

**Family History – Living Along Virginia Colony’s Waterways in the 1600s and
1700s – Lukes, Dales, Etheridges, Veales, Hills, Lewises, Wormeleys, and
Others**

By Richard Torian
2023

dedicated to my beloved granddaughter, Raygan Torian

**Copyright © 2023
Richard Torian
All Rights Reserved**

**No part of this publication may be reproduced in
any form or by any means without prior written
permission from the author, except that brief
portions may be quoted for a review.**

**ISBN# 979-8-987678-0-6
Library of Congress Number 2023901939**

**Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper
by No Waste Publishing
An imprint of Accent Group Solutions**

**St. Louis, MO 63126
2023**

Table of Contents

	page
I. Introduction	5
II. Ancestors' Genealogy	7
1. Introduction	7
2. Chesapeake Bay's Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Counties	7
3. Elizabeth, Nansemond, and James River Counties	8
4. York, Rappahannock, and Potomac River Counties	10
5. Northern Neck Counties	13
III. Ancestors' Histories	14
1. Introduction	14
2. Chesapeake Bay's Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Counties	14
3. Elizabeth, Nansemond, and James River Counties	18
4. York, Rappahannock, and Potomac River Counties	33
5. Northern Neck Counties	44
6. Immigrants	44
IV. Developments in the 1600s and 1700s Affecting Ancestors	56
1. Introduction	56
2. Immigration	56
3. Towns and Counties	61
4. Houses and Churches	68
5. Waterways	72
6. Virginia Colony's Governance	73
7. Economy	78
a. Economic Development Beginnings	78
b. Shipbuilding	81
c. Trade – Exports and Imports	84
d. Ports	88
e. Land and Agriculture	90
f. Slaves	95

V.	Connections in the 1600s and 1700s Affecting Ancestors	page 97
1.	Introduction	97
2.	Connections Through Travel	97
3.	Connections Within the Virginia Colony	100
4.	Connections Outside the Virginia Colony	101
5.	Connections with England's Policies, Actions, and Influences	107
6.	Connections Through Marriages	108
7.	Connections Within and Between Leading and First Families	112
8.	Connections Within/Between Plantation and Merchant Classes	113
9.	Connections Through Security and Conflicts	115
10.	Anglicans, Puritans, Quakers, and Dissenters' Connections	120
VI.	Conclusions	125

I. Introduction

This family history is about my known ancestors who lived along the Chesapeake Bay waterways in the 1600s and 1700s. Ancestors' names include:

Armistead	Fielding	Reade
Bennett	Hill	Ring
Berkeley	Lewellyn	Shepherd
Bowles	Lewis	Stott
Carter	Lowe	Taliaferro
Dale	Ludlow	Thornton
Eltonhead	Luke	Veale
Etheridge	Martiau	Warner
Hone	Miller	Wormeley
Kemp	Neale	Yates

These 1600s and 1700s ancestors that I write about in this family history lived in one or more of the following counties (all adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay or a mainstream river of the Bay):

Accomack	Middlesex	Rappahannock
Charles City	Nansemond	Richmond
Elizabeth City	New Kent	Spotsylvania
Essex	New Norfolk	St. Mary's, Maryland
Gloucester	Norfolk	Upper Norfolk
King George	Northampton	Warwick River
Lancaster	Princess Anne	York
Lower Norfolk	King and Queen	

The ancestors lived in counties on rivers running into the Chesapeake Bay or counties on the Chesapeake Bay. These waterways and the Bay had a major influence on the lives of these ancestors. A goal of this family history is not only to identify my ancestors living in these areas in the 1600s and 1700s, but also to characterize them, their lives and times, and how the waterways, the Bay, and other factors might have affected and influenced the ancestors and their lives and times.

Section II provides genealogy data, for example, ancestor names, and birth and death information.

Section III provides ancestor histories based on information found in historical records.

Section IV provides information and analysis on developments in several topics relevant to my 1600s and 1700s ancestors' lives and times. Topics include immigration; counties and towns; economic growth; houses and churches; waterways; and the Virginia Colony's governance.

Section V provides information and analysis relevant to my 1600s and 1700s ancestors related to interactions, connections, and associations within and outside the Virginia Colony and within and between families.

A separate, previously prepared family history (titled: "Family History – Living in Virginia's Northern Neck During the 1600s and 1700s – Balls, Carters, Champes, Claughtons, Cralles, Garners, and Washingtons) focuses on the Northern Neck.

And another previous family history that I wrote (a family history of my great grandparents Richard W. Robertson, Mary A. Eubank, Dale Delafield Luke, Martha F. Shepherd, George Torian, Amelia Blanche Crawley, Charles Augustus Jenkins, and Lillie Shepherd Cocke) provides information on 1800s and 1900s descendants of my 1600s and 1700s ancestors.

Both of these previous family histories are available on Amazon.

II. Ancestor Genealogy

1. Introduction.

In this section, I provide names, birth and death details, marriage partners, resident locations, and descendent lines for individuals who I believe, based on genealogical research, are 1600s and 1700s ancestors living in counties adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay and mainstream rivers flowing into the Bay.

2. Chesapeake Bay's Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Counties

The following ancestors were born, died, and/or lived in Accomack and/or Northampton Counties during the 1600s and/or 1700s:

ancestor	birth date and place	death date and place
John Luke I	? Devon England	1657 Northampton
Robert Watson Sr	1623 Norfolk England	1703 Accomack
Susannah Etheridge	1626 ?	1680 Accomack
Henry Stott I	1634 London England	1690 Northampton
Priscilla Bryant	1640 Northampton	1690 Northampton
John Luke II	1649 Salisbury England	1709 Northampton
Susannah Richardson	1650 Northampton	1709 Virginia
Henry Stott II	1661 Northampton	1720 Northampton
Susannah Watson	1674 Accomack	1720 Northampton
Daniel Stott	1690 Northampton	1736 Northampton
John Luke III	1690 Northampton	1761 Northampton
Martha Stott	1705 Northampton	1761 Northampton
Isaac Luke	1729 Northampton	1784 Portsmouth

John Luke III (1690-1761) was born and died in Northampton and John Luke II (1649-1709), possibly born in Salisbury England, died in Northampton. John Luke I immigrated from England and died in Northampton in 1657. John Luke III married Martha Stott (1705-1761), a daughter of Daniel Stott (1690-1736). Daniel's grandfather, Henry Stott I (1634-1690), immigrated to Northampton from London in the middle 1650s. He married Priscilla Bryant (1640-1690). Henry Stott I's son, Henry Stott II (1661-1720), married Susannah Watson (1674-1720). Susannah Watson (1674-1720) was the daughter of Robert Watson Sr (1613-1703) and possibly Susannah Etheridge (1626-1680).

A son of John Luke III, Isaac Luke (1729-1784), migrated from Northampton to Portsmouth in Norfolk County by the 1750s.

The above are ancestors of my great grandfather, Dale Delafield Luke (1838-?), born in Portsmouth, with death date and location unknown.

Lukes, Stotts, Bryants, and Watsons were some of the earliest settlers in Accomack and Northampton Counties on the Eastern Shore of what then was the Virginia Colony. Settlers began populating these areas on the Eastern Shore almost immediately following the English immigration to the Virginia Colony.

3. Elizabeth, Nansemond, and James River Counties

The following ancestors were born, died, and/or lived in one of the Norfolk Counties (Lower Norfolk, New Norfolk, Princess Anne, Upper Norfolk), Nansemond County, Charles City County, and/or the towns of Norfolk and Portsmouth during the 1600s and/or 1700s (all along the Elizabeth, Nansemond, or James Rivers):

ancestor	birth date and place	death date and place
Mary Elizabeth Boyle	1582 Shropshire England	1659 Charles City County
Abel Lewellyn	1600s England/Wales	? Lower Norfolk County
Edward Hill I	1600s England	1663 Charles City County
Thomas Etheridge I	1604 Middlesex England	1671 Norfolk County
John Yates	1607 Berkshire, England	1648 Nansemond County
Mary Ann Utie	1619 Norfolk County	1674 Nansemond County
Edward Hill II	1637 Charles City County	1700 Charles City County
Thomas Etheridge II	1645 Norfolk County	1719 Norfolk County
Hannah Horne	1645 Lower Norfolk County	1678 Lower Norfolk County
William Dale	1649 Norfolk County	1715 Norfolk County
Robert Cratchett	1650 Norfolk County	1701 Norfolk County
Morris Veale	1655 Norfolk County	1706 Norfolk County
Elizabeth Johnson	1658 Norfolk County	1748 St. Mary' s County, MD
Edward Lewellyn I	1660 Norfolk County	? Norfolk County
Edward Hill III	1665 Charles City County	1726 Charles City County
Thomas Etheridge III	1668 Norfolk County	1724 Norfolk County
William Veale	1682 Norfolk County	1752 Portsmouth
Dinah Herbert	1682 Norfolk County	1715 Norfolk County

John Carter III	1689 Lancaster County	1742 Charles City County
Mary Cratchett	1693 Norfolk County	1762 Portsmouth
Edmund Creekmore	1700s Norfolk County	? Norfolk County
Letisha Lewellyn	1700s Norfolk County	? Norfolk County
Edward Lewellyn II	1700s Norfolk County	1752 Portsmouth
Elizabeth Hill	1703 Charles City County	1771 Charles City County
Jeremiah Etheridge	1708 Norfolk County	1754 Norfolk County
Lemuel Veale	1713 Norfolk County	1756 Portsmouth
Paul Dale	1715 Norfolk County	1743 ?
Joane Jobe	1722 Norfolk County	1664 Nansemond County
Edward Hill Carter	1726 Charles City County	1792 Spotsylvania County
Isaac Luke	1729 Northampton	1784 Portsmouth
Rachel Dale	1719 Norfolk County	1775 Norfolk
Matthias Etheridge I	1736 Norfolk County	1791 Norfolk County
Sarah Veale	1749 Portsmouth	1809 Portsmouth
Mary Creekmore	1750 Norfolk County	? Norfolk County
Paul Dale Luke	1761 Norfolk County	1819 Norfolk
Matthias Etheridge	1778 Norfolk County	1829 Norfolk County
John Luke IV	1793 Portsmouth	1866 Portsmouth

After Isaac Luke (1729-1784) migrated from Northampton to Portsmouth, he started several generations of Lukes living in Portsmouth, culminating in my great grandfather, Dale Delafield Luke (1838-?) and his daughter, Eva Luke (1838-1939), one of my grandmothers. Isaac was a ship carver, and his grandson, John Luke IV (1793-1866) and his great grandson, Dale Delafield Luke, were ship carpenters.

Isaac likely was in Portsmouth by the 1750s with his marriage to Rachel Dale (1737-1775) in 1757 and with his son's (Paul Dale Luke, 1761-1819) birth in 1761, both in Portsmouth. Rachel was the daughter of Paul Dale (1715-1743) and possibly Elizabeth McGarvey (1708-1738) and granddaughter of William Dale (1649-1715) and Dinah Herbert (1682-1715) (both grandparents died in Norfolk County).

Paul Dale Luke (1761-1819), Isaac's son, married Sarah Veale (1749-1809) in 1789. Sarah was the daughter of Lemuel Veale (1713-1756) and Letisha Lewelling (?-1700s) and granddaughter of William Veale (1682-1752) and Mary Cratchett (1693-1762) as well as Edward Lewelling. William Veale was the son of Morris Veale (1655-1706) (born/died in Norfolk County) and Elizabeth Johnson (1658-1748) (born Norfolk County, died St Mary's County, Maryland). Mary Cratchett was the daughter of Robert Cratchett (1650-1701) (born/died in Norfolk County). So, Paul Dale Luke's wife (Sarah Veale) had several ancestors who were settlers in Norfolk County as early as the 1650s.

Lemuel Veale (1713-1756) married Letisha Lewellyn, and they had Sarah Veale (1749-1809). Lemuel and Letisha Lewellyn Veale named one of their sons Crawford. William Crawford, the person who donated the land in the formation of Portsmouth, was the administrator of Lemuel Veale's will.

Sarah Veale married Paul Dale Luke (1761-1819) and they had John Luke IV (1793-1866), who was the father of one of my great grandfathers, Dale Delafield Luke (1838 -?).

Paul Dale Luke (1761-1819) was the son of Isaac Luke (1729-1819, born in Northampton County) and Rachel Dale (1737-1775). Rachel Dale was the daughter of Paul Dale (1715-1743) and Elizabeth McGarvey (1718-1738) and granddaughter of William Dale (1690-1715). The Dales were born in Norfolk County.

Paul Dale Luke's son, John Luke IV, married Lydia Etheridge (1810-1874). Lydia Etheridge was probably the daughter of Matthias Etheridge II (1778-1829), the granddaughter of Matthias Etheridge I (1736-1791), the great granddaughter of Jerimiah Etheridge (1708-1754), the great, great granddaughter of Thomas Etheridge III (1668-1724), and great, great, great granddaughter of Thomas Etheridge II (1645-1719), who was Thomas Etheridge I (1605-1671)'s son.

The above are ancestors of my great grandfather, Dale Delafield Luke (1838-?) and my great grandmother Martha F Shepherd (1843-1916).

4. York, Rappahannock, and Potomac River Counties

The following ancestors were born, died, and/or lived in the counties of Elizabeth City, Essex, Gloucester, Isle of Wright, King George, Middlesex, New Kent, King and Queen, Rappahannock, Spotsylvania, and York in the Virginia Colony; and/or the Virginia Colony towns of Fredericksburg, Hampton or Yorktown; and/or the Maryland Colony's St. Mary's County during the 1600s and/or 1700s:

ancestor	birth date and place	death date and place
Christopher Wormeley	1589 England	1649 England
Nicolas Martiau	1591 ?	1657 York County
John Lewis I	1592 Monmouthshire Wales	1651 King & Queen County
Elizabeth Jane Page	1593 England	1646 York County
James Miller	1600 Scotland	1657 York County
George Reade	1608 Hampshire England	1674 Yorktown
Richard Bennett	1609 Somerset England	1675 Nansemond County
Mary Jeffreys	1610 Middlesex England	1656 York County
Augustine Warner I	1610 Norfolk England	1674 Gloucester County

William Armistead	1610 Yorkshire England	1671 Hampton
Anne Ellis	1611 Yorkshire England	1671 Hampton
Mary Townley	1614 Lancashire England	1662 Gloucester County
James Neale	1615 England	1684 Charles County, Maryland
Ralph Wormeley I	1618 Yorkshire England	1650 Gloucester County
Agatha Eltonhead	1620 Yorkshire England	1683 Gloucester County
Elizabeth Martiau	1625 Elizabeth City County	1686 Yorktown
Robert Taliaferro	1626 Middlesex County	1672 York County
John Armistead	1630 Elizabeth City County	1695 Gloucester County
John Lewis II	1633 Monmouthshire Wales	1689 New Kent County
Valentine Bowles	1640 Kent, England	1711 Calvert County, Maryland
Elizabeth Miller	1640 New Kent England	1704 King & Queen County
Augustine Warner II	1642 Gloucestershire England	Gloucester County
Mildred Reade	1643 York County	1686 Gloucester County
Richard Bennett, Jr	1644 Isle of Wright County	1667 at sea
Joseph Ring	1646 Wiltshire England	1703 York County
Judith Bowles	1649 Yorkshire England	1699 Gloucester County
Ralph Wormeley II	1650 Middlesex County	1707 Middlesex County
Francis Thornton I	1651 Gloucester County	1726 King George County
Henry Lowe II	1652 Derbyshire England	1717 St. Mary's County MD
Alice Savage	1653 Gloucester County	1695 Gloucester County
John Taliaferro	1656 Rappahannock County	1726 Essex County
Sarah Smith	1659 York County	1720 Essex County
Judith Armistead	1665 Gloucester County	1698 Lancaster County
Susanna Marie Bennett	1666 Maryland	1714 St. Mary's County, Maryland
Elizabeth Armistead	1667 Gloucester County	1716 Middlesex County
John Lewis III	1669 New Kent County	1725 Gloucester County
Henry Fielding	1670 ?	1712 King & Queen County
Mildred Warner	1671 Gloucester County	1701 Cumberland England
Elizabeth Warner	1672 Gloucester County	1719 Gloucester County
Sarah Berkely	1674 Gloucester County	1724 York County

James Bowles	1681 Kent England	1727 St. Mary's County MD
Francis Thornton II	1683 Gloucester County	1737 Spotsylvania County
Elizabeth Ring	1684 York County	1743 Middlesex County
Mary Taliaferro	1685 Rappahannock County	1741 Essex County
John Wormeley I	1689 Middlesex County	1726 Middlesex County
John Lewis IV	1694 Gloucester County	1754 Gloucester County
Jane Lowe	1700 St. Mary's County MD	1718 St. Mary's County MD
Francis Fielding	1702 King & Queen County	1731 Gloucester County
Ralph Wormeley IV	1715 Middlesex County	1790 Middlesex County
Jane Lowe Bowles	1718 St. Mary's County, Maryland	1793 Middlesex County
Fielding Lewis	1725 Gloucester County	1781 Fredericksburg
Elizabeth Washington	1733 Fredericksburg	1797 Culpeper County

Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790) was descended from Ralph Wormeley I (1618-1650, born Yorkshire, England, died Gloucester, County). Ralph Wormeley I started tobacco farming in York County and then Gloucester County, a county on Virginia's Middle Peninsula. Succeeding generations of Wormeley ancestors (Ralph Wormeley II, 1650-1703; John Wormeley I, 1689-1726; and Ralph Wormeley IV, 1715-1790) continued tobacco farming and built one of the largest tobacco growing plantations in the Virginia Colony, on the mouth of the Rappahannock River as it flows into the Chesapeake Bay. Generations of Wormeleys grew and exported substantial amounts of tobacco from their Middlesex plantation, becoming one of the Virginia Colony's wealthiest families. Ralph Wormeley IV married Jane Lowe Bowles (?-1793) (born St Mary's County, Maryland). Jane Lowe Bowles possibly was the great, great granddaughter of Nansemond County's Richard Bennett (1609-1695). Ralph Wormeley IV's father (John Wormeley, 1689-1726) married Elizabeth Ring, 1684-1743); and John's father (Ralph Wormeley II, 1650-1703) married Elizabeth Armistead (1667-1716).

Mildred Warner (1671-1701) was born in Gloucester County on Virginia's Middle Peninsula. She married Lawrence Washington (1659-1698) of the Northern Neck, father of Augustine Washington (1694-1743), George Washington's father. Mildred Warner was the daughter of Augustine Warner II (1642-1681) and granddaughter of Augustine Warner I (1610-1674), both of whom were born in England, dying in Gloucester County.

Mildred Warner was also the daughter of Mildred Reade (1643-1694) (born York County, died Gloucester County). Mildred Warner's ancestors included: George Reade (1608-1674); Elizabeth Martiau (1625-1686); and Nicholas Martiau (1591-1657), all early immigrants to York County. Nicholas Martiau was married to Elizabeth Jane Page (1593-1640; died in Elizabeth City County).

Mildred Warner had a sister, Elizabeth Warner (1672-1719), who married John Lewis III (1669-1725) of New Kent County. John Lewis III was the son of John Lewis II (1633-1689; born Monmouthshire, Wales, died New Kent County) and grandson of John Lewis I (1592-1651; born Monmouthshire Wales, died King and Queen County). John Lewis II's grandson, John Lewis IV (1694-1754) (father of Fielding Lewis, 1725-1781) married Francis Fielding (1702-1731), daughter of Henry Fielding (1670-1712).

Many of the above individuals were early 1600s (before 1650) immigrants to the Virginia Colony.

The above are ancestors of my great grandfather Charles A. Jenkins (1850-1927).

Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790) was the father of John Wormeley II (1761-1809), who was the father of Mary Burwell Wormeley (1796-1865), who was the mother of Rosalie Carter (1818-1853), who was the mother of Charles A. Jenkins (1850-1927), one of my eight great grandparents.

5. Northern Neck Counties

A previous Family History work of mine "Family History - Living in Virginia's Northern Neck During the 1600s and 1700s – Balls, Carters, Champes, Claughtons, Cralles, Garners, and Washingtons", available on Amazon, writes about ancestors living, born, and/or died in the Northern Neck counties during the 1600s and 1700s, all of which are adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay or rivers that flow into the Bay. The Northern Neck Counties in my history are Lancaster, King George, Northumberland, Richmond, and Westmorland.

III. Ancestors' Histories

1. Introduction

While in the previous section I provide genealogical data (birth and date dates and places), in this section I provide ancestor histories based on information and data found in the historical records. Through these histories, I am trying to recognize and remember these ancestors and the lives they lived.

2. Chesapeake Bay's Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Counties

My great grandfather, Dale Delafield Luke (1838-?), was a descendent of immigrants to counties on the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore. Luke's ancestors, who lived in counties on the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore, include those with last names: Luke and Stott. In this section, I provide histories that I have learned about the Eastern Shore ancestors.

Lukes

The earliest known Eastern Shore Luke ancestor, John Luke I (?-1657), possibly immigrated from Devon, England and died in Northampton County in 1657.

Northampton rent rolls shows a John Luke owning forty acres in 1687 and 400 acres in 1704. This is likely John Luke II (1649-1709).

In 1697, a John Luke gave testimony at Northampton's court on the reliability of statements being made in court on a land transaction. Luke told the court he was about 47 years old. This is consistent with this John Luke being John Luke II (1649-1709).

An Eastern Shore John Luke was a ship captain in the 1690s. One ship he captained was the Revolution. Whether this John Luke was John Luke II, of Northampton, is not known. But, as ship captain, this John Luke would be associated with shipping, as many of the Luke ancestors were, increasing the likelihood of this John Luke being related.

A John Luke was appointed in 1707 sheriff in Northampton. Also, a John Luke, according to records, owned four hundred acres in 1704. The 1704 Northampton Rent Roll (the rent roll shows amount due for tax on owned land) shows a John Luke has a tax on land due. These records likely are for John Luke II (1649-1709), a Northampton County ancestor.

John Luke II, before he married Susannah Richardson (1650-1705) and they had John Luke III (1690-1761) in Northampton County, was married to Ann Custis for a brief time. Ann Custis was John Custis II's (1629-1696) sister. John Custis II, the first of several John Custis's living on the Eastern Shore, was a prominent Virginia Colony citizen (and the Custis's a prominent Virginia Colony family), owning much land and holding several government positions, including in the militia.

Ann Custis married (possibly in 1649) Argall Yeardley (1621-1655), the son of the Virginia Colony governor, George Yeardley (1588-1627). Ann lived in Holland when Ann met and married Argall Yeardley. After the marriage, they relocated (with John Custis II, Ann's brother) by 1655 to the Eastern Shore, where Argall died in 1655. In 1671, Ann, after a second marriage (to John Wilcox), marries John Luke II (1649-1709) (her third husband). John was several years younger than Ann. More on the circumstances of John's marriage to Ann would be interesting to know. For example, what position was John in (e.g., socially and economically) that accounted for his marriage to a member of one of the top (socially and economically) families on the Eastern Shore?

Records provide insights. John Luke II and John Custis II worked together in the mid-1690s to help an orphan, Yardley Michael, to become an indentured servant, apprentice to a John Northern, a cord winder (the term cord winder was used for shoemaker). In documents that record this, John Luke is reference as John Luke, Gentlemen. Such a reference provides much about John's social status. Such a reference as gentleman was standard practice in 1600s England to categorize men as members of the gentry, worthy of respect. Being a "Gentleman" indicates that it would not be unusual for John Luke to be in the same class as the Custis family.

Records indicate that both a John Luke (likely John Luke, 1649-1709) and a John Custis were among several individuals who were identified as "attorneys" on the Eastern Shore in the 1650 to 1660 time period. The need for attorneys was likely significantly related to land ownership disputes, the sales of land, and the passing of land ownership through wills and how to handle these issues of land ownership. It is not surprising that there would be a need for several individuals identified as attorneys in the 1600s. One of the primary reasons for establishing courts in Virginia Colony parishes and counties, members of which were called justices, was to deal with land ownership issues.

That John Luke and John Custis are mentioned as working together on helping Yardley Michael is consistent with John Luke knowing and marrying Ann Custis, John Custis's sister. Also presumably, Yardley Michael, with the first name Yardley, was somehow related to Argall Yeardley, Ann Custis's first husband.

That an orphan (Yardley Michael) becomes an indentured servant and also an apprentice informs that the indentured servant system had such an aspect to it – a system that could be used in caring for and apprenticing orphans.

Yardley Michael was the son of John and Mary Michael. Mary's first husband was John Culpepper. Here we see a connection between a Luke and a Culpepper – John Luke caring for an orphan, whose mother's first husband was a Culpepper (John Culpepper). In the 1760s, we see another Luke-Culpepper connection when Isaac Luke (1729-1784) took on an apprentice, John Culpepper, just after Isaac's arrival in Portsmouth, after being in the Eastern Shore. Did the apprentice John Culpepper follow Isaac to Portsmouth from the Eastern Shore? Is this another example of an Eastern Shore-Norfolk/Portsmouth connection with individuals leaving the Eastern Shore and migrating to the Norfolk/Portsmouth area? Other examples will be indicated below.

John Wilcox, Ann's second husband for a brief time, died in 1667 in Hungers Parish, Northampton County. John, like Ann's first husband, Argall Yeardley, was well off, having brought over several immigrants, receiving land for doing so. Both Wilcox and Yardley were Burgesses and Council members. Argall was in the 1624-1625 Virginia Colony muster (census), age 4.

Ann Custis's parents (Henry, 1596-1661, and Joan Whittington) lived in Gloucestershire before they moved to Holland, where they became clothiers, merchants, and innkeepers.

Susannah Richardson (1650-1709), John Luke II's second wife, was the daughter of Robert Richardson (1615-1682) and Susannah Smith (1615-1666). John was Susannah's second husband, her first being a John Stockley.

Robert Richardson (1615-1672) is believed to have immigrated from England in the 1630s aboard the ship Paul and settling on the Eastern Shore, where he married Susannah Smith, and they had Susannah Richardson. Susannah Smith is believed to be the daughter of Richard Smith (1583-1659). Robert Richardson is possibly a descendant of the Richardson family of Pencaitland, East Lothian, Scotland. This family achieved baronet status in Pencaitland.

In the 1660s, Robert Richardson sold his land on the Virginia Colony's Eastern Shore and moved across the Virginia-Maryland border where he purchased land in Somerset County. Was this move related to Robert Richardson being a Quaker? Maryland was more lenient towards Quakers than Virginia and there was a large migration of Quakers from Virginia's Eastern Shore to Maryland's Eastern Shore during the 1660s.

In the latter 1600s, a William Richardson was an Eastern Shore sloop master involved in trade. Could this Richardson be the brother of Susanna Richardson, John Luke II's second wife?

A will for a John Luke (probably John Luke II) was filed in 1716 in Northampton County. In the will, John leaves two hundred acres to a son, John (John Luke III) and also two hundred acres to another son, Isaac. That John Luke II had a son named Isaac is interesting in that John Luke III (the other son of John Luke II) named one of his sons Isaac (Isaac Luke; 1729-1784). Ancestor names were frequently used in descendant families during the 1600s and 1700s. Isaac Luke (1729-1784) named one of his sons Isaac.

In the 1720s, John Luke witnessed several wills in Northampton County. This likely is John Luke III (1690-1761).

In 1723, John Luke III signed a petition to the House of Burgesses, along with several other Northampton citizens, which had to do with town development, debt collection, and the use of copper coins as legal currency. Also signing the petition was William Stott. William was likely related to my Northampton Stott ancestors.

In 1735, a will for Daniel Luke is issued. His wife was Lydia, and a brother was John (possibly John Luke III), who was a witness.

John Luke III (1690-1761) and his wife, Martha Stott (1705-1761), had ten children, including Isaac (1729-1784) and James (1730-1765). A Richardson Luke (born 1725) died at sea. Richardson possibly was a son of John and Martha Luke. Richardson was John Luke III's mother's maiden name. Isaac Luke (1729-1784) migrated to Norfolk County in the middle of the 1700s. In Norfolk County, Isaac was a ship carpenter and carver.

John Luke III (1690-1761) was a planter and had a house on Hungars Creek and land near Nasswaddox Creek both in Northampton County on the Eastern Shore.

By the 1700s, the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Counties' shipbuilding activities greatly declined, for one likely reason being the inlets and creeks there were of insufficient depths to support building and repairing the larger ships being used in the 1700s. However, shipbuilding activities in Norfolk County greatly increased during the 1700s. This might have been an explanation for why Isaac Luke (1729-1784), son of John Luke III, left the Eastern Shore, migrating to Norfolk County by the 1750s.

Stotts

John Luke III (1690-1761), Isaac Luke (1729-1784)'s father, married Martha Stott (1705-1761). Martha was the daughter of Daniel Stott (1690-1736).

A will for Daniel Stott was filed in 1736. His wife Susanna (maiden name unknown) was named, but no daughter was named. This is probably Daniel Stott (1690-1736).

One of Martha Stott (1705-1761)'s great grandfathers, Henry Stott I (1634-1690), immigrated from England in the 1650s and died in Northampton County.

Henry Stott I apparently was a farmer in that he had tithe taxes in the 1660s and 1670s. (A tax, called a tithe tax, was applied to each worker living in a farming family.) In 1679, Henry Stott I buys land close to Hungars Church. Henry was married to Priscilla Bryant (1640-1690).

In 1654, Henry Stott (probably Henry Stott I, 1634-1690) sponsored at least two indentured servants from England to the Virginia Colony. In 1662, Henry Stott had an indentured servant, Edmund Smith, assigned to him.

Another great grandfather of Martha Stott (1705-1761), Robert Watson Sr (1623-1703), also immigrated from England. Robert Watson Sr possibly married Susannah Etheridge (1626-1680) in 1658 in Hungars Parish and they had Susannah Watson (1674-1720), who married Henry Stott II (1661-1720). Tax records indicate that Watson owned land near Marionville in Northampton County. In Watson's will, he refers to himself as being of Occohanock, in Accomack. A 1672 Northampton record refers to Robert Watson as a school master. Watson's will refers to his daughter Susannah Stott and son-in-law, Henry Stott.

The possible marriage of Robert Watson Sr and Susannah Etheridge is interesting historically. Susannah Etheridge is possibly the daughter of Thomas Etheridge (1605-1671), who, by the

1650s, immigrated from England to Norfolk County. Thomas was one of the first of many Etheridges in areas south of the James River, for example, along the Elizabeth River. These Etheridge families intermingled and intermarried extensively with other families (for example, Ballentines, Cratchetts, Culpeppers, Dales, Herberts, Lewellyns, Lukes, Mannings, Veales, and Yates) who are believed to have been, at least in some cases, Quakers and/or Puritans. Well documented is that many Quakers and Puritans also immigrated from England to the Eastern Shore, including around Occohanock, where Robert Watson identified himself with. I have suggested elsewhere in this family history interconnections between the Elizabeth Rive area and the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore. The possibility that Susannah Etheridge from Norfolk met and married Robert Watson of Accomack, through their common Quaker/Puritan beliefs, seems quite possible to me.

Furthermore, it is possible that through this Robert Watson-Susannah Etheridge connection Isaac Luke (1729-1784), a son of Martha Stott, and the great, great grandson of Robert Watson and possibly of Susannah Etheridge, came to migrate to the Elizabeth River area, and then with his descendants intermingling and intermarrying with Etheridges.

In 1695, a Jonathan Stott, along with a Richard Nottingham, was asked by the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Hungars Church to help in developing the roads around the church. Jonathan Stott was likely related to the Stotts who are ancestors of mine. Jonathan may have been a Henry Stott son or nephew. Being able to associate ancestors with community facilities (such as a church), events, and positions adds richness to family history.

Many Stotts lived on the Virginia Colony's Eastern Shore in the 1700s.

3. Elizabeth, Nansemond, and James Rivers Counties

My great grandfather, Dale Delafield Luke (1838-?), was a descendent of several immigrants to counties along the Elizabeth River. Luke's ancestors include those with last names: Ballentine, Cratchett, Dale, Etheridge, Herbert, Lewellyn, Luke, Manning, and Veale.

My great grandmother, Martha F. Shepherd (1843-1916), was a descendant of Shepherds living along the Elizabeth River prior to 1800.

