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PREFACE

The Eastern Shore of Virginia is the lower extremity of the peninsula which outsiders know as Delmarva (See Map p. 20). So isolated and little known is it that it is often omitted from maps of the Commonwealth. The name was given by the first settlers of Virginia because the land lies on the east side of Chesapeake Bay; Eastern Shoremen refer to the rest of Virginia, including Virginia Beach, as the Western Shore.

Of small extent, the Eastern Shore was never of great importance in the economy or history of Virginia, and its relative influence inevitably declined as settlement and population moved north and west. It is of great interest to historians, however, because the county court records, which are extant from January 1633, are the oldest continuous such records in the country; for this reason they have been extensively studied. This paper examines a question antecedent by almost a decade to the beginning of the records.

The Eastern Shore of Virginia was first settled by Europeans in 1614, when the authorities at Jamestown sent a group of men there to produce salt. This settlement, doubtless of short duration, was probably on the seaside just above Wise Point (Cape Charles, not to be confused with the present town of the same name.) Lady Dale had a plantation on what is still known as Old Plantation Creek, the name dating from the fall of 1620, when the Virginia Company sent over the first permanent settlers.

It has been estimated that 75 men accompanied Captain John Willcox in 1620 to clear the Company's land.¹ The next spring the "second wave" arrived under Captain William Epes to settle the

¹Nora Miller Turman, The Eastern Shore of Virginia, 1603-1964 Onancock, 1964, p. 6. This is the most recent account of the history of the Shore.
tract (immediately south of the Company's Land) which had been assigned to the Secretary of the Virginia Company and his successors. These two tracts, each of 500 acres, lie between King's and Cherrystone creeks to the west of the present village of Cheriton. This location was no doubt chosen because King's and Cherrystone are the first creeks north of Old Plantation, to which Lady Dale already held claim.

The first records of the population of the Eastern Shore are in the Census of 1623/4 and the Muster of 1624/5, and it has long puzzled students of the area that the number of reported inhabitants dropped in the space of a year from 76 to 51, or by one-third. It has been surmised that the Eastern Shore, because the Indians there were friendly, became a place of refuge after the Massacre of 1622 and that, when the danger had subsided, the refugees returned to the Western Shore.

Close study of the surviving records, however, reveals that this was not the case; the decrease in population of the Shore was caused by the same factors which produced both Census and Muster—the vicissitudes of the Virginia Company. The Company, which was already in grave difficulty, never recovered from the blow which the Indians inflicted on Good Friday, 1622. It undertook the Census dated 16 February 1623 (1624 New Style) in an effort to determine how many had died either of natural causes or at the hands of the Indians, and how many were still living. A year later, when the Crown had revoked the Company's charter, the Muster was made as an inventory of all persons and possessions about to come under the direct jurisdiction of the Crown.

Both these documents are printed in Hotten; the latter is printed, for the first time in full, in APP. For easiest reference they are given at the end of this article, with the Muster rearranged to conform to the Census order. With minor discrepancies of orthography and of ages, and with one misreading by Hotten of Muimes for Munnes, the two authorities agree so far as the Eastern Shore is concerned. Hotten is used as the source in this paper, with discrepancies noted as necessary.

Of the 76 person listed in the Census, 32 are listed again in the Muster. The identity of Charles Farmer (C 20) with Charles Harman (M 29) is established, since the name is followed by the names of the same three men who are servants in the Muster.

---

Actually the name is Harmar; he was a prominent resident of the Shore and lived until the late 1630s.

Edward, John, and Thomas (C 16-18) are also certainly identified as Edward Rogers (M 8), John Baker (M 7), and Thomas Warden (M 9), who all came over in the *Ann* in 1623. They were personal servants of Capt. Epes, as was Nicholas Raynberd (M 3).\(^4\)

William (C 4) is in all likelihood William Munnes (M 12), and not William Burditt (M 4), who rose to prominence and became a commissioner and a burgess. James ("called the piper") (C 15) is likely James Blackborne (M 14), listed as one of the servants on the Secretary’s Land.

Is Nicholas Sumerfeld (M 15) the same as John Sumfill (C 13)? The surnames are probably intended to be the same; Nicholas is reported to have come in 1619, and neither name is listed otherwise in Census or Muster. I believe we are dealing with the same man. The many obvious errors in both Census and Muster leave the identity within the pale of possibility.

Thomas Parke (C 59) is surely the same as Thomas Sparkes (M 46). John (C 49) listed after John Blower’s name is either John Parramore (M 42) or John Wilkines (M 43), and almost certainly the former. (See below). John How (C 51) is certainly the same as John Home (M 47). The usual form of the name is Howe; he was a prominent man who died about 1640.

Thus, if we may shift our ground to the Muster, 42 of the 51 persons may be accounted for; most by absolute certainty, and a few by fair probability. What of the other nine? First, Nicholas Raynberd (M 3) came over in 1624 and obviously would not be in the Census. Either William Burditt (M 4) or William Munnes (M 12) is unaccounted for. Both stayed on the Eastern Shore, and both survived into the 1640s, as the court records attest. One of them was either off the Shore in 1624 or was missed in the counting.

Henrie Charlton, who came in the *George* in 1623, may not have been in Virginia in time to be counted in the Census, since the Old Style year ended on March 24, and the date of the Census, as noted above, was 16 February.

Ann (Hannah) Savage (M 19), the wife of Thomas, perhaps married him after the Census. Thomas Belson (M 21), their servant, age 12, is one of three in the Muster of the Eastern Shore whose arrival date is not given, and he may have been a newcomer, especially in view of his age.

\(^4\)Nell Marion Nugent, *Cavaliers and Pioneers* Richmond, 1934, p. 7. (Hereafter *CP*).
Percis Scott (M 25), born in Virginia, may have been born after the Census. Temperance Hodgskines (M 34), who came in 1620, very likely married the widower Nicholas (C 62) between Census and Muster.

Thomas Gaskoyne (M 37) may be the same as Thomas Gasko, who in the Census was living at Flowerdew Hundred (Hotten 172), although APP (179-181) does not suggest the possibility. Since it was Governor Yeardley who encouraged the settlement of the Eastern Shore, and it has been suggested that Gaskoyne was the overseer on Yeardley’s land, the hypothesis is attractive. Flowerdew Hundred was of course named for Yeardley’s wife, Temperance Flowerdew.

Almost certainly the John Wilkines (M 43) who is listed as a servant of John Blower (M 40) is omitted in the Census, most likely because there was no such person. In the first place, John Wilkines and his wife Briggett (M 48-49) are undoubtedly the same as John and Goodwife Wilkins (C 55-56). Their free status in 1624 is attested by the term “Goodwife,” and John has his own muster in 1625. Two deaths are reported for 1624 in the Muster of the Eastern Shore, Thomas Helcott (living on the Main near James City in the Census—Hotten 177) and John Wilkines. It strains credulity to suppose that there were three persons of exactly the same name in a population of less than 60, when the surname does not appear elsewhere in either Census or Muster.

There is no question that the John Wilkins of the surviving court records is M 48, since in 1634 his wife’s name was Bridget, he later married Ann, in all probability the widow of John Baldwin of Jamestown. Furthermore, he patented land for his personal adventure in 1618 and paid for Bridget’s passage in 1621 (CP 46, 56), and would not likely have been a servant at any time. John and Bridget apparently had a son Walter, who survived long enough to marry and in 1643 was living on his father’s land. All the rest of the Wilkinses known on the Eastern Shore in the seventeenth century are demonstrably the descendants of John and Ann.

Thus, if there was a John Wilkines, a servant of John Blower (M 40), he is either the same John Wilkines who is also listed as dead in 1624 (although that was more likely a son of John and Bridget),

---


or else he disappears from the records without a trace. I conclude that the name is a mistake and that no such person existed. John Parramore, who came in 1622 and survived into the 1640s, is the person indicated the John of C 49.

Thus we account for the 51 persons of the Muster. What of the 34 enumerated in the Census who are not represented in the Muster? What happened to them?

John Parsons (C 31), John Coomes (C 32), James Chambers (C 33), Thomas Hall (C 36), John Tyers (Tyos in the Muster) (C 38), Robert Edmonds (C 41), and John Evans (C 43) (although there was another man of the same name in Elizabeth City in 1624—Hotten 185) were living on the Treasurer's Plantation in James City in 1625. William Benge is probably the same as William Beane (C 73), and William Comes (C 30) is listed as slain by the Indians (Hotten 235-236).

There are two persons of the name Thomas Hichecocke in the Census, one living on the Main near James City (Hotten 177) and the other on the Eastern Shore (C 42). The Muster lists Thomas Hikkock as a servant on Hog Island (Hotten 237), but which of the census figures he was, if the same man was not counted twice in the Census, it is impossible to say.

Daniell Wattkins (C 46) is doubtless the same who appears as a servant at Pace's Pains in the Muster (Hotten 231). John Butterfield, a freeman (C 52), is recorded at Smith's Plantation (Hotten 232), and John Throgmorton (C 66) appears with his own muster at West and Shirley Hundred (Hotten 208). Abraham Avelin, no doubt the Abram Analin of C 69, was in Elizabeth City in 1625 (Hotten 253). He too was a freeman, as apparently was also John Barnett (C 71), who had moved to James City (Hotten 226).

Thus, of these sixteen persons, nine in all likelihood were servants of the Virginia Company, which recalled them to James-town as it retrenched; only three can be demonstrated to have been freemen, with probably two more.

Although of the other 19 or 20 persons there is no evident trace in the Muster, some are known otherwise. Peter Epes (C 3), the brother of Capt. William Epes, was mentioned in court in 1626 (cited, APP 161). John Fisher (C 8) appears in both of the first two volumes of county records, and Christopher Carter (C 12) is probably the same who in 1645 was granted a certificate for transporting five persons, not including himself. (2 N 457-8; not in CP).

---

7Chambers was witness to a deed in 1629 (CP 168).
8Thos. Hall, granted land in Lower Norfolk County in 1647 for transporting six persons, unnamed, may be the same. (CP 174).
There was an Israell Hill, servant to Capt. William Stone in 1634 (1 N 2, 18), who was likely the Ismale Hills of C 37. Thomas Crampe (C 29) was witness to a deed at Kechoughtan in December, 1626 (CP 71). (The William Drye for whose transportation Thomas Harmanson was granted land in 1654 cannot be the same man as C 9—CP 294).

Thus we are left with about 13 persons, who, like Melchizedek and Ucalegon, appear but once, unless some of these survive in the records elsewhere. Since the Accomack-Northampton court records begin in January of 1633 (not 1632, as usually stated), it is quite possible, and indeed probable, that some of them remained in the county, but died within a decade of the Census.

Furthermore, it is almost certain that the Muster omits several persons who were either still living or had died during the year. As divorce was unheard of, the wives of Robert Ball (C 35) and Thomas Powell (C 58) surely were missed one way or the other, if Powell was not already a widower in 1624 (see below). John Fisher (C 8) was in all likelihood a servant on the Secretary’s Land and almost surely was there when the Muster was made; the same circumstances are indicated in the case of Christopher Carter (C 12)—it has been shown that Fisher certainly and Carter probably appear in the court records. The “boy of Mr. Cans” (C 50) may well have died, as very likely had George (C 19), whose appearance without a surname marks him as a servant, and Philip (C 24), surely a servant on Lady Dale’s land, although it is possible that the two servants had left the Shore upon expiration of their indentures. William Williams and his wife (C 64-65), who patented land on the Eastern Shore in 1620 or 1621 (see below), surely must have stayed and thus should have been counted, whether living or dead, when the Muster was made.

