

Appendix I: Calendars and Dates

Last Revised: November 22, 2013

A few words about calendars and dates may be helpful. The Julian calendar, used for centuries, had by the 16th century gotten seriously out of synchronization with the natural, seasonal one, and Easter was coming later and later into the spring. Pope Gregory XIII therefore initiated a reform: a new calendar that took effect in 1582 in most Roman Catholic areas and at various later times in others.¹ This calendar, still in use today, has through an elaborate formula for adding leap days in leap years almost eliminated the disparity with the natural calendar – and the resulting “creep” of Easter.

England and its possessions delayed adoption of the Gregorian calendar until 1752. In these areas it was not uncommon for dates in January, February, and much of March to be expressed using the year both in the Julian system and that in the new Gregorian system. For example, the birthday of George Washington, born on February 11, 1731, under the Julian calendar, was sometimes written “February 11, 1731/2.” In 1752, the English brought their calendar into harmony with the Gregorian calendar by dropping eleven days between September 2 and September 14 of that year, eliminating the accumulated “drag” that the Julian calendar had caused. In addition, the English began to

¹ The relevant conversion dates were as follows: Belgium, 1582-83; France, 1582; Alsace, 1648; Roman Catholic regions of Germany, 1583; Protestant regions of Germany, up to 1700; Roman Catholic regions of the Netherlands (mainly Holland and Brabant), 1582; Protestant regions of the Netherlands, 1701; Norway, 1701; Roman Catholic regions of Switzerland, 1584; and Protestant regions of Switzerland, 1700.

recognize January 1, not March 25, as the first day of the new year. With these changes, Washington's birthday was instantly transformed into February 22, 1732.

What are the implications for a family history such as this one? Fortunately, most European areas made the change fairly early, before we have specific dates for most events in our families' histories. In other cases, the sources are not always clear about which calendar is being cited for dates subject to possible conversion. Most of the sources appear to have used the Gregorian calendar date, and so I have assumed that dates not otherwise identified are also in fact Gregorian ones. Where double-dating was employed, I have sometimes used the date of the later year and sometimes used the "split" date, depending on how the source cited it. It is possible, however, that a few of these dates are one year off – either because someone else has erred in recording the "actual" date or because I have guessed wrong about which calendar system was being used.

Appendix II: Understanding Land Descriptions and Sales

Land that was settled before 1785, chiefly that along the Eastern seaboard, was acquired and sold using descriptions that were based upon the landmarks and physical characteristics of the land itself – streams, hills, such prominent features as notable trees, and the like – in order to establish where this land abutted other properties. This system was generally termed “metes and bounds” (that is, meeting points and boundaries). The process for turning unsettled land (tellingly, often described as “waste” land) into a particular person’s property typically went as follows. The claimant or original purchaser first obtained – by grant or otherwise – the right to acquire a certain number of acres. He would then select the particular land he desired, marking (usually by blazing or “tomahawking” trees) where it met the property of someone else or some noteworthy natural feature. These were the claimant’s “metes,” connected by “bounds,” which were measured by chain lengths (typically 80 chains equaled one mile) or a certain number of rods, a rod an old measurement equal to 16 1/2 feet.. The settler paced off the bounds to make sure the acreage he was claiming matched that he was allowed.

Naturally, a settler carved out of the wilderness facing him what he thought would be the most desirable total acreage he was entitled to, which as he sought to incorporate adequate water supply, fertile ground, and other choice pieces and others did the same

with their selections brought into being a jumble of odd-shaped parcels with many angles – and often as many owners. Next, the settler or the pertinent jurisdiction engaged a surveyor to make a more precise survey of the property, which when the surveyor signed it made the settler eligible to claim his deed from the colony, the proprietor, or whoever else was making the land available.

Deeds recording later land transactions sometimes repeated the metes and bounds verbatim, but after enough time had passed, the descriptions so carefully written down the original survey (“from two red oak trees on a knoll” or “to the rock outcropping above the big curve in the stream bed”) could lose all meaning. Even when the physical features in the descriptions survived after all those years there could be confusion over which two oak trees or which curve in the stream bed the original survey had been based upon. Trying to track today who owned what land using the metes and bounds that were noted two centuries or more ago is at best a very difficult process.

The metes and bounds descriptions prevailed principally for those of our families who lived in the Eastern seaboard areas, as well as for those who occupied land in what would become West Virginia and Kentucky. Parts of Ohio and the other areas to the west, however, became the property of the United States by the late 1780s. Sale of this unsettled land was a major source of revenue for the new national government. To describe and sell this “public” or “government” land, the United States devised a wholly

new system of descriptions called the rectangular survey system. Beginning with the land legislation of the 1780s, the rectangular survey system became the standard technique that Americans would use as they settled the remainder of the continent.

In the rectangular survey system, various imaginary horizontal Meridians and vertical Base Lines were surveyed and drawn, after which tiers of Ranges (running north and south) and Townships (running east and west) were laid off from Meridians and Base Lines in great parallel strips until another Meridian or Base Line was reached. Any particular point within the grid formed by the crisscrossing strips could, therefore, be described by its Range and Township numbers in relation to the nearest unique Meridians and Base Lines between which this point lies. The horizontal divisions, also called Townships, were, with few exceptions (notably in Ohio) six miles by six miles and were the basis for identifying specific plots of land. These Townships used for land identification were not always identical to the *political* townships that counties created as smaller governmental and administrative units within the overall county; the political townships, which were given names (Cass, Sugar Ridge) and could incorporate land from one or more of the Townships and Ranges that were used for land identification.

The horizontal Townships were divided into smaller entities called Sections that were one mile by one mile in size. There were usually thirty-six Sections of 640 acres each in every Township. The Sections were numbered consecutively, beginning with Section 1

at the northeastern corner of the Township. The numbers continued across the top, down to the west end of the second row and thence east to the edge of the Township, then down to the east end of the third row and back to the west, and so forth until Section 36 was reached at the far southeastern corner of the Township. Every Township was divided up in this same manner, using the same numbering system.

The Sections were further subdivided into square units called half-sections (320 acres) and quarter-sections (160 acres), which in turn could be divided into four 40-acre parcels. Generally speaking, the smallest quantity of public land sold was 40 acres, one-quarter of a quarter-section, and it was years before that small a minimum purchase was allowed by law. These various subdivisions of the Sections were described using the four points of the compass (that is, they were the northwest, northeast, southeast, and southwest quarters of Section 10). These four quarter-sections of 160 acres each could themselves be divided and described in the same manner, so that each one had four equal 40-acre portions, also, somewhat confusingly, called the northwest, northeast, southeast, and southwest quarters. Thus, a particular 40-acre parcel might be described as being the southwest quarter of the 160-acre southwest quarter of Section 10. It would be bounded on the north by the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 10 and on the east by the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 10, both having 40 acres; the remaining one-fourth of the southwest quarter of Section 10 (the northeast quarter of that southwest quarter) would be diagonally opposed to the southwest quarter of the

southwest quarter of Section 10, where the two would touch at the very center of that section's 160-acre quarter.

All of these imaginary lines were surveyed before any land sales took place. Indeed, surveyors were often the first people to set foot on most of the land that makes up the American continent beyond the Eastern seaboard. Poorly paid and with a minimum of manpower and equipment, these surveyors braved the elements, Indian attacks, and primitive conditions to put down on paper the framework within which settlers would establish themselves and development would proceed. Mostly the surveyors did a fine job, although some of them succumbed to temptation and used their offices for private gain. Others were less than competent or energetic. But surveyors are unsung heroes of the westward development of this nation.

Once the surveying was completed, which often took many years, the General Land Office, the government bureau that controlled the western lands, would advertise the sale by auction of the land in question. These sales were often occasions of considerable interest within the community, rivaling the periodic court days. People would gather in order to inspect the official registers of available tracts, discuss the value of the land to be sold, and speculate about possible buyers. The purchase of land was of more lasting importance to the family that obtained it. These acres would determine its destiny for many years to come, perhaps for generations. If they chose well, the family could expect

a secure and bountiful (if difficult) future; if not, their investment of capital and labor might be in vain, leaving them little choice but to move on or give up their hope of owning their own land.

National land policy from 1785 until the Civil War was characterized by smaller and smaller minimum purchases, from 640 acres in 1785 to 320 acres in 1800 to 160 acres in 1804 to 80 acres in 1820, and finally to 40 acres in 1832. The minimum price was fixed at \$1 per acre in 1785 but was raised to \$2 per acre in 1796. In 1804 it was reduced again (to \$1.64 per acre for cash purchases and \$2 per acre for credit purchases), and in 1820 the minimum purchase price was made \$1.25 per acre. It was kept at this amount until the Civil War. Between 1800 and 1820, purchasers could obtain land on credit, making a 25% down payment in cash and paying the remainder in three annual installments. This provision led to so much indebtedness and failure to pay that it was terminated.