My great grandfather, Charles A. Jenkins (1850-1927), was a descendent of immigrants to counties along the Nansemond and James Rivers. Jenkins' ancestors, who lived in counties along these rivers, include those with last names: Bennett, Hill, and Yates.

In this section, I provide histories that I have learned about these ancestors.

Bennetts

Richard Bennett (1609-1675) immigrated in 1626 from Somerset, England to Nansemond County. His wife was Mary Ann Utie (1619-1674). Mary Ann was likely the daughter of John

Utie (1593-1637), who arrived in the Virginia Colony around 1620. John Utie is listed on the 1623/24 muster (census), living on Hogg Island, south of Jamestown along the James River. John was on the Jamestown Council.

Richard Bennett and Mary Ann Utie's son, Richard Bennett II (1644-1674), who married Henrietta Maria Neale (1647-1697), died at sea in 1674. Richard Bennett II and Henrietta had Susanna Maria Bennett (1666-1714), who married Henry Lowe II (1652-1717). Both Susanna and Henry Lowe were residents of the Maryland Colony. Susanna and Henry Lowe had Jane Lowe (1700-1718). Jane Lowe married James Bowles (1681-1727) of St. Mary's County, Maryland.

Jane Lowe Bowles (?-1793) married Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790). Ralph and Jane Wormeley's son, John Wormeley II (1761-1809) was a great grandfather of one of my great grandparents, Charles A. Jenkins (1850-1927).

Was Jane Lowe Bowles Wormeley the daughter of Jane Lowe and James Bowles, or was she the daughter of James Bowles and his second wife, Rebecca Addison, who he married after Jane Love Bowles died? Evidence is uncertain and more research and analysis of primary source records are needed. For example, evidence is needed that shows confidently Jane Lowe's death date and Jane Love Bowles' birth date. Also needed are verifiable records that show Jane Lowe Bowles and Ralph Wormeley IV marriage date. A birth date for Jane Lowe Bowles frequently found is 1726, which is past Jane Lowe frequently found death date, so Jane Love Bowles could not have been Jane Lowe's daughter if these dates are correct. But why does Jane Love Bowles have Lowe in her name in records found after her marriage to Ralph Wormeley IV, for example, in a portrait done of her by John Wollaston?

Puritan (Parliamentarian) Richard Bennett (1609-1675)'s great granddaughter, Jane Lowe (1700-1718), married James Bowles (1681-1727), a pro-royalist. If Bennett's great, great granddaughter was Jane Lowe Bowles (1788-1793), and she married into a strongly pro-royal family (Jane Lowe Bowles marriage to Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1750), this marriage seem to me to reflect that pro-royal versus Parliamentarian feelings and loyalties did not last long beyond their highpoint in the middle 1600s.

Richard Bennett II's wife, Henrietta Maria Neale, was the daughter of James Neale (1615-1684) and Anne Gill, a Lady-in-Waiting to Charles I's wife, Henrietta Maria. Neale and Gill were members of the royal aristocracy and staunch supporters of Charles I, before immigrating to Maryland as Catholics.

In the 1640s, Richard Bennett I went on an expedition, at the behest of the Virginia Colony governor, William Berkeley, to the southern parts of Nansemond County and into North Carolina. Motivation for this expedition seems to include assessing Native American presence and potential for settlements. Apparently the area was viewed as offering opportunities for future immigrants from England.

Richard Bennett, and his uncle Edward Bennett, brought hundreds of indentured servants to the Virginia Colony, many of whom were Puritans, who settled south of the James River.

In 1654, Richard Bennett, a Puritan and Parliamentary supporter, became acting governor of the Virginia Colony; appointed by the English parliament. Bennett also, prior to being governor, served on the Virginia Council and in the House of Burgesses. Richard Bennett's uncle was a wealthy London merchant, who for a time served as the Deputy Governor of English Merchants in the Netherlands.

In the 1640s and later, Nansemond County was an active center of non-conformists, religious dissenters (Puritans and Quakers). During this time, Richard Bennett, who lived in Nansemond County, had ties with St. Mary's County, Maryland, which also had an active community of dissenters. Sometime in this period Bennett relocates for a period to Maryland.

While in Maryland, Richard Bennett served in the Maryland parliament in 1651. His activities in St. Mary's County likely led to his appointment as acting governor of the Virginia Colony by the English Parliament. After being governor and returning to Nansemond County, he was active in Quaker communities.

Richard Bennett accumulated a lot of land, not only in Nansemond County, but on Maryland's Eastern Shore. In his will, he left significant amounts to churches and to provide for the poor. Providing for churches and for the poor was a characteristic of many Puritan and Quaker wills.

Edward Bennett (1577-1651), Richard Bennett's uncle, a wealthy London merchant, was a shareholder in the Virginia Company, which was the group investing in the attempted Virginia colonization. Edward helped establish one of the first colonies (referred to as a plantation) along the James River, to which hundreds of immigrants then went to.

Dales

A William Dale (1649-1715)'s will was witnessed by a Robert Culpepper and Edward Lewelling. William Dale and his wife Dinah had several children, one of which was Paul Dale (1715-1743). William is the first Virginia Colony Dale verifiable ancestor of mine.

William was married to Dinah Herbert (1682-1715), who was the sister of Thomas Herbert (1675-1749). William received land from Dinah's father along the southern branch of the Elizabeth River. William was building a sloop at the time of his death (according to his will). Both Dinah Herbert and Thomas Herbert are possibly the children of John Herbert II.

Records, such as William's will, indicate that there was a group of Norfolk County families in the early to mid-1700s who were much interconnected and intermingled. These family names included Ballentine, Cratchett, Culpepper, Dale, Etheridge, Herbert, Lewellyn, Luke, Manning, and Veale. Marriages are seen between individuals with these last names. Such marriages can suggest ancestor information.

For example, Henry Dale may have been William Dale (1649-1715)'s father. Henry married Francis Ballentine, which connects him to a family name known to be associated with ancestor

Dales. Henry's daughter, Margaret, married Thomas Herbert (1675-1749), perhaps one of the children of John Herbert II that Henry became the guardian of. Herberts were mariners.

In 1698, John Creekmore sold land along the Elizabeth River to Henry Culpepper. George Valentine (Ballentine) witnessed a land sale by Henry Culpepper in 1694. A daughter of George Ballentine and Frances Yates, Dorothy, married a John Creekmore.

In 1724, Henry Dale and Joseph Manning witnessed a land sale deed (John Willoughby sale to Thomas Culpeper). This Henry Dale possibly was the son of the Henry Dale who was possibly William Dale's father. A 1742 Joseph Manning will indicates that Joseph had purchased land from a John Willoughby.

William Dale (1649-1715) and Dinah Herbert (1682-?) had several children including William, Richard (1695-1752), Daniel, Peter, Paul (1715-1743), and Prudence.

William's son, Richard (1695-1752), married Susannah and they had a son, Winfield S. Dale (1715-1766). Winfield married Ann Sutherland and they had Commodore Richard Dale (1756-1826).

Commodore (US Navy) Richard was a commander of the Portsmouth Shipyard, Gosport, for a period of time. Commodore Dale had an interesting and productive career serving on several ships, both American and English, during the Revolutionary War, including serving as John Paul Jones' first lieutenant in naval battles against the English in English waters. Dale would become one of the first commodores of the US Navy and commanded a blockade of Tripoli in 1801 during the First Barbary War in Thomas Jefferson's presidency.

Another of William and Dinah sons, Paul Dale (1715-1743), possibly married Elizabeth McGarvey (1718-1738). Paul and possibly Elizabeth McGarvey Dale were the parents of Rachel Dale (1737-1775).

In 1757, Rachel Dale (1737-1775) married Isaac Luke (1729-1784) in Portsmouth. Rachel and Isaac were great grandparents of Dale D. Luke (1838-?), one of my great grandparents.

Reportedly, Isaac Luke, Rachel Dale's husband, became a guardian for a period of time in 1766 for a Richard. The guardianship began when the boy, Richard, was ten. This Richard was almost certainly the Richard (1756-1826) who becomes Commodore Richard Dale. Commodore Richard Dale's father, Wingfield, died in 1766 (date of his will) and this would make the future Commodore, Richard Dale, ten years old in 1766, the reported date that Isaac Luke becomes a guardian for a Richard.

For a time after his birth, Commodore Richard Dale lived at the still standing (2023) and used Dale-Reed House at 200 Swimming Point in Portsmouth. The house was built in 1732 by William Crawford, Portsmouth's founder, to be a residence for William's plantation overseer, Daniel Dale. This Daniel Dale was most likely another of William and Dinah sons, Daniel, who died in 1765 (according to his will). Daniel refers to Thomas Veale in his will. Thomas was the son of Mary Cratchett Veale, who was a caregiver for William Crawford.

Commodore Dale (1756-1826)'s grandfather, Richard Dale (1695-1752), was the brother of Rachel Dale's father, Paul (1715-1743).

In 1789, Isaac and Rachel Dale Luke's son, Paul Dale Luke (1761-1819) married Sarah (Sally) Veale (1749-1809).

In 1789, Paul Dale Luke assumed the position of administrator for the estate of Dempsey Veale. And in 1806, Paul Dale Luke resigned from the militia as a captain and was replaced by Dempsey Veale.

In 1801, Paul Dale and Sarah Veale Luke sold land to Robert Culpepper.

The daughter of Paul Dale and Sarah Veale Luke marries Reuben Herbert. This, and many other ancestor records, reflect the interconnections over several generations of these Portsmouth-area ancestor families: Ballentines, Cratchetts, Culpeppers, Dales, Etheridges, Herberts, Lewellyns, Lukes, Mannings, Veales, and others.

In the late 1700s, Herbert family members were ship builders and ship owners. Many were Methodists and lived in the Elizabeth River's New Mill Creek area.

Succeeding generations of Dales lived in what was then Elizabeth River Parish and many of them were mariners. Dales lived on Swimming Point, which currently is the location of the Portsmouth Naval Medical Center.

Was my Dale ancestors connected to Sir Thomas Dale (1570-1619), who in the 1610s was a deputy-general of the Virginia Colony? By 1618, Dale had left the Virginia Colony, being re-assigned by the British to duties in India, where he died. Although Thomas Dale and his wife, Elizabeth, did not have any known children, Elizabeth was involved in sending immigrants, some of whom were named Dale (according to the Bristol, England Council Books), to the Virginia Colony after Thomas' death in 1619.

Thomas Dale left land in the Virginia Colony to his wife, Elizabeth, including land on the Eastern Shore and along the James River. Elizabeth was active in sending immigrants to both locations. Those named Dale were not direct descendants of Sir Thomas and Elizabeth (they had no children) but could have been (perhaps likely were) Dale family members.

My first known Virginia Colony Dale ancestor was named William (1649-1715), who died in the 1710s in Norfolk County. Records indicate that one of those Dales that Elizabeth Dale sent to the Virginia Colony was named William and that William had a son, also named William, who resettled in Norfolk County and died in 1714. It is possible that my ancestor William Dale (1649-1715), is the son of the William Dale immigrant sent by Elisabeth Dale to the Virginia Colony.

Etheridges

Lydia M. Etheridge (1810-1874), one of my great, great grandmothers, is believed to be the great, great, great, great granddaughter of Thomas Etheridge I (1605-1671) and Christian Marrington (1608-1671). Thomas is believed to have immigrated from Tottenham in Middlesex County, England by the 1640s. He is assumed to have married Christian after he got to the Virginia Colony.

In 1647, a Thomas Etheridge brought two hundred acres along the southern branch of the Elizabeth River. This probably was Thomas Etheridge I (1605-1671). Thomas served for a time as a surveyor and also as a constable. In 1647, Thomas Etheridge (1605-1671) brought four indentured servants to the Virginia Colony.

Lydia M Etheridge (1810-1874) was probably the daughter of Matthias Etheridge II (1778-1829), the granddaughter of Matthias Etheridge I (1736-1791), the great granddaughter of Jerimiah Etheridge (1708-1754), the great, great granddaughter of Thomas Etheridge III (1668-1724), and great, great, great granddaughter of Thomas Etheridge II (1645-1719), who was Thomas Etheridge I (1605-1671)'s son.

Lydia M Etheridge married John Luke IV (1793-1866), a grandson of Isaac Luke (1729-1789), with Isaac being one of my great, great, great grandfathers. This marriage brought together ancestors from two groups of families that lived in the Elizabeth River area in the 1600s and 1700s (the Ballentine, Cratchett, Culpepper, Dale, Herbert, Lewellyn, Luke, Manning, and Veale group) and (the Etheridge, Creekmore, and Yates group).

John Luke IV and Lydia M Etheridge were the father and mother of one of my great grandfathers, Dale Delafield Luke (1838-?).

John Ealfridge (Etheridge) and John Yates (1607-1648) were two principal shipwrights in Lower Norfolk County in the early 1600s. Etheridge is likely derived from the spelling Ealfridge. Ealfridge had at least two sons, to whom he provided land. The relationship of John to ancestor Thomas Etheridge (1605-1671) is not known, but John Ealfridge and Thomas were likely related.

Richard Yates, a son of a shipwright, lived on Deep Creek (a part of the southern branch of the Elizabeth River) in the 1600s, where he owned 350 acres. Richard was probably John Yates's son.

In the middle 1700s, Amos Etheridge married Abigail Veale. Amos gave the children of ancestors Lemuel Veale (1713-1756) and Letisha Lewellyn (?-?) land. One of those children, Sarah Veale (1749-1809), in 1789 married Paul Dale Luke (1761-1819). Sarah and Paul Dale Luke's son, John Luke IV (1793-1866) married Lydia Etheridge (1810-1874). Amos is believed to have been a descendant of Thomas Etheridge (1605-1671), Lydia Etheridge great, great, great, great grandfather.

Abigail Veale Etheridge, Amos's wife, is believed to be the of sister of George, Thomas, and Lemuel Veale (1713-1756). Amos Etheridge, along with Thomas Veale, was on the Board of

Trustees, established by the House of Burgesses in 1763, to initially manage the new town of Portsmouth.

In the 1600s, Etheridge family members married Yates family members, suggesting Etheridge family members may have had dissenting religious views (either Puritans or Quakers). Yates' family members were well-documented Quakers. A Frances Yates Ballentine was arrested in the 1662-64 period for attending a Quaker Meeting. Frances Yates Ballentine was the daughter of John and Joan Yates.

There are other reasons to believe that Etheridges were Puritans or Quakers (more likely Quakers). First, the Tottenham area of Middlesex County in England, from where Thomas Etheridge (1605-1671) immigrated, had a large Quaker population in the 1600s (which possibly may have been a reason for his immigration, as Quakerism was then just getting started in England, and Quakers were being persecuted). Also, a daughter of Thomas Etheridge, Susannah Etheridge (1626-1680), is believed to have married a Robert Watson (1618-1703), a resident of the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore, and went there to live with Robert (Robert is also an ancestor). The Virginia Colony Eastern Shore had communities of Puritans and Quakers, including in the areas where Robert Watson is known to have lived. (See the above Section III 2, Ancestors' Histories, Chesapeake Bay's Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Counties, for more on this marriage). Another indication of Etheridges being Quakers is that many of them migrated south from along the Elizabeth and Nansemond River areas down into the Dismal Swamp area and across the Virginia-Carolina line into Currituck County. This migration, well documented for Quakers, was at least in some cases to avoid persecution that Quakers were being subjected to by non-Quaker colonists. And, looking at land transaction documents from the 1700, e.g., deeds, there seems to be an unusual, complicated number of land transfers occurring, for strange amounts of land, as if the attempt were to create equality of land ownership, which could possibly be based on Quaker beliefs. (See Section V. 10 (Anglicans, Puritans, Quakers, and Dissenters' Connections) below for more about Puritans and Quakers and their interactions in the 1600s and 1700s.)

Etheridge has been a name in the Elizabeth River area starting in the 1600s and to the present. Many Elizabeth River area Etheridges migrated south from the Elizabeth River area into northern North Carolina, for example, Currituck County,.

Hills

The first known ancestor Hill immigrant to the Virginia Colony was Edward Hill I (?-1663), with records indicating that he arrived in the 1630s. A Robert Hill (1570-1636) apparently was in Jamestown in 1609, but whether he was an ancestor of Edward Hill is not known.

Edward Hill I, who by 1663 had established a farm that became Shirley Plantation in Charles City County, served in the House of Burgesses. Edward Hill I paid for several indentured servants to help establish his farm. The servants provided labor and skills and accounted for additional land for the farm due to the head right system. The Shirley Plantation was on land patented by Edward Hill I in the 1660s.

Edward Hill I, as a militia officer, participated in engagements, some successfully and some not, against native Americans. During the 1640s, Edward Hill I was sent to Kent Island over disputes that were still going on there between the Virginia and Maryland Colonies. This trip apparently led to Edward acquiring land along the Potomac River.

Edward Hill I was on the Virginia Council in 1659. He served for a time as tobacco inspector for the area between Jamestown and Bisker's Creek.

In the 1600s, land rights were granted to colony residents based on services that had been provided by them to the Colony. An example of this was land granted to Edward Hill I along the Rappahannock River for his militia service.

In the 1650s, Hill and several men went exploring along the fall lines for possible metal deposits such as gold and silver.

Edward Hill I had grievances filed against him for misappropriation of funds.

Edward Hill I died in 1663 in Charles City County.

In the second half of the 1600s, Edward Hill II (1637-1700) of Charles City County, who was the son of Edward Hill I and an ancestor, inherited Shirley plantation. Besides being a tobacco grower, he provided merchant services, e.g., was an agent for a New Netherlands Colony individual. Besides being a planter, Edward Hill II also operated a tanner and a tavern.

Edward Hill II was also a sheriff, a colonel in the militia, and a judge on the Admiralty Court. Edward Hill II sided with Gov. Berkeley during Bacon's Rebellion, against the rebellion.

Edward Hill II and Edward Hill III (1665-1726) were members of the House of Burgesses.

Records indicate that Edward Hill III, head of Shirley Plantation during his adult lifetime, had Africans shipped directly to his Shirley Plantation wharfs on the James River, where they became his slaves. Some of these slaves were sold by Hill to other family members, for example, to Landon Carter in Richmond County.

Elizabeth Hill (1703-1771) was the daughter of Edward Hill III and Elizabeth Williams (1670-1710). As Edward Hill I's great granddaughter, Elizabeth Hill, inherited Shirley Plantation, when no male Hills were living. Elizabeth married John Carter III (1689-1742) and they lived at Shirley Plantation.

John Carter III was a son of Robert Carter I (1663-1732) of Lancaster County. John Carter III was the brother of Landon Carter of Richmond County.

Elizabeth Hill and John Carter III's son, Edward Hill Carter (1726-1792), married Sarah Sallie Champe (1733-1814), from King George County, and Edward and Sarah Carter lived on land in Albemarle County, which was owned by Edward Hill Carter's father, John Carter III.

During the Revolutionary War period, Edward Hill Carter hid and protected his neighbor, Thomas Jefferson, who was being sought by English soldiers searching for Jefferson in Albemarle County.

Elizabeth Hill, and her husband, John Carter III (1689-1742), were great, great, great grandparents of one of my great grandfathers, Charles A. Jenkins (1850-1927).

Lewellyns

Edward Lewellyn I (1660-1700) was the son of Abel Lewellyn (1641-1672) and Hannah Horne (1645-1678). Abel probably was born in England or Wales and died in Lower Norfolk County. Hannah was the daughter of Thomas Horne (1628-1657) and Johanna Yates (dates unknown). Johanna Yates was the daughter of John Yates (1607-1648) and Joan Jobe (1608-1664). Thomas Horne reportedly was a cooper (barrel maker).

John and Joan Jobe Yates lived on the Nansemond River. John was a church warden. Abel Lewellyn's wife, Hannah Horne, was the granddaughter of John Yates (1607-1648), who immigrated from Berkshire, England to the Virginia Colony in 1636 and died in Nansemond County in 1648.

Records indicate that John Yates received one hundred acres, under the Virginia Colony's headright system, for bringing Abel Lewellyn to the Colony from England. John worked as a ship builder and shipwright. John's work reflects what was the widespread involvement of the communities around the Elizabeth and Nansemond Rivers in ship building and repairs and the communities' interactions with the Chesapeake Bay waterways. Many of my ancestors in these communities, who have been identified in this family history, had an association with shipbuilding and ship repairs.

Edward Lewellyn I and Richard Lewellyn were the stepsons of John Herbert II, from whom they inherited land in 1677. The first John Herbert arrived in Norfolk County, from England, in 1649. A close friend of John Herbert II was a Henry Dale, who became the guardian of John's stepsons, Edward and Richard Lewellyn, upon John Herbert II's death.

In 1694, Edward Lewellyn I married Margaret Ballentine (birth and death dates unknown). In 1709, Edward purchased one hundred acres from Thomas and Margaret Herbert on Paradise Creek; land that was adjacent to John Ballentine's land. John was Margaret's brother.

Margaret Ballentine, who married Edward Lewellyn I, was the daughter of George Ballentine (1635-1701) and Francis Yates (1635-1702). Francis Yates was the daughter of John Yates (1607-1648). George Ballentine reportedly came to the Virginia Colony as an indentured servant to Christopher Burrows.

Edward Lewellyn II (?-1752) married Margaret Manning (dates unknown). Edward Lewellyn II and Margaret Manning's daughter, Letisha Lewellyn (dates unknown), married Lemuel Veale (1713-1756) and they had Sarah Veale (1749-1809). Sarah married Paul Dale Luke (1761-

1819) and they had John Luke IV (1793-1866), who was the father of one of my great grandfathers, Dale Delafield Luke (1838 -?).

Margaret Manning may have been the daughter of John and Ann Manning. John Manning's 1750 will indicates he had a daughter named Margaret and that he had land in Portsmouth.

The Ballentine, Herbert, Horne, and Lewellyn families are believed to have lived closely together in the Paradise Creek area. Paradise Creek is a creek that flows into the southern branch of the Elizabeth River and is about four miles up the Elizabeth River from the town of Portsmouth. Many of these families' males worked in shipbuilding and ship repairing.

Edward Lewellyn II purchased in 1738 land along Paradise Creek from Thomas and Margaret Herbert.

These families may have been Puritans and/or Quakers. One reason for suspecting this is that Hannah Horne's second husband, John Herbert, is believed to have been the son of Mary Bennett Herbert, the daughter of likely one of the Bennett's (who lived along the Nansemond River) with close ties to the Puritans in England and who participated in Puritan and Quaker communities along the Nansemond River and elsewhere in the colonies.

Many Lewellyns immigrated from Wales in the 1600s to the American colonies. Today hundreds of thousands of Lewellyns in the United States are descended from these immigrants.

Lewellyn was (and is) a common Welsh name.

A Lewellyn family, which was prominent in what was in the 1600s Warwick River County, was possibly related to Edward Lewellyn I (1660-?). A Richard Lewellyn migrated from Lower Norfolk County to Charles City County by 1714. Land was patented to Richard Lewellyn in the Warwick River County area. Richard Lewellyn is possible Edward Lewellyn I's brother.

Lukes

Isaac Luke (1729-1784) migrated from the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore's Northampton County to Norfolk County by the 1760s. Isaac was the earliest known Luke ancestor to live in the Elizabeth River area. Isaac Luke was in Norfolk County as early as 1761. He would have been 32 in 1761.

Isaac Luke was a ship carver. A ship carver built the decorative features found on sailing ships.

Ship carvers, such as Isaac Luke, were key members of the shipbuilding community in the 1600s, 1700s, and early 1800s. Starting as early as the 16th Century, ornamentation became increasingly a standard addition to ships, so that by the late 1700s, most, if not all, ships sailing the seas would seem awkward without such wood-ornamented carvings. The ornamentation would consist of the figure head, often a wooden figurine carving of a female mounted on the bow, in size between 5 and 10 feet long, depending on the ship's size; billet heads - decorative

carvings resembling foliage and other designs, mounted at various sites throughout the ship; and the trial board, a decorative carving mounted on the ship's stern. Ship carvers were skilled wood carvers, who would turn oak and elm wood slabs into amazing ornamental mountings.

The carvings brought pride and comfort to the crew who had to spend lengthy periods aboard the ship at sea. The figure head often reflected a unique attribute or characteristic that the ship-carving artist wanted to portray concerning the ship displaying the carving. The carvings were, in effect, sculptured art, and today those carvings, when still remaining from those early days, are considered as important and valuable creations. Unfortunately, too few remain.

In the 1700s, and earlier, and into the early 1800s, when literacy was not prevalent, wood carvings served as needed messages to the intended recipients. Most shops had wooden carvings out front depicting the shops' trades, again, for communication purposes. These shop carvings represented another product that ship carvers might pursue for a living. By the second half of the 1800s, as wooden sailing ships were replaced by engine-powered, metal vessels, ship carving disappeared as a viable trade.

A 1761 Norfolk County deed book shows that Isaac Luke took on an apprentice, John Culpepper. This would not be long after Isaac's arrival in Portsmouth from the Eastern Shore. Isaac's trade was given as joiner (carpenter), which would include ship carving.

In 1761, Isaac lived on lot seventy-five in Portsmouth, making Isaac an early Portsmouth resident, as Portsmouth had just been recognized as a town in 1752.

Isaac Luke posted a notice in the June 26, 1766, Pennsylvania Gazette, seeking information on a James Luke, born in Northampton County, Virginia. In 1766, Isaac was living in Portsmouth but was still concerned about someone (James Luke) from Northampton County, where Isaac was born in 1729. James Luke was Isaac's brother. What was James doing in Pennsylvania? Were the Eastern Shore Lukes Quakers and would this explain James' travel to Pennsylvania, a Quaker Colony?

Isaac was one of the founders of a church in Portsmouth that eventually becomes the present day Monumental United Methodist Church, located in downtown Portsmouth. Isaac Luke was a vestryman in 1783, along with William Porter. Isaac Luke's daughter, Elizabeth, married William Porter in 1782.

That Isaac Luke's daughter married a Porter is interesting in that in the last half of the 1600s, House of Burgesses member (John Porter), from Lower Norfolk County, was accused of having Quaker sympathies (perhaps was a Quaker) and was expelled from the House of Burgesses for that reason. Was the William Porter, who married Elizabeth Luke, related to John Porter, and, if yes, would this suggest that the Lukes were Quakers (or having Quaker sympathies and associations)?

In 1772, Robert Williams (1745-1775) preached in Portsmouth upon the invitation of Isaac Luke. Robert also preached in the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore's counties in the 1770s. Robert was a well-known evangelical speaker, who was promoting methodism in the Virginia Colony. At one

of the Portsmouth speeches, attendees, supporting the Church of England, hackled Williams, and his methodism. Williams had to flee for his safety. Methodism was just getting started in the 1770s as a dissenting religious community in the Virginia Colony. By the Civil War, Methodists was only exceeded by Baptists as a dissenting church denomination.

Andrew Sprowle (1710-1779), an owner of the shipyard that became known as Gosport, was a Methodist. It is likely that Isaac Luke knew Andrew through both being associated with Methodists in Portsmouth, likely not a large group. And it would not be surprising if Isaac did much of his ship carving at Gosport.

Isaac Luke's efforts and connections to the founding of a Methodist community in the 1770s in Portsmouth helped African Americans begin an "African Methodist Society", from which the current Portsmouth Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church evolved.

Isaac Luke is believed to have been anti-England, pro-independence with respect to the Virginia Colony rebellion in the 1760s/70s, which could be considered consistent with his dissenter (Methodist) affiliation. Isaac was in the Virginia Militia during the Revolutionary War period.

In a 1902 Portsmouth history, Isaac Luke was described as one of the prominent citizens of his time.

During the revolutionary war period, many African slaves ran away from their owners to the British Army. The British had a strategy of incentivizing slaves to run away by offering eventual freedom. Thousands of slaves ran away to the British side. Many of these provided service to the British army and remained under the supervision of the British army at the conclusion of the war. The American-British Peace Treaty addressed these runaways, e.g., whether the runaways' owners would receive compensation and what would be the after-the-war status of the runaways. The treaty provisions had to be addressed after the end of the war. One result was that many of the runaways were relocated in the 1780s by the British to Nova Scotia, Canada and other places.

Records, created by the British, on individual runaways have survived and provide important sources of information in current times for individuals seeking ancestor information. In reviewing the records, I discovered that one runaway, a 36-year-old female named Charity Beacon, ran away from her Portsmouth owner, Isaac Luke. She had been a slave as early as 1767 and ran away in 1777.

Isaac Luke married Rachel Dale (1737-1775) and they had Paul Dale Luke (1761-1819). Paul Dale married Sarah (Sally) Veale (1749-1866) and they had John Luke IV (1793-1874). John Luke IV married Lydia Etheridge (1810-1874) and they had Dale Delafield Luke (1837-?), who was one of my great grandfathers.

Paul Dale Luke was an ensign in the militia in the 1780s. Ensign was a rank given to junior officers.

One of Isaac Luke's sons was Capt. Isaac Luke, Jr. Capt. Luke was married to Nancy Veale, who died young, at age 25, reportedly due to grief (perhaps depression) due to the loss of two

daughters. Capt. Luke, the owner of a merchant ship, believed to be named “William and Mary,” was lost at sea during one of his voyages.

Isaac, Isaac Luke Jr., John Luke IV, and Dale Delafield Luke had occupations associated with ships and shipping.

This high involvement in ships and shipping by Isaac and his descendants suggests that Isaac’s Northampton County ancestors may also have had occupations related to ships and shipping.

Shepherds

Several Shepherds arrived from England as indentured servants in the middle 1600s, going to the Eastern Shore and Norfolk counties. An ancestor, Jacob H. Shepherd (1803-1855), who lived in Portsmouth, possibly descended from one of these Shepherds. Jacob, and his wife Martha, were the only ones of my 1800s ancestors that I could not trace back earlier than 1800.

Jacob H. Shepherd’s parents have not been identified. Jacob had a brother, John (?-1837), and a sister, Elizabeth Shepherd Hunter (1802-1884). Shepherd was a common name in the 1700s in Norfolk and Northampton Counties.

Dale Delafield Luke (1838-?), one of my great grandfathers, was married to Martha F. Shepherd (1843-1916), one of my great grandmothers. Martha’s father was Jacob H Shepherd, and her mother was named Martha (last name unknown).

Several Shepherds are found in Portsmouth in the late 1700s and early 1800s. These include Margaret A. Shepherd who marries Fletcher G. Porter; Solomon Shepherd; Capt. Shepherd, who led a defense of the shorelines against the English in 1807; and John Shepherd who, with other Portsmouth residents, petitions the Virginia General Assembly in 1783. The marriage of Margaret A. Shepherd to Fletcher G. Porter is interesting since Fletcher is known to be descendent of Isaac Luke. Was Martha F. Shepherd, one of my great grandmothers, related to Margaret A. Shepherd?

Yes, a connection between Martha F. Shepherd and Margaret A. Shepherd does exist. On September 13, 1854, Miss Sarah Ann Hunter dies of consumption while at the residence of Mr. Fletcher G. Porter. Fletcher was Margaret A. Shepherd’s husband. Sarah Ann Hunter is in ancestor Jacob H. Shepherd’s 1850 census. Sarah was the daughter of Elizabeth Hunter. Elizabeth Hunter is believed to be Jacob H. Shepherd’s sister. As stated above, Jacob and Elizabeth are believed to have a brother, John. John dies in 1838, leaving a wife, Nancy, and children Margaret and Edward. This Margaret, John Shepherd’s daughter, then is presumably Margaret A. Shepherd who marries Fletcher G. Porter. This would make Sarah Ann Hunter (Elizabeth Shepherd Hunter’s daughter) the cousin of Martha F. Shepherd (Jacob H. Shepherd’s daughter) as well as the cousin of Margaret A. Shepherd Porter (John Shepherd’s daughter), and would account for Sarah, and her mother and sister, Virginia, being in Jacob’s 1850 census, and then for Sarah being at Margaret A. Shepherd Porter’s residence when Sarah dies in 1854.

Ancestor Jacob H. Shepherd (1803-1855)'s brother was John Shepherd (?-1838), and Jacob's sister was Elizabeth Shepherd Hunter.

Veales

Veales, for example Morris Veale (1655-1706), were living in Norfolk County as early as the 1650s. Morris Veale's 1705 will indicates that he was a planter.