Those of whom nothing further has been discovered are Census numbers 5, 9, 36, 44, 54, 70, and 76. Edmond Cloak (C 5) and William Dry (C 9) were probably servants of the Company and living on the Secretary’s Land. Thomas Hall (C 36) appears in a list of Company servants which is interrupted by the names of Robert Ball and his wife. Henry Watkinns (C 44) was one of the first burgesses from the Eastern Shore and was hence a freeman. Petter Longman’s (C 54) name appears in a list of freemen, as does Thomas Blacklocke’s (C 70), and William Quills (C 76) was probably a servant of Thomas Savage.

It is clear, then, that no more than six or eight freemen left the Eastern Shore between Census and Muster, a number which is scarcely higher than would be produced by normal movement in such pioneer conditions.
DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION

Attention to the records reveals that in both 1624 and 1625 most of the population lived on the Company’s and the Secretary’s Land and immediately adjacent. The exceptions can be inferred with a high degree of probability. In the first place, 1-19 in the Census must have been living on the Secretary’s Land—already enumerated before those on the Company’s Land, as a portent of the early decline of the latter.

On the Secretary’s Land in 1625 was located the fort; there were two houses, three storehouses, and one of the two shallops in the Muster. This was a boat propelled by oars and/or sails and used chiefly on rivers, but this one must have been used for crossing the Bay when necessary. It is interesting that the other shallop was at Jamestown, the property of Governor Yeardley. (APP 27)

Lady Dale had two overseers of record, Henry Watkins and Charles Harmar; the date when Harmar succeeded Watkins is unknown, and it has been assumed that Watkins in 1623/4 became one of the first burgesses from the Eastern Shore (the other was Capt. Willcox of the Secretary’s Land) because he was still her overseer. Thus, it is reasoned, the two burgesses represented the two settlements on the Shore. However, Harmar’s name is followed by those of the same three servants (C 21-23, plus surely 24) in both Census and Muster, and in the Muster he reported two houses and a storehouse, surely Lady Dale’s property. Moreover, he had the boat that would have been necessary for communication between Old Plantation Creek and the main settlement. Of the three Watkinses in the Census (C 44-46), only Peregee is reported on the Shore in the Muster, and he had no house. Harmar can confidently be assigned to Lady Dale’s plantation in both Census and Muster, and he thus became her overseer prior to the Census. Henry Watkins of course may have been still on her land, or in that vicinity, in 1624.

Whitelaw “guess[es]” that Thomas Gaskoyne (M 37) was the overseer for Governor Yeardley’s plantation. This fits the hypothesis suggested above, that he may have been the Thomas Gasko of Flowerdew Hundred in 1624. Yeardley’s plantation lay on the north side of the Gulph, (sic), just above the great tract belonging to Thomas Savage, and the dwelling which Gaskoyne shared with William Andrews (Andros) and Daniel Cugley, both freemen,

---

was probably at the foot of Old Town Neck. The order of names in the Census suggests that Cugley and Andros were on Lady Dale’s Land in 1623 (C 25-26). (It is interesting that Cugley, when he married Hannah Savage, widow of Thomas, moved to the site still known as “Cugley,” and opposite the probable site of Yeardley’s settlement.)

The land records for Gaskoyne, Andrews and Cugley reinforce the impression that they lived on someone else’s land at first. If, as suggested above, Gaskoyne was Yeardley’s overseer in 1625, it must be acknowledged that he lacked the boat which would have been necessary to communicate with the rest of the settlement. Although Gaskoyne later moved to Northumberland County, his first patent (1636) was in Northampton on Old Plantation Creek (CP 46). Andrews patented land on King’s Creek in 1628 (CP 13) and on old Plantation Creek in 1635 (CP 23). Cugley, as noted, lived at “Cugley” after his marriage, but his “ould field” (1 N 31) lay to the north of John Wilkins’ King’s Creek tract (see below), and thus very close to the Secretary’s and the Company’s Land. Thus the three men who were together in 1625 were later widely separated, in contrast to most of the other settlers, who reveal a strong tendency to remain in place.

Capt. Thomas Graves (C 27) was doubtless on or near Lady Dale’s plantation in 1624. He later (1628) patented land on the north side of the Creek (ES 1.140). In 1625 he reported a house and a storehouse, indicative of more than a season of residence, and equally indicative of an intent to remain. Thus he may almost certainly be assigned to this area, and Andrews and Cugley may have been part of the labor force for some of the five buildings reported by Harmar and Graves in 1625.

The assignment of Capt. Graves to the Old Plantation Creek area becomes even more probable when one notes that the Census next enumerates the population of the Company’s Land. Capt. Willcox (C 28) is first, as the head of the Muster. The fact that 31, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, and 43 were reported living on the Treasurer’s Plantation in James City in the Muster indicates that they were servants of the Company, although they are not explicitly stated to be so in the Muster. Number 30 was “slaine by the Indians” in James City, and no doubt had been transferred to James City with the rest. The only servant listed with Willcox in 1625 is Henry Charlton (M 17), not in the Census.

The population of the Company’s Land certainly included 28-43, and perhaps the Watkineses also, whose placement makes it uncertain whether they should be attributed to the Company’s Land or to the area near John Blower (C 47), who lived on Old
The curious mixing of free persons and servants in the Company’s Land census undoubtedly reflects an enumeration by households rather than by status. I suggest that the Watkinses may already have left Lady Dale’s land, and that Henry was chosen as a burgess because he had lived there and now lived on the Company’s Land, which had a population of at least 16 and probably many more, whereas the Old Plantation area probably did not have more than 12. In addition, most of the rest of the settlers lived either on or near the Company’s Land: with the population of the Secretary’s Land and of Thomas Savage’s household, which must have been directly across Cherrystone Creek from the Company settlement, altogether about four-fifths of the populace lived in the King’s-Cherrystone area.

John Blower’s household included C 47-50, and in the Muster he reported a house, storehouse, and boat. An abstract was made many years ago of the patent issued to him in 1623 (cited, ES 1. 25, 139); the land is on Old Plantation Creek, as later patents (1628/9) to Thomas Graves and Roger Saunders prove (CP 13-14). The boat shows that he was living there in 1625 and doubtless for several years before that. In fact, he may have moved to the Shore before the Company settlement was made; if so he, not Thomas Savage, was the first settler.

The decline of the Company’s Land by 1625 is obvious. As noted above, eight servants (at least) had been transferred to the Treasurer’s Plantation. Of Thomas Crampe and Thomas Hichcocke (C 29, 42) there is no further record on the Shore, although the former was witness to a deed in Kecoughtan in December 1626. (CP 71). Ismale Hills may have remained: see above, page (x).

Thus we account for C 1-50. Of the rest of the settlers, 51-71 must have lived on or near the Company’s Land, while 72-76 doubtless comprised Thomas Savage’s household across the creek. Information from the Muster and the court records is given in summary form:

51. John Howe reported a house and storehouse. His first patent of record was for 30 acres immediately adjacent to the Company’s Land (CP 12).

53. William Davis reported a house and a storehouse, but there is no record of land.

55. John Wilkins reported a house; he patented several tracts of land, but lived on King’s Creek (ES 1. 161-164 and ff.)

57. Thomas Powell had a house and a storehouse. That he lived on or beside the Company’s Land is proved by a patent of February 1626/7 (CP 8). In 1642 he was living on the Company’s old
tract, now held by Obedience Robins, as a court suit proves (2 N 220).

60. William Smith, who reported a house and storehouse, was living in 1635 just to the south of the present town of Cape Charles (1 N 31). Since this area can hardly have been settled in 1624, he had no doubt moved to his 1635 residence after the Muster.

61. Edward Drew, who also reported a house and a storehouse, patented land in 1636 adjacent to that of Howe and Powell (CP 46).

62. Nicholas Hoskins in 1626/7 leased 20 acres of the Company’s Land. (CP 9).

64. William Williams, unreported in the Muster, patented in 1620 or 1621 100 acres of land which in 1640 was in possession of Obedience Robins (2 N 14). Robins’ residence and land were in the area of the Company’s Land. Williams and his wife may have died before the Muster.

72. Thomas Savage of course held the tract still known as Savage’s Neck and no doubt was settled on it from the beginning. In fact, it was probably the location of Savage’s home that influenced the Company to settle the tract just across the creek. In 1625 Savage had a house and a storehouse, plus a boat, which reinforces the supposition that he lived across the water from the Company’s Land.

There are only a few persons who still remain to be mentioned. Walter Scott (C 39) reported a house in the Muster, but had no land of record. Perregrin Watkins, who alone of the three Watkinses was reported on the Shore in the Muster, reported no house, although it is safe to assume that he had some shelter from a Tidewater winter. His muster is reported between those of John Wilkins and William Davis, and he may have been living with one of them. No land is of record for him. The “Mr. Watkins” of 1 N 54 (16 May 1636) cannot be positively identified; possibly he was one of the three in the Census, but as he is nowhere else mentioned in the court records, he was not living on the Shore. No one prominent enough to merit the title “Mr.” can have escaped mention entirely.

Robert Edmonds (C 41), transferred to the Treasurer’s Plantation before the Muster (above, p. (x) ), apparently returned to the Shore, where his will, dated 27 December 1633, was probated (1 N 40). The John Evens of 2 N 121 and later, a headright of John Towson, cannot be the same as No. 43 in the Census.

The “boy of Mr. Cans” (C 50) in John Blower’s household may have been the son of the Mr. Cann living at Jamestown (Hotten 176). Since Mr. Cann has no wife in the Census, was he a widower, and was there some kinship that led the Blowers to take in the
child? Both the man and the boy disappear in the Muster.

The Thomas Parkes of 2 N (often) can hardly be the same as the person in Census and Muster (C 59), since this man is first mentioned in 1643 (2 N 267), although it is just possible that he had spent the intervening years off the Shore.

Benjamin Knight (C 67), living presumably on the Company’s Land in 1624, and perhaps in the household of John Throgmorton, was transferred before the Muster to the Secretary’s Land, where he was a servant in 1625. No land is of record.

Chad Gunston (C 68) is something of a puzzle. Chad Gulstons, his wife and child are reported dead in Elizabeth City in the Census (Hotten 194), and Hotten (index) cross-references the names, an indication that he believed the same person might be meant. Possibly Gunston/Gulstons survived his wife and child only long enough to be counted in the Census, and the officials failed to strike his name off the list.

Similar circumstances may explain the appearance of “Robert Balls wife” (C 35) both among the living on the Eastern Shore and in the list of the dead at Elizabeth City, although it is possible that Ball’s wife died, that he married again before the Census and was widowed a second time before the Muster.

William Benge’s (C 73) residence in the household of Thomas Savage may indicate more than meets the eye. If our identification is correct, Benge in 1625 is enumerated on the Treasurer’s Plantation among the several men who had been transferred from the Company’s Land on the Eastern Shore. Now, Savage had been in the employ of Capt. John Martin before Governor Yeardley came to Virginia in April, 1619, and some years later Martin charged Yeardley with luring Savage away. Yeardley acknowledged that he had done so (recounted, ES 1. 216), and it is possible that he “lent” a Company servant to Savage as one of the conditions of settling the Eastern Shore.

Solomon Greene (C 74), who seems to have been living in Thomas Savage’s household in the Census, returned his own muster in 1625, when he had a house and a storehouse. No land is of record for him. Since he immigrated in 1618, his indenture perhaps expired between Census and Muster.

THE STRUCTURE OF CENSUS AND MUSTER

The structure of the Census of the Eastern Shore seems to be as
follows: 1-24 were on the Secretary’s Land, while 20-27 represent Lady Dale’s land, or the vicinity. 28-34 were living on the Company’s Land, as probably were 44-46 (the Watkinses) also, since they immediately precede John Blower’s household, and he would have headed his return (47-50). 51-57 were almost certainly all living on or near the Company’s Land, as their later land acquisitions strongly suggest, while 72-76 were already settled at the foot of Savage’s Neck. Thus we get Secretary’s Land, Lady Dale’s Plantation, Company’s Land, John Blower’s household, Company’s Land, Thomas Savage’s household.