The practice of “preemption,” in which persons gained the right to purchase land on which they had personally settled (or that they had been cultivating) before it was offered for public sale, was not permitted until 1830 and was not made permanent until 1841. Most of the public land purchases described in this family history narrative came during or following the 1830s, after the minimum acreage had been reduced to 80 and then 40 acres. Because of the growing backlog of land sales and understaffing at the General Land Office, there was often considerable delay – sometimes several years – between the

time a person entered and purchased land, then applied for a patent, and the time when the patent was actually signed at the General Land Office in Washington, D.C. The date of the patent is, therefore, often only a rough guide as to when the buyer actually took legal possession and began living on it. Only an inspection of state tract books, some held by the states and some at the National Archives, can determine the actual purchase date. Purchases made during the 1830s and later could have been made through preemption; unfortunately, there is no easy way to identify such purchases.

Once public land was in private hands it could be resold, either as it had been purchased from the government or in portions, not necessarily the ones that were used in the rectangular survey system. Over the two centuries since this system was inaugurated, many of the original plots have been subdivided or broken up entirely, which has created its own patchwork of parcels, but in a surprising number of instances the original plots have remained intact – sometimes in the hands of the original families.

With the rectangular survey system there could be no confusion then, or today either, about the precise location of a particular piece of land: the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 8, Township 3 North, Range 6 West in relation to a particular Base Line and Meridian can mean only one place in the United States, and this description will never change. The rectangular survey system was applied ruthlessly, whatever the terrain or features, though there were accommodations for inaccessible

points and the curvature of the earth. This explains why much of America is laid out in a rigid geometric fashion, often perfect squares. Whatever one may think of it on esthetic grounds, the rectangular survey system at least enables us to give a particular parcel of land a unique, unmistakable, and timeless description.

Wherever possible I have cited the survey designations, along with the United States Geological Survey map on which the property is found. Thus it is that we can with ease identify, and usually go right to, the very acreage that some of the people in this family history staked out up to two hundred years ago.

Appendix III: The Vanderpools and Mining

Some Vanderpool family researchers have advanced the theory that the Vanderpools were a family of miners during the 18th century, possibly even before that. Certainly the areas where they lived during those years had mining as a common denominator, and mining thus may help to explain the migration of Abraham Vanderpool from New Jersey to North Carolina. Some background will be helpful.

The Dutch learned about ores in what they called Raritan, New Jersey – which according to their use of the name could have been anywhere inland and westward from New York harbor – as early as the 1640s. The West India Company ordered Director Stuyvesant to develop this resource. In 1659, the Company first heard about copper at “the Neversinks” and near the Esopus. The valley of Neversink, later usually called the Minisink area, runs along both sides of the Delaware River for forty miles above the Delaware Water Gap.² This narrow valley was once thought to have been settled by “Hollanders” by the 1660s, more than twenty years before Philadelphia (at the outlet of the Delaware River) was settled, but there is now considerable doubt about this. Still, it is clear that the early Dutch were at least acquainted with this region and its features and resources.

² Confusing things even more, the Neversink River was then called the Machackemeck.

Here in the Minisink there were deposits of iron ore, lead, silver, and perhaps copper as well. Most of the later mines extracting these metals were on the New Jersey side of the river. One was at the lower point of Paaquarry Flat where the adjacent mountain range nearly touches the water, and another was at the north foot of the same mountain about halfway between the Delaware River and the Esopus. There was also an iron works, Union Furnace, in Hunterdon County, New Jersey, by the early 1740s; it was located on Spruce Run about two miles west of High Bridge.

In about 1725 the Dutch built a church on the Pennsylvania side of the river, opposite Tock's Island near the present-day town of Shawnee. The later (1737) Smithfield church used the Dutch church's building. When the Dutch first entered this area, nearly one hundred miles from the small pockets of European civilization along the Hudson River, there had recently been a bloody conflict with the Indians. For Europeans to have gone so far into the wilds, there had to have been a strong lure; metal deposits may have been that lure. Fortunately, peace with the Indians prevailed from 1664 to 1756, and the Dutch may have negotiated special arrangements with the Indians surrounding the Minisink area.

An intriguing aspect of this story is the key role that Roelofs Swartwout may have played in it. Realizing that the fur trade was in steep decline after the 1650s, he probably grasped the potential of developing mines as an alternative. When he journeyed to

Amsterdam at the end of that decade to convince the East India Company to give him authority at Wiltwyck, he may also have persuaded it to help him develop the mines: the ship that returned him to New Netherland had on board a contingent of soldiers and “agriculturists” who do not seem to have lived in Wiltwyck. Some researchers believe that they were sent, in secret, to populate the Minisink area – and to extract ore from these mines, but there is no firm evidence to support this.

There is also speculation that Adriaen Post, known since the Peach War for being a skilled negotiator with the Indians, served in a similar capacity in working out the arrangements with the Indians that permitted the Dutch to develop the mines in peace. Post was the father-in-law of Johannes de Hooges, who was the stepson of Roelofs Swartwout. What we know about Swartwout casts a different light on the incident in early 1671 (described in the De Hooges chapter of the text) when Swartwout and young De Hooges encountered the strange “southern” Indians partway between Wiltwyck and the Minisink area. In this location was what was known as “the old mine road.” It is possible that Swartwout and young Johannes de Hooges were in transit in this area when they encountered Indians they thought might endanger their business interests.

The British conquest of New Netherland in 1664 stalled Swartwout's plans, but gradually he gained influence with the new English regime. On one occasion during the late 1680s he accompanied the usurper governor, Jacob Leisler, on a tour of the western frontier,

and surely a visit to the mines would have been included. After Leisler was removed and hanged by the British in 1691, Swartwout, as one of Leisler's supporters, surely lost influence again. Whether or not he (and Johannes de Hooges) continued to be involved in the mining operations is not known, but it is noteworthy that Roelofs Swartwout died in the Minisink region, at Machackemeck (now Port Jervis).³ Nor was Swartwout the only person connected with the Vanderpools who was involved with mining. Some of the families with whom the Vanderpool family was associated, or with whom they moved to the South Branch of the Potomac River, seem to have been in the mining business.

In view of this background, it may be more than coincidence that every place Abraham Vanderpool lived after the 1720s had either mines, furnaces, or smelters nearby. In addition, we know that Abraham's brother Melgert was a miner, for he was described as such in the report of his fatal fall in a mine on April 2, 1743. Copper was discovered near Newark in 1719, and it may have been one of the reasons why Abraham moved there within a few years of this discovery. The central section of the northern New Jersey highlands was a center for iron production during these years and probably for the smelting of other ores as well. By 1740 Abraham and his family had relocated to Wallpack in the Minisink area, where what seemed to be copper outcroppings had been observed.⁴ The prospects for copper deposits of any value in New Jersey had diminished

³ There is a lake bearing Swartwout's name not far from Port Jervis, New York.

⁴ The area known as Wallpack extended along the Delaware River below Port Jervis, the western end of the old mine road. The Smithfield church was thirty or so miles south of Port Jervis.

by the 1740s, though, and so it would have been natural for Abraham to have looked elsewhere.⁵

The Virginia frontier where he spent the next decade and more had a number of mining areas. Just about the time the Vanderpools were relocating to Virginia, Robert “King” Carter informed Thomas, Lord Fairfax (who owned much of that part of Virginia) that copper and iron deposits had been reported on the upper reaches of the South Bank of the Potomac River – exactly where the Vanderpools had gone to live. In addition, among the numerous iron furnaces all along the mountain ranges from Pennsylvania to South Carolina, there was at least one near Winchester, where Abraham Vanderpool may have lived for a time. (It was a Dutchman named Vestal who built the first ironworks in Frederick County, Virginia, in 1742, approximately the time the Vanderpools were in the area.) The lead deposits in the New River area of Virginia (near Fort Chiswell, nine miles east of Wytheville) were discovered in 1756, not long before Abraham and other Vanderpools had begun living nearby.