Elizabeth Johnson (1658-1748) was Morris Veale's wife. Of interest is that Elizabeth died in St Mary's County, Maryland. St. Mary's County was an area of many supporters of Puritanism and Quakerism. Perhaps those believed to be Puritan and Quaker families that intermingled frequently over generations in the Elizabeth River area (such as Ballentines, Cratchetts, Culpeppers, Dales, Etheridges, Herberts, Lewellyns, Lukes, Mannings, and Veales) had contacts with other concentrated Puritan and Quaker areas, such as St. Mary's County, Maryland Colony. And perhaps this would account for Elizabeth Johnson being in St. Mary's County when she died.

In 1752, William Crawford, who lived along the Elizabeth River, donated approximately sixty acres of land to establish a town on the Elizabeth River, which would be named Portsmouth. Crawford was a wealthy merchant and shipowner. The Virginia Colony's House of Burgesses approved the establishment of Portsmouth. Previously, the House of Burgesses was interested in establishing more towns in the Colony and Crawford, a long-time Burgesses member, might have been influenced by the House of Burgesses interest in more towns, resulting in his land donation.

Strongly associated with Crawford was William Veale (1682-1752) (Morris and Elizabeth Veale's son) and William's wife Mary Cratchett (1693-1762). Crawford was in poor health in his later years (he died in 1762) and had a housekeeper during this time, who was Mary Cratchett Veale, wife of William Veale. These Veales are ancestors. Crawford apparently left a substantial portion of his wealth to Mary Cratchett Veale. Mary's husband, William, was already dead (he died in 1752) and Mary would die soon after Crawford dies and soon after receiving her inheritance. Mary and William had sons Thomas, George, and Lemuel (1713-1756). Most of the benefits of Mary Cratchett Veale's inheritance went to her sons.

William Crawford was listed as an administrator of Lemuel Veale's will. Lemuel married Letisha Lewellyn and they named one of their sons Crawford.

Veale became a well-known name in Portsmouth after the creation of Portsmouth in the 1750s. Brothers Thomas and George Veale were prominent civic leaders in Portsmouth in the latter half of the 1700s.

Thomas Veale was a prominent merchant in Portsmouth in the 1760s. One record indicates his humanitarianism in that he stood up against sailors on an English ship that came into Portsmouth for repairs and who were threatening Spaniards held captive aboard the ship. The sailors,

perhaps in a drunken state, were intent on harming the captives. The record indicates that Veale was successful in protecting the captives.

Land belonging to Thomas Veale became part of Portsmouth City in 1763, extending Portsmouth to present day Chestnut Street.

In 1763, the House of Burgesses established a board of trustees to manage Portsmouth. On the board were Thomas Veale and Amos Etheridge, two ancestor last names. Thomas Veale was a Portsmouth sheriff.

George Veale, Thomas and Lemuel's brother, was a county magistrate, vestryman, and a town leader in the 1760s and 1770s. One record indicates that George interfered with a pro-revolution group (the Sons of Liberty), who were intent on throwing a pro-royalist into the river. Was this because George was a pro-loyalist or did he act as a magistrate, focused on preserving law and order? George was a Portsmouth representative to the House of Burgesses from 1756 to 1758.

Although George Veale occupied several prominent positions in Portsmouth, he was not free of criticism and dislike. For example, one responsibility that he had was overseeing certain aspects of a church being built. He was deemed to be responsible for hiring incompetent workers and other improprieties related to the church's construction.

George Veale was a wharf builder in Portsmouth in the 1770s.

Sarah (Sally) Veale (1749-1809) was the daughter of Lemuel Veale (1713-1756) and granddaughter of William (1682-1752) and Mary Cratchett (1693-1762) Veale. Sarah married Paul Dale Luke (1761-1819).

In the 1760s and 1770s, several marriages took place that connected ancestor Veales and Dales. For example, Thomas Veale and William Dale were witnesses to the marriage of Capt. Thomas Veale and Bathiah Edwards. This William Dale is likely a descendant of William Dale (1690-1715) and Thomas Veale was probably Capt. Thomas Veale's father.

In 1775, Culpeper land was adjacent to Capt. Thomas Veale land.

Culpepper was one of several names associated, by location, with ancestors of Sarah Veale (1749-1809). These names, in addition to Culpepper, were Ballentine, Cratchett, Dale, Lewellyn, and Manning. Culpeppers lived along Paradise Creek (same name for the creek is still being used today), that runs into the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River.

A marriage in 1765 was between a David Porter and an Agnes Veale (believed to be George Veale's daughter).

In 1789, Paul Dale Luke (1761-1819) assumed the position of administrator for the estate of Dempsey Veale. And in 1806, Paul Dale Luke resigned from the militia as a captain and was replaced by Dempsey Veale.

A daughter of Paul Dale and Sarah Veale Luke married Reuben Herbert.

In 1801, Paul Dale and Sarah Veale Luke sold land to Robert Culpepper.

These connections between Veales, Dales, and Lukes indicate that these families intermingled closely.

4. York, Rappahannock, and Potomac River Counties

Introduction

My great grandfather, Charles A. Jenkins (1850-1927), was a descendent of several immigrants to counties along the York, Rappahannock, and Potomac Rivers. Jenkins' ancestors, who lived in counties along these rivers, include those with last names: Armistead, Bowles, Lewis, Ludlow, Martiau, Reade, Ring, Warner, and Wormeley.

In this section, I provide histories that I have learned about these ancestors.

Armisteads

William Armistead (1610-1671) is believed to be the initial Armistead ancestor immigrant to the Virginia Colony. In the 1630s, he came from Yorkshire in England. William died and was buried in Elizabeth City County. William received 450 acres in Elizabeth City County in the 1630s. William's wife, Anne Ellis (1611-1678), came with him from England, and is buried with William. A main street in current-day Hampton City is Armistead Avenue, a possible connection to William.

William also acquired land in Gloucester County, across the York River from Elizabeth City County, where his son, John Armistead (1630-1695), relocated to a site (along the Piankatank River) where succeeding generations of Armistead's lived. The Armisteads named their residence (plantation house) in Gloucester County (later Mathews County) Hesse. Records suggest that the Armistead ancestors in England had origins in Germany and naming the Gloucester plantation Hesse (a German location) supports the German connection.

John Armistead was, for a time, a sheriff, a justice, a member of the House of Burgesses, a militia colonel, and a member of the Colony Council. John Armistead married Judith Hone (1643-1703).

Judith Hone, born in Gloucester County, was the daughter of Theophilus Hone (1621-1679). Theophilus immigrated from Essex County, England. Theophilus, after immigration, was a justice (in 1652) in Warwick County, a Burgess (in 1666) from Elizabeth City County, and a sheriff (in 1676). In 1667, he was active in militia activities defending against the Dutch threat during the Dutch-Anglo war. During Bacon's Rebellion, his house in Jamestown was destroyed.

Two of John Armistead's daughters (Judith, 1665-1698, and Elizabeth, 1667-1716) married into two families that by the middle 1700s became two of the wealthiest families in the Virginia Colony (the Carters and the Wormeleys).

Judith Armistead married Robert Carter I (1663-1732), who lived across the Rappahannock River from Gloucester County, in Lancaster County on Virginia's Northern Neck.

Elizabeth Armistead married in 1687 Ralph Wormeley II (1650-1703). Ralph Wormeley II lived nearby in the same county (Middlesex) that Elizabeth lived in. Wormeley lived about twenty miles from Elizabeth when they married.

Bowles

James Bowles (1681-1727) immigrated by 1700 to St. Mary's County, Maryland. James Bowles was the son of Tobias Bowles (1659-1729), a wealthy English merchant with a large trading business with the English Colonies. Tobias Bowles married an Armistead (Mary Armistead, 1664-1717) in England and lived there.

That James Bowles apparently was the son of an Armistead (Mary Armistead, 1664-1717) is interesting. William Armistead (1610-1671) immigrated to Elizabeth City County in the Virginia Colony in the 1600s. William Armistead's granddaughter, Elizabeth Armistead (1667-1716), in 1687 married Ralph Wormeley II (1650-1703). And in 1742, Jane Lowe Bowles (1718-1793), a daughter of James Bowles, married Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790), indicating a relationship between the Bowles and Armisteads in England and the Bowles, Armisteads, and Wormeleys in the Virginia Colony.

Wormeley-Armistead-Bowles family ties likely evolved over time, beyond an initial marriage, and not just through marriages but also through business interactions, both in England and in the colonies.

James Bowles' first wife was Jane Lowe (1700-1718), who died young in St. Mary's County, Maryland. Jane and James's possible daughter, Jane Lowe Bowles (1718-1793), married Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790).

Was Jane Lowe Bowles Wormeley the daughter of Jane Lowe and James Bowles, or was she the daughter of James Bowles and his second wife, Rebecca Addison, who he married after Jane Love Bowles' early death in 1718? Evidence is uncertain and more research and analysis of primary source records are needed. For example, evidence is needed that shows confidently Jane Lowe's death date and Jane Love Bowles' birth date. Also needed are verifiable records that show Jane Lowe Bowles and Ralph Wormeley IV marriage date. A birth date for Jane Lowe Bowles frequently found is 1726, which is past Jane Lowe frequently found death date (1718), so Jane Love Bowles could not have been Jane Lowe's daughter if these dates are correct. But why does Jane Love Bowles have Lowe in her name in records found after her marriage to Ralph Wormeley IV, for example, in a portrait done of her by John Wollaston?

With these marriages ((William Armistead (1610-1671) granddaughter's marriage to Ralph Wormeley II (1650-1703) and James Bowles (1681-1727) daughter's marriage to Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790)), family and business connections of Armisteads, Bowles, and Wormeleys, living in England, St. Mary's County, Maryland, and Middlesex County, Virginia create questions.

For example, these connections seem to be a good example of widespread family ties between those living in England and in the colonies. What effects did these connections have on policies and other considerations in England and in the colonies?

James Bowles was a successful merchant administrating tobacco, lumber, livestock, and slaves trade between the Maryland Colony, other English colonies, and England. He was the Collector of Customs for the Potomac District for a time and also a member of the lower and upper houses of the Maryland government. James was appointed to be St. Mary's County's person to promote education for its citizens. By the time James died, he had accumulated a large amount of land. The James Bowles homesite in St. Mary's County became Sotterley Plantation (currently, in 2023, opened to the public for visits), after James Bowles died and his second wife, Rebecca Addison (1704-1750), married George Plater.

Lewis

The earliest known Lewis ancestor immigrant to the Virginia Colony was John Lewis I (1592-1651). He immigrated from Wales to the York River area, where he settled on land in what was then New Kent County and later became King and Queen County. He received 250 acres for bringing himself and his family to the Colony. His land was along the border between New Kent and Gloucester Counties, close to Poropotank Creek.

John Lewis I and his son, John Lewis II (1633-1689), are believed to have immigrated to the Virginia Colony by the 1650s.

John Lewis I was a vestryman at St. Peter's Church in New Kent County and was a major in the militia.

John Lewis II's wife, Elizabeth (Isabella) Miller (1640-1704), was the daughter of James Miller (1600-1657). James apparently arrived in the Virginia Colony in 1630s, settling in York County, where he farmed and was a merchant. James is believed to have immigrated from Scotland.

John Lewis II received a patent for a large amount of land on the north side of the Mattaponi River in New Kent County. John was a captain in the militia. He lost large amounts of assets during Bacon's Rebellion.

John Lewis I's grandson, John Lewis III (1669-1725), married in 1692 Elizabeth Warner (1672-1719), who inherited the Warner Plantation, known as Warner Hall, in Gloucester County. With this marriage and Elizabeth's inheritance, Warner Hall became a Lewis homestead.

John Lewis III and Elizabeth Warner had John Lewis IV (1694-1754). John Lewis IV in 1718 married Frances Fielding (1702-1731). John Lewis IV was in the House of Burgesses in 1748.

Francis Fielding was the daughter of Henry Fielding (1670-1712). Henry died in King and Queen County. Henry had large land holdings in King and Queen County and also had land in England. In the early 1700s, Henry Fielding had business interactions with the Royal African Company of England, related to the purchases of Africans and their importation to the Virginia Colony. Henry's will mentioned his ownership of a ship related to shipping Africans and Henry's desire to give the ship, and to turn over his interests in the Royal African Company, to Gawain Corbin. This Henry Fielding information suggests how extensive and important the African slave trade was to tobacco growers and their involvement in insuring the supply of Africans.

Henry Fielding was the son of Robert Fielding (1650-1675), apparently a physician who lived in Gloucester County. Robert had brothers Ambrose, Richard, and Edward. Ambrose and Richard lived in Northumberland County, and Edward lived in Bristol, England. The Fielding family apparently was well off in England, as well as in the Virginia Colony, owning land in both locations.

Fielding Lewis (1725-1781) was a son of John Lewis IV and Frances Fielding. Fielding Lewis was named after his mother's last name. Fielding Lewis was in the House of Burgesses from 1760 to 1768.

In 1730, John Lewis IV purchased 1,500 acres in what became Spotsylvania County, Virginia Colony, where Fredericksburg is located. This land ownership is likely the explanation for John Lewis IV's son, Fielding Lewis, living and becoming prosperous in Fredericksburg. He became a successful merchant and landowner, and a significant contributor to the American side in the war for independence from England.

Fielding Lewis was a representative of the evolving merchant class of the 1700s based on the export/import trade. As a merchant, he operated stores in Fredericksburg, and owned wharfs and ships associated with Fredericksburg.

Lewis would sell one of his stores to a friend John Thornton (1705-1777), who was likely related to Jane Thornton (1707-1767). Jane Thornton is believed to be the wife of John Champe II (1698-1763). Jane Thornton was the daughter of Frances Thornton II (1683-1726) and Mary Taliaferro (1685-1741). Thornton descendants in the 1700s, and later, were many, with many living in King George, Spotsylvania, and Culpepper Counties and Fredericksburg.

John Champe II and Jane Thornton had Sarah (Sallie) Champe (1733-1814), who in 1755 married Edward Hill Carter (1726-1792). Sarah (Sallie) Champe and Edward Hill Carter are discussed above in Section III 2, under Hills.

During the Revolution War period, Fielding Lewis ran a gun manufacturing facility, sent supplies from his stores to military units, lent money to support governmental efforts, and provided ships serving defensive duties on the Rappahannock River. This depleted much of his

prewar wealth. He was never reimbursed and died poor in 1781. Land that he owned had to be sold to pay off his debts.

Lewis was close to George Washington as a cousin, as a brother-in-law ((Lewis's second wife, Elizabeth Washington (1733-1795), was Washington's sister)), and through business and patriotic interactions.

My great grandfather, Charles A. Jenkins (1850-1927), was a great, great grandson of Fielding Lewis (1725-1781), who was a great, great grandson of John Lewis I (1592-1657).

Elizabeth Lewis (1765-1830), a daughter of Fielding Lewis and Elizabeth Washington, was a great grandmother of my great grandfather, Charles A Jenkins (1850-1927).

Ludlows

In 1660, Sarah Ludlow (1635-1668) married John Carter I (1613-1669). Sarah Ludlow and John Carter I are Northern Neck ancestors. Sarah Ludlow was the daughter of Gabriel Ludlow (1582-1639). Gabriel's brothers were George and Robert Ludlow. Gabriel, who was born and died in Wiltshire, England, possibly never traveled to the English colonies, but his two brothers, George and Robert, did. John Carter I was known to be a royalist.

George Ludlow initially immigrated to New England between 1621 and 1640. He then went to the Virginia Colony. In the 1640s, George patented about 1,500 acres in York County, along what became Wormeley's Creek. The land was adjacent to Nicholas Martiau land, which was patented in 1639.

In the 1640s, a friend of Argall Yeardley, Col. Norwood, visiting from England, left Yardley's residence on the Eastern Shore and went to York County, where he stayed at a "Ludlow Plantation". This Ludlow Plantation was almost certainly George Ludlow's plantation. The Norwood visit is a further indication of the connections between upper class landowners throughout the Virginia Colony that continued into the middle-to-late 1700s. See the Luke section above (Section III 1) for more on Argall Yeardley and the Eastern Shore.

At his death, George apparently owned more than 17,000 acres, including land in Northumberland County, in addition to land he owned in York County. George was in the Council and House of Burgesses, representing York County. George apparently had no children.

It is possible that Sarah Ludlow, George's niece, met her future husband, John Carter I (1613-1669), through George Ludlow, because of George's land ownership in York and Northumberland Counties.

In 1637, Robert Ludlow, Gabriel and George's brother, was a Deputy Governor of the Massachusetts Colony, and then the Chief of Commissions that governed the Connecticut Colony. These appointments suggest that Robert was a Puritan. He did not stay long in New England before going to Ireland, where he died.

That George Ludlow was the brother of the New England Puritan Robert Ludlow suggests that George might have been a supporter of the Puritan movement in England (the Parliamentarians) of the middle 1600s. This period, 1640-1660, also saw Puritan groups in the Virginia Colony in the 1650s, a period when George Ludlow was in the Council and House of Burgesses. George had land in York County adjacent to Nicolas Martiau land, which could be a connection between William Fuller, the St. Mary's County, Maryland Puritan, and Yorktown, where George Ludlow lived, and an explanation for how Sarah Martiau, Nicolas Martiau's daughter, and William Fuller would meet and marry. This assumes that Sarah Martiau's William Fuller was the Maryland William Fuller.

Martiaus

One of the early immigrants to the Virginia Colony was Nicolas Martiau (1591-1657), an ancestor. By the 1610s, Martiau's family fled France for Holland and then moved on to England. In the 1620s, Martiau left England for the Virginia Colony. In France, the Martiaus are believed to have been protestants who were persecuted by the Catholic kings. Persecuted French protestants became known as Huguenots, and many fled France. A substantial number came to the Virginia Colony.

Nicholas Martiau married Elizabeth Jane Page (1593-1646). Elizabeth is believed to have arrived in the Virginia Colony in the early 1620s, aboard the ship Seaflower. After her first husband (Edward Berkeley, 1571-1627)'s death, she married Martiau. Edward Berkeley, who was in the 1624/25 muster (census) taken in the Virginia Colony, was a Martiau friend.

Nicholas was trained as a military engineer in England and reportedly had a good reputation for being one. He was granted citizenship in England. He was sent to the Virginia Colony as a military engineer.

Nicholas Martiau was instrumental in the development of a defensive line reaching from Jamestown to the York River. The impetus for building this defensive line was the 1622 Native American massacre of colonists. A defensive fort was built along the line. The defensive line included a palisade. Martiau was trained as a military engineer, who at that time focused on building defensive structures. The distance of the defensive line was approximately eight miles.

Nicholas Martiau was a representative to the Virginia Colony government from the Kiskyake (named after a native American tribe) section of York County. He represented Kiskyake from 1624 to 1633. Nicolas was on the Virginia Council from 1631 to 1633.

Nicholas Martiau lived in York County where he was buried after his death around 1655. Land on which Yorktown was established in the late 1600s included land owned by Nicolas.

Martiau had two African slaves, who he freed in his 1657 will.

Nicholas Martiau and Elizabeth Page's daughter, Elizabeth Martiau (1625-1686), married, in 1641, George Reade (1608-1674).

Another daughter, Sarah Martiau (1625-1694), married, in 1655, William Fuller. This William Fuller is believed to be the Capt. William Fuller, a Puritan, an ardent supporter of Oliver Cromwell, who became a Maryland leader, hostile to the Catholics there, and strong promotor of Puritanism in Maryland.

Yorktown became an important, active 1700s port on the York River.

Reades

George Reade (1608-1674) immigrated to the Virginia Colony in 1637, accompanying the new Governor Harvey. George immigrated from Hampshire, England and settled in York County, where in 1641 he married Nicolas Martiau (1591-1657)'s daughter, Elizabeth Martiau (1625-1686). Elizabeth was born in Elizabeth City County, the daughter of Nicholas and Elizabeth Jane Page (1593-1646).

George Reade for a time was the Secretary of the Colony, acting Governor (in 1638), and a member of the Council and House of Burgesses at various times. A part of Yorktown was formed on land owned by Nicolas Martiau and George Reade.

Governor Harvey, who George Reade accompanied to Virginia, performed poorly and was recalled to England. Harvey appointed George Reade as Secretary of State after their arrival. Then, when Harvey left Virginia, Reade became acting Governor.

The Custom House in Yorktown was built on land owned by George Reade's son, Benjamin.

One of the daughters of George Reade married a York County Nelson (Thomas Nelson). The Nelson family became a leading York County/Yorktown merchant family in the 1700s.

George Reade and Elizabeth Martiau Reade had a daughter, Mildred Reade (1643-1694), who married Augustine Warner II (1642-1681). Augustine and Mildred Warner had a daughter, Elizabeth Warner (1672-1719), who married John Lewis III (1669-1725). John and Elizabeth Warner were grandparents of Fielding Lewis (1725-1781). My great grandfather, Charles A. Jenkins (1850-1927), was a great, great grandson of Fielding Lewis.

Rings

Joseph Ring (1646-1703) immigrated from Wiltshire, England to York County in the latter 1600s. He married Sarah Berkeley (1674-1740) in 1690. Both Joseph and Sarah are buried in York County.

Sarah Berkeley was the daughter of Edmond Berkeley (1647-1674) and Mary Kemp (1648-1703) and possibly the great granddaughter of John Berkeley, who was killed in the 1622 Native American uprising.

Joseph Ring was instrumental in the formation of Yorktown in the 1690s. Joseph built a plantation known as Ringfield, that stood until 1920. He was a member of the House of Burgesses.

Joseph and Sarah's daughter, Elizabeth Ring (1684-1743), married John Wormeley I (1689-1726) and lived at the Wormeley plantation, Rosegill, in Middlesex County.

Warners

Augustine Warner I (1610-1674) immigrated to the Virginia Colony in 1628 as an indentured servant, who apparently was brought over by Adam Thoroughgood. Augustine Warner I immigrated to the Virginia Colony on the ship Hopewell.

After he completed his indentured servant service he returned to England in the middle 1630s, married Mary Towneley (1614-1662), and returned to the Virginia Colony. They initially lived in York County before relocating in the 1650s to Gloucester County and Warner Hall. Warner Hall became the name of the Warner family plantation along the Severn River in Gloucester County.

Augustine Warner I was on the Virginia Council in 1660 and was Speaker of the House of Burgesses from 1675 to 1677. He also served as a justice in York and Gloucester's Counties.

Augustine Warner II (1642-1681) married Mildred Reade (1643-1694), who was the daughter of George Reade (1608-1674) and Elizabeth Martiau (1625-1686). Elizabeth Martiau was the daughter of Nicholas Martiau (1591-1657) and Elizabeth Page (1593-1646).

Augustine Warner II attended in the late 1650s the Merchant Taylor School in London, a school for boys that continues in operation (2023). He was a supporter of the Governor and the Colony during Bacon's Rebellion.

Augustine Warner II and Mildred Reade had a daughter, Elizabeth Warner (1672-1719), who married John Lewis III (1669-1725). John and Elizabeth Warner were grandparents of Fielding Lewis (1725-1781).

Wormeleys

The first Ralph Wormeley (1618-1651) (Ralph Wormeley I) initially immigrated to York County from Yorkshire, England, and then moved across the York River to Gloucester County where he would be the first of at least six Wormeley generations, going into the 1800s. Ralph arrived in the Virginia Colony around 1650 and was purchasing land in Gloucester County in the 1650s.

Ralph Wormeley I's wife was Agatha Eltonhead (1620-1683), who was from Lancashire, England, and died in Gloucester County. Agatha is believed to be the widow of Luke Stubbins, an Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Accomack County resident. This suggests, with other evidence, how close relations between various parts of the Virginia Colony could be in the 1600s.

Agatha Eltonhead's family in England was strongly pro-royal, as was the Wormeley family in the Virginia Colony. In the mid-1600s, when the English Parliamentarians took charge of the English Government (after King James I's beheading), during a time of civil war in England, the political and religious divisions in England affected the English colonies. For example, in 1654 Richard Bennett, a Puritan and Parliamentarian supporter, became the acting governor of the Virginia Colony, appointed by the English Parliament. Prior to this, Virginia governors were appointed by the monarchy.

In Maryland, conflict arose between pro-royalists and Puritans (supporters of the Parliamentarians in England). A member of the Eltonhead English family (the family to which Ralph Wormeley I's wife, Agatha Eltonhead, belong) was in Maryland, on the pro-royalist side. This Eltonhead was a William Eltonhead, who was killed in the 1650s during a pro-royalist - Puritan skirmish in St. Mary's County, Maryland. William Eltonhead was related to Agatha Eltonhead, possibly her uncle or cousin.

The Eltonhead family in England (i.e., Agatha and William's family) were strongly pro-royalist. As the royalists in England were being outnumbered and outgunned by the Parliamentarians, in the 1640s and 1650s perhaps as many as 20,000 pro-royalists left England (e.g., for safety reasons), immigrating to the Virginia Colony. Likely Agatha and William Eltonhead were part of this immigration, and that they initially immigrated to the Eastern Shore. (Agatha married Luke Stubbins, an Eastern Shore resident, and records show that William was an Eastern Shore resident before his relocation to St. Mary's County in the 1640s.)

Agatha Eltonhead had several sisters that married colonists: Eleanor, who married first, William Brocas, and second, ancestor John Carter I (1615-1669); Alice, who married Henry Corbin; Jane, who married Cuthbert Fenwick of Maryland; and Martha, who married Edwin Conaway, of Lancaster County in Virginia. We see in these marriages a pattern beginning to evolve (in eventually successful Virginia Colony families) of marriages serving economic and social advancement, with economic and social prominence brought by both wives and husbands.

Ralph Wormeley I's possible older brother, or related in some other way, was Christopher Wormeley (1598-1649), who immigrated to the Virginia Colony before Ralph I. Ralph I inherited York County land from Christopher. Christopher Wormeley was one of the first settlers in York County. Wormeley Creek (still the name used today) in York County is believed to be named after Christopher. Ralph Wormeley I lived on land adjacent to this creek.

Records indicate a Christopher Wormeley was the acting English governor of Tortugas Island (a small island near Key West, Florida) in the 1630s, before a Spanish threat led to his departure, and the loss of the island to the Spanish. Christopher reached Virginia in 1635 and received a

grant of 1,450 acres on the York River. Christopher apparently return to England, fought as a Royalist in the English Civil Wars, in which he was killed, and left a will. Ralph Wormeley I inherited Christopher Wormeley's land, which was of importance in helping Ralph prosper.

Ralph Wormeley I was a York County Burgess. He represented York County and then Lancaster County (before a section of Lancaster County became Middlesex County). Later Ralph Wormeleys (II, III, IV, and V) also served in the House of Burgesses.

Ralph Wormeley I built a house, which came to be called Rosegill, in the early 1650s, in Middlesex County where it overlooked the Rappahannock River. Rosegill was the home site of the succeeding Wormeleys generations to the early 1800s. Ralph I and Agatha Eltonhead Wormeley had Ralph Wormeley II (1650-1703).

Ralph Wormeley II was sent to Oxford College in England (the large tobacco planter families often sent their children to England for schooling).

Ralph Wormeley II, who married Elizabeth Armistead (1667-1716), might be considered the most accomplished of the Ralph Wormeleys. He was a graduate of Oxford in England, a member of the House of Burgesses and the Virginia Council, served as president of the Council for a period, was a Secretary of State and a temporary governor, served as a trustee of the College of William and Mary, was an author, had a library of more than 400 books (considered at the time to be one of the largest collections in the Colony), was for 22 years a naval officer in the Rappahannock River District, a Collector of Customs, ran a large plantation producing and exporting huge amounts of tobacco, and donated land on which the Rappahannock River port town, Urbanna, was formed. Ralph was a vestryman at Christchurch.

After Ralph Wormeley II's donation of land to support the development of the town of Urbanna, the Wormeleys would become successful merchants operating out of Urbanna.

Ralph Wormeley II's book collection included both Anglican and Catholic church-related books.

Ralph Wormeley II had several skilled craftsmen (e.g., shoemaker, tailor, miller) as indentured servants in the early 1700s. To support these craftsmen, Wormeley's plantation, Rosegill, had several structures devoted to the crafts. In this regard, Rosegill took on the nature of a small village.

Ralph Wormeley II and his wife Elizabeth Armistead's son, John Wormeley I (1689-1726), married Elizabeth Ring (1684-1743). Elizabeth was the daughter of Joseph Ring (1646-1703), who served as a trustee of Yorktown and a member of Yorktown's governing body for many years.

A daughter of John Wormeley I, Elizabeth Wormeley (1713-1740), married Landon Carter (1710-1778) of Richmond County, on the Northern Neck. Landon Carter was a son of Robert Carter (1663-1732). Robert Carter was a Northern Neck ancestor. You can read more about my Northern Neck ancestors in my family history "Family History - Living in Virginia's Northern

Neck During the 1600s and 1700s – Balls, Carters, Champes, Claughtons, Cralles, Garners, and Washingtons”, available on Amazon.

John Wormeley I and his wife Elizabeth Ring had Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790).

There was Ralph Wormeley III, but he had no children.

Ralph Wormeley IV was married to Jane Lowe Bowles (1718-1793), who was from St. Mary’s County in Maryland. Jane was the daughter of James Bowles (1681-1727) and possibly Jane Lowe (1700-1718), both St. Mary’s County residents. Two sons of Ralph and Jane Lowe Bowles were Ralph Wormeley V (1744-1806) and John Wormeley II (1761-1809).

Ralph Wormeley V was perhaps the most well-known loyalist, during the revolution war period, of those loyalists in the Virginia Colony’s large plantation-owning families. His loyalist pronouncements led to his arrest and exile to land he owned in Frederick County in the Virginia Colony. Ralph Wormeley V would remain a life-long loyalist due to his and his family’s strong history and affiliation with England, from which his ancestors derived much value (in spite of the many hardships his English loyalty caused him during the American Revolution period).

John Wormeley II, Ralph Wormeley IV’s youngest son, was in school in England in the 1770s at the beginning of the Revolution and would enlist in the English Army and served in an English regiment in North and South Carolina during the war. In South Carolina, John met and married Mary Stark (1765-1828), the daughter of an American colonel (Robert Stark, 1740-1806). John Wormeley was captured, held as a prisoner in New York until the end of the war, released, and then applied to the governor of Virginia to be allowed to live in Virginia. He was granted this, returned to Virginia, and lived the rest of his life in Frederick County on land owned by the Wormeley family.

My great grandfather, Charles A. Jenkins (1850-1927), was the grandson of Mary Burwell Wormeley (1796-1865), who was the daughter of John Wormeley II. John Wormeley II was the brother of the fifth Ralph Wormeley V (1744-1806) and the son of Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790).

More about Mary Burwell Wormeley and her descendants, as well as other 1800s and 1900s descendants of the 1600s and 1700s ancestors written about in this family history, can be read in another of my family histories: *A History of My Eight Great Grandparents – Richard W. Robertson, Mary A. Eubank, Dale Delafield Luke, Martha F. Shepherd, George Torian, Amelia Blanche Crawley, Charles Augustus Jenkins, and Lillie Shepherd Cocke*, available on Amazon.

Wormeleys attended Christchurch, a Church of England church, near Rosegill. The current Christchurch Episcopal Church is on the site of the original Christchurch building.

Wormeleys were actively involved in the development of Urbanna. In 1769, Urbanna had at least twenty-three ship arrivals (snows, brigs, schooners, and sloops).

John Wollaston, the active, middle-1700s Virginia circuit portrait painter, painted several Wormeleys. Wollaston, an Englishman, had a good reputation as a portrait painter. While in the colonies, he painted about two hundred portraits in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia.

By the end of the 1700s, the great amount of land the Wormeleys owned became more of a burden than a benefit. Income from the land was no longer great enough to cover the costs of maintaining the property and the many debts that the Wormeleys had.

5. Northern Neck Counties

A previous Family History work of mine “Family History - Living in Virginia’s Northern Neck During the 1600s and 1700s – Balls, Carters, Champes, Claughtons, Cralles, Garners, and Washingtons”, available on Amazon, writes about ancestors living, born, and/or died in the Northern Neck counties, all of which are adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay and/or rivers that flow into the Bay. These counties are Lancaster, King George, Northumberland, Richmond, and Westmoreland.

