




MID-AMERICA

An Historical Quarterly

VOLUME XXIII
(New Series, Vol. XII)
1941



PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE OF JESUIT HISTORY
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

277.7305

I 29i

V. 23

1028

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXIII

ARTICLES

HENNEPIN'S <i>Description of Louisiana</i> . <i>Jean Delanglez</i>	3, 99
CAPTAIN ANZA AND THE CASE OF FATHER CAMPOS. <i>Peter M. Dunne</i>	45
INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE CAUSES OF THE PIMA UPRISING OF 1751. <i>Russell C. Ewing</i>	138
THE FRENCH OF OLD MISSOURI (1804-1821): A STUDY IN ASSIMI- LATION. <i>Harvey Wish</i>	167
THE END OF A JESUIT LIBRARY. <i>W. Kane</i>	190
L'ENFANCE ET LA JEUNESSE DE PIERRE LE MOYNE, SIEUR D'IBER- VILLE. <i>Guy Frégault</i>	214
THE "DE SOTO MAP." <i>Barbara Boston</i>	236
NON-ECONOMIC FACTORS IN THE FRONTIER MOVEMENT. <i>Gilbert J.</i> <i>Garraghan</i>	263
TOMAS DE GUADALAJARA, MISSIONARY OF THE TARAHUMARES. <i>Peter</i> <i>M. Dunne</i>	272
PENICAUT AND HIS CHRONICLE OF EARLY LOUISIANA. <i>Elizabeth</i> <i>McCann</i>	288

DOCUMENTS

POPULATION OF THE EL PASO DISTRICT IN 1692. <i>J. Manuel Espinosa</i>	61
NOTES AND COMMENT	85, 152, 315
BOOK REVIEWS	88, 157, 251, 305
INDEX	323

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 23, NUMBER 1

JANUARY 1941

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JANUARY 1941

VOLUME 23

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 12

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

HENNEPIN'S <i>DESCRIPTION OF LOUISIANA</i>	
.	<i>Jean Delanglez</i>
	3
CAPTAIN ANZA AND THE CASE OF FATHER CAMPOS	
.	<i>Peter M. Dunne</i>
	45
DOCUMENTS: POPULATION OF THE EL PASO DISTRICT IN 1692.	<i>J. Manuel Espinosa</i>
	61
NOTES AND COMMENT	85
BOOK REVIEWS	88

PIERCE, *A History of Chicago: Vol. II. From Town to City, 1848-1871*; MILLING, *Red Carolinians*; JENSEN, *The Articles of Confederation*; DUNNE, *Pioneer Black Robes on the West Coast*; ARMSTRONG, *Chronology of Failure*; BRIGGS, *Frontiers of the Northwest, A History of the Upper Missouri Valley*; LANNING, *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies*.

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN
WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
PAUL J. FOIK
W. EUGENE SHIELDS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON
RAYMOND CORRIGAN
PAUL KINIERY
JEAN DELANGLEZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JANUARY 1941

VOLUME 23

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 12

NUMBER 1

Hennepin's *Description of Louisiana*

A CRITICAL ESSAY

PART I

Two years ago the writer published *Some La Salle Journeys*, in which a refutation was made of the contentions of writers who attributed two extra voyages to La Salle. Then the reviewers had their innings. One of them stated among other irrelevant remarks: "One cannot study La Salle's letters and memoirs adequately without determining who was the true author of Hennepin's book. . . ."¹ Now Father Hennepin wrote four books that have come down to us, three dealing with North America, and the authenticity of none of these has anything to do with La Salle's alleged descent of the Ohio River in 1669-1670 or with his supposed voyage to the Mississippi before 1673. Consequently, any disquisition on Hennepin's *Description of Louisiana* or on his subsequent *New Discovery* and *New Voyage* in *Some La Salle Journeys*, however learned or interesting, could have forestalled a scolding from one reviewer only by inviting a slap on the knuckles from another as so much padding. One simply cannot incorporate any interesting historical problem of Valley history, much less a history of France, in any or every monograph, nor can one turn all avenues toward specific local interests, such as Hennepin. In Racine's comedy, produced in Paris the year after La Salle left for Canada, a garrulous lawyer, being urged to come to the point, solemnly begins his summing up with the words: "Avant la naissance du monde."² And the judge, yawning, begs him to please start with the Flood. While reading the review in question, it was difficult for the present writer to rid himself of the thought that, had the judge been of one mind with the reviewer, he would have earnestly

¹ *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXV (December 1938), 386.

² *Les Plaideurs*, Act III, scene iii.

requested the lawyer to please start with the *rudis indigestaque moles*, which the Greeks called chaos.³

The reviewer's suggestion, however, deserves serious consideration, in spite of its irrelevance to the book under review, if we assume that Hennepin's *Description of Louisiana* is meant. For the authenticity of this work is an interesting and provoking problem of historical criticism, especially if we try to examine it solely on a basis of the valid and pertinent evidence available to date. The present essay, based on just such evidence, arrives at a less one-sided solution than the traditional ones, and it shows that the book, instead of being a unit, divides itself into two parts; credit for each of these will be given where credit is due. First there is discussion of the two principal solutions and an hypothesis.

1. PIERRE MARGRY'S SOLUTION

With regard to the authorship of *Description of Louisiana* Pierre Margry advanced one solution and John Gilmory Shea propounded another. Margry's view is as follows: Hennepin plagiarized a *Relation des découvertes*,⁴ which was published by Margry himself in the first of his six volumes of documents dealing with discoveries, explorations, and settlements of the French in North America.⁵ Among the documents of this first volume, wrote Margry in the introduction, there is "a relation of the Abbé Bernou which goes into greater details [than Tonti's first memoir] but it narrates only the events prior to 1681. Its main interest consists of the fact that it was presented to Colbert and

³ Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, I, 7.

⁴ *Relation des découvertes et des voyages du Sieur de la Salle. . . . 1679, 80-81*, in Margry, I, 435-544; it has been reprinted from Margry with a page for page English translation by M. B. Anderson under the title *Relation of the Discoveries and Voyages of Cavalier de La Salle from 1679 to 1681*, Chicago, 1901. Three fragments are found among Abbé Claude Bernou's papers. The first, a four-page draft, BN, Clairambault, 1016:51-52v, with many erasures and corrections is in the handwriting of Bernou; the second, *ibid.*, 85-91v, is the same as the above, but in the hand of a copyist; both fragments cover only the first pages of Margry's printed text. The third fragment, in the same copyist's hand as the second, *ibid.*, 92-147v, covers from page 466 to page 540 of Margry's printed text. The whole relation is in the Archives du Service Hydrographique, vol. 67, n. 4. There are only slight variations between the third fragment and the complete copy; it is the latter which Margry printed.

⁵ P. Margry, *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, 6 vols., Paris, two editions. The first four volumes of the American edition, without introduction, were published in 1876, 1877, 1878, 1880, respectively; the first three volumes of the French edition, with introductions, were published in 1879, the fourth volume in 1881; the text is the same in both editions. This collection will be hereinafter referred to as Margry, I, Introduction, xxi.

also communicated by the author to Father Hennepin." Of the last two statements the first is erroneous, the second can no longer be maintained in view of forthcoming evidence in this paper. The relation was presented to Colbert's son, Seignelay, who at the time had charge of the colonies.⁶ This is clear from the title of Bernou's autograph memoir which accompanied the *Relation*, and also from internal evidence. Margry inserted the two words in brackets in the title of this memoir, as explained in footnote 6.⁷ The circumstances of composition together with a comparison between the text of the *Description* and that of the *Relation* lead to the almost certain conclusion that the manuscript of the *Relation* came into Hennepin's hands through at least one intermediary.

Margry continues: "Now a comparison between [the *Relation*] and the *Description of Louisiana* shows that the impudent Recollect began his plagiarisms with this document, before he attempted to rob La Salle of the honor of his discoveries, and his good and loyal confrères of the merit of their writings." The subsequent "attempt" here referred to is the *Nouvelle decouverte*.⁸ In this book, published in 1697, as well as in the *Nouveau Voyage*⁹ published the following year, Hennepin asserts that in 1680, two years earlier than La Salle, he went to the mouth of the Mississippi.¹⁰ He also claimed that what is printed in the *First Establishment of the Faith* concerning the exploration of 1682,¹¹ is a copy of his own journal, made by his superior, Father Valentin Leroux, and attributed to Father Membéré by Father Le Clercq.¹² It is quite certain, however, that never at any time, either in 1680 or later, did Hennepin go down the Mississippi farther than the mouth of the Illinois River. No less certainly the relation printed in the *First Establishment* was not written by Father Membéré; for this relation—which Hennepin claims is his "journal" of the mythical voyage of 1680—is an obvious variant of the so-called "Relation officielle," which in turn is a

⁶ Mémoire pour Monseigneur [le marquis] de Seignelay, sur les découvertes du sieur de La Salle, au sud et à l'ouest des grands lacs de la Nouvelle-France, Bibliothèque Nationale (BN), Clairambault, 1016:190-193.

⁷ Margry, II, 277-288.

⁸ *Nouvelle decouverte d'un tres grand Pays, situé dans l'Amerique entre le Nouveau Mexique, et la Mer Glaciale*, Utrecht, 1697.

⁹ *Nouveau Voyage d'un Pais plus grand que l'Europe Avec les reflexions des entreprises du Sieur de la Salle, sur les Mines de Ste Barbe, &c.*, Utrecht, 1698, Preface.

¹⁰ *Nouvelle decouverte*, Preface **6v, and 249 ff.

¹¹ C. Le Clercq, *Premier Etablissement de la Foy dans la Nouvelle France*, 2 vols., Paris, 1691, II, 253 ff.

¹² *Nouvelle decouverte*, 505; *Nouveau Voyage*, Preface.

compilation by Bernou, made up of a letter of Tonti, another letter of Membré, and some largely conjectural odds and ends about the geography of the Mississippi Valley.¹³

In the introductory footnote to the *Relation des découvertes*, after stating that it is the document presented to the Minister, Margry goes on to inquire: "But was this relation written by Cavalier de la Salle himself, or by a learned ecclesiastic who made use of letters from the discoverer to some of his friends and business partners? We are not yet in a position to decide. We shall explain elsewhere our reasons for doubt."¹⁴ This air of mystery and the suggestion of future revelations are typical of many irritating features of Margry's compilation. When he wrote these lines, he had both seen and copied the covering memoir of Bernou; he had also seen Bernou's autograph letters and those of La Salle. It is impossible to imagine what "reasons for doubt" could have persisted, once he had all the above data; and, it may be noted, nowhere else does Margry tell these "reasons."

In his second volume, in a note on a passage of the covering memoir, he observes: "When we come to indicate the provenance of the documents, we shall make known the name of the most likely author of this *Relation [des découvertes]* . . ."¹⁵ Later on in the same volume the *Relation* is said to be "the work of Abbé Bernou, a fact which I am now in a position to demonstrate, when I have to speak of the sources whence I drew the documents of this collection."¹⁶ Turning to the list of documents at the end of the third volume, we read: "Several letters of this honorable clergyman [Bernou] prove that he wrote this official relation and that he is also the author of the memoir entitled by me *Mémoire d'un ami de la Salle*."¹⁷ In the same list of documents, after the title of the covering memoir, we find the following note: "The author of this memoir seems to be the same who wrote the official report [*Relation des découvertes*] . . ., it is as it were its introduction, . . . considering the handwriting alone, the memoir is certainly by Abbé Bernou."¹⁸ The handwriting alone would not prove the authorship of either the memoir or the *Relation*; but if we take into account the letters of the abbé, and his connection with La Salle, and the fact that all the explorer's

¹³ Jean Delanglez, "La Salle's Expedition of 1682," in MID-AMERICA, XXII (January 1940), 1-27.

¹⁴ Margry, I, 435.

¹⁵ Margry, II, 283, note 1.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 306, note 1.

¹⁷ Margry, III, 628.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 629-630.

letters from which the *Relation* was compiled are found today among Bernou's papers, and if we note further the style and use of words, and observe that the rough draft of some pages of the *Relation* with many erasures and corrections are in Bernou's handwriting, all these things taken together show beyond doubt that he is the sole author of the *Relation des descouvertes*. Not until 1879, in the introduction to the first volume of the French edition of his collection, did Margry finally make the categorical assertion that Bernou was the author of the document.

In the introductory note above mentioned, Margry further observes: "Father Hennepin knew this document [the *Relation des descouvertes*] and borrowed freely from it." He adds the reason for its publication: although much of what is in the *Relation* is already in print in the *Description*, yet, the events of twenty-two months are not recorded by Hennepin; moreover, "it is interesting to note the similarities between Father Hennepin's book" and the *Relation des descouvertes*. It is also interesting to note, he says, the "differences between this same document and the text of La Salle's letters, *from which it must have been drawn*, leaving out, however, all that was of a personal and confidential character." Not until 1881, five years later, did Margry realize that the statement italicized in the above quotation provided one of the most conclusive means of identifying the plagiarist of the first two hundred pages, that is, two-thirds of the *Description* proper. Several of La Salle's letters, Margry continues, because they are incomplete, could "not have been understood if published alone, whereas this narrative preceding their publication will at least enable us to see what is lacking in those letters, and will enable us to follow the sequence of events."¹⁹ The editor is here speaking of a peculiar feature of La Salle's autograph letters. With two exceptions, they have been handed down in a mutilated form; in some the beginning is missing, in others both the beginning and the end.

In a note on the text of the *Relation des descouvertes*, Margry remarks: "We did not wish to point out [in notes] the passages of the *Description of Louisiana* where Father Hennepin made the changes to conceal his plagiarisms or to parade his vain person."²⁰ This note concerns a misprint in the *Description*, "per-roquets" instead of "pirogues," most likely the fault of the typesetter. Unfortunately Margry did not print the two documents in

¹⁹ Margry, I, 435.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 466.

parallel columns, showing in footnotes how the ultimate source of the statements in the *Relation* is the autograph letters of La Salle; for this argument, together with the circumstances of composition, is irrefragable. Hennepin's unforgivable sin, in the eyes of Margry, was his claim to have gone down to the mouth of the Mississippi two years before La Salle. This empty boast sent Margry on the warpath. He seems to have been afflicted with the priority complex—a disease still endemic among those who busy themselves with the history of explorations. Hennepin claimed to have been the first to descend the Mississippi to its mouth, whereas this honor belonged to Margry's hero, La Salle. This same priority complex led Margry in another connection to make for La Salle a claim just as foolish as Hennepin's claim for himself—the honor of having sighted and navigated the Mississippi before Jolliet and Marquette. This fairy tale was no more successful than Hennepin's; but Margry did succeed in imposing on the world for a long time the myth that La Salle had discovered and descended the Ohio.

It is only fair to note here, regarding the priority claims of Hennepin and La Salle in connection with the Mississippi, that the former certainly sighted that river eight months before the latter. For Hennepin had come down as far as the mouth of the Illinois by March 7, 1680, whereas La Salle beheld the Father of Waters for the first time on December 5 of the same year.

The solution thus proposed by Margry of the authorship of the *Description* was accepted by other writers. But, remarkably enough, none of them formally discuss the authenticity of this book; and aside from Parkman's comments in a later edition of one of his works, the similarity between the *Description* and the *Relation* is merely given a passing mention. It should be noted, however, that the works of these other writers were already in print when Shea published his alternative and opposite theory in 1880, and though some of the writers were still living, Margry is the only one who took issue with Shea. In the introduction to his fourth volume, published in 1881, Margry recalled what he had written in his first volume with regard to the plagiarism of Le Clercq by Hennepin:

I also said that it was not the first trick of this sort which he played, that he had done the same with the now known manuscript of Bernou. This assertion has been contested; but assuredly it is impossible to explain, except on a basis of plagiarism, how there happens to occur in the *Description of Louisiana* a part of the text of Abbé

Bernou, who made use of the letters of Cavalier de la Salle, sent to him to keep Colbert informed of [the progress of] the undertaking.²¹

And in note 2 of this page of the introduction, Margry calls attention to the parallelism between a passage in an autograph letter of La Salle, a passage in Bernou's *Relation*, and a passage in the *Description*. This parallelism becomes an apodictic proof, once the circumstances and the time of the composition of the two accounts are ascertained; taken together these data upset the very foundations of Shea's arguments.

There may have been another reason for this neglect to inquire into the authenticity of the *Description*. After 1844, when Sparks in his *Life of La Salle* exposed the pilfering of Le Clercq's book by Hennepin,²² the majority of those interested in the history of French explorations in North America during the seventeenth century believed the evidence against Hennepin to be as complete as it was conclusive. Attention was focussed on this literary piracy, and thus the other book received only a passing mention. Many, too, were content to note how the *New Discovery* is in fact a mere amplification of the *Description*, with nothing new except an account of the voyage to the mouth of the Mississippi, lifted in its entirety from Le Clercq. The confusion and misunderstanding thus caused could have been avoided simply by not discussing the *New Discovery* at all, and by centering attention on the *Description*, dividing this book into two parts, one of which is clearly a plagiarism of Bernou's *Relation*, while the other is Hennepin's story written by himself or by a scribe.

Among the various authors of this period who accepted, wholly or partially, Margry's solution regarding the authenticity of the *Description*, several are American writers whose opinions must be commented upon here. Others who wrote on this subject at the time, such as Gravier and Chesnel, deserve only a passing mention. Instead of bringing forward arguments based on a careful and detailed comparison of the texts, these latter took occasion merely to air their silly prejudices and their unbounded enthusiasm for La Salle.

²¹ Margry, IV, Introduction, xvi.

²² Speaking of the parallel passages in Le Clercq and in the *New Discovery*, it has been said: "Il y a corrélation évidente mais qui ne démontre pas que Hennepin soit le plagiaire." H. Lemay, "Le P. Hennepin, récollet, devant l'histoire," in *Nos Cahiers*, 1938, III, 359. This is true; the demonstration of plagiarism consists in the physical impossibility of making voyage to the mouth of the Mississippi during the specified time; and once the authorship of the journal of Membré—which Hennepin claims is a copy of his own—is ascertained, all reasonable doubts about the plagiarist are dispelled.

Harrisse's case is peculiar. In the introduction to his *Notes*, he wrote: "The most important document: *Relation des découvertes* . . . , box 64, number 4, could not be found."²³ This document is Bernou's *Relation* which has been discovered since. At the time when Harrisse wrote the above, in the early seventies, Margry had a copy of the document which he evidently did not communicate to Harrisse. The latter could not compare it with the *Description*, and had to rely on what Margry told him; at the time the two were still close friends.²⁴ Further on in the book, where he discusses at length the career and the claims of Hennepin, Harrisse remarks:

Long after La Salle's death, in a book published in 1697 [the *New Discovery*], which is nothing else than a clumsy amplification of that of 1683 [the *Description*], Hennepin claims as his the glory of having been the first to descend the Mississippi to the sea. . . . Messrs. Jared Sparks, J. Gilmory Shea and Parkman have not only done justice to this claim as impudent as it is false, but they have unmasked the plagiarisms through which this shameless monk so long abused the credulity of the public.²⁵

He adds in a note that the details of this pretended discovery are all taken, many of them word for word, from the *First Establishment of the Faith* published in 1691. "This relation of 1683 [the *Description*] is in reality nothing but a pale copy of one of the memoirs of Cavalier de la Salle." Here Harrisse is merely echoing what Margry had told him, for he had not seen the document himself, and at that time Margry had not yet realized it had been written by Bernou.

As regards Parkman, it is well known how Margry's unwillingness to let investigators have access to public documents of which he was merely the guardian, forced this historian to recast in 1879, his *Discovery of the Great West*, first issued in 1869, the revised edition being entitled *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*. Although Parkman had, in the 'sixties, a manuscript copy of the *Relation des découvertes*, he did not have the

²³ H. Harrisse, *Notes pour servir à l'histoire, à la bibliographie et à la cartographie de la Nouvelle-France et des pays adjacents, 1545-1700*, Paris, 1872, xxiv.

²⁴ Cf. Harrisse's letters to E. B. Washburne, "Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States in Paris," December 4, 1879, November 7, 1871. These letters are pasted on the inside cover of a miscellaneous collection of tracings of early maps with a binder's title "Cartographie du Canada," now in the John Carter Brown Library; and J. Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, 8 vols., Boston, 1884-1889, IV, 242.

²⁵ *Notes pour servir* . . . , 149-150.

letters of La Salle;²⁶ and, like many others, failing to distinguish clearly between the *Description* and the *New Discovery*, he considered the latter to be a later edition of the former.²⁷

Two notes on the *Description*, which are not to be found in Parkman's *Discovery of the Great West*, appear in his *La Salle*.