In North Carolina, too, there is a hint that the Vanderpools might have been engaged in mining activities: in a 1794 deed in Surry County in that state, the property of Abraham Vanderpool the younger (that is, the son of the man who was born in New York) seems to

⁵ The green bands that looked like copper ore were in fact *Kupferschiefer* greens, copper’s counterpart to pyrite (sometimes called fool’s gold).

have adjoined an ore bank that a neighbor was intending to develop as he set up an iron works. One wonders if Abraham too might have been involved in this project.⁶

Even as late as the American Revolution, the 250 or so iron works in the American colonies were clustered in northern New Jersey, the adjacent areas of southern New York, and eastern Pennsylvania – exactly the places where the Vanderpools had lived before migrating to Virginia and North Carolina. All this might help us to understand why the Vanderpools moved where and when they did, but we must bear in mind that the path the Vanderpools took was far from an uncommon one. Many, many families followed the same itinerary from the New York and New Jersey area to western Virginia to the Carolinas, and only a few of them were miners. The circumstantial evidence regarding the Vanderpools is suggestive, however, and we can hope that we will learn more in the future about the role that mining played in their family's history and physical movements.

⁶ South Carolina, too, had mines, and some Vanderpools went there.

Appendix IV: Settling the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia

Because a number of the families this history traces – in particular, the Funkhousers, the Zincks, the Rickabaughs, and the Lionbergers – were pioneers in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia during the first half of the 18th century, it seems appropriate to devote some attention to how that area was settled and how people there lived at that time. Fortunately, considerable research has been done on this subject, and so we know a good deal about both of these topics. Much of that research focuses on the lower (northern) Shenandoah Valley, chiefly what is today Frederick County, but there is reason to believe that much of what we learn from that research pertains as well to the areas further south and southeast. These areas would become Shenandoah County and Page County, where our families lived.

Migrants typically were drawn to a new geographic area both in order to pursue greater economic security and opportunity and to escape conditions they regarded as oppressive. (One cannot ignore, as motivating factors for some migrants, a certain restlessness and sense of adventure.) Most of those who went to the Shenandoah Valley during the first half of the 18th century, or their parents, had recently sailed from Europe to Pennsylvania. Here they spread outward into the several counties that ringed Philadelphia, but high land prices, driven upward by the colony's population growth and delays in opening uninhabited Indian lands to the west, produced an economic squeeze.

Thus families began to look southward to the Shenandoah Valley – where neither Indians nor European peoples resided at this time, where ample good land awaited settlement, and where they could hope to manage their lives with a minimum of interference.

Coincidentally, Virginia's colonial leadership, alarmed by increased French penetration of the vast territory beyond the Allegheny Mountains, mounting clashes with unfriendly Indians, and other worries, took steps during the 1720s and 1730s to encourage settlement of the Shenandoah Valley. Although the Blue Ridge Mountains, on the western edge of Virginia's inhabited areas (and east of the Shenandoah Valley), formed what seemed at first to be a formidable barrier to incursions by French and Indians from further west, newly discovered passes through the Blue Ridge showed that the established eastern counties of Virginia were not as safe as it had been thought. If Virginia could push through those passes and begin to settle the Shenandoah Valley, though, it could create a buffer against unfriendly French and Indians, stabilize that desirable area for future growth, and at the same time eliminate the growing use of the mountains as a haven for escaped slaves.

So it was that Virginia's governor and council took a series of steps to entice new peoples to settle in the Shenandoah Valley. They created new counties and provided for justices and courts so that governmental authority and institutions would be in place when the bulk of the settlers arrived. It exempted newcomers from levies and taxes, land

payments, and the like for ten years. It authorized naturalization of aliens (a major concern of Germans and Swiss immigrants). It set aside funds for arming settlers. And it took a step toward freedom of worship by relieving newcomers affiliated with other denominations of the yearly tithe that provided financial support for the Church of England, again for the first ten years.

Virginia especially hoped to attract white Protestants with families who would in short order establish themselves as independent yeoman farmers in the Shenandoah Valley – and be willing to defend their interests, if necessary, against the French and the Indians. An obvious source for such settlers was the increasing numbers of Germans and Scotch-Irish who were arriving in Pennsylvania and who were looking for better lives elsewhere. Virginians expected (altogether correctly, as it turned out) that such settlers would soon develop a network of extended-family, diversified-agricultural clusters along the colony's western frontier – the Shenandoah Valley – that would anchor that region and allay the apprehensions that Virginians were feeling. (Meanwhile, as we have seen in the Vineyard chapter, Virginia was also actively recruiting German families to fill in the space between the established areas and the eastern slopes of the Appalachian Mountains.)

Beginning during the 1730s, therefore, Virginia made a number of extensive land grants to men (some of them influential German or Scotch-Irish immigrants themselves) in

return for their promises to attract as many as one hundred additional families to the Shenandoah Valley and to sell these families portions of the land Virginia would be granting. And attract settlers these men did, through personal and family ties, word of mouth, printed advertisements, travelers, and agents sent specifically to Pennsylvania and beyond to entice families to migrate to Virginia. Soon wagons full of people had begun arriving in the Shenandoah Valley, after arduous treks that could take up to two months along rudimentary paths and over or through countless creeks and rivers. Some of the families came as intact units; others sent one or more members to scout the land before the remainder followed.

Leaving from Philadelphia or somewhere in the ring of counties outside it, most of the travelers journeyed south and west on the route (there known as the Carolina Road and in the Shenandoah Valley as the Great Wagon Road) that paralleled the mountain ridges. After crossing the Potomac River south of Harrisburg, they entered Virginia just above the site where Winchester was founded in 1743, near the northern end of the sprawling Shenandoah Valley, after which they went through the Strasburg area and then traveled many more miles further south up the Shenandoah Valley. Some would end their journey in North Carolina, others in South Carolina. Still other migrants took a route somewhat to the east, from Lancaster in Pennsylvania to the Monocacy area of Maryland and then over the Potomac River – which also brought them to the Shenandoah Valley's northern section. From there, settlers scattered. Some (the Lionbergers and the Rickabaughs, for

example) followed the South Fork of the Shenandoah River into the Page Valley; others stayed with the North Fork of that river until they found a home in what is now Shenandoah County (the Zincks and Funkhousers, for instance) or even went further south, into what are now Rockingham and Augusta Counties. This kind of dispersion was exactly what Virginia's leaders had hoped for.

Many of these families established deep and lasting roots in the Shenandoah Valley. Although members of their later generations might move on further south and west, across the Allegheny Mountains, numerous descendants of these pioneers who settled in the Shenandoah Valley during the first half of the 18th century remain in this part of Virginia today. In our case, many of the Funkhousers, Griffiths, and Lionbergers remained whereas the Rickabaughs, Zincks, and Crooks families left it entirely.

In addition, certain other families we have studied – the Rings, McCammons, and Cowdens, for example – probably passed through the Shenandoah Valley without ever residing here, or, as in the case of the Neals, without residing there for long. The Vanderpools are a special case, since they were not German or Scotch-Irish but Dutch and arrived in the Shenandoah Valley by means of a different route. In fact, however, they were recruited for the South Branch of the Potomac River region exactly as described in this appendix.

The newcomers found in the Shenandoah Valley a beautiful land with extensive forest cover atop a rich limestone soil, even richer bottomlands near the Shenandoah River's two branches, and numerous forest openings and meadows that seemed to invite immediate cultivation. Where watercourses fell over shale rock, sites for mills abounded. Most of the settlers carefully carved out of the wilderness sizeable tracts with a mix of assets: a reliable water source (a run or a spring), abundant fertile lowland, some higher pasture, and areas of woodland. They had their chosen land surveyed, arranged for payment, and got to work.

The Shenandoah Valley farmsteads that this process created were, unsurprisingly, rather rude at first. A visitor would notice a mosaic of small gardens and fields – fenced only enough to keep the free-roaming cattle, hogs, and other animals out of them – surrounding a simple residence and perhaps a few outbuildings. Orchards of apple, pear, peach, cherry, and plum trees would also be nearby. Scattered among the structures might be racks with skins drying on them (hunting would long remain a major source of both food and clothing), tables for slaughtering hogs, and outdoor fires for rendering and cooking purposes. The settlers one might encounter would be dressed quite simply and much like the Indian natives, in moccasins and skins that their hunting had yielded. They

might or might not address their visitor in English, German-speakers remaining a sizeable segment of the Shenandoah Valley's population for many years.⁷

Shenandoah Valley farmsteads like this would raise several types of grains (wheat, rye, oats, barley) and corn, mostly for foodstuffs but also as a source of liquid refreshment. Flax and hemp might also be cultivated, along with a little tobacco – in large part for the convenience of paying taxes, which were calculated in pounds of tobacco.⁸ Butter and cheese might be produced in sufficient quantity so that a small surplus could be used for trading. Horses to pull plows, cattle for milk and meat (also, in many instances, for sale beyond the borders of Virginia), hogs and sheep for food and clothing, chickens and turkeys – all these would populate the woods and fields around every farmstead in this cluster of families. Many of the animals in fact were almost wild, roaming at will and living off the land.