6. Immigrants

The following table provides the names and birth dates of known ancestors who immigrated from England, along with the known or suspected English counties and towns they came from:

last name	first name	birth date	county	towns
Armistead	William	1610	Yorkshire	Kirk Deighton
Bennett	Richard	1609	Somerset	Wiveliscombe
Berkeley	John	1500s	Gloucestershire	Berkeley
Bowles	James	1681	Kent	Deal
Carter	John	1613	Middlesex	Newgate
Eltonhead	Agatha	1620	Yorkshire	St. Helens
Etheridge	Thomas	1605	Middlesex	Tottenham
Hone	Theophilus	1621	Warwickshire	Thaxted
Kemp	Edmund	1602	Norfolk	Gissing
Lowe	Henry	1652	Derbyshire	Alderwasley
Ludlow	Sarah	1635	Wiltshire	Dinton
Neale	James	1615	Middlesex	London
Reade	George	1608	Hampshire	Linkenholt
Ring	Joseph	1646	Wiltshire	Marlborough
Stott	Henry	1634	Middlesex	London

Taliaferro	Robert	1626	Middlesex	Stepney
Thornton	William	1622	Yorkshire	Thornton
Warner	Augustine	1610	Norfolk	Norwich
Wormeley	Ralph	1618	Yorkshire	?
Yates	John	1607	Berkshire	Farington

Provided below is information I found from research on their English family economic and social status for immigrants listed in the above table.

Armistead

William Armistead (1610-1671) immigrated from Yorkshire arriving in the Virginia Colony in the 1630s and settling on the south side of the York River close to its mouth. Many Armistead families lived in Yorkshire in the 1600s, the largest English county at the time. William is believed to have lived at Kirk Deighton, Harrogate District, in the north of the county. And his Armistead family apparently were viewed as yeomen farmers. The Armistead name had been present in Yorkshire for hundreds of years.

William may have immigrated for faith reasons. Quakerism was emerging in the early 1600s in Yorkshire and a John Armistead attended a Quaker Meeting in Settle, Yorkshire in 1652.

William's wife, Anne Ellis (1661-1678), was also from Yorkshire, where they married.

Bennett

Richard Bennett (1609-1675) immigrated to the Virginia Colony in the late 1620s. His Bennett ancestors were mostly of the gentry class with several at the baronet level socially, meaning they could use Sir and Lady titles officially. Bennetts lived in Somerset, especially the Wiveliscombe area.

Richard's immigration to the Virginia Colony was related to his uncle's (Edward Bennett) and father's (Thomas Bennett) financial interests in the Virginia Company. Also, a possible factor was Richard's beliefs – he eventually became a leader in the Virginia Colony Puritan community.

Berkeley

John Berkeley (1560-1622) immigrated in the early 1620s to the Virginia Colony from Gloucestershire. He came with the mission of starting an iron ore mining and iron production capability on a creek known as Falling Creek, which flows into the upper James River. John was from a mining area of Gloucestershire (and likely acquiring mining skills that prompted his

going to the Virginia Colony) and was related to one of the many Berkeleys who lived in that area. Unfortunately, John was killed during the 1622 Native American uprising.

One of the first plantations along the James River formed by the early 1600s Virginia Company immigrants was called Berkeley Plantation. The name Berkeley was likely used because of the immigrants' connection with the Berkeley Parish (manor) in Gloucestershire.

It is possible that John was the father of Maurice Berkeley, who came with him to Virginia, and who is believed to be the father of Edmund Berkeley (1647-1674) (an ancestor of mine). Edmund married Mary Kemp (1648-1703). Mary was the daughter of Edmund Kemp (1602-1660), who immigrated to Virginia by the 1650s. Edmund Kemp is believed to have been a descendant of the Kempe family of Suffolk, England, which had baronet social status.

Bowles

James Bowles (1681-1727), the son of Tobias Bowles (1659-1727), lived in Deal, Kent County, prior to immigrating to the Maryland Colony in the later 1600s. Bowles was a common name in Kent County in the 1600s, and before. James's grandfather, William Valentine Bowles (1640-1711), reportedly was a Quaker. In St. Mary's County, Maryland, James was a merchant trader interfacing with his father Tobias, who remained in Deal. In the 1600s, Deal was a prosperous North Sea port of merchants and mariners, and Tobias became a wealthy tobacco merchant trading with Maryland.

Tobias also lived and operated his business in London. In 1677, he was listed as a merchant in London on Mincing Lane in the publication known as "Little London Directory", a copy of which survives.

Tobias served as mayor in Deal in the early 1700s.

That William Valentine Bowles may have been a Quaker could account for the Bowles business and resident connections to the Maryland Colony (versus the Virginia Colony), with the Maryland Colony being more Quaker-tolerant in the 1600s.

Carter

John Carter (1613-1669) immigrated to the Virginia Colony in the 1630s. His immigration might have been prompted by an inheritance he received from his father, John Carter (1574-1630). John Carter (1574-1630) was a successful wine merchant at the time of his death in Newgate, Middlesex County (now a part of greater London). John Carter was able to leave material amounts to all his children and others. John Carter (1574-1630) was born in Hertfordshire, adjacent to the then Middlesex County.

The Carters were associated with England's Middlesex Christchurch (the name used for a Carter-financed church in Lancaster County, Virginia Colony). An 1800s-built edition of the Middlesex

Christchurch would last to World War II before being destroyed by a bombing raid. The decision was not to rebuild the church but to turn the land the church was on into a public park, currently enhancing the London area that it is in.

Eltonhead

Agatha Eltonhead immigrated in the mid-1640s from Lancashire County to the Virginia Colony with her four sisters (Elanor, Jane, Katherine, and Martha). They were the daughters of Richard Eltonhead (1581-1665) and Anne Sutton (1589-1654). Although the Eltonheads and their ancestors had been occupants of a manor (land ownership, awarded by the monarchy) near St. Helens, Lancashire, Richard lost the manor due to his support for the monarchy during the English Civil Wars. The sisters' immigration to Virginia could have been due to the economic reversal that the Eltonhead family suffered. Agatha married Ralph Wormeley I (1619-1650) after her arrival in Virginia.

Etheridge

Thomas Etheridge (1605-1671) immigrated in the 1640s from the Tottenham area of Middlesex County (now part of greater London) to Norfolk County in the Virginia Colony. Thomas's father, Thomas Etheridge (1564-1612), was viewed as a yeoman (in church records), meaning a citizen with a small amount of land or perhaps in service in a gentry household. Earlier Etheridges lived in Tottenham. Thomas Etheridge (1564-1612)'s grandfather, William Etheridge (1535-1577), was a constable in Tottenham.

Hone

Theophilus Hone (1621-1679) immigrated from Essex County, England by the 1640s. He is believed to have been the third son of Thomas Hone of Farnham, Essex. A Thomas Hone was baptized in 1586 in Thaxted, Essex at St. John the Baptist Church. Thomas was married to Judith Aylmer, daughter of Theophilus Aylmer (an Archdeacon of London), for whom apparently Theophilus Hone was named.

Kemp

Edmund Kemp (1602-1660) immigrated from Gissing, Norfolk County to the Virginia Colony in the 1640s. Edmund was from a gentry family; his brother Robert went to Oxford and became an attorney. Both Edmund's brother and his father, also named Robert, achieved Baronet status – the lowest hereditary titled British order, with the status of a commoner, but able to use the prefix Sir.

Lowe

Henry Lowe (1652-1717) immigrated in the latter 1600s from Derbyshire to the Maryland Colony. A Henry Lowe was a sheriff in Maryland's St. Mary's County in the 1690s. The Lowes had a manor in the Alderwasley area of Derbyshire, which went to another family when the last male Lowe died in the 1690s without a male heir. Other Lowes lived in the area and Henry may have been from one of these Lowe families.

Derbyshire was a prominent area of religious dissenters (towards the Church of England), who sided with the Parliamentarians during the Civil Wars.

Ludlow

Sarah Ludlow (1635-1668) immigrated from Wiltshire (probably Dinton in Wiltshire) to the Virginia Colony before 1660, when she married John Carter I (1613-1669) in Lancaster County, Virginia Colony. Sarah's uncle, George Ludlow (1596-1655), also immigrated to the Virginia Colony and it makes sense to conclude that Sarah immigrated along with her uncle. Sarah's father was Gabriel Ludlow (1582-1640) and possibly Sarah immigrated due to Gabriel's death. A brother of Sarah, Thomas, also immigrated to the Virginia Colony.

The Ludlow name goes back in Wiltshire to at least the 1300s. Many Ludlows achieved gentry-class social status, holding such positions as high sheriff.

Another of Sarah's uncles, Roger Ludlow (1590-1664), immigrated to New England where he played important roles in Massachusetts and Connecticut colony developments. The town of Ludlow, Massachusetts may be named after Roger Ludlow.

Neale

James Neale (1615-1684) immigrated in the 1640s to the Maryland Colony. James and the Neale family, who lived in London, belonged to what was considered the gentry class, although they did not have titles. The Neales were Catholic and acquaintances of Lord Baltimore, who bestowed on James a large number of acres in the Maryland Colony and a position on the Maryland Council.

James's arrival in Maryland corresponded with the Civil Wars uprising in England and related to that, were conflicts between the Maryland Catholics and royalists, such as James, and the Virginian-Maryland Puritan-Parliamentarian' supporters, led by William Claiborne and Richard Ingle. The conflict ended with the Puritan-Parliamentarians taking over, by the 1650s, the Maryland Colony government. This led to James Neale returning to England. But with the defeat of the Parliamentarians in England and the restoration of the monarchy in the 1660s, Neale and his family returned to Maryland, where he died in 1684.

Reade

George Reade (1608-1674) immigrated by the 1630s to York County in the Virginia Colony. He married Elizabeth Martiau in 1641 in York County. George was from a gentry family, who had a manor in Linkenholt, near Facombe in Hampshire. George's great grandfather, Richard Reade (1536-1627), was granted a manor in the middle 1500s. In the 1630s, the manor, and its land, was sold by the Reade family. This may have accounted for George Reade's immigration to the Virginia Colony around the same time, with the manor sale representing a change in the Reades' circumstances and prospects.

Hampshire borders the English Channel and the ports of Portsmouth and Southampton, and it would not be surprising if George Reade departed for the Virginia Colony from one of these ports.

Ring

Joseph Ring (1646-1703) immigrated in the middle 1600s from Wiltshire to York County in the Virginia Colony. His father, Richard Ring (1609-1675), and mother, Joane Rolfe (1614-1649), lived in Marlborough, Wiltshire, and had an association with St. Peter and St. Paul Church there. The Ring and Rolfe families were long-term residents of Marlborough and likely were considered yeomans, with respect to the British class system.

Marlborough strongly supported the Parliamentarians during the English Civil Wars, and this may have accounted for Joseph's immigration, as the monarchy was being restored at around the time of his immigration. The Rings were apparently Puritans. Apparently, Joane Rolfe's father, John Rolfe (1585-1664), immigrated to Massachusetts during the 1620-1640 great Puritan migration period.

Stott

In the 1650s, Henry Stott (1634-1650) immigrated from England to the Virginia Colony Northampton County on the Eastern Shore. Henry Stott's grandfather, Nicholas (1575-1625), was living in London (where Henry was born) by the late 1500s, when he had a position with the title "Messenger of His Majesty's Chamber", which Henry's father, David Stott (1606-1638) also held. Apparently a "Messenger of His Majesty's Chamber" was a person who would be directed to seek out and bring to the Majesty's Chamber persons that the Majesty Chamber wanted to see. The messenger apparently had "sheriff-like" authority to do so. Such a title suggests the Stotts could be viewed as yeoman class.

Henry's immigration in the 1650s possibly relates to his father's occupation associated with the monarchy, as the Parliamentarians had just taken over in England, with the monarchy no longer in power.

The Stotts were associated with St. Clement Eastcheap Church on King William's Street in London, which may have been the area where the Stotts lived.

Ancestors of Nicholas Stott apparently lived in the Claydon area of Suffolk County, near Ipswich. Nicholas submitted court petitions on his behalf that referenced Claydon, Suffolk County.

Taliaferro

Robert Taliaferro (1623-1672) immigrated by the 1650s from Middlesex County (which included the City of London in the 1600s) to the Virginia Colony. In 1653, he married Katherine Grymes in York County.

Robert was the descendant of Taliaferros who had lived in London since the mid-1500s. The Taliaferros were described as "yeomans," presumably meaning a level below gentleman – one that owned some land and/or was an attendant or assistant to a nobleman or an official.

Robert was baptized at the St. Dunstan All Saints Church in East London. Interesting, Robert's grandfather, Bartholomew Taliaferro (1530-1601), likely was Jewish. Bartholomew is believed to have been recruited by Henry VIII from Venice, Italy to be a court musician, along with other Italian musicians reported to be Jewish. Bartholomew apparently was relatively well off, as he left substantive provisions for his children.

In Virginia, Robert Taliaferro became a large landowner, along the upper Rappahannock River. He was affiliated with Lawrence Smith (1629-1700), another large landowner in the same area. In 1666, Robert and Lawrence received a patent for 6,300 acres in Old Rappahannock County. In 1682, Robert's son, John Taliaferro (1656-1726), married, in Essex County, Sarah Smith (1659-1720), a daughter of Lawrence Smith.

Thornton

William Thornton (1620-1708) immigrated from Yorkshire in the middle 1630s as an indentured servant to William Pryor. In 1641, he married his first wife in Rappahannock County. Thornton was a common name in Yorkshire at the time. A community in West Yorkshire, near Leeds, is named Thornton, possibly the areas that William was from.

William's second wife was Elizabeth Rowland (1627-1655).

Warner

In the late 1620s, Augustine Warner (1610-1674) immigrated from the Norwich/Hoveton area of Norfolk County, England. He came as an indentured servant (apparently paid for by Adam Thoroughgood, a fellow Norfolk, England resident, who immigrated to the Virginia Colony

Norfolk County). After completing his indentured servant service, Augustine returned to England, married Mary Towneley (1614-1662), and they returned to Virginia and received six hundred acres for bringing others with them. By his death in the 1670s, he owned thousands of acres in Gloucester County.

The Warner name goes back in Norfolk County, England to at least the 1400s and some Warners were of the gentry class, entitled to use Sirs and Ladies as titles. However, Augustine's immediate family presumably had financial circumstances so that Augustine needed to go to Virginia as an indentured servant.

Wormeley

By 1650, Ralph Wormeley (1618-1650) immigrated from Yorkshire to the Virginia Colony. Yorkshire had many Wormeley families in the 1600s, with the Wormeley family name (or a version of it) being traced back in Yorkshire to at least the 1300s. Ralph Wormeley's father was possibly Ralph Wormeley, for whom a Yorkshire 1660s will exists. In Virginia, Ralph Wormeley married Agatha Eltonhead.

Yates

John Yates (1607-1648) probably immigrated after 1635 from Berkshire (his daughter Francis was born in Berkshire in 1635). John Yates could have been in a well-to-do Yates family, which had a manor residence, called Buckland Park (near Farington), from the late 1400s to the late 1600s. The Yates were a Catholic family and monarch supporter. Many Yates lived in the area of the manor, and John Yates may have been a son of one of these Yates families.

The following table identifies the regions of England that the counties listed in the table above are in, and the last names of the ancestors from those regions:

regions	counties	last names
southwest	Devon Gloucestershire Somerset Wiltshire	Bennett Berkeley Ludlow Luke Ring

		Bowles Carter Etheridge Neale Reade Stott Taliaferro Yates
southeast	Berkshire Hampshire Kent Middlesex	
west midlands	Warwickshire	Hone
east midlands	Derbyshire	Lowe
east Anglia	Norfolk	Kemp Warner
north	Yorkshire	Armistead Bowles Eltonhead Thornton Wormeley

The table above agrees with what others have concluded: that most 1600s immigrants from England to the Virginia Colony came from counties in the south and middle of England.

In addition to ancestor immigrants from England, I also had 1600s immigrants from France, Scotland, and Wales.

Nicolas Martiau - France

In 1620, Nicolas Martiau (1591-1657) immigrated to York County from London. His parents are unknown, but he was born in France (location uncertain). He is known to have been in London in 1615, when he interacted with the French Huguenot community there. He also received training as a military engineer in England. When he immigrated from France to England has not been determined but before 1615.

He was sent to the Virginia Colony on assignment with the mission of building defensive fortifications, which he did successfully. He never returned to England, dying in York County in 1657.

James Miller - Scotland

James Miller (1616-1657) immigrated to the Virginia Colony and York County, possibly arriving in the 1630s and probably from Scotland. James became a merchant specializing in the tobacco trade with Scotland.

In 1636/37, a James Miller and his wife, Mary, arrived as passengers on the ship Tristan and Jane. This is probably James Miller (1616-1657). Records associated with the Tristan and Jane indicate that James was a cooper (barrel, container maker) and paid for his passage, receiving one hundred acres, at the head of Poquoson River in York County.

John Lewis - Wales

In the early 1650s, John Lewis (1592-1657) immigrated from the Abergavenny area of Monmouthshire, Wales to York County. He received 250 acres for the transport of himself and his family. John was baptized in St. Teilo Church in Llandilo Pertholey Parish in Monmouthshire. Lewises in the Monmouthshire area were referred to as merchants and gentlemen.

Lewis possibly immigrated because he was a royalist supporter during a time when the Parliamentarians were winning against the royalists. Apparently, Lewis sold land prior to his immigration, which might account for the cost of his and his family transport to the Virginia Colony.

Ancestor immigrants in the 1600s for whom I could not find information related to their family origins and economic status in England include:

last name	first name	birth/death dates
Fielding	Robert	1650-1675
Hill	Edward	?-1663
Luke	John	1649-1709
Page	Elizabeth Jane	1593-1646
Savage	Anthony	1623-1695
Utie	John	1593-1637
Watson	Robert	1623-1703
Williams	Thomas	1646-1690

In the following table, I make broad conclusions about family social and economic status, based on my family history research. The conclusions are: 1) the immigrant's wider family's social status in England at the time of the immigrant's arrival in the Virginia Colony, and 2) the economic status of the immigrant's Virginia Colony descendants in the mid-1700s.

For each 1600s immigrant in the table, I provide a yeoman or gentry family social status, based on information I was able to find about the immigrant's parents and other ancestors in England. The gentry status is based on such a description used for the parents and/or ancestors in the

information found, including the use of titles, frequency of prestigious positions, and having manor ownership.

The mid-1700s economic status is based upon what I found about the immigrant's descendants land ownership amounts, which for the mid-1700s, was likely a good indicator of wealth.

immigrant name	England - family social status	Virginia Colony – family mid-1700s economic status
Armistead	yeoman	wealthy
Bennett	gentry	wealthy
Berkeley	yeoman	middling
Bowles	upper yeoman	middling
Carter	upper yeoman	wealthy
Eltonhead	gentry	wealthy
Etheridge	yeoman	middling
Hone	yeoman	wealthy
Kemp	gentry	middling
Lewis	yeoman	wealthy
Lowe	gentry	middling
Ludlow	gentry	wealthy
Martiau	yeoman	middling
Neale	gentry	wealthy
Reade	gentry	middling
Ring	yeoman	wealthy
Stott	lower yeoman	middling
Taliaferro	yeoman	wealthy
Thornton	lower yeoman	wealthy
Warner	lower yeoman	wealthy
Wormeley	yeoman	wealthy
Yates	gentry	middling

Using the broad conclusions in the above table, here is some data:

The number of immigrants with gentry family class status in England at the time of 1600s immigration having mid-1700s descendants judged to be wealthy: four

The number of immigrants with gentry family class status in England at the time of 1600s immigration having mid-1700s descendants judged to be middling: four

The number of immigrants with yeoman family class status in England at the time of 1600s immigration having mid-1700s descendants judged to be wealthy: nine

The number of immigrants with yeoman family class status in England at the time of 1600s immigration having mid-1700s descendants judged to be middling: five

This data, if reasonable accurate, show that the immigrant being from a gentry family background did not make any difference on whether the mid-1700s descendants became wealthy – of the eight immigrants with gentry family backgrounds, four of the immigrant descendants became wealthy and four became of middling economic status.

Also, coming from a yeoman's family background did not, on average, prevent the immigrants' mid-1700s descendants from becoming wealthy. Of fourteen immigrants with yeoman's family backgrounds in England, nine descendants became wealthy, or 64% ($9/14 = 64\%$), in the mid-1700s Virginia Colony.

Another interesting broad conclusion is that being a 1600s immigrant to the Virginia Colony with a gentry or yeoman family background in England provided a greater than 50% chance of having mid-1700s descendants becoming wealthy (13 of 22 immigrants becoming wealthy). This possibly is an indication that from the 1600s to the 1700s, the economic growth in the Virginia Colony was good, perhaps better than in succeeding comparable periods (i.e., from the 1700s to the 1800s and from the 1800s to the 1900s) for both in England and in the United States.

IV. Developments in the 1600s and 1700s Affecting Ancestors

1. Introduction

The emphasis in the section is to identify 1600s and 1700s developments that might have affected and influenced my ancestors. Developments in immigration, towns and counties, economy, houses and churches, waterways, and Colony governance are identified and discussed.

2. Immigration

The initial Jamestown explorers, as they came into the Chesapeake Bay in 1607, would see the rest of the Chesapeake Bay to the north, a river, later called the York River, to the west, and a body of water to the south that became known as Hampton Roads. Once they entered Hampton Roads, they could see three rivers, to become known as the Elizabeth, the Nansemond, and the James Rivers. They would choose the larger of the three rivers flowing into Hampton Roads, the James, to continue up before settling on what would become Jamestown.

The James River, by far the widest and longest of the three Hampton Roads rivers, runs northwest from Hampton Roads. The Elizabeth River runs southeast (a much smaller river compared to the James) and Nansemond River (by far the smallest of the three rivers) runs southwest from Hampton Roads.

By the 1620s, a few English immigrants started living on what would become “New Norfolk County”, which was in the area of the Elizabeth and Nansemond Rivers. By the 1630s, the immigrant numbers increased into the hundreds.

First settlers in New Norfolk County lived along the banks of the western branch of the Elizabeth River. Then immigrants began to settle along the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River.

My ancestor immigrants settling in New Norfolk County area prior to the 1660s included:

ancestor	birth date and place	death date and place
Abel Lewellyn	1600s England	? Lower Norfolk County
Joane Jobe Yates	1608 England	1664 England
Richard Bennett	1609 Somerset England	1675 Nansemond County
John Yates	1616 Berkshire, England	1648 Nansemond County
Mary Ann Utie	1619 Norfolk England	1624 Nansemond County

Immigrant ancestors who continued up the James River, beyond the New Norfolk area, included:

ancestor	birth date and place	death date and place
Mary Boyle	1582 Shropshire England	1659 Charles City County
Edward Hill I	1600s England	1663 Charles City County

Point Comfort is at the mouth of the York River. The Point Comfort area, which was also referred to as Kecoughtan after the Native American tribe living in the area, became an early, initial landing and assembling area because Point Comfort was one of the initial landing areas ships could use after entering the Chesapeake Bay. Because of this, the Point Comfort area would develop as a community providing services to immigrants coming off ships; services such as guest houses and ship repairs. In the early 1600s, the Point Comfort area became a part of Elizabeth City County, which also included communities up the York River.

By 1670, approximately 50 English men, women, and children were living in the area that the Virginia Colony called Point Comfort (located within current Hampton City), at the point where the York River flows into the Chesapeake Bay. Immigrants would continue to assemble at Point Comfort, and further up the York River, as a point of departing from ships arriving from England.

By the 1630s, settlements were appearing further up the York River (initially called Charles River) from Point Comfort.

Further up the York River, along the south bank, two immigrant communities emerged, communities that would be called Chiskiack (after Native Americans living in the area) and Fort York (likely because a fort was built in the area). A primary goal for these areas were to provide protection, a line of defense, a barrier, against the Native Americans who lived even further up the York River. Eventually the two areas, Chiskiack and Fort York, would be part of what became York County.

Immigrant ancestors who settled along the York River, starting at the Point Comfort area include:

ancestor	birth date and place	death date and place
Christopher Wormeley	1589 England	1649 England
Nicolas Martiau	1591 ?	1657 York County
John Lewis I	1592 Monmouthshire Wales	1651 King & Queen County
Elizabeth Jane Page	1593 England	1646 York County
James Miller	1600 Scotland	1657 York County

George Reade	1608 Hampshire England	1674 Yorktown
Augustine Warner I	1610 Norfolk England	1674 Gloucester County
William Armistead	1610 Yorkshire England	1671 Elizabeth City County
Anne Ellis	1611 Yorkshire England	1671 Elizabeth City County
Mary Towneley	1614 Lancashire England	1662 Gloucester County
Ralph Wormeley I	1618 Yorkshire England	1650 Gloucester County
Agatha Eltonhead	1620 Yorkshire England	1683 Gloucester County
Robert Taliaferro	1626 Middlesex County	1672 York County
John Armistead	1630 Elizabeth City County	1695 Gloucester County
John Lewis II	1633 Monmouthshire Wales	1689 New Kent County
Elizabeth Miller	1640 New Kent England	1704 King & Queen County
Augustine Warner II	1642 Gloucestershire England	1681 Gloucester County
Joseph Ring	1646 Wiltshire England	1703 York County
Judith Bowles	1649 Yorkshire England	1699 Gloucester County

Settlers began populating areas on the Eastern Shore almost immediately following the English immigration to the Virginia Colony.

The Eastern Shore was viewed well for its potential for settlement due to multiple protective inlets, ready access to seafood, and the flatness of the land with abundance of trees. Pine trees were abundant on the Eastern Shore in the 1600s. And the land was largely free of rocks.

Initially the settlement on the Eastern Shore was referred to as Accomac, the name of a Native American tribe living on the Eastern Shore. In the 1640s, the name Accomac was dropped and was replaced by Northampton. Then in the 1660s, well into the Virginia Colony period of county formation, the Eastern Shore, called Northampton, was divided into two counties, retaining Northampton for one name, resurrecting Accomack (k added) for the other.

The name Northampton possibly was chosen because of a relationship between those living in the Eastern Shore and the English shire (county) Northampton, which was several miles northwest of London.

Immigrant ancestors who settled on the Virginia Colony's Eastern Shore include:

ancestor	birth date and place	death date and place
John Luke I	? Devon England	1657 Northampton
Robert Watson Sr	1623 Norfolk England	1703 Accomack
Susannah Etheridge	1626 England	1680 Accomack

Henry Stott I	1634 London England	1690 Northampton
John Luke II	1649 Salisbury England	1709 Northampton

Some immigrant ancestors did not stop at the Hampton Roads, the York River, or the Eastern Shore areas but continued north up the Chesapeake Bay. Three who ended up in Maryland are:

ancestor	birth date and place	death date and place
James Neale	1615 England	1684 Maryland
Henry Lowe	1652 Derbyshire England	1717 St. Mary's County MD
James Bowles	1681 Kent England	1727 St. Mary's County MD

Immigrants arriving on 1623-24 ships, for which ships manifestos are available, included the ancestor names Hill and Dale. Whether any of my 1600s ancestors with the same last names were descendants of these individuals have not been discovered but seem possible.

The period 1635 to 1665 saw an increased immigration to the Virginia Colony, and a consequence of this was the assignments of vast amounts of land to the immigrants. Estimates have been made that put the number of immigrants to the Virginia Colony at more than 20,000 during the 1635 to 1655 time period, with several thousand of these coming under the headright system. Other estimates have suggested that between 1630 and 1680, some 50,000 indentured servants immigrated to the Virginia and Maryland Colonies.

By the 1690s, the rate of immigration from England had greatly declined. This led to a change in the percentage of residents being immigrants versus those being Colony born. Such a change likely led to several tipping-point changes in the Virginia Colony, as immigrant-born and Virginia Colony-born perspectives likely differed, and Virginia Colony-born residents became more influential.

By 1700, a noticeable number of France-origin immigrants started appearing in the Virginia Colony. Estimates are that by 1700, approximately a thousand French immigrants were in the Virginia Colony. They left France to first go to other European countries, especially Holland and England, from where they immigrated to the Virginia Colony, probably for the same reasons that most English immigrated – land ownership and economic opportunities.

These French left France because of their non-Catholic beliefs and refusal to accept the French government's demands to reject their protestant beliefs. They became known as Huguenots, and many more Huguenots would immigrate to the Virginia Colony in the 1700s. One of my ancestors, Nicolas Martiau (born 1597, France; died 1657, York County) was a Huguenot.

Ancestors who immigrated to the Virginia Colony as indentured servants include:

Abel Lewellyn, in the 1600s, died in Lower Norfolk County
Augustine Warner I (1610-1674), died in Gloucester County
William Thornton (1620-1708), died in Stafford County

Ancestors who paid for indentured servants' passage to the Virginia Colony include:

Thomas Etheridge (1605-1671), paid for a few
Richard Bennett (1609-1675), several
Edward Hill I (?-1663), several
Henry Stott I (1634-1690), a few
Ralph Wormeley II (1650-1703), several

The following indentured servants, with ancestor last names (but not known to be ancestor related), were sponsored to counties where ancestors lived:

George Dale	1652	Northampton County
Henry Etheridge	1654	Northampton County
Thomas Shepherd	1649	Northampton County

Most indentured servants apparently came from southern England, and most were males, age 15 to 22. Many had occupational skills. The indentured servant program offered many in England land-owning and other opportunities, which were not available in England.

An Eastern Shore muster (census) occurred in 1625 (likely to be the first census on the Virginia Colony's Eastern Shore) counting fifty-one persons. Nine of the people were identified as individuals (not in a family) and the rest (42) were in family units. Two groups were identified: "servant" and "non-servant." The age range of the servant group was 12 to 30 and the non-servant group, 19 to 36. As 1625 was subsequent to the adoption of the headright land policy, the servant group possibly represented "indentured servants" – those for whom transport from England was paid by someone other than those in the servant group. And the non-servant group possibly represented those who paid the passage fees for the servant group for which the non-servant group gained land ownership rights. This group of fifty-one likely were recent arrivals from England.

The ocean-going trip from England to the Virginia Colony that immigrants took in the 1600s was long and dangerous. Sailing times might be longer than 8 weeks. Many died along the way from disease. Conditions were crowded and often unhygienic. Ships were lost to storms.

The indentured servant system served well the Virginia Colony and landowners' needs for needed labor and services.

Paying for an indentured servant passage to the Colony met the payee would have the services of and could manage the indentured servant. In some cases, indentured servants would be offered for sale by the payee to those who might be interested in having indentured servants. This created a need for a system of managing the transport and arrival of the indentured servants, advertising that indentured servants were for sale, and other administrative requirements. These administrative requirements would help in the development of towns and merchants, both of which would improve the administration of indentured servants after their arrival in the Virginia Colony.

The indentured servant system was a major presence in the lives of my Virginia Colony ancestors.

Immigrants to America have frequently occurred in “waves” where the immigrants were connected by a unifying characteristic. Examples of such waves, which include individuals that are ancestors of mine, are:

- In the 1610s, Virginia Company-sponsored immigrants
- In the 1630s to late 1600s, indentured servants
- In the 1630s to 1650s, Puritans
- In the 1640s and 1650s, pro-royalists
- In the mid-1700s, Scottish merchants

This family history deals with the 1600s and 1700s ancestors who immigrated to areas along the waterways of the Chesapeake Bay, except the Virginia Colony’s Northern Neck area. A previous family history (“Family History – Living in Virginia’s Northern Neck During the 1600s and 1700s – Balls, Carters, Champes, Claughtons, Cralles, Garners, and Washingtons) identifies immigrant ancestors who went to the Virginia Colony’s Northern Neck area. This previous family history is available on Amazon.

3. Towns and Counties

Towns

In this section, I present 1600s and 1700s town developments and suggestions on how these developments may have affected my ancestors’ lives.

By the 1630s, historians suggest that the Virginia Colony had a population of a few thousand. Archaeological evidence show groups of houses were close together indicating successful communities (the beginning of towns) being present at the sites of those group of houses.

In the late 1600s and early 1700s, the General Assembly designated twenty-seven sites as potential towns. Of the twenty-seven sites designated to become towns, only seven eventually became towns. These seven were: Onancock (Accomack County); Hampton (Elizabeth City County); Norfolk (Lower Norfolk County); Urbanna (Middlesex County); Tappahannock

(Rappahannock County); Kinsale (Westmoreland County); and Yorktown (York County). I have ancestors that were associated with these towns.

The late-1600s Virginia Colony government initiatives to establish more towns was at a time when very few towns existed. The population in early 1700s towns represented a small percentage of the total Colony population. Many more people lived on plantations and small farms than in towns.

