The Delaware Interregnum

by
Francis Jennings

When William Penn landed at Philadelphia, the Delaware Indians lived in a loose confederation of villages scattered over New Jersey and Eastern Pennsylvania. The impact of European settlement sundered them geographically, reduced them numerically, and demoralized them culturally. Their role in historical events has usually been described as more or less passive, until it altered with dramatic suddenness in the French and Indian War. There is reason to believe, however, that the Delawares were not so much passive as suppressed, and that their eruption in 1755 was not a sudden thing, though its dramatic qualities made it seem so; rather, the Delaware warfare against Pennsylvania was something that had been in the making, gradually acquiring force and implacability, for decades. To visualize this development requires close attention to certain seemingly innocent and sometimes tedious details.

One community of the Delawares had a special relationship with the government of Pennsylvania. This was the community living on the upper Schuylkill River, to whom the name "Unami" was later applied.' William Penn had treated with one of their chiefs, the famous Tamenend or Tammany, and Logan recognized and dealt with his successor, Olumapies (also called Sassoonan) for about thirty years. After Olumapies' death in 1747, an "interregnum" occurred. No comparison can be made with European sovereignties, of course; the term, as used here, means an interval between recognized political leaders. Not until 1752, when Shingas was recognized as chief at Logstown on the Ohio, was there any Delaware of outstanding importance to treat formally for his people. The interval from 1747 to 1752 has generally been accepted as a period of anarchy for the Delawares, and the usual comment made about it has been that the Delawares had a very loose sort of political structure anyway. Such comment is factually correct, for Indian political institutions must not be compared with European institutions, but, as W. W. Newcomb, Jr., has pointed out, the early eighteenth century was a time of reorganization, consolidation, and synthesis, during which "the political entity known as the Delaware tribe emerged. This trend, familiar enough to students, is in puzzling contradiction to the interregnum.

Evidence exists that the Delawares, in their migration from east to west, preserved a sense of group identity and political leadership, loose though it probably was. Anthony F. C. Wallace has remarked that "both on the upper Susquehanna and on the Ohio, the continued (even if irregular) succession of Unami sachems provided a core about which the fragments of other communities coalesced., thenceforth being known as 'Unami.' "3 One chief, in particular, exerted leadership and was recognized as a spokesman both in the east and in the west by Pennsylvania's agents. His name was Pisquetomen, an Indian whose importance has been hidden as a consequence of accident and contrivance.

Perhaps the most powerful force obscuring Pisquetomen's name was the simple fact of his own illiteracy, and that of his people. We can only piece his existence together from fragmentary mention in the papers of aliens who were often his enemies. The second contributing factor to his obscurity has been the specialization of historians and the accumulation of separate bodies of documents for eastern and western Pennsylvania. In both the east and the west, Pisquetomen was overshadowed by dominant and picturesque figures so that his special role has escaped notice. A third factor seems to have been the ill treatment of Pisquetomen by the towering historian, Francis Parkman, whose *Montcalm and Wolfe* volumes set a pattern of interpretation which distorted and obliterated the actual roles played by Indians in their own history.' A fourth factor was an intrigue against Pisquetomen personally, conducted by James Logan, Conrad Weiser, and the Oneida chief Shickellamy.

Yet, though Pisquetomen virtually disappeared from history, he lived a most eventful life, even as dimly seen through the records of his adversaries. His was the village whose land was first "squatted" on by uninvited settlers in Pennsylvania. He was the first Delaware chief to be deprived of normal succession to the headship of his people through cabals between the whites and the Iroquois. He witnessed the momentous meeting in which the Iroquois, at the prompting of Pennsylvania's authorities, ordered the Delawares off their own land; indeed, Pisquetomen was interpreter at that meeting for the banished chief Nutimus. Pisquetomen negotiated not only with James Logan, but later with Benjamin Franklin, William Fairfax, George Croghan, William Trent, Christopher Gist, Frederick Post, Charles Thomson, Conrad Weiser, Israel Pemberton, George Washington, General John Forbes, and, probably, General Edward Braddock. He was the first Delaware chief to strike a blow against Pennsylvania in the French and Indian War, and he was the first of the western Delawares to make peace. He and his brothers guided and led their tribesmen in the east and west through peace and war and peace and war again in a series of events that set the mighty empires of France and Britain into worldwide conflict and determined the precedence of European powers for over a century thereafter. Surely his is a life worth noticing.

More particularly, the facts of his public existence cast light on a controversy, which has continued down to the present day, over the Delawares' motivation and justification for warring against Pennsylvania after Braddock's defeat. Partisans of the Indians have usually dwelt exclusively on the Walking Purchase Of 1737 as the cause for Delaware resentment. However, in the treatment received by Pisquetomen's Schuylkill Indians, and by Pisquetomen himself, lay another cause for the hostility which the French were later to exploit.

In Pisquetomen's youth, relations between the Indians and the settlers were usually fairly relaxed. The Delawares had sold some land along the Delaware River and had retired into the back country, where they led a seasonally migratory life. Their economy- semi-farming, semi-hunting- had become largely dependent on European trade goods; the Europeans, in turn, had found in the Indian fur trade the perfect medium for keeping the colony financially solvent.5 James Logan, secretary of the province and guardian of the Penn family's interests, had made his fortune by

judiciously combining official diplomacy with what he called the "skin trade."' Pursuing both the Penns' interests and his own, Logan had cultivated the good will of chief Olumapies by many kind attentions and small presents.

"The Peace of this Province," Logan once explained to John Penn, "has hitherto been preserved by the prudent measures thy father took at first to Settle and cultivate a perfect good understanding with the Natives, which has still happily enough continued." An event had occurred, however, which obliged Logan to observe, "But the foundation of this was justice, and an Assurance they should never be deprived of one foot of their Land but by their own Consent on fair Purchases from them. "7

Logan's comment was intended as a warning, for an abrupt transformation had occurred in 1722. In that year, Logan's enemy, Governor Sir William Keith, "being at Albany, invited a Company of Palatines there to come into this Province, and directed them to Sit down at Tulpyhockin on the other side of those Hills where our Indians had their principal Settlements." Logan described the effect on the Indians. "These poor People were much disturbed at this, yet finding they could no longer raise Corn there for their Bread they quietly removed up the River Sasquehannah, though not without repining at their hard usage. Not long after, most of their Hunters retired for the Sake of better Game to Ohio." More than the desire for open spaces motivated the Indians' removal. Their unfenced corn had been destroyed by the cattle "of these new-comers whom they knew not." In view of later events, it is startling to see how clearly Logan understood the moral issue. "Tis certain," he wrote, "they have the same reason to resent this as all those other Indians on this Continent have had for the foundation of their Wars that in some places they have carried on so terribly to the destruction of the European Inhabitants."

