The Historical Journal, 43, 2 (2000), pp. 365–381 Printed in the United Kingdom

VILLAGE TENSIONS IN EARLY VIRGINIA: SEX, LAND, AND STATUS AT THE NECK OF LAND IN THE 1620s

DAVID R. RANSOME
Woodbridge, Suffolk

ABSTRACT. *The conventional picture of early Virginia suggests an almost exclusively male population, intent on personal profit, ruthlessly ignoring social considerations, lacking stability. This article argues that such a picture is an exaggeration, and draws attention to three communities, the inhabitants of which more closely resembled the rural English societies from which they had come. Particular attention is paid to the Neck of Land in Charles City, upriver from Jamestown close to the falls. The survival of administrative records makes possible an account of this small community between 1613 and 1629, revealing a hamlet of healthy married families whose concerns were sex, land, and status, rather than death and disease or the neighbouring Indian menace; and where stability in the 1620s did not, however, mean the absence of social tensions. Thus the Neck of Land, taken together with the communities at Point Comfort and on the Eastern Shore, demonstrates the inadequacy of current perceptions of early Virginian society.*

In the colonial history of the Americas there is more than one Black Legend. The best known and earliest emphasizes the Spaniards' cruelty towards their native subjects, but another comparable legend has been more recently created. It draws attention to the instability of early Virginia, ascribing this characteristic to the rapid succession of governors and the existence of a Spanish threat, noting the antisocial individualism of the first English colonists, and portraying early Virginia as the seedbed of black slavery in the English-speaking world.[1] In this scenario the administrative incompetence and the factional in-fighting of the Virginia Company in London is matched by ruthlessness in the James valley, where a small group of successful immigrants

[1] For example, Charles M. Andrews, *The colonial period of American history* (4 vols., New Haven, CT, 1934–8), 1 (reprinted 1964), pp. 143–7; Jack P. Greene, *Pursuits of happiness: the social development of early modern British colonies and the formation of American culture* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1988) pp. 12–13; and Edmund S. Morgan, *American slavery, American liberty: the ordeal of colonial Virginia* (New York, 1975), where chapter 3 is entitled 'Idle Indian and lazy Englishman' and chapter 4 'The Jamestown fiasco'. The most helpful accounts of these years are to be found in two Ph.D. dissertations: Irene W. D. Hecht, 'The Virginia colony, 1607–1640: a study in frontier growth' (University of Washington, 1969), and John Frederick Fausz, 'The Powhatan uprising of 1622: a historical study of ethnocentrism and cultural contact' (College of William and Mary, 1977). The former should be read in combination with Sigmund Diamond, 'From organization to society: Virginia in the seventeenth century', *American Journal of Sociology*, 63 (1958), pp. 457–75; the latter covers not merely the year 1622 but the period 1607–32.

and company officials dominate the almost entirely male population of the colony. Within a generation this ruling clique becomes an oligarchy, exploiting its feckless indentured servants who die in droves, and alternately sponging off the neighbouring Powhatans, whose territory the English had invaded, or seeking to destroy them when they tired of supplying aid and sought to expel the invaders.

Such a legend as this is not of course made up out of whole cloth. Although there is a considerable element of truth in such a picture, it is not the whole truth. In the first years of the colony starvation indeed ignored rank, and death came all too soon to rich and poor alike: the gentleman, the artisan, and the labourer were fellow victims of the unhealthy climate or of Powhatan attack. Moreover, the conventional picture not only almost entirely ignores the presence and thus influence of women in the colony, but also overlooks the fact that here and there communities existed which resembled contemporary English villages more nearly than they did those male encampments of English volunteers in the Low Countries from which many of the first English colonists were probably drawn. In the first years of the colony a community at Point Comfort at the mouth of the James seems to have mirrored life in contemporary England,[2] and in the 1630s there was a traditional English society on the Eastern Shore of Chesapeake Bay.[3] Both of these, however, flourished far from the threat of Powhatan attack. More remarkably, in the 1610s and 1620s, upriver from Jamestown, close to Powhatan territory, and not far from the falls, there was another ordinary English community, at the Neck of Land, Charles City. There the inhabitants led a life dominated not by disease or death or the Indian menace but by internal disputes resulting from social stresses: first settlers against latecomers, former company servants against the 'middling sort'.

That their story can be reconstructed is due to the survival both in England and the USA of administrative records of the Virginia Company and of the early years of royal government, almost all of which are now available in print or on microfilm.[4] They reveal the existence of the community at the Neck of

[2] Virginia Bernhard, 'Jamestown: population and gender in early Virginia, 1607–1610', *Journal of Southern History*, 58 (1992), pp. 599–618.

[3] James R. Perry, *The formation of a society on Virginia's Eastern Shore, 1615–1655* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1990), p. 9. Unfortunately, Perry took only incidental account in chapters 3 and 4 of the many women present on the peninsula and made no systematic attempt to assess their contribution to the formation of society on the Eastern Shore. Evidence provided casually suggests that many households included husbands, wives, and children.

[4] Information on early Virginia is to be found in England in the PRO, Colonial Office papers, and in the Ferrar papers at Magdalene College, Cambridge, which are available on microfilm: D. R. Ransome, ed., *The Ferrar papers, 1590–1790* (14 reels, Wakefield, 1992). The court books of the Virginia Company of London are most easily consulted in Susan M. Kingsbury, ed., *The records of the Virginia Company of London* (4 vols., Washington, DC, 1906–35). The Virginia censuses of 1624 and 1625 are in J. C. Hotten, ed., *The original lists of persons ... who went from Great Britain to the American Plantations, 1600–1700* (London, 1874; repr., Baltimore, MD, 1974). H. R. McIlwaine edited the *Journals of the house of burgesses of Virginia, 1619–1658/59* (Richmond, VA, 1915) and the

Land from 1613 and enable us to trace its fortunes for the next fifteen years or so. In its first phase, until 1622, it was inhabited by a seemingly homogeneous group of former time-expired servants of the company. Forced to abandon the settlement in March 1622 because of Powhatan aggression, the inhabitants nevertheless survived the crisis apparently without loss of life. When return was possible in 1623 they seem to have decided, or to have been persuaded, that an increase in numbers would also increase their ability to defend themselves. At all events the folk that came back to the Neck of Land now included not only the former inhabitants but others, more recently arrived in the colony and of higher social status. Census returns and the record of disputes engendered by this disparity of status enable us to observe these colonists until the records dry up in 1629. What is revealed is in many ways a typical English hamlet, alive with social tensions yet essentially stable, but unexpectedly lacking – if we expect the conventional picture of early Virginian society – an almost exclusively male population in the service of one of the rapacious oligarchs of the James river valley.[5]