This valuable document [the *Relation des decouvertes*] compiled from letters and diaries of La Salle, early in the year 1682, was known to Hennepin, who evidently had a copy of it before him, when he wrote his book, in which he incorporated passages from it.²⁸

The other note merely has:

On his return to France, Hennepin got hold of the manuscript *Relation des decouvertes*, compiled for the government from La Salle's letters, and as already observed made free use of it in the first edition of his book, printed in 1683.²⁹

Parkman seems not to have realized that these additional notes required many changes in his text; for he still speaks of Hennepin's accuracy, of his trustworthiness, and of the corroborative evidence supplied by the *Description*. The following passage, which is the same in the edition of 1869 and in that of 1879, may serve as an illustration, besides affording a basis for comment. After remarking that Hennepin had pillaged the account of the descent of the Mississippi as narrated in Le Clercq, Parkman ends a paragraph with the words: "The records of literary piracy may be searched in vain for an act of depredation more recklessly impudent." He then goes on to say: "Such being the case, what faith can we put in the rest of Hennepin's story? Fortunately there are tests by which the earlier parts of his book can be tried."³⁰

From the context, the "book" here referred to is the *New Discovery*; but since up to the time he reached the Mississippi, March 7, 1680, the narrative in all that pertains to time and place runs parallel to the *Description*, the "earlier parts" mentioned in the above quotation can equally well refer to either Hennepin's first or second book. This conclusion is legitimate, for as we have seen, Parkman regarded the *New Discovery* as simply a later edition of the *Description*.

²⁶ *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, Boston, 1907, 261, note 1.

²⁷ *Discovery of the Great West*, Boston, 1869, 124, note 4; *La Salle*, 123, note 4.

²⁸ *La Salle*, 150, note 1.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 262, note.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 230.

On the whole, [the earlier parts] square exceedingly well with contemporary records of undoubted authenticity. Bating his exaggerations respecting the Falls of Niagara, his local descriptions, and even his estimates of distance, are generally accurate. He constantly, it is true, magnifies his own acts, . . . yet, till he reaches the Mississippi, there can be no doubt that in the main he tells the truth.

The reason for the accuracy of those parts of the *New Discovery* which are taken from the *Description* is easily found: the accurate data, and the estimates of distances, are taken from the letters of La Salle *via* the *Relation des decouvertes*. "As for the ascent of that river [Mississippi] to the country of the Sioux, the general statement is fully confirmed by La Salle, Tonty, and other contemporary writers." Nearly two decades prior to Parkman's *Discovery of the Great West*, partly because he lacked the letters of La Salle, or the memoirs of Duluth and of Tonti, Shea had cast doubts on Hennepin's ascent of the Mississippi; but no one else seems to have questioned the reality of this journey. Parkman must therefore have had Shea in mind when he next observes in a note:

It is certain that persons having the best means of information believed at the time in Hennepin's story of his journeys on the Upper Mississippi. The compiler of the *Relation des Découvertes*, who was in close relation with La Salle and those who acted with him, does not intimate a doubt of the truth of the report which Hennepin on his return gave the Provincial Commissary of his Order, and which is in substance the same which he published two years later.

This passage is especially interesting because of the reference to a "report." It is not easy to see what report could be meant here; and in the absence of valid evidence to show that Hennepin ever did give a report in writing at any time to Father Leroux, the statement that this is "in substance the same which he published two years later" becomes doubly difficult to verify; and one cannot help wondering how, unless he had the report given to Father Leroux, Parkman could make the comparison and assert the similarity between its contents and those of the *Description of Louisiana*.

The Relation [des decouvertes], it is to be observed, was written only a few months after the return of Hennepin, and embodied the pith of his narrative of the Upper Mississippi, no part of which had then been published.

As will be seen, this section of the *Relation* was written before the return of Hennepin to France, and "the pith of Hen-

nepin's narrative" in the *Relation* is taken from a letter of La Salle which reached France several months before Hennepin. The contents of this account, the context in which it is found, and the queer place where it appears in the *Description*, combine to indicate that La Salle very probably did not receive it from Hennepin.

In 1863, at a meeting of the Buffalo Historical Society, O. H. Marshall read a paper entitled "The Building and the Voyage of the Griffon in 1679." The present writer did not see this paper but a reprint of it in the collected writings of Marshall, which, as the editor says, "was afterwards revised and enlarged, and in its present form was published among the Collections of that Society."³¹ In this Marshall wrote:

Its account [*i.e.*, the *Description's* account] of the building of the *Griffon*, is for the most part, a bold plagiarism from the official record [the *Relation des decouvertes*] of that enterprise which had been communicated, either by La Salle himself, or through his instrumentality, to the French Minister of the Marine, in 1682. Nearly all of Hennepin's account is a verbatim copy of that record; with here and there a slight variation, occasionally relieved by an original paragraph. Twenty-one out of thirty-two pages of his *Louisiane*, relating to the *Griffon*, are copied almost literally from the official document above referred to, now deposited among the Clairambault Collections, in the National Library of Paris.

At present the complete manuscript of the *Relation des decouvertes* is to be found not in the Clairambault Collections, but in the Archives du Service Hydrographique. In the former repository there are now only fragments of the original document together with an incomplete copy. As was noted above, however, the covering memoir and the autograph letters of La Salle are in one of the volumes of the Clairambault Collections which contains the Bernou papers. In a note to his text reproduced above, Marshall asks the reader to compare the passages in the two accounts; giving the reference to the *Relation* as in Margry and to the French text of the *Description*.³²

These examples will suffice to show how these writers accepted Margry's statements, with little comment except an

³¹ *The Historical Writings of the late Orsamus H. Marshall . . .* with an introduction by W. L. Stone, Albany, 1887, 73.

³² *Ibid.*, 77. F. H. Severance in *An Old Frontier of France: The Niagara Region and Adjacent Lakes under French Control*, 2 vols., New York, 1917, drew the only logical conclusion if the *Description of Louisiana* is a plagiarism: "Very slight use has been made of Hennepin, who gives us little not found in more trustworthy form elsewhere," Preface, x.

occasional reference to the disturbing parallelism between the two accounts. None of them either forestalled or anticipated the difficulties Shea was to raise; and, in fact, to the best of our knowledge Shea's objections have never been squarely met by any subsequent writer. During the preparation of this essay one of the most puzzling questions was: Why did none of Hennepin's champions nor any of his attackers investigate more thoroughly the makeup of the *Description*? If Margry had not sufficient money to carry on this inquiry, why did not someone who had the necessary funds follow the method so ably employed by Sparks in 1844 as regards the plagiarism of Le Clercq's book by the author of the *New Discovery*?

J. H. Perkins reviewing Sparks' *Life of Marquette* in the *North American Review* of 1839 made a suggestion which should have been acted on long ago, considering what abundant documentation for the early exploration of the Great Lakes Region and the Mississippi Valley has long been available. "We would suggest . . . the appointment of committees to examine and report upon works of doubtful authenticity such as Hennepin's *New Discovery*, Tonti's *Journal*, and La Hontan's *Account of the Long River*. . ."³³ To this list should certainly be added the *Description of Louisiana*, the *First Establishment of the Faith*, and several other "original," "authentic" accounts. Perhaps the reason why Perkins' suggestion was unheeded is that the task, although of paramount importance for history, is an unenviable and thankless one. Littérateurs, sentimental amateurs, and romantic dilettanti are ever ready to vociferate loudly against the iconoclast who presumes to strip off the plumes, ribbons, tinsel, and colorful trappings, with which they themselves have without warrant bedecked their heroes.

In spite of much sound work already done to correct the mistaken notion that history is a branch of rhetoric, this idea is still influencing more people than one would think. Doubtless one should not be particularly alarmed by such titles of historical books and papers as "The Lure of . . .," "The Glamor of . . .," "The Romance of . . .," "The Poetry of . . .," etc. And in the face of so much evidence to the contrary, no one would wish to maintain that good history cannot be good literature. But what is alarming is to see how readily a piece of entertaining literature, wherein imagination is given free reign at the expense of historical accuracy and regard for facts, may be foisted upon

³³ *North American Review*, XLVIII, 1839, 108.

the public as genuine history. On the other hand, the disproof of a legend, the exposure of a forgery, the critical investigation of a document's authorship, the elimination of spurious documents and the detection of false ascriptions, the analysis of documents with a view to determining the sources whence they were derived—all these necessary labors in the interests of historical accuracy, are still looked upon by not a few as so many major tragedies. And only too often, the historian who undertakes such unpleasant tasks might just as well resign himself to see the good old legend appear in print as if nothing had happened. In questions of authenticity which are not settled beyond possibility of debate, it would of course be excessively optimistic to expect that every reference to such matters should take the form of serious discussion supported by valid evidence in favor of the genuinity of the documents involved; but merely to mention in passing, and in such fashion as to express pained surprise or supercilious wonderment, the fact that these documents have been spoken of as questionably authentic, is not likely to contribute to the improvement of historical writing.

As regards Winsor, it is worth noting that he did not fully subscribe to the view either of Margry or of Shea. In the *Narrative and Critical History of America*, the essay entitled "Father Louis Hennepin and his real or disputed Discoveries," which is an original contribution of Winsor himself,³⁴ he merely states the question, giving the views of Margry, Shea, and Parkman.³⁵ But in his *Cartier to Frontenac*, he wrote of the *Description*:

It stands reasonably well a critical test, and the internal evidence is in its favor. It has been alleged by Margry that the correspondence in the text shows a closer relation to an account written by La Salle than is consistent with an independent relation; but this correspondence extends to events of which Hennepin had personal knowledge, and La Salle had not. It is therefore reasonable to suppose that Hennepin may have acted as a scribe for La Salle, and that each used the same records for his own purposes. It is hardly worth while to go to the other extreme adopted by Shea in charging La Salle with pilfering from Hennepin.³⁶

From this we can only conclude that Winsor did not examine the *Relation des decouvertes* very closely, and that he did not make the comparison with La Salle's letters suggested a

³⁴ *Narrative and Critical History of America*, IV, 247-256.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 250.

³⁶ J. Winsor, *Cartier to Frontenac . . . 1534-1700*, Boston and New York, 1894², 282.

decade earlier by Margry. His two suppositions are gratuitous; they are precisely what needs to be proved in order to establish his contention.

The position adopted by Thwaites is perhaps sufficiently clear from the passages in his two-volume edition of the *New Discovery-New Voyage*, which refer to the *Description*. He mentions Hennepin as "the annalist of the expedition," a title to which, in view of the evidence, he has no claim whatever. Without raising the question of authenticity, Thwaites speaks of the *Description* thus:

His first book . . . is that of a boaster, and nearly every incident therein is obviously over-colored. . . . The successors to the volume are . . . marred by inexcusable and bungling mendacity. . . . Nevertheless, when all is said, we must acknowledge Hennepin's works to be invaluable contributions to the sources of American history; they deserve study, and to this day furnish rare entertainment.³⁷

It is interesting to conjecture what Thwaites would have written had he made a comparative study of the texts. His acknowledgment that Hennepin's works are "invaluable contributions to the sources of American history" would undoubtedly have been modified; but it is cheering to note that his statement about the "rare entertainment" furnished by these pages is even truer than he realized at the time it was made.

2. JOHN GILMARY SHEA

Thus far the views of Margry and of those who accepted his solution have been considered. The alternative view proposed by Shea must now be examined. His *Discovery of the Mississippi Valley*, published in 1852, contains a strong indictment of Hennepin. The historian gives a brief analysis of the *Description*, which apart from any intrinsic faults, possesses considerable value, as being the first published, and by far the fullest account of La Salle's expedition. . . . Taking the volume by itself, the reader is struck by the unclerical character of the writer, his intense vanity and fondness for exaggeration.³⁸

The question of plagiarism is not here touched upon, for the *Relation des decouvertes* was not then known to Shea. Im-

³⁷ R. G. Thwaites, ed., *A New Discovery of a Vast Country in America. By Father Louis Hennepin. Reprinted from the second London issue of 1698, . . .*, 2 vols., Chicago, 1903, I, Introduction, xliii.

³⁸ J. G. Shea, *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley*, Redfield, 1852, 100.

pressed by the parallel passages published by Sparks, he was in a quandary with regard to the trustworthiness of that part of the *Description* narrating events subsequent to February 29, 1680:

A question still remains as to what he really did do on leaving Fort Crèvecoeur. . . . The geographical description [of Hennepin's voyage up the Mississippi] is not that of a traveller ascending, as he describes first what he saw last. . . . What did he do between March 12th and April 12th? Then, too, as to his description of the upper Mississippi, I am inclined to think it due to de Luth [Duluth], who as Le Clercq tells us, was the first to reach the lake of the Issatis, and open the way to the missionaries; this seems more probable as in his last work Hennepin attacks de Luth, and endeavors to destroy the credit, as though de Luth could, and perhaps did tell another story. It will, therefore, be a matter of interest to learn whether any reports of his are still to be found, as the mere fact of Hennepin's attacking him gives them considerable value.³⁹

The report of Duluth which Shea hoped for was found, and was published for the first time twenty years after the above was written. A decade after Shea published his *Discovery of the Mississippi Valley*, Margry began to spread his dark hints. He supposedly had documents which would revolutionize what had been accepted as the history of the discovery and exploration of the Mississippi Valley. When the first three volumes of the Margry compilation were published, Shea wrote his broadside entitled *The Bursting of Pierre Margry's La Salle Bubble*.⁴⁰ The blast would have been harsher still, had Shea known what is known today about the nature of some of the "documents" in the first volume.⁴¹ In those days, access to the documents could not be had, or they could no longer be found, or some other excuse was given. But now that anyone who wishes can consult them and compare their contents with the text which Margry published, the disingenuousness of the editor can no longer be doubted. It is nowadays quite clear that he was unfit for his task, and that his repeated assertions of objectivity, impartiality, love for truth, etc., were mere cant, for his prime intent in publishing some of the "documents"—a notable exception being the letters of La Salle—was to prove a thesis. In spite of all this, however, it must be insisted upon that when a document is genuine, when

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 105-106.

⁴⁰ Jean Delanglez, *Some La Salle Journeys*, Chicago, 1938, 4-10.

⁴¹ Jean Delanglez, *Frontenac and the Jesuits*, Chicago, 1939, 176 ff., 215 ff.

its authenticity is beyond question, when only minor errors of transcription are found in comparing it with the manuscript, the document must be accepted, whether published by Margry or by anyone else; for evidence is evidence, no matter how damaging it may be to a theory. Shea seems to have been casting about for arguments which would discredit the bulk of the documents in Margry's compilation. One can readily understand how, misled by the latter's parade of reticence, and reasonably enough annoyed at his failure to make the disclosures which previous boasts and former dark hints had suggested, Shea might well have adopted an excessively recalcitrant attitude. At any rate, the impression one gets is that he was determined to avoid by every possible means, the necessity of being on the same side of the fence with Margry.

To appreciate Shea's position, we must remember that he had already sharply criticized Hennepin for the *New Discovery* and the *New Voyage*, he had even cast doubt on the voyage up the Mississippi as found in the *Description*, going much farther in his strictures than anyone before or since. Under the circumstances, when Margry, Shea's *bête noire*, published a document purporting to show that Hennepin was even blacker than Shea had painted him, and that besides the pilfering done in 1697, he had, as Margry wrote, begun "his plagiarisms with this document," namely with the *Relation des découvertes*, in 1682, it was only to be expected that Shea should attempt to clear Hennepin's name from so calumnious an accusation. To absolve the author of the *New Discovery* from downright false statements and impossible claims, he advanced the interpolation theory, now rejected even by Hennepin's most determined champions, and, when he translated the *Description*, adopted a view diametrically opposed to that then held. According to Shea, it was not Hennepin who plagiarized the *Relation des découvertes*, but it is rather the author of the latter who was guilty of literary piracy.

Shea's arguments are found in the preface to his translation of the *Description de la Louisiane*, and in the notes he appended to the text.⁴² He begins the discussion of its authenticity thus:

The charge that the *Description of Louisiana* was copied from the document now given by Margry has been taken up in this country without sufficient examination: but it is really too shallow even for such an utterly uncritical mind as Margry's to be pardoned for putting forth.

⁴² J. G. Shea, ed., *A Description of Louisiana by Father Louis Hennepin*, New York, 1830.

This *Relation des découvertes* is anonymous and undated. Margry himself asks whether it was written by La Salle himself or "only by a learned ecclesiastic, by means of letters addressed by the discoverer to some of his friends or associates."⁴³

Later, as was shown above, Margry no longer showed such hesitation, but explicitly attributed the document to its rightful author, Claude Bernou. Shea, however, is right in declaring that Margry's charge was accepted in America "without sufficient examination." There was too much subserviency to theories about America advanced by Europeans, whose knowledge of the history and especially of the geography of this country was notably deficient. This overdeveloped sense of provincialism, coupled with an almost superstitious reverence for European scholarship, tended to paralyze independent research and fostered too ready an acceptance of conclusions from across the Atlantic. Shea, however, went too far in depreciating the reliability of distant observers: "Elsewhere [Margry] gives his opinion that it is the work of Abbé Bernou; but as he was never in America, he could only be a compiler, and must have used Hennepin's work. . . ." It is regrettable to find such an obvious "non sequitur" in the writings of so reputable an historian. It does not follow that because Bernou never came to America, he must therefore have copied Hennepin; for he had something in his possession which Hennepin never had nor even saw—La Salle's letters, the ultimate source of ninety-five per cent of the *Relation* and of two-thirds of the *Description*.

If we analyze this Margry document we find it forms three distinct divisions, 1st an account of La Salle's operations down to his and Hennepin's departure from Fort Crèvecoeur; 2d an account of Hennepin's voyage up the Mississippi and through the Wisconsin to Green Bay. 3d an account of La Salle's return to Fort Frontenac, his second visit to Illinois and his operations to 1681.

In fact, the *Relation des découvertes* is divided into two unequal parts: the first, narrating the first ten years of the explorer's life in Canada, covers three printed pages in Margry; the second part, dealing with La Salle's activities in New France, from 1678 to 1681, covers more than one hundred pages, and is all based on the letters he sent to France during this time. Much labor would have been saved had the *Description of Louisiana* proper been examined more closely. This also is divided into two parts. In the first part, as far as page 205, that is, down to the

⁴³ Shea's Preface to the *Description*, 36.

page where the narrative of the capture of Hennepin and his companions begins, the *Description* follows the *Relation*. The second part recounts the adventures or misadventures of Accault, Auguelle, and Hennepin, especially Hennepin, until their return to Lower Canada in the early months of 1681. One of the principal clues to the plagiarism is the difference between these two parts. Plagiarism in this case does not mean that Hennepin either by himself or with the help of a scribe, copied from some other work the whole of the *Description*, but that the first part, two-thirds of the *Description*, is taken bodily from the *Relation*, with the insertion of a few paragraphs of his own. Once this is understood, most of the arguments marshalled by Shea to prove the plagiarism by Bernou of the *Description* fall to the ground. He wrote:

Now as Hennepin was with La Salle or his party during the first period [until February 29, 1680], he was competent to keep a journal of events, that might be written in some form as La Salle's official report, and in another as the missionary's report to his own superiors.

This is beside the point. The question is not about Hennepin's competence as a chronicler, a point concerning which there are grave doubts, but whether he actually kept a journal of events; and this Shea would have found great difficulty in proving.

As to the second part Margry asks us to accept the preposterous idea that La Salle possessed by some supernatural means the knowledge of all Hennepin saw or did after leaving him at Fort Crèvecoeur, that La Salle committed this knowledge to writing, and that Hennepin, instead of describing what he saw and did as an eyewitness, stole his account from this wonderful document of La Salle. La Salle himself acknowledges the receipt of letters from Hennepin and insists on the reality of his discovery; and to uphold it as against Du Lhut insists that Hennepin exaggerated in making out that he was a prisoner. As La Salle himself admits that his knowledge of this part came from Hennepin, he has already refuted Margry's absurd idea that Hennepin stole this from him.

"Margry's absurd idea" was never expressed by Margry himself. He simply failed to distinguish between what is clearly Hennepin's own and what was stolen from the *Relation*. La Salle acknowledges the receipt of only one letter from Hennepin; and as for obtaining knowledge by "supernatural means" about Hennepin's ascent of the Mississippi and capture by the Sioux and rescue by Duluth, there was not the slightest necessity for this. Shea seems to have overlooked the fact that La Salle wrote his

letter of August 22, 1681, at Fort Frontenac,⁴⁴ after he had gone to Montreal; thus his knowledge of events could have come either from Accault, who, despite Shea's assertion to the contrary, did not stay among the Sioux nor at Michilimackinac, or from Auguelle, who was certainly in Lower Canada at that time, or from both. It should be remembered, moreover, that Duluth and some of the men who had accompanied him were also in Lower Canada, and that none of them were sworn to secrecy. The account in the *Relation des descouvertes* of Hennepin's northern odyssey is merely a transcription of the above mentioned letter of La Salle, and in copying this out of the *Relation* Hennepin gives no sign of recognizing it as his own; on the contrary, some of the changes which he introduced play havoc with the geography of the Upper Mississippi.

"As to the third part, there is nothing of it in Hennepin, so that Margry's charge depends entirely on the first part; and he utterly fails to explain how Hennepin refrained from any plagiarism of the third part." This is another weak argument. Neither Hennepin nor his backers in Paris, where the *Description* was concocted, were foolish enough to narrate events which Hennepin did not witness. So crude an error would have been fatal, since readers could hardly have failed to ask whence came his knowledge of such details. The chronological and topographical precision of the events recorded while Hennepin was with La Salle, and the marked vagueness regarding these specific data when Hennepin was alone would, to put the matter colloquially, have given the whole show away. It must also be remembered that what Hennepin wanted most was to present himself as a principal actor—quite an impossible task had he spoken of events which took place when he himself was hundreds of miles away.