One can only speculate about the reason for dividing the return from the Company’s Land into two lists. It may be that 28-46 were either servants or employees of the Company, while 51-71 were renting or squatting on its land. For the estimated 75 men who came in 1620, a number of buildings must have been constructed; in 1625 the persons we are concerned with here reported a total of 19 buildings, both houses and storehouses. The difference between them was perhaps purely a matter of terminology, and it was no doubt mutually advantageous to the Company and to the settlers to use what buildings were already there.

It seems more likely, however, that the census-taker obtained his information about Blower’s household at second hand from the Watkinses (newly arrived at the Company’s Land?), as the imprecision about Mr. Cann’s boy suggests, and wrote the names down for that reason directly after enumerating the Watkinses.

The structure of the Muster defies analysis. The Secretary’s Land comes first, followed by the Company’s Land, then Thomas Savage’s muster. Beyond that no order of geography or rank is discernible; the enumeration jumps back and forth, suggesting that the muster-taker may have stayed in place, probably at the fort on the Secretary’s Land, and questioned the settlers as they showed up there. This supposition is reinforced by the virtual certainty that several persons were missed in the counting.

The overwhelming majority of the population in both 1624 and 1625 lived, as was natural, either on or near the Company’s and the Secretary’s land, while the neighborhood of Lady Dale’s plantation counted no more than probably 8 in 1624 and even fewer in 1625, when Cugley and Andrews appear to have joined Gaskoyne in a new settlement on Yeardley’s land. John Blower, with four in the Census and three or four a year later, was on his own land near Lady Dale’s, as was Capt. Graves, and Thomas Savage was on his. The rest of the Eastern Shore still remained to be claimed and settled by Europeans.
CONCLUSION

There is little evidence to suggest that numbers of persons fled to the Shore for safety after the Massacre of 1622 and returned when the danger appeared past. It has been demonstrated that a principal cause of the decrease in population from 76 to 51 (reported) was rather the impending collapse of the Virginia Company, which dried up the supply of immigrants (few are of record for 1624 in the Muster) and caused the Company to transfer its servants from the Shore. Only a handful of free men can be shown to have left voluntarily during the year.

As a final note, it must be reported that research for this paper revealed that George Hack in 1653 received 400 acres of land for the transportation of eight persons, among them John Parsons, Will. Benge, Thomas Crumpe (sic), John Evans, and Tho. Hickhocke (CP 285). More than a slight suspicion of fraud is raised.

THE CENSUS AND THE MUSTER OF THE EASTERN SHORE, 1623/4 AND 1624/5 (with dates of immigration where known)

1. Capt. William Epps
2. Mrs. Epps
3. Petter Epps
4. William
5. Edmond Cloak
6. William Bibby
7. Thomas Cornish
8. John Fisher
9. William Dry
10. Henry Wilson
11. Petter Porter
12. Christo. Cartter
13. John Sumfill
14. Nicholas Graunger
15. James vocat[us] Piper
16. Edward
17. John
18. Thomas
19. George

1. Capt. William Epes, —
2. Margrett Epes, 1621
12. William Munnes (Muimes), 1619
4. William Burditt, 1615
45. William Bibbie, 1620 or 1621
5. Thomas Cornish, 1620
13. Henry Wilson, 1619
6. Peeter Porter, 1621
15. ?Nicholas Sumerfeld, 1619
11. Nicholas Granger, 1618
14. ?James Blackborne, 1619
8. Edward Rogers, 1623
7. John Baker, 1623
9. Thomas Warden, 1623
20. Charles Farmer
21. James Knott
22. John Ascomb
23. Robert Fennell
24. Philip
25. Daniel Cogley
26. William Andrews
27. Thomas Graves
28. John Wilcocks
29. Thomas Crampe
30. William Coomes
31. John Parsons
32. John Coomes
33. James Chambers
34. Robert Ball
35. Goodwife Ball
36. Thomas Hall
37. Ismale Hills
38. John Tyers
39. Walter Scott
40. Goodwife Scott
41. Robert Edmonds
42. Thomas Hichcocke
43. John Evans
44. Henry Wattkins
45. Peregree Wattkins
46. Daniell Wattkins
47. John Blower
48. Gody (goodwife) Blower
49. John
50. A boy of Mr. Cans
51. John How
52. John Butterfield
53. William Davies
54. Petter Longman
55. John Wilkins
56. Goodwife Wilkins
57. Thomas Powell
58. Gody (goodwife) Powell

3. Nicholas Raynberd, 1624
29. Charles Harman, 1622
32. James Knott, 1617
30. John Askume, 1624 (?)
31. Robert Fennell, 1624 (?)
37. Thomas Gaskoyne, 1619
39. Danniell Cugler, 1620
38. William Andrews (Andros, APP), 1617
39. Capt. Thomas Graves, 1607
16. Capt. John Willcocks, 1620
17. Henrie Charlton, 1623
44. Robert Ball, 1619
23. Walter Scott, 1618
24. Apphia Scott, 1618
25. Percis Scott, born in Virginia
50. Perregrin Watkins, 1621
40. John Blore, 1610
41. Francis Blore, 1620
42. John Parramore, 1622
43. John Wilkines, —
47. John Home, 1621
51. William Davis, 1618
48. John Wilkines, 1618
49. Briggett Wilkines, 1621
26. Thomas Powell, 1618
59. Thomas Parke 46. Thomas Sparkes, 1616
60. William Smith 27. William Smith, 1618
62. Nicholas Hoskins 33. Nicholas Hodgskines, 1616
63. and his child 34. Temperance Hodgskines, 1620
64. William Williams 35. Margrett Hodskines, born in Virginia
65. Mrs. Williams
66. John Throgmorton
67. Benjamin Knight 10. Benjamin Knight, 1620
68. Chad Gunston
69. Abram Analin
70. Thomas Blacklocke
71. John Barnett
72. Thomas Savadge 18. Thomas Savage, 1607
74. Salomon Greene 36. Solloman Greene, 1618
75. John Wasborne 20. John Washborne, 1620
76. William Quills 21. Thomas Belson, age 12, —

Note: That the two settlers, Graves and Savage, reported to have arrived in 1607 actually came in 1608, New Style.
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JOSEPH PRIESTLEY ON GOVERNMENT, RELIGION, AND DIFFERENT KINDS OF AIR

by Gordon Fisher

Departments of Mathematics, and Philosophy and Religion

Joseph Priestley was not one of the founding fathers of America. He was, however, a man of ideas whose name was a household word in the time of the American Revolution, both in England and America. One of his biographers quotes this evaluation of Priestley:

If . . . we choose one man as a type of the intellectual energy of the eighteenth century we could hardly find a better than Joseph Priestley, though his was not the greatest mind of the century. His versatility, eagerness, activity and humanity; the immense range of his curiosity in all things, physical, moral or social; his place in science, in theology, in philosophy and in politics; his peculiar relation to the Revolution, and the pathetic story of his unmerited sufferings, may make him the hero of the eighteenth century.¹

The Revolution mentioned here is the French, not the American. Nevertheless, Priestley also had a peculiar relation to the American Revolution. Writing from Monticello in 1807, while he was President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson said that he “revered the character of no man living more than” Priestley’s.² Priestley migrated to the United States from his native England in 1794, when he was 61, and he spent the last ten years of his life in Northumberland, Pennsylvania. Writing to Priestley in 1801, after Priestly had been very ill, Jefferson said to him, “Yours is one of the few lives precious to mankind, and for the continuance of which every thinking man is solicitous. Bigots may be an exception.”³

Priestley met Benjamin Franklin in London in 1766, in connection with their work in electricity. They became close friends. The

following, from Priestley’s Memoirs, will give an idea of their relationship. The year is 1775, and Priestley says:

My winter’s residence in London was the means of improving my acquaintance with Dr. Franklin. I was seldom many days without seeing him, and being members of the same club, we constantly returned together. The difference with America breaking out at this time, our conversation was chiefly of a political nature, and I can bear witness that he was so far from promoting, as was generally supposed, that he took every method in his power to prevent a rupture between the two countries . . . That the issue would be favourable to America, he never doubted. The English, he used to say, may take all our great towns, but that will not give them possession of the country . . . .

And Priestley continues about Franklin:

It is much to be lamented that a man of Dr. Franklin’s general good character and great influence should have been an unbeliever in Christianity, and also have done so much as he did to make others unbelievers. To me, however, he acknowledged that he had not given so much attention as he ought to have done to the evidences of Christianity, and desired me to recommend to him a few treatises on the subject . . . . Accordingly, I recommended to him Hartley’s evidences of Christianity in his Observations on Man,” and what I had then written on the subject in my Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion”; but the American war breaking out soon after, I do not believe that he ever found himself sufficiently at leisure for the discussion . . . .

Not all our revolutionary leaders were complimentary to Dr. Priestley. After Priestley came to this country, he was attacked as a radical by the abusive newspaperman William Cobbett, otherwise known as Porcupine. By 1798, Timothy Pickering, Secretary of State to John Adams, had some idea of deporting Priestley under the Alien and Sedition Acts. President Adams found this unacceptable, and wrote in 1799 to Pickering. “I do not think it wise to execute the alien law against poor Priestley at present. He is weak as water, as unstable as Reuben, or the wind. His influence is not an atom in the world.”

Again, John Quincy Adams, in a letter of 1800, remarked that “Dr. Priestley loves the French revolution,” but that he, Adams, is “sick of such reasoners as Dr. Priestley.” “The Doctor,” says Adams, “tells us about his speculative turn, and that he speculates upon everything. But if he had limited the subjects of his speculations, he might have been more successful in them. If he had

---

reasoned much less through his life, he would have reasoned better."\(^6\)

This is the shape of Priestley's peculiar relation to the American Revolution. As to his relation to the French Revolution, he appears to have been one of the three chief people Edmund Burke was writing against in the work of 1790 whose complete title is *Reflections on the Revolution in France, and on the Proceedings in certain Societies in London relative to that Event*. Priestley was associated with such societies. And in 1791 a mob burned down his house in Birmingham, along with many valuable manuscripts, letters, books, and scientific instruments, partly because of his sympathy for the French Revolution and because the organizers of the mob erroneously thought he was recommending something similarly violent for England. It was after this that Priestley moved to the United States.\(^7\)

** * * *

Today, Priestley is chiefly remembered as a scientist. Ask any chemist who Joseph Priestley was, and he will probably answer that he was the discoverer of oxygen. Strictly speaking, Priestley discovered not oxygen, but what he called "dephlogisticated air." This became oxygen when Lavoisier shortly afterward developed a new theory of combustion. All together, Priestley discovered some ten new "airs," as he called them, and he made numerous other scientific discoveries. For example, he discovered how to impregnate water with carbon dioxide or "fixed air," and he thus became the father of the soda-water industry, and the grandfather of Coca-Cola.

Priestley's place in science can be estimated by comparing it with those of Jefferson and Franklin. Jefferson was an ardent amateur and patron of science. His original discoveries, however, were slight. Franklin was equally an ardent amateur and patron of science, but he also made some significant scientific discoveries, notably in electricity. He was a bold and continual speculator, although not an infallible one, and a clever experimenter when he had time for it. By the time Priestley met him in 1766, Franklin had an international reputation as a scientist. It seems fair to say that if Franklin had died a few years later, at about sixty say, he

---


would be remembered today as a scientist with an unusual literary talent and interest in civic affairs, or perhaps the other way around. However, it also seems fair to say that Franklin does not belong to the first rank of scientific discoverers. There is little doubt, on the other hand, that Priestley does belong to this rank. He was one of the principal contributors to the transformation of chemistry which began in the later eighteenth century.