The following discussion will sketch the history of this unusual community in the years before 1622, before offering a more detailed consideration of its inhabitants thereafter. Attention will then focus on the social tensions that are revealed, tensions that have nothing to do with death and disease or overmighty proprietors, and little (and that only indirectly) with the Indian menace. Thus life in the hamlet at the Neck of Land can be seen to approximate not to that of its frontier neighbours in Virginia but to that of villages in England such as Terling.[6]

I

English interest in North American settlement had been evident for a generation before the creation of the Virginia Company of London in 1606. At first the company sought to exploit the new colony much as the Iberians had exploited the commerce of Asia and the resources and populations of the Americas, but the company's leaders soon realized that only agricultural development would enable the colony to survive. In less than a decade tobacco cultivation replaced the search for precious metals, and with that change came

---

Minutes of the council and general court of colonial Virginia, 1622–1632, 1670–1676 (2nd edn, Richmond, VA, 1979). Land grants are in Nell Marion Nugent, *Cavaliers and pioneers: abstracts of Virginia land patents and grants* (3 vols., and supplement, Richmond, VA, 1934–80), 1 (reprinted 1983): 1623–66. Virginia M. Meyer and John F. Dorman, eds., *Adventurers in purse and person: Virginia, 1607–1624/5* (3rd edn, Richmond, VA, 1987), provides much biographical information. Despite this wealth of material, readers cannot hope to find such voluminous records as exist, for example, for the Essex village of Terling: Keith Wrightson and David Levine, *Poverty and piety in an English village: Terling, 1525–1700* (New York, 1979), pp. ix–x.

[5] For a more general, marginally later, discussion of early Virginian stability, Jon Kukla, 'Order and chaos in early America: political and social stability in pre-Restoration Virginia', *American Historical Review*, 90 (1985), pp. 275–98.

[6] Wrightson and Levine, *Terling*.

the need not so much for garrisons as for rural societies. Indeed, within weeks of the first settlers' arrival in Virginia, and even before the switch a decade later to an agricultural economy, the English had explored the James river valley to the fall line. Thereafter, settlement below the falls began. It was, however, sporadic and not everywhere successful. Yet in November 1618 the Virginia Company issued instructions to Captain George Yeardley, who was about to be knighted and sent back to Virginia as governor:[7] he was, among much else, to 'reduce' the valley into 'four Cities or Burroughs': Henrico, Charles City, James City, and 'Kiccowtan'.[8] All four cities spanned the James. Beginning at the falls, Henrico extended to the Appomattox river and Charles City ran to the Chickahominy.[9]

The latter had first been known as Bermuda City, and about Christmas 1613 colonists had begun to settle there.[10] Within the city were several hundreds, including Nether Hundred, later termed Bermuda Hundred or the Neck of Land. The first settlers were to be found thereabouts, because – according to Captain Richard Hamor – 'there lyeth the most convenient quantity of corne ground'. By 1614, he continued, a pale of some two miles length already secured eight miles of 'exceeding good corne ground' and houses were built along the river bank, each one a half mile from the next.[11]

Ten years later the General Assembly endorsed 'A Breife declaration' drawn up by 'the Ancient Planters nowe remaineinge alive in Virginia'.[12] Its authors are unknown, but it seems likely that a part, if not all, of it was written by inhabitants of Charles City.[13] They explained that in early 1614 various company servants who had already served 'six or seaven yeares in that generall slavery' were promised 'an absolute freedome' if they spent three years more 'in the buildinge of Charles Cytty and hundred'. They were to have a 'very little allowance of clothinge and victuall, and that only for the first yeare', being promised a month a year, and a day a week from May Day till Harvest, to raise their own crops. They claimed, however, that they were cheated of

[7] Yeardley, a military man, had been in Virginia since 1610; in 1616–17 he had been acting governor of the colony after Sir Thomas Dale left and before the arrival of Captain Samuel Argall.

[8] Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, III, p. 100.

[9] Further downriver were first James City, and then Kiccowtan, in 1620 renamed Elizabeth City: ibid., p. 276.

[10] Charles E. Hatch, Jr, *The first seventeen years, Virginia, 1607–1624* (Jamestown 350th anniversary historical booklet, 6: Williamsburg, VA, 1957), p. 62.

[11] Ralph Hamor, *A true discourse of the present state of Virginia* (London, 1615; repr., Richmond, VA, 1957), p. 32.

[12] The version here cited is PRO, CO 1/3 fos. 78r–86v. McIlwaine, ed., *Journals*, pp. 28–37, prints another version, taken from 'Colonial records of Virginia' (State Senate document, Extra, Richmond, VA, 1874), pp. 69–83. This differs in spelling and other minor variations from the PRO document, but is essentially the same. Here and elsewhere in this article conventional abbreviations are silently expanded. 'Ancient Planters' were those colonists who had reached Virginia before the departure of Sir Thomas Dale in 1616.

[13] In 1624 the Neck of Land was represented in the General Assembly by Luke Boys and Thomas Harris. Boys was a recent (1619) arrival in Virginia; Harris was an Ancient Planter. He had arrived in the colony in 1611, but is not known to have been at Charles City before 1623.

almost half the time promised, which they were forced to pay for, yet were happier than those 'who continued longer in the afore mencioned slaverye', building houses for themselves and repairing them 'and building new, where the old fayled'. In March 1617 the inhabitants of Charles Hundred demanded and received their freedom from George Yeardley, the acting governor: 'We that were freed, with our humble thankes to God, fell cheerefully to our perticuler labours, whereby to our great comfort through his blessinge we reaped a plentifull harvest.'[14]

But two months later in May 1617 Yeardley was replaced as governor by Captain Samuel Argall, whom the authors of the declaration reckoned no friend: 'at his arrivall heere he founde the collony in all partes well stored with corne, and at Charles hundred a grannery well furnisht by rentes lately raysed and received from the Farmers, which corne he tooke possession of, but how yt was imployed himselfe can best give an accounte'.[15]