"The reader will see in the following pages that Margry's document in the first part [that is, until February 29, 1680] agrees pretty closely with Hennepin, omitting comparatively little, while it abridges the second part [of the *Description*] greatly." This too is an invalid argument. The close agreement referred to is explained by the fact that Bernou took the narra-

⁴⁴ It has been said: "Harrisse, *Notes pour servir . . .*, p. 333, assigne à cette lettre l'année 1681. L'erreur est manifeste"; it should be 1682, H. Lemay, *Bibliographie du Père Louis Hennepin, récollet. Les Pièces Documentaires*, Montreal, 1937, 27. Internal evidence shows beyond doubt that when La Salle wrote this letter he had not yet gone to the Gulf; and it is known that in August 1682, he was not at Fort Frontenac, but in the Illinois country; cf. "A Calendar of La Salle's Travels," in *MID-AMERICA*, XXII (October 1940), 292, 305.

tive of Hennepin's adventures from La Salle's letter of August 22, 1681. Having passed that point in the narrative where his own departure from Fort Crèvecoeur is mentioned, Hennepin was on his own; and copying verbatim all that he could find about himself in the *Relation* as well as the description of the Mississippi and its tributaries up to Mille Lacs, he began the story of his adventures, of his voyage up the Mississippi.

The whole question is confined therefore to the first part [until February 29, 1680] and as to that there is a simple test. If the narrative describes in detail events that befel the party while La Salle was absent and alludes briefly to what La Salle did, the narrative is Hennepin's; if on the contrary it follows La Salle's actions day by day, and alludes generally to what the party was doing in his absence, it must be La Salle.

Shea then proceeds to show the first alternative to be the true one. Having assumed as a postulate that Hennepin was not guilty of plagiarism, the historian failed to see that the differences in the first part are exactly the same as those in the second. When Hennepin in transcribing Bernou's account saw that his adventure at Niagara and in the Iroquois country had been dismissed with a few words—for Bernou was preoccupied mainly with La Salle and not at all with Hennepin; and had, moreover, no data about these adventures other than what he got from La Salle's letters—he proceeded to expand the narrative of the *Relation des découvertes* by inserting the occasional paragraphs referred to above. These paragraphs are Hennepin's own, just as the entire second part of the *Description* is his own, but this fact does in no way militate against the view that one-third of the *Relation* was taken over bodily to make up two-thirds of the *Description*.

“La Salle apparently took the Recollects to chronicle his doings. Hennepin kept a journal; Membré did also as Le Clercq assures us; Joutel tells us that he seized and destroyed memoirs of Father Maxime Le Clercq.” Of these four assertions in Shea's preface, only the one about Joutel is true. La Salle was opposed to the idea of anybody chronicling his doings; Hennepin's journal is a myth, invented to explain his pillaging of Le Clercq's account of the descent of the Mississippi in 1682; and the journal of Membré is nothing else than the “relation officielle” written by Bernou and attributed to Membré by the editor of the *First Establishment of the Faith*.

Shea ends his argumentation thus:

Every view of the question confirms the opinion that the narrative is really Hennepin's; and that the document in Margry was compiled from it by an unknown hand. Only one question remains, that is whether Margry's anonymous compiler plagiarized from a document drawn up by Hennepin in America or from his printed work.

The second alternative is Shea's conclusion. Before taking up this point, he tries to show that La Salle was not the author of the document; his only argument for this is the knowledge found in both narratives of the part of France in which Auguelle was, namely, in Paris. La Salle was then in Canada; he could not therefore have known the whereabouts of Auguelle in France, and consequently did not write the *Relation*. Margry, although hesitating for a while, had by this time, 1880, given Bernou as the author of the *Relation des decouvertes*. Incidentally, it would be interesting to see what proof Shea had that Hennepin wrote a document in America.

The fact that it [the presence of Auguelle in Paris] appears in the Margry *Relation* seems to show that its compiler used Hennepin's book without giving credit, and used, not a draft or copy made in America, but the edition printed in Paris but had not the honesty to cite Hennepin and refer to him.

This is no proof whatsoever: the *Relation* in Margry bears intrinsic marks of having been finished in the first months of 1682, and the printer did not have Hennepin's book ready until January 5, 1683. Secondly, Bernou, who wrote the *Relation* in Paris, must have known that Auguelle was there. As a matter of fact he got there before Hennepin, for the latter, as will be seen, literally missed the boat.

From this review of Shea's arguments their conclusiveness is more apparent than real; so apparent, in fact, that until a short time ago, the present writer accepted them as final.⁴⁵ But a more detailed knowledge of what took place in Paris in 1682, after Hennepin's return, a line by line comparison of the two narratives, a comparison between the statements contained in both with the letters of La Salle, and finally a comparison between the style and the use of words in the two parts of both the *Description* and the *Relation*, compelled him to revise his former judgment.

Shea's theory was adopted by several writers who later had occasion to speak of the authenticity of the *Description of Lou-*

⁴⁵ Jean Delanglez, *The Journal of Jean Cavalier*, Chicago, 1938, 138, note 25.

isiana, but, like those who hold with Margry, they merely repeated the arguments of the leader and omitted an independent investigation of the problem. Such, for instance, are Fathers Goyens and Lemay, and Abbé H. A. Scott. The first of these after jotting down a few notes, proceeded to publish a hodge-podge of views no less astonishing than amusing on the history of the exploration of the Great Lakes region and of the Mississippi Valley. American historians of this period would be both entertained and encouraged by a perusal of Father Goyens' definitive statements.⁴⁶ One of the many questions "settled" is Hennepin's voyage down to the mouth of the Mississippi in 1680. Father Goyens demanded that "once for all, the data furnished by Hennepin be compared with the official surveys up and down the Mississippi."⁴⁷ This imperious request has been granted and the comparison demanded has been made.⁴⁸

Hennepin's good name was at last strikingly and apodictically vindicated, thanks to the conscientious and erudite study of Mr. J. Gilmory Shea, published in 1880. In the masterly preface, etc. . . . The plagiarism imputed to Father Hennepin should be clearly proved, texts in hands. We have been waiting for a long time, and are still waiting. . . .⁴⁹

Again, referring to Margry: "He finally decides that 'this document [the *Relation des decouvertes*] must have been composed on La Salle's letters.' This categorical assertion is perhaps sincere, but it does not satisfy those readers who prefer convincing arguments to it."⁵⁰ There is reason to wonder whether the author of this article read the *Relation* and the letters of La Salle and compared them with the *Description*. The article, however, is rather an apology for Hennepin on general grounds than a specific discussion of the *Description*, and its main purpose was to prove the reality of the voyage down the Mississippi in 1680. It drew a caustic rejoinder from the late H. A. Scott,⁵¹ who commented thus on the authenticity of the *Description*:

⁴⁶ J. Goyens, "Le Père Louis Hennepin, O.F.M., Missionnaire au Canada au XVII^e siècle. Quelques jalons pour sa biographie," in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, XVIII, 1925, 318-345, 473-510.

⁴⁷ Goyens, *loc. cit.*, 473.

⁴⁸ Jean Delanglez, "Hennepin's Voyage to the Gulf of Mexico 1680," in *MID-AMERICA*, XXI (January 1939), 43-74.

⁴⁹ Goyens, *loc. cit.*, 497.

⁵⁰ Goyens, *loc. cit.*, 496.

⁵¹ "Un coup d'épée dans l'eau, ou une nouvelle apologie du P. Louis Hennepin," in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, series 3, XXI, 1937, section 1, 113-160; reprinted in H. A. Scott, *Nos Anciens Historiographes et autres études d'Histoire Canadienne*, Lévis, 1930, under the title: "Que faut-il penser du P. Hennepin et de son nouvel apologiste?" 77-147.

In spite of all, if Father Hennepin had only written the *Description of Louisiana*, his name would have been blameless and he would have remained one of the great explorers of the seventeenth century. The accusation levelled against him that his book is a plagiarism of a so-called La Salle relation has long since been known to be false. Why should he need other people's eyes to describe places and events which he saw with his own eyes?⁵²

The last sentence, as is clear, merely repeats in different words what Shea had said. The first sentence is an echo of what Thwaites wrote in the preface to his edition of *Hennepin's New Discovery*.⁵³ As to his fame as "one of the great explorers," it is based on his having travelled with the Sioux from the Wisconsin to the Mille Lacs region. He was not the only white man with the Indians; he was not the leader of the exploring party, for La Salle had entrusted the expedition to Accault.

The most recent writer to concern himself with Hennepin was Father Lemay. As was noted elsewhere,⁵⁴ his premature death cut short the series of studies which he was publishing before attempting to deal explicitly with the most important question regarding the missionary. These articles as well as a volume of contemporary documents written by or about Hennepin⁵⁵ were so many avenues leading to the central question: "Did Hennepin go down the Mississippi to the Gulf in 1680?"⁵⁶ As a prelude to the treatment of this question, Father Lemay was engaged in composing a critical bibliography, arranged according to countries, of all the works concerning Hennepin by various writers in France, Belgium, Holland, England, Italy, Spain, the United States, and Canada. Death cut short this work before the end of the second article, which, as the editors note, was only partially written by Father Lemay, and it is they who have "inserted all the information found among the author's notes."⁵⁷ It is all the more regrettable that Father Lemay could not have finished this article, for in it the opinions of American writers are passed in review. "Let us say at the outset that the worth while works on Father Hennepin, the critical works, are the American studies,"⁵⁸ that is, by writers in the United States.

⁵² *Nos Anciens Historiographes*, 117.

⁵³ Cf. Thwaites, *Hennepin's New Discovery*, Introduction, xxxiii.

⁵⁴ "Hennepin's Voyage to the Gulf of Mexico 1680," *loc. cit.*, 81, note.

⁵⁵ *Bibliographie du P. Louis Hennepin*, . . . , Montreal, 1937.

⁵⁶ "Le Père Louis Hennepin, récollet, devant l'histoire," in *Nos Cahiers*, III, 1938, 245.

⁵⁷ *Nos Cahiers*, III, 1938, 374.

⁵⁸ *Loc. cit.*, 357.

He did, however, complete his survey of French writers' views on Hennepin.⁵⁹ This survey, though based on Goyens, is much more balanced than the latter's. With regard to the authenticity of the *Description*, Lemay, in his comments on Margry, repeats briefly what Shea had said:

Bernou plagiarized Hennepin, that is, very likely the manuscript of the *Description of Louisiana*, which the Recollect had submitted either to Bernou or to Renaudot. Let us note, however, that Bernou's *Relation* plagiarized Hennepin's only in the first part and a part of the third.⁶⁰

There is no mention of Margry's main argument—the letters of La Salle which are the basis of the *Relation*. Clearly Father Lemay was only superficially acquainted with the *Relation* which he termed a plagiarism of the *Description*, and moreover, as the following parallel passages will show, he relied on Goyens' analysis of the contents of the *Relation des decouvertes*, which was supposedly taken from Shea.

En vue d'un examen critique à établir, Mr. G. Shea distingue 3 parties hétérogènes dans la relation (anonyme) soi-disant officielle publiée par Mr. Margry, I, 435-544. La 1^{re} partie comprend le voyage de La Salle avec Hennepin jusqu'au Fort Crève-Coeur (475-7) [i.e., 435-477]; la 2^e, le voyage d'Hennepin avec deux canotiers vers l'embouchure du Mississippi (477-83); la 3^e, le retour de La Salle au Fort Frontenac, sa seconde visite aux Illinois et ses exploits jusqu'en 1684 (483-544). . . .

La 3^e partie est évidemment étrangère à la plume d'Hennepin.⁶¹

La Relation Bernou comprend en effet trois parties hétérogènes. La première décrit le voyage de La Salle avec Hennepin jusqu'au fort Crèvecoeur; la seconde, le voyage du bas-Mississipi; la troisième, le retour de La Salle au fort Frontenac et son activité jusqu'en 1684. La *Description de la Louisiane*, elle, passe sous silence la descente du Mississipi, et, publiée au début de 1683, elle ne dit évidemment rien des aventures subséquentes de La Salle.⁶²

Let the reader turn to the passage in Shea's preface describing the *Relation des decouvertes*, quoted a few pages back in the present essay, and see whether the historian speaks of this

⁵⁹ *Loc. cit.*, 246-276.

⁶⁰ *Loc. cit.*, 248.

⁶¹ Goyens, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, XVIII, 1925, 480.

⁶² Lemay, *Nos Cahiers*, III, 1938, 268.

narrative as giving "Hennepin's voyage . . . toward the mouth of the Mississippi," as Goyens has it, or "the voyage to the lower Mississippi" as Lemay put it. On the contrary, Shea specifically states that what he considered the second part of the *Relation* contains "an account of Hennepin's voyage up the Mississippi," which of course makes quite a difference in the present case. As for the third part, which, we are told, treats of La Salle's exploits (Goyens), or activities (Lemay) until 1684, what Shea actually says is "until 1681." The very title of the *Relation* gives 1681 as the latest date. This is not a misprint on the part of Lemay, for he adds that the *Description* "published at the beginning of 1683, says nothing of the subsequent adventures of La Salle." These errors, slight in themselves, become important as indications that neither Lemay nor Goyens made an independent investigation of the problem. Goyens misquoted Shea, and Lemay repeated the error of Goyens, without even verifying the passage quoted, to say nothing of attempting a textual comparison between the *Description* and the *Relation*.

3. MARC DE VILLIERS

There is another hypothesis, differing from those of both Margry and Shea, which must be examined here, not only because it is closer to facts than either of the above, but because the present writer was formerly so impressed by its compatibility with the evidence as to conjecture it would one day be proved true.⁶³ This is the theory advanced by De Villiers in 1929.⁶⁴ Margry and many another after him, wrote De Villiers, have pointed out Hennepin's plagiarism of the *Relation des decouvertes*, and have on that account abused him:

This time, however, we shall take up the defense of the very uninteresting Recollect and show that far from having secretly pilfered the *Relation*, he evidently confined himself to introduce in a work, the idea of which was perhaps suggested to him, some two hundred pages recast for his use by a man who was both an able writer and a devoted friend of the explorer.⁶⁵

To be sure, the two hundred pages were "recast," but a more detailed comparison than that made by De Villiers between the *Description* and the original *Relation* shows the writer of the

⁶³ "Hennepin's Voyage to the Gulf of Mexico 1680," *loc. cit.*, 45-46.

⁶⁴ M. de Villiers du Terrage, *La Louisiane, Histoire de son nom et des ses frontieres successives (1681-1819)*, Paris, 1929.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 13.

first to have been less able than the author of the second. The idea of writing a book was indeed suggested to Hennepin, but hardly by Renaudot or Villermont, and certainly not by Bernou. If anything was to be published, the manuscript was first to be submitted to La Salle;⁶⁶ and it is stretching probability too far to assert that they "wanted to make use of the Recollect to issue a relation about Louisiana composed according to their own ideas."⁶⁷ The reason is evident: Why should they have wished to publish a relation containing less than one-half of what they then knew of La Salle's explorations in North America? This would defeat their purpose, which, as Bernou states in the memoir accompanying the *Relation des decouvertes*, was to show that La Salle was "the only man in Canada able to lead the undertaking entrusted to him by Monseigneur Colbert."⁶⁸

But, reasoned De Villiers, after these unacceptable premises, "as soon as Father Hennepin got hold of the map and of the documents he needed, he hastened, without the slightest scruple, to separate himself from his collaborators, whom he considered too authoritarian, and he finished the narrative of his voyage after his own fashion."⁶⁹ This supposed what should be proved, namely, that Bernou, Renaudot, and Villermont were Hennepin's collaborators. One thing is certain: Hennepin somehow secured or, more likely, was given a copy of the *Relation des decouvertes*. It is hardly possible that he was able to secure the map then already drawn or in the process of being drawn in Paris, which was presented to Seignelay sometime in 1682, and which includes geographical details that are only found in La Salle's letters. The delineation of the Great Lakes as they appear on the Paris map and on Hennepin's is so widely different that N. Guerard, the draughtsman of Hennepin's map, cannot have had a copy of the Paris map before him when he drew the map accompanying the *Description of Louisiana*.

⁶⁶ "With regard to his [La Salle] latest discoveries, I advise you to give him the relation which I wrote, so that he may correct it, add to it or shorten it. . . ." Bernou to Renaudot, January 25, 1684, BN Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:87. "As for my relation corrected, augmented or re-written, it will be all he can do if he can leave it with you before he leaves. . ." *Id.* to *id.*, February 22, 1684, *ibid.*, 98v. "Do not fail to have him fully annotate the relations dont j'ay été le scribe in case he has no time to re-write it all. . . . I see in re-reading your letter that you intend to re-write the relation with the corrections and additions of M. de la Salle. I was very glad when I read this, and shall be gladder still when I receive the copy you promise to send me." *Id.* to *id.*, March 14, 1684, *ibid.*, 104.

⁶⁷ De Villiers, *La Louisiane*, 14.

⁶⁸ Margry, II, 287.

⁶⁹ *La Louisiane*, 14.

De Villiers argues further that even if Hennepin had already begun his narrative, La Salle's friends realized

They must at all cost prevent the Recollect from narrating after his own fashion the events which took place while he was with La Salle, and it is undoubtedly in the interest of the discoverer that Bernou substituted his prose for that of Father Hennepin, and allowed him, although very unwillingly, to follow his imagination from March 1, 1680 on. . . .⁷⁰

This is not consonant with what he has said above. If Hennepin, once in possession of map and documents, proceeded to separate himself from his collaborators, what need was there for Bernou to substitute his prose for that of Hennepin, and let him "follow his imagination from March 1, 1680 on?" There is only one explanation: Hennepin had a copy of the *Relation des découvertes*, and the substitution, effected by Hennepin himself, consists in his taking the place of La Salle as leader.

"The last hundred pages of the *Description of Louisiana* fully enable us to see in what a fanciful and personal manner Father Hennepin, left to his own devices, would have narrated the events of the first year of his voyage in America."⁷¹ This is discussed later on in the same chapter where De Villiers—the first to call attention to this feature of the *Description*—compares the style of the last third with the style of the first two-thirds. He also lists some of the modifications or corrections made in the text of the *Relation* to make the story agree with the *Description*; that these corrections "Hennepin would have been unable to make" may be readily granted, but the assertion "Bernou was too attached to his work to let anybody touch it" is contradicted by Bernou himself.⁷² The abbé really wanted La Salle to re-write his *Relation*, and only suggested the expedient mentioned in the letter quoted by De Villiers, because Renaudot had written that La Salle would not have time to do this. Only by omitting the first words of the passage quoted from Bernou's letter in Margry, and by changing the future tense into a conditional, does De Villiers make the quotation say that Bernou was too attached to his work to let *anybody* touch it.⁷³

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁷² See the texts *supra*, note 66.

⁷³ "Vous me dites qu'il [La Salle] n'aura pas le temps. Ne faudra-t-il pas qu'il se repose deux ou trois jours à Montrouge? Et, pour abrégé, il ne faudra pas qu'il fasse une relation, mais seulement des notes de correction et augmentation. . . ." Bernou to Renaudot, March 28, 1684, Margry, III, 79.

Undoubtedly, someone did recast the text of Bernou's *Relation* to make it fit in with the *Description*. Who the re-write man was will probably never be known for certain, but he was evidently a man of less ability than Bernou, and in revising the text under Hennepin's direction, he conspicuously failed to blend the two distinct parts into one homogeneous whole. Bernou, says De Villiers, never acknowledged having collaborated in the *Description of Louisiana*.⁷⁴ This is only natural, since his "collaboration" consisted in having unwittingly supplied two-thirds of the material for Hennepin's book.

A more serious difficulty than the one just noted against Hennepin's plagiarism of the *Relation des decouvertes*, arises from Bernou's correspondence with Renaudot. Not once in his extant letters does Bernou allude to the pillaging of his *Relation* by Hennepin, although on several occasions he mentions the missionary explicitly. The present writer long regarded this point to be conclusive.⁷⁵ But since there can be no doubt that the *Relation* was written by Bernou from the letters of La Salle, and that two-thirds of the *Description of Louisiana* are lifted bodily from the *Relation*, the passages in which Bernou speaks of Hennepin must be interpreted in the light of these two facts.

Bernou went to Rome as counsel of the special envoy of the Portuguese government, then in trouble with Spain over Colonia do Sacramento in South America. He left Paris for Rome sometime in April 1683, just as the *Description* was being sold. On May 18, he wrote from Rome to Renaudot:

I am saying nothing to M. de la Salle [in a letter written to the explorer the same day which he asked Renaudot to forward] about the book of Father Hennepin, because it made me too angry while reading it on my way here. It would be well, however, that M. de la Salle be given a copy and that he should annotate it; these annotations could be used in a preface [to a book planned by the explorer's friends which would contain *La Salle's Description of Louisiana*] as a treat for the good Father.⁷⁶

The following year when Bernou heard that La Salle was in France, he wrote:

Give him my relation [scilicet the *Relation des decouvertes*] which I

"Il ne faudrait pas qu'il fasse une Relation, mais seulement des notes de correction et augmentation, . . ." De Villiers' citation of the above passage, *La Louisiane*, 16.

⁷⁴ *La Louisiane*, 18.

⁷⁵ *The Journal of Jean Cavalier*, 138, note 25.