These were the people of Pisquetomen's own village who were so abruptly pushed out of their homeland, and we may justifiably assume that he was among them.' The Delawares protested, of course, but the astonishing thing is that their protests were nonviolent. Logan met them with vague promises of adjustment as soon as one of William Penn's heirs should visit the province. But time passed, no Penn appeared, and white pressure increased on other lands. The Indians became uneasy, and in 1728 Olumapies forced a showdown in a large public treaty in Philadelphia. Logan at first responded by claiming that Olumapies had sold his tribe's lands ten years earlier. Showing a deed signed in 1718, Logan called it a quitclaim for all lands up to the Blue Mountain, including the valley of Tulpehocken Creek. Olumapies stood fast, pointing out that what we today call the South Mountain was the correct boundary; the valley between the South Mountain and the Blue Mountain (a segment of the Great Valley of the Appalachians) had never been sold. To Logan's dismay, Olumapies was publicly supported by white men at the conference. Consequently, Logan retreated from his untenable bluff, acknowledged the Indians' rights, and promised restitutions.10 To the Penns in London, he wrote a series of urgent letters, pressing one of them to come to the province to purchase Indian rights. Meanwhile, with much pains," he "kept the Indians quiet . . . by giving them Assurances that John Penn, who was born in their Countrey and would

exactly tread his father's Steps in dealing with them, would speedily come over and agree with them in person."" However, the Penns disappointed Logan. Their complicated legal and financial affairs required constant attendance in England.

As postponements continued, Logan took "an uncommon care in caressing" Olumapies and his heirs apparent, "making them . . . several little Presents." He was quick to add, "at your Expence," when he mentioned this to John Penn. He recognized that this mollification could only delay the final reckoning, and fully acknowledged the justice of the Delawares' complaints and the danger of their alienation. Worriedly, he reported that the French were tampering with the Delaware emigrants to the Ohio country, "and, if gained, they may prove our deadly Enemies, for the Injury we have done them in robbing them of their Lands. . . . For Indians, from one generation to another, never forget their Rights nor to revenge the Wrongs they have received." Certainly, Logan in private sang a different tune than Logan in public; when he could bring himself to candor he became a prophet. 12

Logan's temporizing was outmatched by the Penns' procrastination. Finally, in 1731, calamity befell. Just as Logan was worrying about the French danger, "Opekasset, the eldest and next heir [of *Olumapies],* died last Spring of the Small pox; and Shachatawlin, the truest, honestest young fellow I ever knew amongst the Indians, and whom I had brought to love my family as his nearest Relations, was lately killed by a sudden Stab from the old King Sassoonan's [Olumapies'] own hand in his liquor. So that none of that family but the unhappy old man, who sorrows almost to death for the accident, is now left for us to treat with except such as we doubt are disaffected." Logan became so desperate to get the land purchases settled before old Olumapies might die that he started negotiations even without the presence of a member of the proprietary family. He justified himself by writing that, "we conceive it of the last importance to you as well as the Countrey, as your whole Interest depends on our peace with these People."13

In August, 1731, Olumapies responded to Logan's invitation and came to Philadelphia, accompanied by "an ill fellow, his next Relation." The ill fellow was Pisquetomen whose importance is demonstrated by his signature, or mark, next below Olumapies' on a deed for a small grant of five hundred acres to four "friends" of Logan's.14 The grant was made ostensibly in consideration of Olumapies' "love and goodwill" for Logan, but Logan does not seem to have sensed much love in Pisquetomen, signature or no. "Finding that Relation of the old man's to be what I have said of him," Logan reported to the Penns, "I concerted measures with Sassoonan, when returned to my house, to have that fellow laid aside and a better substituted in his place, which, 'tis hoped, may take effect." Logan's intrigue against Pisquetomen was to continue for the remaining sixteen years of Olumapies' long life.15

It may be well to observe that Logan's reputation as a "friend of the Indian" has been somewhat overdrawn. He was both a fur trader and a land speculator. Olumapies' Delawares were both his customers and his debtors. An emigrant Indian might well be a vanished investment; at best he was probably a lost

customer. A hostile Indian would surely be less inclined than a friendly one to part with his lands at a bargain price. When it is understood that Logan's friendship was strongly conditioned by his excellent business sense, the later withdrawal of his affection from "our Indians," and its bestowal on the Iroquois instead, is clarified.

Sometimes the fates seem to work with the complex coincidence of a Dickens plot. It was Logan's luck that when he heard the bad news of Shachatawlin's death, he heard it from a man who was to become his main support among the Indians. This was "Shekallemy of the Five Nations (so called, but now they are Six, having taken another into their Confederacy), placed by those people amongst our Indians as a watch over them. Him we first sent back for Sassoonan, and have since engaged him to goe on a Message to those [Six] Nations to invite some of their Chiefs to hasten down to treat with us." Logan's report became circumspect at this point. "The intended Subject of the Treaty is to putt them, if possible, on measures to Strengthen both themselves and us. I must not be more particular here." Thus, in the same letter, Logan described his maneuver against Pisquetomen and suggested a treaty with the Six Nations that would make the Proprietors of Pennsylvania independent of the Delawares."

The negotiations thus begun resulted finally in an alliance between Pennsylvania and the Six Nations. Pennsylvania, through Logan and Weiser) ultimately proposed that the Six Nations assume total suzerainty over all the Indians resident in the province. The arrangement did indeed keep the subordinate tribes under control so long as circumstances prevented their obtaining aid elsewhere, but it was power diplomacy. The peace it created was designed to further the interests of the contracting powers only, to the considerable distress of other parties, Indians and white. Some of the most important agreements in the alliance were arrived at secretly' implying for the Delawares eviction from their homeland in pain and humiliation. When the Delawares learned the full import of this alliance, they never forgot nor forgave."

In 1732, Thomas Penn at last made his long-postponed journey to his province, arriving just in time to take part in the treaty with Olumapies, which settled the payment for Tulpehocken. Pisquetomen's name, significantly, receded to fourth place among the Indian signatures to the deed; it would seem that Logan's "measures" against him had begun to take effect." A formal delegation from the Six Nations appeared in Philadelphia soon afterward to lay the groundwork for the new alliance, and the result was so satisfactory to Logan that he assumed a new manner toward the Delawares when they returned in 1733 to collect the last installment of goods in payment for Tulpehocken. Logan wrote from Stenton to Thomas Penn in Philadelphia that Olumapies had expected "to receive in the whole £700. . . . I took the most proper means I could to give him a righter notion of the bargain." Logan added that Olumapies had, complained of inferior quality in the goods previously given. "He Sayes we have got all his Land, that it is good Land, and he ought to have good Goods for it. He has no more to Sell, and when these Goods are gone . . . he shall have nothing. . . . They have no Interpreter but

Pesqueetoman whom we too well know; yet he seems well enough inclined to interpret faithfully, the contrary of which is a very great crime with them.""

