public offices in England, for the use of Colonel Byrd of Westover, writing the history of
Burke. Thereupon formed the resolution of Virginia; a country of which,
or of its inhabitants, he knew as little as any man in it, save only
what he could extract from these records, or from other histories. The
work was hastily written; and its author was killed in a duel before
he had completed it. So far as it proceeds the ancient manuscript
volumes in his possession, this history is no doubt entitled to the
fullest credit; but it is replete with errors and inaccuracies of many
kinds, whenever the author lost sight of these; his only sure guides. Hening,
had noticed some of these errors, West others; and any man who has
taken the trouble to collect information of the events of past time, in
reference to this country, will be able to point out many more.

Hening, in his compilation of the ancient Statutes of Virginia,
had furnished much evidence to enlighten the obscurity that had
been supposed to envelop this period of our history. The nature of this
work, allowed but little opportunity to the author, of commenting upon
the facts, the proof of which was before him; and he has not avoided
himself, sufficiently, even of the occasions that were presented. Both in
the preface and in some of the notes to the first Volume, he has
undertaken to contradict a pack of the accounts given by Doctor
Robertson; and while exhibiting the evidence upon which he relies
to support his opinion in this respect, he has found himself compelled
to differ also from that offered by Burke, with whom, however, he seems
upon the whole, most disposed to concave.

According to Hening, from the death of Charles the first, to the
restoration of Charles the second, not a governor of Virginia had been
appointed either by the Commonwealth or by Cromwell; but Sir
William Berkeley himself, and each of his predecessors, during this
interval, was elected by a full Assembly, not of cavaliers and aristocrats,
or of the people themselves, but of the representatives of the people.
All these governors, he says, were the mere creatures of the House of
Burgesses, dependent upon their breath for their political existence,
and amenable to their pleasure. He contradicts Doctor Robertson, on
and concurs with Burke, in stating, that neither the Ordinance of 1650,
nor the Acts of 1651, for imposing restraints upon the commerce of
the colonies, took effect in Virginia, notwithstanding the existence
of these Acts is assigned by Doctor Robertson, as one of the causes which confirmed the Virginians in principles of loyalty to the king, and
render'd them impatient under the yoke of Cromwell. (4c)

I have taken some trouble to investigate this interesting period of our history. In the course of this investigation, having found much curious evidence, and collected some amusing anecdotes, I will now state the result of all my researches, and the sources from which it has been derived. This result, has induced me to concur in the account given by Doctor Robertson, as above, in all its parts.

The fact of the apparent continuance of the loyal attachment of Virginia to the crown of England, even after the deposition and violent death of Charles the first, is established not only by the concurrent testimony of all the historians to whom I have referred above, but by many other authentic documents and records I have seen, which, most certainly, could never have been seen or read by those who question or deny its sincerity. Whether this attachment was the effect of religious zeal, which regarded the king as the head of the episcopal church, and appreheended danger to that church from the success of the Puritans of the Parliament, or Burke, supposes was the case—whether it resulted from a grateful sense of the favors that had recently been paid upon the colony by the unfortunate king, as Doctor Robertson thinks—whether it was the consequence of the affection with which Sir William Berkeley, the royal governor, had been always regarded in the colony, at this time—whether it was produced by the combination of all these causes, is a matter of little moment. The existence of this apparently loyal attachment is nowhere denied; and the only doubt is whether it was real or feigned; a sincere attachment, or the mere attenuate of caution and reserve. The same documents which prove its apparent existence establish its truth and sincerity, beyond all doubt, as I think.

Charles the first was beheaded January 30th, 1649, and the first Assembly of Virginia which convened after this event, met on the 10th day of October following. The first Act passed at this session, after exciting the treasonable principles and practices of the republicans, in aspiring the memory of the late most excellent, and now undoubtedly

s/See Hen. 5th Statutes. Vol. 1. pages XIII. 332. 429. 518. 528
b/1. 36. Vol. 1. page 366. note.
"wanted king. enacts: That to defend the late traitorous proceedings against the king, by reasoning distance or argument, makes the person guilty as are accepting false faith — That by inverent or scandalous words or language, to blast the memory and honour of the late most pious king, preserving ever affix and monuments in the hearts of all good men, should be punishable at the discretion of the governor and council. And that to ensnare any doubt, or and concerning the undoubted and inherent right of his majesty that now is (Charles the second) to the colony of Virginia, and all other his dominions, as king and supreme governor, should be high treason. (a)

Such declarations, attend at such a time too, places beyond all question, not only the apparent loyal attachment of Virginians to the royal cause, even at this period, but also the truth and sincerity of that attachment. Caution and reserve might well have prevented the utterance of such sentiments, although warmly and sincerely felt; but could hardly have dictated the expression of them, if the attachment they breathe had been but a feigned and pretended. And that they were believed to be sincere, by the Parliament of England, by the exiled prince, and by the sister colonies of Virginia, is shown as positively, by other documents, as their apparent and real existence is proved by this.