Most of the towns planned for development in the late 1600s never became successful 1700s towns. However, a few that did are listed in the table below.

Towns that developed during the 1700s include:

town	county	estimated 1700 population	recent population
Fredericksburg	Spotsylvania	2,000	29,000
Hampton	York	1,200	135,000
Norfolk	Norfolk	3,000	244,000
Portsmouth	Norfolk	0	95,000
Tappahannock	Essex	0	2,400
Urbanna	Middlesex	0	500
Williamsburg	James City	1,000	15,000
Yorktown	York	60	290

I have 1700s ancestors who lived in Fredericksburg, Hampton, Portsmouth, Urbanna, and Yorktown.

Towns that were significantly more prominent as towns in the 1600s and 1700s, compared to today, but have lost that prominence include Yorktown, Gloucester, and Kinsale.

The town of Yorktown was established in 1691 and became a leading tobacco exporting port in the mid-to-late 1700s. The establishment of Yorktown was a part of the Colony's government effort (with limited success) to establish several towns throughout the Colony. The government viewed the lack of towns in the late 1600s as a problem with respect to increasing exports and imports, raising money via taxes, and increasing the overall welfare and prosperity of the Colony.

The town of Norfolk was established in 1680 in response to the Virginia Colony's initiative to establish more trade and commerce-oriented areas (towns) throughout the Colony. This initiative was in response to a belief that towns were needed to achieve needed trade. Norfolk

(initially referred to as a borough) was established along the north shore of the Elizabeth River, out of Norfolk County land.

When Portsmouth was formed, the area was approximately sixty acres. The Portsmouth plan was typical of plans for other towns targeted for development. In the mid-1700s, the town (borough) of Portsmouth was established on Norfolk County land. Portsmouth was a “planned town” in that lots were planned for a courthouse, a church, and for residences. In 1790, Portsmouth had approximately three hundred houses, with a population of 1,700 (1,035 – white; 615 – slave; and 50 – free black). In the last half of the 1700s, Portsmouth citizens became much more involved in Norfolk town affairs. Portsmouth was established along the south shore of the Elizabeth River.

By 1615, Point Comfort had about twenty residents. Point Comfort became a part of Elizabeth City County. By 1690, the area around Point Comfort had the characteristics of a town and was called Hampton.

Several communities developed in the two Eastern Shore counties during the 1600s, such as Bridgetown and Eastville, but no large Eastern Shore towns, e.g., hundreds of residents, developed, even into the 1800s.

Several ancestors lived in towns identified above. Ancestors and the towns they lived in are:

ancestor	town	birth/death dates
Fielding Lewis	Fredericksburg	1725-1781
William Armstead	Hampton	1610-1671
Anne Ellis	Hampton	1611-1671
Elizabeth Martiau	Hampton	1625-1686
William Veale	Portsmouth	1682-1752
Mary Cratchett	Portsmouth	1693-1762
Edward Lewellyn	Portsmouth	1700s-1752
Lemuel Veale	Portsmouth	1713-1756
Isaac Luke	Portsmouth	1729-1784
Rachel Dale	Portsmouth	1737-1775
Sarah Veale	Portsmouth	1749-1809
John Luke IV	Portsmouth	1793-1866
Ralph Wormeley IV	Urbanna	1715-1790
George Reade	Yorktown	1608-1674
Elizabeth Martiau	Yorktown	1625-1686
Joseph Ring	Yorktown	1646-1703

At least four ancestors were instrumental in town development. These ancestors are:

ancestor	town	years assisted
William Veale and his sons donated land and helped manage development	Portsmouth	1760s
Ralph Wormeley II and his descendants donated land and helped managed development	Urbanna	late 1600s, 1700s
Joseph Ring helped managed development	Yorktown	late 1600s
Nicholas Martiau donated land	Yorktown	mid 1600s

The 1600s/1700s development of towns might serve to be potentially useful as a model of how towns develop. For example, what factors might have been present when Virginia Colony towns developed, that represent a tipping point for town development? Many potential towns that the Virginia Colony wanted developed did not come into existence. Why? What was it about successfully planned towns that “tipped” success and resulted in a town?

Likely developments that might result in tipping points for a site becoming a town include:

- Intersection and success of various travel paths, e.g., a site that can serve as a successful port receiving goods, roads in and out of the site.
- The site successfully serves as a node, using current information science’s descriptions of a node.
- Sufficient numbers of merchants to support the movement of goods into and out of the site.
- A sufficient number of residents and a growth of resident numbers at the site and within a certain distance of the site.
- The ability to out-compete other sites.

Here are some suggestions for why wanted towns did not develop in the Virginia Colony:

- Large tobacco plantations were able to provide their own travel paths for exports, e.g., directly from the banks of their plantations. They did not want to give up this capability.
- Insufficient roads and other factors to develop a node.
- Sites could not compete against other sites, for assorted reasons.
- Insufficient number of merchants needed for a successful town.

Because of the extensive waterway existing in the Virginia Colony, and their use and importance in transportation and commerce, most communities (towns) that developed were adjacent to these waterways.

Counties

Several unexpected developments took place from the beginning of the Virginia Colony. One of the most monumental was the development of counties. The existence of counties was not a consideration or plan initially. County development only occurred as events evolved, as assessments were made that counties were needed to respond to the events. Much good scholarship has investigated those events and how they lead to county development. One of the major events was the continued, ever-increasing numbers of immigrants and the need to govern them.

Eventually eight counties was settled on, covering large areas. And these counties would be reformulated in response to increasing populations and the needs for county courts to be centrally located and within a reasonable distance, such that residents could travel to and from courthouses within a reasonable amount of time. So, by the end of the 1700s, many more counties existed than eight.

Virginia Colony counties that existed during the 1600s and 1700s and in which ancestors lived are:

county	formation date	estimated 1700 population	recent population	ancestors who lived in county at some time
Accomack	1671	3,000	33,000	Etheridge Watson
Charles City	1619	?	7,000	Boyle Carter Hill
Elizabeth City	1634	3,500	annexed into city of Hampton 1952	Armistead Ellis
Essex	1694	?	11,000	Smith Taliaferro
Gloucester	1651	14,000	37,000	Armistead Bowles Eltonhead Fielding Reade Warner Wormeley

King and Queen	1691	?	7,000	Fielding Lewis
King George	1720	not formed yet	27,000	Thornton Champe
Lancaster	1651	?	11,000	Armistead Carter
Lower Norfolk	1637	gone by 1700	divided into Norfolk and Princess Anne Counties 1691	Horne Lewellyn
Matthews	1790	not formed yet	9,000	Wormeley
Middlesex	1673	4,500	11,000	Taliaferro Wormeley
Nansemond	1637	9,000	annexed into Suffolk City	Bennett Utie Yates
New Kent	1654	gone by 1700	annexed into King and Queen County 1691	Lewis
New Norfolk	1636	gone by 1700	divided into Lower/Upper Norfolk Counties 1637	Cratchett Creekmore Dale Etheridge Herbert Johnson Lewellyn Luke Veale
Northampton	1691	4,000	12,000	Bryant Luke Richardson Stott
Spotsylvania	1691	8,000	135,000	Carter Lewis Thornton
St. Mary's, Maryland	1656	gone by 1700	113,000	Bennett Bowles Johnson Lowe Neale
York	1692	100	9,000	Berkely Martiau Miller Page Ring Taliaferro Wormeley

No county names in the areas east and south of James River listed in this family history exist today. These counties have been annexed by one of five cities that have replaced the use of the county name. These five cities are: Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach.

In 1625, the Eastern Shore County population was fifty-one, in 1634 – approximately four hundred, and in 1650 – approximately 1,000.

The population of the two Virginia Colony Eastern Shore counties compared to the Virginia Colony population is shown in the following table:

Year	approximate Eastern Shore	approximate Colony
1610	10	350
1625	51	1,200
1650	1,000	8,000-25,000
1700	2,000	60,000
1750	?	230,000
Late 1700s	7,000 (1/2 slaves)	900,000

The Norfolk County population (based on tithable records) was:

1682	694
1705	714
1731	1,425

In the last half of the 17th Century, Nansemond County’s population was approximately eight hundred, mostly along the Nansemond River.

Middlesex County, which began to be populated in the 1650s, had a believed population of 1,250 in 1670; 1,650 in 1690; 2,230 in 1710; and 3,370 in 1750.

In 1650, England’s population was approximately five million. By comparison, the Virginia Colony population has been estimated at around 25,000 in 1650 and Massachusetts Colony’s population around 12,000 in 1640.

In the 1680s, the Virginia Colony’s population is estimated to have been about 70,000 and by 1700, 85,000.

Capt. Plomer Bray was a witness in 1682 to a deed in Norfolk County. Bray would be a name associated with an 1800s ancestor and Gloucester County. The Plomer Bray presence in Norfolk County and then later the appearance of Brays in Gloucester County suggest that Norfolk County often was a “stopping off” point, as it was right at the entrance of the Chesapeake Bay, before immigrants, or their descendants, continued on further up the

Chesapeake Bay. Other examples of this, related to my ancestor names, are Carter and Kenner, with John Carter I (1613-1669) and Richard Kenner (1600-1645), immigrants to Norfolk County from England, eventually ending further up the Chesapeake Bay (specifically the Northern Neck).

4. Houses and Churches

Archeological evidence indicates that by the 1630s and the establishment of parishes and counties, wooden houses were being built using wooden posts dug into the ground for foundation (posts that archaeologists would find). 1600s ancestors lived in such wooden houses built on wooden posts dug into the ground.

Ancestor families who, by the 1700s, started to acquire wealth through land and slave ownership and successful tobacco sales, and other enterprises, would begin to build more elaborate houses, e.g., made of brick, larger, with different designs, and with names. Ancestors who built such houses were:

ancestor family name	house name	location
Armisteads	Hesse	Mathews County
Fielding Lewis	Kenmore	Fredericksburg
Hills/John Carter III	Shirley	Charles City County
James Bowles	Sotterley	St. Mary's County, Maryland
Joseph Ring	Ringfield	York County
Warners	Warner Hall	Gloucester County
Wormeleys	Rosegill	Middlesex County

The following are more details on the houses listed in the table above:

Hesse (Armisteads). The first edition of Hesse was built in the 1670s by John Armistead (1630-1695). Hesse is on the Piankatank River, where it flows into the Chesapeake Bay. Hesse is near the Blades community in present day Mathews County (previously Gloucester County). The present house, which is privately owned and not available for touring, probably dates from the second quarter of the 18th century.

Kenmore (Fielding Lewis). Kenmore is a two-story, brick house built in the 1770s in Fredericksburg (on the Rappahannock River) by Fielding Lewis (1728-1781), where he lived with his second wife, Betty Washington Lewis (1773-1797). The original house is still standing and is opened for touring.

Shirley (Hills/John Carter III). Shirley is on land (along the James River in Charles City County) that was patented by Edward Hill (?-1660). The present house was built in the 1730s, where Elizabeth Hill ((1703-1771) (the inheritor of the house and land)) lived when, in 1723, she married John Carter III (1689-1742). Descendants of Elizabeth Hill and John Carter III continue to own Shirley, which is opened at times for touring.

Sotterley (James Bowles). The land that the present day Sotterley Plantation is on was the homesite of James Bowles (1681-1727). When James died, his land was inherited by his second wife, Rebecca Addison Bowles (1704-1749), who then remarried George Plater (1695-1655), with Rebecca and George Plater continuing to develop the homesite. Sotterley Plantation, near Hollywood, St. Mary's County, Maryland, on the Patuxent River, is opened for touring.

Ringfield (Joseph Ring). Built by Joseph Ring (1646-1703) in the 1690s, shortly after he acquired the land, Ringfield stood until 1920, when it was destroyed by fire. Ringfield was located on York River's King Creek, in York County, about six miles north from Yorktown. Early 20th Century photographs of the house survive.

Warner Hall (Warners and Lewises). Located on land patented by Augustine Warner I (1611-1674), Warner Hall is near Abingdon, Gloucester County, on the Severn River. The river distance from where Warner Hall is located on the Severn River to the Chesapeake River is about ten miles. The original house was built in 1674 and the current house built around 1900, which is operated as a bed and breakfast inn. The last Warner to own Warner Hall was Elizabeth Warner (1672-1715), who married John Lewis III (1669-1725), with ownership passing to Lewis family descendants. Lewises owned the Warner Hall property until the 1830s.

Rosegill (Wormeleys). The land patented in 1649 by Ralph Wormeley I (1618-1650) was where he and his descendants lived until the early 1800s. The current house, which has been enlarged and improved several times, was built in the 1740s. The Rosegill property, on the Rappahannock River, is less than a mile downriver from the town of Urbanna.

Of note is that all the houses identified above are located within short distances of Chesapeake Bay waterways. Chesapeake Bay waterways played a critical role in the development of the Chesapeake Bay colonies in the 1600s and 1700s.

The larger houses associated with large land holdings would began to be referred to as plantations. The large brick houses (and churches) that were built on the large tobacco-growing

plantations were probably attempts by the owners to reflect the English aristocracy lifestyle that the plantations owners ascribed to.

Ancestors during the 1700s would experience significant innovations in housing.

Churches that records indicate ancestors were associated with include:

ancestor family name	church/parish	location
Warner	Abingdon	Gloucester County
Wormeley	Christchurch	Middlesex County
Bennett/Yates	Glebe	Nansemond County
Martiau/Reade	Grace	Yorktown
Stott/Watson	Hungars	Northampton County
Luke	Monumental	Portsmouth
Armistead	St. John's	Hampton
Lewis	St. Peter's	New Kent County

The following are more details on the churches listed in the table above:

Abingdon. The current-day Abingdon Episcopal Church is on land donated by Col. Augustine Warner (1610-1674). The first brick building on the site was built in 1655. The church is in the Gloucester County town of Abingdon. The church is about five miles from Warner Hall, where Warners and Lewises lived in the 1600s and 1700s.

Christchurch. The current-day Christchurch Episcopal Church, located near Saluda, Middlesex County, is on land that was at one time part of the Wormeley Rosegill Plantation. By 1714, a still used brick building replaced a wooden structure. Ralph Wormeley II (1650-1703) is known to have served on the church's vestry. Another ancestor, Theophilus Hone (1621-1679), grandfather of Elizabeth Armistead (1667-1716), who married Ralph Wormeley II, reportedly is buried in the church's cemetery.

Glebe. The present-day Glebe Episcopal Church at 4400 Nansemond Parkway, Suffolk, is on land that in the 1600s and 1700s was the site of Puritan church services. The current Glebe Episcopal Church history refers to how this Puritan history predated and relates to the current church. Ancestor names associated with the Puritan church services include Bennett and Yates. The current church building dates back to the 1730s and is less than two miles from the Nansemond River.

Grace. Grace Episcopal Church is in Yorktown (111 Church Street). The church can trace its origins back to 1634, meeting not far from the current location. In the 1900s, the

remains of ancestors Nicolas Martiau (1591-1657), Elizabeth Page Martiau (1593-1640), Elizabeth Martiau Reade (1625-1692), and George Reade (1608-1674) were reburied in the church's cemetery.

Hungars. John Luke III (1690-1761) lived near Hungars Church, and a Johnathan Stott did work developing roads around Hungars Church in the 1690s. A Hungars Parish has had services in Northampton County since the 1640s. The current building was built in the 1740s.

Monumental. In the 1770s, Isaac Luke (1729-1784) was a founding member of the Monumental Methodist Church in Portsmouth. Monumental is one of the oldest Methodist Churches in Virginia and is now located at 450 Dinwiddie Street in Portsmouth.

St. John's. The present-day St. John's Episcopal Church in Hampton traces its history back to 1610, when worship services are known to have occurred near the present church site. Two ancestors, William Armistead (1610-1671) and Anne Ellis Armistead (1611-1678), are buried in St. John's cemetery.

St. Peter's. The current brick building being used by St. Peter's was built by 1704. It is located in New Kent County, about midway between West Point and Richmond. Ancestor John Lewis III (1669-1725) was a vestryman at St. Peter's. Martha Dandridge (1731-1802) was a member of St. Peter's before her marriage to George Washington (1732-1799). Martha Dandridge married into the Custis family. Ancestor connections to Custis' are provided in Section III. Ancestor's Histories – Chesapeake Bay's Eastern Shore Counties, above

At many houses and churches, one would likely see fences. Most vegetable gardens would likely be surrounded by a fence, probably made of wood. Stone and brick fences were also found. Many types (designs) of wooden fences, such as wattle, palisade, paled, plank, and post and rail provided security against wild animals eating crops, confinement of domestic animals, and barriers to attack by native Americans.

Many fence designs and types were brought by immigrants from England. Something as simple, and perhaps overlooked, as the transfer of fence designs, is a good example of the importance of useful technologies being transferred from where they were developed over a long time to new locations.

Many houses had separate buildings that served various functions, e.g., as kitchens, for storage, and as slave quarters.

5. Waterways

Being on Chesapeake Bay was perhaps the greatest asset for the Virginia Colony. The several rivers that flow into the Bay, the inlets and coves along the banks of these rivers, where sailing ships could dock to wharfs and load and unload tobacco and other goods, quick access to the Chesapeake Bay, and then the Atlantic Ocean, all provided support for a strong sailing ship export and import trade. The importance of ships and using the many waterways associated with the Virginia Colony should not be underestimated.

The Colony's roads were bad and overnight lodging lacking. Travel by horse was lengthy and tiring. Shipping products by road was difficult and the exception. So, traveling and shipping by water, with ships of multiple sizes and purposes, was the norm during the 1600s and into the 1700s. Ships and shipping management had a unique position in the 1600s and 1700s in the Virginia Colony, likely not easily understood and appreciated today, because of the reliance on the Virginia Colony's waterways then, but a lot less now.

Waterways allowed for much better exploration and settlement of the Colony.

Virginia waterways was necessary for several important Virginia industries such as shipbuilding, shipping, export-import commerce, and fishing.

The waterways at the mouth of the James, Elizabeth, and Nansemond Rivers became known as Hampton Roads. Roads apparently was used in the name Hampton Roads as roads was a mariner term to refer to safe areas for ships to anchor.

Fredericksburg reflects how the development of commerce in the Virginia Colony depended on the Chesapeake Bay waterways, how using the waterways promoted trade leading to economic growth. That Fredericksburg could operate as a port on the Rappahannock River greatly enhanced the town's economic development. An ancestor who lived in Fredericksburg, Fielding Lewis (1725-1781), owned ships and as a merchant used, to advantage, Fredericksburg as a port on the Rappahannock River.

Two areas along the Elizabeth River, where groups of ancestor families lived in the 1600s are Deep Creek, a small tributary of the Elizabeth River, and the Western Branch of the Elizabeth River. Both areas have inlets and coves, which would serve well as protection for the small boats that 1600s residents depended on for transportation. This pattern of living in such protective inlets and coves was also seen by the early settlers of the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore counties.

Ancestors who settled in both of these areas (along the Elizabeth River and on the Eastern Shore) greatly depended on the waterways for their livelihood as shipbuilders, ship carpenters, and mariners. These ancestor family names include Dale, Etheridge, Herbert, Lewellyn, Luke, and Veale.

In the late 1700s, interest developed in building canals that would be a way of using waterways to improve transport of goods and better trade. One canal was built during the 1790s south of the

Elizabeth River in the area of the Dismal Swamp. An ancestor, Frederick Lewis (1725-1781), was an investor in this canal building project. The canal helped in connecting the Chesapeake Bay with the Albemarle Sound in the North Carolina Colony.

6. Virginia Colony's Governance

In this section, I present information on how the Virginia Colony governance's development, and governance decisions and actions, might have affected and influenced my ancestors.

The Colony's government had an important influence on where development occurred. This was seen from the first beginnings of the Virginia Colony governance. A primary influence included where land was granted and where protections against native Americans were provided.

The Virginia Company that financed the Virginia expedition in 1607 was a private, stock distributing company, with investors providing funding for the expedition, and expecting profits (returns) on their investments. This made the Virginia expedition's orientation and perspective on governing, and other aspects, different compared to the other English-related expeditions to New England, which focused on religious perspectives.

From the beginning, the Virginia Colony existence had a strong connection to wealth making versus, for example, the Massachusetts and Maryland Colonies, which had strong connections to religious purposes. The Virginia Colony adventure, financed by the Virginia Company in England, was intended to bring profits to the company's English shareholders. These connections likely influenced government decision-making in diverse ways.

The Colony connection to wealth making likely influenced who immigrated to the Virginia Colony. For example, a higher percentage of immigrants who emphasized financial over religious pursuits, possibly came to Virginia versus going to Massachusetts and Maryland.

Practices over time in the Virginia expedition's management and policies, such as record keeping and reporting back to England, likely were strongly influenced by practice norms in England. The Virginia expedition leaders were chosen by company investors in London and could be replaced by those investors. The selected Virginia expedition leaders had a lot of authority but also a lot of accountability to investors in London. Whether profits were being obtained (they were not during the first several years) led to replacements of expedition leaders, which influenced residents, including my ancestors.

Such a system oriented towards continuing review in England with respect to economic success led to a management environment in Virginia that sought changes that would lead to improvements and successes related to profit making. A conclusion is that the evolution of the management system fortunately took place in such a way that it had flexibility and the ability to enact change, which was an essential characteristic that help to account for the Colony's eventual success and prosperity. Perhaps one of the most important characteristics developed by the Colony government was flexibility in its management and decision making.

A steady changeover in leadership likely helped to account for the flexibility. Also, the ability of Colony residents to vote (with the establishment of the House of Burgesses, the Colony residents gained the ability to vote and send representatives in the House of Burgesses) added to increased flexibility.

Although in 1624, the English Monarchy took over the management of the Virginia Colony, an emphasis on profits from the Colony seems to have continued, perhaps even more so, and with expectations of greater accountability by the Colony management back to England. The Colony became known as a Royal Colony, which may have change some ancestors' perspectives.

Early on, in the 1610s, the Jamestown Council (that morphed into the Virginia Colony Council), the ruling authority over Colony settlers, pursued setting up several settlements along the James River, on the York River, and on the Eastern Shore.

In 1619, the Jamestown government recognized four areas as separate communities and called them: James Cittie; Charles Cittie; Elizabeth Cittie; and Henrico Cittie. James Cittie was the area around Jamestown, on both sides of the James River. Charles Cittie was an area up the James River from Jamestown. Elizabeth Cittie was the area round the mouth of the James and York Rivers. Henrico Cittie was an area further up the James River, beyond Charles Cittie. The term Cittie did not mean that the areas were cities as used by that term today. Then, in the early 1600s, the English term cittie had more the meaning of a permanently settled area. I had ancestors who settled in the Charles and Elizabeth Cittie communities.

As settlements developed, they would be designated as Church of England parishes and given names and referred to as parishes. Such parishes were recognized as representing an organizing system upon which to govern. Eventually groups of parishes, clearly adjacent, would be recognized as counties. In this respect, associations were created between religion (the Church of England), governing, geography, and parish names. Church of England congregations had strong influences on county affairs.

In 1634, the Jamestown government added four additional communities recognized as permanently settled areas. These were: Accomack; Charles River; Warwick; and Warrosquoake. Accomack was an area on the Eastern Shore. Charles River was an area further up the York River from Elizabeth Cittie. Warwick Cittie was an area on the James River between James Cittie and Elizabeth Cittie. And Warrosquoake was the area across the James River from Warrick Cittie, which today is the Isle of Wight County. Warrosquoake was used as the name because a Native American tribe named Warrosquoake lived in the area. Warrosquoake was renamed in 1637 as Isle of Wight. I have ancestors who immigrated to Accomack, Charles City, and Warrosquoake Counties.

Sufficient settlements had developed and in close proximity to one another, that Colony leaders recognized the need for counties.

Names used (adopted) by Colony leaders for the various assembled communities would change over time.

The Virginia Colony Council decided in the 1630s that the counties (initially called shires, a term adopted from use in England) would be required to establish a governmental oversight body that would meet on a monthly basis. In 1634, record keeping was switch from a central responsibility in the capital Jamestown to a local responsibility (the counties). Colony management recognized the need to obtain financial support from the counties to finance the Colony’s government. This led to the establishment of land taxes, known as quitrents, collected at the county level.

The Eastern Shore County (initially only one Virginia Colony was established on the Eastern Shore, which eventually will became two Eastern Shore Colony counties - Accomack and Northampton) established a governmental “body” in 1632, with members referred to as justices. The body initially met in the justices’ private homes. This group would soon be referred to as a court. The primary purpose of this court initially was to resolve disputes related to sales and purchases and other financially related transactions. Similar developments occurred in other counties.

The evolution of the Virginia Colony governance system continued. One change, in the 1640s, was the establishment of two groups responsible for management: a group called the Council, with members appointed by the governor, and another group called the House of Burgesses, with members elected at the community level. The primary role of the Council early on was to advise the Governor and serve as a court in certain matters. A primary role of the House of Burgesses related to taxes.

Several ancestors served in the Colony government structure during the 1600s and 1700s.

Ancestors who served in the House of Burgesses were:

ancestor	birth-death dates
Edward Hill I	? -1663
George Reade	1608 - 1674
Richard Bennett	1609 -1675
Ralph Wormeley I	1618 - 1651
John Armstead	1630 - 1695
Edward Hill II	1637 - 1700
Augustine Warner II	1642 - 1681
Ralph Wormeley II	1650 - 1703
Edward Hill III	1665 - 1726
John Lewis II	1633 - 1689
John Lewis III	1669 - 1725
John Lewis IV	1694 - 1754
Joseph Ring	1646-1703
Ralph Wormeley IV	1715-1790

Fielding Lewis	1725 - 1781
----------------	-------------

The following ancestors served on the Council:

ancestor	birth-death dates
Edward Hill I	? -1663
Nicholas Martiau	1591 - 1657
George Reade	1608 - 1674
Richard Bennett	1609 -1675
Augustine Warner I	1610-1674
John Armstead	1630 - 1695
Ralph Wormeley II	1650 - 1703

The following ancestors had appointed positions in the Virginia Colony government:

ancestor	birth-death dates	position
George Reade	1608 - 1674	Secretary of the Colony; acting Governor
Richard Bennett	1609 - 1675	acting Governor
Augustine Warner I	1610-1674	Speaker of the House of Burgesses
Ralph Wormeley II	1650 - 1703	Secretary of the Colony; President of the Council

Out of the Virginia Colony government transformations evolved the importance of local governance. A good example of this might be found in the 1600s when the counties of the Eastern Shore (Accomack and Northampton), because of the Chesapeake Bay transportation barrier, had to, and did, rely more on local decision-making and governance, versus receiving directions from across the Bay.

During the 1600s, management changes would be evident. For example, one problem recognized by Virginia Colony management was a need for more immigrants, such as farm workers with needed trade skills. Solving this problem likely was behind the establishment of the headright system, a system that by the end of the 1600s (it was ended in 1699) prove to be successful in increasing the number of immigrants. Developing prosperous counties needed a long-term process that provided sufficient manpower having necessary skills, adequate tools and other materials, and overcoming hardships caused by disease and other calamities.

The outcomes of the headright system lead to an important development – a greater number of communities and towns. With these new communities and towns, management and policy initiatives and responsibilities shifted even more from a central “authority,” for example, those in the Colony capital (Jamestown and later Williamsburg), to a local “authority,” for example, those living in the counties. Such a shift would never be complete, e.g., totally “central” or totally “local,” leading to tensions in political philosophy perspectives in America continuing to the present.

Another Colony-needed change was the establishment of communities (towns) at various locations along the James, York, and Elizabeth Rivers, and across the Chesapeake Bay on the Eastern Shore. This led to the establishment of Trading Town Acts, the first being created in the 1680s. The Trading Town Acts seem to be a good example of actions originating in General Assembly meetings to manage economic development. Such actions represented attempts at aligning the right relationships between governmental oversight and private enterprises to optimize economic considerations. The Acts are good examples of attempts at governmental-private enterprise interactions that will continue to the present day.

Although the Trading Town Acts represents good attention on the part of government, it also represents how such attentions can fail. Only a few of the planned export/import-focused towns, with planned features, came into existence.

The late-1600s government initiatives to establish more towns was at a time when only three towns existed: Jamestown, Norfolk, and Yorktown. The population of these three towns represented a small percentage of the total Colony population. Many more people lived on plantations and small farms than in towns.

By the early 1700s, the Colony’s leaders recognized the problems that Jamestown had as a town and capital site (such as the mosquitoes and tidal smells), so that a decision was made to move the capital away from the James River to the middle of the peninsula that Jamestown was on, about five miles north, northeast from Jamestown. This new town was called Williamsburg.

As Norfolk town's commercial success grew, the Norfolk area started to be more influential in the Virginia Colony's governmental affairs. One example of this was an attempt in 1735 to move the Hampton Roads Customs House activities from Hampton to Norfolk, on the basis that Norfolk was a much larger port and having the Customs House in Norfolk benefited shippers more.

Another example of Norfolk's increasing colony-wide influence was the granting of House of Burgesses representation to Norfolk town, after its incorporation in the 1730s.

The Virginia Colony government provided incentives to shipbuilders, perhaps in response to the greater influence of House of Burgesses representation by citizens from shipbuilding areas such as Norfolk.

A John Carter, likely the ancestor John Carter I (1613-1669), served as a representative from Norfolk County to the House of Burgesses from 1641 to 1643. John Carter was a representative in 1633 from the Upper Norfolk County to the Virginia Council. John Carter I died in Lancaster County, Northern Neck, in 1669. He possibly had a son (or in some other way related), named Edward Carter (died in 1682 in England), who represented Nansemond County in the House of Burgesses. Edward lived along the Nansemond River.

Many of my Norfolk County and south of the James River ancestors were involved in shipbuilding and as mariners and merchants associated with imports and exports. Virginia Colony regulations and laws related to the shipping industry affected these ancestors. Such laws could have great effects, such as who the colonists could trade with and whether only English-owned ships could be used in importing and exporting out of Colony ports.

7. Economy

In this section, I present information related to how the Virginia Colony's economy developed and how that development might have affected my ancestors' lives and what they experience.

a. Economic Development Beginnings

Auxiliary industries during the 1600s and 1700s were the processing of grain and timber at mills; the extraction of and processing of minerals, such as iron ore; and production of consumer goods, such as pottery, furniture, and textiles. The plantation class was a major investor in processing mills and mineral extraction and processing. I had ancestors who ran mills and owned iron ore mining sites. By the 1770s, iron products were the third highest export category to England, behind tobacco and wheat.

The multiple inlets and creeks on the Chesapeake Bay side of the Eastern Shore was a focus of the Eastern Shore economic activity. The inlets and creeks would serve well in support of the creating of shipping capabilities desperately needed by English settlements for success. The inlets and creeks would provide protection from weather, as well as foreign threats (e.g., the Dutch and French), and were suitable for ship building, ship repairs, and for establishing wharfs

and stores for handling shipping supplies. One limitation of the many Eastern Shore inlets and creeks were not being very deep and large – probably not as important in the 1600s as in the 1700s, as the sailing ships became increasingly large and in need of deeper depths to navigate. This depth limitation of the inlets and creeks could possibly account for the decline of the Eastern Shore counties as centers of shipbuilding and repairs by the 1700s. And this decline was possibly a reason for ancestor Isaac Luke (1729-1784)'s migration from the Eastern Shore to the Norfolk County sometime before the 1760s.

The 1607-initiated London private stock company to develop profit-making enterprises across the Atlantic proved to be unsuccessful in making profits, and by the 1620s the company essentially went bankrupt. This led in 1624 to England's royal family system to take over the ownership of and management of the Virginia Colony. The Virginia Colony became more successful economically after the management change, perhaps because it had more backing by the English government.

In the early days of the Virginia Colony, profits were non-existent. The minerals, food stuffs, and other hoped-for materials derived from the land was not sufficiently and easily-enough available to make the expedition effort worthwhile. Land in itself was not sufficient for profits. Only later would land, smartly used, lead to profits. This happened when Europeans acquired a great demand for tobacco pipe-smoking, and Virginia was able to meet this fast-growing demand. Tobacco a critical element in the Virginia Colony's success.

One favorable factor in the early development of the Virginia Colony in the 1600s was the emergence of increasingly greater demand for tobacco in England. This caused prices and demand to be adequate enough to cover the expenses of growing and shipping the tobacco to England and also providing good profits. By the mid-1600s, estimates are that the Virginia Colony was exporting around 500,000 pounds of tobacco to England a year. Several ancestors grew tobacco for exports to England.