⁷⁶ Bernou to Renaudot, May 18, 1683, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:10.

left with you. He may use it as an outline; let him correct it or lengthen it, if this should be easier for him, although I would prefer him to re-write it, not being very satisfied with it myself, especially with regard to the beginning, for which I lacked dates and memoirs.⁷⁷ Remind him to give Dom Hempin a good drubbing; it will be his revenge and mine.⁷⁸

The lack of dates and memoirs is a reference to the lopsidedness of the *Relation des descouvertes*; the first eleven years of La Salle in Canada cover only three pages in the printed text of the *Relation*, whereas the last three years, for which Bernou had dates and memoirs, namely, the letters of La Salle, take up more than one hundred pages. Bernou's anger and desire for revenge on Hennepin are difficult to account for, on any basis but a realization that his own work had been pillaged. And La Salle could hardly have shared these sentiments, except by coming to know that Hennepin assumed throughout the rôle of leader which rightfully belonged to La Salle himself. Regrettably, the preface of *La Salle's Description of Louisiana* was never written; it would have thrown interesting light on the whole plagiarism affair, to say nothing of other matters.

The above texts taken from signed autograph letters by the author of the *Relation des descouvertes* suggest a further conclusion which, as will be seen in detail later on, is confirmed by the following considerations. It is impossible to believe that Bernou did not know how Hennepin came to be in possession of the manuscript of which there were only a few copies.⁷⁹ The leakage could only have come through the influential sponsors of Hennepin's book, the very same men who were striving to prevent the recall of Frontenac. In this they had failed, and they seem to have sought consolation in making public in the *Description* the praises of the governor's administration. The Jansenistically inclined members of the coterie would naturally be glad to have a book on the missions of Canada, the first one since the Jesuits, ten years previously, had stopped publishing their famous *Relations de la Nouvelle-France*; Renaudot, for instance, would not at all be averse to the publication of a book which would speak of the Canadian missions without saying a word about the Jesuits there. From the book itself, one might suppose the Jesuit

⁷⁷ Cf. "Le P. Hennepin, récollet, devant l'histoire," in *Nos Cahiers*, III, 1938, 268-269, the curious interpretation given to this particular passage.

⁷⁸ Bernou to Renaudot, February 1, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n.a., 7497:89.

⁷⁹ Cf. *Id. to id.*, January 25, 1684, *ibid.*, 87; *id. to id.*, February 22, 1684, *ibid.*, 98v, etc.

missions no longer existed. The author speaks of the three great mission stations of the West, Green Bay, Michilimackinac, and Sault Ste Marie; he passed through Green Bay, and spent the winter at Michilimackinac, but he does not so much as hint that there were missionaries there. Instead, laboring always under the "first" complex, he has Recollect missions scattered all over the map which graces the *Description*, with what accuracy one may gather from the following:

Another noticeable point of the map is the representation of a mission station far north of the source of the Mississippi, where it is certain that none had been established, or at least there is no record of such. The placing of it there seems to have been a pretension on the part of the Recollect Hennepin that his order had outstripped the venturesome Jesuits. . . .⁸⁰

All these circumstances combine to explain why Bernou did not speak of the plagiarism of "Dom Hempin" in his letters to Renaudot. Moreover, it is unlikely that he failed to discuss the matter with his friend before leaving for Rome. Renaudot, who also knew the circumstances of the composition of the *Description*, kept his friend informed how the book was being received; he told the abbé in Rome that it was a success and was helping the affairs of La Salle, which was after all the primary end they had in view in publishing some account of the explorer's adventures. "What you tell me of the good effect of the bad book of Father Hennepin . . . gladdens me."⁸¹ Bernou had by this time changed his mind with regard to publishing anything himself about La Salle's affairs; to tell the truth, "I have always thought that his [La Salle's] relation should not be printed."⁸² This is a further indication that he did not "collaborate" in the *Description*.

In the study of De Villiers which we have already discussed at length, the author calls attention to Hennepin's position when he arrived in Paris. The *privilege* (copyright) of the *Description*, he notes, is dated September 3, 1682; "seven or eight months, at the most, elapsed since Hennepin's arrival in Paris and the handing of the manuscript to the Royal Censor." De Villiers still gives too much time for the composition of the *Description*.

The missionary probably brought back a few notes from Canada . . . , nevertheless without collaborators, without protectors, in bad

⁸⁰ J. Winsor, *Cartier to Frontenac*, 278-279.

⁸¹ Bernou to Renaudot, February 29, 1684, Margry, III, 74.

⁸² *Id.* to *id.*, May 26, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:108v.

terms with the Jesuits, and even with some of the Provincials of his Order, in spite of the *imprimatur* of Fathers Harveau and Micault, Hennepin would never have been able to secure (one does not see how) the manuscript of Bernou, recast it skilfully, find an editor, and finally obtain so quickly the *privilège* for a work dealing with New France, a subject particularly thorny at this time of many-sided rivalries.⁸³

De Villiers did not know the correspondence of M. Dudouyt with Bishop Laval. These letters show that Hennepin had collaborators, influential protectors, that he was not then on bad terms with either his own Provincial or with the Provincial of Paris. The textual analysis of the *Description of Louisiana* shows that he was able to secure the Bernou manuscript, that the recasting was not made by Hennepin alone. Thanks to his protectors, it was not difficult to find an editor or to obtain the necessary royal *privilège*. This element of time is important in determining the date of composition of the *Description*, a fact which those who claim that Bernou plagiarized Hennepin seem to have overlooked. Internal evidence of both works permit us to narrow down to within a few months the time when the two accounts were composed. As a preliminary, we will follow Hennepin from the time he left Fort Crèvecoeur, February 29, 1680, until we lose sight of him in July 1682. This chronology will serve several purposes. For the American period, it will serve as a basis for comparison between the chronology in the last third of the *Description* and the first two-thirds; for the French period, it will make clear that the time which elapsed between the arrival of Hennepin in Paris and the final draft of the *Description* is even shorter than De Villiers thought; indirectly it will prove the *Description* posterior to the Relation and dependent upon it.

4. HENNEPIN IN AMERICA 1680-1681

Accault, Auguelle, and Hennepin left Fort Crèvecoeur the last day of February 1680.⁸⁴ They descended the Illinois to its mouth, arriving at the confluence with the Mississippi March 7, 1680⁸⁵ There, owing to drifting ice, they waited until March 12, and

⁸³ *La Louisiane*, 15.

⁸⁴ "Ils partirent le dernier jour de Février. . . ." La Salle's autograph letter signed, *post* September 29, 1680, Margry, II, 55; in another autograph letter signed, dated August 22, 1681, La Salle wrote: "Ils partirent du fort Crèvecoeur le 28 février au soir. . . ." Margry, II, 246.

⁸⁵ La Salle's letter of August 22, 1681, Margry, II, 247.

then went north.⁸⁶ On April 11, they were taken prisoner by a band of Sioux;⁸⁷ captives and captors reached St. Anthony Falls early in May, and arrived in the Mille Lacs region "about Easter time of the year 1680," as Hennepin wrote in the *Description*.⁸⁸ From this time on, his local and chronological sequences are untrustworthy, inaccurate, and hopelessly muddled. He met Duluth, he says, on July 25,⁸⁹ at some point between the Wisconsin and the Chippewa. Duluth, according to his own memoir, coming from Lake Superior, ascended a river (the Brulé) which has its mouth eight leagues from the westernmost tip of the lake. At the headwaters of this river, he portaged to a lake (Upper Lake St. Croix) which discharged itself into a river (the St. Croix) and so brought him to the Mississippi. There to his surprise, he heard that Hennepin and two Frenchmen were prisoners of the Sioux. Accordingly with his interpreter and two Frenchmen, he went "where the Reverend Father Louis was, and as the distance was at least eighty leagues, I canoed two days and two nights, and the next day, at ten o'clock in the morning, I met him [Hennepin] with about one thousand or eleven hundred souls."⁹⁰ Duluth had left some undetermined place on the shore of Lake Superior "in June"; hence, if we regard the date given by Hennepin for the meeting as approximately correct, we must conclude that his trips up and down the Mississippi are not as numerous as he claims.⁹¹ The whole party went up to the Issati villages, where, says Hennepin, they arrived August 14, 1680.⁹²

Then, we are told, they stayed at the village until the end of

⁸⁶ *Relation des descouvertes*, Margry, I, 479.

⁸⁷ La Salle's letter of August 22, 1681, Margry, II, 255.

⁸⁸ *Description de la Louisiane*, Paris, 1683, 242.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 285.

⁹⁰ Memoir of Duluth, who signed his name Dulhut, in Harris, *Notes pour servir . . .*, 179. Harris erroneously dates it 1685 instead of 1682. Cf. *ibid.*, 179, "le Reuerend pere Louis Henpin Recollet de present au couuent de St. Germain"; Hennepin never returned to Paris after 1682; in 1685, he was at Renty, according to the *New Discovery*; and that year Duluth was in the Northwest, cf. Seignelay to de Meules, March 20, 1685, Archives des Colonies, B 11:116v. The memoir is reprinted in Margry, VI, 20-25; it was Englished by Shea in his translation of the *Description*, 374-377, reprinted by L. P. Kellogg, in *Early Narratives of the Northwest, 1634-1699*, New York, 1917, 329-334.

⁹¹ The distances given by Hennepin after March 7 are not very helpful. The value of his league varies. Thus from the Illinois River to the Wisconsin it is three and a half miles to the league; from the Wisconsin to the Falls of St. Anthony, two miles; from the Falls to Mille Lacs, one and a half miles. The *Description* gives a total of 184 leagues from the mouth of the Wisconsin to Mille Lacs; accordingly, Duluth would have met him some seventy miles below the Wisconsin, and even farther south, because Hennepin's elastic league south of Prairie du Chien is worth three and a half miles.

⁹² *Description de la Louisiane*, 286.

September. This date cannot be correct if the preceding one is; for Duluth in his memoir of 1682, makes it clear that he did not tarry six weeks in the village. He tells us that a week after his arrival in the Sioux village, a council was held, in which he reproached the chiefs for their bad treatment of the missionary and the two Frenchmen. They tried to appease Duluth; but this did not "prevent me from saying to the Reverend Father Louis that he must come with me toward the Outagamys [Fox Indians] which he did." This whole episode upset Duluth's plans for he had heard of a sea in the west-north-west, and was anxious to continue his explorations in that direction, especially because he thought that this sea was the Gulf of California.

Nevertheless, having made known to the Indians my just indignation against them, I preferred to retrace my steps rather than remain among them after the violence they had done to the said Reverend Father, and to the two Frenchmen who were with him. Taking all three [lesquels] in my canoe, I brought them to Michilimackinac, where is the mission of the Jesuit Fathers.⁹³

Hennepin tells us an Indian chief gave him a map which showed them the route to this mission.⁹⁴ In fact, this map would hardly have been necessary, for Duluth himself knew the way down the Mississippi River to the Wisconsin, the route up the Wisconsin and down the Fox River to Green Bay, which had been explored ten years before and was known to traders and *coureurs de bois*, to Duluth, to Fafard, and also to many people in Lower Canada, thanks to the Jolliet and Randin maps.

According to Hennepin's assertion in the *Description*, the party arrived at Michilimackinac before the month of December 1680.⁹⁵ The story of his stop at Green Bay, and of his preaching at Michilimackinac is peculiar. At Green Bay, he says, he was able to say Mass because Frenchmen who were there "had some wine in a pewter flagon."⁹⁶ This suggests that there were no missionaries at Green Bay. But in that very year, at the Jesuit mission of St. Francis Xavier, which had been established there long before Hennepin ever came to America, two Jesuit missionaries were stationed: Fathers André and Albanel. The same is true of Michilimackinac, where Hennepin spent the winter of 1680-1681. There were, in 1680, three Jesuit missionaries

⁹³ HARRISSE, *Notes pour servir . . .*, 180.

⁹⁴ *Description de la Louisiane*, 289.

⁹⁵ "Pour employer utilement le temps je preschay toutes les Festes & Dimanches de l'Avent & Careme. . ." *Description de la Louisiane*, 294.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 292.

at the post, Fathers Nouvel, Pierson, and Enjalran.⁹⁷ Consequently, it is unlikely that Hennepin's services as a preacher were the crying need of the moment.

From now on some of the chronology of the *Description* can be checked, and Hennepin's dates are usually found to be incorrect. He wrote that he left Michilimackinac during Easter week of the year 1681. It was still very cold, the lake was frozen, and the party had to "drag the provisions and canoes over the ice of Lac d'Orleans [Lake Huron] for more than ten leagues . . . until finding the ice sufficiently broken . . . we launched our canoes on the open water, after having celebrated the feast of Quasimodo Sunday."⁹⁸ In 1681, Easter fell on April 6, hence Quasimodo, the first Sunday after Easter, was April 13. This first specific date of the *Description* since August 14 of the previous year is contradicted by Duluth, who states that he left Michilimackinac while the lake was still frozen, "as early as March 29, of the year 1681, with the said Reverend Father [Hennepin] and the other two Frenchmen [*i.e.*, Accault and Auguelle] dragging [on the ice] my canoe and our provisions . . ."⁹⁹

Quasimodo Sunday is the last specific date in the entire *Description*. Hennepin's mention of the route followed by the party, though it cannot be directly checked because his is the only record of it, is surely incorrect. From Michilimackinac to Montreal there were three routes: one, the most frequented route, went by way of Georgian Bay, Lake Nipissing, and the Ottawa River; the second, by way of Lake Simcoe, across a portage to Teïoïagon and then along the north shore of Lake Ontario to Fort Frontenac and Montreal, which was La Salle's favorite route; the third, down Lake Huron, through Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, Niagara, and Lake Ontario. At that time, this third route was used least of all; yet Hennepin asserts that they took it,¹⁰⁰ thus asking us to believe that they made a detour of more than 500 miles. This is all the more incredible because Duluth was anxious to reach Lower Canada as soon as possible so as to clear himself of the accusation of insubordination and disobedience to the explicit orders of the kind. In his memoir he is emphatic on this point: "I reached our settlements three months before the amnesty which your Majesty kindly granted his subjects . . .

⁹⁷ Jesuit Catalogues for that year.

⁹⁸ *Description de la Louisiane*, 296.

⁹⁹ HARRISSE, *Notes pour servir . . .*, 180.

¹⁰⁰ *Description de la Louisiane*, 296-297.

arrived," in Canada.¹⁰¹ It is known that the decree of amnesty reached Quebec before August 11, 1681,¹⁰² hence Duluth was in "our settlements," that is, at least as far as Montreal, at the beginning of May. It took a month, sometimes less, sometimes a little more, to go from Michilimackinac to Montreal *via* the Ottawa, hence if Duluth left the western post March 29, he would have reached Montreal by the beginning of May. There is nothing in the evidence to suggest that Duluth went one way and Hennepin another, for the pioneer speaks of one canoe, and usually, for mutual safety, as many as possible traveled together.

Duluth's silence regarding the route followed might be considered as a sign that Hennepin is correct in what he says. But if, on the sole authority of Hennepin, it is maintained that they took the roundabout way through the Great Lakes, other difficulties present themselves. Hennepin speaks of a visit at "the large Seneca village," situated, he tells us, thirty leagues from Niagara, and eighty leagues from Fort Frontenac. He reached this village "about Pentecost of the year 1681,"¹⁰³ that is, about May 25, 1681. The date of his arrival at Fort Frontenac—another visit which rests on his sole authority—is not given. To travel eighty leagues by canoe along the shore of Lake Ontario would have taken at least one week, which means that he would have been at the fort during the first part of June. La Salle himself arrived at the fort a few weeks later, but says not a word in his letter of August 22, 1681, about the visit of "the bare-footed one who is [must be] a spirit to have traveled so far."¹⁰⁴ In the same letter, La Salle speaks of Duluth at some length, but does not refer to his having visited the fort at this time, in spite of Duluth's being in Hennepin's company. This argument from silence is, of course, not conclusive, especially when we remember that La Salle was not interested in Hennepin. He was much interested, however, in Accault, the leader of the expedition he had sent to Sioux, and hence it is rather surprising that he did not mention the visit of the party to the fort.

No date is given of Hennepin's arrival at Montreal. We are told merely that he covered the distance from Fort Frontenac to

¹⁰¹ HARRISSE, *Notes pour servir* . . . , 181.

¹⁰² The day when the decree was entered into the registers of the Sovereign Council, *Jugements et délibérations du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle France, 1663-1710*, 6 vols., Quebec, 1885-1891, II, 624.

¹⁰³ *Description de la Louisiane*, 297. In one of his letters La Salle gives 70 leagues as the total distance along the shore from Niagara to Fort Frontenac, Margry, II, 64; in his first memoir, Margry, I, 578, Tonti gives 60 leagues, the length of the diagonal between these two points.

¹⁰⁴ *Description de la Louisiane*, 300.

the town, sixty leagues, in two and a half days. In Montreal, however, there was a personage whose movements are known—Frontenac himself, who wined and dined Hennepin “for twelve days.”¹⁰⁵ This is simply mentioned in the *Description*; but in the *New Discovery*, it is fully dramatized, and there are numerous details, such as the meeting with Bishop Laval, near Champlain.¹⁰⁶ The movements of His Excellency, during this period, have been ascertained; it is certain, for instance, that he was at Champlain on June 3, 1681.¹⁰⁷

Hennepin asserts that “about Pentecost” (May 25) he was at the great Seneca village on the south shore of Lake Ontario, and that when he arrived in Montreal, Frontenac was there. Frontenac went to Montreal twice in 1681. He left Quebec May 5,¹⁰⁸ for the upper St. Lawrence, a journey which in ordinary circumstances took about one week;¹⁰⁹ hence he would have reached Montreal in the middle of May; and there is positive evidence that he was at Repentigny,¹¹⁰ enroute for Chambly, on June 7, and back in Quebec on June 30.¹¹¹ On his second trip, he left Quebec July 9,¹¹² was at Montreal on July 30,¹¹³ and was back in Quebec on August 11.¹¹⁴ Hence Hennepin must have met the governor on the latter’s first journey up the St. Lawrence.

Keeping these facts in mind, the argument is as follows: If about May 25—the date given in the *Description*—Hennepin was eighty leagues from Fort Frontenac, he cannot have been at Champlain below Three Rivers, 110 miles north of Montreal, on June 3, having meanwhile been feasted for twelve days at Montreal by Frontenac. And this does not include the time he is supposed to have spent at Fort Frontenac—assuming, of course, that he was actually there. Hennepin’s apologists cannot have it both ways: either he “fixed” the dates in the *Description* or else in the *New Discovery*; considering his tendencies, the likelihood is that he arranged the chronology in both.

From all this it seems very probable that Hennepin kept no “journal” and hardly took any notes during his travels; at any

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 302.

¹⁰⁶ *Nouvelle decouverte . . .*, Utrecht, 1697, 475.

¹⁰⁷ A. Gosselin, *Vie de M^{sr} de Laval*, 2 vols., Quebec, 1890, II, 252.

¹⁰⁸ *Jugements et délibérations*, II, 576.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Tonti’s first memoir, Margry, I, 574; P. Kalm, *Peter Kalm’s Travels in North America*, A. B. Benson, ed., 2 vols., New York, 1937, II, 514.

¹¹⁰ *Jugements et délibérations*, II, 599.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 581.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 595.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 615.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 622.

rate, he cannot have had such a journal in his possession nor anything but the sketchiest notes of his own when the *Description* was being put together in Paris, in the middle of 1682. Another remark more pertinent than the above to the central problem of plagiarism is the following: As long as he had Bernou's *Relation*, based on La Salle's letters, Hennepin was able to give a coherent account of his travels precisely because during the period he was with La Salle, who kept a diary; but once left to his own devices, after parting with La Salle his wanderings are hopelessly muddled, and his chronology is impossible. Furthermore, during the entire time when he was separated from La Salle, the explorer's travels are so detailed, that he can be followed almost day by day.¹¹⁵ Those who hold that La Salle had "Hennepin chronicling the events" cannot afford to ignore this important consideration, though it is more easily ignored than refuted. We conclude, therefore, that a comparison between the chronological and local sequence of events in the two parts of the *Description*, before and after February 29, 1680, leaves little doubt that two-thirds of the book is a direct plagiarism of the *Relation des decouvertes*.

After Hennepin's arrival at Montreal, the *Description* leaves no clue as to where he went next. We are not even told whether or when he went to Quebec. From his presence in Paris in 1682, the inference is that he passed through the capital of New France, and stopped at Quebec because he speaks of a letter sent to Father Leroux by Father Membré.¹¹⁶ In this letter, as well as in one which is said to have been sent by the same missionary to Frontenac, and which the governor received "while I was regaining my health at his table," Father Membré is said to have given an account of the Iroquois attack on the Illinois in September 1680 and of the murder of Father de la Ribourde by prowling Indians. Because of the mutual dislike between Tonti¹¹⁷ and himself which led to recriminations of La Salle's lieutenant in the *Description* and still worse abuse of him in the *New Discovery*, Hennepin places at Tonti's door the moral responsibility for the death of Father de la Ribourde. A comparison between the accounts of the killing of the missionary as found in Hennepin,

¹¹⁵ "A Calendar of La Salle's Travels, 1643-1683," *loc. cit.*, 295-298.