All authors concur, in ascribing, the hard provisions of the Ordinance of 1660, and the restraints upon commerce imposed by the two Acts of 1651, to the irritation felt by the Parliament, at the loyalty of some of the colonies, among which Virginia was one. By the first of these laws, the colonists of Barbados, Virginia, Bermudas and Antego, were denounced as notorious traitors and rebels; and all vessels, whether belonging to natives of England or foreigners, were prohibited from entering their ports, or carrying on commerce with them. By the latter of these Acts, all merchandise in course is expressly prohibited, between any of the colonies and foreign states, and all importations into the colonies from foreign states, is confined to vessels belonging to English subjects, navigated by crews of which, the greater part must be Englishmen. Voluntarily to incur the pains and privations of such laws, may perhaps sufficiently establish a devotion to the royal cause, by which devotion they were called down to the very point of death.

(a) See Jennings's Statutes, Up. I. pages 558, 9, 60.
(b) See Ordinance of October 5, 1660. Scobell's Acts page 1027. See also Act of October 9, 1651. Scobell's Acts page 1449.
upon the heads of the colonists: but is utterly inconsistent with the
notion of a feigned loyalty, exhibited by caution and reserve merely.
It is certain, therefore, that the Parliament of England must have
believed the Virginians to have been sincere in their professions of
loyalty.

That the exiled prince concurred in this opinion, is manifest from
the fact of the new commission sent to Sir William Berkeley, as
governor of Virginia, transmitted by Charles the second from Beida,
where he went to meet the Commissioners from Scotland. This
commission bears date in 1650, and may be found in Chalmers.[1]

And that the neighbouring and sister colony of Massachusetts
united in the same opinion, will clearly appear from the act passed by
the Assembly of that colony, in 1651, whereby trade with the other
colonies mentioned in the Ordinances of the Parliament of 1650, is
forbidden, until their compliance with the Commonwealth of
England, or the further order of that General Court.[2]

With such evidence before them, who can doubt of the sincere
loyalty and warm attachment of Virginia to the Royal cause, even
after that cause was abandoned everywhere else?

The suggestion made by Beida, that Virginia merely forbore to
acknowledge the new government, but took no step to open any intercourse
with the Royal party, does not seem to be warranted by the fact. The
commission mentioned above, as granted at Beida in 1650, goes far to
prove that Charles the Second must have been then informed of the
Act of Assembly passed in 1649, which recognized his "undoubted and
inherent right to the colony of Virginia." And one of the Articles of
the Convention for surrendering the colony, in 1652, provides expressly,
"that there be one sent home at the present governor's choice, to give an
"account to his majesty of the surrender of his country, the present
"governor bearing his charges, that is Sir Williams Berkeley." From
whence it very plainly appears, that intercourse was kept up between
Virginia and the Royal party, from the death of Charles the first.


until the rebellion of this colony in 1652. Nay, Lord Clarendon states expressly, and he must have been personally acquainted with the fact, that Sir William Berkeley had "industiously invited many gentlemen and others thereto, as to a place of security; and that he said to the king, "almost inviting him thereto, as to a place that wanted nothing." (6)

Whether the spirit of loyalty thus shown to exist in Virginia, was at last constrained to yield, and submitted only to the necessity imposed by the superior force dispatched by the Parliament to subdue this colony; or whether other causes contributed to induce the surrender of the country to the Commissioners sent out from England, is a question which cannot be settled at this day. The force sent, was unquestionably sufficient to produce this effect, although both Marshall and Burke are mistaken, when they represent the whole force sent from England under the command of Sir George Agassie, to have been that to which the surrender was made. Beverly states more correctly, that the squadron which entered the Chesapeake, was commanded by Captain Somers. Agassie sailed from England early in September 1651; arrived at Barbadoes October 16, 1651; and after bringing that island to capitulation, he dispatched Captain Somers to Virginia, with only a part of his force, in pursuance of his instructions to that effect. (c)

