

# Colonial Origins: Race and Slavery

## Introduction

In 1606, King James authorized the joint-stock Virginia Company to found a colony in present-day Virginia, which the settlers called Jamestown. In the first winter, Jamestown's residents rapidly declined from 105 to 38; the fledgling colony survived only because of the help of the local Indians, whose chief was named Powhatan. However, after Powhatan's death in 1622, war broke out and continued until the 1640s. During this period, the mortality rate in Virginia was extremely high. Thousands died from disease and Indian warfare. Those who survived used the abundant availability of land to grow crops. In 1616, John Rolfe started to grow tobacco, a plant that the Indians smoked, and shipped it to Europe. From this point on, Virginia's fortune as a colony became linked to tobacco production.

Several of the settlers who came to Virginia between the 1640s and the 1660s were younger sons of the English landed gentry or members of the aristocracy who had fled from England, where they could not rise in wealth and influence. In Virginia, they formed a substantial upper class and behaved like a local titled aristocracy; soon they started to grow tobacco on large plantations, where they put both indentured servants and slaves to work. Indentured servants were poor white men and women who had sold them-

selves for the price of the passage to America. Depending on the terms of their indentures, they were bound by a contract to work for a master for 10 to 20 years in harsh exploitative conditions. In 1676, Nathaniel Bacon led a rebellion of indentured servants, small farmers, and slaves against the Virginian planter elite. Bacon managed to burn Jamestown and threaten the elite, but shortly afterwards Governor Berkeley subdued the rebels and hanged 33 of them.

The first Africans arrived in Virginia aboard a Dutch ship in 1619. During the following 75 years, most of the Africans who arrived in the Chesapeake were “seasoned”: they came from the English Caribbean, where they had already adjusted to the new disease environment and learned some English. However, from about 1680, planters began to rely on slaves coming directly from Africa, both because they were cheaper and because they were less likely to bond together and cause trouble. By 1680, special laws – the slave codes – established lifetime slavery, limited the rights of slaves and free blacks, discouraged masters from freeing slaves, and prescribed severe corporal punishments for rebels. They were followed by even more restrictive codes in the early eighteenth century.

The very first settlers in the Carolinas were successful Barbadian planters who acquired land in the coastal region of South Carolina in the 1660s and moved there with their “seasoned” slaves. In the last third of the seventeenth century, South Carolinians made several attempts to find a suitable crop for the low country environment. They eventually found it in rice, which some of the recently imported African slaves knew how to plant, cultivate, harvest, and thresh, since they had worked with this crop in their homelands. Rice soon became the main staple crop grown in the low country, and rice exports made the port-city of Charleston wealthy. The planting of rice required an initial outlay of substantial capital, because the crop required sophisticated irrigation works. Consequently, only already wealthy individuals, such as the emigré Barbadian planters, could enter the rice business. Rice planters soon formed the distinctive elite of a society which had been based on inequalities of race and class from the start.

From its very early days, South Carolina had a majority black population, both slave and free. Whether coming from Barbados or from Africa, slaves provided rice planters with a suitable workforce for the rice fields. The areas of rice cultivation were mostly swamps infested with malaria and mosquitoes during half of the year. No white person could live there during the summer season; enslaved Indians had been unable to survive in the rice swamps as well. Only Africans proved able to resist the harsh conditions, and hence they made a decisive contribution to the low country’s booming rice economy. Already by 1690, slave codes similar to those in Virginia restricted the freedom of any person of color and sanctioned the lifetime enslavement of Africans. They were followed by harsher codes in 1696, 1712, and 1742.

### Further reading

- Berlin, I., *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998).
- Breen, T. H. and Innes, S., “Myne Owne Ground”: *Race and Freedom on Virginia’s Eastern Shore, 1640–1676* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).
- Chaplin, J. E., *An Anxious Pursuit: Agricultural Innovation and Modernity in the Lower South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).
- Eltis, D., *The Rise of African Slavery in the Americas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Jordan, W., *White Over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968).
- Littlefield, D. C., *Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity and the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina*, 2nd edn. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991).
- Morgan, E., *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: Norton, 1975).
- Vaughan, A. T., *The Roots of American Racism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
- Wood, B., *The Origins of American Slavery: Freedom and Bondage in the English Colonies* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1997).
- Wood, P. H., *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion* (New York: Knopf, 1974).

## The First Blacks Arrive in Virginia (1619)

The first Africans arrived in North America with the expeditions of the sixteenth-century Spanish explorers Panfilo de Narvaez, Francisco Vasquez de Coronado, and Hernando de Soto. As early as 1565, there was already a population of more than a hundred Africans concentrated in the Spanish settlement of St. Augustine, Florida. However, the landing of 20 Africans at Jamestown, Virginia, in 1619, marked the start of a chain of events that led to the formation of the largest black community outside Africa and the most successful slave society in North America. The document describing the arrival of this first group of Africans in Jamestown is a letter written by Virginian planter John Rolfe to Sir Edwyn Sandys. In the letter, Rolfe casually describes the selling of “20 and odd Negroes” by “a Dutch man of Warr,” a ship probably engaged in piracy against the Spanish empire in the Caribbean. The letter does not provide any specific detail, and its importance lies mainly in its being the earliest known reference to the presence of Africans in the Chesapeake.

About the latter end of August, a Dutch man of Warr of the burden of a 160 tunes arrived at Point-Comfort, the Commandors name Capt Jope, his pilott for the West Indies one Mr Marmaduke an Englishman. They mett with the Treer in the West Indyes and dtermyned to hold consort shipp hetherward, but in their passage lost one the other. He brought not any thing but 20 and odd Negroes, which the Governor and Cape Marchant bought for victualle (whereof he was in greate need as he pretended) at the best and easyest rate they could. He hadd a lardge and ample Comysson from his Excellency to range and take purchase in the West Indyes.

(John Rolfe to Sir Edwyn Sandys, January 1619/20)

## Slavery Becomes a Legal Fact in Virginia (17th-Century Statutes)

The first generation of African slaves in the Chesapeake coexisted with a large number of white indentured servants; until the 1630s legal statutes made little distinction between the two. Starting in the 1630s, however, the law increasingly discriminated between different categories of unfree labor. At the same time, a corresponding hardening of racial barriers led to the passage of laws such as the 1630 statute forbidding white men from having sexual relations with black women. By the 1670s, the expression “negroe slaves” – which characterizes the 1680 Act on Negroes Insurrection – had replaced more ambiguous terms such as “negro servants” or simply “negars.” The change in terminology reflected a much more dramatic change in labor conditions; by 1640, Africans were enslaved for life. As the Chesapeake became a primary center of tobacco production and the flow of indentured servants from Europe decreased, black legal rights rapidly deteriorated. The 1662 Act defined the status of black children according to the free or enslaved condition of their mother, while the following 1667 Act declared that baptism of slaves did not exempt them from bondage. As the black population increased, so the colonial authorities passed an increasing number of laws like the 1680 Act in order to prevent slave insurrections and punish runaways and “other slaves unlawfully absent.”

