Five Nations, the Susquehannocks splintered and twenty-six families joined Delaware River Lenape bands. As a result of the second meeting, mediated by Israel Helme and other Swedish interpreters, New York Governor Edmund Andros arranged for communication and trade between the sachems and his government.

Penn did not arrive onto a scene devoid of the activity of his fellow Quakers, either. With the aid of Governor Andros and Swedish and Dutch interpreters, Quakers had been moving into the valley since 1675, the year after John Fenwick and Edward Byllynge purchased rights to West-Jersey from Sir John Berkeley. Fenwick and Byllynge soon quarreled and split their interest in the colony. Prefiguring Penn’s activities,

---

Fenwick, while still in England, gave away or sold 150,000 acres of land to prospective colonists and published a promotional tract entitled *The Description of a Happy Country*. After founding the town of Salem, Fenwick, "well knowing that it would greatly advance his interest here if he could effect a purchase in a friendly and peaceable manner with the natives, convened their chiefs, and a contract was entered into with them." That contract, signed with the marks of one Lenape woman and her son in March 1676, purported to convey land rights to Fenwick that covered enough area for two counties.\(^8\) Fenwick's colony, if existing records can be trusted as representative, lived peacefully and without incident among the Lenape. Salem struggled to survive, however, and it was not until the founding of Burlington in August 1677 that the promotion of West Jersey yielded serious European migration.

Approximately 1,400 colonists arrived in West Jersey between 1677 and 1681, more than double the entire European population of the valley during the Dutch and Swedish colonial periods.\(^9\) This scale of immigration required extensive acquisitions of land from the Lenapes, and it was to the Swedes and Dutch that the new Quaker arrivals turned. Israel Helme, Jacob Falkinbur, and other long-time residents of the valley interpreted at several early meetings between the Burlington English Quakers and the Lenapes. Through three deeds negotiated with three distinct and large groups of Lenape sachems, the West Jersey Quakers claimed possession of lands extending several miles inland and from the Falls of the Delaware just north of Burlington to the southernmost


\(^{9}\) Jennings, "Miquon's Passing," 54; Dahlgren and Norman, *Rise and Fall*, 121.
border of the former New Sweden colony. This new wave of colonists was not without guidance about the conduct of their relations with the Lenapes. The Quaker theologian George Fox traveled through West Jersey in 1672 and wrote in *To Friends Colonizing West Jersey* that “the eyes of other governments or colonies will be upon you; yea the Indians to see if you order your lives and conversations.” And Edward Byllynge, credited with formulating many of West Jersey’s early laws, advised that colonists should negotiate land acquisitions with the sachems, agree with the “Indians” according to “law and equity” on the resolution of conflicts, and convict Indians of crimes only after a trial by a jury composed half of Europeans and half of Indians.

Quaker sources make it seem that their concern for just treatment of the Lenapes diminished or eliminated conflicts. In 1679, Burlington residents became concerned about rumors that the Lenape were planning to destroy the colony before it became too populous. According to rumor, the Lenapes believed the settlers had brought “them the Small-Pox, with the Mach Coat they had bought of us.” The colonists and the Lenape sachems (with “many more Indians”) met at Burlington to discuss the problem. The English reminded the sachems of their deeds and purchases, and complained that since they had been just, kind, and respectful, they knew no reason why the Lenape should attack them. “Our Young Men may Speak Such Words as we do not like, nor approve of,” began Thomas Budd’s version of one sachem’s answer, “and we cannot help that: And some of your Young Men may speak such Words as you do not like, and you cannot

---


12 Budd, *Good Order Established*, 32.
help that.” The sachem was reminding the colonists that neither the Lenapes nor the English colonists could absolutely control the behavior and speech of their families and neighbors. But, Budd reported that the sachem stated “we are your Brothers, and intend to live like brothers with you.”

This desire to “live like brothers,” the desire to cooperate, was also part of a historical and spiritual perspective on the Lenapes’ experience with European colonization. The sachem apparently observed that “as to the Small-Pox, ” there had been an epidemic in his “Grandfathers time” and his “Fathers time.” The English had not lived in the country then, and just as they had not been responsible for those epidemics, so were they guiltless for these. The sachem also expressed religious conviction that seems, when mediated by Thomas Budd, monotheistic: “I do not believe they have sent [the Smallpox to] us now: I do believe it is the Man above that hath sent it [to] us.”

The sachems had rejected Christianity decades earlier, but they knew its basic tenets from Campanius’s Delaware Jargon translation of a Lutheran catechism. The reference to a “Man above” is a studied compromise that would not violate Lenape beliefs but would appeal to Christian sensibilities. Even the physical arrangements of the meeting--Lenapes sitting on one bench and Quakers facing them on another--seem to suggest a careful consideration of compromise protocols (the arrangement was very similar to that seen in fig.8).

Other events suggest that another side of the sachem’s metaphor of brotherhood indicated that they might not be living as brothers already and that the factionalism the sachem warned of was real. In the same year as the Burlington meeting, New York’s Governor Edmund Andros and Ockanikon, a Lenape sachem of the band living in the
immediate vicinity of Burlington along the Rankokes Creek, clashed over land surveys. The Andros Government claimed that the Lenape had sold the area around the falls in 1675. Ockanikon began actively preventing surveyors from dividing up the area in 1679. Through Israel Helme, Ockanikon insisted that the deed signed by a Chiepessing-area band of Lenapes was invalid.\textsuperscript{14} This deed, like other early English deeds, included the language of absolute proprietorship to large areas of land. Deeds commonly included statements claiming that the “Indian own[er] and p[roprietor] . . . [has] given, granted, bargained, sold, assigned, Transported and made over” community lands to an Englishman or some other person. But the question remains whether the sachems and the colonial representatives were referring to the same things when they talked of sale and land. One early English deed explicitly stated that it ceded only the right to “live upon” a “p[ar]cel of land . . . without hinderance.” Ockanikon may have been claiming that Chiepessing-area sachems had sold privileges that they did not possess the right to grant.\textsuperscript{15}

The narrative of a Dutch traveler in the region in 1679 described and interpreted conditions in the valley and is emblematic of the changes and continuities in Lenape relations with Europeans since Thomas Young’s 1634 visit to the area.\textsuperscript{16} Jasper Dankers found Dutch, Swedish, and English settlers living along both sides of the river. On separate occasions, he described a settler living in a hewn log block house with an Indian woman from Virginia, a Lenape boy traveling to Burlington to get a gun repaired, a Quaker man on the eastern shore who knew the whereabouts of a group of Lenapes, and

\textsuperscript{13} ibid., 32-33.
an anonymous man who had enough contact with Lenapes on the western shore to know that they had gone inland to hunt for the winter.