Invited inside the dwelling of the family, our visitor would be reminded again that life on such a frontier farm was simple and without comforts. Most early structures were basic one-room cabins of notched logs with beaten earth (possibly puncheon) floors, although stone structures were not uncommon. Typically twenty or twenty-two feet wide across

⁷ George Washington's diary entry (cited in the Vanderpool chapter of the text), recorded after his visit to Abraham Vanderpool's property on the South Branch of the Potomac in 1748, must have been prompted by a scene something like the one described in this paragraph.

⁸ Wheat as a cash crop was increasingly grown in the Shenandoah Valley from the 1760s onward, as higher prices for flour overcame the high cost of transporting it to Eastern destinations. A bounty for producing the hemp so important for naval use, again from the 1760s onward, stimulated production of this crop.

the front and sixteen or eighteen feet deep at the ends, a log or stone cabin would have an off-center door and a single window in front, a large stone fireplace at the end opposite the door, and a pitched roof of shingles or thatch. Such a structure was little more than a kitchen and shelter from the weather, and its furnishings would be few in number and rudimentary in nature: a rough table, perhaps a chair or two, a couple of rope beds, a candlestick, a mirror if the family could afford it, and not much more.

Once larger residences were constructed many of the earliest cabins were turned into outdoor kitchens, where smoke and heat and the danger of fire could be kept separate from the newer principal residence. Other cabins became the first modules of larger dwellings. As other buildings were subsequently built, they were joined to the earlier ones and the resulting amalgamation was covered over in ways to make it look like a single – and more modern – structure.

A farmstead's outbuildings might include a stable, a spring house, a smoke house, and perhaps a shed for drying skins. A barn was a high priority, since the welfare of one's animals was almost as important as the welfare of one's family. Single-story barns similar to the settlers' cabins might be erected first, but Pennsylvania bank barns usually were erected as soon as possible. On one side of such barns, a ramp led up to a floor and loft used for threshing and storing crops; on the opposite side an outdoor animal lot

opened into a lower level, tucked beneath the projecting main floor above, where animals could find shelter.

What the Shenandoah Valley pioneers ate is evident from what they raised. Fresh meat might be available throughout the winter, since men folk would hunt – mostly deer but also such smaller animals as raccoons and squirrels – throughout the colder months. Chickens, turkeys, and cattle could also be slaughtered and consumed even during colder weather, but much of a family's meat over the winter was preserved. Pork, along with cornmeal the major ingredient of the pioneer's diet, was salted after the hogs were butchered (usually in early winter). Beef could be potted in a sealed crock, where it would keep for months. Fruits and vegetables might be pickled, preserved (in brandy or sugar), or dried during harvest season in preparation for the long winter ahead. Some foodstuffs, like potatoes and apples, would keep in a root cellar for an extended period. Variety in meals was not common.

Linked to this small farmstead by a number of primitive paths (or "traces") would be a scattering of other farmsteads occupied by kin and close friends and, perhaps, a place of worship. Although most of those living nearby would likely be members of the same ethnic group, Germans could be found in Scotch-Irish areas and vice versa. Multiple marriages would bind generation after generation of German neighbors to one another in complex webs of relationships, and Scotch-Irish neighbors to one another in similar

relationships, but rarely would the two groups intermarry. Unless the settlers in an area had gotten together and petitioned for a road (after which an overseer would be charged with seeing that the tithable males would build and maintain it), this cluster of families would most of the time be a universe within itself – one of the many clusters of settler families that Virginia had sought to plant in the Shenandoah Valley.

Isolated and diversified as these Shenandoah Valley farmsteads might be, they were far from self-sufficient and independent. Indeed, they were *interdependent* elements of a broader exchange economy in which their labor and products served as a kind of money. During the period we are focusing on here, the 18th century, there were almost no merchants or stores in the Shenandoah Valley and only the occasional itinerant trader with his pack of wares. Instead, families traded goods and services with one another, getting in return labor or products they could not produce themselves. This was not a one-to-one barter system but an ongoing and complex system that extended the benefits of such exchanges over a wide area.

The intrinsic value of products and labor, calculated in monetary terms (their recognized “worth”), circulated in a continuous flow from one family to another and, in time, throughout the Shenandoah Valley’s economy. Money itself usually did not change hands, although gold and silver specie – which was scarce – could be exchanged as commodities themselves; mostly, money was used to balance accounts, if and when that

was required. The result was a stable system of revolving debts and credits extending over a long period of time, often many years, that functioned as a kind of perpetual-motion machine – almost completely without the involvement of the government, merchants, banks, or other middlemen. Eventually stores and a monetary system would evolve to replace the exchange economy, which had largely disappeared by 1800, and in time cash would become the medium for purchases and sales.

A simple exchange would be a straightforward transaction involving two families. One of them would trade, say, several hogs in return for a newborn calf; unlike a straight barter, any difference in value between the items changing hands would be held over for a future exchange. But the benefit of the exchange economy was its ability to make possible more complex exchanges of labor and products. For example, one family might offer several days of labor, a few deer skins, and some pairs of shoes (made as a sideline to farming, since most Shenandoah Valley artisans could not yet support themselves solely through their trade) in exchange for another family's flax seed, linen, and fifty pounds of honey. The family receiving the honey might use some of it to acquire liquor or lead for bullets from someone else, perhaps a total stranger to the first family, and then trade some of the lead to yet another person as payment for having a horse gelded. The lead, in turn, might continue in motion as part of yet another exchange, and so on.

Credit and debits thus were passed along from family to family – just as our dollar bills are passed along, over and over, to various merchants and individuals in turn. All the while, the trading partners maintained, usually in their heads but sometimes on paper, their “balances” with others. Credits and obligations could be preserved in such mental banks until needed, perhaps for many years. The object of participating in this exchange system was not to “make” money but to remain in approximate balance with others while filling one’s needs.

Supplementing this system was a similar one in which personal notes, or IOUs, did serve as a kind of paper currency. A debtor might write out an acknowledgement of his debt, which the creditor would use to obtain something from a third party who would (if all went well) accept the note as payment in the confidence that he could recover the stated value from the writer of the note – or who discounted it by a certain amount that corresponded with his lack of confidence in this ability to collect what he was owed. Alternatively, a creditor receiving a note might subtract the amount he was owed and pass along an amended note for the remainder. These notes, too, could pass through many Shenandoah Valley hands before being retired. Written orders for payment, like today’s checks, also circulated. In this instance, in order to satisfy his creditor the writer of the order would instruct a third party to pay to the creditor (perhaps someone unknown to that third party) that third party’s own debt to the initiator of the order. Here again the

written order could be endorsed, for the full amount or some portion thereof, over to persons not involved in the original transaction.

In all these ways the exchange system extended its reach throughout the Shenandoah Valley (and even beyond, since manufactured goods were typically obtained in Philadelphia or, later, Baltimore, using a similar system of credits and debits, notes, and orders) and served as a more or less fluid method for the flow of trade and commerce over both time and space.

To be sure, the Shenandoah Valley of the first half of the 18th century was a far different place than it is today, although one can see – in addition to the enduring beauty – vestiges of that earlier culture in the peoples, folkways, values, settlement patterns, and architecture of the modern Shenandoah Valley. The experience newcomers gained while settling the Shenandoah Valley during the 18th century was also put to use as Americans subsequently crested the Allegheny Mountains, during and after the American Revolution, and continued to pursue our nation's constantly moving frontier during the decades that followed. Thus the Shenandoah Valley served as a kind of precursor or model for the later frontier experience that would become one of America's most distinctive and powerful features.

Appendix V: The Neals and Daniel Boone

I heard from my grandfather, who evidently had heard it from the Neals who preceded him, that his family had begun in Pennsylvania and had traveled west with Daniel Boone. Boone was born in the Reading, Pennsylvania, area in 1734 or 1735 and arrived in Kentucky by way of North Carolina. There is also family lore that the Neals intermarried with the Boones. Since we still know only a limited amount about Edward Neal's origins and route to Kentucky, the evidence at hand will never enable us to prove or disprove this tradition within the Neal family, but it seems useful to consider this tradition closely for what it might tell us.

It must be said that certain traditions are so commonly found in family history accounts that they almost take on the character of urban legends, difficult to track down and verify – or dismiss. Such traditions include “Three brothers came to America; one went north, one went south, and one went west and was never heard from again” and “One of our ancestors lived to be 115 years old.” Among those who migrated from the East into Kentucky, one common tradition is “Our family traveled to Kentucky with Daniel Boone.”