From that time on, Olumapies lived as a "guest" of the Six Nations at their village of Shamokin. Here he was under the constant supervision of Shickellamy, and thus of Logan. Every year or so, he paid a courtesy call on Logan, received some handouts, and went back to Shamokin to live in increasing drunkenness, the solace of which he purchased with the tribal wampum in his care.20 Pisquetomen also made Shamokin his home, but the younger man lived a more active and sober existence. After the purchase of Tulpehocken, Logan found Indian affairs less pressingly urgent. Other land problems, involving other Delaware tenure rights, beset him; but once he had obtained the Six Nations alliance he made no more settlements with Delaware chiefs that involved compensation. He had found stronger friends to "caress."

One of these outstanding land problems is particularly relevant because Pisquetomen was a participant in its denouement. It concerned the land at the "forks of Delaware," between Tohickon Creek and the Kittatinny [Blue] Mountains. This area included the Lehigh Valley, like Tulpehocken a segment of the Appalachian Great Valley, and also included the land below the South Mountain down to Tohickon Creek. The landlord Delawares were led by one Nutimus, a persistent and courageous chief who strove for twenty years in a *cause célèbre* that has reverberated in the histories ever since. In fact, so much attention has been given to Nutimus' struggle that it is generally accepted as the only example of unfair dealing by Pennsylvania with the Delawares. For Pisquetomen, Nutimus' conflict was only one act in a serial drama.21

Nutimus paid a courtesy call on Thomas Penn in 1733, and met more formally with Thomas and his brother John at Durham in 1734. At Durham the Penns broached the subject of Nutimus' lands, but detailed discussion was put off until 1735 when Nutimus and other chiefs called in state at Pennsbury. Contemporaneous minutes of these events are missing; our only surviving records are odd scraps and obviously partisan reconstructions. From the interest and participation he later showed, it seems likely that Pisquetomen was at Pennsbury, but this must be conjecture. Regardless of his actual presence; he was certainly informed of Nutimus' version of the events, for he later acted as formal interpreter for Nutimus in the climactic conference of the series at Philadelphia in 1742.22

In brief, at Pennsbury Thomas Penn produced an incomplete and unsigned copy of an old deed purporting to be an Indian agreement to sell all the lands measured by a day and a half's walk, for which payment had already been made back in 1687. The Indians protested this strange piece of paper, but were bullied by Logan who was by now very much in charge of the situation. They agreed to return after consultation; and the Penns, after seeing them off, accelerated the process already well under way of selling the lands in question to settlers and speculators.23

In August, 1736, Pisquetomen accompanied Olumapies once more to Philadelphia for a "friendly visit," which the sarcastic tone of the Provincial Council minutes implies was a begging expedition. With them, however, were some Conestoga Indians from the lower Susquehanna., who had land claims of their own; the association makes clear that Pisquetomen was personally involved in or in touch with all the land disputes of his era. The visit Of I 736 proved to be a quiet one. Presents were given out by the Proprietor with the promise that he would "take some further Care of our old friend Allummapees. "24

Shortly thereafter, Logan heard that the Six Nations were once more on their way to complete the negotiations begun in 1732. He instructed Weiser to steer them to his home, Stenton, for secret conferences before letting them go on to Philadelphia; and he cautioned Weiser to keep his instructions secret.25 Olumapies and his people were to be kept away. As it turned out, both Olumapies and Pisquetomen were sick and perhaps could not have attended.26

In the subsequent conferences, the Six Nations disposed of one land problem for the Proprietors by declaring that the Conestoga Indians had been defeated in war and, therefore, had no territorial rights at all. Through conquest, the Six Nations had acquired the Conestogas' lands, and they sold them by right of conquest.27 The diminished Conestogas could not dare to challenge the Six Nations' strength, supported as it was by the government of Pennsylvania. But Nutimus' "Forks" Delawares were on a different footing than the Conestogas. Though the Delawares acknowledged Six Nations supremacy, the Six Nations in turn acknowledged and respected Delaware land ownership. Even in the secret sessions of the 1736 conference, the Delawares' rights were preserved intact. James Logan recapitulated the Six Nations' limits to their own claims in a later note to Weiser. "The utmost Extent of their Claims they Said were the heads of the Branches or Waters running into Sasquehannah." That is, they made no claim to the lands drained by the Delaware.28

In general, however, Logan was so satisfied with the Six Nations' stipulations during the conference that he proposed a £200 present be given them, besides the payment to be made for the sale of the lands on the Susquehanna .29 The Six Nations themselves were not so well satisfied. They had received a noncommittal answer to their request for Pennsylvania to intercede in their behalf with the governments of Maryland and Virginia to compensate them for their claims to land "on Sasquehannah and at Chanandowa."30 They had caught the Pennsylvanians in an awkward position. A boundary dispute between Lord Baltimore, proprietor of Maryland, and the Penns, had been in and out of court for decades, and John Penn had written that Lord Baltimore was becoming especially obstreperous." A formal explanation could not easily be made to the Six Nations that Pennsylvania's intercession for them with Maryland was worth something less than nothing. An evasion ensued, and the Six Nations were forced to bide their time.

Their opportunity came, not during the conference, but after it was officially over. Subtle Logan conceived a plan to convert the Six Nations' refusal to claim Nutimus' lands into a release of claim, which was so worded as to imply that the claim had once existed; and, as he framed the papers, the conversion worked

wonders. "It was understood that they laid no manner of Claim to the Lands on Delaware River or on the Waters running into," he wrote Weiser. "However it may be proper for them, under their hands, to Declare that they release to the Proprietors of Pennsylvania . . . all their Claim and Pretensions whatsoever to all the Lands Between Delaware and Sasquehannah . . . as far Northward as to that Ridge or Chain of mountains called the Endless ... Hills [Blue Mountain]."32 Logan explained in another letter his intent, and his explanation is a small masterpiece of distortion. "Nootamis and his Associates . . . have resolved, as I am very lately told, to apply to these Chiefs of the Five Nations on their Return, and Endeavour to procure from them some Colour of a Grant by which they may still Claim."33 What Nutimus wanted from the Six Nations was not a grant but an adjudication; he wanted his "uncles"-i.e., his superiors and protectors-to give him a fair hearing and to defend him against the Pennsylvanians .34

Logan had Olumapies in mind also. "If I mistake not, Allummapis and his people . . . design to get some Grant for the Land above the Hills [in the Wyoming Valley] which ought to be prevented."" With Weiser's instructions, Logan sent two deeds, asking Weiser to get the more comprehensive one signed if possible, but to make every effort to get signatures at least to the smaller one. The short deed contained only the renunciation of claim to Nutimus' lands. The longer deed included the renunciation also, and went on to "promise and engage . . . *[never to]* bargain, sell, grant or by any means make over to any person or persons whatsoever, whether white men or Indians, other than to the said Proprietors . . . any Lands within the Limits of the Government of Pennsylvania as 'tis bounded northward with the Government of New York and Albany."" Clearly, the longer deed would take care of both Nutimus and Olumapies and their troublemaking advisors.