When Dankers’s travel narrative is contextualized within the burgeoning Quaker population, it demonstrates that interpersonal face-to-face meetings were probably common—even if communication was awkward. Without sharing more than a pidgin Lenape-European trading vocabulary, Dankers and the Lenapes he met interacted mostly through the exchange and use of objects such as canoes, cloth, creeks, rivers, spoons, wampum, and Dankers’s traveling equipment. “While we were waiting, and it began to get towards evening, an Indian came on the opposite side of the creek... he had a canoe in which he would carry us over, and we might swim the horses across.” Sometimes the encounter sounds more planned. Across the river from Burlington, at “about three o’clock in the afternoon a young Indian arrived with whom we agreed to act as our guide, for a duffels coat which would cost twenty-four guilder in zeewant [wampum].” Neither Dankers, his host, nor his traveling companion could speak Lenape sufficiently, and the young man could not speak Dutch. He left for Burlington to get a gun repaired (which would have been illegal) and never returned. On a third occasion a man appeared to help them cross another creek. “The Indian, having made himself ready, took both our sacks together and tied them on his back for the purpose of carrying them, as we were very tired.”

Dankers casts the Lenape individuals he met as willing, if temporary, servants or helpers, and perhaps they were. But his communication appears to have been dominated by object-exchange, gestures, and probably basic expressive sound.

---

15 The quotations are from deeds: See Hazard, Pennsylvania Archives, 1: 34-35.
16 Dankers, Journal, 97-106.
17 Dankers, Journal, 139, 149, 159.
This awkward communication also incorporated subtle reconstructions of Lenape perceptions of gender roles into patterns that were mostly consistent with European prescriptions of propriety. Dankers regarded one Lenape woman, the “wife” of a sachem, as a “Queen” and described her domestic duties for the guests and the sachem. Gabriel Thomas created a dialogue to describe “the manner of Discourse that happens between [the ‘Indians’] and the Neighboring Christians... when they meet one another in the Woods.” It is a discussion with an “Indian” man about the commodities he owns, his “house,” whether he has a “wife,” and how many children he has had by her. The extended kinship relations that would have been essential in the Lenapes’ matrilineal society are totally absent.

The colonists’ exaggeration of male power among the Lenapes was not new, and Gabriel Thomas’s discourse with a Lenape man emphasized the same small family unit that Peter Lindestrom painted in 1654. But the social demographic context of immigration into the valley in the late 1670s and early 1680s was changing in fundamental ways. Besides the increasing numbers of colonists, immigration involved whole families, not simply individuals. Many of these Quaker families were in the process of dismantling the extended kinship ties they had relied upon before emigrating to Pennsylvania—the same familial ties they were encountering among Lenapes. But

---

19 Gabriel Thomas, *An Historical and Geographical Account of the Province and Country of Pennsylvania; and of West-New-Jersey in America* (London, 1698); this work is also published in Myers, ed., *Narratives of Early Pennsylvania*, 309-352 under the title “An Historical and Geographical Account of Pennsylvania and of West-New-Jersey” (Thomas’s sample discourse is on pages 342-43 of this later volume); Dankers, *Journal*, 159-60.
these extended family networks were also an important part of the consensus and factional politics of Lenape society. Some Lenapes undoubtedly wished to live "like Brothers" with the newly arriving Quakers, but broad gaps in communication and in the organizing principles of their societies remained. Quaker recognition of factions unfriendly to aspirations, would have undermined the promotion of West Jersey.

The tendency to emphasize stability over faction, male over female, and European over Lenape social patterns is reflected in a pamphlet West Jersey and London Quakers published in London in 1682 entitled *A True Account of the Dying Words of Ockanikon*. The pamphlet claimed that when Ockanikon died in Burlington on May 12, his nephew, his wife, a Lenape shaman, a Dutch interpreter, four English women, and a Quaker proprietor of the colony were present. Ockanikon urged his brother’s son, Jahcursoe, to assume an active role in council meetings. Sehoppe and Swampisse, men he had previously desired to succeed him, had insulted him by avoiding his death bed. Although Ockanikon may have violated matrilineal inheritance rules by nominating his brother’s son, he did not get his way. When the Lenapes and William Penn’s representatives negotiated the first agreements for land to settle the Pennsylvania colony two months later, Sehoppe, Swampisse, and several other Lenape leaders participated. Jahcursoe did not.

---

21 Dankers, *Journal*, 156. Dankers claimed that the Lenape were upset about the Quakers’ expansion of their settlements. “The Indians [around Burlington] hate the Quakers,” he wrote in one of many moments where exaggeration reveals his bias against the Quakers. The Lenape “hated” the Quakers “on account of their covetousness and deceitfulness.”


Two distinct forms of factional strife are implicit in the *True Account of the Dying Words of Ockanikon*, but the author explains neither the gendered struggle between Ockanikon and his “wife” Matollionequay nor the struggle between Ockanikon and the younger would-be sachems. Instead, Ockanikon is presented to the London readers as a “King” and Jahcoursoe as the “Intended King.” The only reason given for Sehoppe and Swampisse’s absence is that they were drinking at another colonist’s home and were therefore uninterested in the dying sachem. And the reader is not told why Matollionequay and several Quaker women, some from prominent families, attended the sachem on his deathbed at the home of one Jacob Falkinbur. Both forms of factionalism, however, are examples of the kinship and consensus politics of the Lenape: the sachemship descended through the female line and therefore women had the final say in the sachem’s successor.

Beyond focusing attention on the male-centered inheritance drama in which the author cast Ockanikon and Swampisse, the *True Account* established Ockanikon as a wise proto-Christian. After Ockanikon designated his successor and instructed him to live peacefully with the Christians, Thomas Budd, who later claimed to have been taking notes, asked him about the one true god. “*There is a great God, who Created all things, and this God giveth Man an understanding of what is Good, and what is Bad, and after this life rewardeth the Good with Blessings, and the Bad according to their Doings.*” Budd’s question, printed as a statement, was not only a desire to find a common ground with Ockanikon, it reflected the central tenet of Quakerism: all individuals possess God’s

---

24 Sarah Biddle was married to William Biddle, a cordwainer from London. Jane Noble was married to Richard Noble, a landholder and merchant. Anne Brown and her husband John owned an indenture in 1696, and Mary Cripps was married to John Cripps, a yeoman responsible for getting the *True Account* published: See Nelson, *Documents Relating to New Jersey*, 1: 426, 444, 491, 657.
inner light and the ability to know his saving power. According to the pamphlet, Ockanikon answered that "It is very true, it is so, there are two Ways, a broad Way, and a strait Way; there be two Paths, a broad Path and a strait Path; the worst, and the greatest Number go in the broad Path, the best go in the strait Path." For Budd and the Quakers in the Delaware Valley and in London, such a statement would be enough to prove the validity of their belief in the inner light. However, Ockanikon may actually have been ridiculing Budd. In an earlier meeting a sachem, possibly but not definitely Ockanikon, had told Budd and the Burlington colonists that the "broad path" was a path they would reserve for their relationship with the English. By telling Budd that the broad path was the path of the great multitude of morally imperfect people, Ockanikon associated the path of "the worst and greatest number" with the path reserved for the English. This was the scene into which the Welcome sailed in October 1682 carrying the valley’s new governor and proprietor, William Penn.