A primary purpose of the initial Eastern Shore settlement (ten men who were sent there by the Jamestown Council) was to develop the ability to extract salt from the Chesapeake Bay's salt water in sufficient quantities to supply Jamestown and the other settlements with salt that was critically needed for the Colony's meat preservation. Just how successful and to what extent the salt-producing goals for the Eastern Shore settlement met the needs of the rest of the Colony has not been discovered. In the Eastern Shore counties, salt production for the benefit of the Colony would continue to be pursued and take place through the 1600s. But the full amounts of the Colony's needed salt were likely never provided by Eastern Shore salt production.

Apparently in the 1640s mills were beginning to be constructed and used in the Eastern Shore counties, suggesting an important milestone in the counties' economic development.

Data suggests that Virginia Colony ship workers and mariners earned more than their counterparts in England. This might be due to market forces, e.g., the supply of ship workers and mariners in the colonies was less capable than in England to meet the demand for ship workers and mariners. This possibly could be a reason for ship workers and mariners' immigration to the Virginia Colony. Several of my ancestors were ship workers and mariners.

Local economic development had a major influence on other aspects related to the localities. For example, land south of the James River proved to be poor for growing tobacco sufficiently well to compete economically, compared to land on the peninsulas north of the James River. This difference might account, at least partially, for differences in how people lived south of the James River compared to north of it. Counties to the north, where tobacco harvesting was successful, developed much larger “plantation” size farming and lifestyles that went with large, rich plantations. South of the James River would see the development of more merchant, shipping, and shipbuilding economies, with different family perspectives. For example, perspectives of families south of the James River seem to be much less “pro-royal” and Anglican, more Puritan-dissenter oriented. I had ancestors in counties south and north of the James River.

The development of a merchant class in the Virginia Colony’s 1700s was a critical component to the success of the Virginia Colony. A merchant class is vital for the welfare of growing populations needed for growing towns, and a successful economy. Some of my ancestors were in what I would describe as a merchant class.

A key to economic development in the Virginia Colony was interactions between Virginia Colony locations. Critical to these interactions were travel, which were primarily done on the significant waterways that the Colony had. Many ancestors assisted in the use of these waterways by being shipbuilders, ship carpenters, and mariners.

Economic historians suggest that in the 1700s, the purchasing power per colonist was better than for citizens in England. This suggests a prospering economy by comparison to England, benefitting my immigrant ancestors from England.

A scarcity of skilled workers raised salary levels to attract such workers. This may be one of the reasons that ancestor Isaac Luke (1729-1784) migrated from the Virginia Colony’s Eastern Shore to Norfolk County in the mid-1700s.

In the Virginia Colony, currency in the 1600s and a sizable portion of the 1700s was pounds of tobacco. Workers were paid in tobacco warehouse receipts (tobacco notes), which in term could be used by the workers for purchases.

English coins, as well as Spanish pieces of eight coins (Spanish currency was the closest to an international currency that existed in the 1600s), were in circulation and could be accepted for payments, but coordinating the coins’ values against one another, and against tobacco prices, could be a tedious, uncertain task.

During the 1600s, the highest prices that ordinaries (taverns) could charge for meals were fixed by the Colony government.

Indentured servants, in return for providing labor to their “masters” (the person the indentured servant was obligated to) for a stated period of time, would receive food, clothing, and lodging during that period.

Social, political, and economic conditions in England in the 1600s produced high unemployment and poverty. This likely greatly enhanced the number of English immigrants to the Virginia Colony, via the indentured servant system.

During the Cromwell (the Parliamentarian) period, in the mid-1600s, many royalists voluntarily left England for the Virginia Colony, but many were also forced to leave for Virginia.

The forced immigration of English convicts to the colonies in the 1700s by the English government, which was very upsetting to Colony authorities, could have played a role in the colonies seeking separation from England rule.

Bricks were produced in the 1600s, but in limited quantities, and mostly used in chimney construction. Also, early houses were mostly constructed by the owners of the houses.

Shipbuilding was one of the Virginia Colony's first industries. Many ancestors worked in the shipbuilding industry.

Large plantations usually employed several "trades/craftsmen" workers – which helped in developing a needed craftsman population in the towns that grew after 1700.

The English government tried to suppress the manufacturer of goods in the colonies, so that the colonies would be a stronger market for English manufactured goods.

Many large plantation owners in the 1700s pursued income-producing activities, in addition to tobacco growing, such as operating mills and iron production. An ancestor who pursued iron production and manufacturing iron-based products was Fielding Lewis (1725-1781).

Although large tobacco-growing plantations had economic success for the owners, Colony-wide economic success mostly began only when towns started to be created and successful, in the 1700s. Section IV 3, above, identifies ancestors who were involved in town development and management.

b. Shipbuilding

Encouraging and improving shipbuilding and ship repair technologies and capabilities were an important, high-level strategic goal of the Virginia Colony's General Assembly. Incentives were provided by the Assembly to those pursuing shipbuilding and repair. Due to first, the large amount of waterways that permeate Virginia and the Virginia Colony; second, a vital industry being the export of goods (e.g., tobacco and forest materials) to England and other places; and third, the need for Colony residents to cross the waterways to achieve needed interchanges with one another, it is not surprising that the General Assembly would view the development of shipbuilding and repair as a priority.

Recognizing and setting up shipbuilding and ship repairing areas was an important objective of early Virginia Colony governing authorities. Two such areas recognized as such were the Eastern Shore counties and along the Elizabeth River in Lower Norfolk County.

Shipbuilding and ship repairing would become an important Virginia Colony Eastern Shore industry in the 1600s. This is not surprising do to the location of the Eastern Shore counties on the Chesapeake Bay and the several very suitable inlets and creeks for ship use, helping to develop a shipping industry. But by the 1700s, the Eastern Shore counties' shipbuilding activities greatly declined, for a possible reason being the inlets and creeks were of insufficient sizes and depths to support building and repairing the larger ships used in the 1700s.

Other Virginia Colony areas, besides the Eastern Shore, engaged in 1600s area shipbuilding and repairs. Ships were built in York County, along the York River. Another area having recognized shipbuilding was Elizabeth City County, at Point Comfort, and along the Hampton River. In the 1600s, Point Comfort was known for having good careening capabilities (ship bottom cleaning and repairing).

In 1697, Virginia Colony government information indicates eight shallops, eleven brigantines, and fifteen sloops were built in the Colony. However, large ocean-going ships were slow to be built at Virginia shipyards. This could have been because smaller ships were much more in demand from Virginia customers and England dominated the market for large ships. Smaller ships had, for example, a capacity of 100 to 200 tons; large ships, 400 to 500 tons. A 100-ton ship might be in the 60-foot length range, while a 500-ton ship in the 160-foot length range.

The 1700s saw the growth in Norfolk County, along the Elizabeth River, of shipbuilding and repairing capacities to the point that by the end of the 1700s, Norfolk County had the largest shipbuilding and repair trade anywhere on Chesapeake Bay. Norfolk County was also a center of rope making, an extremely important commerce during the 1700s in support of sailing ships.

By the mid-1700s, the Norfolk County-area waterways, to include what would become known as Hampton Roads, would dwarf, in shipbuilding, repairing, and the export/import trade, other Virginia Colony areas on the Chesapeake Bay.

In the 1760s, a "naval yard", to be called Gosport, was established in Portsmouth, along the Elizabeth River's southern shore. The name Portsmouth came from Portsmouth, England. Gosport was also the name of a shipyard in Portsmouth, England.

1760-1771 data show the numbers of shipyards in the Virginia Colony as:

Alexander	11
Elizabeth River	3
Gloucester County	7
Hampton	1
Norfolk County	83
Princess Anne	3
Suffolk	3

At least three hundred ships are believed to have been built in seventeen Virginia shipyards during the 1763-1774 twelve-year period. Twelve of the seventeen shipyards were located within a 35-mile radius of Hampton Roads. This data supports why an ancestor, Isaac Luke (1729-1784), would relocate from Virginia's Eastern Shore to Portsmouth in the middle 1700s.

The forest products coming from the Dismal Swamp, south of the Hampton Roads area, were also important resources for the Norfolk area shipbuilding and ship repairing activities. These products were also important exports. The forest products included turpentine, rosin, tar, pitch, and wood.

To meet the need for planks and other wood products, sawmills were needed and producing such mills was a Colony objective. Results were seen by the 1630s, when mills started to provide planks. Once these planks were available, barkues, pinnaces, and row boats started to appear in higher numbers around Chesapeake Bay. By 1650, coastal-capable ships were being built and by the 1660s, ocean-capable ships were being built.

The size of the ships that were built in the Virginia Colony increased throughout the 1600s and 1700s. Ship types built by Chesapeake Bay shipbuilding included: shallops, sloops, ketches, brigantins, frigates, and pinnaces. Shipbuilding and repairs require advanced skills, tools, and planning.

The shipbuilding industry was one of the most important, largest industries developed by the end of the 1700s in the Virginia Colony. And during this time important technological advances in the shipbuilding industry took place.

Specially designed boats (e.g., barges, scallops, and sloops) were designed and built to move tobacco.

As often was the case with developments in the Virginia Colony, friction, tensions, and controversies emerged between Colony residents and groups in England. One example of this was difficulties that English shipbuilders had from time-to-time with shipbuilders in the Virginia Colony. Shipbuilding became so competent in the Virginia Colony by the late 1600s that English shipbuilders were complaining about the competition. These difficulties increased in the 1700s as the Colony shipbuilding industry grew.

This growth and the opportunities shipbuilding and repairs provided for employment in the Virginia Colony would see Englishmen with shipbuilding skills immigrate to the Virginia Colony. Skilled workmen were required in these endeavors and were heavily recruited in England. This possibly accounts for some of my shipbuilding-skilled ancestors immigrating to the Virginia Colony.

By the 1700s, the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore counties' shipbuilding activities greatly declined, for one plausible reason being the inlets and creeks there were of insufficient depths to support building and repairing the larger ships being used in the 1700s. However, shipbuilding activities in Norfolk County greatly increased during the 1700s. This might have been an

explanation for why Isaac Luke (1729-1784), son of John Luke III (1690-1761), left the Eastern Shore, migrating to Norfolk County.

Ancestors who worked in the shipbuilding and repair industry include:

ancestor	birth-death date	resident
John Yates	1607-1648	Lower Norfolk County
Isaac Luke	1729-1784	Portsmouth
John Luke IV	1793-1866	Portsmouth

Also, records indicate that members of the following Portsmouth ancestor families worked in shipbuilding and repair: Ballentine, Dale, Etheridge, Herbert, Horne, and Lewellyn. Ancestor families that included mariners (e.g., ship captains and ship crewmen) were Dales, Herberts, and Lukes. George Veale, a member of the Portsmouth Veale ancestor family, was a wharf builder in the 1770s. George also was an apprentice of Isaac Luke in 1757.

In the late 1770s, Norfolk County shipbuilders built a schooner for a Northern Neck customer Robert Carter of Nomini. Robert Carter was a member of the Northern Neck Carter ancestor family.

c. Trade - Exports and Imports

Being on Chesapeake Bay was perhaps one of the greatest assets for the Virginia Colony. The several rivers that flow into the Bay, the inlets and coves along the banks of these rivers, where sailing ships could dock to wharfs and load and unload tobacco and other goods, have quick access to the Chesapeake Bay, and then to the Atlantic Ocean, all provided support for a strong sailing-ship export and import trade.

Ancestors who had export-import merchant-related activities are:

ancestor	birth-death date	resident	merchant activity
James Miller	1600-1657	York County	Scottish merchant in tobacco trade

Richard Bennett	1609-1675	Nansemond County	merchant, connections with The Netherlands
Edward Hill II	1637-1700	Charles City County	provided merchant services
Henry Fielding	1670-1712	King & Queen County	ship owner/tobacco grower
James Bowles	1681-1727	St. Mary's County MD	represented father (Tobias Bowles, 1659-1727, London merchant); Collector of Customs for the Potomac District
Ralph Wormeley IV	1715-1790	Urbanna - Middlesex County	Urbanna merchant, tobacco exporter
Fielding Lewis	1725-1781	Fredericksburg	store owner merchant/ship owner

A record from 1647 indicates that anchored in the James River were thirty-one ships – 12 of which were identified as English, twelve as Dutch, and seven from New England. That 39% of the ships (12/31 = 39%) were Dutch is another indication of the magnitude of Dutch interactions in the Virginia Colony. That 23% (7/31) of the ships were from New England also is interesting in that it suggests substantial trade was taking place between the Virginia Colony and colonies in New England.

In the mid-1600s, tensions arose in governmental affairs between England and Colony residents over trade with the Dutch. Mid-1600s prominent colonists such as Argall Yeardley, Edmond Scarborough, and John Curtis, all Eastern Shore residents, had strong connections with the Dutch. Ancestors Richard Bennett (1609-1675) and Ralph Wormeley (1618-1650) also had connections with the Dutch.

In the General Assembly of 1680, a “Trading Town Act” was passed as an effort to improve the regulations, loading and unloading, and other practices associated with the Colony export and import trade. A proposal of the act was to establish import/export towns in each county where export/import trade was substantial. New towns would be created at sites on waterways with substantial export/import trade. Towns were planned for the following areas:

Accomack, Onancock
Elizabeth City, westside of Hampton River
Gloucester, Tindell’s Point
Lancaster, Corrotoman River

Middlesex, westside of Wormeley's Creek
Nansemond, Huff's Point
Northampton, northside of King's Creek
Northumberland
Warrick, Deep Creek
Westmoreland, Nomini
York, Mr. Reade's land

This list above identifies important arrival and departure locations of exports and imports in the late 1600s. In the 1700s, a significant reduction of sites with substantial export/import trade occurred.

The Eastern Shore inlets and creeks were likely valuable in support of the tobacco export and import trade from the Virginia Colony, especially in the 1600s, as they could provide a final (or initial) stopping point for ships about to enter (or leave) the Atlantic Ocean, traveling to (or from) England and elsewhere.

In the 1600s, the Eastern Shore counties grew and exported substantial amounts of tobacco. Tobacco exports were a predominant part of these counties' economy. Ships leaving and coming into Eastern Shore inlets with exports or imports went not just to and from England but to and from New England and the West Indies. Although exports from the Virginia Colony were, by policy, intended only for England, the Colony, in practice, had substantial export (import) trade with the West Indies and other colonies in North America, ignoring England's directives.

In the 1760s, records indicate that shipping took place between the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore and Philadelphia, Maryland, Rhode Island, Boston, Barbados, and Halifax (Canada).

Custom houses, tobacco inspection stations, and tobacco warehouses were government initiatives to support and regulate the tobacco trade.

Fredericksburg, which was a major port on the Rappahannock River by the middle 1700s, was a site of a tobacco inspection station. Many ports, besides Fredericksburg, had tobacco inspection stations.

A tobacco warehouse was established at Gloucester Point in Gloucester County in the 1630s. Norfolk County established, in the 1770s, a tobacco warehouse on the Elizabeth River in the area known as Town Point. Warehouses were established in other locations and were an important part of the tobacco trade.

One of the first, if not the first, Colony custom house operation was inaugurated in Yorktown, through which exports and imports were regulated.

In Lower Norfolk County, by the 1670s/80s, a "storehouse" (warehouse) would be built by the Colony to store tobacco prior to export and to store imports from England. This storehouse inaugurated Norfolk's official functioning as a port. By 1705, Norfolk started shipping to other

areas (ports) on the Chesapeake Bay. By the 1720s, Norfolk (which then had been a port since the 1670s) had over twenty docks for cargo ships. In 1728, William Byrd wrote that Norfolk was the largest of towns exporting and importing, mostly with the West Indies. Goods exported included beef, pork, flour, and lumber.

A large export for Norfolk was lumber and the various other products (e.g., pitch, tar) that could be produced from a forest. Forest areas in and around the Dismal Swamp, south of the Elizabeth River, and further south to the North Carolina/Virginia Colonies border, accounted for a lot of lumber and other forest products. England needed these products as their international trade and Navy grew. The West Indies was also a large recipient of these forest products. Norfolk was a center of trade to the West Indies.

In the 1600s and 1700s, Virginia was abundant in forests and trees that not only provided materials for export but were also important in supporting the Virginia Colony shipbuilding industry.

Corn and meat, especially hogs, relatively large agricultural outputs of Norfolk and Nansemond Counties, also accounted for significant trade to the West Indies. Not only was trade with the West Indies significant for Norfolk and Portsmouth, but so was trade with other colonies, e.g., Maryland and the New England colonies.

As Norfolk's commercial success grew, Norfolk started to be more influential in the Virginia Colony's governmental affairs. One example of this was an attempt in 1735 to move the Hampton Roads Customs House activities from Hampton to Norfolk, on the basis that Norfolk was a much larger port and having the Customs House in Norfolk benefited shippers more. By 1775, Norfolk was a major shipbuilding and export/import center.

In the 1700s, many of the successful Norfolk and Portsmouth merchants, with export and import commerce interests, had their origins in the sea trade, e.g., starting out as ship masters (captains).

In the 1700s, Virginia and other colonies were an important source of iron for England.

The greater imports to the Virginia Colony compared to Colony's exports to England met that silver and gold coins flowed in greater quantities from the Virginia Colony to England than vice versa. This resulted in a scarcity of coins in the Virginia Colony, a problem in conducting transactions in the Colony. One result of this was possibly the establishment of tobacco quantities as a payment system (a currency).

In the 1600s and 1700s, high risks, such as storms, ship malfunctions, poor navigational practices, and privateering, were involved in shipping. Shipping between England and its colonies involved a lot of risk, not only from weather and ship sea worthiness, but also the many privateers seeking fortunes from ships at sea. In response to the threat of privateers, convoys accompanied by war ships became a norm. Such convoys required more interactions and planning between English traders and colony exporters and importers.

Much of the tobacco that was exported from the large tobacco plantations was loaded on ships that docked at wharfs/piers owned by the plantations. These plantations were along the James, York, Rappahannock, and Potomac Rivers. Ancestors who were large tobacco plantation owners included:

John Carter III (1689-1742)	Charles City County
Edward Hill III (1665-1726)	Charles City County
John Lewis IV (1694-1754)	Gloucester County
Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790)	Middlesex County

Large tobacco plantations were at their peak in the first half of the 1700s. These large plantations only existed because of developmental work done by earlier generations.

Ships carrying tobacco to England would often carry little else. The ships would return with mixed cargos.

The ability to load tobacco on ships directly from the large plantations' docks and wharfs, located on the plantation land on the rivers, was a huge competitive advantage in developing a successful tobacco export business. The large tobacco-growing plantations took advantage of this competitive advantage to develop substantial amounts of wealth which not only benefited the growers but also the Virginia Colony.

Through the middle 1700s, the balance of trade for the colony would always be, in economic terms, a deficit, in that the total costs of imports were always greater than the total prices received for exports. This would be a large advantage for England, providing at least some of the capital that supported its 1600s and 1700s rise as a global power. This trade surplus perhaps was one of the greatest benefits England acquired from its overseas colony adventures. However, beginning in the middle 1700s, England received less and less trade benefit with its American colonies, leading to harsher and harsher terms and oversight with the colonies, likely a major tension leading to the colony's rebellion in the late 1700s.

d. Ports

Virginia Colony towns that operated as ports in the 1600s and 1700s included:

town	county	waterway	current status as port
Fredericksburg	Spotsylvania	on the Rappahannock River	small

Gloucestertown	Gloucester	on the York River	none
Hampton	Elizabeth City	on the mouth of the York River at the Chesapeake Bay	small
Jamestown	James City	on the James River	none
Norfolk	Norfolk	on Hampton Roads	large
Onancock	Accomack	the Eastern Shore, on the Chesapeake Bay	none
Portsmouth	Norfolk	on the Elizabeth River	large
Suffolk	Nansemond	on the Nansemond River	none
Tappahannock	Essex	on the Rappahannock River	none
Urbanna	Middlesex	on the Rappahannock River	none
Yorktown	York	on the York River	none

As ships became bigger, requiring more water depth to operate, as roads improved and transport on roads became more economical, and with the emergence of larger ships, the use of many of these ports began to decrease.

In 1662, Jamestown ceased to be the required port of entry for imports. This would be a major development for the growth of other towns as ports.

Ports where ancestors lived or interacted with for commercial reasons include Fredericksburg, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Tappahannock, Urbana, and Yorktown.

Yorktown was the port that imports for Williamsburg came through. This would be significant for Yorktown's welfare, as Williamsburg grew in size and importance as the Virginia Colony's capital.

1700s ports were critical to the economic development and welfare of the Virginia Colony. The development of canals and railroad projects in the early 1800s, such as the James River and Kanawha Canal project; the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Project along the Potomac River, a project related to the port of Alexandria on the Potomac River; the Manchester Road Project, a road creation project to serve the Richmond port; and the Chesterfield Rail project to serve the Richmond port, were enacted because of the importance of these ports.

By the late 1700s, when Virginia tobacco was no longer in great demand, and prices were greatly reduced and profits evaporated, Yorktown greatly diminished as a port, and as a prominent Virginia town.

In the 1600s and 1700s, England had, relative to today, much more significant ports in Barbados and Bermuda. Interactions between these ports and Norfolk and Portsmouth were substantial, compared to later day interactions.

Fredericksburg, which was a major port on the Rappahannock River by the mid-1700s, was a site of a tobacco inspection station. Many ports, besides Fredericksburg, had tobacco inspection stations.

By the late 1700s, Norfolk and Portsmouth became a leading East Coast port rivaling most other East Coast ports.

In the 1700s, Glouchestertown tried to serve as a port, but not competitively against the port established at Yorktown, just across the York River. Not being competitive as a port would account for Glouchestertown demise, as lack of sufficient competitiveness would also diminish other ports such as Jamestown, Onancock, Suffolk, Tappahannock, Urbana, and Yorktown.

By the 1730s, Norfolk had more than twenty wharfs, far exceeding other Virginia Colony ports.

Because of the Chesapeake area waterways being so important in how people traveled in the Virginia Colony, ports became and served as primary transportation hubs during the 1700s. Such hubs were important contributors to the Colony's economic growth.

e. Land and Agriculture

An important large incentive for English persons immigrating to the Virginia Colony likely was the ability to own land. Little land was available for ownership in England, as most of it was already owned by a relatively few large landowning, aristocratic families, with little, if any, of that land coming on the market. And if it did, likely at unaffordable prices for most English persons.

The following table shows ancestors known to own land based on archival records:

ancestor name	birth/death dates	acres	location
Nicholas Martiau	1591-1657	hundreds	York County
Richard Bennett I	1609-1675	thousands	Nansemond County and Maryland
James Neale	1615-1684	hundreds	Maryland
John Yates	1607-1648	hundreds	Nansemond County
Ralph Wormeley I and descendants	1618-1650	thousands	York, Middlesex Counties
John Armistead and descendants	1630-1695	hundreds	Elizabeth City, Gloucester Counties
John Lewis II and descendants	1633-1689	thousands	New Kent, Gloucester Counties
Henry Stott I	1634-1669	hundreds	Northampton County
Edward Hill II	1635-1700	thousands	Charles City County
Augustine Warner II and descendants	1642-1681	hundreds	York, Gloucester Counties
Joseph Ring	1643-1727	hundreds	York County
Edward Lewellyn I	1660-?	a few	southern branch of the Elizabeth River, Norfolk County
Henry Fielding	1670-1712	hundreds	King & Queen County

James Bowles	1681-1727	hundreds	St. Mary's County, MD
Richard Bennett II	1684-1667	thousands	Maryland
John Carter III and descendants	1689-1742	thousands	Charles City, Lancaster, York, Albemarle Counties
John Luke III	1690-1761	a few	along Nasswaddox Creek in Northampton County
Paul Dale and descendants	1715-1743	a few	southern branch of the Elizabeth River, Norfolk County
Fielding Lewis	1725-1781	1,500	Spotsylvania County
Sarah Veale and descendants	1749-1809	a few	Portsmouth
Paul Dale Luke	1761-1819	a few	Portsmouth
Robert Etheridge IV	1772-1828	a few	Norfolk County

A few immigrants, through various means, such as drive and innovation, acquired enormous amounts of land in the Virginia Colony. And it was from these few, early Colony immigrants that many, of what became the families referred to as first families of Virginia, developed. Ancestor families who would become large landowners by the end of the 1700s included Carter, Hill, Lewis, and Wormeley families.

Likely reasons for becoming large landowners in the Virginia Colony include:

- Arrive early in the Colony (in the 1600s).
- Make effective use of the headright system.
- Be in a family with descendants, succeeding generations who continue to own the land and add to the amount successfully.
- Acquire and use African slaves successfully.
- Participate in the Colony government as members of governing bodies and as office holders.

Often large landowners would own land in multiple locations in the Virginia Colony. For example, one of my ancestors, John Carter III (1689-1742), own land in Charles City, Lancaster, York, and Albemarle Counties.

However, importantly to note, enough land was available for ownership, such that many immigrants would be able to acquire enough land to be small to middling farmers. As these immigrants acquired what land was available, a central theme in 1700s and 1800s in America would be children of immigrants migrating further west where unowned land was available.

That so much land was available, further west, can have negative consequences. If land is easily available by relocating then innovation related to improving the land productivity might suffer.

A favorable factor in helping the Virginia Colony and its counties grow and develop was the adoption of a new land ownership policy known as the headright system. Land was granted to those paying for the transport of indentured servants to the Colony. Apparently, the price of transport was considered a fair price for the land that would be obtained, since the headright system had much use. And free transport brought many to the Colony looking for opportunities as workers – workers that were in great need in the Colony. Another outcome of the headright system was a greater participation in land ownership versus the earliest period in the Virginia Colony when only Virginia Company investors became landowners.

In the later 1700s, limits on the opportunity to pursue and acquire land placed on the colonies by England (e.g., The Royal Proclamation Act of 1763) led to tensions between the colonists and England. The Royal Proclamation Act made illegal land ownership by colonists beyond the Appalachian Mountains.

Ancestors of the 1600s and 1700s who sponsored immigrants and therefore received land included:

ancestor name	birth/death dates
Nicolas Martiau	1591-1657
John Lewis I	1592-1657
George Reade	1606-1674

Thomas Etheridge	1605-1671
William Armistead	1610-1671
Augustine Warner I	1610-1674
John Carter I	1613-1669
John Yates	1607-1648
Ralph Wormeley I	1618-1650
Edward Hill II	1637-1700

The headright system ended in 1699.

English citizens had other ways of acquiring land in the Virginia Colony. These included royal grants; treasury rights; and military warrants.

Ancestors who were granted land (e.g., by royal grant) included Edward Hill I (?-1663), who was granted land along the Rappahannock River. Hill was granted this land for his service in fighting Native Americans in the early 1600s.

By the 1650s, a sizable proportion of available land in the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Counties had been patented (associated with an owner by title).

Prior to 1655, the only Eastern Shore County records surviving are “transactions” records – ones that record decisions by the court related to financial transactions and disputes. These records indicate the following number of land acquisitions in the Eastern Shore Virginia Colony counties by individuals:

1620-35	68
1636-40	72
1641-45	87
1646-50	82
1651-55	113

By the 1650s, York County was a leading tobacco growing area in the Virginia Colony. In addition to being a leader in quantity, the county could get a higher price for its tobacco in England because the York County soil (the soil on the Jamestown-Williamsburg peninsular) provided a sweeter taste to the smoker, a taste that most pipe smokers preferred and would pay more for.

Tobacco could not be successfully grown and marketed south of the James River and south and east of Hampton Roads due to soil conditions, which possibly accounted for why the culture and

other characteristics of the region would develop differently than those in the large tobacco-growing plantations counties elsewhere in the Virginia Colony.

As tobacco became relatively less in demand in England and Europe past 1750, and with increasing demand for grain products, tobacco ceased to be the most grown product in the Virginia Colony, supplanted by grain, and grain became the most exported agricultural product.

The English believed that any ownership rights to land that Native Americans lived on was based on English decisions. This view reflected the European, white man view towards Indigenous people (that they had no historic land ownership rights) wherever the Europeans sought settlements.

Mariners received land for transporting indentured servants to the Virginia Colony. This probably accounts, at least partially, for why my ancestors, who were mariners and settled in Norfolk County and south of the James River, owned land. Merchants also received land for processing the arrival of indentured servants.

f. Slaves

The recognition of the need for manpower in order to work the land certainly played a role in the investment to buy Africans that were being offered for sale by traders visiting the colony as early as 1619. Estimates are that by 1650 more than 300 slaves were in the Virginia Colony; by 1700, 16,000; and by 1740, 70,000.

Yorktown (in York County), which developed as a town in the early 1700s, became the largest slave market in the Virginia Colony. A slave market would continue there to the late 1700s. Estimates are that over 30,000 Africans were sold at Yorktown. The slave market represented important commerce for Yorktown.

A great increase in slaves imported into the Virginia Colony started in the early 1700s, after the end of the headright system resulted in fewer English indentured servant immigrants. During the 1700-1770 period, estimates are that more than 100,000 Africans were imported into the Virginia Colony as slaves.

The Virginia Gazette was used to announce the arrival of slaves from Africa at the slave market. The large tobacco plantations often had dozens of slaves, in some cases more than a hundred. Ralph Wormeley II, an ancestor, had more than ninety in the 1680s. Slavery was readily accepted by the tobacco plantations as it provided needed labor at a cost that could help to insure profits.

Edward Hill III (1665-1726), an ancestor, had slaves delivered by ship to his Shirley Plantation in Charles City County on the James River. Edward Hill III and Henry Fielding (1670-1712), another ancestor, were agents for the Royal African Company, an English enterprise established to make profits on the slave trade between Africa and the English colonies. Supporting the slave trade operations were financiers, wholesalers, shippers, mariners, and consignment agents.

The Royal African Company was set up in the 1660s to purchase Africans in Africa and to sell them to buyers who needed cheap, permanent, life-long manpower. One of the largest market for these Africans in the 1600s and early 1700s was the Virginia Colony. The Virginia Colony's economic needs supported the demand for slaves. And England's capacities (e.g., the Royal African Company) provided the supply. Once the economics of this demand-supply system proved to be highly beneficial to both demanders and suppliers, the system flourished. The flourishing demand-supply system overwhelmed and vaporized moral and ethical considerations.

By the mid-1600s, the Virginia Colony Government was active in creating regulations and laws motivated by insuring the continued success of the slavery system that was under development. Success met optimizing the advantages of slaves for white use, with minimal, if any, indications of concerns with present-day accepted moral and ethical concepts. These regulations and laws were of great benefit to the Royal African Company. The Virginia Colony's creation of regulations and laws governing the practice of owning and using slaves would become the most unfortunate act the Colony government would be associated with.

In those counties that had large tobacco-growing plantations, slaves numbered in the hundreds, maybe thousands, in the early 1700s. By the end of the 1700s, these counties' slave populations could have been as high as 50 percent, or higher, of the total population. Some estimates are that there were 30,000 slaves in 1730 in the Virginia Colony, and by 1775, 200,000 slaves. By 1770, most living slaves had been born in the Colony. My large plantation-owning ancestor families, such as the Carters and Wormeleys, owned large numbers of slaves. Many Virginia colonists owned slaves.

Two ancestors, Fielding Lewis (1725-1781) and Isaac Luke (1729-1784), aided African Americans in the last half of the 1700s. Isaac Luke efforts in the founding of a Methodist community in the 1770s in Portsmouth helped Africans in Portsmouth begin an "African Methodist Society", from which the present-day Portsmouth Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church evolved.

Fielding Lewis was a trustee in the 1760s Fredericksburg version of the Bray Associates Colonial School for enslaved children. Other versions were in Williamsburg, Philadelphia, and other locations in the colonies. The Frederiksberg version continue to 1770 when it closed due to local slaveholder opposition.

Slaves likely provided significant amounts of the labor behind the building of the Colony's infrastructure such as roads.

V. Connections in the 1600s and 1700s Affecting Ancestors

1. Introduction

The emphasis in this section is to identify connections that ancestors were involved in, encountered, might have been affected by, and/or which has relevance to understanding what ancestor lives might have been like.