¹¹⁶ *Description de la Louisiane*, 302.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Jean Delanglez, "Tonti Letters," in *MID-AMERICA*, XXI (July 1939), 234.

in Tonti's memoir and in La Salle's letter, will enable the reader to decide how far the charge is justified.¹¹⁸

That a letter was sent to Father Leroux some time in 1681 by Father Membré, telling the Superior of the Recollects in Canada of the death of Father de la Ribourde, is not only probable but quite certain, but before taking Hennepin's word about what Membré wrote with regard to the death of one of their brethren, anyone who takes into account Hennepin's dislike of Tonti and his tendency to read into a text pretty much what he pleased,¹¹⁹ would prefer to wait until the letter itself comes to light. As for the letter of Membré to Frontenac, there is reason to doubt whether it ever existed. For we know that at the time Hennepin was recuperating in Montreal, namely, in the middle of May, La Salle, Tonti, and Father Membré were on their way to Lower Canada; and in the latter part of June, La Salle and Membré arrived at Fort Frontenac.¹²⁰ Membré could not have written a letter which would reach Frontenac at Montreal in May, for during the preceding months he was with Tonti among the Potawatomi cut off from all means of communication.

Though the *Description* is silent regarding Hennepin's whereabouts after he reached Montreal, the *New Discovery* written fifteen years later is not so reticent. He tells, in the latter work, how he accompanied Frontenac down the St. Lawrence; how they met Laval "as we were entering the river leading to the Fort of Champlain"; how Laval tried to worm information from him, and how he managed to hide from the bishop "our great discoveries." His next paragraph is queer. That he was asked by the bishop to do missionary work is implied, but not explicitly stated, in the opening sentences. He begs to be excused, telling His Excellency that "the Lord Count de Frontenac had prescribed me a very special course of diet," and he asks the bishop to be allowed

to return with him [Frontenac] to our convent of Quebec, there to live in seclusion; indeed, I was not then able to teach catechism to the children, nor was I able to take part as a missionary in the visitation which the Lord Bishop was then making of the few people in Canada; I needed rest which would enable me to work more vigorously afterwards.¹²¹

¹¹⁸ Cf. Tonti's first memoir, Margry, I, 588; his second memoir, Kellogg, *Early Narratives of the Northwest*, 294; La Salle's letter of the autumn of 1681, Margry, II, 124-125.

¹¹⁹ Cf. *Frontenac and the Jesuits*, 258, note 19.

¹²⁰ La Salle's letter, Margry, II, 158; Tonti's first memoir, Margry, I, 593.

¹²¹ *Nouvelle decouverte* . . . , 477-478.

To anyone who knows how the bishop felt toward Hennepin's religious brethren in general and toward himself in particular, it is very doubtful, to say the least, if Laval asked Hennepin to accompany him in the visitation of his diocese. He was given leave, he tells us, to finish his voyage as he had requested. With two of Frontenac's guards, "who were very good canoemen," he went to his convent of Quebec, avoiding the town itself, slipping in, so to speak, by the back door.¹²² After accusing his Superior of copying his "journal" of the descent of the Mississippi, he goes on to tell us that Father Leroux "begged me to return to Europe to acquaint the public with the great discoveries I had made. . . . I followed [his] advice, and resolved to return to Europe."¹²³

All this is very interesting, too interesting. As long as there was only the *New Discovery* as evidence, what is known of the fertile imagination of its author might have led one to wonder whether there might not be another story, a story which he might prefer to leave in the background, particularly since Hennepin gives no indication either in the *Description*, or in the *New Discovery*, or in the *New Voyage*, of how long he remained in Quebec nor of when he left for Europe. Now since the letters of M. Dudouyt to Bishop Laval are available, however, it is possible to catch a few glimpses of Hennepin during his last months in Canada.¹²⁴ In a letter begun March 9, 1682, and continued off and on until April 25, the vicar-general of the Bishop of Quebec wrote from Paris:

M. de Bernières has already written to me concerning the behavior of Father Louis [Hennepin], and has forwarded the letter which you sent him concerning his [Hennepin's] words and actions at Chamblis [Chambly]. M. Trouvé [a Sulpician] has told me how he behaved on the way from Quebec to France, how he kept on saying the same things against you, and the Jesuits, and M. the Intendant [Duchesneau] which he had been saying all the time in Canada. He heard confessions in all the settlements along the St. Lawrence below Quebec, although you had forbidden him to do so.¹²⁵

¹²² *Ibid.*, 500-501.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 504-505.

¹²⁴ These letters are in the Archives du Séminaire de Quebec (Laval University). They were used uncritically by A. Gosselin in his *Vie de M^{sr} de Laval*; Father Lemay printed all the passages which mention Hennepin, *Bibliographie du Père Louis Hennepin*, 16-24; his study "Le Père Louis Hennepin, récollet, à Paris, 1682," in *Nos Cahiers*, III, 1938, 105-140, is based on these letters; they naturally do not deal exclusively with Hennepin, for they also contain information about individuals connected with the missionary while he remained in Paris.

¹²⁵ Dudouyt to Laval, March 9-April 25, 1682, Archives du Séminaire de Québec, *Lettres*, Carton N, no. 61.

This letter tells us where Hennepin went after his return from the West. There is no evidence to show whether he went to Chambly directly or first to Quebec and then to Chambly. Since he was clearly *persona non grata* with Bishop Laval, might not the prelate have advised him to go back to Europe in order to regain his health? The other letters of M. Dudouyt make this hypothesis far from improbable. At any rate, Hennepin certainly makes no reference to the Chambly episode in any of his books. His stay at Chambly took place after May 1681. M. de Bernières' letter preceded him to France; at the latest, it was sent by the last mail ship which left Quebec between November 10 and November 17, 1681.¹²⁶

Further light on Hennepin's stay in Lower Canada after his return from the West is obtainable from a letter of M. Dollier de Casson, the superior of the Sulpicians of Montreal. In 1681, steps were being taken to open a Recollect convent in Montreal. In a postscript to this letter, addressed to Hennepin's superior, Father Leroux, we read: "In the name of the Lord, for the sake of our union in Montreal [do] not [send anyone like] Father Louis [Hennepin]. I beg of you!"¹²⁷ Whether because of the Chambly episode, or for some other reason, M. Dollier clearly does not favor the idea of Hennepin's being assigned to the new foundation. He must have known where Hennepin was; perhaps he also knew that he was free, and that, as the superior of the Recollects was short of men, there might be a likelihood of sending him to Montreal.

Another indication of the activities of Hennepin during this same period is found in a letter of M. Tronson, the superior of the Sulpicians in Paris, to M. de Belmont. This letter is not dated, except for the year, 1683, but it is found between two others written February 21 and April 11. Margry, in printing an excerpt from it, dates the passage March 13, 1683.¹²⁸ M. Tronson divided his letter into numbered sections; the Margry excerpt, for instance, is n° 21, and the one which will be quoted here is n° 1. The letter is evidently an answer to one from Montreal written in the last months of 1682. With regard to section n° 1, it has been said:

To understand the passage in question one should have M. de Bel-

¹²⁶ *Jugements et délibérations*, II, 723, 727.

¹²⁷ Dollier de Casson to Leroux, October 29, 1681, printed in S. Le Tac, *Histoire chronologique de la Nouvelle France ou Canada . . .*, E. Réveillaud, ed., Paris, 1888, 215.

¹²⁸ Margry, II, 305.

mont's letter: "Celle [la pratique] du P. Louis ne fera pas une règle parmi eux [les Récollets], et je ne croy pas qu'il y en ait beaucoup aux mesmes extremités." All that one may surmise is that this may refer to the pending project of the foundation of a Recollect convent at Montreal, in which foundation the Sulpicians were intimately interested.¹²⁹

This surmise is incorrect. The passage in question does not refer to the foundation of a Recollect convent in Montreal. What it does refer to is specifically stated in the answer of M. Tronson. He begins thus: "We regard to the affairs of the Indians [of the Mission de la Montagne, in charge of M. de Belmont] I shall answer in a few words the fifty-two pages [26 feuillets] which you wrote."

The great question in 1682 was the unrestricted sale of hard liquor to the Indians; this was as energetically and uncompromisingly opposed by the Sulpicians as it was by the bishop, the diocesan clergy and the Jesuits.¹³⁰ M. Tronson's answer to M. de Belmont begins:

They are convinced here that drunkenness caused by the brandy trade is the source of great disorders in Canada, but they are also persuaded that it is necessary [in order that] commerce [may flourish]; hence we must not expect that the king will forbid it.

Louis XIV had been told that to stop the brandy trade would ruin the colony. "The instances [of disorders] which you mention are terrible,"¹³¹ but it is useless to expect the government to regulate the nefarious traffic "as long as the governors do not send reports different from those they have been sending until now." All one can do is "to ask Our Lord to enlighten and move the hearts" of those in power who are in favor of the unrestricted sale of brandy to the Indians.

The practice of the Recollect Fathers will go far to increase [autorisera beaucoup] the disorder [caused by the brandy trade], if their practice is such as you say it is; that followed by Father Louis [Hennepin] will not be a rule among them, and I do not think that many will go to such extremes as he. I spoke to their Provincial who promised to send [to Canada] only good religious, and I am persuaded that he means it. God grant that he be not misled! Since M. the Marquis de Seignelay promised me to speak to him about it, I think this

¹²⁹ H. Lemay, *Bibliographie du P. Louis Hennepin*, 39.

¹³⁰ *Frontenac and the Jesuits*, 101 ff.

¹³¹ Some instances may be seen in "Histoire de l'eau-de-vie en Canada," by M. de Belmont, printed in *Collection de Mémoires et de Relation sur l'histoire ancienne du Canada*, n. 8, Quebec, 1840.

will oblige him to be on his guard and to take special care in choosing those whom he will send.¹³²

M. Dollier's letter to Father Leroux referred to above, is dated October 29, 1681. At that time, Hennepin was still in Canada apparently waiting for an assignment. Duluth, who had brought Hennepin back from the West, was ready to leave for France at the end of October. As has been seen, after hearing at Michilimackinac that he was looked upon as the chief of the *coureurs de bois*, he had hastened to Lower Canada to clear himself. Other serious charges were being made against him by La Salle and Duchesneau. The former maintained Duluth had "encroached upon his fur trade privileges";¹³³ in reality, La Salle was opposed to Duluth because La Salle "could brook no rivals."¹³⁴ Duchesneau claimed he was a partner of Frontenac in the illicit trade carried on with New England.¹³⁵ Frontenac had outwardly disowned Duluth in 1679,¹³⁶ and now the governor begged Seignelay to question the *coureur de bois* in order to discover the facts of the case; "and for this reason I am sending him to France notwithstanding the amnesty"¹³⁷ granted by the king in May 1681,¹³⁸ which had been engrossed into the registers of the Superior Council in the preceding August.¹³⁹ This letter of Frontenac is dated November 2, 1681; the last ships sailed for France between November 10 and November 17.¹⁴⁰

(To be continued.)

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Institute of Jesuit History, Chicago

¹³² Tronson to Belmont, 1683, n. 191. Copies of these letters are in the Dominion Archives, Ottawa, Canada.

¹³³ L. P. Kellogg, *The French Régime in Wisconsin and the Northwest*, Madison, 1925, 213; cf. La Salle's letter, August 22, 1681, Margry, II, 251-254.

¹³⁴ L. P. Kellogg, *Early Narratives of the Northwest*, 334, note 4.

¹³⁵ Cf. Duchesneau to Seignelay, November 10, 1679, in E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, Albany, 1855, IX, 131; *id.* to *id.*, November 13, 1680, *ibid.*, 141; memoir of Duchesneau, November 13, 1681, *ibid.*, 159-160.

¹³⁶ Frontenac to Colbert, November 6, 1679, in *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1926-1927*, Québec, 1927, 105.

¹³⁷ Frontenac to Seignelay, November 2, 1681, *ibid.*, 135.

¹³⁸ Amnistie pour les *coureurs de bois* de la Nouvelle-France, in *Edits, ordonnances royaux, déclarations et arrêts du Conseil d'Etat du Roi concernant le Canada*, 3 vols., Québec, 1854-1856, I, 249.

¹³⁹ *Jugements et délibérations*, II, 624.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 723, 727.

Captain Anza and the Case of Father Campos

Whoever has read Bolton's *Rim of Christendom* will recall the name of Father José Agustín de Campos, "next to Kino the most important missionary in Pimería Alta in the seventeenth century."¹ Campos came to Pimería in 1693, six years after the arrival of Francisco Eusebio Kino. In various ways the earlier portion of Campos's career was closely related to the career and activities of the great missionary and frontiersman, cattle-man and explorer whom history knows as Kino. While the latter's main mission and center of activities was Dolores in northern Sonora, the mission and residence of Father Campos for over forty years was San Ignacio almost twenty miles northwest. San Ignacio was sixty miles from the present Arizona border and directly south of the modern Nogales which rests upon the international line. Campos had under his care two other missions, one about six miles south, Magdalena, now a picturesque Sonora town, the other Ímuris, the same distance north. These pueblos were strung along the delightful Sonora valley, then called the St. Ignatius, which is now threaded by a modern railway.

Campos and Kino worked often and for years together. Kino himself spoke of Campos as "the great master of the languages of all these nations."² Lieutenant Juan Mateo Manje wrote to the viceroy in glowing terms of the missions and the Jesuits, mentioning particularly Kino, Campos, and Minutuli. Campos was with Kino on the latter's first visit to the lower Altar River; he was in the midst of the famous uprising of 1694 when Father Francisco Saeta was martyred at Caborca, one hundred miles east from San Ignacio.³ Campos bestirred himself to the rescue of his fellow Jesuit missionary, Daniel Janusque, at Tubutama, but was later himself forced to flee south to Cucurpe. He accompanied as chaplain General Domingo de Terán in forays north-east against the Apaches at the time the general met his death.

¹ Herbert E. Bolton, *Rim of Christendom*, New York, 1936, 270. Other references to Campos may be found in the index of the above work. See also Gerardo Decorme, S. J., *La obra de los Jesuitas en México en la época colonial*, MS., II, chap. 12.

² Bolton, *op. cit.*, 451.

³ Manje narrates the exigencies of this uprising, mentioning Campos in his *Luz de la Tierra Incógnita . . .*, (edition published in Mexico, 1926), Lib. II, cap. 4, 236 ff.

When Kino visited Mexico City in 1695 Campos took charge of his mission at Dolores. When Kino was departing on one of his great expeditions northwest to the Colorado River Campos furnished his brother Jesuit with horses and provisions from his mission of San Ignacio for the exploration. In August 1702 Campos buried at San Ignacio his old fellow missionary, Francisco Gonzalvo, who had been laboring at San Xavier del Bac, near the present Tucson. For the period when the Altar Valley was without a padre both Campos and Kino kept an eye on that section and when Francisco Picolo came into the country as official visitor in 1705 Campos received him at San Ignacio; at the time he was busily engaged in building a church and house at Magdalena. The three of them, Picolo, Campos, and Kino rode north together to Cocospera not far from the Arizona line to inspect the mission there. Campos made expeditions into the desolate Seri country where these savages, the lowest of all whom the fathers contacted, lived like moth-eaten beasts on the waste and dreary upper reaches of the Gulf of California coast. It was Campos who with Father Antonio Leal encouraged Kino to write his famous *Favores Celestiales*. Towards the end of Kino's life when more men were needed and the missionaries were petitioning in vain, it was Campos, with Kino and Minutuli, who watched over the outlying districts. Finally after the great figure of the frontier came to the end of his earthly labors, at sixty-six years of age, it was Campos who consigned him to the grave.

Kino in March 1711 had come over to the mission of Father Campos, Santa Magdalena, to dedicate a finely built church. During the ceremonies he took suddenly and violently sick and was carried into Campos's house. He lay down upon his accustomed mattress of two calfskins where he died. Campos buried his friend in the church on the gospel side and wrote the epitaph commemorating a few of his resounding deeds. Then the tireless Campos rode fifty miles northwest to Tubutama, procured the body of Father Manuel Gonzales, first friend and companion of Kino in the mission, and carried it back to Magdalena where he laid it beside the body of Kino so that the two friends might rest together.

Thus closely was Father Agustín Campos associated with Kino. But he survived the pioneer Black Robe for over a quarter of a century. He lived almost continuously during this long period among his sons, the Pimas, at San Ignacio, and after Kino's death, according to Manje, made many *entradas* into the Yuma

country.⁴ A tragedy unusual in mission lore came to Campos and proved to be a distressing and almost calamitous episode for the missions and for their *padres*. Failing in mind during his last days, he died ultimately broken by the weight of many years and many conflicts, exiled from his mission. Indeed, as one who knows most about him once remarked, his activities and his vicissitudes would fill an interesting volume.

Father Campos, for all his heroism of labor and sacrifice in the missions of Pimería Alta, had early shown signs of what seemed at the time to be an individualistic temperament, but what were later analyzed as indications of mental disturbance. He had at least one brush with Kino. When the latter sent Indian justices from Dolores to arrest the murderers of Father Saeta, and as these envoys were passing through San Ignacio, Campos interfered to the extent of sending them point-blank back to Dolores with a strong letter for Kino. Campos in this missive, though he was not Kino's superior and was his junior both in years and in the mission, took him to task for meddling in secular affairs. Campos's impetuous spirit is again glimpsed in a letter to Kino, incorporated by the latter in his *Favores Celestiales*. "Petition, petition again," writes Campos, "clamor, clamor again to the Señor Viceroy" for additional missionaries for the northwestern country of the Colorado and the Gila.⁵ Eleven years after Kino's death, namely, in 1722, Campos had a misunderstanding with his superiors and was ordered from the missions down to Mexico City. We are ignorant of the circumstances, but his return to San Ignacio the following year would argue that he enjoyed a favorable hearing from the provincial, Father José Arjo, who later joined Campos in the labors of the Pimería.

Presumably, the Jesuits considered such incidents as extraordinary, but attributable to nerves and trying labors in difficult surroundings. But outbursts of temperament increased in number and intensity as time wore on. Campos's forty years of heroic service gave way to one filled with turbulence. His mind was becoming clouded, and unfortunately it was some time before his superiors became fully aware of the condition or realized the gravity of the old man's mental affliction. One will travel far in the Jesuit missionary annals before coming upon a story so unique and witnessing a train of events so extraordinarily dis-

⁴ *Ibid.*, 304.

⁵ Bolton, *Kino's Historical Memoir of Pimería Alta*, 2 vols., Los Angeles, 1919, II, 69.

turbing. One hundred and sixty-four manuscript pages in the Mexican National Archives, consisting of fifty-two letters written by Jesuit superiors and missionaries, tell the astounding story.⁶ This weighty mass of documents might lead the unwary to magnify the importance of the events, but they tell only of an episode and are tributes to the spirit of humanitarianism manifested by Jesuit superiors and Captain Anza toward an unfortunate laborer.

Early in the year 1735 there was appointed a new governor of Nueva Vizcaya, Señor Manuel Bernal Huidobro, who was looked upon by the fathers as a bitter enemy of their Order. He was the same who had such unpleasant relations with the fathers in Lower California during the uprising of 1733. Soon after his appointment as governor he made an official visitation of the Sonora missions, but contrived to hide his real feelings under a cloak of seeming pleasantness and sympathy. His real colors, however, showed themselves in an official memorial on the state and proper management of the missions. Number nineteen of the memorial was an attack upon the ecclesiastical immunities of the missionaries. Campos at San Ignacio suddenly grew active. He told those about him and wrote letters to the effect that the animosity of the Governor toward the Jesuits was to be blamed upon the fathers themselves, and especially upon the Father Visitor, Luis María Marciano.

The fathers in Sonora considered that this number nineteen of Governor Huidobro's report should be answered in properly documented form so that the immunities of the Jesuits might be proved to the Governor from the law. Father José Toral was appointed for this task and in due time finished his work. The document had the approval of a cleric of high standing, Don Juan José de Grijalva, the Señor Vicario, probably representing in Sonora the Bishop of Durango. Toral's reply to the Governor was sent around to all the Jesuit missionaries of the province for signatures to add to the document more official and corporate weight. Campos alone refused to sign. Instead, he indited a lengthy document defending the Governor and attacking the position of his Jesuit brethren in an insulting manner. Copies of this letter he sent to the Governor, to the Vicar, Grijalva, to the Provincial, Barba, in Mexico City, and to others. This happened sometime in August 1735.

⁶ *Archivo General y Público de la Nación* (hereinafter cited as A. G. N.), *Historia*, tomo 333, fol. 1 to 82. Transcripts in the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

When the Visitor, Marciano, learned what Campos had done he decided to hold a meeting at Cucurpe of all the fathers working in this mission unit, *Rectorado de los Dolores*, some ten or twelve in number, and to give a penance to Campos for his action, reading him a public chapter and demanding from him a *culpa*, or public declaration of his fault in the refectory. Presumably, either Marciano underestimated the mental disturbance of Campos, or sought to test him out by requesting this rather mild apology. But this could not be done as the Visitor had planned, for Campos did not put in an appearance, pleading illness. The Visitor then sent Luis Xavier Velarde, together with Fathers Ignatius Xavier Keller and Nicolás de Perera up to San Ignacio to impose the penance upon Campos at his mission. Campos submitted. But on September 4 Campos wrote from San Ignacio to Luis María Gallardi, rector of Dolores and therefore his immediate superior, the one man who seemed to enjoy his confidence, protesting against the injustice of the treatment he had received, defending his action in writing his defense of the Governor, and threatening to have revenge by provoking an uprising among his Pimas, aided by the Seris and the Tiburones. This letter is typical of all his letters from then on to the end and even after the crisis: it is obscure, jumbled, rebellious, and sarcastic in the extreme.