Penn’s early writings about Pennsylvania were both descriptive and prescriptive in their promotion of the conditions, design, prospects, and purpose of the colony. The proprietor summed up his conception of Pennsylvania when he wrote in 1681 that colonies were "begun and nourished by the care of wise and populous Countries; as conceiving them best for the increase of Humane Stock, and beneficial for Commerce." Penn’s thinking was influenced by the “political arithmetic” of mercantile economic theory, a forerunner of modern statistics that linked population to national wealth. A
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25 True Account of the Dying Words of Ockanikon (London, 1682), 166. The theological exchange was published again by Thomas Budd in Good Order Established, 32.
26 Budd wrote in Good Order Established, 32, that a sachem sought to reduce tension promising, “We are willing to have a broad Path for you and us to walk in, and if an Indian is asleep in this Path, the English-man shall pass him by, and do him no harm; and if an English-man is asleep in this path, the Indian shall pass him by, and say, He is an English-man, he is asleep, let him alone, he loves to sleep.”
productive and industrious population produced a wealthy state. In mercantile capitalism the goal of national policy was to “buy cheap and sell dear” in order to accumulate wealth, and international economic competition was sometimes considered a form of warfare. Penn’s phrase “Humane Stock” expresses the essence of his appropriation of political arithmetic theory. The noun “Stock” refers primarily to population and secondarily to individual people. The adjective “Humane” refers to the cultural qualities of individual people and populations.

Although modern dictionary definitions of humane associate it with benevolence, kindness, sympathy, and compassion, in one seventeenth-century dictionary the connotations of humane were more closely related to “civility” and “virtue.” In an effort to “reduce [the English language] into a tolerable order,” and thus hopefully solve some of the problems of public discourse, the Royal Society repeatedly commissioned and urged John Wilkins to correct the “errors and incongruities in writing which our Forefathers taught us.” In 1668 Wilkins published his results. He defined words by classifying them and juxtaposing members of each class against their opposites and equivalents, and he defined “humane” without reference to benevolence or kindness. Humane is defined as courteous and courtesy. “Courtesie” is defined as civility or affability. But the definition of affability merely refers back to “courtesie.” “Civility” is defined first by reference back to courtesy and only secondarily as “complaisance.” Complaisance is defined as “Vertue,” which is principally defined as a habit that is “infused” or “acquired.” It is a habit of intellect or morality, the state of mind, and the condition of

29 John Wilkins, An Essay towards a Real Character, and a Philosophical Language (London, 1668), 19,
body. In short, Wilkins’s definition of humane connotes a pattern of public (civil) behavior, a pattern of personal manners, and an English version of the Italian Renaissance humanist term *virtu*.  

What was at issue in the term “Humane Stock” were the habits of mind and action that admitted one to full membership in the community of “Humane”-beings. Although I do not know if Penn was familiar with Wilkins’s work, Penn was a member of the Royal Society, and he corresponded with other members such as Robert Boyle and John Aubrey. Penn’s own usage of the term humane coincides with and builds upon Wilkins’s definition. “Humanity” or “Humane-ness” constituted both a mode of behavior and thought; it was relevant to commerce, social organization, and personal conduct as well as physical and intellectual vigor. In Penn’s terms, it was absolutely essential that the colonists provide “examples of Justice and Goodness” for the Lenape. Some ancient colonizers, the pacifist Penn reminded his readers, had made colonies flourish by conquering the minds rather than the bodies of barbarians--more their “Barbarity than Them.” They had “not only reduc’d but moraliz’d the Manners of the Nations they subjected.” But the proprietor had specific ideas of what constituted

---

“Dedictory.”

30 Wilkins, *Philosophical Language*, “humane,” “courteous,” “courtesie,” “civility,” “affability,” “compaisance,” “virtue,” and “vertue.” The term “virtu” was used to indicate a general state of intellectual, moral, and physical vigor.


justice and goodness and what reducing and moralizing a subjected nation should mean. Therefore he did not want just anyone to emigrate to Pennsylvania. He had specific ideal types in mind that exemplified the humane ideal and gave further definition to ideas of civility and virtue. The five ideal types were "industrious husbandmen" and day-laborers, "laborious handicraftsmen," "ingenious spirits much oppressed for want of a livelihood," younger disinherited sons, and lastly, men of "universal spirits" who "understand and delight to promote good Discipline." Two years later, after he had made his journey to the Delaware Valley, Penn contrasted the Lenapes with the ideal type of colonist he was seeking in order to demonstrate their capacity for assimilation.

In his Letter to the Society of Traders, published in 1683, Penn accentuated the Lenapes' basic virtue while highlighting several areas in which he believed they were yet uncivil. Between descriptions of the Delaware Valley's forests and the region's first colonies, Penn discussed the "The Natives... in their Persons, Language, Manners, Religion and Government." Their personal appearance was very simple and functional, their language "lofty" but "wanting in moods and tenses" and vocabulary. Their manners were volatile. Although great orators, they were also "great Concealers" of their thoughts and intentions due to the "Revenge that hath been practised among them." They gained their livelihood with ease. "We sweat and toil to live; their pleasure feeds them, I mean, their Hunting, Fishing and Fowling, and this table is spread every where." As a Quaker, Penn was radically different from many of his contemporaries in that he believed the Lenapes possessed the "Inner Light"--access to God's saving grace and eternal truth. For

---


35 Myers, ed., Narratives, 191-92, describes the construction of brick homes and mills, the pursuit of husbandry, farming, and mining, and the "Peacable, Useful, and Servicable" behavior of the Lenape as creating the "Conveniency for Humane Life."
Penn the Lenape were God's creatures, but they were not yet "humane." According to Wilkins's *Philosophical Grammar*, virtue was principally an acquired characteristic. Penn wished to believe he could transform the Lenapes and "moralize" them, and he implied that they showed potential to be reformed. Although they were "in a Dark Night respecting Religion," they recognized that one great God ruled the world and all things. And although they practiced consensus politics whenever considering something "of moment," they had what Penn described as "Kings" who ruled the common people. Such Lenape Indians would have seemed strange to Penn's ideal settler, but in demonstrating the potential to submit to a regular order (deeds and the Proprietary government), they demonstrated the potential to assimilate themselves into what Penn and his colonists would have considered a civil, industrious, and ordered society.

Just as Penn saw distinctions between "Native ease" and immigrant discipline, so he also divided Pennsylvania into ordered, populated spaces and natural, vacant spaces. This division is visible in the maps of Pennsylvania and Philadelphia that Penn used in his promotional literature (see fig. 9 and fig. 10). Some purchasers of *Some Account of Pennsylvania* received a map of the colony's territory. The map was decorated with icons of the trees and mountains to be found in the Valley. The representations of nature are suggestive, not overwhelming. But the map is devoid of iconic representations of Lenape or Susquehannock villages. A large Susquehannock fort on the Susquehanna River some fifty miles west of the Delaware is marked as "Demolished."36 An uninitiated reader would not know the difference between names that denote Lenape village sites from the

---

36 Penn, *Some Account of Pennsylvania* (London, 1681): At least some copies were distributed with this map (see Wing microfilm collection copy); J. William Frost, "William Penn's Experiment in the Wilderness: Promise and Legend," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 107 (1983), 583:
anglicized names for creeks and islands, but the residences of Richard Noble, Peter Aldrix, Peter Cock, and others are clearly noted (see fig. 10). Presumably because of these residents and places such as "Birdlington Towne," the map's cartouche describes the region as "being partly Inhabited". The map portrays a Pennsylvania where Indians are minimally present: the land is open and ready for settlement. The one native icon on the map is the "Susquahana fort Demolished" (upper left hand corner fig. 10). And skeptical readers would learn from the text of Some Account that the Lenapes who lived in the region were not an obstruction to settlement. Just and good treatment, in fact, might inspire the Lenapes to give up their practice of revenge and the darkness of their religion for the justice, order, and light of humane society.