At the end of 1618 the Virginia Company replaced him with Yeardley, who, knighted by the king at Newmarket, returned to Virginia with instructions that delighted the colonists. Those resident there before the departure of Sir Thomas Dale in 1616 were immediately freed from all service to the company; the laws martial were replaced by English common law; an elected assembly was to meet annually; and colonists were to receive dividends of land:

> the effect of which proceedinges gave such incouragement to every person heere that all of them followed their perticuler labours with singuler alacrity and industry soe that through the blessinge of God uppon our willinge labours, within the space of three yeares, our countrye flowrished with many new erected Plantations from the head of the River to Kicoughtan, beautiful and pleasant to the spectatours and comfortable to the releife and succor of all such, as by occasion did travaile by lande or water every man giveinge free entertainement both to frendes or others. The plenty of these tymes likewise was such, that all men generally weare sufficiently furnished with corne, and many alsoe had plenty of cattle, swine, poultry and other good provisions to nourish them. Monethly courts were held in every precinct, to doe justice in redressinge of all small and petty matters, others of more consequence being referred to the Governour, counsell and Generall Assemblie.[16]

In retrospect, and despite 'great sicknes and mortalitie',[17] the years 1619–21 were seen as a golden time, for when Sir Francis Wyatt succeeded Yeardley late in 1621 he confirmed the colonists' privileges and 'the country alsoe flowrished'.[18] The inhabitants of the Neck of Land in Charles City no doubt shared in this season of prosperity, but who were they? Five can certainly be identified from the records and perhaps two others were also there before

[14] PRO, CO 1/3 fos. 82–3; cf. McIlwaine, ed., *Journals*, pp. 32–3.
[15] PRO, CO 1/3 fo. 83; cf. McIlwaine, ed., *Journals*, p. 34.
[16] PRO, CO 1/3 fos. 85–85v; cf. McIlwaine, ed., *Journals*, p. 36.
[17] PRO, CO 1/3 fo. 85v: 'Those yeares fallinge out to be generally contagious through this continent, … divers … ships [in addition] brought with them most pestilent infections.'
[18] Ibid.

March 1622.[19] Agreements reached in January 1623 (cited below) make it unlikely that many others had settled there earlier.

On 18 or 19 March 1622 Francis Michell agreed to buy from Joshua Chard two houses and six acres of land at the Neck of Land in Charles City. For this property, south of the James river, once he had received the 'writtinges' and been put in possession, he was prepared to pay 150 pounds of tobacco. Nearly four years later Chard, still trying to get payment from Michell, took him to court. The court, however, gave judgement for Michell on 12 December 1625, holding that his offer was for both houses and land, and that he had not been put in possession at the time that the houses were burnt by the Indians.[20]

This is almost all that is known about events at the Neck of Land during the Indian attack in the spring of 1622. That Chard 'was forced by the Ennymie with others to quitt' is also stated,[21] but it would seem that that was the extent of the inhabitants' loss. The attack was part of a more general Powhatan onslaught on the colonists. Provoked by the recent expansion of the rapidly growing numbers of the English, encouraged by their new chief, the warlike Opechancanough, and exasperated by the colonists' murder of the warrior-priest Nemettanow, the Powhatans in March 1622 attacked the dispersed settlements of the colonists, successfully clearing the English from the upper reaches of the James. Some three hundred of the colonists, roughly a quarter of the English-speaking population, were killed, but while the casualty list published in London later in the year names the dead at the neighbouring plantations,[22] it makes no reference to the Neck of Land. It is therefore to be presumed either that the hamlet was not attacked during the first assault on 22 March (an unlikely supposition) or that the inhabitants made a fighting retreat to one of the neighbouring settlements, perhaps to Samuel Jordan's,[23] or that it held out until relieved by Captain Roger Smith and his men.[24] Hatch

[19] John Price, Richard Taylor, William Vincent, George Grimes, and Joshua Chard; and Sgt William Sharpe and John Dods.

[20] McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, pp. 79–80, terms Chard 'Joseph', but the two censuses of 1624 and 1625 both style him Joshua. I have assumed an identity and supposed that the council's clerk had in his rough notes merely written 'Ios.', which he later misinterpreted.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, III, pp. 565–71: the tally moves downriver from the Falls. After listing the victims at four sites in Henrico, it continues with those (5) 'At Apo-mattucke River at Master Abraham Pierce his Plantation', (6) 'At Charles-Citie and about the Precincts. Of Capt. Smiths Company', (7) 'At other Plantations next adioyning', (8) 'At Mr. William Farrars House', and then crosses the river to name those at (9) 'Berkley-Hundred' and (10) 'Westover'.

[23] According to Captain John Smith, 'Master Samuel Jordan gathered together but a few of the straglers about him at Beggers-Bush, where he fortified and lived in despight of the enemy.' Philip L. Barbour, ed., *The complete works of Captain John Smith (1580–1631)* (3 vols.,Chapel Hill, NC, 1986), II, p. 303. Beggar's Bush, later known as Jordan's Journey, was the nearest haven if the folk from the Neck of Land remained south of the James, but it may have been safer for them to have crossed the river to Sherley Hundred. Smith, however, remarks upon the 'want of Boats': ibid., p. 302.

[24] On 13 April Smith received 'absolute power and Command in all matters of warr over all the people in Charles Cittie'; he was required 'to be vigilant and carefull over the people, and catle, and all thinges there': Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, III, p. 609. A week later he received the same powers at 'Henerico Ileand and Coxendale' and was instructed 'to use all care and vigilancie, for the safe bringeing away of all the said people: ibid., p. 611. On 18 May Smith was given command of

suspects that the tally of victims was incomplete, but Fausz offers an alternative explanation – 'that stout defenses repulsed the Indians'.[25]

In late April the council at Jamestown sent news of the attack to London:

> they have massacred in all partes above three hundred men women and Children, and have, since nott only spoyled and slaine Divers of our Cattell, and some more of our People, and burnte most of the Howses we have forsaken, but have alsoe enforced us to quitt many of our Plantacions, and to unite more neerely together in fewer places the better for to Strengthen and Defende our selve against them.[26]

Among those strongpoints were Flowerdew Hundred, Sherley Hundred, and 'a Plantacione of mr Samuell Jourdes', and it was doubtless to one or other of these that the inhabitants of the Neck of Land withdrew.