### [1630]

September 17th, 1630. Hugh Davis to be soundly whipped, before an assembly of Negroes and others for abusing himself to the dishonor of God and shame of Christians, by defiling his body in lying with a negro; which fault he is to acknowledge next Sabbath day.

*(Statutes 1:146)*

### [1662] Act XII Negro womens children to serve according to the condition of the mother

Whereas some doubts have arrisen whether children got by any Englishman upon a negro woman should be slave or ffree, *Be it therefore enacted and declared by this present grand assembly*, that all children borne in this country shalbe held bond or free only according to the condition of the

---

*Source:* Willie Lee Rose (ed.), *A Documentary History of Slavery in North America* (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 16–22

mother, And that if any christian shall committ ffornication with a negro man or woman, hee or shee soe offending shall pay double the ffines imposed by the former act.

(*Statutes 2:170*)

**[1667] Act III An act declaring that baptisme of slaves doth not exempt them from bondage**

Whereas some doubts have risen whether children that are slaves by birth, and by the charity and piety of their owners made pertakers of the blessed sacrament of baptisme, should by vertue of their baptisme be made ffree; *It is enacted and declared by this grand assembly, and the authority thereof,* that the conferring of baptisme doth not alter the condition of the person as to his bondage or ffreedom; that diverse masters, ffreed from this doubt, may more carefully endeavor the propagation of christianity by permitting children, though slaves, or those of greater growth if capable to be admitted to that sacrament.

(*Statutes 2:260*)

**[1680] Act X An act for preventing Negroes Insurrections**

Whereas the frequent meeting of considerable numbers of negroe slaves under pretence of feasts and burialls is judged of dangerous consequence; for prevention whereof for the future, *Bee it enacted by the kings most excellent majestie by and with the consent of the generall assembly, and it is hereby enacted by the authority aforesaid,* that from and after the publication of this law, it shall not be lawfull for any negroe or other slave to carry or arme himselfe with any club, staffe, gunn, sword or any other weapon of defence or offence, nor to goe or depart from of his masters ground without a certificate from his master, mistris or overseer, and such permission not to be granted but upon perticuler and necessary occasions; and every negroe or slave so offending not haveing a certificate is aforesaid shalbe sent to the next constable, who is hereby enjoyned and required to give the said negroe twenty lashes on his bare back well layd on, and soe sent home to his said master, mistris or overseer. *And it is further enacted by the authority aforesaid* that if any negroe or other slave shall presume to lift up his hand in opposition against any christian, shall for every such offence, upon due prooffe made thereof by the oath of the party before a magistrate, have and receive thirty lashes on his bare back well laid on. *And it is hereby further enacted by the authority aforesaid* that if any negroe or other slave shall absent himself from his masters service and lye hid and lurking in obscure places, comitting injuries to the inhabitants, and shall resist any person

or persons that shalby any lawfull authority be employed to apprehend and take the said negroe, that then in case of such resistance, it shalbe lawfull for such person or persons to kill the said negroe or slave soe lying out and resisting, and that this law be once every six months published at the respective county courts and parish churches within this colony.

(*Statutes 2:481–2*)

## South Carolina Restricts the Liberty of Slaves (1740)

From its very early days, South Carolina had a black majority. Consequently, white anxiety ran higher than in any southern region and resulted in the erosion of rights of all the persons of color, especially after the mid-1720s, when imports of African slaves reached 1,000 per year. A special “Negro Watch” was established in Charleston in 1721 to confine blacks found in the streets after 9 p.m. At the same time, the colonial militia organized patrols which controlled the movement of blacks in rural areas. In 1739, newly imported slaves from Angola started the Stono Rebellion. They managed to kill 30 whites before they were eventually captured and executed by planters. Thereafter, white South Carolinians lumped together all blacks, considering them dangerous to white society, and further tightened the restrictions on both slaves and free blacks, as the 1740 statute shows. Together with limitations on personal rights, the statute includes long sections in which the slaves are forbidden to bear arms and gather or travel together.

I. *And be it enacted*, . . . That all negroes and Indians, (free Indians in amity with this government, and negroes, mulattoes and mustizoes, who are now free, excepted,) mulattoes or mustizoes who now are, or shall hereafter be, in this Province, and all their issue and offspring, born or to be born, shall be, and they are hereby declared to be, and remain forever hereafter, absolute slaves. . . .

XXIII. *And be it further enacted* by the authority aforesaid. That it shall not be lawful for any slave, unless in the presence of some white person, to carry or make use of fire arms, or any offensive weapons whatsoever, unless such negro or slave shall have a ticket or license, in writing, from his master, mistress or overseer, to hunt and kill game, cattle, or mis-

---

Source: Paul Escott and David Goldfield (eds.), *Major Problems in the History of the American South*, vol. 1: *The Old South*, 1st edn. (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1991), pp. 47–8.

chievous birds, or beasts of prey, and that such license be renewed once every month, or unless there be some white person of the age of sixteen years or upwards, in the company of such slave, when he is hunting or shooting, or that such slave be actually carrying his master's arms to or from his master's plantation, by a special ticket for that purpose, or unless such slave be found in the day time actually keeping off rice birds, or other birds, within the plantation to which such slave belongs, lodging the same gun at night within the dwelling house of his master, mistress or white overseer. . . .

XXXII. *And be it further enacted* by the authority aforesaid. That if any keeper of a tavern or punch house, or retailer of strong liquors, shall give, sell, utter or deliver to any slave, any beer, ale, cider, wine, rum, brandy, or other spirituous liquors, or strong liquor whatsoever, without the license or consent of the owner, or such other person who shall have the care or government of such slave, every person so offending shall forfeit the sum of five pounds, current money, for the first offence. . . .