If Pennsylvania was open and unowned land, Philadelphia was ordered property. When Thomas Holme, following Penn's directions, surveyed and laid out the plan of Philadelphia, he created evenly spaced, rectilinear blocks and provided both ends of the city with access to the ocean by way of the Schuylkill and Delaware Rivers (see fig. 9). The only representations of non-constructed nature lay on the outskirts of the city. Within the city Holme represented trees in geometric regularity and confined them to four symmetrically arranged parks. The trees are mature, far older than any recently planted trees would be: Holme's map is not a reflection of what the city actually looked like. Just as Penn's descriptions of the ideal settler were hypothetical, Holme's map of Philadelphia is likewise an assertion of how the city should look.

Penn never clearly elaborated how his prescription of order and discipline was supposed to peacefully mesh with or replace what he described as the "manners" of the

Frost states that Penn sent maps along in a letter to a friend and business partner.
37 John W. Reps, Town Planning in Frontier America (Princeton, New Jersey, 1969), 204-216.
Valley’s native inhabitants. Neither he nor any of his contemporaries in Pennsylvania made serious missionary efforts among the Lenape and Susquehannocks until the middle of the eighteenth century. This was partly because Penn—and Quakers generally—shared the belief that it was “a moral impossibility to accept religious beliefs on other men’s directives.”38 Proselytizing would not bring the Lenape to “True Religion.” Only God could do that. What made Penn’s expectation that his colony would moralize and not simply destroy the Lenape was his belief that daily events and the long sweep of history were the progressive revelation of God’s will. Penn viewed himself as a messianic figure and Pennsylvania’s role in history as a final act of God’s providence bringing about the Eternal Kingdom.

This theological and historical argument is vividly reflected in the copy of Sir Walter Raleigh’s History of the World that Penn recommended to a friend and brought with him to the colony in 1682. Raleigh’s history placed western Europe at the center of God’s plan for humanity.39 Raleigh, whose own sea-going life formed a basis for his study of world history, assumed “that men in the earliest epochs of the sacred history, and men who were his European contemporaries in the seventeenth-century, were moved by similar motives to similar actions with similar results.”40 His history was the story of God’s “for euer unchangeable” judgments that were the consistent and moral guide of

39 Frost, “Penn’s Experiment,” PMHB, 585; Sir Walter Raleigh, History of the World (London, 1614); For Penn’s ownership of Raleigh’s history and his bringing it to Pennsylvania see Fredrick B. Tolles, Meeting House and Counting House (Philadelphia, 1937), 146; Penn recommended the preface of Raleigh’s history especially: See William Penn to Sir John Rodes, [October 8, 1693], PWP, 3: 378.
history and made God "the Author of all our tradgedies." ⁴¹ This vision of history was commonplace in Tudor England, and his *History of the World*, with its additional emphasis on the order and consistency of God's judgments, was popular enough to be published ten times in the seventeenth century. ⁴² Raleigh sought to reconcile the Mosaic history of the dispersal of people throughout the world following the Flood with the colonial encounters of European and Native American populations in his own era. ⁴³ Penn, similarly, viewed "Man" as a collectivity and saw the events of human history as the evidence of divine plan. ⁴⁴ When he opined that American Indians were descended from the lost tribes of Israel, he extended Raleigh's argument and expressed a similar ethnological perspective. When Penn crossed the Atlantic to the Delaware Valley on board the *Welcome*, he carried with him this messianic vision of his role in providential history as the frame of his policies regarding the recruitment of settlers, the treatment of the Lenapes and Susquehannocks, and the allotment of land. ⁴⁵

As a series of events that began with his letter "To the Kings of the Indians" and included the period in which Markham, Budd, and the Swedish and Dutch interpreters negotiated the first Pennsylvania deeds in Penn's name, the founding of Pennsylvania was an attempt to replace the native order with a Quaker European order. Penn, his deputies, and prominent planters wrote of intentions to establish trials by juries consisting of "Six planters and Six natives." But trial by jury was an English judicial cultural institution not necessarily consonant with the kin-based system practiced by the Lenape.

The settlers promised to make amends for offenses of “Word and Deed,” but assumed that legitimate disputes would be similar to those committed by “fellow planters.” Similarly, they promised that the Lenape would have “liberty to do all things relating to improvement of their Ground, and providing sustenance for the families, that any of the planters enjoy.” The Pennsylvania settlers’ discourse of tolerance and kindness was bound and limited by their own sense of order. The Lenapes would enjoy only the rights that any of the planters enjoyed. Various and overlapping use-rights under the control of different sachems who managed property for a community of kin would not be among those rights.

How this vision of order was communicated and how the Lenape understood it raises again the problem of cross-cultural discourse that had plagued the Swedish period of colonization. The deeds that Markham negotiated with the help of Lars Cock in the summer of 1682 purported to give the land to Penn’s “Heires & Assignes forever.” But the first deed had to be renegotiated at Lars Cock’s home when other sachems appeared, one of whom possessed use-rights to some of the same land. Several signers of the first deed also signed the second deed, which stipulates more carefully how payment should occur and adds several “Memorandum” that attempted to clarify the relationship of the two societies (see fig. 6). The sachems and Penn’s representatives could have interpreted each of the memoranda differently: the Quakers were tactful in their approach to the sachems, and the sachems—perhaps remembering the Susquehannocks’ warnings about the encircling Christians—were cautious. The memoranda asserted trial by jury, established cooperative military intelligence, and affirmed a desire for peaceful conflict-resolution. They called for freedom of travel through each other’s lands, which could

---

have protected traders’ access to the inland Susquehannocks and Five Nations and could have protected Lenape use of and access to fishing and hunting resources. The memoranda called for “a Meeting once every year” to read the stipulations of the agreement—and presumably for the sachems to receive ceremonial gifts from the Quaker settlers. The colonists also felt it necessary to include the request, or perhaps demand, that the Lenapes “Not distinguish between English and Quakers,” a statement echoing Jacob Dankers’s 1679 remark that the Indians always differentiate between the Quakers and other Englishmen.47

There is no reason to assume that the sachems fully understood the Europeans’ claims to absolute title over the land or that they were prepared for the demographic and geographic extent of the immigration that began in 1682.48 During the Swedish period, the Dutch recorded at least two cases in which sachems described their land sales to the Swedish as limited to small areas upon which the Swedes could build dwellings. Some of the sachems in the 1680s appear to have felt the same way about their sales to Penn, even though, like the Swedish deeds, Penn’s deeds claimed absolute ownership of very large areas of the Delaware River Valley.