The news of the massacre reached London in July. The Virginia council there quickly drafted a reply, lamenting, among much else, the 'relinquishing of Charles Cittie, Henerico, the Iron Works, the Colleg landes, and Martins hundred' and declaring that 'the replanting them is of absolute necessitie'.[27] Although some of the leading colonists were against the premature dispersal of the survivors, the council at Jamestown reported in the following January that they were 'now about to resettle' the College tenants and would supply them with corn till harvest.[28] Two months later, in March 1623, George Sandys wrote home that he had, against his better judgement, hired a ship 'now under sayle' to carry the College men to their plantation, and he added that 'The other day a party went up to seat on ye Kinge of Apomatuckes townes, but before they could get thither, they were soe deminished by death, and weakened by sickenes, that they were fayne to give it over'.[29] Nor were these isolated occurrences: on 4 April the governor and council wrote home that they had 'lett as many returne to theire Plantationes as have desired the same'.[30]

II

At just what moment in the spring of 1623 Joshua Chard and the other inhabitants of the Neck of Land returned to their settlement is unclear. On 11 January 1623 Richard Taylor, William Vincent, and George Grimes agreed that the lands they had cleared should be divided between Thomas Harris '& such others as were then to plant on ye said land', and nine days later the

---

Pasbehay and the Maine: ibid., p. 623. Presumably he had by then evacuated the upper reaches of the James.

[25] Hatch, *Virginia, 1607–1624*, p. 66; Fausz, 'Powhatan uprising', p. 377.

[26] Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, III, p. 612.

[27] Ibid., p. 670; the letter is dated 1 Aug. 1622, was sent by the *Truelove*, and had been received by 20 Jan. 1623: ibid., IV, p. 10.

[28] Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, IV, p. 16.

[29] Ibid., pp. 24, 25.

[30] Ibid., p. 99; and note ibid., III, p. 682: Richard Pace having sought permission to return to his plantation 'thother side of the water', the council at Jamestown recorded, 'This petition graunted, as many others[,] resouled [?reseated] upon ther plantations according to order receaved from England.'

governor granted five acres each in perpetuity to all those intending to settle at the Neck of Land.[31] Certainly by April 1623 the situation in the colony had been stabilized if we may judge from the census undertaken in February 1624. At that time two lists were compiled: of those living on 16 February 1624, and those who had died since April 1623.[32] In the latter category only fourteen out of 346 were said to have been killed. Clearly by that date the emergency was over and the Neck of Land had been reoccupied.

The new community would not have had the look of an English village, even though in March 1626 it apparently possessed a church.[33] An anonymous critic of the colony, who had earlier visited the James, commented in the summer of 1623 that the colonists' 'houses standes [sic] scattered one from another, and are onlie made of wood, few or none of them beeing framed houses but punches[34] sett into the Ground And covered with Boardes so as a firebrand is sufficient to consume them all'.[35]

But even if the Neck of Land did not look very like an English village, its inhabitants resembled a village community more closely than might be expected. The census of February 1624 and another taken almost a year later, in January 1625, supplemented by details to be found in the records of the Virginia Company of London, the minutes of the Jamestown council, and the registers of land grants, allow us to build up a picture of this community. For the next four or five years, while our records last, they offer evidence of a social stability that may surprise. Unlike other locations in Virginia of a similar size – Hog Island and Mulberry Island,[36] for example – the ratio of the genders at the Neck of Land was much more nearly equal than elsewhere; the site was healthier, or safer, or both; and none of the great men of the colony upset the social balance at the Neck by ownership of a plantation. Nevertheless, stability was not the same thing as peace, as we shall see.

In February 1624 there were forty inhabitants. Five others had died in the preceding ten months, one of whom had been killed, but whether by Indians or accidentally is not stated.[37] Of the forty, Nathaniel Reeve may have been

[31] McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, p. 129. [32] Hotten, ed., *Original lists*, pp. 169–95.

[33] This was five months before the council ordered every plantation to provide by 25 March next 'some decent house or fittinge roome ... for the service of God'; it was to be 'sequestered for that purpose only', and 'a place [was to] be stronglie paled or fenced in for the buriall of the dead': McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, pp. 96, 105(8).

[34] The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines a punch as 'A post supporting the roof in a coal-mine.'

[35] McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, p. 259. The endpapers of Ivor Noel Hume, *Martin's Hundred* (London, 1982), give an artist's impression of Wolstenholme Town, a not wholly dissimilar settlement. See also Ivor Noel Hume, 'First look at a lost Virginia settlement,' *National Geographic*, 155 (1979), pp. 738–40.

[36] For the imbalance that came from an ever-changing population and the existence of an absentee landlord, see, for Hog's Island, Hotten, ed., *Original lists*, pp. 181, 193, 236–8; for Mulberry Island, ibid., pp. 174, 240–1. In this latter instance the task of tracing individuals is made harder by the fact that in the 1624 census Mulberry Island was not reckoned a separate entity.

[37] Moses Conyers, George Grimes, William Clements, Edward [blank] had died; Thomas Fernley had been killed.

merely a visitor passing through, for a man of the same name was boatswain of the *Southampton* then in the James.[38] Even so, there really were forty inhabitants of the village, for Henry Coltman happened to be away when the census was taken.

Two of the most immediately noticeable facts about the village are that it consisted chiefly of married households, and yet included at the most only two teenagers. There were (if we include Henry Coltman) twelve husbands, twelve wives, three infants (all boys), a young girl of six, two other women – one of whom was perhaps a teenage servant,[39] the other either a servant or a visitor. These twelve households included five male servants, one of whom was a teenage boy from aboard the *Duty*. In addition, there were certainly four, and perhaps five, bachelor households, the uncertainty arising from the fact that while William Clements was said to be one of them, a William Clements was one of those from the village who had died since the previous April.

Almost a year later the second census was taken.[40] Numbers had grown, from forty to forty-four. There were still the same sixteen households (no mention of William Clements this time), but one of the bachelors, Joshua Chard, had taken a wife, and eight of the families now included children. Elizabeth Perkinson, it would seem, had moved from the Dods's household to the Harrises'.[41] So much for the credit side. On the debit John Price's servant, Robert Turner, had left the village, apparently for the neighbouring Jordan's Journey; Nathaniel Reeve, presumed boatswain of the *Southampton*, had also gone, and so had Margaret Berman, of whom more later. Unlike most of the other plantations and settlements, but like the College land at Henrico, the Neck of Land reported no deaths, thus bearing out the accuracy of the anonymous critic of 1623 who had said that in 'The Cities of Henrico & Charles … the ayre [was] good and wholesome.'[42] Thus the increase in population came not by immigration but by natural increase, and there were now at the Neck of Land thirteen husbands, thirteen wives, ten children (five boys and five girls), three bachelors, and five servants, one of them a teenage girl.