This is done by considering connections in the following areas:

- Through Travel
- Within the Colony
- Outside the Colony
- With England's Policies, Actions, and Influences
- Through Marriages
- Within and Between Leading and First families
- Within and Between Plantation and Merchant Classes
- Through Security and Conflicts
- Anglicans, Puritans, Quakers, and Dissenters

2. Connections Through Travel

The Chesapeake Bay, the rivers that flow into it, creeks, inlets, and other waterways around the Bay, available to the English settlers and settlements, were of extreme importance as they served as readily available highways for inter-connections between settlements – highways necessary for commerce and economic conditions to prosper. For example, the Eastern Shore was dependent on receiving services and goods from areas on the other side of the Bay.

Ships, shallops, sloops, and canoes were as well known to colonial Virginians as cars, trucks, vans, and motorcycles are to today's Virginians.

The waterways at the mouth of the James, Elizabeth, and Nansemond Rivers became known as Hampton Roads. Roads apparently was used in the name Hampton Roads as roads was a mariner term to refer to safe areas for ships to anchor.

The economic success of Colony farmers likely depended to a degree on where they were positioned and how capable they were to do the require traveling to locations necessary for success. Locations of rivers, ports, and county courthouses likely correlated well with farming's commercial success

Very few horses existed in the Virginia Colony in the early 1600s. Most transportation was initially by walking or use of the waterways. Although horses were available from the earliest days of the Colony, studies suggest that horses did not appear in significant numbers until the

mid-1600s. Wild horses started appearing after 1650. After the 1650s, apparently sufficient numbers of horses were available to meet the demand for horses. Wild horses began to be present in the backwoods. By the 1700s, horses were used extensively for travel, e.g., to church, to the courthouse, to neighbors, to towns, and to other locations. Horse racing became a prominent pastime for the well-off.

A Virginia Colony 1702 Act outlined the need for ferries and provided operating and other guidance.

By the 1700s, passenger travel by boats (which would begin to be referred to as ferries) between Norfolk County and Elizabeth City County and Gloucester County developed. At first, such services were privately provided, but in time, county and Colony government resources would be used to sustain the needed ferries. Also in the 1700s, ferry service existed between the Eastern Shore counties and York, Elizabeth City, and Norfolk Counties. A ferry operated in the 1700s between Yorktown and Gloucester County, across the York River. Dozens of ferries would eventually exist in the 1700s in the Virginia Colony, indicating how extensive the waterways are in Virginia and the need to cross them to interact and to grow commerce.

A ferry terminal existed in the 1700s at King's Creek (near present-day Cape Charles Town) in Northampton County. In 1724, a ferry terminal was established at Hungars Creek. And a terminal was established by the 1760s further north serving Accomack County. Ordinaries often existed at ferry terminal sites.

It is likely that Isaac Luke (1729-1784), one of my great, great, great grandfathers, took a ferry from Northampton County, where he was born, when by the 1750s, he migrated to Portsmouth, where he would live the rest of his life.

Ancestors who owned sailing ships included:

Henry Fielding (1670-1712)
Fielding Lewis (1725-1781)
Isaac Luke, Jr. (late 1700s to early 1800s)

Connections in the 1600s and 1700s between the Virginia Colony and Bermuda and the West Indies were substantial, perhaps in quantity and characteristics much different from later periods. That these ties were based on sailing ships might have played a role in connecting the areas in a unique way compared to today. Sailors may have had a role in the differences. In the 1600s and 1700s, the Virginia Colony colonists and English possibly viewed the West Indies much differently than visitors to the West Indies do today. The West Indies relationship to the Virginia Colony and England likely was much different than it is today.

As the characteristics of travel change over time, e.g., from the 1700s to the 2020s, it is likely that misleading views by the traveler of the places traveled to decreases. This might have been a factor in the British being more inclined to grant independence to the colonies in the late 1700s

than they were earlier in the 1700s. Travel has an important educational impact, and likely the nature of the travel, e.g., frequency and quantity, changes the results of the impact.

Native Americans developed an extensive system of paths and trails for traveling and many of these became trails and roads that colonists would use.

By the 1700s, roads between towns were in use. These included the King's Highway that in Virginia ran from Suffolk through Norfolk County to Williamsburg, Yorktown, Fredericksburg, and Alexandria. Several of my ancestors lived not far from this road and likely used it.

According to a 1730s visitor to the Eastern Shore, roads there were as good as roads in England.

Ordinaries (taverns) existed along roads where meals, overnight lodging, and horse care could be obtained. The Colony ports, e.g., Alexandria, Fredericksburg, Hampton, Norfolk, and Yorktown, would have had roads to them. Details on roads in the historical records, e.g., where ones ran in counties, seem to be lacking.

The extensive tobacco farming and production required a road system that would enable the movement of huge quantities (weights) of tobacco to plantation wharfs and ports.

Carts, coaches, and carriages were in use in the 1700s. But roads were prone to being muddy and rough to travel on, not well maintained, blocked by falling tree parts. This led to the development of counties being responsible for maintaining their roads. Initially road maintenance was a church parish responsibility. In the 1630s, responsibility shifted to county government. At first, the governments required all county male citizens to help maintain the roads.

Because of the many rivers and streams in the Colony, river and stream crossing provided substantial drawbacks in travel. Ferry services developed but likely not ever sufficiently to satisfy the crossing needs. Records indicate that in 1705, twenty ferries crossed the James and York Rivers, eight crossed the Rappahannock, and one crossed the Potomac. Ferries required a lot of manual labor to pull the ferry craft across the river and took a relatively long time for only a few to cross. Initially, most ferries apparently were privately owned and run as an enterprise versus being run by governments.

Little is known about what bridges might have existed and their adequacy.

Wharfs along the rivers were common where smaller sailing ships could unload and load people and materials. Wharfs were in use from the earliest days of the Colony and were extensively used by the large tobacco growing plantations to ship tobacco and to receive goods.

Developing an adequate travel (transportation) system (e.g., roads, ferries, ports) was a major Virginia Colony goal. Advances in travel infrastructure likely were critical to connections within the Colony and to other colonies, to urbanization, and to industrialization.

A sailing trip from Norfolk to St. Mary's Town in Maryland might take 24 hours, assuming the ship would travel at 4 miles per hour (distance on the Chesapeake Bay from Norfolk to St. Mary's is about one hundred miles). From Virginia's Eastern Shore, the trip to Norfolk likely would take six to eight hours (the distance is about thirty miles).

Rough estimates are that ocean sailing ships in the 1700s could cover, at best, 100 to 150 miles per day, depending on many factors such as ship design, weather, and route. Assuming a travel distance from Norfolk to London of about 3,600 miles, this suggests a travel time on one of these ocean-going sailing ships from 3 to 5 weeks (3600/100; 3600/150).

3. Connections Within the Virginia Colony

One hope for this family history project is to explore the extent of connections between the Virginia Colony's Eastern Shore counties and the Norfolk area counties. One connection appears to be related to the many residents living on the Eastern Shore and living in Norfolk County with Dutch connections. While Anglo-Dutch conflicts existed beyond the North American colonies, such conflicts in the Chesapeake Bay area do not seem to be on the same scale as elsewhere. 1600s Virginia Colony governors Yearley and Berkeley, Eastern Shore counties prominent families, e.g., Littleton and Custis, and Norfolk County prominent families, e.g., Thoroughgood, were supportive of the Dutch. The Dutch were involved (specialized) in wood cutting and wood use, two specialties of high importance to the Eastern Shore and Norfolk counties.

Another example of an Eastern Shore-Dutch connection is represented by Sir Thomas Dale (1570-1619), the Deputy Governor of the Virginia Colony in the 1610s. Dale spent time exploring the Eastern Shore, including attempting to initiate a salt production capacity on the Eastern Shore. Dale had strong connection with the Netherlands, including possibly being born there. He spoke fluent Dutch and served in the Dutch Army when young.

Dale was re-assigned from the Virginia Colony to India, where he died in 1619, leaving Virginia Colony land both on the Eastern Shore and along the James River (awarded to him for his service in the Virginia Colony) to his widower, Elizabeth. Elizabeth then became active in sending immigrants to her Virginia Colony land

One Norfolk County resident, Edward Scarborough, who represented the Norfolk Lower County in the House of Burgesses, had business ties with the Colony's Eastern Shore counties. In the 1640s, he had been granted a patent for Eastern Shore land. In the 1660s, he had salt works in Accomack County. Such interactions support the proposition that Eastern Shore residents, especially those involved in shipping, shipbuilding, and mariner activities, interacted with (including relocation to) the Norfolk-area counties as the Norfolk counties grew economically (on the basis of shipping-related commerce).

An example of this is ancestor Isaac Luke (1729-1784)'s migration from the Eastern Shore, where he was born, to Norfolk County by the 1760s.

Agatha Eltonhead (1620-1683) married Ralph Wormeley I (1618-1650) of Middlesex County, where they would live. Agatha is believed to have been a member of the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore Eltonhead family, and if so, is another indication of connections between Virginia Colony counties, which were separated by Chesapeake Bay.

Capt. Plomer Bray was a witness in 1682 to a deed in Norfolk County. Bray would be a name associated with an 1800s ancestor living in Gloucester County. The Plomer Bray presence in Norfolk County and then later the appearance of Brays in Gloucester County suggest that Norfolk County could be a “stopping off” point, as it was right at the entrance of the Chesapeake Bay, before immigrants, or their descendants, continued on further up the Chesapeake Bay. Another example of this, related to ancestor names, is John Carter (1613-1669), an immigrant to Norfolk County from England, eventually ending further up the Chesapeake Bay (specifically the Northern Neck).

In the early 1600s (before 1649), Richard Kenner (1600-1649) and his wife, Elizabeth Warsham (1600-1651), immigrated from Oxfordshire, England to the Virginia Colony and died in (Lower) Norfolk County. At least one of their sons, Richard Kenner Jr (1635-1692) ended up in the Virginia Colony’s Northumberland County, becoming one of my Northern Neck ancestors.

Except for the highest social classes, the nature of connections in the 1600s and 1700s between residents in one area of the Virginia Colony with residents in another area was likely different than today. Reasons for this include the nature of travel then compared to today and distances between areas. The attitudes, perspectives, and expenses were likely to be adverse for many (except for the highest classes) in connecting with others outside their immediate orbit. Connections had predominantly a local nature, for example, within parishes and counties. Institutional connections were much different then. Institutions were much fewer. Organizations, such as companies, with several locations were few, such that travel and connections between such organizations were almost non-existent.

A good example of the nature of connections in the 1600s and 1700s between residents in one area of the Virginia Colony with residents in another area was likely different than today is represented by the Eastern Shore. In the middle 1600s, the Eastern Shore had about twenty percent of the colony’s population, and Eastern Shore considerations and influences were significant, with respect to the Colony’s government - at their peak in Virginia’s history. Today, the Eastern Shore is a minor player in Virginia governmental affairs.

4. Connections Outside the Virginia Colony

In this section, I address connections that 1600s and 1700s Virginia Colony residents might have had with places outside of the Colony. What influences might those connections have had on the Colony lives and times?

A primary connection would be with countries from where immigrants came. Immigrants and their children, and succeeding generations, likely would feel connected, in many ways, to the

country from which the immigrants came. These influences could in many ways affect lives, and in ways not easily discerned by historians.

The following table provides countries that my ancestors came from, where in those countries, and where the ancestors ended up:

In-Country Location	Country	Immigrant	Birth - Death Dates	City or County Death Location
?	England	Edward Hill I	?-1663	Charles City
?	England	Akal Lewellyn	?-?	Lower Norfolk
?	England	Joane Jobe	1608-1664	Nansemond
?	England	Christopher Wormeley	1589-1649	York
?	England	Elizabeth Jane Page	1593-1646	York
Berkshire	England	John Yates	1607-1648	Nansemond
Derbyshire	England	Henry Lowe II	1652-1717	St. Mary's, MD
Devon	England	John Luke I	?-1657	Northampton
Gloucestershire	England	Augustine Warner II	1642-1681	Gloucester
Hampshire	England	George Reade	1608-1674	York
Kent	England	Valentine Bowles	1640-1711	Calvert, MD
Kent	England	James Bowles	1681-1727	St. Mary's, MD
Lancashire	England	Mary Towneley	1614-1662	Gloucester
Lancashire	England	Lawrence Smith	1629-1700	Gloucester
Lancashire	England	Elizabeth Gerard	1636-1716	St. Mary's, MD
London	England	John Carter I	1613-1669	Lancaster
London	England	Henry Stott I	1634-1690	Northampton

Middlesex	England	Thomas Etheridge II	1605-1671	Norfolk
Middlesex	England	Robert Taliaferro	1623-1672	York
Monmouthshire	Wales	John Lewis I	1592-1657	King & Queen
Monmouthshire	Wales	Elizabeth Lydia Warner	1610-1680	King & Queen
Monmouthshire	Wales	John Lewis II	1633-1689	New Kent
?	France	Nicolas Martiau	1591-1657	York
Norfolk	England	Robert Watson Sr	1623-1703	Accomack
Norfolk	England	Augustine Warner I	1610-1674	Gloucester
Norfolk	England	Mary Ann Utie	1619-1674	Nansemond
Shropshire	England	Mary Elizabeth Boyle	1592-1659	Charles City
Somerset	England	Richard Bennett	1609-1675	Nansemond
?	Scotland	James Miller	1600-1657	York
Wiltshire	England	Sarah Ludlow	1635-1689	Lancaster
Wiltshire	England	John Luke II	1649-1705	Northampton
Wiltshire	England	Joseph Ring	1646-1703	York
Worcestershire	England	Anthony Savage	1623-1695	Richmond
Yorkshire	England	Ralph Wormeley I	1618-1650	Gloucester
Yorkshire	England	Agatha Eltonhead	1620-1683	Gloucester
Yorkshire	England	John Armistead	1630-1695	Gloucester
Yorkshire	England	Judith Bowles	1635-1699	Gloucester
Yorkshire	England	William Armistead	1610-1671	Hampton

Yorkshire	England	Anne Ellis	1611-1671	Hampton
-----------	---------	------------	-----------	---------

Based on the above table, one possible outside-the-Colony influence is that many Virginia Colony county names were based on county names in England, e.g., Gloucestershire (Gloucester County), Lancashire (Lancaster County), Middlesex (Middlesex County), and Yorkshire (York County).

The above table shows locations in England where multiple ancestors came, e.g., Kent, Lancashire, London, Middlesex, Norfolk, Wiltshire, and Yorkshire. Multiple ancestors also came from Monmouthshire, Wales.

Also, it is likely that speech patterns and pronunciations in the Virginia Colony (which would continue to recent times) were influenced by speech patterns and pronunciations that immigrants had when they arrived in the Colony.

Trade between the Virginia Colony and other North American colonies was substantial. This trade served as an important communication link, as well as perhaps encouraging individuals from the various colonies to travel to and spend time in other colonies. Virginia Colony trade with other colonies led to better relationships with those colonies.

During the middle 1600s, the Virginia Colony's Eastern Shore counties had contact with the Maryland Colony's Kent Island in the upper Chesapeake Bay, just offshore from Maryland's section of the Eastern Shore. Apparently by the 1640s, a controversy emerged related to Kent Island, possibly over religious differences (Catholic versus protestant/Puritan) and/or to what colony Kent Island belonged (Virginia or Maryland). Maryland was recognized and promoted as an English colony, by King Charles I, and as a destination for prosecuted Catholics to immigrate to. At the same time, Virginia Company colonists were looking north, for example, to Kent Island, as areas for settlement.

One of these Virginia Company colonists was ancestor Nicolas Martiau (1591-1657). Martiau brought dozens of English immigrants, some of whom he, and other Virginia Company colonists, intended to send to Kent Island to live.

Martiau's intentions related to Kent Island created tensions between him and the then current Virginia Governor, John Harvey, who supported catholic/Maryland Colony claims and plans for Kent Island. Martiau was at the time on the Virginia Council, along with another ancestor, John Utie (1593-1624), who was aligned with Martiau's views. And it was on the Council where tensions played out. Overtime the tensions went away, but not before Martiau was arrested for a time and Utie had to return to England to face trial, but not before dying in England.

The first group of English who settled, by the 1640s, along the shores of the Potomac River on the Virginia Colony side of the river (the area known as the Northern Neck) came from both Kent Island and the St. Mary's County section of the Maryland Colony. Those coming from Kent Island likely did so, at least in part, because of the controversies on Kent Island.

During the middle 1600s, a strong connection developed between the Puritans who lived in counties south of the James River in the Virginia Colony and the Maryland Colony. This connection related to the Maryland colony higher tolerance for puritanism and Puritans compared to the Virginia Colony. Such tolerance and intolerance varied over time – it was not a constant. See Section V 10, Anglicans, Puritans, Quakers, and Dissenters’ Connections, below, for more on the Virginia-Maryland Colonies connections with puritanism and Quakers.

During the 1600s, and possibly later, the Dutch had substantial presence and influence around the Chesapeake Bay. Many immigrants to the Virginia Colony’s Eastern Shore counties and the Norfolk County were Dutch or had Dutch connections. Surviving furniture used in the Virginia Colony from the 1660s, and records of furniture from that period, show Dutch furniture designed and production influences. Archaeologists have found many Dutch items from the 1600s period.

In 1641, apparently the Dutch had a “trading post” in a Virginia Colony’s Eastern Shore county. Dutch merchandise was considered to be of high quality, which was not readily available from English merchants.

In the 1660s, apparently the Hungars Parish area of Northampton County had several Dutch settlers, for during this period, a church in Hungars Parish sent for a Dutch Reformed Church pastor living in Long Island, New Amsterdam.

Several prominent Virginia Colony persons had Dutch connections. Sir Thomas Dale once served for a period in the Dutch Army. Another was Richard Bennett, who served as Colony governor in the 1650s. The Bennetts were prosperous merchants with strong ties to Holland. Richard Bennett’s uncle was a wealthy London merchant, who for a time served as the Deputy Governor of English Merchants in the Netherlands. Richard Bennett is a possible ancestor.

In the late 1600s, Ann Custis, a member of the Eastern Shore prominent Custis family, was, for a time, married to an ancestor, John Luke II (1649-1705). The Custis family had strong ties to The Netherlands. John Custis (1629-1696), a member of the Virginia Colony’s Council, was raised in the Netherlands, before moving to the Eastern Shore in the 1650s.

Ralph Wormeley I (1618-1650), an ancestor, had connections with a Dutch merchant house in the 1640s, as did Richard Bennett (1609-1675), a possible ancestor of mine. Ralph Wormeley I may have had connections with the Eastern Shore. He married Agatha Eltonhead (1620-1683), who may have been connected to the Eltonhead family that lived on the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore.

Sarah, a daughter of the Norfolk County prominent resident, Adam Thoroughgood, married the son of a leading Dutch tobacco merchant.

In the mid-1600s, Dutch mariners were prominent in the delivery of tobacco from Virginia to England and in delivering merchandise to the Virginia Colony. This prompted England’s passing restrictions on the Colony’s exports and imports – requiring only trading with England and requiring English or Colony ships be used in the trade.

Anglo-Dutch wars, for example, in 1665-1667 and in 1672-1674, likely had an influence on life in the Virginia Colony's counties, due to Dutch ships potentially roaming off-shore. The English and the Dutch would be ardent competitors during the 1600s. The Dutch had sights on North American colonies just as the English did. However (especially when not at war), trade would go on between the English colonies, such as the Virginia Colony, and the Dutch colonies, such as New Netherland, as well between the Virginia Colony and The Netherlands.

In the later 1600s, dozens of ships arriving at Virginia ports originated from Bristol in England. Bristol agents were used by many Virginia tobacco growers as representatives in England. In 1666, nineteen of twenty-three ships that docked at Bristol had tobacco from the Virginia Colony and Barbados.

The ancestor Sarah Ludlow (1635-1668), grandmother of ancestor John Carter III (1689-1742), had possible connections with the New England colonies. Sarah's uncle is believed to be Robert Ludlow, who had important governmental positions in the New England colonies.

In the 1700s, the forest resources south of the Elizabeth River, e.g., adjacent to and in the Dismal Swamp, and extending into the North Carolina Colony, increased contact between the Elizabeth River Virginia Colony area and the North Carolina Colony. Forest products became an important Elizabeth River area need in shipbuilding and repairs and an area export. Virginia Colony immigrants were beginning to settle in the Virginia Colony-North Carolina border areas by the 1650s

Ancestor Etheridges, who were born in the Elizabeth River area, migrated to Currituck County, North Carolina County.

Fielding Lewis (1725-1781), an ancestor, was involved in an investment to build, in the late 1700s, a canal connecting the Dismal Swamp in Virginia to Albemarle Sound, North Carolina Colony. The investment also intended to drain parts of the Dismal Swamp, using those parts for agriculture (trying to drain the Dismal Swamp failed).

The West Indies islands Barbados and Jamaica, English colonies, had a special connection to the Virginia Colony. In addition to trade between the colonies, Barbados and Jamaica served as initial destinations of slave ships coming from Africa on their way to the Virginia Colony. Then these slave ships would carry tobacco and other goods to England, after unloading the slaves in the Virginia Colony. In England, the ships would go back to Africa to get slaves, forming a shipping triangle.

Bermuda, on a line between the Virginia Colony and England, served as an important "way station" (for ship repairs, resupplying, and refuge from harsh weather), and, as such, an important connection to the Virginia Colony, especially in the 1600s.

Individuals who were assigned by England to various governmental positions in the West Indies colonies and Bermuda might be reassigned to positions in the Virginia Colony.

The Virginia Colony had extensive trade with other English colonies.

5. Connections With England's Policies and Actions

Colonization management skills in the late 1500s and early 1600s were lacking. The act of colonizing a foreign land was a difficult one, with little, if any, skill-developing experiences before the late 1500s. It was a tough on-the-job learning process, with many erroneous starts, uncertain adjustments, and other uncertainties that needed good management skills, which unfortunately were not available. A study of England's colonization of its colonies in the 1600s would likely suggest that these statements are correct.

Virginia Colony settlement practices were influenced by and similar to what the English experienced in their colonization of Ireland in the late 1500s and early 1600s.

Ancestors such as Nicolas Martiau (1591-1657), George Reade (1608-1674), and Joseph Ring (1646-1703), as well as possible ancestor Richard Bennett (1609-1675), had roles in the early Virginia colonization process.

Regime changes in England affected policies and outcomes in the Virginia Colony. After the accession of the Parliamentarians to England rule by the 1650s, the toleration to Puritans and Quakers in the Virginia Colony changed. A possible ancestor, Richard Bennett (1609-1675), a Puritan, was appointed as Virginia Colony governor in the 1650s by the Parliamentary government in England.

The 1650-1675 period of Anglo-Dutch conflicts were mostly over trade issues. During this period, the Parliamentary-run government in England forbade the Virginia Colony from trading with Holland. This was highly resented by Virginia exporters and was frequently violated by colonists.

England passed an act in 1651 (the Navigation Act) that required that imports into England had to be on English ships. This led to a war with The Netherlands. A following act in 1659 stated that all Virginia Colony exports had to go to England. The 1659 act was greatly resented and ignored by Virginia colonists.

After the monarchy restoration in the 1660s, England's interest in the American colonies increased as the colonies began to be viewed as a successful provider of needed revenues.

In 1664, with England winning a war with Holland, England took over the Dutch New Netherland Colony (an area between the Virginia and Maryland colonies and the English New England colonies).

In 1678, the king of England declares that he has ultimate authority over the Virginia Colony and its General Assembly. What resulted was an increase, by the 1700s, in England's on-hands oversight and management of the colonies, leading to a more robust Navigation Act; the creation of a Board of Trade, which decreased Colony decision-making powers; and a consolidated governance of New England colonies. This increased on-hands oversight and management had primarily to do with increasing revenues to England.

The revised Navigation Act attempted to put the decisions of the export-import trade of the Virginia and other colonies in the hands of ministers in England rather than Virginian colonists. This increased attempt to manage the colonies from England led to England deciding that in order to be successful in managing trade, England needed agents assigned on-site in the colonies to monitor trading activity. This, it seems to me, represented a new, critical turning/tipping point in the relationship between England and the colonies, a turning point/tipping point that relates to sovereignty and how one views sovereignty with respect to self-interest. These agents were a much expanded threat to the colonists in their ability to govern themselves. These agents might be viewed as the beginning act leading to the colonies' armed rebellion by the end of the 1700s.

The 1698 establishment of the Board of Trade in England changed the various roles that governing individuals and bodies had in the Virginia Colony. One change was an increase in the Virginia Colony Council's power and a decrease in the Virginia Colony governor's power. The Council members were now chosen by Board members in England, versus being chosen by the Colony's governor.

The 1780s were a period of greater economic hardships in the Virginia Colony (and other colonies), no doubt playing a role in tensions between the colonies and England. Importing items from England became much more expensive.

During the late 1700s, other conflicts and disagreements occurred between the Virginia Colony (and other colonies) and the royal ministers in England (representing the King). One specific event was the Stamp Act, which led to much public colony opposition to the act. These conflicts and disagreements eventually led to armed rebellion in the 1770s.

The Church of England never obtained a long-lasting, strong recognition as the "government's church" in the colonies. This perhaps allowed greater freedoms and flexibility for dissenting religious views, views that were important considerations in governmental decision making. That the Church of England never became the "official" church is perhaps an occurrence not fully understood and appreciated in considering 1700s relations between the colonies and England.

6. Connections Through Marriages

On 1600s and 1700s wills and other records, one finds marriages, land sales, and other connections between neighbors that remain so over generations. A group of ancestor families who intermarried, witnessed one another wills, sold land to one another, and in other ways interacted as neighbors and friends were Ballentines, Cratchetts, Dales, Herberts, Lewellyns, Lukes, Mannings, and Veales, ancestors discussed above in Sections II and III. Another group, also discussed above in Sections II and III, who would interact similarly are the ancestor names Etheridge, Creedmoor, and Yates.

Starting as early as the 1640s, ancestor Ballentines, Cratchetts, Creekmoors, Dales, Etheridges, Herberts, Lewellyns, Mannings, and Veales lived along tributaries that run into the Elizabeth

River. Many of them had close connections with the Chesapeake Bay waterways by being shipbuilders, ship carpenters, and mariners.

Marriages and other interactions are an indication of the close connections within groups over several generations, which were common in the 1600s and 1700s, possibly continuing into the 1800s, but certainly not to the present day.

An occurrence in the 1600s and 1700s in the Virginia Colony was the frequent marriages between members of families in the top social class. Examples of this are marriages seen between Bowles, Carter, Hill, and Wormeley family members. For example, Jane Lowe Bowles (1718-1753; from St. Mary's County, Maryland) married Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790; from Middlesex County, Virginia) and Elizabeth Hill (1703-1771; from Charles City County, Virginia) married John Carter (1689-1742; from Lancaster County, Virginia). These family connections and marriages were not governed by close living vicinities of the families (as in those families identified in a previous paragraph) but by wealth and power-planning considerations, irrespective of living vicinities.

Other ancestors who frequently married based on wealth and power planning considerations included Armisteads, Lewises, and Warners. These groups of names represent the large tobacco-growing plantation owners, which tended to dominate the families in the top social class in the Virginia Colony.

The following table shows known ancestors' marriages in the 1600s and 1700s:

male	female	approximate date of marriage
Nicolas Martiau (1591-1657)	Elizabeth Jane Page (1593-1646)	1624
George Reade (1608-1674)	Elizabeth Martiau (1625-1686)	1641
Richard Bennett I (1609-1675)	Mary Ann Utie (1621-1674)	1641
Robert Watson I (1623-1703)	Susannah Etheridge (1623-1680)	1658
John Cater (1613-1669)	Sarah Ludlow (1635-1668)	1660
John Armistead (1630-1695)	Judith Hone (1643-1703)	1665
John Lewis I (1592-1657)	Elizabeth Miller (1640-1704)	1666
Augustine Warner II (1642-1681)	Mildred Reade (1643-1694)	1670
Abel Lewellyn (1600s)	Hannah Horne (1695-1678)	1677
Robert Carter (1663-1732)	Judith Armistead (1635-1698)	1678
Henry Lowe II (1652-1717)	Susanna Bennett (1666-1714)	1686

John Luke II (1649-1709)	Susannah Richardson (1650-1709)	1686
Ralph Wormeley II (1650-1703)	Elizabeth Armistead (1667-1716)	1687
John Lewis III (1669-1725)	Elizabeth Warner (1672-1719)	1692
Frances Thornton II (1683-1737)	Mary Taliaferro (1685-1741)	1703
William Dale (1649-1715)	Dianah Herbert (1682-1715)	1703
John Wormeley I (1689-1726)	Elizabeth Ring (1684-1743)	1712
William Veale (1682-1752)	Mary Cratchett (1693-1762)	1713
James Bowles (1681-1727)	Jane Lowe (1700-1718)	1716
John Lewis IV (1694-1754)	Francis Fielding (1702-1731)	1718
John Carter III (1689-1742)	Elizabeth Hill (1703-1771)	1723
Paul Dale (1715-1743)	Elizabeth McGarvey (1718-1738)	1735
Ralph Wormeley IV (1715-1790)	Jane Lowe Bowles (1718-1793)	1742
Fielding Lewis (1725-1781)	Elizabeth Washington (1733-1797)	1750
Edward Hill Carter (1726-1792)	Sarah Champe (1733-1814)	1755
Isaac Luke (1729-1784)	Rachel Dale (1732-1775)	1757
Matthias Etheridge (1736-1791)	Ann McPherson (?-1814)	1765
Charles Carter (1751-1827)	Elizabeth Lewis (1765-1830)	1781
Edward Hill III (1665-1726)	Elizabeth Williams (1670-1710)	1600-1700
Frances Thornton I (1651-1726)	Alice Savage (1653-1695)	1600-1700
George Ballentine (1635-1701)	Francis Yates (?)	1600-1700
Henry Fielding (1670-1712)	?	1600-1700
Henry Stott I (1634-1690)	Priscilla Bryant (1640-1690)	1600-1700
Henry Stott II (1661-1720)	Susannah Watson (1674-1720)	1600-1700
James Johnson (1620-1673)	Elizabeth Gerald (1636-1716)	1600-1700
John Taliaferro (1656-1726)	Sarah Smith (1659-1720)	1600-1700
John Yates (1607-1648)	Joane Jobe (1608-1664)	1600-1700
Joseph Ring (1646-1703)	Sarah Berkely (1674-1721)	1600-1700
Morris Veale (1655-1706)	Elizabeth Johnson (1658-1748)	1600-1700

Ralph Wormeley I (1618-1650)	Agatha Eltonhead (1620-1683)	1600-1700
Richard Bennett II (1644-1667)	Henrietta Neale (1647-1697)	1600-1700
Robert Cratchett (1650-1701)	Mary ? (1658-1713)	1600-1700
Thomas Etheridge II (1604-1671)	Christian Marrington (1608-1674)	1600-1700
Thomas Etheridge III (1645-1719)	Eleanor Nichols (1649-1719)	1600-1700
Thomas Etheridge IV (1668-1724)	Elizabeth Green (1677-1735)	1600-1700
Daniel Stott (1690-1736)	Susannah ?	1700-1800
Edward Lewellyn II (?-1752)	Margaret Manning (?)	1700-1800
Jeremiah Etheridge (1708-1754)	Sarah (?)	1700-1800
John Champe II (1698-1763)	Jane Thornton (1707-1767)	1700-1800
John Luke III (1690-1761)	Martha Stott (1705-1761)	1700-1800
Lemuel Veale (1713-1756)	Letisha Lewellyn (?)	1700-1800
Matthias Etheridge II (1718-1824)	Lydia McPherson (?)	1700-1800
Thomas Horne (1628-1657)	Johanna Yates (?)	1700-1800
John Luke IV (1793-1866)	Lydia Etheridge (1810-1874)	1800s

The above table indicates that individuals in the upper social class (e.g., large plantation owners) tended to marry in the same class (e.g., Carter-Champe; Champe-Thornton; Lewis-Washington; Wormeley-Ring). The table also shows that males in the shipbuilding/shipping class tended to marry daughters of shipbuilding/shipping class fathers (e.g., Luke-Dale; Dale-Herbert; Lewellyn-Ballentine).

Knowing biographical backgrounds on the ancestors in the table above suggests marriages between shipbuilding/shipping class were usually between partners who lived close to one another and whose fathers worked in shipbuilding/shipping. On the other hand, marriages in the top social class were often not between families living close to one another. Another indication from the table, knowing backgrounds, is partners who shared Puritan beliefs married, e.g., Yates-Jobe; Bennett-Neale; and Bennett-Utie.