The presence of this force, supported by the reinforcement it might soon expect, must have produced much effect in Virginia, no doubt. But Beverly enunciates very broadly, that the treachery of two members of the council contributed not a little to this capitulation. This treachery continued even to my early day; and I have often heard the names of Proces and Seabrooke mentioned, as those of the traitors. To this was added that the indignation of the colonists, afterwards compelled them to so treat, while they fled from the country they had betrayed, some that never returned. This treachery, however, had not its origin in any spirit of reform: but is reprehensible to have proceeded from a very different cause, and to have

(6) Beverley's History of Virginia, page 62.
sprung from motives exclusively personal and selfish. Nor has there any warrant for the affection he begat, that there was any division of sentiment existing here, at that time, arising from any such general cause.

It is true, that a diversity did exist among the colonists, at that time, the curious evidence of which I will presently state; but this difference of sentiment, so far from showing any abatement of the loyalty of the Virginians, is a proof of its continuance undiminished, even after the capitulation and surrender of the colony had been complete.

In the ancient records of Northampton County, to which I have before referred, I found a singular document spread upon the record in the year 1669. Its substance is, that by the death of Charles the first, effected as that was, the government of this country was dissolved; and all the powers and authorities of the Assembly were extinguished. That the capitulation of March 1669, having been concluded by an Assembly chosen before the death of the late king, this body had no legal authority after that event; and of course none to make that surrender. Therefore, that the people of the County of Northampton were not bound by that act, or by any other of the acts of this Assembly; the more especially, as they had not been represented therein. Resolving themselves, they had no objection that Maj. Richard Bennett should be made governor by the next Assembly; they protested, however, against the exercise of power by him, if it was derived from any other source than an election by the Assembly.

It would seem from this document, which I think was intended for instructions to the burgesses of Northampton County chosen for the next Assembly, that doubts were entertained as to the legitimacy of the authority of those who made the capitulation, to agree upon such an act. Notwithstanding this, such was the situation of the colony at the time, that it was thought better to adhere to the capitulation than to reject it. But that if adhered to, the governor, under it, must derive his powers from the Assembly, and not from no
other sources. And that the authority of Mr. Bennet as governor, not being so
desired, was not then generally recognized. This last circumstance, goes far
to justify the conclusion, that the surrender of the colony to the Parliament,
was the result of the necessity imposed by superior force, acting upon
the disorderly and unsettled state of things then existing.

This paper seems to have received the approbation of Colonel
Stedman, who presided in the court when it was ordered to be recorded.
Some of its parts distinctly proved, by the list of the members of the
Assembly who agreed to the capitulation, in which last no members for
the County of Northampton will be found. (e)

Whether the three governors who presided in Virginia after Sir
William Berkeley was forced to abandon his post, were appointed by the
Parliament and Cromwell, as Doctor Robertson states; or by the
Assembly, as Stedman contends, I have seen but little other evidence
than that which the latter advances. From all this however, I am
induced to believe, that both of these authors are right; and that their
respective statements may easily be reconciled thus. Either the
Parliament or Cromwell named the governor, to whom it was thought by
them most advisable to commit the colony, and this governor was then
elected by the Assembly; or the Assembly elected a governor known to be
most acceptable to the Parliament or Cromwell, who was afterwards
approved and confirmed by them. Both modes were practiced at different
periods, probably.

Richard Bennet, the first governor after the surrender of the
colony, was one of the Commissioners sent out by the Parliament, to
settle and arrange its affairs. If the document, the substance of which
I have before given, may be relied upon, and there is no reason to doubt
its correctness, it thereby appears, that Bennet acted as governor
immediately after the Assembly, which met on the 26th of April 1663, and elected him
governor and Capt. William Clayborne (and vice of these Commissioners)
Secretary. (f) From whence it would seem, that Bennet, although
afterwards elected by the Assembly, had been governor previously

(f) See the Instructions, signed by President Bradshaw. Harl. 6971. 538.
previously to this election.

On the 22nd of November 1665, Edward Diggs was nominated by
the governor and council, to be one of the council; and was approved
by the Assembly unanimously, "he having given a signal testimony
of his fidelity to This Colony and Commonwealth of England". On
the 01st of March 1666, the same man was made governor by the
Assembly. Now Bennet, the preceding governor, had been elected
originally for one year, or until the next meeting of the Assembly.
Both these terms had expired before the election of Diggs as above;
yet Bennet continued to act as governor until March 00, 1665.