XXXIV. *And whereas*, several owners of slaves have permitted them to keep canoes, and to breed and raise horses, neat cattle and hogs, and to traffic and barter in several parts of this Province, for the particular and peculiar benefit of such slaves, by which means they have not only an opportunity of receiving and concealing stolen goods, but to plot and confederate together, and form conspiracies dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole Province; *Be it therefore enacted* by the authority aforesaid. That it shall not be lawful for any slave so to buy, sell, trade, traffic, deal or barter for any goods or commodities, (except as before excepted,) nor shall any slave be permitted to keep any boat, perriauger or canoe, or to raise and breed, for the use and benefit of such slave, any horses, mares, neat cattle, sheep or hogs, under pain of forfeiting all the goods and commodities which shall be so bought, sold, traded, trafficked, dealt or bartered for, by any slave, and of all the boats, perriaugers or canoes, cattle, sheep or hogs, which any slave shall keep, raise or breed for the peculiar use, benefit and profit of such slave. . . .

XXXVII. *And whereas*, cruelty is not only highly unbecoming those who profess themselves christians, but is odious in the eyes of all men who have any sense of virtue or humanity: therefore, to refrain and prevent barbarity being exercised towards slaves, *Be it enacted* by the authority aforesaid. That if any person or persons whosoever, shall wilfully murder his own slave, or the slave of any other person, every such person shall, upon conviction thereof, forfeit and pay the sum of seven hundred pounds, current money, and shall be rendered, and is hereby declared altogether and forever incapable of holding, exercising, enjoying or receiving the profits of any office, place or employment, civil or military, within this Province. . . .



XXXVIII. *And be it further enacted* by the authority aforesaid. That in case any person in this Province, who shall be owner, or shall have the care, government or charge of any slave or slaves, shall deny, neglect or refuse to allow such slave or slaves, under his or her charge, sufficient cloathing, covering or food, it shall and may be lawful for any person or persons, on behalf of such slave or slaves, to make complaint to the next neighboring justice, in the parish where such slave or slaves live or are usually employed. . . .

XLIII. *And whereas*, it may be attended with ill consequences to permit a great number of slaves to travel together in the high roads without some white person in company with them; *Be it therefore enacted* by the authority aforesaid, That no men slaves exceeding seven in number, shall hereafter be permitted to travel together in any high road in this Province, without some white person with them. . . .

XLV. *And whereas*, the having of slaves taught to write, or suffering them to be employed in writing, may be attended with great inconveniences; *Be it therefore enacted* by the authority aforesaid, That all and every person and persons whatsoever, who shall hereafter teach, or cause any slave or slaves to be taught, to write, or shall use or employ any slave as a scribe in any manner of writing whatsoever, hereafter taught to write, every such person and persons, shall, for every such offence, forfeit the sum of one hundred pounds current money.

XLVI. *And whereas*, plantations settled with slaves without any white person thereon, may be harbours for runaways and fugitive slaves; *Be it therefore enacted* by the authority aforesaid, That no person or persons hereafter shall keep any slaves on any plantation or settlement, without having a white person on such plantation or settlement.

*Two Infant Slave Societies in the Chesapeake and the Lowcountry*

Philip D. Morgan

In *Slave Counterpoint*, Philip Morgan analyzes and compares black life and culture in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake and the South Carolina low country; his analysis focuses upon the similarities and differences between the

---

Philip D. Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), pp. 1–23.

experiences of the slaves in the two regions. In this excerpt, Morgan shows how different historical conditions gave rise to two different types of slave societies with a number of common characteristics. In the late seventeenth century, Virginia had a fully fledged plantation economy based on a long-standing tradition of tobacco cultivation; at the same time, the colony's still flexible slave statutes allowed for a significant population of free blacks. South Carolina, on the other hand, was a relatively new colony, but one with an already closed slave society. Moreover, South Carolina's planter class was still searching for a suitable crop for plantation agriculture. As the end of the seventeenth century approached, Virginia passed increasingly stricter laws on manumission, while South Carolina's plantation economy became fully identified with the cultivation of rice.

By the late seventeenth century, Virginia had a plantation economy in search of a labor force, whereas South Carolina had a labor force in search of a plantation economy. A tobacco economy for decades, Virginia imported slaves on a large scale only when its supply of indentured servants dwindled toward the end of the century. By the time Virginia began to recruit more slaves than servants, a large white population dominated the colony. In fact, before the last decade of the seventeenth century, Virginia hardly qualified as a slave society. Only by the turn of the eighteenth century did slaves come to play a central role in the society's productive activities and form a sizable, though still small, proportion of its population. In 1700, blacks formed just a sixth of the Chesapeake's colonial population. By contrast, South Carolina was the one British colony in North America in which settlement and black slavery went hand in hand. From the outset, slaves were considered essential to Carolina's success. With the Caribbean experience as their yardstick, prospective settlers pointed out in 1666 that "thes Settlements have beene made and upheld by Negroes and without constant supplies of them cannot subsist." Even in the early 1670s, slaves formed between one-fourth and one-third of the new colony's population. A slave society from its inception, South Carolina became viable only after settlers discovered the agricultural staple on which the colony's plantation economy came to rest. By the turn of the century, then, the Chesapeake was emerging as a slave society; the Lowcountry, a slave society from its inception, was just emerging as a productive one.<sup>1</sup>

In spite of this fundamental difference, both infant slave societies shared several characteristics. In both societies, seasoned slaves from the Caribbean predominated among the earliest arrivals; early on, the numbers of black men and women became quite balanced; many slaves spent much of their time clearing land, cultivating provisions, rearing

livestock, and working alongside members of other races; race relations were far more fluid than they later became. All of these similarities point toward a high degree of assimilation by the slaves of the early Chesapeake and Lowcountry. Many slaves arrived speaking English, could form families and have children (more readily than white servants, for example), worked at diverse tasks, and fraternized with whites both at work and at play.

Nevertheless, as the seventeenth century drew to a close, differences began to outweigh similarities. The Chesapeake imported quite large numbers of Africans long before the Lowcountry; and, by the 1690s, the region had many more slave men than women, whereas the Lowcountry boasted more equal numbers of men and women than ever before – and for many decades thereafter. If these differences seem to point toward a more Africanized slave culture in the Chesapeake than in the Lowcountry, other dissimilarities incline in a different direction and were ultimately more decisive in shaping the lives of blacks in the two regions. Slaveowners in Virginia put most of their new Africans to planting tobacco on small quarters, usually surrounded by whites, whereas their counterparts in South Carolina, though still experimenting with many agricultural products, grouped their slaves on somewhat larger units with little white intrusion. Furthermore, the Lowcountry always was – and increasingly became – a far more closed slave society than the Chesapeake. Lowcountry slaves had less intimate contact with whites and constructed a more autonomous culture than their Chesapeake counterparts.