Campos was now commanded by Marciano, "by the formality of Holy Obedience" not to send out any letters without first showing them to his superiors. This command under obedience obliged him to obey according to his vow and made disobedience a serious offense. All during November Campos was furious.⁷ The Visitor then ordered Gallardi, rector and friend of Campos, to issue another order under obedience to the recalcitrant. Accordingly, on December 10, Campos was ordered to get together all copies of his bitter criticisms of the Society of Jesus and to send them to the Visitor, and to get back all copies he had already sent to various people. On December 23 Gallardi wrote again to Campos worried because he had no reply to his letters of the tenth, though he knew Campos received the missive. On Christmas Day the Visitor, aroused and alarmed, ordered Gallardi to forward to Campos a copy of a portion of the letter meant for Campos himself. This paragraph contains three points for Campos's attention: that the only governor who has been inimical to the Order is the present one; "Never have I," writes

⁷ A. G. N., *Historia*, tomo 333, fol. 40.



Marciano, "seen a Jesuit who was against his mother, the Society, and who has written such letters as Your Reverence against her."⁸ This mode of action cannot go on, continues the Visitor. Besides, the *partido* of San Ignacio must give the ordinary financial contribution. If there be no ready money, then let the payment be made in mules. Visitor Marciano now threatens Campos that if these payments be not made immediately, then he will appoint a father for San Ignacio who will make them. Gallardi adds a few sentences to this stern note from the Visitor in which he urges Campos to obey with that religious spirit of obedience he has heretofore always shown.

Thus the Christmas season of 1735 and the new year came and went, but the storm-petrel still proclaimed his preference for stormy seas. Unfortunately Father Gallardi, Campos's immediate superior and trusted friend, died early in the year and Luis Velarde was made vice-rector of the Rectorado de Dolores. As early as January 9, 1736, Velarde wrote to Campos, both in his own name and in the name of Visitor Marciano, commanding him in virtue of holy obedience to send into headquarters all papers in his possession bearing on the present matter. Campos was likewise again forbidden to write to anyone without first showing his letter to the superior of the mission, and when he did write to "let the letters treat only of business."⁹

Thus the new year opened and this letter from Velarde is well understandable, for Campos in his missives had been habitually revealing a distorted thought process. These repeated commands were no sedative to the effervescent spirit of the old veteran, nor indeed was anything anybody might say or do, especially if these were his superiors. Why, it might be asked, did the superiors take them at all seriously? The answer most probably is that Campos was an ancient in the land, a great worker in his time. Moreover, charity on the one hand forbade branding a man as insane and medical examinations for assessing actions were unheard of in Pimería.

The crisis of this whole affair was reached the spring of 1736. On February 9 Campos wrote Visitor Marciano a letter so stormy, bitter, and obscure that it seems clearly the product of an overwrought brain. Campos excuses himself on the plea of illness for not having congratulated Marciano on his appointment as visitor, speaks of his own many grievances, his penance

⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 37.

⁹ *Ibid.*, fol. 38.

of eight days, his letter to the Governor, and a motley multitude of jumbled things.¹⁰ He appends a *pliego* or apology, written to his superiors of the Rectorado de Dolores. Campos insultingly entitled this diatribe *Respuesta a la junta de ingenios*, Reply to the Council of Geniuses, referring to the group of consultants who met with the Visitor to devise ways and means of meeting the insubordination of the old padre. He calls this document in sarcasm his *historia*, *historita*, *historiola*; *cuento*, *cuenticito*, *como dicen esos ingenios, y me acumulan de sin substancia*. The fathers have accused him without any foundation in fact, superiors have blundered stupidly in the past in these missions. Finally in this document the old man comes back to the present charge against him: "They said that I wrote to Governor Huidobro a poorly composed, acrid and insulting letter and that after a few days I wrote another . . ." ¹¹ Apparently, the time of the arrival of the Governor coincided with that of Campos's complete mental breakdown.

Marciano received this letter at Ures where Father Nicolás de Perera found him in a state of collapse, not only because of Campos's attack but through worry over the scandal of the whole affair. However, Marciano rose to the occasion in a Christian spirit and answered these insults, February 18, humbly and kindly. But this was not weakness; it was the restraining strength of Christian humility. On February 27 Marciano acted toward confining Campos, when, after taking counsel with the fathers, he indited letters to Perera, Keller, Roxas, Gallerati, and Campos. Nicolás de Perera as the Visitor's secretary or vicar was told to act with full authority. Marciano then "orders and ordains" that Campos is to be removed first to Cucurpe where he is to be put into a room under the surveillance of Perera and allowed no communication with Indians, seculars, or even servants, except those necessary for his personal care. He is to have no writing materials and to receive no letters. Such letters as come to him are to be forwarded to Marciano. Then after the necessary arrangements for mules and provisions Campos is to be sent to the college at Chihuahua. To make his journey easier Father Keller is to accompany him to Cuquiarachi (which is on the road east to Chihuahua) and from there Father Carlos de Roxas will take charge of him as far as Basaraca, where Father Ignacio Arjo will see him to Janos. If Campos is too ill to travel,

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, fol. 1.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, fol. 4.

then let him be kept closely under surveillance at Cucurpe until orders shall have arrived from Mexico. During this time Campos is to have what is necessary and to be treated with all charity. Perera or some other father is to read to him every day passages from *The Imitation of Christ*, from Alphonso Rodríguez on obedience, books on the state and duties of the religious life, and Ignatius Loyola on the virtue of obedience.

This letter was written from Rosario del Pescadero. On that same day, February 27, Visitor Marciano also wrote to Campos, Keller, and Roxas giving the same orders, and to Father Constancio Gallerati, rector of the college of Chihuahua, saying that Campos was about to come to his college. Campos before leaving San Ignacio was officially to hand over the mission to Father Juan Nieto.

The fireworks started on Tuesday, March 6, when Perera endeavored to serve these notices of departure upon Campos at San Ignacio and to get him to hand over the charge of the mission to Nieto. On that day the three fathers, Perera, Keller, and Nieto, converged upon San Ignacio and upon poor Campos. Of the extraordinary events which ensued we have a clear narrative from the pen of Perera writing to Visitor Marciano at one o'clock in the morning of Thursday, March 8. Nieto also wrote an account of the crisis to the Provincial, Barba, and this agrees in all details with the story of Perera.

On Monday, March 5, Perera with Nieto, according to orders, left Cucurpe for San Ignacio arriving there late. Keller had not yet come in until later. They found Campos in bed. From the number of Pima Indians and Spaniards about, it became evident what Campos had done, even as the loyal Indians told the fathers. Campos had written to Spaniards of the vicinity to come to his defense physically and to prevent the arrival of the fathers at San Ignacio. Likewise he had made a *tlatole* with his Pimas, namely, had gathered them together in a sort of indignation meeting and urged them to stand by him in the approaching crisis. Indeed, armed Indians of Imuris tried to impede the journey of Perera and Nieto to San Ignacio.

Now on Tuesday morning when Perera and Nieto, with Keller following, passed before the house of Campos on their way to the church to say Mass, they saw that Campos was in the *ramada* or porch with the Indian governor of San Ignacio, Indian justices, and some Spaniards. The fathers saluted Campos, but the old man's irritation broke forth at once. He shouted out to

Perera asking him why he had come to San Ignacio, and what purpose he had in mind. Perera naturally had desired to deliver his papers with the utmost secrecy, but this became now impossible. Perera was forced to tell the purpose of his coming by handing over to Campos the Visitor's letter ordering him to leave San Ignacio and go to Chihuahua. Campos took the letter, opened it forthwith, and in the presence of all bystanders read its contents in a loud voice. Then, as if out of himself with rage, he began to shout out insults against Visitor Marciano. He insisted that he would never hand over the mission, unless ordered to do so by the Provincial.

For approval of this outburst Campos turned to the Indians who were present. Whereupon the Indian governor spoke out taking Campos by the hand: "You will not go, Father, you will not go; for we will defend you." Father Keller now told the Indian to hold his peace, while Perera administered to Campos some very clear and very personal reflections. Perera pointed out to Campos the scandal of his slight religious spirit, of his making thus public the orders of his superiors, and especially of his calling together and inciting to insubordination the Indians of his several pueblos. The fathers were able ultimately to quiet the Indians, and Campos retired within his house.¹² Perera followed Campos into his room and there administered to him officially a reprehension in the name of Visitor Marciano, though he softened somewhat its terms.¹³

Campos now feigned repentance and humbly confessed his fault, this in the presence also of Fathers Nieto and Keller. Perera now notified him that according to the orders of his superior, Marciano, he must formally and officially hand over the mission of San Ignacio, with its *visitas* of Magdalena and Ímuris, to Nieto. Campos refused, and when told that whether he would obey in this or not he must in any event leave San Ignacio for Cucurpe thence on to Chihuahua, he feigned illness and said he could not mount a horse. Perera replied that he would then be carried in a chair. When Campos said there was no chair, Perera said he would fetch one. Perera assured Campos that no gathering of Indians could intimidate him from following out the orders of his superiors, but Campos tried to convince him that the Indi-

¹² *Ibid.*, fol. 61. Father Cristóbal de Cañas referring to this scene in a letter to the Provincial says that what is certain is that Campos has gone "from abyss to abyss so that he is enraged or crazy or completely out of himself."

¹³ *Ibid.*, fol. 63 f.

ans rose simply from grief and emotion at the prospect of losing one who had reared them since childhood. Perera now left the room and confronted the Pimas who were gathered outside. He scolded them severely. They must obediently accept what missionary would be given them.

The following day, Wednesday, March 7, the continued insubordination of Campos added to the seriousness of the situation. But finally Campos gave in to the extent of pleading for a month's delay, and this compromise was accepted by Perera. The three fathers prepared to return to Cucurpe. But the Indians kept coming in, nor did Campos try to quiet them. The Spaniards of the northern parts of Sonora became alarmed. They feared an uprising and consequent stoppage of work by the Indian laborers in the mines called Arizona. These Spaniards addressed themselves to the highest civic authority in the land, the Señor Justicia Major, begging him to intercede in favor of Campos's continued residence at San Ignacio. This he did. Don Juan Bautista de Anza, captain of the forces at the presidio of Fronteras and father of the more famous Anza of California and New Mexico history, then entered the scene. He had long harbored a sincere affection for the padre and moved by this he interceded on his behalf. Anza thought at least a delay in view of the threatening temper of the Pimas would be wise. It was further feared the Opatas might come up from the south. In this case there would be bloodshed.

All during Wednesday the Indians kept coming in. By eleven that night there was a large and angry crowd of them at San Ignacio. Campos told them he was about to be taken away by force. They said they would rise and defend their padre. One hour after midnight, Perera sat down to write to Marciano, giving him the state of affairs and admitting to much trouble and confusion. He confides to Marciano that to carry out orders at the present time seems too dangerous, and says the three of them will leave in the morning for Cucurpe, having granted Campos a delay; the fate of Campos's companion on the mission, Father Julio de Echagoian, is likewise to be feared. The Indians might slay him. Perera asks Marciano for directions. At day-break Perera, Keller, and Nieto departed with heavy hearts on the journey south thirty miles to Cucurpe, fearing the worst and especially fearing for the life of Father Echagoian. Thus ended the first crisis, just short of tragedy. The Indians actually did not rise, even though Campos was now calling in Spaniards to

his aid, and the fathers began to think the threat of uprising was a bluff.

Campos now thoroughly complicated matters by fleeing north ten miles to his pueblo of Ímuris. He fortified himself in a stronghold called *Rochela de Ímuris*, appointed Indian sentinels and sent out spies! Marciano at Ures a hundred miles south, having heard all, evidently accepted the proposition of delay, but commanded Campos under obedience to dismiss the Indians. On March 10, the very day after the departure of the fathers from San Ignacio, Campos again took the pen in his own defense. He wrote of the uprising of the Indians. They had risen before, he warned, once against Father Keller. There were more than three hundred armed Indians. Had the fathers attempted anything there would have been murder and bloodshed.¹⁴

Things were quiet now for the rest of March and during the early part of April 1736. Then the fireworks started again. Marciano, in consultation with the fathers, was willing to concede Campos a month's respite before insisting upon his fulfillment of the orders given him; they had determined, however, that the orders be ultimately carried out. Promptly then on April 9, just a month since the first crisis reached its peak, Perera wrote to Campos from Cucurpe saying that now sufficient time had elapsed to quiet the Indians and to take over the mission; he said he would soon come with Nieto to attend to the final making over of the papers.

This letter got up to Ímuris in a day and Campos answered immediately. He would fight it out! He tells Perera the Indians are each day more determined in their stand and had they not been withheld by him they would have marched to Cucurpe to destroy the pueblo. He will write to the Provincial in Mexico City, he will write to the viceroy also; he will even carry his case to Rome to the Father General. Several days passed before the Visitor acted in the following manner. To aid in dislodging Campos from his stronghold at Ímuris the Visitor Marciano sent up Father José Toral with definite instructions: Campos is to be gotten out, an uprising is to be prevented, the secular arm is to aid in both the one and the other. The mission is to be handed over to Father Gaspar Steiger instead of to Nieto.

Toral immediately upon receipt of Marciano's letter left his mission of Banamichi to go to Ímuris, seventy-five miles northwest. The date of his departure was approximately April 19. He

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, fol. 20.

left on a Wednesday and on Thursday morning was at Cucurpe. Here Toral met Captain Anza, told him of his purpose to execute the orders of his superiors and reminded the Captain that in case of an uprising it was his duty to protect the fathers with an armed force. An Indian scout reported to Keller (probably also at Cucurpe) that not many Indians had gathered at Ímuris, but that the Cacique Lázaro had sworn that did they attempt to remove Campos he would kill the captain and the fathers all. Toral, nevertheless, probably with Keller, set out for Ímuris. Captain Anza with a band of soldiers started for the same pueblo taking another route. When the fathers arrived at Remedios, twenty miles from their destination, they paused to consider the gravity of the situation. There were indeed signs of preparation for an uprising. Spies reported seditious activities. His lieutenants reported these things to Captain Anza and added that Campos was urging his Indians on. They said there would certainly be an uprising.

Toral was ready to disperse the fathers and call upon the loyal Pimas themselves to remove Campos even if it took a year. He wrote to Marciano:

How afflicted we were in such extremities, seeing that a whole province of the Church might be lost, and its destruction be brought about by one of our men. This would involve the good name of the whole Society. But we fathers at the risk of our lives stood firm to quiet these disturbances and to carry out your orders by removing the father who was the cause of all the trouble.¹⁵

Happily things did not come to the point of Indian rebellion and destruction of the mission. The knowledge that Captain Anza was marching to Ímuris with a troop of soldiers was probably too much for Campos. As Anza was approaching Ímuris there came out to meet him a Spaniard, Mariano de Sosa, with word about Campos. The message of Sosa was the following: Father Campos had called him to his room. Here the father, weeping and kissing his soutane or robe, in the presence of Sosa bewailed the many and grave scandals he had caused, saying that because of these things he was an unworthy Jesuit. Campos begged Sosa to go to Captain Anza and to manifest to him his repentance, and to inform Father Toral that he stood now ready to obey superiors in all things. Such is the message Sosa carried to Anza as the latter was approaching Ímuris. Sosa added his own opin-

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

ion that perhaps Campos had already spoken to the Indians to quiet them.

Hearing this good news from Sosa, Campos's ambassador, Captain Anza did not continue on the road to ímuris, but with his troops returned to Remedios taking Sosa with him to carry the happy news to Father Toral. Toral says that Anza dropped on his knees before him and in favor of Campos begged the three following concessions: Not to take Campos to Cucurpe, for the padre feared imprisonment there; not to come to ímuris at all for Campos had promised to leave the mission of his own accord with arrangements made for its transfer to Nieto; that Campos be allowed to go to the presidio at Fronteras and be a guest in Anza's house there until his health be regained. Father Toral reported on this: "I was only too happy to grant the requests so far as I could. I asked the Captain to inform the father that I would be all charity to him." Anza took this down in writing, gave the script to Sosa, who hastened back to ímuris to give it to Campos. Toral was willing to allow Campos to go directly to the presidio at Fronteras, though he could not on his own authority grant him permission to remain there for the length of a convalescence. Only Marciano could decide this. The point of his not coming to ímuris Toral could not concede. From Remedios, then, Toral, Perera, and Steiger, who had joined them, on April 22, in company with Captain Anza and his soldiers started on the seventeen mile journey to ímuris. Toral praised Anza, and spoke of the soldiers "which he [Anza] for his love for the Society furnished us, but unofficially so that it would not have to go on the records and the reputation of the Society thus be safeguarded."

Arrived at ímuris the company went directly to Campos's house. Captain Anza gave his orders and the soldiers stood at attention. As the fathers were dismounting there came to the door Campos himself supported by two Indians. Indian justices were there, and a crowd of Pimas began to gather. After a few preliminary exchanges, Toral reminded Campos of the public apology or *culpa* he had been ordered to make by Marciano. Campos had the apology ready in writing and at the request of Toral he read it, partly in Pima, partly in Spanish, before the fathers, the soldiers, and the crowding Indians. It was to the effect that he had been gravely at fault, but was now consoled and at peace. He revoked all that he had formerly said. Let it now be buried in the past. After this apology Campos, still sup-

ported by his two Indians, went over to the church with the fathers and formally in their presence handed over the sacred vessels to Steiger, whom Toral rejoiced to see now in charge of this mission. By the following day, April 23, everything had been settled and Campos was prepared to leave. At eight o'clock in the morning of April 24, accompanied by Nieto and a band of soldiers, Campos started from Ímuris on his way almost directly east to Cuquiaraquí and the presidio of Fronteras which were eighty and ninety miles distant respectively.

Toral's long report on this seemingly happy denouement was written from Ímuris itself April 23, the day before Campos left, and it was signed by Toral and the three other fathers who were at the pueblo, namely, Nieto, Perera, and Steiger. But there was no grain of unkindness in Toral. He makes a long plea with the Visitor that Campos actually be allowed to remain for the period of his convalescence at the house of Captain Anza. The Captain, argues Toral, is devoted to the Society and to Campos. Indeed, his home at Fronteras has been the fathers' home, and the Captain's wife, an excellent lady, is very devoted and charitable. Campos will receive much better care and be much happier here than at Cuquiaraquí, for the poor father is very old and sick.

Thus Toral wrote on the evening of April 23. But the following morning Toral noticed that whereas Campos all that day and the preceding went around as a very sick and lame man supported by his two Indians, on the twenty-fourth, the day of his departure, he walked without any support at all. Therefore, in a postscript to his report written April 24 Toral concludes that Campos's sickness is all a fiction and thus informs the Visitor that he might the better understand. Marciano probably did not need Toral's warning. Due to Campos's mental condition the plan of sending him to Chihuahua, three hundred miles southeast, seems to have been dropped.

For several months Father Campos addressed numerous amazing missives to his superiors and fellow missionaries. They were long, inconsistent, querulous, and even scandalous. At times his mental condition was such as to inspire great pity for one who had served the missions so heroically in earlier years. Finally, writing to the Father General, he begged that he be permitted to return to his old mission at San Ignacio. But alas for poor Campos! A note is appended to this the last document pertinent to this affair to the effect that Campos wrote to the Provincial and received a reply from him through Marciano denying him permission to return to San Ignacio.

As a refreshing epilogue to this Campos episode let us cite a letter of Captain Juan Bautista de Anza written from Ímuris April 21, 1736, to the Provincial:

Very Reverend Father Provincial and my Superior: Through the favor of Reverend Father Juan Antonio Oviedo¹⁶ I have received the honor of being admitted as a brother into the venerated Society of Jesus without any merit on my part except my great and recognized affection for the Society, because of what it has done for Nueva Vizcaya in general, and the close friendship I have enjoyed with the missionary fathers of these provinces in the course of the twenty-four years I have held service here.¹⁷

Anza now goes over the second Campos crisis of April, giving exactly the same facts as are contained in Father Toral's report to Marciano, adding only that when the angry Pimas came to him asking that he prevent the removal of Campos he replied correctly that this was in the hands of Campos's Jesuit superiors, and he reproached these Indians for the disorder of their procedure. They begged pardon for their ignorance. The trouble with the Indians is now ended, continues Anza. The Captain now begs the Provincial that he allow Campos to live and be cared for in his home at Fronteras, "whom with much joy and charity I will attend in my home until his death, for in his present state of health he has not much longer to live. Since I am a [Jesuit] brother I can with joy serve the sick in my house with permission of superiors."¹⁸ The request had not at least by August yet been granted. How long Campos lived we do not know. But the mission was quiet again and its military captain was a Jesuit "brother."