Certainly, so that Bennet, who has been shown to have acted as
governor previously to his election by the Assembly, continued to act
in that capacity after the expiration of the term for which he was so
elected. Therefore, Bennet, although elected by the Assembly, must
have derived his authority from some other source. (b)

His successor Diggs also, who had been elected March 01, 1665,
was still acting as governor in December 1666, without any new
appointment from the Assembly; and therefore, must have derived
his authority from some other source. And Matthews, the successor of
Diggs, although elected as early as December 1666, and then described
as "governor elect", was afterwards postponed until the departure
of Diggs, who was requested by the Assembly, "to execute the reins
of government in his hands, during his absence in the country". (c)
A circumstance inconsistent with the new legislative appointment
of either of these persons. This notion is also opposed by the fact,
that Matthews, while governor, attempted to disband the Assembly;
a course he would hardly have attempted to adopt, if he had been but
the creature of this body, subject to be annihilated at their pleasure, as
Hening states. (e)

These considerations incline me to believe, that Bennet, the
first governor after the surrender of the colony, was appointed
by the Parliament. He, finding a strong party existing in the country,
who, although willing to elect him themselves, were reluctant to
reconcile him as governor if he declined his powers from England.

(c) Iam. page 426.
(e) Iam. pages 499.
to put an end to all controversy, and to effect the union of the people, was willing to seem to devote his appointment from the Assembly, until the pleasure of the Parliament should be known. That the Parliament approving this course, he continued to act as governor for several years, without any new election or appointment; but being constrained to return to England, by his private affairs, Diggs was sent out from thence to supply his place as governor, whenever the vacancy might occur. Diggs, after his arrival in the country, was elected by the Assembly, purely as his predecessor had been. He too being compelled to return to England, before any successor had been chosen to fill the place, the Assembly elected Matthew, on anticipation of the departure of Diggs. Matthew, being sent to England, was there appointed to succeed Diggs, and came out to Virginia as 'governor elect.' Soon after Matthew began his government, he attempted to dissolve the Assembly; but that body refusing to be dissolved by him, the question was referred to the Lord Protector; and Matthew was again elected governor for two years. During this period Matthew died; and the colony being without a governor, the people turned their eyes towards their old governor Sir William Berkeley, who was still in the country, and went to have him for their governor. Matthew died in January 1662, and the Assembly which met March 13, 1662, finding the temper of the people, elected Sir William Berkeley immediately. Charles the second was not restored in England, until May 29, 1660. But as the determination to restore him had been made sometime before the actual restoration took place, it cannot be doubted, that this loyal governor made haste to acknowledge his master, and actually die so before he was proclaimed in England. So that the boast of Virginia, stated by Doctor Babington, is literally true.

As a corroboration of this, I will state a fact mentioned to me by my grandfather Waller. The motto of the ancient arms of Virginia, was 'En de Virginiens quinquies.' When I asked him the meaning of this, he told me, that the arms and motto had been given to the colony by Charles the second upon his restoration, and that the motto was intended, by that monarch, to compliment the loyalty of the colony, in being the first of all his dominions to recognize his authority. Therefore, he had associated Virginia with England.


(2) ibid., page 529.
France, Scotland and Ireland, excelling in the meaning, of the
motto, "Behold Virginia gives a fifth kingdom." Beverley says also, that
there was a tradition in his times, that Charles the second, in
"compliment to the colony, wrote at his coronation, a letter made of the
Vellis, that was sent from Thomas." (b)

I cannot suppress my astonishment, when I read the opinions
of both Bush and Hening, that in no part of the penal codes of
Virginia, during the existence of the Commonwealth, is the authority
of the Acts of Parliament recognised, under which acts the severe
restrictions of our commerce were imposed. Both these authors,
while they utter these opinions, produce a case extracted from their
ancient records, in which the obligation of these acts is distinctly
admitted, and their penalties applied to the ship "Seapoldus of
Dunbar." Bush considers this case as not satisfactory, "as
and as the Parliament was at war with the partied traders." I do not
find this so have been the case however. Dunbar was taken by the
Spaniards, September 26, 1652. They held it until it was retaken
by the French and English and given up to the latter, in 1658; and
the war between Spain and England did not take place until
the latter end of 1655. Now the seizure and condemnation of the
Seapoldus occurred in 1655, at a time when war did not exist
between England and Spain, which latter power then held
Dunbar, as I have said. Nay, the very grounds of the
condemnation of this vessel, is expressly stated to be "The Act
of Parliament for restraining navigation." Therefore, none
ought to doubt of the obligation of this act in Virginia, when
this condemnation took place; and of this I have seen several other
examples. (b)