Both Logan and Weiser knew that what was proposed violated all the protocol of Iroquois government and diplomacy. The Six Nations' hard and fast rule was that no binding agreements could be made except in formal council, formally convened and observing due ceremony. Logan was so uncertain of their reaction, and so anxious to get his hands on a piece of paper with some signatures on it, that he wrote, "If ten or twelve of the Chiefs sign, it may be sufficient." He concocted an elaborate alibi for not having raised the matter in formal council, but left the presentation to Weiser's discretion. Noting that the Proprietors had sent up more money with his message, he wrote: "I am sure thou sufficiently understands the management of all such Affairs with those people to doe it to the best advantage." But he did want one thing made very plain: "The reason to be given for the two parts, and especially for their not making any Grant to the Indians further than to allow them to live on the Land, is this: that the five Nations are our Brethren-honest, wise, discreet, and understanding men-and we can treat with them with pleasure. But the others are "weak and too often knavish (such as Civility, Pesqueetomen, Nootamis, and the like), to whom, though we are alwayes very kind and take great care of them as of ourselves-that they may in no point be abused-yet we are not willing to enter upon Treaties with them as with our Brethren of the five Nations for whom we keep our fire and therefore *would treat with them only in behalf of* all *or any*

of the others."37 This was the big bribe; the extra money was only to provide the salesman's entertainment expenses for his customer.

At no time during the formal meeting in Philadelphia had the Iroquois requested or the Pennsylvanians offered exclusive recognition of the Six Nations as *sole "collective* bargaining agent." The treaties of 1732 and 1736 had created an alliance; what Logan was now offering, in secret, was a bloodless conquest. Logan's confidence was well placed. Weiser did understand his business, and he produced fifteen signatures for the larger of the two deeds, but not without a struggle. For, until this time, the Six Nations' relationships with their tributaries involved mutual obligations; the Delawares were "tributary in an Indian Sense," as Conrad Weiser once explained. How different this was from European notions is implicit in Weiser's description to Logan of the difficulties he encountered in trying to get the Six Nations to violate their own obligations to the Delawares. "It went very hart," wrote Weiser, "about syning over their right upon delaware [river] because they Sayd they had nothing to doe there about the land. They war afaired they shoud doe any thing a mis to their cousins, the delawars." The persuasive devices to which Weiser resorted are clear enough. "I must goe to Carry up some of their goods with about ten Horses. There is no help for it. They are disabled to Carry for sicknes and strong liquors sake. They Charges will be some what larger than you most Expect."38

After the Six Nations had gotten over their first scruples against betraying the Delawares, they entered into the spirit of the thing. Logan's excuse for the secrecy of his proposal was that he had "forgotten" to mention it while the Indians were in Philadelphia. The latter now suddenly discovered that they too had forgotten something. They sought out Weiser and dictated a "petition" to "beseech our Brethren . . . to write in our behalf to Governor or Owner of the Land in Maryland and to the Governor of Virginia to let them both know that we expect some consideration for our Land now in their occupation. . . . We desire further of our Brethren *Onas [governor of Pennsylvania]* and James Logan to use their utmost endeavour to sell the Goods cheaper to us, or give more for our Skins." And then the *quid pro quo.* "We desire further of our Brethren Onas and James Logan never to buy any Land of our Cousins, the Delawares, and Others whom we treat as Cousins; they are people of no Virtue and..... deal very often unjust with our Friends and Brethren the English..... They have no Land remaining to them, and if they offer to sell, they have no good design." So that the point should be absolutely clear, they added, immediately after this sentence, a postscript. "If so be that the Chief Man of Annapolis and the Chief Man of Virginia do neglect to make us any Consideration for our said Land, We desire our Brethren Onas and James Logan to let the Great King over the Great Sea know of it, but notwithstanding, let us know as soon as possible the Answer to both."" As diplomats, the Iroquois understood their business perfectly. Logan might have their written statements to use against the Delawares as he chose, and as he did. The latter could be expected to resist and to appeal, as later they did, to the Six Nations. The Iroquois would then be in a position to ask, before enforcing their deed to Logan, "Whatever happened to that request we made for compensation from Maryland and Virginia?" They had absolute control of the situation .40

With the preparations well made, Nutimus' Indians were once more, in 1737, conferred with in Philadelphia. As insurance, their reluctant signatures were obtained to a new copy of the old Walking Purchase deed of 1686, and a well-rehearsed and well-engineered performance was enacted, which resulted in the Penns' seizure, without compensation, of the land from Tohickon Creek to the Blue Mountain-all the remaining land in the province claimed of right by the Delawares. Pisquetomen was probably an observer since he was in Philadelphia on August 6, 1737. The final signing took place there on August 25, and the Walk was performed in nearby Bucks County on September 19.41 Nutimus and Tishakomen, two of the signers of the 1737 agreement, were both recorded later as associates of Pisquetomen in diplomatic events.42

Indian protests against the Walk began even before it was completed. Nutimus cried fraud, and refused to move off his land. White settlers now poured in, however, and the Penns issued patents for vast estates which they had actually sold to speculators long before the Walk was arranged.43 Moravian settlers at Nazareth found it advisable to pay out of their own pockets the local Indian claim, and incidents of violence occurred or threatened throughout the region.44 Now Logan plucked the fruits of his secret diplomacy. After a violent episode in 170, Governor Thomas called the Delawares to order and cited the Six Nations statements denying them land ownership. He also mentioned that the Six Nations would soon be coming to Philadelphia for another conference, whereupon the Delawares promised to remain orderly until they could have a fair hearing before the Iroquois.45

Nutimus' people were not the only Delawares to embarrass the Pennsylvanians. Old Olumapies came to Philadelphia in August, 174I, to bid farewell to Thomas Penn before the Proprietor departed for England. In the course of ceremonial expressions of abiding love and friendship, Olumapies gently informed Penn that past arrangements were about to take a new turn. The old sachem presented his chosen successor, "the Person who is to have the chief command and to be the mouth of his people" after Olumapies' death. The mouth so chosen was Pisquetomen's, and it had said things Logan did not like to hear. His election suggested a hardening temper among the Delawares.46

Early in June, 1742, news had reached Logan that the Six Nations delegation was on its way. His first reaction was to try to keep Olumapies and his people away, but a "farther thought" struck Logan, and he suggested in a postscript to Weiser that "it may be proper enough that Allummapis with some few of his Council attend, for probably we may have an important Treaty."47

They did indeed, and a number of touchy matters were disposed of amicably. As for the Delawares, Secretary Richard Peters could report, "The Six Nations, at the Instance of our Governor, have ordered the Delaware Indians to remove immediately off the Land in the Forks on pain of their highest Displeasure, and they are preparing to leave." Logan wrote contentedly, "This has been, throughout, an excellent treaty. "48

But what did it mean to the Delawares? Pisquetomen was Nutimus' interpreter at the treaty. He listened as Canasatego, the Iroquois chief, pronounced sentence of one of the harshest dooms ever delivered to an unsuspecting petitioner. "Cousins," he said, "Let this Belt of Wampum serve to Chastize You; You ought to be taken by the Hair of the Head and shaked severely till you recover your Senses and become Sober; you don't know what Ground you stand on, nor what you are doing." Suddenly, Canasatego had discovered that the land, which the Iroquois had refused to claim till 1736 because of Delaware ownership, had never belonged to the Delawares at all. In a moment, he erased the former distinction between the Delawares and the Conestogas. "How came you to take upon you to Sell Land at all? We conquered You, we made Women of you. You know you are Women, and can no more sell Land than Women. Nor is it fit you should have the power of selling Lands since you would abuse it. This Land that you Claim is gone through Your Guts. You have been furnished with Cloaths and Meat and Drink by the Goods paid you for it, and now You want it again like Children as you are."