As one might expect in Virginia in the 1620s the thirteen husbands were of a certain age. None was less than 30 years old, the eldest was fifty. Their average age was 38·6 years , and the median age was 39.[43] The three bachelors were 36, 30, and 22; the male servants 23, 22, 20, and 18; and the maidservant 15. As in England, and indeed in Europe, the social hierarchy was thus based on age, and service was a phase through which adolescents and

[38] McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, pp. 13–14; Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, IV, pp. 459–64, 471.

[39] If the sequence in which names are recorded gives an indication, as it seems to, of households, then Elizabeth Perkinson may have been a servant of the Dods.

[40] Hotten, ed., *Original lists*, pp. 201–65.

[41] In January 1625 Elizabeth Perkinson has vanished and in the Harris household there is a 15-year-old Elizabeth who lacks a surname.

[42] Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, IV, p. 259.

[43] One was 50, one 44, one 43, three 40, one 39, one 38, two 36, one 35, one 31, and one 30.

young adults were expected to pass, before reaching independence and ultimately marriage.

Of the thirteen wives two did not give their age;[44] of those who did, the youngest was 21, the oldest 42. The two oldest, Joan Vincent (42) and Jane Dods (40), were older than their husbands, William Vincent being 39 and John Dods 36. The median age of the wives was 25, and the average 27·8 years (or without the two most senior 24·8).[45] The married households thus fall into one or other of three patterns: in two cases the wives were the older partner, by three or four years; in three more cases the pattern was exactly reversed, the husbands being the senior;[46] the other six husbands were anything from eleven to twenty-nine years older than their wives,[47] and Thomas Oage [?Cage] and Luke Boyse may also have been much older than their wives. Thus most of the husbands belonged almost to a different generation: they would have remembered the years of the Spanish war, which were also years of dearth, whereas for the most part their wives were born in the calmer times that followed 1600.

Asked to say when they had arrived in Virginia the thirty-four teenagers and adults did their best. Only Mrs Dods and Mrs Vincent gave no details. No less than eleven of the householders were Ancient Planters who had come before 1617, as Jane Dods and Joan Vincent may well have done.[48] It is impossible to say now whether this congregation of seniority was accidental or planned: in January 1623, in replying to instructions from London, the council at Jamestown announced the imminent departure for Henrico of the College tenants, 'havinge strengthned them with divers of the olde Planters uppon ye Conditions which yourselves have propounded'.[49] Alternatively, individual initiative may have suggested to the householders at the Neck of Land that they should combine their energies and experience. Of the eleven Ancient Planters, John Dods had come over in 1607 in the *Susan Constant*, and Richard Taylor in the *Mary and Margaret* in 1608. Joshua Chard had set out in the *SeaVenture* in 1609, and after an enforced winter in the Bermudas had arrived in 1610 in the *Deliverance* or the *Patience*. Henry Coltman was only a lad when he came in the *Noah* in 1610, the year that William Vincent arrived in the *Mary and James*. In

[44] Ann Oage[?Cage] and Alice Boyse: it is likely that both Ann and Alice were significantly younger than their husbands. Ann's husband was 40; she had come over in 1618 and in 1625 was the mother of a 2-year-old son. Alice is unlikely to have been much over 30 and was perhaps not out of her 20s: her son by her second marriage was said to be still in his 'infancy' in 1644. She was apparently still alive in March 1666: Meyer and Dorman, eds., *Adventurers*, p. 254.

[45] One was 42, one 40, one 33, one 28, one 26, one 25, one 24, two 23, and two 21.

[46] Alexander Bradwaye (31) and Sisley (28); Joshua Chard (36) and Ann (33); Henry Coltman (30) and Ann (26).

[47] John Price (40) and Ann (21); Sgt William Sharpe (40) and Elizabeth (25); Thomas Harris (38) and Adria (23); Richard Taylor (50) and Dorothy (21); Hugh Price (35) and Judith (24); and Robert Greenleafe (43) and Susan (23).

[48] John Dods, William Vincent, John Price, Joshua Chard, Sgt William Sharpe, Thomas Harris, Richard Taylor, Thomas Oage[?Cage], Henry Coltman, Robert Greenleafe, and Thomas Farmer.

[49] Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, IV, p. 16.

1611 John Price, William Sharp, and Thomas Oage [?Cage] were fellow passengers in the *Starr*, and Thomas Harris came in the *Prosperous*. Finally, Thomas Farmer and Robert Greenleafe arrived in the *Tryall* in 1616. Most of these Ancient Planters were in all likelihood the company servants who in early 1614 had accepted the offer of 'absolute freedom' in 1617.[50] In contrast, the other five householders had reached Virginia only after the new policy instituted late in 1618 of granting fifty acres 'headright' to each immigrant, or – more precisely – to whoever had paid the immigrant's way.[51] That the five were promptly able to take up lands suggests that for the most part they had paid their own way and were thus to be distinguished from the first families of the Neck. Luke Boyse and Hugh Hilton arrived together on the *Edwin* in May 1619, Hugh Price landed the preceding January, from the *William and Thomas*.[52] Alexander Bradwaye and Thomas Sheppey were the most recent arrivals, in the *Supply* from Bristol, in 1620.

Whatever their status at the Neck of Land, it is probable that many of its inhabitants had come to Virginia as servants. Apart from the five still so described in January 1625, John Dods, termed by Captain John Smith 'labourer' or 'soldier' in the colony's first months, was, like almost all the early settlers and Ancient Planters to arrive in the colony, a company servant;[53] and Hugh Price had been one of the five servants for whose transport in 1618–19 John Bayly's grandson and heir in 1643 belatedly claimed his headright.[54] Two other householders at the Neck, Bradwaye and Sheppey, had been sent out by the Berkeley Hundred partners,[55] and it is likely that William Clements and perhaps Richard Fernley, who both died at the Neck of Land between April 1623 and February 1624, were other Berkeley Hundred survivors of the massacre.[56]

With the exception of Joshua Chard's wife Ann, who had come on the *Neptune* in 1618, and Judith Price, in the *Marygold* in 1619,[57] and probably of

[50] Thomas Harris is a likely exception; for him, see n. 13 above.