There is then, I think, no reason to question the account given
by all our earliest historians, that Virginia remained loyal to
the king, after all his other dominions had forsaken him, and
that she was the first to return to the allegiance she had been the
last to renounce. I have devoted more time to establish this than

(a) See Beverley's History of Virginia, page 83.
(c) See Daniel's History of France, Vol. IV., pages 81, 89, 92.
was probably necessary; because, the contrary opinion being that which is now the most popular, will probably prevail; and in a few years, the ground upon which the old accounts can be supported will be forgotten and lost in obscurity. But to return to my narrative.

Colonel Stillton, like the rest of his countrymen, had retained his attachment to the royal cause until he opposed this attachment was treason drawn from him, he was one of those who refused to recognize the power of the new governor, Benedict, until this governor should be elected by the Assembly. But so soon as this occurred, Colonel Stillton became a warm supporter of the existing government, and filled a conspicuous place under it, as one of the Council of State.

In 1669, much discontent seems to have existed in the county of Northampton, excited, as appears, by Colonel Edmund Scoborough, an influential man, who resided in that county. He seized several vessels under the pretext that they had violated the Navigation Act, then recently enacted by the Parliament of England. Yet while he thus afforded obedience to the Parliament, he openly denied the authority of the existing government; because, the death of the late king, and the expiration of his son had put an end to all government. This last notion, was boldly and imperiously announced, in a memorial presented to the Assembly, signed by him and a number of the inhabitants of Northampton County, who were probably influenced by him. In consequence of these acts, so dangerous to the tranquillity and prosperity of the country, a petition was presented to the Assembly, praying that proper measures might be taken to correct and prevent their effects. At the head of these petitioners, is found the name of Colonel Stillton, the Commander, and of most of the other Commissioners of this County. The Assembly took both these papers under consideration; voted the memorial of Scoborough, and his associates to be "scurrilous and seditious," disabled him and his friends from holding any office, until he and they had answered the charges preferred against them; and created a Court, composed of Richard Bennett, esquire, the governor, the Secretary of State and others, whom they directed to proceed to Northampton "for the settlement of the peace of the country, and punish the delinquents." (6)

The ancient records of Northampton show, that in pursuance
of this Act, the governor, with several of the assessors appointed by
the Assembly to accompany him, did proceed to that county, where
they held several sessions; the proceedings of which are all there
recorded; and that they finally fulfilled all the objects which had
induced them to undertake this journey. Scarbrough and his
associates were mulcted in heavy fines; some of them were degraded
and disqualified from holding any office; and others werepardoned,
after recanting their seditionai language and praying forgiveness.

Colonel Littleton seems to have been present at all
these meetings; and this was the last public duty which
he seems to have performed. He must have died during the year
1662: for a patent granted to Edward Littleton, in 1666, recites,
that Colonel Nathaniel Littleton during his life, viz May 1, 1662,
had purchased a tract of land, then and still called Arlington,
from its former proprietor Thomas Harmer, which land was,
therefore, granted to the said Edward Littleton, as the son and
heir of the said Nathaniel; and in January 1663, the records
of Northampton County State, Mrs Ann Littleton, his widow,
exhibited a complaint against the misconduct of one of her
white female servants, who, in consequence, was ordered to be
punished, for her insolence to her mistress.

Colonel Littleton resided, during his life, on the
lower end of what is now Northampton County, and in that part
of it then and still called Magatty Bay. Here he held a body of
eight hundred acres of land, situated on the sea land side,
adjoining the estate called Arlington, which was situated on
the Bay side, at the mouth of Old Plantation Creek. During his
life, he augmented this tract by the purchase of Arlington, which
then contained twelve hundred acres. After this purchase,
his estate comprised two thousand acres. The whole of this
descended upon his eldest son Edward Littleton, after the death
of his father, who died intestate in 1664.