Pennsylvania’s population growth between 1682 and 1700 greatly outpaced that of West Jersey. An estimated ninety ships carrying 7,200 people arrived in Pennsylvania between 1682 and 1685.49 By 1700 there were approximately 3,500 colonists along the eastern bank of the Delaware and 20,000 in Pennsylvania.50 Within one year the settlers

---

47 The quotations are from the first and second Pennsylvania deeds. See PWP, 2: 261-9; Dankers, Journal, 156; Weslager, Delaware Indians, 162.
48 Jennings, “Brother Miquon,” in Dunn and Dunn, eds., World of William Penn, 201.
49 This estimate is William Penn’s. See “A Further Account of Pennsylvania,” in Myers, ed., Narratives of Early Pennsylvania, 260.
hunted enough game that the Lenapes began charging prices twice as high as they had formerly charged the Swedish and Dutch. The European influx also may have resulted in the unceremonious appropriation of Lenape fields. Thomas Paschall wrote in 1683 that he knew “a man together with two or three more that have happened upon a piece of Land of some Hundred Acres, that is all cleare, without Trees. . . the farther a man goes in the Country the more such Land they find.”51 The Lenapes began to move as much as one hundred miles west and northwest. Some colonists noted that the Lenapes claimed that one or even two of them died of disease for every new settler. Twenty four ships arrived between 1682 and 1683. Swampisse, the sachem Ockanikon tried to “disinherit” in 1682, moved with his people some thirty-five miles inland by 1686.52 In West Jersey, sachems occasionally refused to sell land to the colonists. By the mid-1680s, sachems in both Pennsylvania and West Jersey demanded greater payments before permitting any new settlements.53

Although English and Quaker colonists in the valley portrayed peaceful and uncomplicated relations with the Indians when they portrayed them at all, it is likely that this immigration and Penn’s claim to absolute proprietorship caused several early conflicts. In July 1683, Ninichican endorsed a deed that proposed to “graunt, Sell and dispose all [his] Right, Title & Interest” to lands that included the site of the legendary Shakamaxon meeting. The sachem was “in hand paid” with the “reciept whereof is hereby acknowledged.” Peter Rambo and Swan Swanson, Swedish settlers who had been living nearby for many years and whose families had been trading with local Lenapes

since the 1650s, were among the chief interpreters. In September Penn gave orders to have thousands of acres of this land surveyed. Five thousand acres were to be laid out “so taking in the low Land at Matsonk wch the Indians doe plant on.” A year later, according to a settler’s letter to Penn, Ninichican and “The Indians” were “Mutch displeased at our English settling upon their Land, and seeme to Threaten us, saying that William Penn hath deceived them not paying for what he bought of them.” Ninichican was particularly “out of patience,” the letter continued, and said that “William Penn shall be his brother no more.” The writer hoped that the provincial court would be able to settle the sachems’ complain in within a two or three weeks, but there is no record of a meeting.54

The Proprietor commented directly on only one disagreement, a near-violent conflict with the sachem Tammanend. Tammanend made his mark on a deed in 1683 while Penn was still in the valley (see fig. 11). But in 1684, Thomas Holme claimed that Tammanend was angry about the expansion of Pennsylvania into what the colonists were calling Bucks County. The sachem insisted that he had not been paid for the land the settlers were seeking to move into, and he drove off some settlers and threatened to use force against the surveyors. Holme wrote to Penn twice about the incidents, but he and other officials in Pennsylvania probably reached an agreement with Tammanend without Penn’s input. I assume that they either made some sort of payment to Tammanend in assent to his demand or did not settle upon the disputed land. When Penn did send instructions he told Holme to be firm with Tammanend. “I gave them many matchcoats, stockings & some Guns in earnest,” wrote Penn in June 1685. “If therefore they are rude and unruly, you must make them keep their word by Just course... If the Indians will not

punish [Tammanend], we will & must, for they must never see you afraid of executing the Justice they ought to do." Penn wrote these words only a few months before claiming in *A Further Account of Pennsylvania* that rumors of difficulties with the Indians in Pennsylvania were spurious and that "so far are we from ill terms with the Natives, that we have liv’d in a great friendship. . .[and] In Pay and Presents they have received at least twelve hundred pounds of me.” Continued Penn, “they offer us no affront, not so much as to one of our Dogs; and if any of them break our laws, they submit to be punished by them: and to this they have tied themselves by an obligation under their own hands.”

One Penn biographer has suggested that Holme exaggerated this conflict and that its resolution proves that peace reigned in Pennsylvania. This interpretation misses the aspects of this conflict that reflected fundamental differences between Lenape and European land-use practices and ownership principles. When Tammanend “sold” to William Penn and his assignees the right to settle on Lenape lands, he did not necessarily relinquish all of his use-rights. The distinction between proprietary rights and use-rights was becoming a high-stakes contest as European colonists poured into Pennsylvania to appropriate land.

The full possession of land, according to European standards of ownership, is what the settlers wanted and what Penn had resolved to provide from the beginning. But despite Penn’s stated intention to eliminate the “Indian encumberance” on the land through purchase, and despite the fact that Markham’s first deeds claimed total proprietary ownership for Penn and his assignees, the Lenapes seem to have expected to

---

receive regular payments for the colonists’ continued residence upon the land. In 1684
colonial petitioners issued a list of complaints against William Penn’s administration of
land. In the opinion of these plaintiffs there had been no regular purchase of lands. The
Lenape had merely accepted gifts and given promises allowing the settlers “to sit down
thereon. . . so long as the Proprietars reciprocal Kindness continue to them in his daily
gifts & Presents.” This, the settlers insisted, was an unacceptable situation. They
requested that the land be surveyed and that they be required to pay only one price and
pay it only once. In his defense, Penn asserted that one-time fee purchases were what he
had always intended and negotiated with the Lenapes.  

If the settlers repeatedly paid
gift-tributes to the sachems, it was either the result of the initial negotiations with the
Lenape for land, miscommunication, Lenape assertions following the large-scale
European migration into Pennsylvania, or, possibly, the sachems’ understanding of the
deeds. If the sachems thought they were admitting Penn to the rights of a sachem, they
may have expected Penn to give them regular gifts as a means of maintaining alliances.

Surveying and expansion continued, and they continued to produce conflict. In
1685 and 1686, settlers complained to the Provincial Council about “Indians” killing
swine. In 1686 a number of Lenapes killed a settler family; although William Markham
explained the cause as a desire to steal rum, it was more likely a continuation of the
dispute over settler expansion and land-surveying. The incident apparently began in early
summer when Lenapes living in the vicinity of Philadelphia held a dance near the house
of a Zachariah Whitpaine. Whitpaine attended the ceremonies, then went home to bed.