We may taste the flavor of the science of the time in this extract from a letter of Priestley to Benjamin Franklin in 1771, later incorporated in Priestley’s paper entitled “Observations on Different Kinds of Air,” read before the Royal Society in 1772. Priestley says to Franklin:

One might have imagined that since common air is necessary to vegetable as well as to animal life, both plants and animals would affect it in the same manner; and I own I had that expectation when I first put a sprig of mint into a glass jar, standing inverted in a vessel of water; but when it had continued growing there for some months, I found that the air would neither extinguish a candle, nor was it at all inconvenient to a mouse which I put into it.  

Priestley was here working with what we call the oxygen-carbon dioxide cycle. In the course of his reply to this letter Franklin says:

I hope this will give some check to the rage of destroying trees that grow near houses, which has accompanied our late improvements in gardening, from an opinion of their being unwholesome. I am certain from long observation, that there is nothing unhealthy in the air of woods; for we Americans have everywhere our country habitations in the midst of woods, and no people on earth enjoy better health, or are more prolific.

* * *

It is, however, ironic that Priestley is chiefly remembered today as a scientist. He considered his scientific work an avocation. He was for some time employed in dissenting academies as a schoolteacher of ancient and modern languages, oratory, history, and what today might be called political science. But his true profession was that of a Christian minister and theologian. His works on theology alone, not counting his many other writings, run to some twenty-two volumes. It was here that he thought he was making his greatest contribution.

Priestley was raised as an Independent Calvinist, and this made him a dissenter. That is, he did not subscribe to the Articles of the Church of England. This was not a small matter in eighteenth-

---

8Rutt’s edition of Priestley’s Memoirs, op. cit., p. 148. Rutt interpolates letters, etc.
century England. It was enough, for example, to bar him from the Establishment, that is, from appointment as a civil or military official, and to keep him out of Oxford or Cambridge. The mob in Birmingham burned down Priestley's house not only because he sympathized with the French Revolution, but also because he was a dissenter.

In addition, Priestley was not orthodox among dissenters. He found difficulty quite early with the doctrine of original sin. He came to rest in a humanitarian view of the person of Jesus. He accepted the miracles and resurrection of Jesus, but not the divinity, at least not in any orthodox form. He was a leader of Unitarianism in England and later in the United States; the Unitarian religion was much influenced by his writings, although later Unitarians such as William Ellery Channing rejected Priestley's supposed materialism. 9

A recurrent theme in Priestley's writings is the desirability of separating religion from government, and complete toleration of different religious sects, and also of atheists and heathens. In his Essay on the First Principles of Government, and on the Nature of Political, Civil, and Religious Liberty, written in 1771, he says "The most important question concerning the extent of civil government is, whether the civil magistrate ought to extend his authority to matters of religion." The title of this work sounds quite general, and Jeremy Bentham once said that his famous slogan "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" occurred to him while he was reading it. 10 But in fact, nearly two-thirds of it is devoted to the relations of church and state, and the general principles appear to be there in order to support particular arguments for disestablishment. 11

Again, in Priestley's Letters to Mr. Burke, written in answer to Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France, nine of the fourteen letters plead for separation of church and state, and criticize Burke's views on this question. This is the substance of Priestley's disagreement with Burke. 12 And Priestley wrote much more on this subject.

Priestley's dedication to the separation of church and state may

9See Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, (ed.) Hastings, XII, article "Unitarianism." For more on Priestley's religion, see A Life of Joseph Priestley, Anne Holt, Oxford, 1931.
10See David Baumgardt, Bentham and the Ethics of Today, N. Y., 1966, p. 36, note.
11Theological Works, Vol. XXII.
12Ibid., Vol. XII.
not seem stirring to Americans who have grown accustomed to it since their republic was founded. But it was of vital interest to Americans at the time of our revolution. In his book *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1787 that

The first settlers in this country were emigrants from England, of the English church, just at a point of time when it was flushed with complete victory over the religious of all other persuasions. Possessed, as they became, of the powers of making, administering, and executing the laws, they shewed equal intolerance in this country with the Presbyterian brethren, who had emigrated to the northern government. The poor Quakers were flying from persecution in England. They cast their eyes on these new countries as asylums of civil and religious freedom; but they found them free only for the reigning sect . . . . The Anglicans retained full possession of the country about a century. Other opinions began then to creep in, and the great care of the government to support their own church, having begotten an equal degree of indolence in its clergy, two-thirds of the people had become dissenters at the commencement of the present revolution.¹³

Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams in 1813 that he had read Priestley’s *Corruptions of Christianity, and Early Opinions of Jesus*, over and over again,” and, he said, “I rest on them, and on Middleton’s writings . . . as the basis of my own faith.” In the general conclusion to the former work, Priestley says

After relating . . . the rise, progress, and present state, of what I deem to be Corruption of Christianity, and especially in the established systems of it, all of which I consider as antichristian, being both exceedingly corrupt in their principles, and supported by a power totally foreign to that of the kingdom of Christ; I cannot help expressing my earnest wishes, that something may be done by those who have influence, to remove these evils, or at least to palliate them.¹⁴

The “Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom” was written by Jefferson in 1777 and passed by the State of Virginia 1786. We may conclude, I think, that in his views and acts on religious freedom, Jefferson owes something to Priestley.

Robert Lisle

Department of Foreign Languages

In The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution, Bernard Bailyn observed:

Most conspicuous in the writing of the Revolutionary period was the heritage of Classical antiquity. Knowledge of Classical authors was universal among colonists with any degree of education.

But then, as the focus of his book was directed elsewhere, he added this highly subjective judgment:

The Classics of the ancient world . . . contributed a vivid vocabulary but not the logic or grammar of thought, a universally respected personification but not the source of political and social beliefs. They heightened the colonists' sensitivity to ideas and attitudes otherwise derived.

Any attempt to justify or refute that judgment inevitably assumes the ability to read the minds of colonial Americans and to record the psychological patterns of association in which an individual's ideas interacted in his head. Rather than make so futile an attempt, therefore, I shall simply present some of the evidence, and hope that the reader will judge for himself.

The leaders of the American Revolution — some of them, at least — looked upon themselves as modern Roman heroes. On July 26, 1776, Charles Lee wrote to Patrick Henry: “I us’d to regret not being thrown into the world in the glamorous third or fourth centuries of the Romans; but now I am thoroughly reconcil’d to my lot.”

The images of the old Roman heroes were almost living presences in the political writings of eighteenth-century America. In The Farmer's and Monitor's Letters to the Inhabitants

---

3Meyer Reinhold (ed.), The Classick Pages: Classical Reading of Eighteenth-Century Americans (University Park, Pa.: American Philological Association, 1975), p. 20. Six years later Lee wrote to Robert Morris, “It is natural to a young person whose chief companions are the Greek and Roman Historians and Orators to be dazzled with the splendid picture” (ibid., p. 40).
of the British Colonies, published in Williamsburg in 1769, Arthur
and Richard Henry Lee wrote:  

From the birth of Roman liberty . . . to its total extinction by the death of
Brutus . . . how glorious was the empire which freedom established — how
firm, how happy! What an illustrious train of heroes did this free spirit
produce: the Fabii, the Fabricii, Decii, Metelli, Scipiones, Aemelii, and
others without number . . . Such was the virtue, order and stability which
liberty produced, such vital energy did it infuse through the whole body of
the state, . . . that vigor . . . animated by a sense of Freedom.

Samuel Adams wrote of establishing a “Christian Sparta” in Bos-
ton. His diatribes against Governor Bernard and Thomas Hutchin-
son were full of references to Roman patriots and Roman tyrants,
and his audiences at the Boston town-meetings were “in an ecstasy
to find the Old Roman Patriots still surviving” in the figures of
Adams and his fellow-speakers.  

Edmund Pendleton described
his fellow-delegates to the Virginia Convention of 1776 as “treading
upon the Republican ground of Greece and Rome.” In an
article entitled “John Adams, Togatus,” Richard Gummere de-
clared: “One who has read carefully in colonial literature and
oratory will come to the conclusion that there was seldom an epoch
when the leading men were so imbued with the Classical tradi-
ton.”

Alexander Hamilton thought his contemporaries foolish for try-
ing to emulate the ancient Romans; but even he admitted, “The
Roman republic attained to the utmost height of human great-
ness.” Washington’s manifesto of August 1777, written as an
answer to Burgoyne, included the words, “The associated armies in
America act from the noblest motives, liberty. The same princi-
ules actuated the arms of Rome in the days of her glory; and the
same object was the reward of Roman valour.” Virtus (“valor
attested by deeds of valor”) is personified as the central figure on
the seal of Virginia, designed by George Mason; underneath the
prostrate figure of Tyranny appear the well-known words Sic

4Howard Mumford Jones, O Strange New World (New York: Viking Press, 1964),
p. 254.
5Richard M. Gummere, The American Colonial Mind and the Classical Tradi-
asserted, “It is fair to say that Plutarch was to the rebellion what Cicero was to the
Declaration, and Aristotle and Polybius to the Constitution” (p. 14).
7Philological Quarterly, XIII (April 1934), 203.
8Gummere, Classical Tradition, p. 185.
9Ibid., p. 18.
Semper Tyrannis. The American colonials, as they sought to establish a new nation, looked upon ancient Rome not simply as a model of greatness but as the source of those attitudes and ideals that make greatness possible — in any age. William Smith in A General Idea of the College of Mirania (1753) expressed the typical eighteenth-century educator’s view of the value of the Classics in shaping moral character: “The History of Greece and Rome . . . may be justly called the History of Heroism, Virtue, and Patriotism . . . . It is History that, by presenting those bright Patterns to the eyes of Youth, awakes Emulation and calls them forth steady Patriots to fill the Offices of State.”

The Classics formed the backbone of education beyond the elementary grades. The entrance requirements for admission to King’s College (now Columbia University) read as follows (1755):

None shall be admitted . . . but such as can read the first three of Tully’s [Cicero’s] Select Orations and the three first books of Virgil’s Aeneid [in Latin] and [translate] the ten first chapters of St. John’s Gospel in Greek into Latin . . . so as to make true grammatical Latin.

The curriculum at Princeton, as recorded in the words of President John Witherspoon in 1770, was rooted in Classical thought and literature.

First Year: Latin, Greek, Classical antiquities, rhetoric.
Second Year: One ancient language, geography, philosophy, mathematics.
Third Year: Language, mathematics, natural and moral philosophy.
Fourth Year: The higher Classics, mathematics, natural and moral philosophy, history, literary criticism, and French if desired [the one elective].

For the bachelor’s degree at any college a thesis was required: “an acid test of technical reasoning, in Latin.” This academic training

---

10Ibid., p. 14. The reverse of the seal bears an inscription quoted from Vergil (Eclogues, I,6).
11Reinhold, pp. 16 f.
12Ibid., p. 6. The tutor of Jacky Custis (Washington’s stepson), who was preparing the boy (then 14 years old) for admission to King’s College, recommended the following reading list: Terence, Horace, Cicero, Livy, Martial, Grotius, the Greek Testament, a key to Homer, grammars, Blackwell’s Sacred Classics, Hooke’s Roman History, and Kennet’s Roman Antiquities (Gummere, Classical Tradition, p. 59). This was not a special case of child-abuse: James Logan, chief justice and acting governor of Pennsylvania (1736-38), expected his son William to have read, by the time he was 16, Vergil’s Aeneid, Eclogues, and Georgics; Cicero’s De officiis, Thomas a Kempis, the Consolatio of Boethius, some Tacitus, Seneca, Juvenal, Persius, and the Greek Testament (ibid., p. 122).
13Gummere, Classical Tradition, p. 64.
14Ibid., p. 70.
provided the intellectual framework for the thoughts and ideas of America’s early leaders, and made them think of revolution as respectable. One bachelor’s thesis as early as 1699 dealt with the question *An Salus Populi Sit Suprema Lex?* ("Is the Highest Law the Welfare of the People?")