The origins of the earliest black immigrants to the Chesapeake and Lowcountry were similar. Most came, not directly from Africa, but from the West Indies. Some might have only recently arrived in the islands from their homeland and a few were probably born in the Caribbean, but most were seasoned slaves – acclimatized to the New World environment and somewhat conversant with the ways of whites. Some came with Spanish or Portuguese names; others with some understanding of the English language. . . . Both Lowcountry and Chesapeake received a somewhat gentle introduction, as it were, to New World slavery. Neither experienced a massive or immediate intrusion of alien Africans.

By the late seventeenth century, however, Africans began to arrive, especially in the Chesapeake. From the mid-1670s to 1700, Virginia and Maryland imported about six thousand slaves direct from Africa, most arriving in the 1690s. While the Chesapeake's slave population was being transformed by a predominantly African influx, the Lowcountry did not undergo the same process for another twenty or so years. In the

year 1696 the first known African slaver reached South Carolina; a constant trickle of Africans became commonplace only about the turn of the century.

The structures of these two societies' slave populations, much like their origins, were initially similar. By the 1660s in the Chesapeake and by the 1690s in the Lowcountry, a rough balance had been achieved between slave men and women. Although men outnumbered women among the earliest black immigrants to both regions, women apparently outlived men. Moreover, some of the children born to the earliest immigrants reached majority, also helping to account for the relative balance between men and women. When, in 1686, Elizabeth Read of Virginia drew up her will, she mentioned twenty-two slaves: six men, seven women, five boys, and four girls. Twelve of these slaves had family connections: there were three two-parent families and two mothers with children. An incident involving a free black of Northampton County illuminates a typical Chesapeake slave household at this stage of development. On the eve of the New Year of 1672, William Harman, a free black, paid a visit to the home quarter of John Michael. Harman spent part of the evening and parts of the following two days carousing with Michael's slaves, who numbered at least six adults, three men and three women, only one of whom had been newly imported. The rest had been living with their master for ten years or more.

By the last decade of the seventeenth century, however, Harman would have found it harder to find such a compatible group. By this time, many Chesapeake quarters included at least one newly imported African. In addition, most plantations could no longer boast equal numbers of men and women, because the African newcomers were predominantly men and boys. In fact, evidence from a number of Chesapeake areas during the 1690s indicates that men now outnumbered women by as much as 180 to 100. The impact of this African influx was soon felt. Before 1690, one Virginian planter had boasted of his large native-born slave population; by the first decade of the eighteenth century, another Virginian despairingly found "noe increase [among his blacks] but all loss." In 1699, members of the Virginia House of Burgesses offered an unflattering opinion of these new black arrivals, referring to "the gross barbarity and rudeness of their manners, the variety and strangeness of their languages and the weakness and shallowness of their minds." Prejudice aside, these legislators were responding to the increased flow of African newcomers.<sup>2</sup>

Even as the Africans started arriving, Chesapeake planters put their slaves to more than just growing tobacco. Ever since 1630, when Virginia's tobacco boom ended, the colony's planters had gradually begun to diversify their operations. They farmed more grains, raised more live-

stock, and planted more orchards. Pastoral farming in particular gained impetus during the last few decades of the seventeenth century when the Chesapeake tobacco industry suffered a prolonged depression. Some planters devoted more attention to livestock than ever before, and large herds of cattle became commonplace. Slaves were most certainly associated with this development. In late-seventeenth-century Charles County, Maryland, there were more cattle in the all-black or mixed-race quarters than in those composed solely of whites. . . .

The diversified character of the youthful South Carolina economy owed little to the fluctuating fortunes of a dominant staple and more to the harsh realities of a pioneer existence. Many slaves spent most of their lives engaged in basic frontier activities – clearing land, cutting wood, and cultivating provisions. If late-seventeenth-century South Carolina specialized in anything, it was ranch farming – the same activity into which some Chesapeake planters were diversifying. Indeed, some Virginians took advantage of the opportunities presented by the nascent colony. In 1673, Edmund Lister of Northampton County transported some of his slaves out of Virginia into South Carolina. Presumably they had already gained experience, or displayed their native skills, in tending livestock, because Lister sent them on ahead to establish a ranch. The extensiveness of this early cattle ranching economy became apparent when South Carolinians took stock of their defensive capabilities. In 1708, they took comfort in the reliance that could be placed on one thousand trusty “Cattle Hunters.”<sup>3</sup>

The multiracial composition of the typical work group suggests yet another similarity between Chesapeake and Lowcountry. In both societies in the late seventeenth century, blacks more often than not were to be found laboring alongside members of other races. The South Carolina estate of John Smyth, who died in 1682, included nine Negroes, four Indians, and three whites. All sixteen undoubtedly worked shoulder to shoulder at least some of the time. . . . Similarly, in late-seventeenth-century Virginia, white servants and slaves – both Indian and black – often worked side by side. An incident involving William Harman, the free black already encountered, underscores the lengths to which work time cooperation extended. In the summer of 1683, Harman’s neighbors came to assist him in his wheat harvest. As was the custom, once the task was accomplished, they relaxed together, smoking pipes of tobacco in Harman’s house. Nothing unusual in this pastoral scene, one might surmise, except that those who came to aid their black neighbor were whites, including yeomen of modest means and well-connected planters. Harman was not, of course, a typical black man, but his story proves that blacks and whites of various stations could work together, even cooperate, in the late-seventeenth-century Chesapeake.<sup>4</sup>

In spite of these similarities, the economic situations of these two societies diverged. By the late seventeenth century the Chesapeake possessed a fully fledged plantation economy. No matter what the level of diversification of a late-seventeenth-century Chesapeake estate, therefore, most slaves were destined to spend the bulk of their time tending tobacco. There were some all-black quarters; accordingly, a few slaves acted as foremen, making decisions about the organization of work, the discipline of the laborers, and the like. However, most slaves simply familiarized themselves with the implements and vagaries of tobacco culture. Seventeenth-century South Carolina, by contrast, was a colony in search of a plantation economy. Experiments were certainly under way with rice, which was first exported in significant quantities in the 1690s. In June 1704, one South Carolina planter could bemoan the loss of a Negro slave because the season was "the height of weeding rice." This was still a pioneer economy, however, with no concentration on one agricultural product. Indeed, if South Carolinians were "Graziers" before they were "planters," they were just as much "lumbermen," too. About the turn of the century, a South Carolinian wrote to an English correspondent extolling the virtues of a particular tract of land. If only the proprietor had "twelve good negroes," the writer asserted, "he could get off it five Hundred pounds worth of tarr yearly."<sup>5</sup> . . . South Carolinians might have been thinking in terms of large profits and sizable labor forces from the first, but, as yet, these were not to be derived from any single agricultural staple.