Traditions like these enrich a family's history, but we must be wary when we encounter such lore. This is not to say that all such traditions should be dismissed out of hand: I

am convinced that a family's oral tradition is a very valuable clue about its history. But that oral tradition must be tested against what else we know, about the family and about the specific subject, to see if it seems plausible. That is what we must do with the tradition that our Neals traveled with Daniel Boone.

After having studied Boone's life, I am inclined to doubt our family lore. Although it was usual for several families to migrate in a body (as we have seen with the Starks and the Vineyards, for example), the Boones typically traveled as a *single* family unit. In addition, one of Daniel Boone's peculiarities was that he moved from place to place too often to get very well acquainted with other people and evidently preferred the solitude of traveling alone. For these reasons it seems unlikely that hardly *anyone* actually "traveled with" the Boone family or its most famous member.

Before we learned what we know now about Edward Neal and his movements, it seemed possible that the Neals might have taken a similar path to Kentucky, perhaps at about the same time, and perhaps even as part of a larger group that gravitated from Pennsylvania to North Carolina to Kentucky in rough proximity to (or on the heels of) the Boones. Looking at the history of the Boones and their migration thus seemed to offer some hope of seeing how the Neal family might have made their way from Pennsylvania to Kentucky during that area's first years of settlement.

In 1750, the Boone family, including young Daniel, journeyed westward in Pennsylvania to Harrisburg, then south along the valleys on the Carolina or Great Wagon Road. (U.S. 11 now takes essentially this same route.)⁹ They forded the Potomac River at Williamsport, Maryland, and followed the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia southward all the way to North Carolina. While passing through the Shenandoah Valley, the Boones encountered the Bryan family, the family of Daniel's wife Rebecca. By the early 1750s the Boones were living at the fork of the Yadkin River in Rowan County, North Carolina. Daniel Boone was exploring in Kentucky by the late 1760s and was there again in 1770.

Reports of the fertility of Kentucky land circulated widely in the East, and there was a surge of “Kentucky fever” in the seaboard colonies in 1772 and 1773. Accompanying this was unhappiness in most of these colonies over the disproportionate taxes and fees that governments in their far-off eastern portions seemed to be imposing on the western sections. Land speculation, too, was a strong motivating factor in driving people further west – which frequently meant south and then west, as we have seen. Successive waves of migration had begun to fill the valleys of Virginia and the farmland of the western Carolinas. All of these factors, plus Americans' seemingly endemic wanderlust, were impelling people just east of the frontier to move beyond it. During the 1770s, pressure to move west was building behind the leading edge of civilization.

⁹ Sometimes called the Philadelphia Road in the South because Philadelphia was its northern terminus.

During the fall of 1773 Daniel Boone led about forty or fifty persons to Kentucky in the first serious attempt at permanent settlement of the area. I found no reference to Neals being part of this group, which in this case was largely though not entirely composed of Boone's own relatives. There were additional settlements in Kentucky in 1775, as we have seen (including Harrodsburg and Boonsboro), and in 1779 Boone recruited still more settlers in the Yadkin area. It is possible that Neals were in this group instead, but many of these pioneers died or retreated to North Carolina and Virginia after failing to make a go of it in Kentucky or because of renewed Indian attacks.¹⁰ There is no evidence, therefore, to link our Neals' arrival in Kentucky to Daniel Boone's own arrival there during the 1770s, and what we know about them during these years places them still in Virginia and South Carolina.

Movement into Kentucky swelled during the 1780s. Much of the migration passed through the Cumberland Gap, where a single opening allows the crossing of some otherwise-formidable mountains and the traveler finds himself, once the last mountain range has fallen away, in central Kentucky. By the 1790s, though, travel to Kentucky through Pennsylvania and down the water routes had begun to predominate. Surprisingly, Boone became involved in this later westward settlement process not by guiding newcomers through the mountains but by serving their needs upon arrival: by

¹⁰ A list of the earliest (1773-1775) settlers of Kentucky includes no men named Neal, although there is a William Deal among them. This list is hardly complete, for about half of those known to have arrived in Kentucky by then cannot be identified by name. We know from a later court case that a Benjamin Neel lived in the St. Asaph area before 1780. See the Neal chapters for more on Neals in Kentucky.

1783, he was operating a combination inn, tavern, supply store, and wharf on the Ohio River at Limestone, Kentucky, just down the river a bit from the mouth of Limestone Creek. This is the town that would be renamed Maysville in 1786 and where some of our Starks would land a few years later – and where our William Hughbanks family would live even later.

A very small town when Boone lived there, Limestone/Maysville was one of the main disembarking points (along with Louisville) for those settlers who came the 400 miles down the Ohio River from Pittsburgh and then took the overland route – an old buffalo trace sometimes called the Maysville Road or the Limestone Road – on to Lexington and other points in Kentucky's Bluegrass region. Boone also surveyed and served as a land hunter, locating good land for others. He moved from Maysville, first (in 1789) eastward into what is now West Virginia and then, in 1799, on to Missouri.

An estimated 12,000 persons landed at Limestone Creek between 1786 and 1789 alone. Had the Neals been among the growing number of migrants after the American Revolution who went directly from Pennsylvania to Kentucky, they might have floated down the Ohio River from Pittsburgh on flatboats (as the Starks, Vineyards, and possibly other families related to the Neals did) before heading inland in Kentucky. The Neals might have landed at the Boone establishment, provisioned at his store, drunk his liquor, or stayed at his inn. Boone might even have helped to find or survey the Neal land

(assuming they were not just squatting). But we now know none of this can had been so, because our Neals did not take this route into Kentucky.

Unfortunately for family tradition (and, perhaps, family pride), therefore, our research now makes it clear that the Neals from whom we descend went from Pennsylvania to western Virginia to South Carolina and only then to Kentucky – during the 1790s. Daniel Boone did not figure in this migration. How, then, do we account for our family’s tradition that the Neals “traveled with Daniel Boone”?

One answer is that there are other Boones besides Daniel we should consider. Squire Boone, Daniel's brother, arrived in Indiana from Kentucky in 1802, and from 1806 until his death in 1816 he ran a mill on the public road in Indiana twenty-five miles west of Louisville. Squire Boone had lived in Camden District in South Carolina when both our Neals and Matthew McCammon were residing there, and so we can hypothesize a link between the Neals and this other Boone family. Possibly the Neals accompanied Squire Boone across the mountains into Kentucky, and this kernel of reality, repeated and burnished and transformed over the generations, gave rise to the family story that the Neals “traveled with *Daniel* Boone.” In addition, a Ratliffe Boon, a cousin of Daniel (and later a governor of Indiana), moved from Kentucky to Indiana in 1809, about the time our Neals made their own move there. Perhaps our Neals moved a portion of the

way with Ratliffe Boon and he morphed into Daniel Boone as the story got repeated over the decades.

Establishing just when and where the Neals might have known the Boone family continues to elude us, then. Family lore often alters and gilds the truth as it gets told and retold over generations farther and farther removed from personal knowledge of the events. We can only wonder what truth, if any, lies at the bottom of this interesting story that we Neals traveled with Daniel Boone.

Turning to the tradition that Neals and Boones were intermarried, we find sounder information. In fact, the McCammon family did intermarry with the Boones, as did the Cowden family. There is some disagreement over the exact nature of the former family's connections with the Boones,¹¹ but the Cowden connection is clear: Elizabeth {Cowden} Neal's sister Henrietta married a direct descendant of Daniel Boone himself. Could it be that the Neal family lore about the relationship to Boone has actually come to us from the McCammon or (more likely) Cowden family, which did travel to Kentucky with Boone? (The Cowdens may have lived in North Carolina, as we have seen.)

It is also possible, I suppose, that the existence of this actual tie by marriage between the Neals and the Boones gave birth to the apparently spurious tradition that Neals had

¹¹ One source states that Jane {McCammon} Neal's sister Elizabeth married Daniel Boone's nephew, George. Another source describes George as Daniel's full cousin.

actually traveled to Kentucky with Daniel Boone, but we have now reached the point where we cannot separate legend and history.

Appendix VI: An Indiana Family

Why were all those people on the Neal side Hoosiers? What was it about Indiana, anyhow? And what was Indiana like during the many decades they lived there?