57 Wildes, William Penn, 182.
58 Jennings, “Brother Miquon,” in Dunn and Dunn, eds., World of William Penn, 201.
59 The complaint was entitled “Humble Remonstrance & Address of several, the Adventurers, Free holders
& Inhabitants and others therein concerned”. For the quotation and cite see Hannah Benner Roach, “The
That night several Lenapes allegedly killed Nicholas Skull and his entire family, sparing only a young Irish servant. It is possible that they thought they were killing Israel Taylor, a deputy surveyor, for the surviving boy ran the mere three-quarters of a mile to Whitpaine's house, where Israel Taylor was lodging. The boy announced to Whitpaine that the "Indians" were coming to burn down his house. Whitpaine saw "that the Indians were Coming with Firebrands" and fled to Philadelphia. Taylor hid in the house all night, but the Lenapes neither burned nor broke into it. The Provincial Council attempted to explain the attacks as the result of Skull's acting "Contrary to Law in selling prohibited Liquors [to the Indians]," but in the following weeks the sachems from above the falls held other Canticos dances and appear to have reiterated the threat to kill Israel Taylor if he surveyed any land "before it be bought." With the aid of two Swedish interpreters, Markham set a date to meet Swampisse and other sachems, but the deed that was supposedly signed in August has not survived.\(^6\) Clearly, if Markham had attempted to implement Penn's instructions to punish such rudeness and disorderly conduct, he would have met with considerable resistance. Markham and Holme could not speak Lenape, and I assume that the interpreters probably advised Markham to settle the controversy on Lenape terms--through exchange rather than judicial punishment. In New England or Virginia, incidents such as these sometimes became catalysts for open warfare. In

---

\(^6\) PWP, 3: 106-107, 112-113; Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania..., Vol. 1... March 10, 1683, to November 27, 1700 (Philadelphia, 1852), 162, 181-82, 187-88; Robert Proud, in his History of Pennsylvania, notes a similar type of incident or incidents in 1688. According to Proud rumors circulated through West Jersey and Pennsylvania of a general uprising. The fears were resolved, however, when a Chester County area sachem whom Proud claimed told the authorities that, although the Pennsylvanians were "behind fifteen pounds" on the payment that Penn promised, his people had no plans to assault the colony. The sachem claimed his people were confident that they would be paid when the clear-cutting was completed and full settlement begun. See pages 337-38.
Pennsylvania, pacifism meant amelioration rather than escalating violent confrontation, but the sources of the tension remained unresolved.

Despite such clashes and problems with Lenape sachems, Penn continued to plan expansion and to override native use-rights. Deeds from the mid-1680s included statements that seem to confirm the significance of a network of overlapping use-rights and the effort to eliminate the rights of anyone not mentioned specifically in the deed: one deed conveyed land to “Wm Penn his Heirs and Assignes for Ever without any molestation or hinderance from or by Us or... any other Indians whatsoever that shall or may Claime any Right Title or Interest” in the land. As Penn wrote in his 1690 Some Proposals for a Second Settlement, he believed that he was terminating “Indian Pretensions” to the land fairly by “purchasing their title from them, and so settle with their consent.”61 However, in 1692, Tammanend again challenged Pennsylvania’s expansion into the interior. This time he was one of a group of sachems who demanded they be paid nine guns, ten matchcoats, and ten blankets for lands then being populated by settlers. Apparently unable to contact Penn in a timely manner because he was in England, the colonial commissioners gave the sachems what they wanted.62 The document that probably settled this episode of the ongoing conflict contains a sentence that expresses the nature of the misunderstandings regarding property as well as the Quakers’ frustrations with Tammanend’s assertions. Tammanend, Swampisse, and others “release & discharg the said Proprietor his Heirs & Successrs from any farther claims, dues &

62 Weslager, Delaware Indians, 169-70.
demands whatever, concerning the said Lands or any other Tract of Land claimed by Us from the beginning of the World to the day and the date hereof [italics mine].”

Like Pennsylvania’s earlier conflict with Tammanend, the resolution of this conflict has been viewed as an indication of the amicable relations between the sachems and the colony. But the resolution is more accurately described as creative strategy, not amicable understanding. The impact of Penn’s colonization policy on the Delaware River valley Lenapes seems unmistakable: it drove off or surrounded Lenape communities. In letters and published accounts early Pennsylvania settlers noted that many Lenapes were moving either further north and west to the woodlands nearer the Iroquois in New York colony or further west toward the Susquehannocks at Conestoga. Some simply migrated into theSusquehanna River Valley. Instead of trade goods, some Lenapes demanded wampum from colonists in order to present themselves to the Susquehannocks and Iroquois. Of those Lenapes who stayed behind, many were living in “reservations” in West Jersey and Pennsylvania by the first years of the eighteenth century. Penn himself set up one of the reserves around Brandywine Creek near the Delaware border (marked “Brandywine Cr” in fig. 10). Still others scattered through Pennsylvania’s towns while maintaining some of the older hunting practices, craft skills, or kinship ties.

---

64 Bronner, *Penn’s Holy Experiment*, 64.
Penn's principal goal, to "moralize" the Lenapes, was a negation of the native social order. Deep ethnological and historical assumptions validated a conception of the Lenapes whose differences from Europeans were mere curiosities, whose similarities indicated their capacity to assimilate, and whose destiny and advantage was to acquire "Good Discipline." The Lenapes in Penn's estimation were already English subjects by declaration of the king of England. Their virtue was that they were nearly and potentially good subjects. These assumptions negated or redefined the Lenapes' own notions of authority, gender, kinship, and property. When some individuals proved to be more intractably Lenape, Penn did not reconsider his vision of them. Instead he conceived of Tammanend's actions as those of a recalcitrant subject in need of disciplinary justice. This is really only benevolent when benevolence is conceived as Samuel Johnson conceived it in 1755. Johnson defined benevolence through civility, and to be a "civilizer" was to be one who "reclaims others from a wild and savage life; he that teaches the rules and customs of civility." To become civilized was to become "agreeable to rule; consistent with the mode prescribed."66

---

CODA: the fetish of intent

"It is very hard to distinguish universal and widespread benevolence from consummate tact."

Observing that many colonial communities in the Northeast had purchased rather than seized lands from native populations, Thomas F. Gordon wrote in his 1829 history of Pennsylvania that Penn's "merit consists in the justice and kindness which characterized all his intercourse with the natives." "His memory," continued Gordon, "is still gratefully cherished by their descendants, amid the distant wilds to which they have been driven by the tide of population."¹ For Thomas Gordon, Penn was uniquely kind and just in his dealings, and the Lenapes' westward-migration was a product of the natural forces of history rather than the activity of the Proprietor.

I know of no evidence of Lenape sachems praising William Penn's policies before the eighteenth century. Penn's self-approbation in 1701 at a council meeting of Iroquois sachems held in Philadelphia is the earliest historical recounting of the founding. None of the sachems present at that meeting were identified as Lenape, and Penn made no mention of Shakamaxon or a 1682 treaty of peace and amity. In the "Articles of Agreement" that the meeting produced, Penn claimed that "hitherto there hath always

been a Good Understanding & Neighborhood between the said William Penn... since
his first arrival... and the several Nations of Indians.” His account concluded “they shall
forever hereafter be as one head & one heart & live in true Friendship & Amity as one
people.”\(^2\) That the Lenape may have believed they had found an ally in Penn, a symbolic
“Brother,” seems possible because Lenape sachems attempted to establish such a
relationship with the Dutch, English, and Swedish. At meetings with colonial
representatives they expressed these sentiments in an idiom filled with kinship,
friendship, and corporeal metaphors. But Penn and the Lenapes understood words such as
“friendship,” “consent,” “love,” and “brotherhood” differently. While Penn was
subjecting the land and people to his ideal mercantile order, the sachems were probably
admitting Penn to some form of a sachem’s rights. Some sachems appear to have
expected regular gifts from Penn and his settlers in exchange for the land, but
Pennsylvanians expected the Lenape to be subject to English law and land tenure
practices.