In one final area – the flexibility of early race relations – the Chesapeake and Lowcountry societies also resembled each other. The once-popular view that the earliest black immigrants in the Old Dominion were servants and not chattels is no longer tenable. Rather, from the outset, the experience of the vast majority of blacks in early Virginia was slavery, although some were servants and even more secured their freedom. In fact, the status of Virginia's blacks seems singularly debased from the start, evident in their impersonal and partial identifications in two censuses dating from the 1620s; their high valuations in estate inventories, indicating lifetime service; the practice of other colonies, most notably Bermuda, with which Virginia was in contact; and early legislation, such as a Virginia law of 1640 that excepted only blacks from a provision that masters should arm their households – perhaps the first example of statutory racial discrimination in North American history – or an act of 1643 that included black, but not white, servant women as tithables.

In spite of the blacks' debased status, race relations in early Virginia were more pliable than they would later be, largely because disadvantaged blacks encountered a group of whites – indentured servants – who

could claim to be similarly disadvantaged. Fraternalization between the two arose from the special circumstances of plantation life in early Virginia. Black slaves tended to live scattered on small units where they were often outnumbered by white servants; more often than not, the two groups spoke the same language; the level of exploitation each group suffered inclined them to see the others as sharing their predicament. In short, the opportunity, the means, and the justification for cooperation between black slaves and white servants were all present. Racial prejudice, moreover, was apparently not strong enough to inhibit these close ties.

Not only did many blacks and whites work alongside one another, but they ate, caroused, smoked, ran away, stole, and made love together. In the summer of 1681, a graphic example of white-black companionship occurred in Henrico County. One Friday in August, Thomas Cocke's "servants" were in their master's orchard cutting down weeds. The gang included at least two white men, who were in their midtwenties and presumably either servants or tenants, and at least three slaves. After work, this mixed complement began drinking; they offered cider to other white visitors, one of whom "dranke cupp for cupp" with the "Negroes." One of the white carousers, Katherine Watkins, the wife of a Quaker, later alleged that John Long, a mulatto belonging to Cocke, had "put his yard into her and ravished" her; but other witnesses testified that she was inebriated and made sexual advances to the slaves. She had, for instance, raised the tail of Dirke's shirt, saying "he would have a good pricke," put her hand on mulatto Jack's codpiece, saying she "loved him for his Fathers sake for his Father was a very handsome young Man," and embraced Mingo "about the Necke," flung him on the bed, "Kissed him and putt her hand into his Codpiece." Thus, a number of white men exonerated their black brethren and blamed a drunken white woman for the alleged sexual indiscretion. If this was sexism, at least it was not racism.<sup>6</sup>

Black and white men also stood shoulder to shoulder in more dramatic ways. In 1640, six servants belonging to Captain William Pierce and "a negro" named Emanuel belonging to Mr. Reginald stole guns, ammunition, and a skiff and sailed down the Elizabeth River in hopes of reaching the Dutch. Thirty years later, a band of white servants who hoped to escape their Eastern Shore plantations and reach New England put their faith in a black pilot as a guide. In 1676, black slaves and white servants joined together in a striking show of resistance. With Nathaniel Bacon dead and his rebellion petering out, one of the last groups to surrender was a mixed band of eighty blacks and twenty white servants. . . . This willingness to cooperate does not mean that white laborers regarded blacks as their equals; it may connote only a temporary coalition of

interests. Nevertheless, the extent to which whites, who were exploited almost as ruthlessly as blacks, could overlook racial differences is notable. Apparently, an approximate social and economic (as opposed to legal) parity sometimes outweighed inchoate racial prejudices.<sup>7</sup>

The flexibility of race relations in the early Chesapeake is illustrated most dramatically in the incidence of interracial sex. At first glance, this might seem an odd proposition, for surely interracial sex is largely synonymous with sexual exploitation – particularly of black women. Abuse of slave women undoubtedly occurred in the early Chesapeake, as in all slaveowning societies. At the same time, the evidence of sexual relations between the races suggests that choice, as much as coercion, was involved – as might well have been the case for Katherine Watkins. For one thing, much recorded miscegenation in early Virginia was, not between white men and black women, but between black men and white women. Many white female servants gave birth to mulatto children. The only realistic conclusion to be drawn from this evidence – and Virginia's ruling establishment was not slow to see it – was that “black men were competing all too successfully for white women.” In addition, many black women shared relationships of mutual affection with white servant men, and many of their mulatto children were the offspring of consensual unions. . . . Finally, there were a number of marriages between blacks and whites in the early Chesapeake. In 1671, for example, the Lower Norfolk County Court ordered Francis Stripes to pay tithes for his wife, “shee being a negro.” Occasionally, even a male slave was able to engage the affections of a white woman. . . .<sup>8</sup>

The access slaves had to freedom is a third area that reveals the flexibility of race relations in the early Chesapeake. Some slaves were allowed to earn money; some even bought, sold, and raised cattle; still others used the proceeds to purchase their freedom. This phenomenon may be attributable, in part, to the Latin American background of some of the earliest black immigrants. Perhaps they had absorbed Iberian notions about the relation between slavery and freedom, in particular that freedom was a permissible goal for a slave and self-purchase a legitimate avenue to liberty. Perhaps they persuaded their masters to let them keep livestock and tend tobacco on their own account in order to buy their freedom. Perhaps, however, some of the first masters of slaves were somewhat unsure about how to motivate their new black laborers and assumed that rewards, rather than sheer coercion, might constitute the best tactic. . . . Finally, the confusion that reigned in early Virginia concerning the legal status of the new black immigrants created other paths to liberty: some seventeenth-century Chesapeake slaves even sued for freedom in colonial courts. . . . [W]hatever their origins and precise numbers (which were certainly small), free blacks in late-seventeenth-



century Virginia seem to have formed a larger share of the total black population than at any other time during slavery. In some counties, perhaps a third of the black population was free in the 1660s and 1670s.