In part, Indiana just happened to be the place where abundant and cheap public land was available at the time these families were moving westward. More precisely, that Indiana land became available just as a generation of Kentucky men and women in their twenties were starting – or about to start – their families. As a result, an entire cohort of couples of a similar age (Vanderpools, Neals, Zinks, Shakes, Chastains, Starks, and others) decided to do so above the Ohio River in the new Territory of Indiana mainly because they were in Kentucky at this time. Their offspring intermarried and the rest was history – the Neal history. In addition, the land situation in Kentucky, where most of these families found themselves toward the close of the 18th century, was in a mess, with competing and overlapping land claims, inaccurate surveys, conflicting boundaries, and dispute after dispute over all of these. All this was a major disincentive to land ownership: fewer than half of all Kentucky households in 1790 possessed land.

Many settlers, having failed to prove their claims or otherwise obtain land of their own, thus were ripe for leaving Kentucky. Monetary inflation and rampant speculation drove Kentucky land values artificially high, too. Many of those in Kentucky were, therefore,

legally landless, perhaps renting but probably squatting. It should be no surprise that many of them decided to cross over into the new territory of Indiana as soon as – or even before – Indian claims could be “extinguished,” as these claims were in southern Indiana by about 1815, and the government began to sell this virgin land. Here there was plenty of good public land, not controlled by speculators – and cheap (\$1.25 an acre after 1820).

Compounding the situation in Kentucky was a rapidly rising population that made the chances of getting sufficient good land there look increasingly unfavorable. From 1784 to 1788, the population of Kentucky increased dramatically, and by 1790 there were 73,000 persons living where practically no one at all had lived just a dozen years earlier. By 1792 the population of Kentucky had grown to 100,000 persons, and it had doubled that number by 1800. Given all of these factors, when Indiana opened for settlement at about this time, the eager families we have met in this family history flocked into it and put their roots down.

The particular circumstances that brought these people to Indiana helped to shape the nature of that state, too. The relative absence of speculators and the arrival of large numbers of families in a short period of time meant that Indiana would become predominantly an area of small, independent farmers. In time, they would do a healthy business supplying their surplus crops to the states surrounding Indiana in return for commodities the people of those states could grow or manufacture. Yet another

consequence was Indiana's position as one of the least-urbanized states of the Union: its largest city as late as 1840 (New Albany) had but 4,226 residents, and even ten years later that city had barely crested 10,000 inhabitants.¹²

Southwestern Indiana, beyond which none of these families ventured, was heavily wooded but not exceptionally fertile, outside the river bottoms and hilltops, and some portions of the area were rather rugged. Northern migration into Indiana having been stalled by circumstances ranging from a barrier of hostile Indian tribes to transportation difficulties to misconceptions about the nature of the soil of northern Indiana, most of the newcomers to that territory and state were generally from the Southern uplands: Kentucky frontier types who moved west seemingly out of habit or farmers unsympathetic to the development of the plantation. (Southeastern Indiana, settled in large part from Ohio, had more families that had originated in the Mid-Atlantic states.) Although they were southern in their outlook and culture and language, these people who settled most of this part of Indiana were generally not sympathetic to the planter ethos or a slave economy. They were nearly all small landholders and democrats by background who had no love for the Southern aristocracy.

¹² Another product of this development is the stereotype of the "back-country Hoosier," which one – sympathetic – expert wrote "might be dismissed as a piece of subjectivism were it not for striking parallels to objective fact."

An oddity about how Indiana was settled, observable even today in Indiana, is the fact that the early movements into the state rose northward to a line approximately where U.S. 40 (and now I-70) crosses the state, at about the north-south midpoint of the state, and then stopped. As late as 1840 more than 80% of the population of Indiana lived in that southern portion. Whereas most of those who settled here were from the South or perhaps the Mid-Atlantic states, those who (generally later in the 19th century) migrated to northern Indiana were predominantly from New England and the Mid-Atlantic region. (After 1828, though, Ohioans increasingly moved westward into southern Indiana by way of the Whitewater Valley, and in time there would be as many of them in Indiana as there were Southerners.)

The newcomers picked out their land, purchased¹³ it (for our families, that was probably at the United States land office in Vincennes), and began to settle in. Some settlers preferred level ground, others hilly; some liked the dark limestone soil, others the sandy loam; some would not think of being far from a spring, others were content to dig a well; some nestled their houses in amongst the trees, others insisted on a clear patch out of the

¹³ United States land statutes changed several times during the span of time that saw these families show up and get settled in Indiana, the first state where these laws were applied to an entire new state of the Union. (They had been applied in part in Ohio but not at all in Kentucky, Tennessee, or Vermont.) The land law of 1804 sold public land for \$2 per acre, with a quarter of the purchase price due within forty days and the remainder to be paid after the second, third, and fourth years. Purchasers paid interest on what they owed but could receive a discount if they paid off their balances early. Economic distress and the inability of purchasers to complete payment induced Congress to require cash purchases in 1820, but this change was accompanied by a reduction in the sale price to \$1.25 per acre. The minimum purchase, which had been reduced to 160 acres in 1804, was further reduced to 80 acres in 1817 and 1820. It was reduced to 40 acres in 1832.

woods. Undoubtedly the families we have met in this family history narrative shared these prejudices and attitudes and chose their places accordingly.

Throughout the nearly two centuries of Indiana life we have had in view, life in rural Indiana did not change very dramatically until the latter part of the 20th century. At the outset of the settlement process, during the first couple of decades of the 19th century, families moved onto new land using rough traces and the waterways to reach it. Frequently the adult males moved ahead of the others in order to build a rude shelter and to get a crop started. Since the land had been purchased – not from speculators as in Kentucky and other areas, but from the national government, probably on credit (a few dollars down with four years to complete payment and receive a patent signifying ownership), improvements could begin immediately. The most urgent work was clearing a little land, acre by acre, by girdling the trees and removing the brush. A one- or two-room log house with a dirt floor would be the next major project, one perhaps completed with help from other families nearby. Subsistence farming was the norm at this stage since there were no markets or stores close by – and since money for purchases was scarce anyhow.

The strenuous work of primitive farming occupied the time of virtually every adult and child; corn, hogs, vegetables in season, nuts, berries, game, and perhaps some chickens or ducks supplied the food, and much else besides. The lucky family had some oxen or a

horse, perhaps a milch cow – and lots of children. Sooner or later some corn would be transformed into alcohol, easier than corn to transport. More corn would be used to fatten up hogs, which usually roamed free in the woods feasting on mast before being slaughtered. Eventually a crossroads or mill in the area would bring close enough a blacksmith, a post office, and perhaps a small store. Often a distillery (another destination for a corn crop) would be nearby, and tanneries and brickyards were also scattered across the countryside.

Life was simple, and so were life's pleasures. Worship (at first in homes, only later in dedicated structures) was the center of social life. Schooling, when it was offered (and when children could attend), might last six or eight weeks of classes during the late fall and winter; Indiana did not have a comprehensive public school system until the late 1860s. The family Bible might be the only book at hand, and "culture and the arts" as we think of them did not exist. Once or twice a year the family might go to the county seat for court day or militia mustering or some other occasion.

By the 1840s, Indiana farming had become reasonably prosperous and progressive. Judging from probate records of the time, most farmers had a variety of animals (cows, sheep, hens, horses, and pigs) and modest farm equipment. In part this was owing to the overall prosperity of the state, but in addition farmers in pre-industrial Indiana had to be relatively self-sufficient. A typical farm might (as one inventory shows) have "pickling

barrels, meat tubs, wood planks of walnut and pine, a coffee mill, cobbling equipment, horseshoes, barrels of nails, carpenters equipment (mortising chisel, gouges, augers, planes, saw, hammers, and grindstones), blacksmith equipment, sheep shears, bridles, saddles, wagon covers, wagon parts, rifles and guns, and barrels of soap.” Inventories also show “an abundance of stored food and storage equipment (pickled pork, lots of bacon, barrels of salted meat, tubs of lard, barrels of salt, dried fruit, lots of wheat, corn, sugars, and butter churns).” Farmers, wives, children – all had to learn how to use these tools and prepare these foods.

Household inventories also reflect a growing prosperity as the 19th century wore on. Lots of children meant numerous beds, though never enough for everyone to have his or her own bed. Other typical household items might include a fiddle, “clocks and brass cogs to repair the clocks, [a] set of plates, a few cups and saucers, heavy jugs and mugs made of stoneware and earthenware, large canning jars, skillets, kettles, several trunks, whiskey kegs, books in algebra, grammar, history, and a Bible.” Since stores were few and ill-stocked, what the farm could not make it had to do without or improvise for; what it bought and wore out had to be rebuilt or reconditioned for further use.¹⁴

¹⁴ I recommend additional reading that enlightens those of us living in modern America about the ways of rural life, specifically the largely self-sustaining family farm and how it functioned. A sound understanding of life on such a farm will enable us to avoid viewing that life as either consistent enjoyment or unending drudgery. (In truth, there were elements of each.) Two books in particular provide a good introduction: Bob Artley’s *Once Upon a Farm* and Wheeler McMillen’s *Ohio Farm*. Although neither book is set in Indiana, the life each depicts (in Iowa and Ohio, respectively) is similar enough to what our family members experienced in Indiana from the early 1800s into the 20th century that we can profit greatly from reading them.