It was a lawyer's style of argument that Canasatego used. First he denied that the Delawares had had any right to sell the land at all. Then he berated them for having used up the goods received SS years earlier, in 1687. Then, with the inconsistency possible to brute force, he bullied them further for not sharing those goods with the Iroquois at that early date-at a time when the Iroquois laid no claim to Delaware lands. "What makes you sell Land in the Dark? Did we ever receive any Part, even the Value of a Pipe Shank, from you for it? You have told Us a Blind story that you sent a Messenger to Us to inform Us of the Sale but he never came amongst Us, nor we never heard any thing about it." It was nicely mixed up; the activities of half a century earlier were thrown in the same pot with the events of the 1730's and stirred together. The stew was made no easier to swallow by the pious unction with which Canasatego now served it up: "This is acting in the Dark, and very different from the Conduct our six Nations observe in their Sales of Land. On such Occasions they give Publick Notice and invite all the Indians of their united Nations, and give them a share of the Present they receive for their Lands. This is the behaviour of the wise United Nations, but we find you are none of our Blood." Shickellamy and Saristaquo, the Oneida chiefs who had signed the deed at Weiser's in 1736, listened quietly as Canasatego thus converted black to white.

But he was not done. "For all these reasons, we charge You to remove instantly. We don't give you the liberty to think about it. . . . This String of Wampum serves to forbid You, Your Children and Grand Children, to the latest Posterity, for ever, medling in Land Affairs. . . . Depart the Council and consider what has been said to you."49

This was the Delawares' nadir. Having forgotten their Stone Age crafts, they were dependent on trade with the whites for their implements both of livelihood and warfare. So long as the Six Nations were their allies and protectors, they had had some independence of movement; for, if need became extreme, there was always access through Six Nations territory to the French. But now, unaccountably, they were no longer subordinate allies of their uncles. A new alliance had been forged, and the Delawares' role now was that only of the surrounded and helpless victim

and dupe. It was a conquest without a shot. No recourse was left. The whipped and humiliated Delawares left the meeting and their homeland."

They never fully trusted the Iroquois or the Pennsylvanians again, but for nearly a decade they were of no importance in Indian affairs. As individuals, some went with the Iroquois on raids against the southern Indians. Pisquetomen joined one such raid in 1744, and when his kinsman by marriage, Andrew Montour, was disabled by illness, Pisquetomen nursed him in Virginia until recovery made it possible for them to return."

As subjects, the Delawares proved to have a stubborn side. In 1746, Weiser reported that the Six Nations had "invited" the Delawares living in the vicinity of Shamokin to remove to the headwaters of the Susquehanna, but the latter "had no Inclination to go"; and, in fact, there is no indication that they did go.52 They intended to visit Philadelphia in 1746, but were detained by Olumapies' illness. For several years, the ancient chief had been keeping himself in an alcoholic stupor, maintaining just enough presence of mind to veto all attempts to have him abdicate. Shickellamy, the Iroquois viceroy, advised the Pennsylvanians to set up a successor chief on their own authority." Logan instructed Weiser to use his "utmost Endeavour" to prevent the succession of Pisquetomen, and sent a present for Shickellamy to stimulate the conspiracy against Pisquetomen. 54 Weiser assumed full authority and proffered the chieftainship to "an Honest, true-hearted man" named Lappapitton, with "very good Natural Sence."55 But Lappapitton's sense was altogether too good for the success of the intrigue. He declined the honor. "He is afraid he will be Envyd and consequently bewitched by some of the Indians," Weiser reported to Logan." "Bewitched," in operational terms, meant "killed."57 Lacking a candidate, Weiser and Shickellamy decided to let the matter "lie still till next Spring," and the interregnum actually continued until 1752.

This is the explanation for the "chaos" that appears in white men's histories of Delaware affairs. Logan, Weiser, and Shickellamy could prevent Pisquetomen from assuming the chieftainship, but they could not impose a puppet chief. The actuality was not a lack of political consciousness, but the Delawares' stubborn adherence to precedent and legitimacy against overlord intervention and manipulation. The Delaware community was offcially disorganized, which is to say that it had no responsible head whom Pennsylvania or the Six Nations, for their own respective reasons, would recognize. But if it had been actually disorganized, there would have been no trouble in making Lappapitton chief. Not the lack of ethnocentric will and institutions, but the unswervable assertion of them was the reason for the outward appearance of disorganization.

As for Pisquetomen personally, it may be well to recapitulate his experiences with his "friends," the Pennsylvanians. They had invaded his home valley of Tulpehocken, and had forced his people to evacuate it. Logan had even attempted to bluff their chief out of compensation for the seized lands. When payment finally was obtained, it was in an amount less than the Indians thought was due, and in shoddy goods. Pisquetomen had associated with the Conestogas whose habitation had been sold by the Iroquois to the Pennsylvanians. He had lived through the Walking Purchase, and, together with Nutimus, had been dismissed from the 1742

treaty by the Iroquois at the prodding of the Pennsylvanians. And, from 1731 to 1747, his own legitimate succession to the leadership of his tribe had been conspired against in ways that must have exposed themselves at least occasionally to his notice. Sometime after 1747, he left Shamokin for the Ohio. We can guess his feelings easily enough and understand his motivation at placing himself in 1755 at the head of the first Delaware war band ever to strike at Pennsylvania. In particular, he sought to revenge himself against Conrad Weiser."

But his re-emergence occurred in circumstances that, to be understood, require some backtracking along another trail. 1747 was a memorable year in Indian affairs for other reasons than the beginning of the Delaware interregnum. The Iroquois were concerned about the Delawares not only at Shamokin but on the Ohio. The Iroquois monopoly in Indian negotiations offered by Logan in 1736 was threatened by developments in the west. An Irish immigrant trader named George Croghan had stirred up the far western tribes to war against France, and had persuaded the government of Pennsylvania to make a present directly to the western Indians, to the great displeasure of the Iroquois grand council at Onondaga. Many migrant Iroquois were among the western villages who acknowledged formal subordination to the Onondaga Council, and the latter maintained viceroys among them to keep its control, but the distance was great and the tendency to autonomy asserted itself constantly." Moreover, the Delawares at Ohio, with their old allies and kindred tribes, far outnumbered those of the Six Nations Indians who were most strongly pro-British."

Even the Six Nations themselves were being split by the AngloFrench rivalry in the Ohio region. Supremacy in this territory was open to question at every level. The King of England contended for it against the King of France. The Province of Pennsylvania claimed against the Province of Virginia. And the Onondaga Council of Iroquois claimed supremacy by conquest, yet the resident Indians had set up their own councils.