And, once free, these blacks interacted with their white neighbors on terms of rough equality. At least through the 1680s, Virginians came close to envisaging free blacks as members or potential members of their community. Philip Mongon, a Northampton County free black and former slave, was certainly a full participant in the boisterous, bawdy, and competitive world that was seventeenth-century Virginia. Mongon arrived in Virginia as a slave in the 1640s. While still a slave, he entertained and harbored an English runaway maidservant. Early in 1651, now a free black, he arranged to marry a white woman, a widow. Perhaps the marriage never took place, for, if it did, his bride soon died, and Mongon took a black woman as his wife. However, his contacts with white women were not over: in 1663, he was charged with adultery and with fathering an illegitimate mulatto child whose mother was an unmarried white woman. Mongon gave security for the maintenance of the child. Like many a lower-class white, Mongon was not always deferential to his erstwhile superiors. Accused of hog stealing in 1660, he was able to prove his innocence, but then elicited a fine for his "presumptuous actions" in throwing some hogs' ears on the table where the justices presided. . . . He stood up for his rights, as in 1681, when he claimed six hundred pounds of tobacco for dressing the meat for his landlord's funeral dinner. Relations with his neighbors occasionally descended into outright friction. He came to court in 1685 to confess that he "had most notoriously abused and defamed my most loveing friends and neighbours John Duparkes and Robert Jarvis." Two years later, Mongon was a member of an interracial fracas. One Sunday, a number of whites, both tenant farmers and yeomen, both husbands and wives, came to Mongon's house. After much "drinking and carousing as well without doors as within," some of the men began to victimize one of the tenant farmers present. Both Mongon and his son as well as a number of his guests joined forces to inflict a severe beating on the hapless man. Surely seventeenth-century Virginia could claim the pugnacious, truculent, and enterprising Philip Mongon as one of its very own.

The most celebrated free black family, the Johnson clan, also met with little apparent discrimination. Their activities and opportunities seem not much different from their fellow white planters'. They owned land, paid taxes, and acquired servants and slaves. They went to court, signed legal documents, served as witnesses, and transacted openly with white planters. They not only borrowed money from but extended credit to whites. Although they were excluded from military duties, they might well have voted and served on juries.

The fluidity and unpredictability of race relations in early Virginia gradually hardened into the Anglo-American mold more familiar to later generations. The cooperation between white servants and blacks began to dissolve as the numbers of white servants declined and slaves increased. Moreover, a greater distance between lower-class whites and blacks inevitably arose as more and more black newcomers arrived direct from Africa, unable to speak English and utterly alien in appearance and demeanor. As T. H. Breen has put it, "No white servant in this period, no matter how poor, how bitter or badly treated, could identify with these frightened Africans." There was, of course, more to this distancing than natural antipathies. The Chesapeake ruling establishment did all it could to foster the contempt of whites for blacks. Legislation enacted in the late seventeenth century was designed specifically to this end: no black was to "presume to lift up his hand" against a Christian; no Christian white servant was to be whipped naked, for nakedness was appropriate only for blacks; the property of servants was protected, whereas slaves' property was confiscated.<sup>9</sup>

Legislation was not the only way in which this separation occurred. At midcentury, Lancaster County Court appointed Grasher, a black man, to whip offenders who were almost exclusively white, an action that certainly strained good feelings between blacks and lower-class whites. More than a generation later, an Accomac County planter enlisted his mulatto slave Frank to help beat a white maidservant who was ill and not pulling her weight. At about the same time, a white tenant farmer of neighboring Northampton County invented a scheme to take advantage of the worsening climate for free blacks. He told Peter George, manumitted just six years earlier, that "there was a law made that all free Negroes should bee slaves againe." He promised to look after George's property – three head of cattle and hogs – and encouraged him, by providing his cart, to leave the colony. Three years later, George returned to Virginia and successfully brought suit to recover his livestock. More significant than George's small victory was the growing constriction of status and opportunities for free blacks, a transition that prompted whites of modest means to exploit their black neighbors.<sup>10</sup>

In these and other ways, the slaveowning planter class of late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century Virginia attempted to drive a wedge between servants and slaves, whites and blacks. They were undeniably successful. As slaves grew more numerous in the work force, claims to English customary rights, such as reasonable amounts of food, adequate clothing, and observance of holidays, could more easily be ignored. Onerous work, harsh punishment, and rudimentary conditions became associated primarily with black laborers. . . . A stigma was doubtless attached to working in the fields alongside or near slaves: some servants

even agreed to longer terms to avoid such work. Resistance to authority now came largely from blacks, not from the mixed groups of earlier years. At the same time, the authorities were not reticent in proclaiming the new dangers, thereby fostering a sense of caste consciousness among all whites.

Nowhere were Virginia's rulers more assiduous in separating the races than in the realm of sex. In 1662, they passed a law doubling the fine for interracial fornicators. Almost thirty years later, Virginia took action to prevent all forms of interracial union by providing that any white man or woman who married a black, whether bond or free, was liable to permanent banishment, and by laying down fines and alternative punishments for any white woman who engaged in illicit relations with blacks. This legislation can be ascribed to practical, moral, and religious concerns; but, in part at least, it sprang from deeper anxieties. In Winthrop Jordan's words, the legislators lashed out at miscegenation "in language dripping with distaste and indignation." A Maryland law of 1664 referred to interracial unions as "shamefull Matches" and spoke of "diverse free-born English women . . . disgrac[ing] our nation"; Virginia legislators in 1691 denounced miscegenation and its fruits as "that abominable mixture and spurious issue."<sup>11</sup> This legislation reflected a desire to cordon off the "white, Christian" community – and particularly its female sector. Though never completely successful, the laws gradually had the desired effect, and voluntary interracial sexual relations occurred much less frequently after the turn of the century.

A strenuous attempt to limit the numbers of free blacks began in 1691, when the Virginia assembly forbade masters from freeing slaves unless they were willing to pay for their transportation out of the colony. . . . Furthermore, manumissions after 1691 tended to be conditional rather than absolute. . . . With few additions to their numbers, the proportion of free blacks in the total black population declined. Their numbers had always been small: by the third quarter of the seventeenth century, the celebrated and intensively studied free colored population of Virginia's Eastern Shore totaled no more than fifty individuals. But even some of these pulled up stakes in the middle to late seventeenth century, no doubt because of the growing hostility they faced. Those who remained might cling to freedom, but only as a pariah class. Poverty, landlessness, and dissociation from whites increasingly constituted their lot. Occasional amicable relations between free blacks and whites were perhaps still possible, but such associations had to be conducted more furtively than before. By the turn of the century, Virginia, like all the other mainland plantation colonies, was set to become a closed slave society. There was to be no room for an intermediate body of freedpersons.

South Carolina was never at any time an open slave society. And yet seventeenth-century Lowcountry society also had more flexible race relations than its eighteenth-century successor. By comparison with seventeenth-century Virginia, early South Carolinian race relations scarcely seem flexible, but, in the overall history of Lowcountry slave society, the first thirty or so years of slavery constitute something of a privileged era, a time when relations between the races contained an element of spontaneity and unpredictability that they subsequently lost. White servants and black slaves resided on the same plantations in early South Carolina, . . . black newcomers might labor like hired hands. Servants and slaves traded with one another, leading the colony's legislators to pass laws against the practice in 1683, 1687, and again in 1691. In play, as in work, blacks participated rather fully in early Lowcountry life – to the point that their involvement in the trade for strong liquors elicited official displeasure in 1693. In politics, as in leisure, black involvement led one observer to protest that, in the elections for the assembly in 1701, “Strangers, Servants, Aliens, nay Malatoes and Negroes were Polled.”<sup>12</sup> . . .