Such was life in rural Indiana during the nearly two centuries during which our families lived there. What was the effect of a long-term exposure to such a life? I think George Kennan, the noted historian whose own early family lived on similar farms (though not in Indiana), captured the impact quite well when he wrote of the small family farm:

“It bred, or tended to breed, strong people – strong both physically and emotionally. It effectively ruled out for married couples the escape hatches of separation and divorce; and in this way it encouraged the cohesion of the family. If it discouraged, as it plainly did, flights of speculation on more abstract and theoretical questions, and could thus be seen as restricting intellectual development, it engendered, in place of all this a certain simplicity and practicality of outlook and expression that had its own charm and eloquence, contrasting favorably with most of the artificialities of urban culture. It left enduring marks on succeeding generations.... Beyond which, the inescapable discipline of the small family farm inculcated in its devotees certain qualities of self-reliance, independence, individual responsibility, and pride of land ownership that played a unique role in the shaping of character.”

Later, Kennan extended his point by adding this comment about the effect of the small family farm on character and outlook:

“Now, extreme personal independence of this sort implied and demanded, of course, the forfeiture of such support as could have been had from closer association, commercial, professional, social, or what you will, with others. ... And it was, in these circumstances, not surprising that when these [Kennans] and members of later generations of the family turned to the problem of selecting long-term professional involvements, it was to what might be called the lonely ones – the farm, the law, the pulpit, the pen, and the scholar’s dedication – that they gave precedence. These callings, whatever their implicit burdens, presented a measure of defense against interference or domination from outside.”

Can it be any coincidence that with farming no longer a viable option the *chosen* (if not eventual) occupations of my grandfather, father, self, and two sons were, respectively, minister, writer, professor, actor, and firefighter – all intensely individualistic and independent callings?

Appendix VII: Of Voyages, By Sea and By Land

Most of the families we have discussed in this history, excepting the Dutch and Walloons who came to New Netherland so early, traveled across the Atlantic Ocean sometime during the first three-quarters of the 18th century. (My mother's grandparents came later, during the 1880s and aboard very different ships, but some of what follows applies to them as well.) Almost all of those whose itineraries we can identify evidently came down the Rhine River and through the Dutch port at its mouth, Rotterdam, and then via England to America. Other emigrants came directly from the British Isles, including Ireland. Probably a majority of these people paid their own way across the Atlantic Ocean, but a few individuals no doubt came to America as indentured servants.

Whatever the circumstances, or the motivations – an inability to secure adequate land, a desire for religious freedom, or simply a restless nature, they all ultimately made the fateful decision to resettle permanently in America. The time came to pack up a few of one's dearest possessions and to say goodbye (given the state of long-distance travel and communication, especially for persons in lower socioeconomic groups, almost certainly forever) to family and friends staying behind. This was an undramatic form of heroism, to be sure, but the courage of the decision to leave all that was familiar behind and look for a place to begin anew should not be underestimated. Everything, quite literally, was riding on the rightness of this move.

An ocean crossing at that time was no pleasure cruise. A week's food would typically include two or so pounds of oatmeal, four or five pounds of bread or biscuit, a pound of molasses, another pound of peas, and probably less than a pound of meat or cheese. There were rarely any fruits or fresh vegetables at all and certainly none after the first week or so of the voyage. Meals were scanty and monotonous, therefore. Often the food spoiled, leaving not much more than bread and water for sustenance. Even the bread and water could be problematical: the bread might go moldy and become filled with weevils; water, never plentiful enough for anything more than basic survival, sometimes became brackish or barely drinkable. This simple diet was repeated for six, seven, eight, or nine weeks, the duration of a normal passage.

Living conditions aboard ship were spartan at best. It was usual for up to one hundred passengers, possibly even more, to be crowded into a small, dank space between decks. If this space was five feet in height it was unusually roomy. There was no fresh air, no heat, no lighting, and no privacy. Accommodations were rude at best – perhaps a wooden shelf or the deck itself upon which to sleep, and nothing but a small common area in which to pass the long days and weeks of the voyage. Sanitary conditions could become appalling, especially as seasickness and illness afflicted so many, and disease spread very quickly. Exercise in the fresh air on deck was rare, and only the prospect of a new life in America and family cohesiveness could relieve the boredom.

Stormy conditions (surely frightening to those who had never been aboard a ship or seen an ocean before), homesickness, uncertainty about where the ship was or might end up, and the dangers of foundering and pirates added to the anxiety that most of the passengers must have felt for weeks on end. In short, the ocean crossing was not a trip that anyone who came to America this way truly enjoyed, and for many the conditions left trauma they never forgot. It is a wonder that more people did not die en route, but since in general emigrants (and indentured servants) were young people in their teens and twenties they were in reasonably good health – at least for that era of history. When death did strike, the victims were usually the most vulnerable among them: the youngest and the oldest passengers, who after they succumbed were committed to a watery grave.

This saga of uprooting one's family and traveling to a new life was often repeated in America. For many families, after all, the decision to set out for America was really only the first of several moves. Most immigrants moved from port city to hinterlands rather quickly, perhaps into an area only recently settled – or even directly to the frontier. But even those families who at first resided not far from the seaboard saw members of subsequent generations set out on a series of one-way journeys south or west into unfamiliar territory. The motivations again could be economic, religious, political, or personal. As we have seen throughout this history, some families were nearly constantly

on the move after their first members arrived in America. Again the time came to pack up, say goodbye, and shove off on a voyage into the unknown.

Painful as the moment of decision might be, families were rarely alone. It was not uncommon, as we have seen, for interrelated families to travel together. Making their way down old Indian paths or animal traces that were in the process of becoming roads (many of these routes are still in use today), a group of two, three, or more family groups would set sail, as it were, for a new place. If they were lucky they had wagons or carts for their household goods and equipment, maybe with some space set aside for those unable to walk. Or perhaps they had mostly packhorses and sledges that they dragged, mile after mile. Dodging stumps and rocks, struggling through swamps and the mud that followed the rain, paying dearly to be ferried across streams too deep to ford, the travelers drove their horses or oxen, herded their cattle and other animals – and tried to keep track of all their children. Sometimes they built rafts or barges on which they loaded their possessions, poling these craft up (less often down) the rivers or having animals drag them along. Either way, none of this was easy work.

Day after exhausting day, the drudgery went on. Sometimes, the travelers passed small settlements or a homestead. At other times, they were breaking new ground. Wherever they were, though, places to eat and to stay were rare, rude, and far from reliable, so the travelers had to sleep in the open and depend for food upon their own limited supplies or

success at hunting. On and on they went, rising through foothills and passing through (sometimes) low gaps, then holding back the weight of the loads as the ground sloped down on the other side. Would they have enough food? Would the water they found be clean enough to drink? Would they encounter Indians or robbers? Would the weather turn ugly? Would someone be injured, get sick, have to deliver a baby, or die? What would the travelers find when they finally did arrive (assuming they had a specific destination in mind)? And would it all prove to be worth the sacrifices?

Much of this is beyond our comprehension, insofar as details go, but surely we can grasp the sense of gravity and the tension that accompanied any these voyages – by sea or by land – and their many trials. (Surely we can imagine as well the spirit of adventure that must have compensated for some of the danger and tribulations.) So let us give thanks for all these voyagers: those who cut their ties with the familiar in order to carry the seeds of a new beginning onward to a another place – perhaps only to pick up and repeat the process all over again. Somehow our lives seem rather tame by contrast.

And let us always be grateful to those whom God spared: the strong, resilient, and persevering people who stoutly endured such conditions to plant their – and thus our – families on these shores, and then to push onward in search a better life further inland.

Appendix VIII: Philadelphia and Lancaster

The one American city that most of the early generations of our families had in common (excepting the Dutch in New York and a handful of others who arrived in New England and Virginia) was Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. This was the Philadelphia of the 18th century, the empress city of an era that began about the time Benjamin Franklin arrived there from Boston in 1723 and lasted through the American Revolution. Thus it seems fitting to say a few words about the city that these many immigrants found when they arrived there during that half-century.