To this kindling, some gentlemen in Virginia touched a match. In 1747, they formed themselves into the Ohio Company to promote settlement and sell lands." After some preliminary hesitation, they hired surveyor Christopher Gist to explore the territory they claimed, and to invite the resident Indians to a treaty. Gist started out in the fall Of 1750. Perhaps his most important discovery-to him at leastwas that the Ohio Indians had already been alerted to the Company's plans, and that they did not share its enthusiasm for settlement. Gist was threatened, and his position became so dangerous that he "pretended to speak very slightingly" of his business of exploration. He told the Indians he had come with a message from the King, and boasted later that his timely invocation of royal sponsorship made everything easy." Nevertheless, he found that he needed the assistance of the Pennsylvania trader George Croghan.

Croghan, who probably had been a source of the Indians' information about the Ohio Company's schemes, had already provided for his own future by obtaining a Six Nations deed for 200,000 acres of land which overlapped the Company's grant." As Gist had secrets from the Indians, so Croghan had secrets from Gist and from some of the Indians. He must have relished helping Gist invite the Indians to

a treaty, for Gist intended to give them a large present from "the great King over the Water." Even though the present would be delivered by commissioners from Virginia, much of the credit for it could be arranged to rub off on Croghan. He introduced Gist to the natives in a series of village meetings, and obtained their answer at Logstown in May, 175I, several months after Gist had returned to Virginia. This answer did not quite conform to the Virginians' desires. They had invited the Indians to come to Virginia. The Indians, in their reply forwarded by Croghan, offered to receive the Virginians and accept their present at Logstown. What had been intended as a treaty completely under Virginia's management had developed into an affair with George Croghan as executive partner. Outfoxed, the Virginians prepared for Logstown.64

Croghan had also moved in another direction to assure control. In 175i, he had conveyed to the Indians at Logstown a Pennsylvania request for the Delawares to end their interregnum .65 It would seem that, with the Virginians intruding on the scene, the Pennsylvanians felt the necessity of dealing with the Delawares directly as a people, Six Nations intermediation had become inadequate. Then, too, the French had become active and belligerent in efforts to win over the Ohio tribes, and their intrusion had to be met by adjustments in old policies.

The Indians themselves were in a dilemma. They weighed the traders' accounts of the Ohio Company's plans, and in 1749 they watched with concern as French Captain Ce'loron de Blainville buried inscribed lead plates along the Ohio to establish French claims. One Indian asked Gist rather somberly, "where the Indian's Land lay, for that the French claimed all the Land on one Side the River Ohio, and the English on the other Side."66 The Indians desired nothing more fervently than to have France and Britain fight out their quarrel themselves-somewhere else. But once again they had to face the bitter fact that they had become dependent on the white man. To feed and to defend himself, the Indian had to have the tools and weapons that only the whites could provide.

It was into this world that Pisquetomen had migrated some time after the intrigue against him in Shamokin, and it was in this world that he finally won his long battle with the combined forces of Pennsylvania and the Six Nations. For when, at Logstown in June, 1752) a new Delaware "King" was recognized, it was Pisquetomen's brother, Shingas, and all records show them to have been in perfect accord .67 Shingas, Pisquetomen, and a third brother, Tamaqua (or Beaver), were the core of what a white captive called the "Royal Family" of the Delawares. 68 Some doubt may be raised as to whether everyone named as a brother in this large family was related by kinship to all the others. Except for Shingas, Pisquetomen, and Tamaqua, "brothers" seem to come and go in the records- a circumstance that suggests the Indian institution of adoption. But the "Royal Family" was a political institution even if by white men's conceptions it was neither royal nor familial. The brothers-whether kin by genetics or alliance-led the Delawares openly from Shingas' installation in 1752 through the French and Indian War, the truce after the fall of Fort Duquesne, and Pontiac's Uprising. Even during the interregnum, Christopher Gist was told in 175I that Beaver was the "Sachamore or Chief of the Delawares.""

With the available evidence, a thesis about the Delaware interregnum seems supportable. When the Six Nations refused to recognize Pisquetomen as hereditary Delaware chief, the Delawares refused a puppet. Pisquetomen, recognizing the hopelessness of the situation at Shamokin, migrated to the Ohio, where his own people had become stronger and more numerous than in the east. He joined or organized political alliances with other Delaware leaders, which in effect became a "resistance" to the Six Nations. These alliances were made firm by the familiar Indian device of adoption, and Pisquetomen's kinship to the deceased Olumapies provided legitimacy. Eventually, in the crisis beginning in 1751, the Six Nations were obliged to capitulate to the resistance, withdrawing from their attempt to impose a puppet and inviting the Delawares themselves "to choose one of your wisest Counsellors and present him to us, for a King."70

Perhaps they had privately stipulated that Pisquetomen himself could not be chosen. Perhaps Pisquetomen let them save face, or perhaps he simply felt too old by then to assume the burden of top leadership. But it seems indisputable that the flanking maneuver by which Shingas was put forward represented a Delaware victory. Though the Six Nations insisted, "we let you know that it is our Right to give you a King," they had to add, "we think proper to give you Shingas for your King . . . with whom all publick Business must be transacted between you and your Brethren, the English."71 Logan, Shickellamy, and Weiser were undone. The Delawares had ceased being subjects. Though still tributary, they spoke for themselves thenceforth.

Glassboro State College FRANCIS P. JENNINGS

1 Source literature is vague about anthropological distinctions between organization by kinship relations and organization by territorial location, so I have resorted to evasive terms like "community" and "people" which must be understood as an effort to name without describing. Authorities do agree that the Delawares at the village called Tulpehocken on a branch of the Schuylkill, who later changed their headquarters to Shamokin on the Susquehanna, had some sort of special status among the Delaware people. Their chief held the ceremonial title which I have transcribed as Olumapies, following the practice of Conrad Weiser. According to a nineteenth century anthropologist, Olumapies meant "preserver of the records," and was given to "a head chief of the Delawares." Daniel G. Brinton, *The Lenape and Their Legends; with the Complete Text and Symbols of the Walam Olum* (Philadelphia, 1885), 60. The Moravian missionary to the Delawares, David Zeisberger, stated that one .'tribe" of the Delawares, the Unami, were considered the head of the whole "nation," and their chief was entrusted with the conduct of treaties in behalf of the whole. Succession to the chief's office was hereditary through a female line of descent. A. B. Hulbert and W. *N.* Schwarze, eds., "David Zeisberger's History of the Northern American Indians," *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly,* XIX (1910), 27, 99, 113. These statements have been accepted by Brinton (47, 6o, 244), and by W. W. Newcomb, Jr., in *The Culture and Acculturation of the Delaware Indians, -Anthropological Paper No. 10 of the Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan* (Ann Arbor, 19S6), 84. But a caution must be observed as to dates; Zeisberger's observations were made late in the 18th century, and the present paper is devoted to an earlier period.