Of Colonel Littleton's character and situation in life,
I can discover nothing more than what may be inferred from
the facts stated above. From the various public employments,
which he fulfilled and from the manner in which he seems to have discharged their duties, I am induced to believe that he was a man highly respected in the county where he resided, and by his fellow subjects in Virginia generally; and that he well merited the high estimation he seems to have enjoyed. He left three children, two sons, Edward and Southe, and a daughter, Nester. She afterwards married Captain John Robins, a very respectable gentleman of Northampton County, the son of Colonel Obedience Robins, who, after the death of Colonel Tillett, was elected to succeed him as one of the Council of State.

Edward Tillett, the eldest son of Colonel Nathaniel Tillett, survived both his father and mother, and married; but he died without issue, in 1663. This appears by the proceedings in several suits in Northampton County, instituted by his brother, Southe Tillett. In these suits, lands which had belonged to Edward, are claimed by Southe, as his heir at law. It is more particularly shown also, by a deed from Francis Pigot and Frances his wife (who was the widow of Edward Tillett) to Southe Tillett, in which deed these facts are stated:—Edward Tillett must have been quite young at his death, but even then he appears to have been recommended and appointed as one of the Commissioners of Northampton County.
Southy Stillton, the youngest son of Colonel Nathaniel Stillton, was born in Virginia, between the years 1642 and 1646. I state this very confidently, because by the will of his mother Ann Stillton, which is dated in 1666 and is recorded in Northampton County, she directs that he shall "be kept at schools until he shall arrive unto the age of fifteen or sixteen years." Therefore, he could not have been born before 1642. And as the proceedings in the suits referred to above, show that he was of full age in 1667, he could not have been born later than 1646. It appears, too, by the same will, that Southy Stillton was older than his sister, Baxter, who, as is therein stated, would "come to the age of twenty and one years in An. Dom. 1669."

Southy must have been married while he was quite young, for it appears by his own will, a copy of which I have, that he had survived his wife and had seven children then living; and this will is dated in 1679. Who his married? I know not certainly: but from the names of his second son, and other circumstances, I infer that the maiden name of his wife was Bowmann, and that her family resided either in Somerset county, Maryland, or in the upper part of the contiguous county in Virginia, which is now called Accomac. (a)

Although Southy Stillton must have resided in the county of Northampton during much the greater part of his life, it does not appear by the ancient records of that county, that he ever acted in any public capacity there. But he seems to have been a member of the Royal Council while he was yet quite young; and he was one of the "Court, Martials, held in Board by Pope John Martinus Chippewa, in Yorks county, January 1767," for the trial of Thomas Hall and others, who had been "adjudged in the rebellion of Bacon. (b) He is therein distinguished (c) The present county of Somerset in Maryland, extended quite across the peninsula, at this time, from the Bay to the Sea, and included the present county of Worcester. (d) See Shenandoah Statutes. Vol. II. page 505.
as "Col. Southy Stilleton."

Family tradition, had always taught me to consider this gentleman as the most conspicuous and memorable of his name, who had lived in Virginia. By this, he was represented as the particular and intimate friend of Sir William Berkeley, the governor, who resided in Magulby's Bay with Colonel Stilleton, as his guest, during the period of the governor's sojourn in this part of the country, to which he had been driven by the success of Bacon, and his adherents. From this circumstance, from the reputed wealth of Colonel Stilleton, and from the active part he was said to have taken in the struggle which convulsed the country, in his day, I was disappointed in not being able to collect more information concerning him, from the ancient records of the county in which he dwelt.

I can account for this omission, only by supposing that the early part of his manhood was not passed in this county. This supposition derives some confirmation from the fact, that the patrimonial estate, which he derived from his immediate ancestors, was situated on P lands cuech, and upon the division of the county of Northampton, in 1660, this estate was included within the limits of the new county of Accomack. Hence, therefore, Southy Stilleton lived, most probably, until after the death of his brother Edward. By that event, he became entitled to the manor plantation in Northampton county, where his father Colonel Nathaniel had resided; but Southy Stilleton did not remove thither until after the death of his wife. Before this occurred, the excitement produced in the county by Bacon's war, began to exhibit itself. Then, the nature of the offices which Southy Stilleton held, as one of the Royal council and as military officer, compelled him of course to spend much of his time, during this turbulent period, at a distance from his home.