Founded by the English Quaker William Penn in 1682, Philadelphia was a late starter. It had quickly risen to prominence, though, and by the mid-1700s Philadelphia was by far the largest, richest, and (most contemporaries agreed) most beautiful city in America. The core of the city stretched westward six or eight blocks from the Delaware River, after which fields and farms predominated. It was orderly, having been laid out in an unusual grid with straight streets (systematically named with numbers running in one direction and tree names the other) and regular, large blocks. But it was also full of energy and enterprise. The overall impression, therefore, was one of spaciousness and neatness, even elegance, along with activity and prosperity. Some visitors paid it the highest compliment (in their eyes) when they said it almost looked European with its

sophistication and increasingly impressive church spires. It is not surprising, then, that so many other American cities sought to model themselves on Philadelphia.

This young American metropolis was built on bustling and profitable trade. Its large port area, which dominated Water and Front Streets, ran about two miles along the Delaware River. Here there were scores of businesses to support the city's seafaring industry: factors, ship builders, chandlers, warehouses, rope walks, and provisioners. Ships large and small worked their way up and down the river, which connected Philadelphia with the Atlantic Ocean through Delaware Bay. As exports like lumber, wheat, and iron flowed out and a host of goods from Europe and the West Indies flowed in, Philadelphia reaped profits from the exchange. So, too, was Philadelphia the major port of entry for newcomers. Both trading activities and the constant arrivals of ships bearing immigrants were responsible for its rapid growth in population (from about 10,000 during the 1720s to 30,000 or more by the 1770s).

Quakers had founded Philadelphia, and in so doing they had set the tone for the city. As the 18th century wore on, many non-Quaker groups (most notably Presbyterians and Baptists) had also grown in influence, and thanks to both the tone the Quakers had set and the shared leadership the city had taken on an air of civility, toleration, and good will. As the city was a center of commerce and toleration, it was no surprise that Philadelphia would lead in such fields as printing and publishing, as well as in the arts, science, and

medicine. In general, Philadelphia was known for its civility, for its many innovative social institutions (ranging from a public library to a volunteer fire department), and for such cultural manifestations as fine painting and the theater (though it was also not without its poor, its beggars, and, especially, its occasional bouts with the scourge of smallpox).

The city, still the capital of the province of Pennsylvania, was marked by large public buildings and churches, including the noteworthy State House – which we know as Independence Hall owing to its later role – that was built during the first half of the 1700s. This impressive edifice’s walled yard, almost an entire city block, was open to the public and served as a kind of park. Rooming houses, public houses, and inns (we would consider some of them restaurants) afforded travelers many choices, though at premium prices, but there were also a large number of substantial residences to house those visitors fortunate enough to know a Philadelphian well.

Philadelphia had a very large public market on High Street, which would later take Market Street as its name. Here farmers from the countryside near and far would bring their products on Wednesdays and Saturdays. Philadelphia’s streets, though cluttered with traffic and, like all pre-modern cities, ripe with evidence that animals were used for transportation, were impressive: they often had gutters, brick walkways, trees, and even whale oil lanterns to light the evening hours.

These, then, were the sights that greeted so many of our families when they arrived. None of them seem to have remained in the city of Philadelphia itself for long, instead passing through en route to the vast expanses of good land for which America was even more famous. Whether they stayed in Philadelphia a few days or longer, however, the city must have made an impression on the newcomers, most of whom would never again see, let alone reside in, a comparable city. (Nor would the majority of their descendants.) Arriving in Philadelphia must have been a remarkable introduction to a life that would subsequently be spent far from the sights that had greeted the newcomers upon their arrival.

The chances are good that those newcomers to America also passed through Lancaster, the seat of Pennsylvania's first "western" county, as they took their departure from the Atlantic seaboard and sought a place to reside and, probably, to farm. This small city, larger than many interior towns in England and Germany, was in fact America's first inland town of significance. If Philadelphia had served as the portal for newcomers, Lancaster was the most likely first way station on their route westward.

Lancaster, also well-planned by its founders, gained its strategic advantage and prominence not because it was on a major waterway but by taking on the role of market town, commercial center, and road hub. Soon connected to Philadelphia by the King's

Highway, it collected goods – furs and foodstuffs – from further west and helped to transfer imports in return to the growing population of the American outback. Set in rich farmland (still producing abundantly today), Lancaster had grown to perhaps 3,000 residents by the mid-1700s. It emulated Philadelphia’s orderly grid, early established a community marketplace, and welcomed the hard-working and resourceful German and Swiss immigrants who were streaming into the colony’s port city. Many of these settled around Lancaster or opened shops or workshops in the town itself, and soon these German and Swiss newcomers made up a large majority in the town and county of Lancaster.

Lancaster would become well-known as the place to buy things or get them made, and two of its products, guns and wagons, would become both American staples and world famous. Given its population, the area around Lancaster also became distinctive for its many Protestant religious groups, from Lutherans and German Reformed to Amish, Mennonites, Moravians, and Schwenkfelders. All these peoples referred to themselves as *Deutsch*, which their English neighbors soon transformed into the Pennsylvania “Dutch” moniker we still hear today.

For many of our families, then, these two 18th-century Pennsylvania places – Philadelphia and Lancaster – were their introductions to life in America. Although few of these people remained in either place for long, we at least can reflect, as we visit these

cities today, that our ancestors also experienced Philadelphia and Lancaster for a time and perhaps even called one or both of them home for awhile.

Appendix IX: Virginia's Tithable and Tax Systems

Although definitions would evolve and modifications would be made from the institution of these systems during the mid-1600s onward, in general for the period relevant to this family history, the 17th and 18th centuries, Virginia obtained revenue from its residents by levying two systems. The first was from an annual capitation tax on "tithables" (defined below); the second, in place from 1782 forward, was from yearly payments of land and personal property taxes.

Tithables were those who paid (or for whom another person paid) an annual tax imposed on free, white, male adults aged sixteen years old or older; on African-American slaves; and on Native-American servants. Women who were heads of household were also taxed. Counties were divided into precincts or districts, for each of which one or more tax commissioners were responsible for collecting that year's levy and for delivering the total assessment to county officials at a stated time, usually about mid-way through the calendar year. Heads of household and masters were required to report the number and names of all tithables living with them; penalties were imposed for concealing tithables, and public notice of the county's entire tithables list encouraged compliance.

One important attribute of Virginia's tithable lists is that a young male would typically begin to listed, in someone else's household, after he had turned sixteen years of age; in

addition, a free male who appeared on the tithable list under his own name probably had become twenty-one years old during the preceding tax year. This makes such lists helpful in determining a young tithable's year of birth, but the lists are not infallible: some males may not have been listed immediately after having reached these ages – or were never listed at all. Tithable lists exist for many but not all of Virginia's counties, but even where they do exist they are not always complete. Other colonies and/or states (especially Kentucky) employed tithable systems similar to Virginia's.

In 1782, after independence, Virginia created an entirely new system for financing its governmental operations. (The tithable system continued even after 1782 but eventually was abandoned.) The new system included taxes on both real (land) and personal property. Annual lists of both types of property were made, again at the county and district levels, and, as before, each county's tax commissioners were charged with collecting these new levies. Since a tax district is sometimes identified by the name of the designated collector, or by its geographic region within the county, or by the militia unit that was drawn from the same part of the county, the tax list can be a valuable clue as to where a particular family lived.

The Virginia land tax lists display the names of owners of acreage and town lots, the amount of land owned, the value(s) of the land or lot(s), the tax rate in effect that year, and the taxes due (sometimes stated in pounds, shillings, and pence but by 1810 only in

dollars and cents); by 1814, descriptions of the physical location(s) of properties began to be recorded on them. The name of a deceased owner continued to be shown on the annual lists until the estate was settled. Surviving tax records for Virginia are available from 1782 onward.

The 1782 revision of Virginia's tax laws also required yearly enumerations of certain types of personal (sometimes called moveable) property, usually items of significant value or those regarded as luxuries. The collection system employed here was the same as that for the collection of land taxes also enacted in 1782.

The Virginia personal property lists include the name of the person responsible for the tax, the names of white, male tithables over the age of twenty-one years, the number of white, male tithables between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one years, the number of slaves both below and above the age of sixteen years, various categories of animals (usually horses and cattle, occasionally sheep and stud horses), and sometimes other items ranging from carriages to (mostly in later years) pianos and billiard tables. Many of these lists have survived and also are available for research. Once again, other states employed systems similar to the one Virginia adopted.

“So we beat on, boats against the current, borne back ceaselessly into the past.”

F. Scott Fitzgerald, *The Great Gatsby*