No effort is made herein to assert anthropological competence in determining just what sort of group the Unami were. Whatever they were, however, their chief was Olumapies and he lived first at Tulpehocken and then at Shamokin. Perhaps the best evidence of his pre-eminent responsibility and accepted leadership is the fact that the Iroquois stationed their viceroy over the Delawares in his village.

2 Newcomb, 2.

3 Anthony F. C. Wallace, "Woman, Land, and Society: Three Aspects of Aboriginal Delaware Life," *Pennsylvania Archaeologist,* XVII (1947), 15.

4 See Francis Jennings, "A Vanishing Indian: Francis Parkman Versus His Sources," *Pennsylvania Magazine* of *History and* Biography (hereafter PMHB), LXXXVII (1963), 306-323.

5 Albright G. Zimmerman, "James Logan, Proprietary Agent," *PMHB,* LXXV111 (1954),174-175.

6 Nicholas B. Wainwright, "George Croghan-Indian Trader," unpublished master's thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1951; James Logan to John Falconer, Oct. 23, 1727, Logan Letter Book, 5o6, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP). Unless otherwise stated, all manuscripts cited are in the Society's collection.

7 Logan to John Penn, Aug. 2, I 73 1, Penn Papers, Official Correspondence, 11, 181. When documents are quoted in this paper, abbreviations and punctuation have been corrected where necessary to make them more understandable.

8 Ibid.

9 In 1731, Pisquetomen was a mature man living with his uncle Olumapies at Shamokin, where Olumapies had removed from Tulpehocken. Indian Treaty Minutes, Aug. 17 and 18, 1731, James Steel's Letter Book (1730-1740, 274-276; Logan to John, Thomas and Richard Penn, Aug. 26, 1731, Penn Papers, Official Correspondence, II, 191.

10 Minutes *of* the *Provincial Council of Pennsylvania: Colonial Records* (Harrisburg, 18381853), III, 319-324, cited hereafter as *Council Minutes.*

11 Logan to John Penn, Aug. 13, 1729, Penn Papers, Official Correspondence, 11, 83.

12 Logan to Penn, Aug. 2, 1731*, ibid., 181*.

13 _Ibid.

14 Sassoonan's Grant, Aug. 11, 173i, Logan Papers, XI, 16; *Council Minutes, 111,* 430.

Is Logan to John, Thomas, and Richard Penn, Aug. 26, I 73 I, Penn Papers, Official Correspondence, 11, 191.

16 Ibid.

17 The best description of the alliance is in Paul A. W. Wallace, *Conrad Weiser, 1696-176o: Friend of Colonist and Mohawk* (Philadelphia, I 945). See especially Chapters 6, 9, and 16. My interpretation varies from Dr. Wallace's in certain respects.

18 Copy of deed, Logan Papers, XI, 21.

19 LogantoThomasPenn,Aug. *16,1733,Pennsylvania Archives,SecondSeries(Harrisburg,* I874-1890), VII, 145.

20 Weiser to Richard Peters, July 2o, 1747, *Pennsylvania Archives, First Series* (Philadelphia, 1852-1860), I, 761.

21 A strongly moralistic account of the Walking Purchase is in William J. Buck, *History of the Indian Walk* (Philadelphia, 1886). The fullest and most balanced treatment is in Anthony F. C. Wallace, *King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung, 1700-1763* (Philadelphia, 1949). Only a superficial gloss can be given here of the complex and controverted events in Nutimus' struggle. In addition to the documents cited herein, some fresh evidence contained in property deeds and patents convinces me that Nutimus. was in the right. A paper on the subject will be offered later.

22 *Council Minutes,* IV, 578 - For a discussion of the Delaware Indian land tenure system, see W. W. Newcomb, Jr., 22-24; Wallace, "Woman, Land, and Society," 2-6; W. C. McLeod, "The Family Hunting Territory and Lenape Political *Organization," American Anthropologist,* XXIV (1922), 448-463.

23 In 1762, the Walking Purchase was described for the Proprietors by William Allen and for the Indians by Teedyuscung. See Board of Trade Papers (transcripts at HSP). Allen's account starts at page 183, volume XXI, Part I. Teedyuscung's account is scattered through the minutes of the conference, held then, but see especially the entry for June 19. Sir William Johnson's report begins on page 57, *ibid.* A coherent Indian narrative from a chief respected by both sides is "Moses Tatamie's Account of Indian Claims taken from his mouth at Easton by CT *[Charles Thomson],"* Etting Collection, Miscellaneous Manuscripts, 1, 94.

An example of a pre-Walk land sale in the disputed territory is a 5000-acre tract surveyed for Thomas Penn as a private person on May A, 1732. This land was conveyed immediately to Joseph Turner who reconveyed it to William Allen on Sept. IO, I 735. Allen surveyed a tract out of this acreage in the Lehigh Valley, Oct. 9, 1735, which was formally patented Aug. 2o, 1739. Pennsylvania Patent Book A-9, 68j.; Warrants and Surveys of the Province of Pennsylvania, 1682-1759, II, 226-227. Originals of patent books are in the Land Office, Pennsylvania Department of Internal Affairs, Harrisburg. Microfilm copies can be consulted at the Department of Records, City Hall, Philadelphia. Warrants and Surveys are located both in Harrisburg and Philadelphia but are not duplicates. Those

cited here are in the Archives Division, Department of Records, City Hall, Philadelphia. William Allen bought 20,000 acres from William Penn the younger and Springett Penn, which were largely located in territory unpurchased from the Indians. See John, Thomas and Richard Penn to R. Hill, 1. Norris, S. Preston, and J. Logan, Sept. 6, 1729, Penn Papers, Letters of the Penn Family to James Logan, 11, 74; James Logan to J., T., and R. Penn, Nov. 16,1729, Logan Letter Book, III, 316.

24 Council Minutes, IV, 53-56.

25 Logan to Weiser, Sept. 5, 1736, Logan Papers, X, 6o.

26 Weiser to Logan, Sept. 16, 1736, Logan Papers, X, 62.

27 Council Minutes, IV, 87-89, 93; Logan to "Honoured Friend," July 1o, 1727, Penn Papers, Official Correspondence, 1, 283. The grounds for Conestoga discontent are not recorded, but the issue can be inferred from an earlier letter of Gov. Sir William Keith to Gov. Calvert of Maryland, June 23, 1722, in which Keith acknowledges that Pennsylvania "is bound by old Treatys" to give the Conestogas "a full scope and Liberty in their Settlements from the Christian Inhabitants." *Council Minutes,* III, 184.

28 "Directions to Conrad Weiser, Sent after him and the Indians, October, 1736," Logan Papers, XI, 26.