[51] Briefly, therefore, there were three categories of newcomer: those who paid their own way and received a headright of fifty acres at each entry into the colony; those who, until the company's dissolution in 1624, were shipped over as company servants; and those who came as servants to individual planters. These last were entitled to their servants' headrights.

[52] Mistakenly he called it the *William and John*, but see Nugent, *Cavaliers and pioneers*, I, pp. 143–4. In this group Hugh Price is the exception: see n. 54 below.

[53] Barbour, *Complete works*, I, pp. 209, 244; II, pp. 142, 193.

[54] Nugent, *Cavaliers and pioneers*, I, pp. 143–4.

[55] Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, III, pp. 405, 426, 427: Sheppey, or Sheepy or Shipway, was a 'gentleman'; Bradwaye or Broadway was probably kin, perhaps a brother, to Giles Bradwaye, who had died at Berkeley Hundred during the massacre.

[56] Clement was 'Cook and Gardner' at the hundred, where he was to serve for six years: Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, III, p. 197; for him see also ibid., p. 674, and McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, p. 42. Richard 'Fernley' is also apparently 'Firmely' (McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, p. 42). Could he also be the gentleman Richard 'Ferreby', said to have been killed at Berkeley Hundred in the massacre? (Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, III, pp. 426, 527).

[57] This vessel brought out Captain Christopher Lawne and his company. In July 1619 he represented his Wariscoyack plantation at the first meeting of the General Assembly, but soon after

Joan Vincent and Jane Dods, the ten other women at the Neck had crossed the Atlantic in the years when Sir Edwin Sandys and the company in London were actively seeking to provide a supply of wives for the settlers. Though not technically company servants nor, strictly, sold on arrival, few if any of these women paid their own fares; thus they were hardly to be distinguished from servants. It is all but impossible to identify most of them now, since by the time they appeared in the 1625 census they had married and thus changed their surnames. However, the company's archive preserves details of fifty-seven who were sent out to Virginia in 1621.[58] Probably one of these fifty-seven, and possibly a second, was to be found at the Neck of Land in 1624 and 1625.

The 1624 census lists at the Neck, one after the other, Thomas Harris, his wife Harris, Ann Woodley, and Margaret Berman. A year later the January 1625 census provides more details about the household. Thomas Harris was then 38 years old and had come to the colony in May 1611 in the *Prosperous*; Mrs Harris's name was 'Adria', her age 23, and she reached Virginia in November 1621 on the *Marmaduke*. Ann Woodlase was their kinswoman, aged only seven. Margaret Berman had left, but the household now included Elizabeth, a 15-year-old servant.

Despite an alternative explanation of her origins,[59] Adria Harris would appear to be Audry Hoare, one of the fifty-seven maids sent out by the Virginia Company in 1621.[60] Surviving company records claim that she was then 19, and was born in Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire, where her father was a shoemaker.[61] Both her parents were alive in 1621, and she was one of at least four children. Her brother Richard had been an apprentice to a fustian dresser, and the implication was that he was already dead. Of her two sisters one, Joane Childe, was married and living in London 'in the Blackfryers downe in the Lane neer the Catherine', and it was this Joane who brought Audry to the company's offices. There it was noted that her skills included 'plaine worke and black workes' and the making of 'all manner of buttons'.

'by his owne sycknes and his peoples (wherein there was improvidency) he quytted his Plantacion, went upp to Charles Cyty, and about November died'. Perhaps it was then that Judith went first to the Neck.

[58] David R. Ransome, 'Wives for Virginia, 1621', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 48 (1991), pp. 3–18.

[59] Relying on the claim that Adria was an Ancient Planter, made when Captain Thomas Harris re-patented Longfield, Henrico county on 25 Feb. 1639 (Nugent, *Cavaliers and pioneers*, I, p. 101), Meyer and Dorman, eds., *Adventurers*, p. 355, suggest she was perhaps the daughter of Edward and Ann Gurganey. From the latter Harris claimed on 12 July 1637 to have inherited Longfield by a will made on 11 Feb. 1620: Nugent, *Cavaliers and pioneers*, I, p. 60. Neither on that occasion nor in an earlier registration of the grant on 2 May 1636 (ibid., p. 37) was there any mention of Adria as an Ancient Planter. It seems clear, however, that, whoever she was, by 11 Sept. 1626 Adria was dead and Harris had remarried: McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, p. III.

[60] Ransome ed., *Ferrar papers*, item 306 [formerly Ferrar papers 1601b]. Unless otherwise noted, all information in this paragraph derives from this item.

[61] Audry Hoare the daughter of Thomas Hoare was baptized at St Mary's, Aylesbury, on 25 Aug. 1604.

That Audry Hoare had become Mrs Adria Harris is made all the more likely by the presence in the household of the child Ann Woodley/Woodlase – or more often Woodliffe. Described as the Harrises' kinswoman, she was, it would appear, the daughter of Captain John Woodliffe.[62] Commissioned as governor and captain by the proprietors of Berkeley Hundred, his dealings with them reveal that he came from Prestwood in Buckinghamshire, less than ten miles south-south-east of Aylesbury.[63] Hence, no doubt, the justification for the claim that little Ann was the Harrises' kinswoman.

And what of Margaret Berman? Could she be, as seems likely, another of the fifty-seven maids, the Margaret Bourdman who came to Virginia in 1621 in the *Warwick*?[64] If so, according to the company records she was aged 20 in 1621 and an orphan, born at Bilton in Yorkshire.[65] Sir John Gibson was an uncle on her mother's side, and she was recommended to the company by Captain Wood, Mr Erasmus Finch, and Mr Kilband.[66] And what had happened to her in 1624? She was no longer at the Neck of Land in the January 1625 census, and there had been no deaths there. Presumably therefore she was still alive, but elsewhere. Margaret was not a common name in Virginia in 1625. Of the seventeen named in the census four had been born there and a fifth was only 9 years old.[67] One had died in the preceding year at Wariscoyack and was almost certainly the wife of Benjamin Syme.[68] Of the remaining eleven, ten name the ship on which they crossed;[69] the exception is Mrs Graye, living on Jamestown island. She might therefore be the former Margaret Bourdman, but since one, and only one, of the ten Margarets named the vessel in which she sailed as the *Warwick*, it seems safer to regard her as the Margaret Berman, perhaps Bourdman, of 1624. Moreover, in 1625 she is to be found next door, so to speak, to the Neck of Land, at the College land in Henrico, where she was the wife of Ezekiel Raughton.[70]

[62] Meyer and Dorman, eds., *Adventurers*, pp. 339–40.