, and concluded with an affirmative answer—laying the groundwork for the Declaration of Independence. A thesis in 1742 argued that citizens are under no moral obligation to obey laws that are “contrary to Nature.” Samuel Adams wrote his Harvard master’s thesis (in Latin, of course) on the overthrow of tyrants.

Not all the political activists in the cause of American freedom had the full benefits of a college education. But at least three who did not — Edmund Pendleton, George Wythe, and Patrick Henry — steeped themselves in Classical literature by wide reading on their own, in the original Greek and Latin. "Henry, studying at home with his father and his clergyman uncle, read Livy and Vergil in the original ... Grotius, Bacon, Horace, Juvenal, Homer, Ovid, and translations of Demosthenes as a model for oratory." Jefferson advised a young friend to study Greek history by "reading everything in the original and not in translations."

Thus quite naturally, the literature of protest that preceded the outbreak of the Revolution is loaded with references to Greek and Roman history. Classical literature provided the colonial editors and pamphleteers both with a ready-made vocabulary of invective and with a standard scale for measuring the degrees of tyranny they felt exposed to. A contemporary witness recorded the reactions of the editor of the *South Carolina Gazette* when he learned of a new British tax: "Mr. T. was so breathless he ran out of English and imported a font type in the Greek alphabet and used it liberally, with thoughtful translations, so that anyone could know what had happened to the tyrants of Syracuse and Sparta."

A detailed examination of newspapers and pamphlets published in America during the Revolutionary period revealed quotations

---

15Ibid., pp. 70 f.  
16Ibid., p. 71.  
17Ibid., p. 116.  
18Only 24 of the 55 original members of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 are attested as college graduates. Of these 24, 9 were Princeton alumni. See The Classical Journal, XXX (1934-35), 20.  
19Gummer, Classical Tradition, p. 62. Wythe was taught Greek "by his mother in the back woods" (H. M. Jones, p. 250).  
20Reinhold, p. 18.  
21Gummere, Classical Tradition, p. 4.
from the following Classical authors:

**Greek**
- Homer
- Sophocles
- Euripides
- Herodotus
- Thucydides
- Plato
- Xenophon
- Aristotle
- Polybius
- Strabo
- Lucian
- Dio Cassius
- Plutarch
- Epictetus

**Roman**
- Cato
- Lucretius
- Caesar
- Cicero
- Vergil
- Horace
- Ovid
- Nepos
- Sallust
- Livy
- Seneca
- Lucan
- Petronius
- Juvenal
- Tacitus
- Pliny
- Suetonius
- Curtius
- Marcus Aurelius
- Ulpian
- Gaius
- Justinian

One weekly paper, *The Independent Reflector* (published in New York), “shows about 100 Latin or Greek tags, quotations, names, or allusions scattered among 345 pages of text” (the total issues for the period 1752-53).\(^2^3\) John Dickinson, “the Penman of the Revolution” — noted for “his Attic eloquence and Roman spirit” — ended each of the twelve essays in his *Letters of a Farmer in Pennsylvania* (a series begun in 1767) with a Classical quotation in Latin; the *Letters*, in addition, contain citations of Sophocles, Thucydides, Cicero, Vergil, Livy, and Tacitus, along with other lesser known Classical authors.\(^2^4\) One biographer of Samuel Adams asserted that Adams’ audiences and the circle of Thomas Hutchinson “knew the literature of Rome far better than they did that of England.”\(^2^5\)

Ben Franklin was sixteen when he began his publishing career with the *Dogwood Papers*, but even at that early age he was arguing for freedom of speech by referring to Roman heroes from the pages of Livy and Roman oppressors from the *Annals* of Tacitus (along with references to the reigns of Titus, Nerva, and Marcus Aurelius). Despite his foreshortened formal education, he quoted in those youthful writings a sentence in Latin from Pliny’s


\(^{23}\) H. M. Jones, p. 245.

\(^{24}\) Gummere, *Classical Tradition*, pp. 109 f. The *Letters* were “hailed as a masterpiece throughout the Colonies . . . A Boston town-meeting sent Dickinson a vote of thanks for his ‘Spartan, Roman, British Virtue, and Christian spirit joined’” (ibid., p. 108).

\(^{25}\) Ibid., p. 119.
Panegyric (68.6), and another from Tacitus’ Histories (I.1).\textsuperscript{26}

The writings of Tom Paine refer repeatedly to the Greeks and the Romans, including Solon, Herodotus, Diodorus, and Diogenes Laertius.\textsuperscript{27} In The American Crisis, No. 5 (1778), Paine wrote: “The wisdom, civil governments, and sense of honour of the states of Greece and Rome are frequently held up as objects of excellence and imitation. Mankind have lived to very little purpose, if, at this period of the world, they must go back two or three thousand years for lessons and examples.” Yet he was also willing to admit, “Almost all the scientific learning that now exists came from the Greeks.”\textsuperscript{28} He saw “more to admire and less to condemn in that great people [of ancient Athens] than in anything which history records,” and declared, “What Athens was in miniature, America will be in magnitude.”\textsuperscript{29}

Thomas Jefferson, perhaps more than any other of the shapers of the early American republic, was himself formed and molded by the Classics. In his early years he copied into his commonplace book passages from Homer, Herodotus, Euripides, Anacreon, Quintus of Smyrna, Cicero, Catullus, Vergil, Horace, Livy, Ovid, Statius, Manilius, and Seneca.\textsuperscript{30} In the year 1800 he wrote to Joseph Priestley, “To read the Latin and Greek authors in their original is a sublime luxury . . . . I thank on my knees him who directed my early education for having put into my possession this rich source of delight, and I would not exchange it for anything which I could then have enjoyed, and have not acquired.”\textsuperscript{31} About eight years later he confessed, “I read one or two newspapers a week, but with reluctance give up even that time from Tacitus and Horace, and so much other agreeable reading.”\textsuperscript{32} Yet Jefferson valued the Classics for much more than merely agreeable reading; in his Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge (1779), for example, he stressed their importance in teaching the ideals of

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., p. 126. Franklin must have had more than a rudimentary knowledge of Latin, for he was able to tutor his son in that language. He exchanged letters in Latin with Paulus Frisi of Milan (ibid., p. 129). In a letter to Jared Eliot he casually introduced quotations from Xenophon, Vergil, and Horace (p. 130). The form and style of his writing were influenced chiefly by Xenophon’s Memorabilia; his moral philosophy by Plato and Plutarch (p. 127).
\textsuperscript{28}Ibid., p. 92.
\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., p. 95.
\textsuperscript{30}Reinhold, p. 21, n. 15.
\textsuperscript{31}Ibid., p. 130.
\textsuperscript{32}Ibid., p. 100.
liberty. Tacitus, whose influence in strengthening the American dedication to liberty was at least as great as that of John Locke, was termed by Jefferson "the first writer in the world without exception." John Adams called the Classics "indispensable." In his *Dissertation on the Canon and the Feudal Law* (1765), he wrote: "Let us study the Law of Nature; search into the spirit of the British constitution; read the histories of the ancient sages; contemplate the great examples of Greece and Rome." The personal library of John Adams contained the complete works of Cicero, Livy, and Tacitus in Latin; and Plato, Aristotle, Demosthenes, and Plutarch in Greek; alongside these were translations of Homer, Thucydides, Epictetus, Lucretius, Horace, Sallust, and Justinian. When his son was about twenty, Adams wrote him advice concerning his political education:

There is no History, perhaps, better adapted for this useful Purpose than that of Thucydides, an Author of whom I hope you will make yourself perfect Master, in . . . Greek, the most perfect of all human Languages . . . . You will find it full of Instruction to the Orator, the Statesman, the General, as well as to the Historian and the Philosopher.

In a letter of 1805 Adams testified to the relevance of Rome for the men of his time:

Almost fifty years ago I read Middleton's *Life of Cicero* with great pleasure and some advantage . . . . Within a month past I have read Middleton's *Life* of him again, and with more pleasure because with more understanding than before. I seem to read the history of all ages and nations in every page, and especially the history of our own country for forty years past. Change the name and every anecdote will be applicable to us.

The republican constitution of the state of Massachusetts, which John Adams drafted practically by himself in October 1779, was based on his study of Greek and Roman political institutions.

---

33*Ibid.*, p. 82
34*Mulrett (n. 22, supra), p. 102. References to libertas occur repeatedly in the works of Tacitus: *Agricola*, 3; *Histories*, I.15, IV.8, 17, 32, 55, 64; *Annals*, I.4, 8, 74, 77, 81, II.10, 45, 46, III.75, XI.17, XIII.26, 50, XIV.39.
39Reinhold, pp. 84 f.
Adams wrote to Lafayette in 1782: “I am a Republican on principle; all the best things in civil life have originated under such systems. Athens and Rome have done more honour to our species than all the rest of it.” Between October 1786 and January 1787, while he was serving as U. S. Ambassador to Great Britain, Adams wrote his Defence of the Constitutions of the United States of America, a 300-page historical survey of political governments in Europe for the guidance of delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787. A large part of the material was drawn from the history of Greece and Rome. In this work Adams declared, “The history of Greece should be to our countrymen [like a room lined with mirrors] . . . , a place where, in whatever direction they turn their eyes, they see their own faces and figures multiplied without end.” Benjamin Rush said of Adams’ study, “This gift to his country has done us more service than if he had obtained alliances for us with all the nations of Europe.”

The political difficulties that arose from the Articles of Confederation, as D. G. Adair observed, forced the leaders of the young republic to undertake an intensive study of the governments of Greece and Rome. No models of republican government existed anywhere in the world of the eighteenth century, and the most useful precedents could be found only in Classical antiquity. In Adair’s words, the “frightening lessons from Classical history added to their own present difficulties under the Confederation . . . produced the total dimension of the crisis of 1787.”

At the Constitutional Convention of 1787, history — especially the history of the ancient republics — was the basic document. Madison described history as “the oracle of truth,” and added, “Where its responses are unequivocal they ought to be conclusive and sacred.” For the benefit of the Convention delegates, Madison “pointed out all the beauties and defects of the ancient republics” and offered a detailed analysis of the confederacy of ancient Lycia, citing Polybius and Strabo.

Delegate James Wilson (a

42Reinhold, pp. 82 f.
43Ibid., pp. 397 f.
44Ibid., 398.
45Reinterpretation of the American Constitution, p. 405.
46Ibid.
47Adair, p. 400. Hamilton viewed history as “the least fallible guide of human opinions.” (ibid.).
former Latin instructor at the College of Philadelphia) “traced the causes and effects of every revolution from the earliest stages of the Greek commonwealths down to the present time.”49 At the Convention James Monroe quoted Polybius and, referring to the Greek amphictyonies, declared, “One could not find a political system and principle so favorable to equality and freedom of speech as that of the Achaean League.”50 The Records of the Federal Convention include references to all the following:51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slavery in Greece and Rome</th>
<th>The Decemvirs of Rome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The kings of Sparta</td>
<td>Roman triumvirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The “Thirty Tyrants” of Athens</td>
<td>Roman consuls and proconsuls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricians and plebeians in Rome</td>
<td>Roman emperors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Roman tribunate</td>
<td>Roman dictators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mentioned in the discussions of the Convention were the works of Aristotle, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Plutarch, Dio Cassius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Cicero, Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus.52

The political theory on which the U. S. Constitution is based derives from Aristotle’s Politics and from Polybius’ misinterpretation of the Roman government in Book VI of his Histories. Montesquieu’s doctrine of separation of powers is drawn from Polybius.53 Even the system of checks and balances — “far from being the outgrowth of a mechanical, Newtonian world-view —... can be traced back... to Polybius.”54 Copies of Polybius’ Histories were shipped to Madison at the Constitutional Convention by Jefferson in Paris.55 John Adams had quoted large parts of Polybius’ Book VI in his Defence of the Constitutions of the U. S.56 Though he recognized the operation of checks and balances in the British constitution, Adams resorted to ancient history to validate the principle; he wrote, “We shall learn to prize the checks and balances of a free government, and even those of modern aristoc-

48Gummere, p. 181.
49Ibid., p. 182. The Achaean League was recommended as a model in a letter Madison wrote to Jefferson in 1787 (Ibid.). Monroe quoted Polybius again at the Virginia Ratification Convention of 1788 (Reinhold, p. 122).
51Gummere, Classical Tradition, p. 178.
52Cicero too helped to establish the idea through his theory that the best form of government is a mixture of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy (De re publica II.41; De legibus III.28).
54Gummere, Classical Tradition, p. 174.
55Reinhold, p. 122.
racies, if we recollect the miseries of Greece, which arose from its ignorance of them."^57

Because America lacked a hereditary aristocracy, and rejected the concept of a hereditary monarchy, the British government was a less useful model than the old Roman republic. The dualism of "the Senate and the Roman People" was closer to the American experience than the hierarchy of "King, Lords, and Commons." From Rome came the principle of a democratic bicameral legislature (the comitia centuriata and the comitia tributa^58), a popularly elected chief of state with a fixed tenure (a feature also of the Athenian constitution), the veto power over legislation (tribunicia potestas), and the legal process of impeachment (analogous to the Athenian practice of subjecting officials to a euthyna — a public audit — when their terms expired).