The table also shows first names that were most popular amongst the ancestors listed in the table. For males, the most popular first names are John – 13; Thomas – 4; Henry – 4; Robert – 3; and Edward – 3. For female names, the most popular first names are Elizabeth – 13; Mary – 6; Susannah – 5; and Sarah – 4. Chances are good that these names ranked high in popularity amongst all the Colony residents

Due to the high frequency of short life spans and the importance of being married for children's welfare during the 1600s and 1700s, remarrying quickly, e.g., within a year, after a spouse had died, was common. Another explanation for quick marriages was that the ratio of men to women, especially in the 1600s, was quite high. Due to short life spans, especially with women due to frequent deaths related to childbirth, it was common for men to marry several times.

7. Connections Within and Between Leading and First Families

A few immigrants, through various means, and to a substantial extent based on drive and innovation, acquired enormous amounts of land in the Virginia Colony. And it was from these few, early Colony immigrants that became many of the families referred to as first families of Virginia.

By the 1750s, the overwhelming influence that the top families (top social class) had on the Virginia Colony government began to wane. One reason for this was a decline in the wealth of these families as tobacco profits began to decline and large land ownership took on more of a loss than a gain. Another reason was the increased influence that other groups, such as merchants, acquired.

Associated with this decline was the decline in the influence that the Virginia Council (the upper body of the General Assembly) had. In the early 1700s, Council membership were overwhelmingly represented by members of the top families, and as these families' wealth declined so did the influences of the family members in the Council.

The Custis family in the Eastern Shore counties is a good example of how the top social class in the Virginia Colony interacted. This interaction helped to insulate, protect, and maintain the top class's continuing existence and privileges. In the 1600s and early 1700s, the Custis's served in governmental positions in the Colony government, as did many members of other first-class families, with few, if any, participants from lower classes. Through this government service, the families became acquainted and interacted socially, and through this created an essentially impregnable shield preventing others from governmental positions and influence.

By 1770, the Virginia Colony has been estimated to have a population of 450,000 with an estimated less than one hundred families that would be considered to be first families of Virginia, families representing a unique class, based on their long standing (back to the 1600s) prominence in Virginia Colony affairs, and based on their wealth. Ancestor family names that might have been included in a list of first families are Armistead, Carter, Hill, Lewis, Warner, and Wormeley.

The Virginia Colony period from the mid-1600s to the mid-1700s might be thought of as a useful model for how England's ruling, aristocratic class system emerged, which led to a disaster class system that still burdens England. Fortunately, factors came to bear in the Virginia Colony that stopped this class system evolution. Today, first family names of the 1700s do not carry any particular aristocratic, privileged, or noble association or influence.

One characteristic of the Virginia first families was to send sons (but not daughters) to England for schooling. At least three ancestor Wormeleys were sent to England for schooling: Ralph Wormeley II (1650-1703); John Wormeley I (1689-1726); and Ralph Wormeley V (1745-1806).

8. Connections Between Plantation and Merchant Classes

The plantation and merchant classes were not very developed until the 1700s.

A plantation class likely only develops over time after continuing accumulation of land and other assets, e.g., slaves, can be achieved and accumulated. From the start of the Virginia Colony, an emphasis was placed on building what were called plantations, where an initial landowner and his descendants would live and work to achieve plantation success. Several such plantations were, or attempted to be, set up along the large rivers that flow into the Chesapeake Bay.

The large tobacco growing plantations had the characteristics of small, self-sufficient towns. Those living on the plantations (families, indentured servants, and slaves) would have a variety of capabilities to meet the plantation needs. Success of the plantations depended on the entrepreneurship and management skills of the owners and managers.

Most of the large plantation enterprises did not fully develop until the 1700s. In the 1600s, late 1600s, most of the tobacco farmers would be best characterized as middling or slightly above middling planters.

The large tobacco plantations often had dozens of slaves, in some cases more than a hundred. Ralph Wormeley II, an ancestor, had more than ninety in the 1680s. Slavery was readily accepted by the tobacco plantations as it provided needed labor at a cost that could greatly increase profits.

With the development of towns in the 1700s, e.g., Norfolk, Fredericksburg, Hampton, Portsmouth, and Yorktown, a new, powerful class evolved consisting of merchants, especially those who were involved in the export and import trade. In the 1700s, this merchant class began to significantly counter the governmental influences that the tobacco/plantation class had enjoyed since the 1600s.

A merchant class development likely requires, first, sufficient town/community development and the complexities that are inherent in a well-developed town/community. Such development did not occur until such towns as Norfolk, Fredericksburg, Hampton, Portsmouth, and Yorktown developed in the 1700s. And second, a merchant class requires the skills of individuals in unique areas, skills which only sufficiently develop through merchant experience, and which are passed down to succeeding generations.

Merchants in the Virginia Colony's 1700s provided unique services. They often served as interface between the buying Virginian and the selling Englishman. In this regard, the merchant's clients (the buyer and the seller) had needs that the merchants needed to be aware of

and satisfied. The role of this type of merchant, and what it encompassed would be interesting to know more about.

Land south of the James River turned out not to be suitable for tobacco growing, unlike land in other parts of the Virginia Colony. This meant that economic development in counties south of the James River (e.g., the Norfolk and Nansemond Counties) would evolve in different directions. One result of this is that the merchant class in these counties became somewhat unlike the merchant class in other areas of the Virginia Colony, with merchants, especially in the Norfolk Counties, associated with ship building and maintenance, while merchants in other areas were mostly associated with supporting the tobacco growing enterprise.

The lack of need for tobacco merchants in the counties south of the James River and along the Elizabeth River likely led to these merchants seeking trading opportunities in such goods as forest products, grain, corn, and meat to England and other locations such as the West Indies. This likely led to a more diverse population and society in these counties, which in turn helped develop a different culture than found in the tobacco growing counties of the Virginia Colony.

The development in Norfolk and Nansemond Counties of Puritan and Quaker communities might be one outcome of this more diverse cultural development. A more diverse merchant culture might be more accepting of diversity, looking for innovative ideas to manage that diversity, versus a plantation class seeking constancy based on a single economy, where diversity might be frowned upon.

The merchant class in Norfolk and Portsmouth consisted largely of export and import merchants (e.g., shippers, ship owners). This class would not in the 1700s achieve the same level of prominence and respect across the rest of the Virginia Colony as the tobacco growing/plantation owners' social class, which was viewed as being the aristocrats, the nobility of the Virginia Colony. One reason for this was, in many cases, the tobacco plantation "barons" were, in numerous ways, associated with aristocratic families in England, in a way that the Norfolk and Portsmouth merchants were not.

Other classes can be defined, in addition to the plantation and merchant classes. These include

- Water commerce, e.g., shipbuilding and ship repairs, mariners
- Middling and poor farmers, e.g., those owning relatively small acreage
- Government, e.g., those who worked in government
- Labor, e.g., those who provided basic labor
- Craftsmen, e.g., those who provided building and repairing skills related to housing, travel, and other skilled-needed occupations.

Most of my 1600s/1700s Virginia Colony ancestors fall into either the plantation class (e.g., Carters, Hills, Lewises, Wormeleys), the water commerce class (e.g., Dales, Lewellyns, Lukes), or the middling farmers class (e.g., Eastern Shore Lukes, Stotts).

In 1676 and 1677, an event in Virginia Colony history, which has class association, was Bacon's Rebellion. Nathaniel Bacon, the rebellion's leader, was supported to a significant extent by middling and poor farmers, who were protesting government actions, and opposed by the plantation and government classes.

London merchants had a high interest in the Virginia Colony because many of them prospered by a surge of tobacco sales in England and Europe. Many of the merchants had direct links to the large tobacco plantations and were important for the success of the plantation owners. The success of the arrangement between London merchants and Virginia tobacco growers started to be strained in the 1700s as changes were occurring.

One such change was the emergence of Scottish merchants setting up operations in the Virginia Colony in the 1700s. These merchants were able to provide financial relationships (e.g., debt and credit arrangements) with the tobacco growers in new ways (e.g., closer, direct associations), which were more advantageous to the tobacco growers than their relationships with the London merchants. The Scottish merchants started to stock European-produced merchandise at sites they operated in the Colony, close to the plantations, providing tobacco growers needed items, with payment on credit secured by future tobacco production. The close-by Scottish merchants could provide services that the distant London merchants could not. We see here, in this merchant-client change, evolving ways of doing business more successfully, an evolution that continues to this day.

Tobacco sales began to slow as the 1700s progressed, and in response to this, many of the large tobacco-growing plantation owners started to pursue other business opportunities, such as operating stores, lending money, operating ferries, mills, and ironworks, and growing other than tobacco, such as wheat and corn. Ancestor plantation owners who pursued such businesses included Carters, Lewises, and Wormeleys.

As the 1700s progressed, the dominance of the plantation class in Virginia Colony government and commerce waned. At the same time, the evolving merchant class acquired greater influence in and benefit from the Colony government and commerce.

Apparently, none of the 1800s descendants of the 1700s plantation class ancestor families (e.g., Carters, Hills, Lewises, and Wormeleys) had the same level of prosperity and influence as the 1700s plantation families had.

9. Connections Through Security and Conflicts

This section attempts to comment on various periods and types of security concerns and conflicts in the Virginia Colony in the 1600s and 1700s, that my ancestors might have been affected by.

Violence was experienced by colonists in the 1600s, for example, between Native Americans and the colonists.

Up the York River, along the south bank, two immigrant communities emerged, communities that would be called Chiskiack (after Native Americans living in the area) and Fort York (likely because a fort was built in the area). A primary goal for these areas were to provide protection, a line of defense, a barrier, against the Native Americans who lived further up the York River. Eventually the two areas would be part of what became York County.

The “defensive line” that was created in the early 1630s between Jamestown and the York River had a community about halfway between Jamestown and the York River that was referred to as the Middle Plantation. The Middle Plantation would evolved into the town of Williamsburg by 1700. Nicholas Martiau (1591-1657), an ancestor, helped in the building of the defensive line. Nicholas settled in the Chiskiack area along the York River in the 1620s.

The Native American tribes on the Eastern Shore, such as the Accomac Tribe, were considered to be peaceful, interacting well with the English settlers. For example, these tribes did not participate in other Native American tribes’ 1622 uprising elsewhere in the Virginia Colony. The peaceful nature of the Eastern Shore Native Americans incentivized increased migration from other Chesapeake Bay areas to the Eastern Shore, especially after the 1622 time period. Ancestors settled on the Eastern Shore in the early 1600s.

Treaties with the Native Americans usually had specific terms written out, which apparently the Eastern Shore tribes and settlers stood by, while other tribes and settlers did not. This might suggest that the Eastern Shore settlers governed and interacted with the Native Americans by different standards than elsewhere in the Virginia Colony. There was a Dutch presence in the Eastern Shore that was unique compared to other areas of the Virginia Colony. In the 1600s, the Netherlands apparently had a tolerant society that was unique in Europe. Such Dutch tolerant attitudes might have helped in a more peaceful relationships with the Native Americans on the Eastern Shore.

Also, Puritans and Quakers, who are present in the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore in the middle 1600s, might have influenced more tolerance towards the Eastern Shore Native Americans.

1622 was not only a massive massacre by the Native Americans on the settlers living along the James River but also saw a pandemic and food scarcity, causing many deaths. A high percentage of the settlers died.

The 1620s to 1660s was a period of unusual high death rates in the Virginia Colony.

Initially on the Eastern Shore, where the Virginia Colony ended, and the Maryland Colony started, was not well determined and agreed upon. This led to some conflict and tension. Eventually the English monarchy would step in to establish a boundary line.

In the 1630s, Kent Island in Chesapeake Bay, across from present-day Annapolis, Maryland, was the site of disputes between those with allegiance to the Maryland Colony and those with allegiance to the Virginia Colony. Migrants from Kent Island, with Virginia Colony allegiance, went to the southern coast of the Potomac River (a part of the Virginia Colony’s Northern Neck) as initial settlers there. Some of these migrants were ancestors. (See a separate, previously

prepared family history “Family History – Living in Virginia’s Northern Neck During the 1600s and 1700s – Balls, Carters, Champes, Claughtons, for more on the settlements along the Potomac River. This family history is available on Amazon.)

In the 1640s to 1670s, dominant government alliances in St. Mary’s County in the Maryland Colony went from pro-royal to Puritan/Parliamentarian. This likely related to the English civil wars in the 1640s to 1670s period. Ancestors such as James Bowles (1681-1727) and possible ancestor Richard Bennett (1609-1673) were St. Mary’s residents during this time. England’s civil wars led to Puritans challenging Catholic dominance in Maryland, including skirmishes and the Puritans taking over the Maryland government for a period during the 1640s to 1670s.

The Puritan Richard Bennett (1609-1675) (a possible ancestor), who became the acting governor in the Virginia Colony in the middle 1600s, participated in helping the Puritans in Maryland install a Parliamentarian-allied government in St. Mary’s County. Captain William Fuller (1609-1695) (who had connections with Puritans in York County, Virginia and with Richard Bennett - the acting Virginia Colony Puritan governor) was in St. Mary’s County in the 1650s during the pro-royalist/Puritan conflict there. In York County, William Fuller married Sarah Martiau (1625-1694), Nicholas and Jane Martiau’s daughter. Nicolas Martiau (1591-1657) and Jane Martiau (1593-1640) were ancestors.

During the English “civil wars” period in the middle 1600s, the predominant Virginia Colony Eastern Shore attitude apparently was pro-royalist, versus pro-Parliamentarian.

The English civil war, and its influence in the colonies, had not just a political aspect to it (for example, royal rule versus Parliamentarian rule), which disrupted and confused Virginia Colony governance, but also a religious aspect (for example, Church of England versus Catholic-Puritan influence). The religious aspect of the civil war affected ancestors who were Church of England participants and those who were Puritans.

The English civil war distracted and complicated tobacco trade between the Virginia Colony and England’s merchants. This opened up opportunities for Dutch merchants, which they successfully took advantage of.

The immigration of royalists to the Virginia Colony greatly increased in response to the English civil wars. At the same time, Puritans in the colony probably gained a new sense of freedom of expression. As in England, Virginia Colony royalist adherents tended to be from the aristocratic classes and Parliamentarian adherents - craftsmen, tradesmen, and some gentry.

Accomack County, one of the counties on the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore, became an area for retreating to by pro-royals during the tensions between the pro-royals and the Parliamentarians in the 1650s and 1660s, when England was in its civil war period, and during the Bacon Rebellion period in the 1670s. Retreatment usually required personal connections between those retreating and those living in Accomack County. Those retreating needed accommodations and other necessary support functions that were only readily available from families living in the retreating area. Such retreating indicates a concern for safety.

Gloucester Point in Gloucester County was the site of a fort in the 1660s built in response to the Anglo-Dutch Wars, indicating concern in the Virginia Colony about attacks by the Dutch. Several similar forts were built, or planned, elsewhere in the Colony for the same reason.

1676 saw an uprising by many Virginian farmers, known as Bacon's Rebellion, with violence and property destruction occurring. Bacon's Rebellion was class related, where small to middling farmers and indentured servants rebelled against authorities, supported by large landowners. The rebels believed that unfair practices towards them and negligence by the government related to Native American threats existed. However not all large landowners supported the government. Two ancestors who did not were Edward Hill II (1637-1700) and Ralph Wormeley II (1650-1703).

William Berkeley (1605-1677) was governor of the Virginia Colony from 1642-1652 and then from 1660-1677. During 1676's Bacon's Rebellion, while Berkeley was in his second term, he relocated to the Eastern Shore for safety reasons, as the Bacon rebels sought his removal from office, and possible harm. Berkeley had good relationships with large planters in the Virginia Colony, including John Custis II (1629-1696) of the Eastern Shore whose residence Berkeley stayed at while on the Eastern Shore. John Custis II was the brother of Ann Custis who for a time was married to ancestor John Luke II (1649-1709).

Pirating reached its peak in, and around, Chesapeake Bay in the early 1700s. The Atlantic Ocean side of the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore counties was a prominent refuge area for pirates.

As often was the case with developments in the Virginia Colony, friction, tensions, and controversies emerged between Colony residents and groups in England. One example of this was difficulties that English shipbuilders had from time-to-time with shipbuilders in the Virginia Colony. These difficulties increased in the 1700s as the Colony shipbuilding industry grew. Many of my ancestors were shipbuilders and ship carpenters.

The 1760s was a period of tensions in the Norfolk area, as it was in other areas of the colonies, in response to the Stamp Act and other ways in which England was imposing its will on the colonies. This period of increased tensions would be manifested in several ways, such as increased confrontations among various groups in the colonies, who had various degrees of affection for England, from weak to strong.

In addition to the tensions caused by the English impositions of various policies on the colonies, other factors accounting for social tensions in the Norfolk area included:

Unlawfulness due to the many ships bringing goods into Norfolk, releasing large numbers of sailors into the community while ships were in port.

Competitions and disagreements between the merchants for influence.

As elsewhere throughout the Virginia Colony in the 1760s and 1770s, the Norfolk area was split into pro-English (loyalists) and pro-revolution (pro-independence from England).

A group known as the Sons of Liberty was active in Norfolk County in the 1760s (also active in other areas). This group formed in response to Colony residents' feelings that English policies in the colonies were unfair and abusive towards the colonies. With the repeal of the Stamp Act by England, such feelings subsided, at least temporarily. Sons of Liberty groups formed in other colonies, most notably Massachusetts.

In the 1770s, Norfolk's inclinations to be pro-loyalist (English) became more evident. Norfolk was mostly a loyalist community, perhaps the largest such community in the Virginia Colony and the final location of the Virginia Colony government and its governor (Lord Dunmore), before his departure from Virginia to return to England.

With a possible conflict with England in the 1770s, a Committee of Safety was established by officials in the then capital Williamsburg. One of the initiatives of the committee was the creation of a navy, designating sites on the James, York, and Rappahannock Rivers as locations for building ships. The shipbuilding facility, known as Gosport, on the Elizabeth River in Norfolk County, was authorized to build two frigates of size five hundred tons with thirty-six guns. Earlier in the 1700s, Gosport was a naval yard supporting English naval ships. Gosport was also the named of an English shipbuilding and repair yard in Portsmouth, England, which almost certainly was the source of Gosport and Portsmouth's name. Important shipbuilding and repairing activities have continued along the Elizabeth River, which divide the cities of Portsmouth and Norfolk, to the present.

Although in the early-to-mid 1770s, Virginians controlled Gasport, in 1779, the English military regained control of the yard, at which time they burned many ships and supplies at the yard. The burning of Gosport by the English during the Revolutionary War was a substantive setback for shipbuilding in Virginia and likely had a negative impact on many of my Portsmouth ancestors who were involved with ship building, e.g., Dales, Lewellyns, and Lukes.

Not only did the British do severe damage to Gasport but they also did severe damage to the Cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth, greatly hindering its capacity as a port for years, being an economic disaster for the cities. As many of my ancestors lived in Portsmouth and along the Elizabeth River and were involved in the shipping industry in numerous ways, this damage certainly had a negative effect on them.

The 1780s were a period of great economic hardships in the Virginia Colony (and other colonies), no doubt affecting colonists, including my ancestors.

After independence from England, Gosport became a United States War Department facility. When the United States created, in 1798, a Naval Department, Gosport was transferred to the Naval Department. The first US Navy commander of Gosport was Commodore Richard Dale. Gosport would become a major shipbuilding site for the US Navy in the 1800s. Commodore Dale belonged to the Portsmouth Dale family, members of which are ancestors. My father, a Naval engineer, was stationed at the Portsmouth Naval Yard (earlier known as Gosport) in the early 1950s.

10. Anglicans, Puritans, Quakers, and Dissenters' Connections

Immigrants who identified themselves as Puritans appeared in Nansemond County before the 1640s. The middle 1600s was a period in which more Puritans began appearing in Lower Norfolk and Nansemond Counties, as events in England brought Oliver Cromwell, the Parliamentarians, and puritanism to power.

Norfolk and Nansemond Counties tended to have higher numbers of Puritans, including Quakers, than elsewhere in the Virginia Colony. Quaker missionaries apparently appeared in Norfolk County in the 1660s.

The 1640 to 1660 period not only saw an increase of Puritans in the Virginia Colony but also of Quakers. Puritans and Quakers often were closely aligned in objectives and beliefs, and possibly intermingled with one another during that period (possibly more so than in later periods).

The Nansemond County settlements of Puritans and Quakers would represent the highest number of Puritans and Quakers anywhere in the Virginia Colony. The Puritans and Quakers' communities likely represented views and affairs that would distinguish them from communities made up mostly of Church of England participants. However, such views and affairs did not mean absolute fracture with Church of England adherents and communities.

Quakers continued to live in Nansemond County during the 17th Century, especially along the Nansemond River.

Puritan and Quaker immigrants into the Virginia Colony in the 1650s were taking advantage of perceived greater freedoms to practice their beliefs and live unbothered due to the Parliamentarians coming to power in England. They also, like most immigrants, were seeking economic benefits.

Connections between Puritans in the Virginia Colony and in the Massachusetts Colony occurred. These occurred in correlation with the ascendancy of the Parliamentary rule in England, supported by the Puritans. Nansemond County Puritans had connections with Puritans in Massachusetts. In the 1640s, Puritans in Nansemond County sought a minister from the Massachusetts Colony.

These connections occurred during a time that saw increased migration of Puritans and Quakers into the Virginia Colony. After the overthrow of the Parliamentary government in England in 1660, many Puritans left Virginia, with many going to Maryland.

One member of the Virginia Council during the middle 1600s was George Ludlow. Ludlow is an ancestor name (Sarah Ludlow, 1635-1668, married John Carter I, 1613-1669. Sarah is likely related to George, perhaps as a sister). That George Ludlow was the brother of the New England Puritan Robert Ludlow suggests that George was a supporter of the 1600s Puritan movement in England. This period, especially the 1640s to 1660s, saw the emergence of Puritans in the Virginia Colony government in the 1650s, a period when George Ludlow was in the Council and House of Burgesses. George Ludlow appears to have been a Puritan, or at least a sympathizer.

In the middle 1600s, Sarah Martiau (a daughter of Nicolas Martiau, 1591-1657, a York County ancestor), married William Fuller. This William Fuller was the Capt. William Fuller, a Puritan, an ardent supporter of Oliver Cromwell. Fuller became a Maryland governor, hostile to the Catholics there, and a strong promotor of puritanism in Maryland. George Ludlow had land adjacent to Nicolas Martiau land in York County, which could be a connection between William Fuller, the St. Mary's County, Maryland Puritan, and Yorktown, where George Ludlow lived, and account for William Fuller meeting Sarah Martiau and marrying her.

Quakers were in the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore counties by the 1650s. Evidence suggests a connection between Puritan and Quaker communities residing in the Virginia Colony Eastern Shore counties and those in the Norfolk and Nansemond River areas. The Virginia Colony Eastern Shore had a Puritan contingent relocating to Maryland in the mid-1600s.

In the 1670s, a Nansemond River-area resident was Thomas Jordan. Jordan was also a name found in the Eastern Shore Virginia counties in the 1600s. The known Norfolk County's Edward Scarborough connection with the Eastern Shore (for example, through Edward Scarborough's salt works), the Jordan name appearing both in the Eastern Shore and along the Nansemond River, with the Nansemond Jordan likely a Puritan, and Edward Scarborough's son marriage to a Nansemond River Bennett (the Bennetts was a well-documented Puritan family) are supportive of Puritan connections and migrations between the Eastern Shore and the Norfolk and Nansemond River areas. Edward Scarborough's son's marriage to a Nansemond County Bennett, a Puritan family, suggests that the Scarborough family may have been Puritans.

However, this mid-1600s rise of puritanism in the Virginia Colony did not last, and by the end of the 1650s Puritans began to leave the Virginia Colony, with many ending up in Maryland. A leading explanation of the decline of Puritans in Virginia during this period was William Berkely assuming the Virginia Colony governorship in 1660 (for the second time). Berkely was a strong backer of the royal family and its rule, and anti-Puritan.

Puritan and Quaker establishments were not always friendly towards one another. Quakers could be considered as a threat to Puritan (and Church of England) beliefs, practices, and well-being. Such threats led to Virginia Colony anti-Quaker laws in the 1600s.

Puritan and Quaker immigrants from England likely were aware of potential Virginia Colony Puritan and Quaker intolerance and that such intolerance could vary from area to area and over time.

Richard Bennett (1609-1675) (a possible ancestor) (died in Nansemond County) was an active Puritan in Nansemond County and had ties with St. Mary's County in Maryland. Bennett's granddaughter, Susanna Maria Bennett (1666-1714), lived and died in St. Mary's County.

John Yates (1607-1648) (an ancestor), and other Yates, attended Quaker meetings in the latter half of the 1600s in Nansemond County. During this period, Nansemond County had several families pursuing Quaker and Puritan religious practices. An associate (William Edmundson) of the Quaker leader, George Fox, visited Nansemond County in 1672.

Lower Norfolk County, and its successor names, also had Quakers in the later 1600s and 1700s. The Quaker communities in Lower Norfolk County and in Nansemond County were interconnected by visits and probably in other ways. Such interconnections likely resulted in marriages between representatives of different communities. These marriages would seem to represent somewhat of a departure from marriages during that period that usually occurred among families living in close geographic vicinity. However, the Nansemond River, which runs through the center of the then Nansemond County is actually quite close to Norfolk County, only approximately ten miles from the Elizabeth River running through Lower Norfolk County. The two areas are close enough to perhaps considered them as one Quaker Community.

In the 1600s, Etheridge family members (Norfolk County) married Yates family members (Nansemond County), suggesting Etheridge family members may have had dissenting religious views (perhaps as Puritans or Quakers). Yates' family members were well-documented Puritans and Quakers. Etheridges and Yates are ancestors.

Quakers south of the James River were known to migrate further south to the North Carolina Colony, beyond the Dismal Swamp, where they sought refuge from harassment and persecution. Two Etheridges, Robert Etheridge (1719-1784) and Robert Etheridge (1772-1828), were born in Norfolk County, but died in Currituck County, North Carolina Colony, just south of the Dismal Swamp. Perhaps they were Quakers, which accounted for their Currituck County connection.

Quaker groups in England, as a widespread policy, sent books to Quaker recipients in Virginia, and other locations, in the last half of the 1600s. John Etheridge was referenced in records in England describing that policy. Etheridge is a Norfolk County ancestor name. A Quaker tradition is to keep a library in the Quaker (Society of Friends) meeting houses.

The Ballentine, Herbert, Horne, and Lewellyn families (ancestors) lived closely together in the Paradise Creek area. Paradise Creek flows into the southern branch of the Elizabeth River and is about four miles up the Elizabeth River from the town of Portsmouth. These families may have been Puritans and/or Quakers. One reason for suspecting this is that Hannah Horne's second husband, John Herbert, is believed to have been the son of Mary Bennett Herbert, the likely daughter of one of the Bennett's (who lived along the Nansemond River). The Bennett family was well known Puritans, who participated in Puritan and Quaker communities along the Nansemond River and elsewhere. That these families lived along a creek named Paradise might also suggest a Puritan/Quaker connection; with the name Paradise having an "evangelical" connotation.

Ballentine, Herbert, Horne, and Lewellyn being ancestor names suggest that many of my ancestors were Puritans and/or Quakers.

Many of the Ballentine, Herbert, Horne, and Lewellyn males worked in shipbuilding and ship repairing. A high percentage of 1600s immigrants sailed from the port of Bristol, a center of shipbuilding. Connected to Bristol is Gloucestershire, also a center of shipbuilding in England. Both of these areas had high concentrations of Puritans and Quakers in the 1600s. This suggests

a connection between Ballentines, Herberts, Hornes, and Lewellyns, the Bristol/Gloucestershire areas, shipbuilding, and Puritanism and Quakerism.

A last half of the 1600s House of Burgesses member (John Porter), from Lower Norfolk County, was accused of having Quaker sympathies (perhaps was a Quaker) and was expelled from the House of Burgesses. Porter was a Portsmouth name in the 1700s, associated with my Luke ancestors.

In the 1670s, the Church of England leadership pushed for greater control and authority over parish affairs in the Virginia Colony. This corresponded with political changes in England. This Anglican Church pushed for greater control and authority likely was a factor in migrations of Puritans and Quakers from the Virginia Colony after the mid-1600s, with many of them going to the Maryland Colony. Discriminations against Puritans, Quakers, and Catholics in the Virginia Colony occurred at various times and in various intensities. The Maryland Colony had a much more tolerant government during this period than the Virginia Colony.

The Puritans and Quakers viewed themselves as a religious practice independent from the Church of England. In the 1700s, other “independent” groups, e.g., the Methodists and Baptists, started appearing in the Virginia Colony in noticeable numbers. And as a whole, the independent groups were often referred to as “dissenters.” The Nansemond River area, with Puritans and Quakers, was one of the first areas of dissenters, pre-dating dissenters of other views and appearing in other areas.

Although the Church of England was thought of as the “official” Church in the Virginia Colony, by the early 1700s other Christian religious groups started appearing in the Colony, with tolerance by the Virginia Colony. These groups were referred to as “dissenters” and included Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists. These “non-official” groups were tolerated (not officially bothered) but not without tensions between Church of England groups and dissenters. This attitude (toleration; acceptance) likely started a precedent, which later helped influence America’s founders separating state and religion. This tolerance evolved over a period of time and in reaction to a variety of circumstances. For the most part, there was what would be described as a “liberty of conscience” perspective among the Colony leaders.

By 1800, Baptist became the largest denomination in Virginia.

In the 1600s and 1700s, attending the local church on Sunday offered one of the few, if the only, opportunities of socializing and other benefits, which likely played a huge role in church attendance being a much higher percentage of the population then than today.

In the mid-to-late 1700s on the Virginia Colony’s Eastern Shore, as in other Colony areas such as the Northern Neck, religious groups, such as the Methodists, started to appear and attract participants. Methodists leaders Robert Williams and Francis Asbury visited the Eastern Shore in the 1770s. Francis Makemie was active in trying to establish Presbyterian congregations in the Virginia Colony.

Ancestor Isaac Luke (1729-1784), a ship carpenter, helped form a Methodist Church in Portsmouth (today's Monumental United Methodist Church). Isaac helped to bring Robert Williams to Portsmouth to speak.

The 1600s and 1700s seem to be a period when those of a particular belief, e.g., Anglican, Puritan, or Quaker, could be identified with specific areas. Identifying ancestors who lived in those areas, but not certain about the ancestor beliefs, can suggest what those ancestors' beliefs were, providing useful insights about the ancestors.

VI. Conclusions

In this section, I am presenting conclusions not about content that I present above (such conclusions are scattered throughout the above content), but conclusions about the process of finding family history and then writing about it. Here are conclusions about the process:

1. I could not have done the above without the support of Ancestry.com's family tree application that has been available to me without subscription fees. This application not only allows for the tracking, in family tree format, of the dozens of my 1600s and 1700s ancestors, but also makes recommendations on possible ancestors, unknown to me, based on my names already of the family tree. These recommendations are based on Ancestry.com searching its extensive genealogical-related databases. Trying to find these recommended names by my physical searching such database would be an overwhelming task that I could not have accomplish. More often than not the suggested names are believed to be correct.
2. The process of searching for and finding ancestor identities stimulates the desire to learn the history of the times, places, events, and other considerations relevant to the ancestors. This has extensively increased my interest in history and my historical knowledge and made the activity immensely more enjoyable. And it has prompted me to add much of this history that I found in the above.
3. A huge amount of what I found in my research and included above could not have been possible without the excellent work of many genealogists, researchers, and historians. A lot of the above is dependent on their work, and without this work by others, the above would be much diminished.
4. The power of the Google search system has become imminently obvious as I have used it for searching. I am overwhelmed by the quantity of relevant results that is routinely returned by a well-worded search. The Google search system has been critical in finding a lot of the information provided above. This system is an important, critical resource.
5. Related to searching with Google is the extensiveness of the Internet in terms of what can be found and in how so many entities have digitized so much, and now the Internet provides access to such enormous amounts of information.
6. And county and state historical societies; state and city historical libraries; and city, state, and university special collections are essential for the family historian.