[63] Ibid., pp. 705–7; Kingsbury, eds., *Records*, III, p. 200.

[64] Unless otherwise noted, all information in this paragraph comes from Ransome, ed., *Ferrar Papers*, item 309 [formerly FP 1601c].

[65] The eldest of three recorded daughters of Adam Bourdman, she was baptized at Bilton Ainsty on 4 Feb. 1599.

[66] Captain Wood may be the man appointed to the council in Virginia in 1609: Kingsbury, ed., *Records*, III, p. 13; see also Barbour, ed., *Complete works*, II, pp. 219, 222. Nothing has been discovered about Finch and Kilband, but it is to be noted that both are granted the honorific 'Mr'.

[67] Margaret Jordan, aged 1, at Jordan's Journey; Laydon and Waters, both born in 1624, at Elizabeth City; and Hodgskines on the Eastern Shore.

[68] Hotten, ed., *Original lists*, p. 243; for Syme's abortive attempt to find a(nother?) wife, McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, pp. 154–5.

[69] Raughton, at Henrico; Partin, at West and Sherley; Fludd, at Jordan's Journey; Kemp and Jones, at Pasbehaighs; Ellis, at the Maine, Jamestown; Johnson, at Archer's Hope; Pilkinton, at the Treasurer's Plantation, Jamestown; Fowler, at Elizabeth City; and Epes, on the Eastern Shore.

[70] Ezekiel was from Lincolnshire and had come to Virginia in the *Bona Nova* in 1621: Ransome, ed., *Ferrar papers*, items 317, 318, 328 [formerly FP 1346–8].

III

Thus the community at the Neck of Land contained sixteen different households, which were separated not only by the distance between the houses. Some had been at the Neck before the massacre,[71] others had been admitted to share the site since. The older men (and perhaps a couple of the wives) had come in the days when Sir Thomas Smith ran the company, when warfare with the Powhatans was endemic; the other, mostly younger, folk had come in the more peaceful years when Sir Edwin Sandys determined the company's policy and was encouraging emigration. Neighbourliness there was, no doubt, between the households, but there were also tensions and animosity; and whereas good fellowship seldom finds a place in the record, resentments make their way to court and leave traces.

Nevertheless, among more numerous examples of dissension at the Neck the council minutes record one occasion on which there was agreement. In 1626 a proclamation required each plantation to name a single 'marchant' to go to Jamestown and there buy commodities for the whole plantation.[72] At a meeting for this purpose at Jordan's Journey Sgt William Sharpe and Richard Taylor made their dislike of the proclamation evident, 'sweringe many violent oathes (saide) we are Freemen and as Free as Sir George Yardley himselfe', adding that despite the proclamation they would go aboard any ship and buy their own provisions.[73]

More often, however, it was a dispute within the village that reached the council chamber. In January 1627 Richard Taylor complained in court at Jamestown that he 'susteine[d] much wronge from Thomas Harris and others that plant[ed] on his divident'. Summoned by warrant, Harris and the others produced a deed whereby four years earlier Taylor, with William Vincent and the late George Grimes, had agreed to share their cleared lands with the defendants. Judgement was therefore given for Harris and the other newcomers, and Taylor was ordered to reimburse the defendants their costs.[74] Two years later Taylor was more successful in a case he brought against William Sharpe and others. He claimed that they were keeping him from land granted to him by Sir George Yeardley and produced his patent. Since his claim was not challenged, the court gave him possession.[75]

Taylor's court appearance in January 1627 was not the first time that he had appeared in a case involving Thomas Harris. A year earlier, however, he had merely been giving evidence.[76] The principals – it is to be assumed, for no other

[71] On 20 Feb. 1620 John Price was granted 150 acres on Turkey Island; when his son Matthewe registered the grant in 1635, Price's widow held other land adjoining: Nugent, *Cavaliers and pioneers*, I, p. 88. Chard, Taylor, Vincent, and Grimes were certainly at the Neck before the massacre; Sgt Sharpe possibly (Meyer and Dorman, eds., *Adventurers*, p. 554); and perhaps Dods (see below, n. 80).

[72] McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, pp. 106–7.

[73] Ibid., pp. 113–14; in their excuse one witness stated that 'they then were overcome with drinke when they used those wordes'.

[74] Ibid., p. 129: the agreement was dated 11 Jan. 1623.

[75] Ibid., pp. 180–1: 20 Jan. 1629.

[76] Ibid., p. 96.

record of the case survives – were Thomas Harris and Joan Vincent. According to Taylor's evidence, taken on 6 March 1626, she said 'That there was Fowerteene women in the Church,[77] And that seven of them were Thomas Harris his whoores. And … That Thomas Harris made faste the doore and would have layne with a woman in the Plantacione against her will'. The summary in the clerk's court record does not indicate whether Taylor was appearing for the plaintiff or the defendant, but the fact that Taylor did not plead 'deafness' and was willing to repeat Joan Vincent's slanders suggests that he was not unhappy to report her words. A week later there was a hearing that cannot have been unconnected with Joan Vincent's: Thomas Harris and his wife came to court on 13 March after receiving a summons procured by William Vincent. Vincent himself, however, failed to appear. The court therefore discharged the Harrises and ordered Vincent to pay not only them but a witness, John Chambers of Paspaheghs, thirty pounds of tobacco each for their costs and time.[78]

Nor was Joan Vincent's squabble with Thomas Harris the first time that she had been before the Jamestown council, which in the colony was forced to take on the role of a church court, assuming the responsibility for policing morality that would in England have belonged to the local archdeacon. In 1624 there had been a series of episodes in which she had made sexual allegations against another of her neighbours. Having claimed that Alice Boyse, one of the newcomers to the Neck of Land, had given birth to a bastard, Joan was taken to court. Failing to prove her contention, she was condemned to stand in a white sheet before the congregation and ask Alice's pardon. This she refused to do. She then appealed to the council, but her appeal was dismissed. Unrepentant, she then accused Alice of causing trouble at Jordan's Journey between Samuel Jordan and his wife because of Samuel's great love for Alice, and further alleged that Alice and her husband 'had made … an arswarde Bargane before [they] were maryed'. Alice thereupon sought to have Joan prove her slanders and be censured.[79]

Here the record, maddeningly, ends, but not before it has provided further evidence of the resentment between those who had been at the Neck of Land before the massacre and those who had come since. Indeed, one suspects that the true matters in dispute were not sexual misbehaviour but property and

[77] That the church was at the Neck of Land is to be inferred from the fact that there were indeed fourteen women at the Neck in 1625 if the 15-year-old servant-girl Elizabeth is included in the tally.