The status of Anza as a Jesuit brother leaves much room for speculation, since it was so very unusual. He lives apart from the Jesuit community, remained married and in his home, and continued under military obedience, and hence it is impossible to believe that he made the customary vows of the Jesuits, poverty, chastity, and obedience. Certainly in his circumstances he could assume no great number of the obligations of religious life, and if he had assumed the obligations he could not have been readily exempted from them in whole or in essential parts. Moreover, the

¹⁶ Oviedo was Provincial of the Province of New Spain from November 4, 1729, to November 4, 1733, and from November 3, 1736, to June 25, 1739.

¹⁷ A. G. N., *Historia*, tomo 333, fol. 77. Anza speaks of having secured from the Reverend Father (Provincial?) a dispensation from certain obligations concerning religion (the religious life?), and states that he is doing the best he can in that respect. *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 79.

Jesuits did not have a Third Order, that is of men living in lay circumstances and partaking of certain spiritual duties and privileges of the Order. A surmise may be made as to Anza's actual status, namely, that the Provincial permitted him to come under the Society's direction in spiritual practices without binding either party in the legal and cononical manner. The Provincial, Juan Antonio de Oviedo, who "received" Anza, a Colombian by birth, was in office from November 1729 to November 1733.

Anza was of a distinguished family always known to be on very friendly terms with the Jesuits of Sonora. His father had been an officer on the frontier of Sonora for thirty years, where Anza served from 1712, the year after Kino's death, until 1739. Father Francisco Xavier de Mora, one of Kino's former superiors, died at Arizpe in Anza's arms.¹⁹ Eventually Anza became captain of the presidio of Fronteras and he was acting in this capacity during the Campos incident. The Captain saw the decline of the northern Sonora missions after Kino's death and their recuperation with the coming of Father Jacobo Sedelmayer, who was at Tubutama in 1736, and of Father Ignacio Keller, who was at Suamca the same year.²⁰ Anza saw the beginning of new troubles in 1737 when the Lower Pimas of Tecoripa and Suaqui rose and fled to Cerro Prieto.²¹ He was sent in pursuit of the fugitives and brought them back to their pueblos after executing three ringleaders among whom was Chief Arizivi. But he did not live to see the more serious Yaqui and Mayo revolt of 1740, for he was slain the previous year by the Apaches.²² Juan Bautista de Anza, Jr., the "more famed son,"²³ was born in 1735 and was a babe in arms during the Campos episode. Like his father and grandfather he served many years on the same frontier and carried on the tradition of his family through his friendly relations with the last generation of Jesuits before the expulsion of 1767.

PETER M. DUNNE

University of San Francisco

¹⁹ Bolton, *Rim of Christendom*, 593.

²⁰ José Ortega, *Historia del Nayarit*, Mexico, 1887, 427.

²¹ *Doc. Hist. Mex.*, series IV, vol. I, 219.

²² H. H. Bancroft, *The North Mexican States and Texas*, San Francisco, 1884, I, 521, 524.

²³ His activities are recorded in Bolton, *Anza's California Expeditions*, 5 vols., Berkeley, 1930; and Alfred B. Thomas, *Forgotten Frontiers*, Norman, 1932.

DOCUMENTS

Population of the El Paso District in 1692

INTRODUCTION

From the point of view of social and cultural conditions, our knowledge of the El Paso district in the period from 1685 to 1725 is very meager. The following census list, published here for the first time, throws new light on the subject.¹ It is more than a mere list of names, for it gives a good picture of life in the El Paso settlements in the year 1692.² It should be of special value to students of Texas and New Mexico history. The census was taken by Governor Vargas of New Mexico from December 22, 1692, to January 2, 1693, for the purpose of ascertaining the number of settlers to be taken from the El Paso settlements to recolonize New Mexico. The list does not include the soldiers of the presidio, the missionaries, nor all of the local officials. When the census was examined by the viceroy of New Spain, the Conde de Galve, he also had before him the letters of certification from Governor Vargas, dated January 2 and 12, 1693, and correspondence from Vargas and the *cabildo* of Santa Fe, which had its headquarters at El Paso since the withdrawal from New Mexico in 1680, dated El Paso, January 3, 11, and 12, 1693.³ These letters emphasized the destitute condition of the settlers. According to Governor Vargas the householders were living on the same miserable economic scale as were their servants. They lacked sufficient clothing, and only about one-fourth of the inhabitants had as much as a single horse. The *cabildo* pointed out that the residents were in desperate need of government aid due to the extreme poverty of the settlements, and that only one-fourth of the New Mexico exiles of 1680 were still living in the El Paso dis-

¹ This document may be found in *Audiencia de Guadalajara*, legajo no. 139, Archivo General de Indias, Seville. Photostatic copies are in the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C., and the Coronado Library, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

In the translation no changes have been made in the spelling of proper names; they have been left exactly as they are found in the original manuscript, hence the variations in spelling and the absence of accent marks.

² For a discussion of the exact location of the five towns listed in this census, see Carlos E. Castañeda, *Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, The Mission Era: The Finding of Texas, 1519-1693*, I, 275-277.

³ A. G. I., *Guadalajara*, legajo no. 139.

trict. The census reveals that at this time, 1692-1693, the total population of the district was approximately 1,000.⁴

THE DOCUMENT

I have named as witnesses to accompany me on the visit [to be made in order to take the census], Sergeant Major Francisco de Anaya Almazan, ordinary alcalde of first vote, and Captain Juan Garcia de Noriega, alguacil mayor of the *cabildo*.

Don Diego de Vargas Zapata Lujan Ponze de Leon. Before me, Alphonso Rael de Aguilar, secretary of government and war.

Pueblo del Passo

Today, the said day and year of the above record, in full compliance with it, I, said governor and captain general, accompanied by the witnesses therein named, and with the assistance of my secretary of government and war, began the personal visit to obtain the census and list of the residents, in their houses, in which they live, in this pueblo of El Paso del Rio del Norte, of the kingdom of New Mexico, in the following manner:

First I visited the house of Captain Antonio Montoya, ordinary alcalde of second vote, married to Maria Hurtado, with eight children, three males and five females: Juan, eighteen years of age, Andres, fourteen years old, and Antonio, a babe in arms, Juana, thirteen years old, Maria, eleven years old, Antonia, seven, Nicolasa, five, and Thomasa, three years of age.

Captain Juan Garcia de Noriega, alguacil mayor of the *cabildo*, married to Francisca Sanchez y Yñigo, with three sons and a daughter: Juan Antonio, eleven years old, Francisco, seven years old, Joseph, five years old, Maria, two years old. Also found in the said house were the following servants: Juana, eighteen years of age, Luisa, twenty years old, Getrudes, seven years old, Bernardino, four, Maria, five years old, Monica, five years old, Alonso, three years old, Matheo, one year old, Antonio, nine years old.

Adjutant Antonio Luzero, councilman [*regidor*], married to

⁴ For the population of the El Paso district in the early 1680's see Charles W. Hackett, ed., *Historical Documents relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, and Approaches Thereto, to 1773*, III, 327-328, note 133, and Castañeda, I, 254. We have no exact figures for the period immediately after 1693. However, in 1693 a large number of the El Paso residents moved north to establish new homes in and around Santa Fe. See J. Manuel Espinosa, "New Light on the History of the Reconquest of New Mexico," *MID-AMERICA*, XXII (1940), 271. A description of the El Paso settlements in 1726 may be found in General Don Pedro de Rivera's *Diario . . .*, quoted in Castañeda, I, 276.

Antonia Varela de Perea, with three sons and two daughters: Antonio, five years old, Juan, three years old, Diego, one year old, Martina, fifteen years old, Bernardina, seven years old. Also two sisters, one a widow named Geronima, without children, and the other Maria, eighteen years old, and an orphan girl eleven years old.

Diego Montoya, councilman, married to Josepha de Hinojos, with six children: Salvador, three years old, Juan Esteban, five years old, Antonio, three years old, Maria de la Rosa, eight years old, Luisa, four years old, Juana, two years old. Also, in the same house, two married servants named Antonio and Ana Duran, his wife. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he is very willing to enter [New Mexico] and settle there with his wife and children when I, said governor and captain general, enter.

Captain Joseph Tellez Xiron, married to Doña Cathalina Romero, with one daughter named Jacintha Tellez Xiron, and another named Maria Zapata, and he states that she has a maiden daughter who is with her brother Juan Tellez Xiron, and that she writes to the said son telling him to bring her here, and her name is Juana Tellez. He also states that he has two other children, Lucia and Catalina. Also five servants named Getrudes, Maria, Josepha, Ysabel, and Nicolas. And he says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he is very willing to enter [New Mexico] whenever I, said governor and captain general, enter to colonize the said kingdom.

Sergeant Major Juan Luzero de Godoy, married to Doña Ysabel de Salazar. He declares as his children Mathias, thirty years old, Cayetano Luzero, forty years old, and Barbara, one year old. He states that he has four servants: Maria, Juana, Josepha, and Juan. And he says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty, he is very willing to enter [New Mexico] with his family whenever I, said governor and captain general, enter to colonize the said kingdom.

Sergeant Major Bartolome Gomez Robledo, bachelor. He declares as his family the following persons: Doña Juana Ortiz, his widowed sister, Doña Ana Maria Robledo, Doña Maria Ortiz, Francisca, Lucia, Maria Rossa, Doña Ana Gomez, Gregoria, and Francisca. Also four female and two male servants named Magdalena, Petrona, Maria, Ana, Luis, and Sevastian. And he says that he will enter [New Mexico] with me, said governor and captain general, only to construct his house and irrigation ditch,

and after this is done he will return and enter with all of the above persons.

Captain Lazaro de Mizquia, married to Doña Maria Luzero de Godoy, with five children, three males and two females, named Alonso, thirteen years old, Domingo, eleven years old, Salvador, one year old, Leonor Rosa, fourteen years old, and Francisca, seven years old. Also Joseph, twelve years old, who is their nephew. And he says that he will enter [New Mexico] with the said governor alone, and that later he will return for his family.

The adjutant general of the kingdom, Diego Varela, married to Mariana Fresqui, with six children, three males and the other three females: Xptoval, fifteen years old, Juan, seven years old, Joseph, six years old, Antonia, twelve years old, Gregoria, eleven years old, Maria, five years old. And he has as servants, Maria and Antonio. And he also states that he has in his house two orphans named Juana and Maria. Also Maria, the wife of Juan Sanchez Cavello. And he says that he will enter [New Mexico] alone in order to build his house, and that after it is built he will return for his entire family, and will enter to settle in the said kingdom.

Captain Francisco Romero de Pedraza, married to Doña Francisca Ramirez de Salazar, with two children named Domingo, six years old, and Graciana, twelve years old. And he has as servant Juan, married to Maria, and the said servant has two children named Domingo, four years old, and Antonia, eight years old. He also states that he has another servant named Maria, thirteen years old. And he says that he is ready to enter [New Mexico] with his family whenever the said governor and captain general enters to colonize the said kingdom.

Serjeant Major Antonio Jorge, bachelor. He says that he is ready to enter [New Mexico] whenever I, said governor and captain general, enter.

Captain Luis Martin, married to Melchora de los Reies, with three sons and three daughters named Francisca Martin, twenty years old, Manuel, nine years old, Sebastian, six years old, Sebastiana, twenty years old, Catalina, nine years old, and Polonia, three years old. And he states that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he will enter [New Mexico] whenever I, said governor and captain general, enter to colonize the said kingdom.

Joseph Gallegos, married to Catalina Hurtado, states that he has five children named Antonio, five years old, Juan, seven

years old, Nicolas, five years old, Diego, three years old, and Juan, three years old. He says that with aid from me, said governor and captain general, he will gladly enter the said kingdom with his family.

Andres Hurtado, married to Antonia Dominguez. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he will enter and settle in New Mexico when I, said governor and captain general, enter.

Antonio Montaña, married to Ysabel Jorge de Vera, with seven children, four of whom are males, named Antonio, eight years old, Joseph, seven years old, Lucas, six years old, Manuel, three years old. Polonia, eleven years old, Maria, five years old, and Leonor, two years old. Also two servants, Juan and the Indian Joseph; a married woman, whose husband is absent, named Ysabel Luzero, with a daughter named Michaela, seven years old; also an Apache girl. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he is very willing to enter [New Mexico] whenever ordered to do so, but that for the present he will enter only to rebuild a house, and will return for his family later.

Captain Juan Luis, bachelor. He states that he has in his household two Indians named Magdalena and Clara, the latter eighteen years old; and the said Magdalena, thirty years old, has a son eight years old. He says that he is ready to enter [New Mexico] with open arms any day designated.

Sergeant Major Alonso Garcia, widower, states that he has five children named Juan Antonio, fifteen years old, Alonso, fourteen years old, Luis, ten years old, Vizente, five years old, and Juan, five years old. He states that he also has in his household Mary, thirty-five years old, and Lorenzo and Joseph; and that when I, said governor and captain general, enter [New Mexico] he will enter very gladly to build a house and will later return for his family.

Juan de Perea, married to Luisa de Tapia, with a son named Francisco, six years old. He also has in his household his mother-in-law, named Maria de Chaves, and her maid, named Maria Lopez, fifteen years old. Also in his house is his brother-in-law named Francisco, fourteen years old. He says that if the others go [to New Mexico] he will gladly go, provided that he is given the help necessary to make it possible.

Hernando Martin, married to Maria Montaña, with a daughter named Pasquala, fourteen years old. He says that he is very willing to enter and settle [in New Mexico] when I, said governor and captain general, enter.

Xptoal Martin, married to Antonia Moraga, with six children, four of whom are males, named Xptoal Martin, fourteen years old, Simon, eight years old, Miguel, five years old, Diego, four years old, and Juana, two years old. And he says that he is very willing to enter the said kingdom and settle there with his family whenever he is ordered to do so.

Juan de Rivera, married to Maria Garcia, with four children named Juan, seven years old, Maria, three years old, Juana Andrea, six years old, and Bernardina, five years old. He says that he is ready to enter and settle in New Mexico whenever his Honor enters the said kingdom.

Domingo de Herrera, married to Maria Martin, with six children, four of whom are males, named Marcos, seven years old, Francisco, nine years old, Juan, four years old, Mathias, two years old, Antonia, ten years old, and Josepha, eleven years old. And he says that he is willing to enter with his entire family to settle in New Mexico when I, said governor and captain general, enter.

Luis Martin, married to Maria de Vega, with three children, two of them girls, named Antonio, four years old, Josepha, eight years old, and Petronila, one year old. And he also has in his house a sister-in-law named Francisca de la Vega, and a boy named Pasqual, one year old. He says that he is willing to enter and settle in the kingdom of New Mexico whenever the entry is made.

Sevastian Martin, married to Maria Luxan, with a son named Martin, one year old. He says that he is willing to enter [New Mexico] with his family when I, said governor and captain general, enter.

Pasqual Covos de la Parra, married to Lucia del Castillo, with a son named Lucas, age twelve. He says that his wife is very ill, but that if she is well when the entry [into New Mexico] is made, he will enter very gladly.

Christoval Duran, bachelor, with his sister and her three children named Lorenzo, seven years old, Alejo, five years old, and Ana Maria, nine years old. He says that if he had sufficient provisions to enter [New Mexico] he would do so. He also has two brothers named Sevastian, thirteen years old, and Miguel, nine years old, and a sister named Maria, twelve years old.

Xptoal de la Serna states that he has with him his mother and seven brothers and sisters. His mother's name is Ysabel Luxan, widow, and his brothers and sisters are Francisco, twelve

years old, Antonio, five years old, Antonia, thirteen years old, Maria, ten years old, Gregoria, seven years old, and Cayetana, six years old. And he says that he is willing to enter New Mexico with his mother and his brothers and sisters whenever the colonizing expedition is ready to enter.

Bartholome Truxillo, widower, with two children named Lorenzo, three years old, and Sevastiana, thirteen years old. He says that he is willing to enter and settle in the said kingdom of New Mexico whenever I, said governor and captain general, enter.

Diego Duran, married to Juana de la Vega, with two children named Nicolas Duran, two years old, and Maria, four years old. He says that he is willing to enter and settle in the said kingdom of New Mexico when I, said governor and captain general, enter.

Agustin de Perea states that he has in his house his grandmother, named Francisca Garcia, and also Phelipe de Perea, Juana de Perea, and Ysabel de Perea, and the latter two are his sisters. His said sisters have four children named Francisco, twelve years old, Anttonio, eight years old, Theressa, twelve years old, and another child named Theressa, four years old. He says that he is willing to enter and settle [in New Mexico] whenever the said entry is made.

The above mentioned Joseph Tellez Xiron, of the fifth household listed in this census, stated that there are more persons under his charge to declare, saying that he had four orphans: Maria, five years old, Josepha, four years old, Ramon, also four years old, and Ysidro Joseph, two years old.

Catalina de Esparza, maiden lady, with three of her nephews named Juan, fifteen years old, Manuel, twelve years old, and Maria, seven years old. She also has six servants named Miguel, forty years old, Magdalena, thirty years old, Francisca, fifteen years old, Luissa, ten years old, Miguel, eight years old, and Maria Magdalena. She is willing to enter with all her family to settle in the said kingdom.

Tiburcio de Ortega, married to Margarita de Oton, with five children, four of whom are boys, named Antonio, age twelve years, Ysidro de Ortega, eight years old, Pablo, four years old, Gregorio, two years old, and Maria, thirteen years old. He also has three female Indian servants and one male servant named Luisa, Juana, Anastassia, and Phelipe. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he is very willing to do whatever is ordered of him, and that he will enter with his family to settle in the said kingdom.

Jacinto Sanchez Yñigo, married to Ysabel Jiron, with two children named Joseph, one year and a half old, and Juana, four years old, and a female servant. He says that with sufficient provisions with which to take his family he will enter and settle in the said kingdom of New Mexico.

Pedro Sanchez de Yñigo, married to Leonor Vaca. He says that he is willing to enter and settle in the said kingdom [of New Mexico].

Matheo Truxillo, married to Maria de Tapia, with six children and four step-children, [the former] named Augustin, twelve years old, Antonio, six years old, Francisco, two years old, Lucia, ten years old, Juana, five years old, and Juana de Truxillo, one year old; the step-children are named Diego Romero, twenty years old, Joseph Romero, fifteen years old, Antonio Romero, fifteen years old, Jacinto Romero, fourteen years old. He says that he is willing to enter with his family to settle in the said kingdom of New Mexico, as well as to carry out whatever else I, said governor and captain general, so order, as a loyal vassal of his Majesty, as he has always done. He has only one beast and says that with sufficient provisions he will take his wife and family, to which I answered that as for provisions nothing will be lacking for the execution of his journey at the said time.

Augustin Luxan, bachelor, says that when I, said governor and captain general, enter to colonize the said kingdom, he will go with me if he is given sufficient provisions.

Juan de Archuleta, married to Ysavel Gonzalez, with five children: Andres de Archuleta, ten years old, Diego, six years old, Maria, eight years old, Antonia, four years old, and Juana, six months old. He says that he is willing to enter the said kingdom of New Mexico and settle with his family when I, said governor and captain general, enter, if he is provided with that which is necessary.

Maestre de Campo Alonso Garcia, married to Doña Theresa Varela. He states that he has twelve servants: Juana, twenty years old, Bernardino and his wife named Josepha, Xptoval, Francisca Magdalena, Catalina, Maria, another Maria, another Maria, Juan, Antonio, and Catalina. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he is willing to enter and settle in the said kingdom of New Mexico, but that he finds himself without the means to take his family either on foot or on horse, although he is very willing to do so. I told him that I, said governor and captain general, would assist him in every way possible in the said matter.

Josepha de Fontes, widow of Diego Hurtado, states that she has two sons named Juan, fifteen years old, and Diego, six years old, and an Apache woman.

Doña Bernardina Truxillo, widow of Captain Andres Hurtado, with a daughter named Doña Mariana Salas Orozco, eighteen years old, and a step-daughter named Juana, with two daughters and a son, named Maria, fourteen years old, Bernardina, eight years old, and Joseph, four years old.

Diego Romero, bachelor. He has in his house three brothers and a sister, named Bernardo, ten years old, Xptoal, seven years old, and Ysavel, sixteen years old. He says that he will enter the provinces of New Mexico with his brothers and sister to settle there.

The widow Juana Garcia, with six children named Maria, twelve years old, Theresa, nine years old, Leonor, seven years old, Francisco, six years old, Antonio, seven years old, and Francisca, fifteen years old. She has five servants named Maria, thirty years old, with a two year old son named Miguel, and another named Antonio, six years old, Catalina, nine years old, and Juliana, five years old.

The widow Ana Maria Garcia, with five children named Manuel, twelve years old, Salvador, three years old, Maria, thirteen years old, Rufina, seven years old, and Juana, five years old.

The widow Josepha Duran, with three children named Joseph, four years old, Augustin, a babe in arms, Maria, five years old; also, a sister named Juana Duran, and brothers named Lazaro Duran and Bartolome Duran, the latter twenty years old. Also two servants named Xptoal and Maria, the latter twelve years old.

Juan de Herrera, with three [sic] children named Xptoal Maria, ten years old, Mathias, fifteen years old, Maria, six years old, and Juana, four years old.