Our histories inform us also, that in the year 1677, Colonel Southy Stilleton and Colonel William Kendall were appointed agents on the part of Virginia, to repair to Albany in New York, there to confirm the peace, which Colonel Courshey of Maryland had made for Virginia, with the two nations of Indians, who had long caused great interruptions of the tranquillity of the colony.(c)

(c) See Menings Statutes, Vol. II page 97.

(d) See Popham his History of Virginia, Vol. II page 282.
While at Albany, engaged in this duty, Colonel Southy Lettleton died. His will is dated at Albany, September 16, 1679, and being first proved there and recorded there, a copy of it was certified from Thence to Northampton County Court, where it now remains of record.

Colonel Southy Lettleton left seven children. Of these, three were sons, Nathaniel, Bowman and Southy; two were sons, and four were daughters, Esther, Sarah, Elizabeth, and Gertrude. To Nathaniel, his eldest son, he devised the old family estate in Magoggy Bay, which he had acquired by the death of his elder brother Edward, and had augmented by several purchases of contiguous lands, until it comprehended more than four thousand acres. This Nathaniel Lettleton married, and died young, leaving none other than two female descendants.

To Bowman, his second son, Colonel Lettleton devised "all the rest of his land at Singake [Chingakeque] in Somerset county, not devoted to his daughters and others. He was entitled to a very extensive territory, in this part of the country, after carving out of which large portions for each of his daughters, and second farms for his faithful white servants, there still remained a considerable tract, comprehending several thousand acres, that prefaced under this devise to his second son. And to his youngest son Southy, he devised his plantation at Ramdue, lying and situated in Albemarle county in Virginia, containing two thousands two hundred and seventy acres."

I have not been able to trace what became of either of these two sons. But I suppose that they died without issue, or leaving none other than female descendants; for the name has long been extinct as a patronymic, although it is still preserved as a baptismal name in the families of the Dennis, the Teackle, the Savages, the Vandals, and many others, on the Eastern shore both of Maryland and Virginia. From this, I infer that the female descendants of Colonel Southy Lettleton and of his sons, intermarried with the ancestors of these families; and that according to a custom then very prevalent, the family name of the mother, became the baptismal name of some of her male descendants, and was thus preserved among them.
for a long time.

All that I have been able to discover of any of this family, except what relates to the youngest daughter of Colonel Southy Stilleton, is that Sarah, the second daughter, married a Mr. Adam Michael, who dying before her, she in turn married after his decease with John Curtis esquire, whom she also survived. She seems to have died without issue, and to have left a will that bears date April 14, 1720, and is now recorded in the County Court of Northampton. Elizabeth, the third daughter, married a Mr. Waters. His descendants were once numerous and respectable in Northampton; but I believe none now remain there, although I have heard that a branch of this family still exists in Maryland or in Accomac. Of Ferdinand, the youngest daughter, I will speak more fully hereafter.

This is all I have been able to collect concerning Colonel Southy Stilleton. Two events occurred, however, during his life, in each of which he was actively concerned. As each of these events was long considered of great importance, throughout the colony, and are related but very imperfectly in any of our histories, before I conclude this sketch, I will endeavour to give a more accurate and connected account of them than you will be able to judge. The first of these events was "Raccoon Rebellion," and the other the Treaty concluded at Albany with the Five Nations of Indians.

With regard to the first, very different opinions seem to have prevailed in the country, at different periods. Immediately after the insurrection headed by Nathaniel Bacon the younger, the escapes that had been committed by the insurgents while in arms; the disregard they manifested to the haughty mandates of the constituted authorities; and the necessity under which the party ultimately victorious found itself placed to account for and to justify their cruel and illegal acts, were probably the causes why this commotion was denominated a "Rebellion." All our early accounts, however, were the works of the victorious party; and therefore, may be regarded very properly as the effects of much inflammation and excitement, coloured too by the effort to extenuate the impropriety of acts, which, when considered with more calmness, could not be justified.
Near a century afterwards, when the natural growth of the colony and the extravagant proceedings of the mother country had prepared the minds of men for that revolution and division of the British empire, which was effected at last, it was quite natural for them to look back upon their past history, with a view of finding in it additional evidence of ruin. There, all persons who were found opposing such proceedings whom they had once, especially if their conduct was seen to have been visited with harsh, illegal, or cruel treatment, would certainly be regarded with a favorable eye. Their cause would probably be identified with that existing; their fate and fortunes would meet general sympathy; and those who had once been proclaimed as rebels and denounced as traitors, would then be regarded as patriots and suffering martyrs in the cause of necessary reform.