[78] McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, p. 97.

[79] Ibid., p. 31. That there may have been some truth in Joan's allegations is suggested by events at Martin's Brandon in February 1627 (ibid., pp. 139–42): after a session in which half a dozen had drunk two or three gallons of wine, Alice, now widowed, shared a bed with Captain William Epes in a room occupied by others. Among them was Captain John Huddleston, who objected: '[T]here was soe great a motion in the bed that [I] rose and sayd *for shame doe not doe such thinges before soe many people* [to which] Capt Epes answered *fye brother thats too plaine*.' Despite Huddleston's evidence and that of several others, the court on 4 Apr. held that Capt Epes and Mrs Boise were 'cleare and guiltlesse' (ibid., p. 148).

status.[80] Women's gossip in early Chesapeake society, it seems, typically resorted to sexual allegations,[81] and a generation later in Maryland, in a somewhat comparable case, a boundary dispute apparently triggered allegations of sexual misbehaviour.[82]

For safety's sake and future protection from the Powhatans, it may be suggested, Taylor, Vincent, and Grimes in 1623 had agreed to share their holdings at the Neck of Land, and now they had to watch others both benefiting from their earlier clearances and overtaking them in status. In February 1624 Luke Boyse and Thomas Harris represented the Neck in the General Assembly,[83] and this exclusion of the first settlers appears to have occasioned a compromise two years later: Luke Boyse sat again in 1626, but this time his partner was Richard Taylor. The latter was chosen again in 1628, but alone. Boyse had died on 21 June 1626,[84] and no one apparently replaced him, an indication perhaps that the village was not growing in numbers as other plantations were. In 1629 Samuel Sharpe represented the Neck; he lived in Charles City, not at the Neck but on the other side of the river; in 1630 the Neck's representative was indeed an inhabitant of the Neck and one of the Ancient Planters there, Thomas Farmer. Had a compromise been reached? Did representation now alternate between those living north of the river and those living south? If it did, it prefigured the agreement made in the 1650s whereby alternate sessions of the county court were to be held on one side of the river or the other.[85]

In 1632 and 1633 there was a further rearrangement of the Neck's representation: in those years the Neck first shared representation with Arrowhattocks, Henrico, and Curles, neighbouring settlements upriver from the Neck. Their joint representative was Captain Thomas Osborne, who had sat in the General Assembly for the College land continuously since 1625, having assumed command there in February 1623.[86]

That the College land and the plantation at the Neck were by this time regarded as a single unit is also suggested by other measures taken by the Jamestown council. On 4 July 1627 it ordered a synchronized attack to be

[80] For a property dispute that was settled amicably – between William Vincent and John Dods – see McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, p. 166: 9 Feb. 1628. The peaceful outcome hints that Dods too had settled at the Neck before the massacre.

[81] Carol Berkin, *First generations: women in colonial America* (New York, 1997), pp. 11–12.

[82] Mary Beth Norton, 'Gender and defamation in seventeenth-cntury Maryland', *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 44 (1987), p. 17 n. 30. See also George B. Curtis, 'The colonial county court, social forum and legislative precedent: Accomack county, Virginia, 1633–1639', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 85 (1977), pp. 274–88, esp. p. 284; and Clara Ann Bowler, 'Carted whores and white shrouded apologies: slander in the county courts of seventeenth-century Virginia', ibid., pp. 411–26, both of which discuss the legal rather than the social context of slander.

[83] In 1619 the Neck of Land was not separately represented; the names of those who sat in 1621 are unknown.

[84] McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, p. 132.

[85] For the names of the burgesses and for information about the county courts, McIlwaine, ed., *Journals*, pp. vii–xiv, 101, 107, 108.

[86] McIlwaine, ed., *Journals*, pp. ix–xiv; *McIlwaine*, ed., *Minutes*, pp. 60–1, 64.

made on 1 August on nearby Indians in order to cut and remove their corn. By this plan the plantations at the Neck of Land and the College were to attack the Tanx Powhatans, and were to be commanded by Osborne, with Thomas Harris as his second-in-command.[87] Twenty months later, on 7 March 1629, the council confirmed Osborne's appointment, but this time left him the choice of his subordinate.[88]

IV

The records of the Virginia Company end in 1626 and the surviving pages of the Jamestown council's minutes virtually cease in 1629. It is thus almost impossible to follow the later fortunes of the villagers at the Neck of Land in Charles City county. A few items can be gleaned from the land grant records, but they tell only of marriages and deaths, of headrights and acres registered. Thus though they help us to compile individual biographies, they convey no such sense of the community at the Neck of Land, with its alliances and dissensions, as can be derived from the records of the 1620s, nor do they draw attention to the unusual nature of the village in that decade. Lacking the mortality to be found elsewhere in the James river valley, lacking also the gender imbalance to be encountered at other settlements, and without the distorting social presence of one of the colony's great landed proprietors, the community at the Neck of Land serves to remind us that in Virginia from an early date and from one end of the colony to the other, far upstream from Jamestown, down at the river's mouth at Point Comfort, or across the Chesapeake Bay on the Eastern Shore, there existed little societies that more closely resembled the English villages that these settlers had left rather than the predominantly male settlements, their frontier neighbours in Virginia. Aware of the Powhatan menace, but more concerned with cultivating their rich cornfields, the folk at the Neck of Land also busied themselves with a struggle for land and status, a struggle that one at least of their womenfolk not untypically expressed in sexual terms. In these circumstances it would be prudent to accept not only that the current view of early Virginian society needs considerable modification but that the materials for such a modification are available. Early Virginia is likely to emerge as a less masculine, less military society; women and children will make their presence more accurately felt.

[87] McIlwaine, ed., *Minutes*, p. 151.

[88] Ibid., p. 192.