Contemporary British society figured in American political discussions as a negative model, a horrible example of the political and social effects of moral corruption. John Adams compared England with "the Roman republic . . . when Jugurtha . . . pronounced it a venal city ripe for destruction, if it can only find a purchaser."^59 The moral fervor in American political propaganda is to be explained in part, of course, as the influence of religion in colonial life; but the connection between morality and political stability was a theme drawn directly from Classical sources. The Romans served not merely as a model of republican government but also as the embodiment of a moral ideal. This component of the force exerted by Rome on the American mind is clearly illustrated by Andrew Burnaby's characterization of George Wythe as a man "who . . . had . . . such respect for the divine laws, such philanthropy for mankind, such simplicity of manners, and such inflexible rectitude and integrity of principle as would have dignified a Roman senator, even in the most virtuous times of the republic."^60

The consistently moral thrust of political discussions in Classical literature predisposed eighteenth-century Americans to believe that liberty was naturally and inevitably linked with virtue. The

^57Ibid., p. 85.

^58Hamilton, in the Federalist, No. 34, declared that Rome was at its height when the comitia centuriata and the comitia tributa worked in proper balance (Gum- mere, Classical Tradition, p. 189). The Roman senate was not a legislative body; its decrees were resolutions, not laws.

^59Bailyn, in Reinterpretation of the American Revolution, p. 230. Bailyn declared (p. 231) that the theme of moral corruption in British politics provided the American cause with a new dimension: "it transformed [colonial declarations] from constitutional arguments to expressions of a world regenerative creed."

^60H. M. Jones, p. 250. These words were written in the 1790's.
Classical authors most frequently mentioned in colonial writings were Cicero and Tacitus. Cicero was cited not only for his theories of government but for his public defiance of the internal enemies of the Roman republic. The American colonists, in their verbal assaults against British degeneracy (their view), identified themselves with the German frontier tribes whose pristine manliness and uncorrupted mores Tacitus contrasted with Roman decadence. The concept of “the common good” (utilitas publica) is a recurrent refrain in Tacitus’ writings. The main purpose of his Histories and Annals seems to be the terrifying exposure of the egomaniacal behavior of the Roman emperors, and the viciousness of those who wielded power under them. John Adams commented in a letter to Jefferson (1816), “The Morality of Tacitus is the Morality of Patriotism.”

Thus America’s struggle for independence was readily endowed with a high moral purpose. As early as 1765, John Adams had written:

The liberties of mankind and the glory of human nature is in their keeping . . . America was designed by Providence for the theatre on which man was to make his true figure, on which science, virtue, liberty, happiness, and glory were to exist in peace.

The significance of that utterance extends beyond its moral import; it implies an ideal image of Man. This view of man, in his relationship to Nature and in his relationship to the State, was of much more fundamental and far-reaching importance to American political thought than was the mechanics of Roman government. Most human societies have developed some notion of freedom and justice, but it was the Greeks and the Romans who elevated these concepts to the status of “inalienable rights” assigned to men as individuals by the Law of Nature. Gummere’s comment on “natural rights” is worth quoting.

---
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63 Reinhold, p. 99.
64 Bailyn, Ideological Origins, p. 20.
The Law of Nature, illustrated by Cicero, the Stoics, and the Roman legalists, was perhaps the most invoked doctrine of colonial times. At first, especially in New England, it was kept strictly in second place as a hand-maiden to seventeenth-century theology and scholastic philosophy, in the form of Divine Law. But with the increasing interest in Classical testimony, it was recognized as an equal partner of the Christian message. The Law of Nature became the chief slogan for local self-government, in the tracts of John Wise, in the writings and speeches of James Otis, and continued with increasing force in the appeals of Samuel Adams and the final statement of the Declaration of Independence.

The Natural Rights of the Colonists, a paper which appeared in 1772, cited both Cicero and John Locke. In his speech Pro Milone Cicero declared, “There is this law which has not been made by men but which is a part of their nature, a law which we have not been taught but which is instinctive in us.” In his treatise De re publica (III.33), he referred again to Natural Law.

We cannot be freed from its obligation by Senate or Popular Assembly, and we need not look outside ourselves for an authority to interpret it . . . . One eternal and unchangeable law, [it] will be valid for all nations and all times. God is the author of this law. Whoever disobeys it is a traitor to himself and a violator of his own human nature.

Man is able to know what this law dictates because he is endowed with reasoning ability. When he uses accurate reasoning (Right Reason) along the paths marked out by Nature, according to Cicero (De re pub. III.33), man arrives at True Law. In his De legibus (1.6.18), Cicero defined this law as “the highest Reason, founded in Nature, which prescribes what should be done and prohibits what should not be done.” This doctrine of Natural Law is the keystone of any free society, for it establishes as an inviolable principle the right and duty of every citizen to subject all the laws and acts of his government to the test of Right Reason, by the authority of that part of Nature (human nature) that resides in himself. Lacking recourse to this higher, universal authority, which is impervious to the terrors or temptations of any human power-broker, men would be forever at the mercy of “man’s tyranny over man.” The Roman legal scholar Ulpian rendered his verdict early in the third century: “All men are free by the Law of Nature.”

It was Cicero’s formulation of Natural Law on which Arthur Lee

---
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of Virginia based his argument for the principle of “the consent of the governed.” When the Reverend Thomas B. Chandler asserted that any right not expressly granted by law is not a legal right, Philip Livingston wrote, in *The Other Side of the Question* (1774): “In the name of America, I deny it . . . . [Legal rights] are . . . those rights which we are entitled to by the eternal laws of right reason.” Lucretius’ *De rerum natura* was also an important influence in support of Natural Law, and five lines from Sophocles’ *Antigone* on the Unwritten Laws of the gods are quoted by James Otis in *The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved* (1764). Alexander Hamilton wrote in 1775:

> The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or musty records. They are written, as with a sunbeam, in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of divinity itself, and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power.

The political and legal ramifications of the belief in Natural Law were less revolutionary in the eighteenth century than the full impact of that belief — gradually brought to bear in the first half of the nineteenth century — on developing ideas of human values and the dignity of the individual without regard to birth and economic circumstance. Attitudes of self-reliant individualism, engendered by the conditions of life in colonial America, took root in American soil during the one hundred fifty years antecedent to the Revolution, and were necessary preconditions for American independence and the establishment of a republican government. But when, in the political discussions that led up to the Revolution, these home-grown attitudes were expressed in terms of the universal principles derived from Graeco-Roman humanism, a spark was ignited in the moral and intellectual plasma of American life. The ideological shock-waves produced by the pre-revolutionary and post-revolutionary justifications of the American cause — justifications based upon Greek and Roman ideas of Man and Society, with all the generalizing and universalizing thrust of those ideas — exerted periodic pressure on contemporary notions of freedom and equality, forcing them to expand outward, and so gave sustained impetus to the further radicalization of American thought.

---
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Today we celebrate the life of a Virginian who shaped the birth of our nation in a major way. James Madison was justly called the “. . . master builder of the Constitution.” Soon after graduating from Princeton (theology and law — in two years) 205 years ago, he entered political life, becoming a member of the Continental Congress in 1780 at the “ripe” age of 29. His numerous contributions to The Federalist Papers and other writings display great concern about central powers of government versus powers retained by individual states; he knew the country was becoming quite large in land area and pondered the problem of maintaining and preserving liberty in a widely dispersed population unable to effectively communicate with each other. He was swept up in problems of freedom of trade and urged the use of trade embargos as a means of combatting constraints on international commerce placed upon us by the British and French. When inaugurated, he was the first president to be attired in all American-made clothing. Let me quote to you a few words from his first inaugural address:

“The present situation of the world is indeed without a parallel, and that of our own country full of difficulties. The pressure of these, too, is the more severely felt because they have fallen upon us at a moment when the national prosperity being at a height not before attained, the contrast resulting from the change has been rendered the more striking.”

Sounds contemporary, doesn’t it?
In Madison’s time, we were testing a new form of national government and debating the appropriate distribution of authority between federal, state, and local powers. Today the Constitution, in the wake of Watergate, shows its power and timelessness and the American people show their resolve to uphold it. We continue

—

to wrestle with the distribution of power, especially in environmental protection and land use decisions.

International commerce was and remains our economic lifeline. We can less afford major constraints today than we could in 1800. In Madison’s time, we invoked an embargo to protect ourselves and tightened our belts to break trade barriers imposed by foreign powers. Today we face a similar imperative due to the high international oil price and threat of new oil embargos. Do we possess the resolve to tighten our belts? Can we establish policies that will enable us to become sufficiently less dependent on imports that future embargos can do little harm to us? Madison, in answer to the British and French constraints on our trade, urged that we restrain imports. Refusing to import would “... be a solemn indication of the vigorous tone of national sentiment of the resolution of American people to sacrifice their luxuries and even many of their comforts to avenging the insults and injuries so wantonly inflicted on them.’ ” We ask that same question today about oil. The answer isn’t yet clear. Madison over-rated the willingness of the people to make sacrifices to support a policy short of war. Hopefully, we know better this time.

We could continue to discuss parallels between Madison’s time and our own, but the point is made — there are similarities. Each age, it seems, must readdress ageless questions, albeit cast in new forms. How can men and nations live in peace, yet attain personal and national aspirations? How can we maintain charity for others, yet not be taken advantage of?

While similarities abound between Madison’s time and our own, there are also very striking differences. Madison and his fellow men lived in an infinite world. Even our own nation was felt to be too large to handle. Our land area was less than half that of the present United States, even after we include the Louisiana purchase. Our 6,000,000 people numbered five per square mile. Madison said, “The larger the country, the less easy for its real opinion to be ascertained, and the less difficult to be counterfeited; ... the more extensive a country, the more insignificant is each individual in his own eyes. This may be unfavorable to liberty. Whatever facilitates a general intercourse of sentiments ... is favorable to liberty . . .”

---


Now we number 210,000,000 and almost 60 people per square mile. The population increases more in 10 months than in 10 years of Madison’s time. Madison was concerned about the dangers to liberty imposed by our size. Had the technologies of railroad and telegraph, followed by a stream of advances in transportation and communication, not occurred, Madison’s concerns might have proven valid. We today are much more concerned about the erosion of traditional liberty caused by crowding. We have encountered finitude. It is this encounter that I want to address today.