To these opposite causes, may very probably be ascribed the different and conflicting accounts of Bacon’s rebellion, which may be found in our histories and ancient records. In some of these Bacon is stigmatized as an accursed traitor, and is branded with many other opprobrious epithets; while in others he is compared to Brutus and to Cromwell. Each of these representations, is probably wide of the truth; being dictated by the feelings prevalent in the country, at the time it was given.

However great theiration or ancient the enthusiasm by which Bacon and his adherents were propagated, it cannot be believed that either he or they, were so ignorant of the condition of the colony at that time, as to have conceived it to be practicable to have separated Virginia from the mother country; or to have maintained independence, even if it had been desirable to achieve it. The unoccupied territory of Virginia, at this time, did not extend beyond the tide water country, nor any direction. This narro territory was occupied by a population scattered very sparsely over it, the whole of whose population, of every description, both free and free, did not amount to forty thousand souls. The military force of the colony, was composed entirely of its militia, and did not exceed five thousand men, of all sorts. And such was the poverty of the people, that the whole revenue of
Virginia, although derived under a system of much burthen some and oppressive taxation, did not exceed twenty thousand dollars per annum,
the greater part of which was payable in tobacco. It must have been
mixed folly that could have desired the independence of
such a country, or entertained the vain hope that it would be
practicable to accomplish any such purposes, against the will
of the parent state. Thither known to us of the character of
Owen, justifies the suppositions that he was an enthusiastic so
visionary as to have conceived any such wild scheme. His object
seems to have been merely to obtain relief against some of the grievances
by which the colony was oppressed by its own local government;
and the idea of shaking off allegiance to the British crown, does
not appear to have been entertained either by himself or by any
of his adherents.

To understand the true causes of this commotion, we must
endeavour to obtain an accurate knowledge of the condition of
the colony, at this time. To do this however, it will be necessary to
examine the nature of the government, by which it was brought
into this condition; as well as the immediate causes of the
generals discontent that then prevailed. I will endeavour to
explain these things as briefly as possible.

Virginia was settled at first, under the direction of a
company of Knights, Gentlemen, Merchants and other Adventurers
of the City of London, who were incorporated by a Charter granted
to them by Henry James the first, on the 10th day of April 1606. By
this charter, the government of the intended colony, was
committed to a Superior Council established in England,
consisting of thirteen persons, who were to be appointed by the
King. Besides this Superior Council however, the immediate
government was entrusted to another subordinate council,
of thirteen persons, to be established in the colony itself, which subordinate
council was to be appointed by the Superior Council. These
councils, were to govern the colony, in all things, “according to
such laws, ordinances and instructions, as should be in
that behalf given and signed by the King.” (c)
(c) See The History of Virginia, Appendix, No. I, page 1690.
Such a government, was as titles suited to the prosperity of the colonists, as to the interest of the Company. Therefore, very soon after the first settlement in the colony was made, the Company applied to the King to amend this charter. Their application was granted; and on the 25th of May 1609, they received a new charter, from the same monarch. By this new charter, the Company was styled "The Treasurer and Company of Adventurers and planters" of the City of London, for the first Colony of Virginia, and the former government of the colony was changed. The new charter continued the Superior council established in England, according to the provisions of the first charter; but added to the other subordinate councils there by required. In lieu of this, it gave authority to the Superior council in England, to make ordain and establish any forms and ceremonies of government and magistracy, which they might think fit, and necessary, for and concerning the government of the colony and plantation.  

In pursuance of this authority, the Superior Council in England, established, at first, a species of military government, and appointed Sir Thomas West, Lord Delawar, to be Captain General of Virginia, during his life. Under this form of government, the colony continued for many years, until the death of Lord Delawar; when the complaints of the colonists, in consequence of the tyrannical conduct of Captain Argall, the deputy governor, induced the Superior Council to abolish it. This Council then ordained, that thenceforth there should be two councils in Virginia, the one to be called the Council of State, to be placed and displaced by the Treasurer Council and Company in England, from time to time, whose office was to be that of advising and aiding the governor. The other to be called the General Assembly, to be convened by the governor yearly or oftener, which was to consist of the council of state, and of two burgesses out of every town, hundred or plantation, to be respectively chosen by the inhabitants. In

(1) See Mr. The History of Virginia, Appendix. No. I., page 109.
(2) See Mr. The History of Virginia, page 101.