Beginning in 1720, two years after Penn’s death, Pennsylvania’s governors began
praising Penn’s policies with the “Indians” when they met the sachems of the Iroquois,
Susquehannocks, and Delawares--as the Lenapes would be known in the eighteenth
century. Governor William Keith claimed “I am now in the place of the Great William
Penn.” It was Governor Keith who first described the “strict Alliance” between the
Indians and Penn as a treaty of mutual love and friendship. But when he said “Indians,”
he meant specifically the Iroquois and Susquehannocks; when he referred to a treaty, he
referred only to agreements beginning with Penn’s 1701 meeting at Conestoga.\(^3\)

\(^2\) PWP, 4: 51.
\(^3\) Hazard, Pennsylvania Archives, 1: 364, 370-71, 392, 393, 413.
By 1727, Keith had been succeeded by Patrick Gordon who also never mentioned a 1682 or 1683 treaty. Gordon, however, elaborated Keith’s metaphorical language and merged the story of the founding with the story of the 1701 meeting at Conestoga. And for the first time, between 1727 and 1728, Gordonformulates and reformulates the fully articulated myth of Pennsylvania’s founding. Penn, “when he first came into this Province, took all the Indians of it by the hand.” He “embraced” them, said Gordon metaphorically, as “his Friends & Brethren & made a firm League of Friendship with them.” He “took all the Indians and the old Inhabitants by the hand &... took them to his heart & loved them.” Gordon then described what he thought were the “Chief” or “Strongest” tenets of their alliance. Eight of the nine points are to be found in either Penn’s 1681 “Letter to the Kings of the Indians” the second 1682 deed for land, or the 1701 treaty between Penn and the Susquehannocks (figs 5, 6, 7). The ninth point Gordon described, the idea that the Indians and colonists should keep their doors open to one another and visit one another freely, was an occasional practice on the Delaware from the era of Swedish colonization through to the end of the seventeenth century. Taken together, these documents and practices should be understood as being Penn’s “treaty” with the Indians. The treaty documents were not lost or destroyed by later generations; their meaning became mythologized.4

The story of Penn and the Indians made useful rhetoric at conferences, and tokens commemorating the peaceful understanding began appearing in the eighteenth century. In 1720, the year during which Governor William Keith was beginning to sound the praise of Penn at official meetings, a medal commemorating the founding of Pennsylvania was

---

4 The first two quotations are from Gordon’s 1727 speech to the Five Nations—the second two from a 1728 speech at Conestoga: Hazard, Pennsylvania Archives, 1: 431, 442-45, 467-68 (for nine treaty points see
issued. On the reverse side Penn shakes hands with a man wearing a plumed head-dress similar to those in Benjamin West’s painting. Above the two figures is a caption that reads “BY DEEDS OF PEACE.” (fig. 14) Several other medals issued between 1757 and 1766 featured an image of King George III on the obverse and an unidentified settler meeting with an Indian and smoking a pipe on the reverse. Still another image, antedating West’s Treaty by two years, possesses all the elements of Penn’s treaty. Its subject, however, is not Penn’s Treaty but New York’s “Covenant Chain” with the Iroquois (fig. 8). Colonists used these images to remind Lenapes, Iroquois, Susquehannocks, and others of the relatively pacific days of the early proprietorship.5

These artifacts, West’s painting Penn’s Treaty with the Indians, and Penn’s rhetoric of love and kindness all suggest a mutual agreement that included, as the 1701 treaty put it, a “Good Understanding.” They assume the stereotype of the Noble Savage who was awed by Europeans, could find a livelihood with ease, and therefore fully agreed to either vacate their ancestral homelands or adopt the frock-coat and morality of the Quakers. In the 1770s, contemporaries and political allies of the embattled Penn family saw a relationship that they could approve in Benjamin West’s painting Penn’s Treaty with the Indians. Here was William Penn at the center of an active and peaceful meeting awash in color and crowded with life at a time of deteriorating relations between official Pennsylvania and the Lenape. Just nine years after settlers from Paxton Township in western Pennsylvania had murdered christianized Lenapes and Susquehannocks at Conestoga, here was an image that seemed to demonstrate that colonization could be peaceful.

444-45).
The first formal historical writing asserting Penn’s benevolence appeared in 1780, but the author made no mention of a treaty meeting at Shakamaxon. This last element of the colony’s myth first appeared in print in 1813. It was an ideology that justified colonialism and the colony’s origins by representing Penn’s prescriptions as historical necessity. The story omitted the dissent represented by Ninichican, Ockanikon, Swampisse, Tammanend, and other nameless sachems and “young men” who told Dankers that they thought the Quakers were “covetous” and refused to sell land well into the eighteenth century.

---

6 The first mention of Shakamaxon as treaty site is in Clarkson, *Memiors of William Penn*. The first history of Pennsylvania is Proud, *History of Pennsylvania*. Proud wrote his history in 1780 and published it in 1797.

and 1798.
My Freinds

There is one great God and Power that hath made the world and all things therein, to whom you and I and all People owe their being and wellbeing, and to whom you and I must one Day give an account, for all that we do in this world: this great Power {God} hath written his law in our hearts, by which we are taught and commanded to love and help and do good to one an other, and {not} to do harme and mischeif one unto {one} another: Now this great God hath been pleased to make me concerned in ye parts of the World, and the king of the Country where I live, hath given unto me a great Province therein, but I desire to enjoy it with your Love and Consent, that we may always live together as Neighbours and freinds, else what would the great God say to us, who hath made us not to tie devoure and destroy one an other but live Soberly and kindly together in the world. Now I would have you well to observe, that I am very Sensible of the unkindness and Injustice that hath been too much exersised towards you by the People of thes Parts off the world, who have sought themselves, and to make great Advantages by you, rather then be examples of Good {Justice and Goodness} unto you, which I hear, hath been matter of trouble to you, and caused great Grudgeings and Animosities, sometimes to the shedding of blood, which hath made the great God Angry. but I am not such a Man, as is well known in my {own} Country: I have great love and regard towards you, and I desire to Winn and gain your Love & freindship by a kind, just and peaceable life; and the People I send are of the same mind, & shall in all things behave themselves accordingly; and if {in} any thing any shall offend you or your People, you shall have a full and Speedy Satisfaction for the same by men just men on both sides {by an equall number of honest men on both sides} that by no means you may have just Occasion of being offended against them; I shall shortly come to you my selfe. I shall shortly come to you my selfe.

At what time we may more largely and freely confer & discourse of thes matters; in the mean time, {I have sent my Commissioners to treat with you about land & a firm league of peace.} let me desire you to be kind to my {them and the} People, and receive thes Presents and Tokens which I have sent to you, as a Testimony of my Good will to you, and my resolution to live Justly peaceably and friendly with you, I am your Freind.

Wm Penn

First day of August 1682
Att the house of Capt Lasse Cock.  