29 Council Minutes, IV, 86. The Provincial Council had an afterthought about the present and decided that, since the Indians were getting a "large Quantity of Goods" for the land sale, the present should be reduced to "between sixty and seventy Pounds." *Ibid., 88.*

30 Ibid., 92, 94.

31 John Penn to Thomas Penn, Feb. 4, 1736, Penn Letter Book, 1, I36-I37.

32 Logan Papers, XI, 26.

33 Logan to Weiser, Oct. 18, 1736, Logan Papers, X, 64.

34 Nutimus, *et al,* to Jeremiah Langhorne, Nov. 21i, 1740, and Jan- 3, 174I, Penn Papers, Indian Affairs, IV, *30; Council Minutes,* IV, 48 I. Nutimus stated explicitly in his letter, "We never sold [Penn] this land."

35 Logan Papers, X, 64. In this instance, Logan's use of the word "grant" is valid.

36 Certified copy of deed, Penn Papers, Indian Affairs, 1, 40.

37 Logan Papers, X, 64. Author's italics.

38Weiser's "Indian Sense" remark is in "An Account of ... the Six Nations," The American Magazine (Boston: December, 1744), 666; his letter to Logan is dated Oct. 27, 1736, Logan Papers, X, 65. 1 have altered the spelling slightly. Original printed in P. A. W. Wallace Conrad Weiser, 74.

39 Certified copy of petition, Penn Papers, Indian Affairs, 1, 39.

40 My interpretation is grounded on the Iroquois' willingness, later demonstrated more openly, to sacrifice Delaware interests for their own. The continued intrigue against Pisquetomen, in itself, justifies this reading. Also consider that at Easton in 1758, the Six Nations permittedtheDelawares of New jersey to sell their lands publicly,andstatedexplicitlythat the Delawares could fix their own price because the Six Nations "had no claims" to these lands. The transaction was completed and a thousand Spanish dollars paid. Council Minutes, VIII, 209-2io. If the Delawares had been a conquered people, as asserted in 1736, they would have been, like the Conestogas, disabled to sell any land anywhere.

We may note also that the Mohawk tribe of the Six Nations had not been represented at Philadelphia or at Weiser's in 1736. They were highly critical of Pennsylvania's encroachment on lands above the Blue Hills (the Minnesinks), occupied by the Shawnees until 1737. The Mohawks stated, "We think it is Governor Penns fault" that the Shawnees left this land to join the French. "It is a Custome amongst the Christians that when they buy Land of the Indians to take in more than is agreed for. And we believe Mr. Penn has Encroached on their Lands." E. B. O'Callaghan and B. Fernow, eds., Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York (Albany, 1856-1887), VI, 99, io3-106

41 Logan to Weiser, Aug. 6, 1737, Peters Manuscripts, 1, 156; James Steel's Letter Book, 1730-1741, i56; Pennsylvania Archives, First Series, 1, 539-543.

42 Nutimus in Council Minutes, IV, 578; Tishakomen, given as "Tassacomin," in ibid., VIII, 189.

43 See footnote 23.

44 Joseph M. Levering, A History of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1741-1892 (Bethlehem, 1903), 50-5I, I54-155.

45 Penn Papers, Indian Affairs, IV, 30.

46 Sassoonan's Speech, Aug- 7, 1741, Records of the Provincial Council and Other Papers.

47 Logan to Weiser, June 10, 174-2, Peters Manuscripts, 1, 84.

48 Peters to "Honoured Proprietaries," Aug. 25, 1742, Peters Letter Book, 1737-175o, 26; Logan to "Proprietaries," July 12, 1742, Peters Manuscripts, 1, 89. Author's italics.

49 Council Minutes, IV, 578-580.

50 Anthony F. C. Wallace has discussed the nature of Delaware subordination to the Iroquois in "Woman, Land, and Society."

51 Weiser to Logan, Sept. 29, 1744, Pennsylvania Archives, First Series, 1, 662. Montour's "first wife was a granddaughter of Allummapies." Virginia Historical Collections, New Series, III (1883), 17n.

52 Weiser to Thomas Lee, July 5, 1746, Correspondence of Conrad Weiser, I, 15.

53 Memorandum of Conrad Weiser, Council Minutes, V, 88.

54 Logan to Weiser, July 30, 1747, Peters Manuscripts, II, 8i; also Oct. 18, 1747, ibid., 82; William Logan to Weiser, Oct. 2o, 1747, ibid., 83.

55 Weiser to Richard Peters, July 2o, 1747, Pennsylvania Archives, First Series, 1, 762.

56 Weiser to Logan, Oct. 15, 1747, Logan Papers, XI, 33.

57 Zeisberger, I 25.

58 Weiser to Gov. Morris, Oct- 31, 1755, Du Simitiere Papers, Library Company of Philadelphia; Council Minutes, VI, 683. When Pisquetomen attacked, Lappapitton "always true to the English" warned the whites. Weiser to Gov. Morris, Oct. 26, 1755, Council Minutes, VI, 649.

59 Nicholas B. Wainwright, George Croghan, Wilderness Diplomat (Chapel Hill, 1959), 14-17.

60 Weiser estimated there was a total Of 789 fighting men on the Ohio in I 748. Of these, 165 were Delawares, 16-2 were Shawnees traditionally allied to the Delawares, and IS were MOhicans of Delaware stock. The most neutral or pro-French tribe of the Six Nations, the Senecas, comprised 163 more, and the unpredictable Wyandots made up another 100. "Journal of the Expedition under Conrad Weiser to the Indians on the Ohio in 1748," Photostat at HSP. A Virginian estimated in 1750 that the Ohio Indians had increased to nearly 2,000 warriors.

P. A. W. Wallace, Conrad Weiser, 319.

61 Lois Mulkearn, ed., George Mercer Papers Relating to the Ohio Company of Virginia (Pittsburgh, I954), 2.

62 Gist's journal, Nov. 25, 1750, Mulkearn, 9-1o.

63 Deed, Etting Collection, Ohio Papers, 11, 7; Wainwright, Croghan, 28, 28o. Croghan himself stated that Pennsylvania's old foe Thomas Cresap had informed the Indians that Virginia planned to settle the Ohio region. Pennsylvania Archives, First Series, II, 31.

64 Mulkearn, I I ff., 33 ff.; Wainwright, Croghan, 37; Council Minutes, V, 537.

65 Council Minutes, V, 533.

66 Gist's journal, Mar. 12, 1752, Mulkearn, 39-5

67 Journal of the Virginia commissioners, June 11, 1752, Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XIII (1905), 167. The Virginia commissioners reported that the Delawares were headed by two brothers, Shingas and Beaver, May 28, 1752, see ibid., 155. In 1753, Pisquetomen was identified as Shingas' brother at Carlisle, where Conrad Weiser acted as interpreter, Council Minutes, V, 68 5.

68 Account of the captivity of Hugh Gibson, Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Third Series, VI (1837), 141, 148.

69 Gist's Journal, Dec. 17, 1751, Mulkearn, 35.

70 Council Minutes, V, 533; Journal of the Virginia commissioners, Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, XIII, i67.

71 Ibid.

The Delaware Interregnum
Francis P. Jennings
The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography
Vol. 89, No. 2 (Apr., 1965), pp. 174-198