Our founding fathers inherited and sustained concepts born of Western European Christian thought and the industrial revolution. The concepts include dualism (nature viewed as designed to serve the pleasures of man); man apart from the rest of creation; and expansionism (problems are solved through increased production). Our “infinite west” and bountiful natural resources underscored the European tradition and the constant cornucopia of American technological inventiveness capped the case. Malthus, a contemporary of Madison, argued that exponential population growth in a finite system was ultimately impossible. The industrial revolution and the vast new lands of the western hemisphere seemed to discount his argument.

Thus came the “Cowboy economy”; the lusty lunge toward the infinite west; the seeming never-ending succession of successes of science. Exponential growth became accepted, even expected. To be sure there were exceptions. Thoreau had his Walden, Muir his mountain life. Emerson spied the fallacy of dualism in pointing out that nature never gives anything away; everything is sold at a price. It is only in the abstractions of idealism that choice comes without consequence.

Industrial smoke meant money for many folks, but soon it was realized that it also meant health problems for others. Samuel T. Coleridge, after a visit to Cologne in which he was impressed with its stenches, wrote this to the people of the city:

The river Rhine, it is well known,  
Doth wash your city of Cologne;  
But tell me, Nymphs! what power divine  
Shall henceforth wash the river Rhine?\textsuperscript{4}

The finite capacity of the earth’s environment to suffer man’s abuses dawned slowly on Western man because those abuses were absorbed or at least blunted by nature’s restorative forces. It was not until the wake of World War II that events transpired to seriously challenge the appropriateness of the Cowboy economy and technological society. The crescendo of successes of science during and immediately following the war seemed to reinforce the feelings of the invincible capacity of science to bail mankind out of his woes. Whatever our problem, the constant cornucopia of technology was there to provide an escape. It even reached the stage where it became implicit that what we could do with technology we should do. As the decade of the forties ended and we moved through the fifties and sixties, we began to see our idols topple. Nuclear weapons helped shorten a war, but forever put man in new jeopardy. The gross national product rose in our “disposable” society, but few people felt their quality of life was growing as fast as the GNP. Pollution encroached ever more closely on citizens, despoiling their surroundings and impacting their health. Serious challenges were raised about proposed new socially irrelevant technologies such as the supersonic transport airplane with its sonic booms (Boeing Company called it the “20th century sound”). Critics acclaimed it thusly: “The SST is a marvelous machine; it can carry you from Harlem to Watts in two hours . . . .” Max Born, the German physicist, pleaded for “ought” to reign over “can” in our decision process:

Intellect distinguishes between the possible and the impossible; reason distinguishes between the sensible and the senseless. Even the possible can be senseless.\(^8\)

Other events eroded society’s confidence in the exponential. World population growth accelerated, especially in those places that could least afford it. The “green revolution,” created by technological wizards, mostly resulted in more mouths, not more food, per mouth. Pollution became a planetary issue because its effects became planetary. A wave of social action erupted during the ’60’s and continues a decade later. Landmark litigation, legislation, and regulation has reshaped our economic system by insisting that non-market costs of doing business (such as pollution) are no longer allowed. As in Madison’s time, many issues revolve around the rights of states versus the federal government in pollution control.

Our population growth rate, as high as that of a third world population growth rate, as high as that of a third world

nation 20 years ago, has dropped to replacement level. We recognize more clearly each day the stark reality of the finiteness of our planet — so graphically portrayed in the Apollo 13 photographs — and the finiteness of our material resources — so traumatically brought to our attention by the most recent oil embargo.

The events of the past decade and those that lie immediately ahead may well comprise the most important and dramatic climax in our national history since the Revolution. We are in the midst of a confrontation with the anachronism of much of our basic approach to problem-solving. The West is not infinite. The exponential is to be avoided, not sought. We are facing the finitude of science to provide painless answers to problems of institutions to anticipate and manage our affairs. Why do all the world’s problems seem to be thrown at our generation? What do we do about it? Shultz’s Lucy, in the comic strip “Peanuts,” answered a similar query from Linus by saying, “Let’s stick the next generation.” In a way that’s what we’ve been doing for a long time. It’s time to start paying our way. There are several things we must do:

(1) Learn to anticipate technological problems and to take action in time to head them off gracefully. The dependence on imported oil began in the early sixties. The possibility of embargo and a price cartel was predicted years before it happened. Adlai Stevenson once remarked that “... man never seems to see the handwriting on the ‘wall’ until his back is up against it . . . .” Our response to the energy problem will require years, perhaps decades, of hard work to take effect. Had we started a decade ago, we’d not be in our present fix. As technology becomes more complex, the time required to develop and introduce new technologies increases. A new energy source, once “scientifically demonstrated,” can require a quarter century and mammoth capital investment before it becomes a significant factor in the nation’s supply.

(2) Recognize the planetary imperative for population equilibrium. We simply cannot continue to expand population and still hold out hope for a better life for mankind. Four of every five new babies are born in third world countries where each day people temper their dreams with the reality of an even dimmer future. To offer some food to offset their hunger today may comfort the giver but will probably only worsen the ultimate lot of the receiver. Any food aid programs should be contingent upon active fertility control programs. Population stabilization needs a century or more to be effected somewhat gracefully through social evolution. We no longer have that much time; each year’s delay will worsen matters for those that come after us.

(3) Reshape our society from a Cowboy economy (disposable
society) to Spaceship economy (durable society). We developed our high material standard of living over the past century by using high grade natural resources — minerals and energy supplies that required literally millions of years to accumulate. We are rapidly depleting this inheritance. More and more capital is required to produce commodities or sustain a quality of life as we shift to lower grade ore and as consumption exceeds the production rate of renewable resources (e.g., ocean fish). We must replace the inherited wealth of “natural resources” with the accumulated wealth of human ingenuity. Careful application of the cumulative wisdom of man can enable living standards to be maintained at vastly lower resource consumption rates. At present prices we can economically cut energy demand growth in half by 1985 at virtually no loss in standard of living. We must commit ourselves to resource stewardship, recognizing the fallacy of the infinite west. The higher energy price has at least one happy side effect - garbage is now getting to be worth something. “Urban ore” contains energy and potentially valuable materials. It has been described as “America’s only growing resource.”

(4) Cast aside dualism. We’ve learned that man is not apart from nature. Man is a part of nature — special, to be sure, but inextricably interwoven with the rest of creation. Man’s ultimate chance to reflect the height of the creative process at work in the Universe depends in large measure on his own actions. We can get out of the numbers race (“... how many people can we crowd on board...?”) and return to some sensible number that places us in long term harmony with the earth. If we don’t we’ll stunt our spiritual and mental growth and further despoil the loveliest heavenly body I know.

The challenges to our generation are wondrously great. We have the opportunity, in these years clustered around our Revolutionary Bicentennial, to initiate a new revolution. The new revolution will require decades, if not a century, to complete. It calls for hearts as stout and loyal, minds as keen and committed, as James Madison’s. It will require new scientific and social wisdom, new institutions, new levels of understanding between cultures. Exciting? Undoubtedly. Necessary? Consider the alternatives. How do we start? One way is to help develop public opinion, for, as Madison said, “Public opinion sets bounds to every government, and is the real sovereign in every free one.”

Numerous artists attempted to capture the features of James and Dolley Madison during their lifetimes. Among the artists, the best to be found in the new republic, were Charles Willson Peale, John Vanderlyn, Asher Durand, Chester Harding, and Eastman Johnson. Of all the portraits it is apparent that Gilbert Stuart’s 1804 paintings of both James and Dolley Madison have been the most admired, for it is these two that have been most frequently copied. James Madison’s secretary from 1809 to 1815, Edward Coles, cited the 1804 Stuart as being the best likeness of the fourth President.

To paint James Madison cannot have been an easy task. His features were not strong or distinctive, but must have been rather delicate. He stood five feet six inches tall and was very slender in build. Contemporary cartoonists showed him as a slight, spindly figure and delighted in contrasting him with the tall Thomas Jefferson. Edward Coles provides us with a written description:

In his dress, he was not at all eccentric, or given to dandyism, but always appeared neat and genteel and in the costume of a wellbred and tasty old school gentleman. I have heard in early life he sometimes wore light-colored clothes. But from the time I first knew him, wh. was when he visited at my Fathers when I was a child, I never knew him to wear any other color than black; his coat being cut in what is termed dress fashion; his breeches short, with buckles at the knees, black silk stockings, and shoes with strings or long fair top boots when out in cold weather, or when he rode on horseback of which he was fond. His hat was of the shape and fashion usually worn by gentlemen of his age. He wore powder on his hair, which was dressed full over the ears, tied behind, and brought to a point above the forehead, to cover in some degree his baldness. . . . In height he was about five feet six inches, of small and delicate form, of rather a tawny complexion, bespeaking a sedentary and studious man; his hair was originally of a dark brown color; his eyes were bluish, but not of a bright blue; his form, features, and manner were not commanding, but his conversation exceed-

1He also admired the 1833 drawing by Longacre now lost but known to us in an engraving. “The features and expression in his likeness, I think, are more accurate and faithful of him in the 83rd year of his age, than likenesses taken of him at an earlier period.” Theodore Bolton, “The Life Portraits of James Madison,” The William and Mary Quarterly, 8, 1 (January, 1951), p. 39.

ingly so and few men possessed so rich a flow of language, or so great a fund of amusing anecdotes, which were made the more interesting from their being well-timed and well-told. His ordinary manner was simple, modest, bland, and unostentatious, retiring from the throng and cautiously refraining from doing or saying anything to make himself conspicuous.3

Dolley Madison’s features were very lovely, and one finds in all the life portraits something of the sweetness and liveliness that was a part of her character. Eastman Johnson’s description of her in 1841 is an interesting and revealing one:

On Saturday I commenced a portrait of Mrs. Madison. She was very agreeable and I take much pleasure in going every morning to her house. She comes in at 10 o’clock in full dress for the occasion, and as she has much taste she looks quite imposing with her white satin turban, black velvet dress and a countenance full of benignity and gentleness. She talks a great deal and in such quick, beautiful tones. So polished and elegant are her manners that it is a pleasure to be in her company. Today she was telling me of Lafayette, Mr. Jefferson and others.4

The gathering of photographs of life portraits of James and Dolley Madison for the benefit of the Madison College community was my objective. In the process the lists of portraits of James Madison published by Theodore Bolton in 19515, and of Dolley Madison published by Allen C. Clark in 19146 have been brought up to date.

**PORTraits of James Madison**

**1781**  
Joseph Sansom  
Silhouette  
Inscribed “James Madison Esq. Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia Aged 30.”

**1783**  
Charles Willson Peale (1741-1827)  
Miniature, 1 11/16” X 1 1/4”  
Ivory

---

5Bolton, op. cit. pp. 25-45  
6Clark, op. cit. pp. 505-506. Much of the material was found in the Catalogue of American Portraits at the National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. with the generous aid of the curator Mrs. Mona Dearborn. All errors and omissions are mine.
Charles Willson Peale
Oil on canvas
The Thomas Gilcrease Institute of American History and Art, Tulsa, Oklahoma

Guiseppe Ceracchi (1751-1801)
Medallion relief, 28 1/2” X 23 1/2”
Alabaster profile on marble
Department of State, Washington, D.C.
Carved by Ceracchi in Florence in 1794 from a terracotta bust which he had modeled from life in 1792
Copies and variants:
—Plaster cast, Princeton Art Museum, Princeton, New Jersey

James Sharples (c. 1751-1811)
Pastel on paper
Copies and variants:
—A similar portrait is reportedly owned by Mr. Herbert Lee Pratt of Glen Cove, Long Island, New York.

Gilbert Stuart (1755-1828)
Frontispiece
29 1/4” X 24”
Oil on canvas
Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia
Copies and variants: Stuart did three replicas of the 1804 portrait of Madison and from the four works we have many copies.