Wee whose names are here underwritten for our Selves & in name & behalf of the rest of the within mentioned Sashamakers (in respect of a mistake in the first bargaine betwixt us & the within named Wm Penn of the number of Ten guns more then are mentioned in the within deed, wee should have then received) doe now acknowledge the receipt of the sde Ten guns from the sd Wm Penn; And whereas in the said deed there is onlie mention made of Three hundred & fiftie fathom of wampum not expressing the qualitie ther of, Wee therefore for our selves & in behalf as said is declare the Same to be one halfe whyte wampam, and the other halfe black wampam; And wee Kekerappamand, Pytechay and Essepamazatto Indian Sashamakers who wer the right owners of the Land called Soepassincks & of the Island of the same name & who did not formerly Sign and Seal the within deed, nor were present when the Same was done, doe now by Signing and Sealling hereof Ratefie Approve and Confirme the within Named deed and the possession of the Lands therein mentioned writ & given on the back thereof in all the points, clauses and articles of the same, and doe declare our now Sealing hereof to be as Valid effectuall & sufficient for the Conveyance of the whole Lands & others within named to the sd Wm Penn his heirs & assigns for evermore, as if wee had then with the other within named Sashamakers Signed and Sealfed the Same.

Signed Sealed and delivred in presence of us

Nathaniell Allen The Mark of Idquoqueyiunion
Lasse Cock The Mark of Swampisse
The Mark of Kekerappamand
The Mark of Nannecheschan
The mark of Essepamazhatte
The Mark of Pytechay

Memorandum.

1 That they make no Differences between the Quakers & English
2 To Take upon there Delivery of the Land a Turfe out of The Ground To bring them (upon the Trety wth Them) to give us notice if any other Indians have any designe against us
3 Remembring our neighbouring Collonies
4 That There be a Meeting once every yeare to Reade the articles over; the day to be apointed
5 That wee may Freely pass Throug any of Their Lands as well that wch is not purchased as that wch is with out molestio[n] as They doe quietly amongst us
6 That if English or Indian should at any time abuse one the other Complaint might be made to their Respective Gover, and that satisfac­tion may be made according to their Offence
7 That if at any time an English man should by mistake Seate himselfe upon Land not purchased of The Indians that the Indians shall not molest them before Complaint made to the Government where they shall Receive Satisfaction.

Source: Dunn and Dunn, eds., Papers of William Penn, 2: 264-5.
ITEM* that the 5th Kings & Chiefs (each for himself & his people engaging) shall at no time hurt Injure or defraud or suffer to be hurt Injured or defrauded by any of their Indians any Inhabitant of the said Province either in their persons or Estates and that the 5th William Penn his heirs & successors shall not suffer to be done or Committed by any of the Subjects of England within the said Province any Act of Hostility or Violence Wrong or Injury to or agst any of the 5th Indians but shall on both sides at all times daily do Justice & perform all acts & Offices of Friendshipp & goodwill to Obliedge Each other to a lasting peace as aforesaid.

ITEM That all & every1 the 5th Kings & Chiefs & all & every particular of the Nations under them shall at all times behave themselves Regularly & Soberly according to the Laws of this Government while they live near or amongst the Christian Inhabitants thereof, and that the said Indians shall have the full & free privileges & Immunities of all the said Laws as any other Inhabitants they duely Owning & Acknowledg the Authority of the Crown of England & Government of this Province.

ITEM that none of the said Indians shall at any time be Aiding Assisting or Abetting to any other Nation whether of Indians or Others that shall not at such time be in Amity with the Crown of England & with this Government.

ITEM that if at any time any of the said Indians by means of Evill minded persons & sowers of sedition should bear any unkind or disadvantageous Reports of the English as if they had Evill Designs agst any of the 5th Indians in such case such Indians shall Send notice thereof to the 5th William Penn his heirs & successors or their Lieutenants and shall not give Credence to the said Reports till by that means they shall be fully Satisfied concerning the Truth thereof and that the said William Penn his heirs or Successors or their Lieutenants shall at all times in such cases do the Like by them.

ITEM that the said Kings & Chiefs & their successors & people shall not suffer any strange Nation of Indians to Settle or plant on the further side of Susquehannah or about Potomack River but such as are there already seated nor bring any other Indians into any part of his province without the Speciall Approbation & Permission of the said William Penn his heirs & successors.

ITEM That for the Prevention of Abuses that are too frequently putt upon the said Indians in trade that the said William Penn his heirs & successors shall not suffer or permit any person to trade or commerce with any of the said Indians but such as shall be first allowed or approved of by an Instrument under the hand & Seal of him the said William Penn or his heirs or successors [or their Lieut] and that the said Indians shall suffer no person whatsoever to buy or sell or have commerce with any of them the said Indians but such as shall first be approved as aforesaid.

ITEM that the said Indians shall not sell or dispose of any of their Skins Peltry or Furs or any other Effects of their hunting to any person or persons whatsoever out of the said province nor to any other person but such as shall be authorized to trade with them as aforesaid and that for their Encouragement the said William Penn his heirs & successors shall take care to have them the said Indians duly furnished with all sorts of necessary goods for their use at Reasonable Rates.

ITEM that the Potomock Indians aforesaid with their Colony shall have Free leave of the said William Penn to settle upon any part of Potomock River within the Bounds of this Province they strictly observing & practising all & singular the Articles aforesaid to them relating.

ITEM the Indians of Connostogoe11 and upon and about the River Susquehannah and more especially the said Connoodaghthah their King doth fully agree to, And by these presents absolutely Ratifie the Bargain and Sale of Lands lying near and about the said River formerly made to the said William Penn his heirs & Successors and since by Orettyaghi & Addaggy junkquagh parties to these presents confirmed to the 5th William Penn his heirs & successors by a deed bearing date the Thirteenth day of September last under their hands & seals duely Executed12 and the said Connoodaghthah doth for himself and his nation covenant and Agree that he will at all times be ready further to confirm and make good the said Sale according to the Tenour of the Same, and that the said Indians of Susquehannah shall answer to the said William Penn his heirs and successors for the good Behaviour and Conduct of the said Potomock Indians and for their performance of the Severall articles herein Expressd.

ITEM the said William Penn doth hereby promise for himself his heirs & successors to he and they will at all times shew themselves True Friends and Brothers to all and every of the said Indians by assisting them with the best of their Advices Directions & Councils and will in all things just and Reasonable Befriend them behaving themselves as aforesaid and submitting to the Laws of this Province in all things as the English and other Christians therein Doe to which they the said Indians hereby agree and Obliedge themselves and their Posterity forever.

In Witness whereof the said Parties have as a Confirmation made Mutuell Presents to Each other the Indians in five parcels of Skins and the said William Penn in several English Goods and Merchandises as a binding pledge of the promises never to be Broken or Violated and as a further Testimony thereof have also to these presents Interchangeably Sett their hands and Seals the Day and year above written.
By the Honorable Sir William Johnson Bart. His Majesty's sole Agent and Superintendant of Indian Affairs for the Northern Department of North America. Colonel of the Six United Nations their Allies and Dependents &c. &c.

June 22, 1633
Tamamom
June 22, 1643
Tamamom
June 23, 1643
Tamamom (Receipt for Money)
June 23, 1643
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