The degree of cooperation between blacks and lower-class whites was far more attenuated in the Lowcountry than in the Chesapeake – and this, of course, applied to interracial sexual relations as in other spheres. The reason was simple: South Carolina never had a substantial class of white indentured servants. There was therefore little basis for the anxieties about the sexual preferences of white servant women that existed in the Chesapeake. Furthermore, South Carolina had fewer nonslaveholding whites than the Chesapeake and therefore less need or occasion to encourage caste consciousness by outlawing interracial marriages. In the Lowcountry, as in the plantation societies of the West Indies, the yawning social chasm between most whites and most blacks bred a self-confidence about the unthinkability of interracial marriage that was absent in the Chesapeake. Whereas interracial marriage did not have to be prohibited, open concubinage between male planters and female slaves could be treated more casually than elsewhere in North America, precisely because it presented less of a danger to fundamental social distinctions. Nevertheless, in spite of these social realities, sexual relations between whites and blacks probably occurred more frequently in the seventeenth than in the eighteenth century. . . .

To compare the infant slave societies of the Chesapeake and the Lowcountry is, in essence, to engage in different ways of measuring time. In fact, three forms of historical time must be kept simultaneously in mind. First, the obvious youthfulness of these two seventeenth-century societies accounts for many of their shared features: both acquired their first slaves from the same places, race relations tended to be flexible

in the early years, and whites and blacks often worked alongside one another. To make such a comparison is to employ the time scale common to all social organisms: they are born, develop, and die. What could be more natural, then, but to see the likenesses in these two societies in the youthful stages of their development?

Yet, fundamental differences arose from another facet of historical time – the sheer fact of precedence. Virginia was founded almost three-quarters of a century before South Carolina. From this perspective, to compare Virginia and South Carolina is to compare two societies that, in their historical trajectories, were moving in parallel paths but from different starting points. Virginia acquired slaves, imported Africans, and inserted them into a fully fledged plantation economy much earlier than did South Carolina. This comparison draws on the simplest, most basic form of historical time: the sheer fact of chronological precedence.

Another set of differences comes into view if historical time is conceived in one further way – not which society was founded first, but which was the more developed as a slave society. In this respect, turn-of-the-century Virginia was a late developer while its southern cousin was thoroughly precocious. To make this comparison is to measure these two societies, not by the implacable uniformity or fixed divisions of clock-and-calendar time, but by their internal rhythms. In this comparison, the rank order needs to be reversed, with South Carolina being placed ahead of Virginia, for, in 1700, the Lowcountry contained a much larger proportion of slaves and depended more fundamentally on slave labor than its Chesapeake counterpart.

The significance of this juggling act in temporalities lies in our being able not only to situate these two turn-of-the-century slave societies more clearly but also to see in what directions they were pointing. The similarities of youthfulness were most important in defining these two societies in their mid- to late-seventeenth-century phases. At this point, most blacks spoke English, worked alongside whites, and associated fairly easily with them. The cultural distinctions between the two races were muted. The black population was not generally numerous enough to provide the critical mass for autonomous cultural development. Many of the earliest blacks in both the Chesapeake and the Lowcountry assumed the customs and attitudes of their white neighbors and acquaintances.

Furthermore, the early emergence of an assimilationist culture among the slaves of both societies diminished, much more than might otherwise seem possible, the African influences that accompanied the later infusion of African immigrants. In other words, the recently arrived Africans were probably incorporated into an embryonic cultural system that, though creole, nevertheless approximated the Anglo-American model. Later

arrivals faced a double challenge. They had to adjust not only to new surroundings but to the rules and customs already worked out by the earliest migrants. The first colonists acted as a "charter group," determining many of the terms under which the newcomers were incorporated.

But the contrasts that were soon evident between these two youthful societies, arising from the timing of their settlements and the rate of their social developments, point in a different direction by the end of the seventeenth century. In the Lowcountry, an assimilationist slave culture had little chance to put down roots before it was swept aside by a rising tide of African slaves. Although these growing numbers of Africans had to adapt to an embryonic cultural system, they swamped it more than they were incorporated within it. Moreover, from the first, Carolina blacks had more freedom to shape their culture than blacks had elsewhere on the North American mainland. Their numbers were not large in the seventeenth century, but most blacks lived in units made up of more than a few of their fellows; and, in the society as a whole, blacks always formed a significantly large proportion of the population. An important urban center that provided a key gathering place for Lowcountry slaves also emerged quickly. As early as 1698, South Carolina legislators took action against the "great numbers of slaves which do not dwell in Charles Town [who] do on Sundays resort thither to Drink Quarrel Curse Swear and pro[p]hane the Sabbath." The autonomy of the cowpen and the freedom of movement inherent in stock raising also contributed to the latitude early Carolina blacks enjoyed. It is not difficult to envisage these seventeenth-century Lowcountry slaves incorporating significant elements of their African past into an embryonic African American cultural system. This early Africanization gained momentum, of course, when the floodgates opened in the early eighteenth century and African immigrants poured into the region.<sup>13</sup>

In the Cheseapeake, an assimilationist slave culture took much firmer root. To be sure, Africans began to enter the region in large numbers at least by the 1690s. But, in comparison with Lowcountry patterns, they were dispersed more widely, formed a much smaller proportion of the overall population, and for the most part were unable to constitute enclaves within an increasingly black countryside. Of course, they did not abandon their African heritage entirely. The Johnson clan of the Eastern Shore, for example, could hardly have behaved more like typical white settlers. And yet, in 1677, John Johnson, grandson of Anthony Johnson, "the patriarch of Pungoteague Creek," purchased a tract of land that he called "Angola." As T. H. Breen and Stephen Innes put it, "If the Johnsons were merely English colonists with black skins, then why did John, junior, name his small farm 'Angola'?" This small shred of

evidence, the authors declare, suggests the existence of a deeply rooted, separate culture, a judgment that, although it likely goes too far, at least points to memories of a homeland being kept alive by at least one third-generation free black (and presumably others).<sup>14</sup>