The Williamsburg original of 1804
—Charles B. King, oil on canvas, 30” X 25”, Redwood Library, Newport, Rhode Island
—T.C. Lübbers, miniature, pencil on ivory, New York Historical Society, New York, N.Y.
—G. M. Healy, 1855, Blérancourt Museum, France
—Thomas Sully, 27 1/2” X 19 1/2”, oil on panel, 1809, Corcoran Gallery, Washington, D.C.
—Thomas Sully, 30” X 25”, oil on canvas, 1856, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia
—Unknown artist, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine
Arts, Philadelphia, Pa. (now at Octagon House, Washington, D.C.)
—Unknown artist, Hirst and Adler Gallery, New York, N.Y.
—Unknown artist, engraving after an unknown painting reproduced in Peterson, op. cit. p. 251. The face seems to be a copy of this Stuart. The engraving may have been taken from a painting by Chappel at one time in the possession of the publishers—Johnson Fry and Co., New York.
*The Bowdoin College Replica, 1805 Figure 5 48 1/4” X 39 3/4”, oil on canvas, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.*
—Thomas Badger, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
—James Frothingham (attribution), 30 7/8” X 24 1/4”, oil on panel, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
—John Trumbull, 29” X 23”, c. 1805 (face not body), John Jay Homestead, Katonah, New York. (The representation of Madison in Trumbull’s “Resignation of George Washington” is based on this portrait.
—Jane Stuart, Louisiana State Museum, New Orleans, La. (?)
*The Thomas Jefferson Coolidge Replica, 1810-1815 25 5/8” X 21 1/8”, oil on panel, Mr. Thomas J. Coolidge, Boston, Mass.*
—E. Andrews —E. Parker, c. 1876, White House, Washington, D.C.
—Asher Durand, 30 1/4” X 25 1/2.” 1835, New York Historical Society, New York, N.Y.
—Asher Durand, 32” X 26”, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.
*The Amherst College Replica, 1822 40” X 32”, oil on canvas, Amherst, Mass.*
—Catherine Drinker, 24 1/4” X 26”, oil on canvas, 1875, Independence National Historical Park, Philadelphia, Pa.
1816  John Vanderlyn (1775-1852)  Figure 6  
Oil on canvas  
White House Collection, Washington, D.C.  
Copies and variants:  
—Augustus Goodyear Heaton, 29 1/2" X 24 1/4", oil on canvas, 1891, may be at Blair House, Washington, D.C.  

1817  Joseph Wood (c. 1778-1830)  Figure 7  
9" X 7"  
Oil on wood  
Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia  
Copies and variants:  
—Alice Mathilda Reading, water color, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.  

c. 1817  Giuseppe Valaperta (fl. 1816-1818)  Figure 8  
Bas relief 3" high  
Red wax on dark blue glass  
New York Historical Society, New York, N.Y.  

1825  John Henri Isaac Browere (1792-1834)  Figure 9  
Life mask, plaster  
New York State Historical Association, Cooperstown, N.Y.  
Taken at Montpelier, Va., Oct. 19, 1825.  
Copies and variants  
—Bronze bust cast from the plaster original, New York State Historical Association, Cooperstown, N.Y.  
—Plaster bust, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia  

c. 1829-30  Chester Harding (1792-1866) (attribution) Figure 10  
30" X 25”  
Oil on canvas mounted on a panel  
Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia  
Copies and variants:  
—Chester Harding (attribution), 30" X 25", oil on canvas mounted on a panel, National Portrait Gallery, Washington, D.C.  
—G.P.A. Healy, 30" X 25", oil on canvas, Corcoran Gallery, Washington, D.C.  

1830  George Catlin (1796-1872)  Figure 11  
Oil on canvas  
Wisconsin State Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin
Copies and variants:

1830
George Catlin (1796-1872) Figure 12
Virginia convention: a group portrait composition with Madison and other delegates.
Oil on wood panel, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Va.

Copies and variants:
—Original sketch for the above, washdrawing on paper, 24 1/2" X 22 1/2", New York Historical Society, New York, N.Y.

1832 or 1833
Asher B. Durand (1796-1886) Figure 13
Oil
New York Historical Society, New York, N.Y.

Copies and variants:
—Asher B. Durand, oil, 1834 (?), Century Association, N.Y., N.Y. Bolton (op. cit. p. 46, n. 3) notes that it is impossible to determine which of these portraits is the life portrait and which is the replica.

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS OF JAMES MADISON


Engraving of drawing by J. B. Longacre, 1833. Drawing lost. The engraving is inscribed “Engraved by T. B. Welch from a Drawing by J. B. Longacre taken from life at Montpelier, Virginia, July, 1833.”


Portrait by Joseph Wright, oil. Location unknown.

Portrait by Robert Edge Pine, oil. Location unknown.
Portrait by J. G. Chapman, oil, 1834. Location unknown.

Portrait by Jacob Cist. Princeton Art Museum, Princeton, N.J.

See Bolton (op. cit. p. 47) for a listing of some alleged portraits of James Madison.

### PORTRAITS OF DOLLEY MADISON

**1794**

Unknown artist (formerly attributed to James Peale and to Anna Claypole Peale.)

Miniature, 2 5/16" X 1 7/8"

Water color on ivory

Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Gift of Mrs. John Hill Morgan.

**1796-98**

James Sharples (c. 1751-1811)

Pastel


Copies and variants:
—Ellen Sharples, pencil drawing, Bristol Museum and Art Gallery, England

**1804**

Gilbert Stuart (1755-1828)

29" X 24"

Oil on canvas

Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts (on loan to the White House).

Copies and variants:
—John Vanderlyn, “finished” by C. B. King, Greensboro Historical Museum, Greensboro, North Carolinà
—Professor Eliphalet Andrew, Cosmos Club, Washington, D.C. Silver snuffboxes were given at the Dolley Madison breakfast, May 20, 1912, with a bas relief “after the Andrews portrait.”
—Mary Whitlock. This portrait, done in 1908, was presented to the White House in 1912 by the
Virginia Society of Colonial Dames.
—unknown artist, Cincinnati Art Museum, Cincinnati, Ohio.

1817 Joseph Wood (c. 1778-1830) Figure 16
9” X 7”
Oil on wood
Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia
Copies and variants:
—Alice Mathilda Reading, water color, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

Prior to Bass Otis (1784-1861) Figure 17
1818
29” X 28”
Oil on canvas
New York Historical Society, New York, N.Y.

1825 John Henri Isaac Browere (1792-1834) Figure 18
Life mask, plaster
New York State Historical Society, Cooperstown, N.Y.
Taken at Montpelier, Virginia, October 18, 1825

1841 Eastman Johnson (1824-1906) Figure 19
24 1/4” X 44 3/4”
Crayon heightened with white chalk on buff paper.
Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. Grenville L. Winthrop Bequest
Copies and variants:
—Eastman Johnson, replica for Daniel Webster, 18 7/8” X 14 3/4”. charcoal on paper, Essex Institute

c. 1844 Mary Cutts
Miniature
Water color
Mrs. Lyons Lee and Mrs. John L. Simmons, Asheville, North Carolina
Copies and variants:
—a miniature in the White House collection is probably a duplicate, perhaps done by Mary Cutts herself.

1844 Elizabeth Macdonald Gulick (1813-1893) Figure 20
Miniature, 3 5/8” X 2 7/8”
Ivory
Princeton Art Museum, Princeton, New Jersey

1848 William S. Elwell Figure 21
30” X 25”
Oil on canvas
National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS OF DOLLEY MADISON

Silhouette by unknown artist, 5 1/4” X 4 1/2”. Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia Figure 22


Miniature by unknown artist. Location unknown. Painted in 1812 or 1813 on ivory. Reproduced in Our Presidents, Their Wives and Children.

Sketch by John Vanderlyn. Location unknown.


Portrait by Jacob Cist, Princeton Art Museum, Princeton, N.J.

Portrait by Charles Yardly Turner, copied after an unidentified work. Cosmos Club, Washington, D.C.


Daguerreotype of Dolley Madison (c. 1848). Photographer Matthew Brady. Published in Arnett, op. cit. p. 389.
Frontispiece

Photograph courtesy of Colonial Williamsburg
Gilbert Stuart
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James Madison Esq. Representative in Congress for the State of Virginia
Aged 30

Photograph courtesy of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania
Joseph Sansom
Figure 2

Photograph courtesy of the Thomas Gilcrease Institute of American History and Art
Charles Willson Peale
Photograph courtesy of the Department of State, Washington, D.C.
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Guiseppe Ceracchi
Photograph courtesy of the Independence National Historical Park Collection
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James Sharples
Photograph courtesy of the Bowdoin College Museum of Art
Gilbert Stuart
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Photograph courtesy of the White House Collection
John Vanderlyn
Figure 7

Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society
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Figure 8

Photograph courtesy of the New York Historical Society
Guiseppe Valaperta
Figure 9

Photograph courtesy of the New York State Historical Association
John Browere
Figure 10
Photograph courtesy of Washington and Lee University
Chester Harding (attr.)
Figure 11

Photograph courtesy of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin

George Catlin
PORTRAITS OF JAMES AND DOLLEY MADISON

Figure 12

Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society
George Catlin
Figure 13

Photograph courtesy of the New York Historical Society
Asher B. Durand
Photograph courtesy of the Independence National Historical Park Collection
Figure 14
James Sharples
Figure 15

Photograph courtesy of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts
Gilbert Stuart
Figure 16

Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society

Joseph Wood
Figure 17

Photograph courtesy of the New York Historical Society
Bass Otis
Figure 18

Photograph courtesy of the New York State Historical Society

John Browere
Photograph courtesy of the Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Grenville L. Winthrop Bequest
Eastman Johnson

Figure 19
Figure 20
Photograph courtesy of the Art Museum, Princeton University
Elizabeth Gulick
Photograph courtesy of the National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution
Figure 21  
William S. Elwell
Figure 22

Photograph courtesy of the Virginia Historical Society
Unknown artist
GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED (1975) AND TITLES OF MASTERS THESES

JAMES NEWTON DICKSON (History)
   Progressivism in Colorado: The Reform Administration of Governor John Franklin Shafroth, 1909-1913

MARILEE ANN BLACK GERARDI (Biology)
   Effects of Methylenechloride on the Growth, Pigmentation, and Photosynthesis of Chlorella Pyrenoidosa

DONNA SPISSO HOMES (English)
   Foundations of Love in Reason and Grace: A Study of the Romance of the Rose and Books II and III of the Faerie Queen

NANCY LYNN LLOYD (Reading Education)
   Patterns of Reading Strengths and Weaknesses Among Young Male Offenders at the Maryland Correctional Institute

WILLIAM HENRY MIELE (Biology)
   Effects of PH on the Growth, Sporulation, and Pigmentation of an Isolate of Humicola Languginosa

WILLIAM E. PONN, Jr. (English)
   The Role of Women in the Novels of Philip Roth

JAMES RICHARD TALTY (English)
   Jungian Archetypes in Robert Penn Warren’s Brother to Dragons
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MANUSCRIPT POLICY

The Studies and Research Bulletin, consisting of articles written by the Madison College Faculty, is published annually. The Editorial Board welcomes articles of original scholarly research or critical analysis and considers manuscripts for publication during September and October.

Manuscripts must not have been previously published and should not exceed twenty pages in length. All articles must be typed in double space with pages numbered consecutively in the upper right hand corner. Three copies must be submitted. In general, the Bulletin uses William Giles Campbell and Stephen Vaughan Ballou, Form and Style: Theses, Reports, Term Papers (4th ed., New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974) as a style guide.

Abstracts of exceptional Masters’ theses and student papers may be submitted for consideration if they are recommended by the faculty member under whose direction the paper was written.