There is also evidence, both for this clan and for other free black families, and by implication for slaves, of blacks seeking out other blacks. No doubt, the colony's earliest black residents wove webs of friendship and kinship through which they transmitted cultural values. Racial identity was not necessarily sacrificed even where blacks associated widely with whites. As early as 1672, Surry County "Negroes" were said "to mete together upon Satterdayes and Sundayes . . . to consult of unlawful p[ro]jects and combinations." Eight years later, Virginians discovered a "Negro Plott," hatched in the Northern Neck, which they again blamed on the relative autonomy of the black community, particularly "the great freedom and Liberty that has beene by many Masters given to their Negro Slaves for Walking on broad on Saterdays and Sundayes and permitting them to meete in great Numbers in making and holding of Funeralls for Dead Negroes." Clearly, then, late-seventeenth-century Chesapeake blacks participated in their own social and cultural events.<sup>15</sup>

One way that late-seventeenth-century Chesapeake slaves transmitted values was through their naming patterns. Among the eighty-nine Virginia slaves that Lewis Burwell owned between 1692 and 1710, the vast majority became known at least to their master by English names. Nevertheless, one in nine Burwell slaves achieved something more distinctive: at least five men retained African names, two couples chose an African name for one of their children, and another three parents seem to have combined an English name with a West African naming principle – that is, the father's first name became the son's second name. In this way, African memories were not lost altogether.<sup>16</sup>

A further tantalizing glimpse of possible African influences derives from the decorated clay tobacco pipes produced in the early Chesapeake. Although most known pipe forms were either Native American or European in shape, all three major social groups in the region – Indians, Europeans, and Africans – seem to have made and decorated them. Although many of the decorative techniques (repeated patterns of dots or dashes known as pointillé and rouletted or white inlay) and motifs (hanging triangles, stars, and diamonds) might have been African in inspiration, they also can be traced in prehistoric Indian and European decorative arts traditions. Perhaps African slaves incorporated abstract designs and representational motifs drawn from their homelands, but most likely the pipes are evidence of a vibrant cultural syncretism in the seventeenth-century Chesapeake. A bone handle discovered

at Utopia quarter along the James River in Virginia has been dated to the early eighteenth century, when a large community of Africans was transferred to the site. The bone handle is intricately carved in ways reminiscent of the abstract designs found on many Chesapeake pipes.

Overall, syncretism was more pronounced than African influence in the culture of early Chesapeake slaves, whereas the scales tipped in the other direction in the culture of early Lowcountry slaves. The emergence of an assimilationist cultural amalgam structured later developments in both regions, helping to explain the relative paucity (in New World terms) of African cultural features in eighteenth-century British North American slave life. But the Lowcountry slave world was, from the first, more autonomous than that of the Chesapeake. Carolinian slaves took advantage of this relative measure of latitude to shape a culture more in touch with memories of an African past than Chesapeake slaves could construct. By 1700, the paths on which these two slave societies were embarked had diverged; they moved even farther apart as time passed.

## Notes

- 1 William L. Saunders (ed.), *The Colonial Records of North Carolina*, vol. 1 (Raleigh, NC, 1886), p. 150.
- 2 Richard Beale Davis (ed.), *William Fitzhugh and His Chesapeake World, 1676–1701* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1963) p. 175; Robert Bristow to John Grason, Sept. 15, 1707, Robert Bristow Letterbook, VSL [Virginia State Library]; W. Noel Sainsbury et al. (eds.), *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies*, XVII, 1699 (London, 1908), p. 261.
- 3 *Boston News-Letter*, May 17–24, 1708, as quoted in Clarence L. Ver Steeg, *Origins of a Southern Mosaic: Studies of Early Carolina and Georgia* (Athens, Ga., 1975), p. 106.
- 4 Peter H. Wood, *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion* (New York, 1974), pp. 54–5, 97.
- 5 Elizabeth Hyrne to Burrell Massingberd, Mar. 13, 1704, Massingberd Deposit, Lincolnshire County Archives, Lincoln, England; Thomas Smith to Burrell Massingberd, Nov. 7, 1705, Massingberd Deposit.
- 6 Warren M. Billings (ed.), *The Old Dominion in the Seventeenth Century: A Documentary History of Virginia, 1606–1689* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1975), pp. 161–3.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 159; Accomac County Orders, 1671–1673, p. 95, as cited by J. Douglas Deal, *Race and Class in Colonial Virginia: Indians, Englishmen, and Africans on the Eastern Shore during the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 1993), p. 32; Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York, 1975), pp. 327–8.
- 8 Lorena S. Walsh, “‘A Place in Time’ Regained: A Fuller History of Colonial Chesapeake Slavery through Group Biography,” in Larry E. Hudson, Jr., ed.,



- Working toward Freedom: Slave Society and Domestic Economy in the American South* (Rochester, N.Y., 1994), p. 5.
- 9 T. H. Breen, "A Changing Labor Force and Race Relations in Virginia, 1660–1710," in Breen, *Puritans and Adventurers: Change and Persistence in Early America* (New York, 1980), p. 145; William Waller Hening, *The Statutes at Large: Being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia . . .*, 13 vols. (Richmond and Philadelphia, 1809–1823). vol. 2, p. 481, vol. 3, pp. 448, 459–60.
  - 10 Lancaster County Deeds, I, 1652–1657, p. 213, as cited in Robert Anthony Wheeler, "Lancaster County, Virginia, 1650–1750: The Evolution of a Southern Tidewater Community" (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1972), p. 24; Accomac County Wills, 1682–1697, pp. 91a, 93a–96a, as cited in Deal, *Race and Class in Colonial Virginia*, pp. 103–4; Northampton County Orders and Wills, 1689–1698, p. 116, as cited in Deal, "A Constricted World: Free Blacks on Virginia's Eastern Shore, 1680–1750," in Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo (eds.), *Colonial Chesapeake Society* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1988), pp. 281–4.
  - 11 Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550–1812* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1968), pp. 139, 79–80; Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom*, pp. 333–6; Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race, and Power in Colonial Virginia* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1996), pp. 197–201.
  - 12 Thomas J. Little, "The South Carolina Slave Laws Reconsidered, 1670–1700," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, (1993), pp. 92, 94, 98.
  - 13 An Act for the Better Ordering of Slaves, no. 168, 1698, MSS Acts, SCDAH [South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia].
  - 14 T. H. Breen and Stephen Innes, "Myne Owne Ground": *Race and Freedom on Virginia's Eastern Shore, 1640–1676* (New York, 1980), pp. 17–18, 71–2.
  - 15 *Ibid.*, pp. 103–4, 83–8, 100–2; "Management of Slaves," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (1899–1900), p. 314; H. R. McIlwaine et al. (eds.), *Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia*, vol. 1 (Richmond, Va., 1925), p. 86.
  - 16 Walsh, "'A Place in Time' Regained," p. 5.