Ynes de la Cruz, with three daughters named Ynes, thirty years old, Juana, twenty years old, and Maria, twenty-four years old. Also two orphans, Blas, four years old, and Getrudes, five years old, and another boy named Joseph, six years old.

Leonor Martin, widow, with two children, named Antonio, fifteen years old, and Juana de Ojeda, six years old.

Captain Don Fernando Duran y Chaves, married to Doña Lucia de Salazar, with nine children named Bernardino, sixteen years old, Pedro, fifteen, Antonio, fourteen, Ysabel, thirteen, Francisco, eleven, Luis, nine, Nicolas, six, Maria, four, and Cata-

lina, one. Also, a servant named Francisca, twenty-eight years old, and a child named Ventura, five years old.

Maria Romero, married to Pasqual Naranjo, absent, with two sons and a daughter named Juan, eighteen years old, Fabian, ten years old, and Francisca, six years old.

Manuel Gomez, married to Antonia Vrsola Duran, with seven children named Francisco, twelve years old, Joseph, twenty years old, Nicolas Lopez, his son-in-law, who is living in his house, married to his daughter Maria de la Rossa, Theresa, ten years old, and Josepha, eight years old.

Real de San Lorenzo

Personal visit made and census taken, and the list of the residents of this *real* of San Lorenzo, which is two short leagues from El Passo del Rio del Norte.

Maestre de Campo Luis Granillo, lieutenant governor and captain general, married to Doña Magdalena Varela de Losada, without children. He has three orphans: Maria, eighteen years old, Felipe, sixteen years old, and Juan, fifteen years old. Servants: Domingo, sixty years old, married to Catalina, forty years old, and their children Catalina, twenty years old, Maria, eighteen years old, and Agustin, fifteen years old; also, an Indian servant named Clara, thirty years old, Josepha, eight years old, Francisco, four years old, and Antonio, two years old; and another Indian named Margarita, eighteen years old. He says that he has served his Majesty faithfully for thirty-nine years, that he was never an *encomendero* in New Mexico, and that he is so poor that without help he cannot move his household. Heedful of the said answer, I, said governor and captain general, told him that it was the will and intention of his Excellency the viceroy, the Conde de Galve, by agreement of the gentlemen ministers of the Royal Junta de Hacienda, and the order issued, that I should take the families and residents living in the pueblo of El Paso and the settlements of the surrounding area, their transportation being assured; and that his Excellency the said viceroy offered, promised, and granted them the honors and privileges of colonizers, with which he would honor them, sending them the royal *cédula* of his Majesty and other dispatches in which his Greatness would clarify the matter, explaining the said honors and privileges, and granting land; also, that those wishing to go with the salary of presidials would be thus provided, and that those going with the aid granted to settlers will go in that capacity in the same manner, the matter being left to his decision,

and to me, said governor and captain general, in accordance with the said order and command to which I have referred.

Sergeant Major Francisco de Anaya Almazan, ordinary alcalde of first vote of the cabildo, married to Doña Phelipa Rico de Roxas, with three children, two males and one female: Salvador, ten years old, Antonio, eight years old, Maria, four years old. Also, an orphan named Maria, fifteen years old, a widowed sister of his named Doña Ynes de Anaya, her son named Joseph, twenty-one years old, her servant girl, and an Indian named Antonia. He says that he has been serving his Majesty for over forty years at his own expense, and that he never had an *encomienda*; that at the time of the general uprising in New Mexico he was on one of the frontiers as the leader of six men under his charge, and that upon hearing of the said uprising he was unwilling to abandon the said frontier; and that on the said occasion he lost his wife and children. He said that without help he cannot move his family because he is extremely destitute, to which I, said governor and captain general, answered that which is stated above with regard to the order and command of his Excellency the viceroy, Conde de Galve, to which I refer.

Sergeant Major Lorenzo Madrid, married to Doña Ana de Almazan, without children. He states that he has five servants named Luisa, thirty years old, Paula, nine years old, Eugenia, eight years old, Juan Francisco, eight years old, Xptoval, fourteen years old, and Pedro, a babe in arms. He says that he has been serving his Majesty in New Mexico and in these parts for forty-one years, having been an *encomendero* in the said kingdom, and that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he is willing to enter and settle in the said kingdom if his Majesty gives him the necessary aid; that he will enter to build a house and will take his family later.

Captain Pedro Sedillo, widower, with two sons named Juan Rico de Roxas Sedillo, twenty-three years old, and Joachin Rico de Roxas, sixteen years old, the former being absent, having gone to *tierra firme*, and an Indian woman. He says that he needs much help before he can move to the said kingdom of New Mexico.

Captain Alonso del Rio, married to Doña Maria Gonzalez, with two orphans named Juliana, fifteen years old, and Nicolasa, twelve years old; also an Indian servant named Jacinta, another servant twelve years old, and Antonia, also a servant, thirteen years old. He says that he is willing to enter and settle in the

said kingdom if his Majesty grants him the necessary aid; that he will go to build his house, and will later return for his family. Also found in his house were his mother, named Doña Maria Madrid, with a maiden daughter, a child named Juan del Rio, twelve years old, a female servant thirty years old, a male servant named Xptoval, thirteen years old, Antonio, twelve years old, a girl named Magdalena, and another named Andres, eleven years old.

Sergeant Major Cristoval Tapia, married to Juana Valencia, without children. Found in his house were an orphan named Maria, twenty years old, another orphan named Juana Andrea, seven years old, a servant twenty years old, the mother of the aforesaid named Elena Ruiz, an orphan named Angela de Tapia, who is a widow with two sons named Bernardino, twenty years old, and Antonio, twenty-seven years old, a son [sic] Joseph, eighteen years old, an orphan named Domingo, and an Indian girl twelve years old. He says that he is willing and ready, as a loyal vassal of his Majesty, to serve God and the king, and that he will first enter with me, said governor and captain general, to build his house, and later enter with his family, provided he is given the necessary aid for that purpose.

Francisco Jurado, married to Doña Lucia Varela de Losada, with four sons and four daughters named Juan, twenty years old, Joseph, eighteen years old, Francisco, six years old, Antonio, four years old, Maria, twelve years old, Ysabel, ten years old, and Magdalena, eight years old. Also seven servants named Petrona, thirty years old, Margarita, eighteen years old, Maria, fourteen years old, Alonso, thirteen years old, Antonia, twelve years old, Nicolas, nine years old, and Manuel, five years old. He says that he has served his Majesty in New Mexico and in these parts for twenty-six years and that he is ready to obey the orders of his Majesty, and that if he is given the assistance necessary to move his family he will enter and settle in the said kingdom.

Sergeant Major Sevastian Gonzalez, married to Josepha Rico de Roxas, with four sons and four daughters named Francisco Gonzalez, twenty years old, Augustin, sixteen years old, Sevastian Gonzalez, ten years old, Miguel Gonzalez, one year old, Antonia Gonzalez, fifteen years old, Maria Gonzalez, thirteen years old, Lucia, eight years old, and Francisca Gonzalez, three years old. Also four servants named Maria, thirty years old, Juan, nine years old, Josepha, four years old, and Miguel, twelve years old.

He says that he has been serving his Majesty for thirty years at his own expense, that he never has had an *encomienda*, and that his Majesty's will is his will. And he says that in order to move he needs all manner of help, for he lacks even a shirt.

Captain Juan del Rio, married to Ana de Moraga, with three sons and three daughters named Diego, twenty-five years old, Francisco, twenty-three years old, Joseph, twenty-two, Mary, twenty-four years old, another Mary, eighteen years old, and Antonia, fifteen years old. Also a servant girl named Diega, nine years old. He is willing to settle in the said kingdom provided that his Majesty supplies all the necessary assistance, and that for the present he will go alone to build his house, and will later return for his family.

Captain Pedro de Leiba, married to Maria de Nava, with two sons and three daughters named Diego, six years old, Juan, three years old, Maria, fifteen years old, Antonia, ten years old, and Maria Magdalena, one year old. Also a servant named Maria who has three children named Luis, eight years old, Juan Antonio, five years old, Caietano, one year old, and another servant named Antonio, ten years old. Also found in the said house were an unmarried niece thirty years old named Juana, with two children, Joseph, nine years old, and Juana, eight years old. He says that he is willing to enter and settle in the said kingdom if his Majesty provides him with all of the necessary assistance because he is poor and on foot, and that he has been in his service for twenty-five years without ever having received any favors.

Pedro Hidalgo, married to Ana Martin Griego, with two daughters and four sons named Nicolas, sixteen years old, Alonso, twelve years old, Xptoal, eleven years old, Francisco, eight years old, Maria, seven years old, Marta, four years old, and an orphan named Bernardina, five years old. Also six servants named Maria, forty years old, with two children, Antonio, fourteen years old, Josepha, twelve years old, Getrudis, nine years old, Bernardino, four years old, Salvador, nine years old, Ysabel, thirty years old. He is willing to enter and settle in the said kingdom, and to serve his Majesty as ordered, if he is provided with the necessary assistance. He says that he has served him [his Majesty] in the said kingdom and has participated in the *entradas* which have been made, at his own expense; that he will go in order to build his house and that his family will enter later if given assistance.

Captain Pedro Madrid, married to Yuimar [?] Varela, with

four sons named Domingo Lorenzo, fifteen years old, Antonio, twelve years old, Diego, ten years old, Joseph, eight years old, and two daughters named Juana Madrid, twenty years old, and Lucia, six years old. He says that he is a loyal vassal of his Majesty the king, our lord, and that he will enter and settle in the said kingdom with his family if given all the necessary assistance.

Bartolome Romero Pedraza, married to Doña Lucia Varela, with three children named Mathias, nine years old, Juana, three years old, and Maria, a babe in arms. He says that he is and always has been a loyal vassal of his Majesty, and that he is willing to go and settle in the said kingdom of New Mexico if given all the necessary assistance without which it would be impossible.

Alonso Maese, married to Catalina Montañó, with six sons and three daughters named Gabriel, twenty years old, Antonio, fifteen years old, Francisco, twelve years old, Nicolas, ten years old, Juan, six years old, Cayetano, three years old, Diego, five years old, Joseph, three years old, Josepha, twenty years old, Maria, fifteen years old, Anamaria, ten years old. He also has in his said house two sisters named Luisa, twenty years old, and Maria, eighteen years old. He says that he has served his Majesty at his own expense, and that he is in great need of assistance if he is to settle in the kingdom of New Mexico.

Juan Pacheco, married to Antonia de Alatia, with three children named Juan Antonio, twelve years old, Phelipe, nine years old, and Matias, seven years old. He says that as a loyal vassal of the king, our lord, he is willing to enter and settle in the said kingdom if provided with the necessary assistance.

Manuel Vaca, married to Maria de Salazar, with three sons and three daughters named Antonio, nine years old, Diego, one year old, Gregorio Vaca, three years old, Maria, thirteen years old, Josepha, seven years old, Bernardina, five years old. He says that he is willing and ready to fulfill his Majesty's orders if given the necessary assistance with which to enter and settle in the kingdom of New Mexico.

Xptoal Varela, married to Casilda de Gracia, with a son and a daughter named Geronimo, three years old, and Maria de la Rosa, a babe in arms, and two orphans named Antonio, thirteen years old, and Petrona, twelve years old. He says that he is willing and ready to carry out the orders of the king, our lord, but that he is in need of every assistance if he is to move, for he is on foot.

Antonio de Zisneros, bachelor, with his poor widowed mother whom he supports, named Ana Gutierrez, and a brother and four sisters named Francisco, thirteen years old, Magdalena, twenty years old, Ana Maria, fifteen years old, Catalina, twelve years old, and Geronima, sixteen years old. Also four orphans named Juan, three years old, Maria, twelve years old, Maria, four years old, and Augustina, a babe in arms. He says that he is willing to enter New Mexico with me, said governor and captain general, in order to build his house, and that later he will return for his family, if his Majesty provides him with the necessary assistance.

Augustin Luxan, married to Maria Cisneros, with four daughters and two sons [sic] named Juan, twelve years old, Maria, seven years old, Ana, five years old, Antonia, three years old, Francisco, sixteen years old, and Antonio, a babe in arms. He says that he will obediently enter with me, said governor and captain general, in order to build his house, and that he will take his family later, if provided with the necessary assistance.

Sebastian Gonzalez, bachelor, with his mother Polonia Varela, seventy years old, an orphan named Ynes, thirteen years old, and a servant named Antonia who has three children named Joseph, thirteen years old, Ventura, two years old, and Estefana, fifteen years old. He says that he will go to build his house [in New Mexico] when I go there, and that he will take his family later, if he is given all the necessary assistance.

Captain Francisco Lopez, married to Maria Moraga, without children. He has three orphans named Matias, a babe in arms, Maria, fifteen years old, and Maria, *natural*, without children. He says that he is an obedient vassal of his Majesty, and that he is in dire need of assistance if he is to settle in the said kingdom.

Juan Varela, married to Ysabel Rico de Roxas. He says that he is ready to enter and settle in the said kingdom if his Majesty grants all the assistance necessary.

Luis Maese, married to Josepha Montoya, with two sons and four daughters named Juan, thirteen years old, Xptoval, nine years old, Maria, sixteen years old, Francisca, seven years old, Rossa, nine years old, and Antonia, three years old. Also two orphans named Francisca, thirteen years old, and Felipa, nine years old. He says that he is a loyal vassal of his Majesty and that he will carry out the orders very willingly if he is provided with the necessary help, because at present he is destitute.

Juan Griego, bachelor, with two brothers and two sisters named Francisco, sixteen years old, Antonio, ten years old, Juana, twenty years old, and Maria, eighteen years old; also three orphans named Nicolas, one year old, Maria, three years old, and Josepha, four years old. He will willingly settle in the said kingdom when given the necessary assistance.

Juan Antonio, married to Maria Magdalena, without children. He has a brother-in-law named Thomas, fifteen years old. He says the same as the others, that if he is given all the necessary assistance he will go and settle in the said kingdom.

Captain Francisco Luzero de Godoy, married to Doña Josepha Zambrano, with eight children, two of them males, named Andres and Francisco, and the daughters named Beatriz, Juana Tomasa, Maria Magdalena, Antonia, Gregoria, and Francisca Josepha.

Doña Juana Almazan, widow, twenty-eight years old, with the following children: Alonso, twelve years old, Ygnacio Baca, eleven years old, Juan, ten years old, Luis Baca, four years old, Geronima Baca, four years old, Gregoria Baca, eight years old, Antonia Baca, seven years old, Maria Magdalena, six years old, Margarita, two years old; also Anamaria, her niece, fifteen years old. Servants: Antonio, thirty years old, Baltasar, six years old, Joseph, four years old, Pedro, six years old, Pasquala, forty years old, Francisca, twelve years old, Marzela, thirty years old, Antonia, twenty-five years old, Ysabel, fifteen years old, and Margarita, ten years old. She says that if she is given financial assistance with which to move her household she will enter and settle in the said kingdom.

Doña Lucia Xaramillo, widow, with two orphans, and they say that they will go wherever his Majesty orders them to go.

Maria Luxan, widow, with two sons: Francisco Luxan, twenty-four years old, and Luis Luxan, seventeen years old. They say that they will go wherever his Majesty the king, our lord, orders them to go.

Those listed above are found in the said houses visited. And the said residents listed told me, said governor and captain general, that the native Mexicans who also live in the said *real* and pueblo of San Lorenzo had accompanied and followed them since the uprising of the apostate Indians of the villa and capital of Santa Fe and the kingdom of New Mexico, and that in loyalty and obedience to the divine and human Majesties they have persevered with the hope of returning [to New Mexico] upon the re-

covery and restoration of the said kingdom to the Royal Crown, in order to settle and live there, accompanying them wherever they go. In view of the above justifiable request, and that it be of record in this census list, they were listed in the following manner.

List of the native Mexicans who formerly lived in the Villa of Santa Fe in the company of the original Spanish residents who hail from there.

Juan de Dios, married to Catalina, with a daughter four years old.

Augustin Brito, married to Fabiana, with a daughter named Pasquala, fourteen years old; also an orphan twelve years old.

Juan Bruselas, married to Juana Christina, with an orphan named Augustina de la Cruz, ten years old.

Pablo Archuleta, married to Leonor Griego, with a daughter named Juana Maria, twenty years old, and an orphan named Augustina, two years old.

Nicolas, widower, with two sons: Blas, thirteen years old, and Antonio, two years old.

Francisco Brito, married to Maria de la Concepcion, with four children: Nicolas, twelve years old, Joseph, four years old, Maria, three years old, and Augustin, a babe in arms.

Joseph Brito, married to Catalina.

Miguel Moran, married to Maria de Ortega, without children.

Domingo, married to Angelina, with four children: Felipe, twenty years old, Juliana, eighteen years old, Francisca, eight years old, and Antonio, a babe in arms.

Miguel de la Cruz, married to Juana de Archuleta, with an infant daughter; and in the same family Anamaria, a widow.

Xptoval de Apodaca, widower, with two children; Cayetana, seventeen years old, and Juan, ten years old.

Bernardina Ysabel, widow, with two daughters: Maria, eighteen years old, and Luisa, sixteen years old. Also two orphans, Augustin, four year old, and Antonio, two years old. And in the same family was found Joseph, twenty years old.

Clara Susana, with a daughter named Andrea, and three orphans: Francisco, twelve years old, Diego, ten years old, and Santiago, two years old.

Maria Brixida, with three children: Juan Joseph, seven years old, Anamaria, five years old, and Lucas, two years old. Also found in the said house was Melchora, eighteen years old.

Josepha de Ortego, with four children: Lazaro, twenty years

old, Angelina, sixteen years old, Magdalena, seven years old, and Diego Antonio, four years old.

Agueda Moran, with two children: Benito, twenty years old, and Juan Luis, three years old. Also Maria, her daughter-in-law, with two children: Maria, four years old, and Juan Moran, two years old.

Josepha de la Cruz, widow, with two children: Juana, twenty years old, and two orphans [sic].

Joseph, married to Juana, with four sons and daughters: Andrea, twenty-two years old, Francisca, fifteen years old, Cayetano, four years old, and Maria, a babe in arms.

Magdalena de Ogano, widow, with two children: Juana, twenty years old, and Maria, fifteen years old. Also an orphan named Pasquala, two years old, and Getrudes with a daughter five years old.

[*Senecú*]

Personal visit and census list of the residents of this pueblo of Senecú, three short leagues distant from El Paso del Rio del Norte.

Captain Joseph de Padilla, alcalde mayor and war captain of this said pueblo of Senecú, married to Maria Lopez, with ten children named Phelipe, nineteen years old, Juan Antonio, sixteen years old, Antonio, fourteen years old, Diego, twelve years old, Joseph, nine years old, Cayetano, seven years old, Joachin, three years old, Luis, a babe in arms, and two orphans named Josepha, fourteen years old, and Juan de Dios, nine years old. Servants named: Diego, thirty years old, Antonio, twenty-four years old, Domingo, fifteen years old, Xptoval, sixteen years old, Gabriel, thirteen years old, Alonso, eleven years old, Diego, ten years old, Joseph Antonio, ten years old, Augustin, eight years old, Nicolas, seven years old, Juan six years old, Juanillo, thirty years old, Maria, thirty-five years old, another Maria, twenty-six years old, Juana, forty years old, Lucia, forty years old, Maria, ten years old, Antonia, ten years old, Getrudes, nine years old, Ana, ten years old, Dorotea, fourteen years old. He says that he has been twenty years in the kingdom as a loyal vassal of his Majesty, and that he has always carried out what has been ordered of him without receiving favors from his Majesty; and that if his Majesty provides him with the assistance that will enable him to move his family, he will go [to New Mexico] first to build his house there, at the place which I, said governor and

captain general, designate, and then he will take his said family there.

Lazaro de Moraga, married to Augustina de los Reyes, with six children named Joseph Antonio, a babe in arms, Maria, twenty years old, Francisca, twenty years old, Antonia, seven years old, Estefana, three years old, Juana, two years old. Also living in his house are his father-in-law and mother-in-law, and a brother-in-law and a sister-in-law. [The father-in-law's name is] Cristobal, the mother-in-law's name is Ysabel, and the brother- and sister-in-law are named Xptoal and Ana. The latter have ten children named Juan de la Crux, sixteen years old, Francisco, fourteen years old, Sevastian, nine years old, Domingo, eight years old, Esteban, six years old, Xptoal, three years old, Bartolome, one year old, Francisca, ten years old, Maria, four years old, and Graciana, three years old. Also three nieces and nephews of his father-in-law, Angelina, twenty years old, Esteban, six years old, Ventura, five years old, Maria, thirty years old, Diego, twenty-five years old, and two children of the aforesaid [sic], Augustina, twenty years old, and Antonia, two years old.

Ysleta

Personal visit and census list of the residents of this pueblo of Ysleta, four leagues distant from El Passo del Rio del Norte.

Captain Diego de Luna, married with Elvira Garcia, with two sons named Antonio, fifteen years old, and Nicolas, five years old, a daughter named Gregoria, twenty-four years old, and two servants named Juan, forty years old, and Juan Antonio, ten years old. Also six other servants named Franzisca, thirty years old, Juan, four years old, Thomassa, thirty years old, Maria, ten years old, Juana, five years old, Josepha, one year old, and the mother of the said Captain Diego de Luna, named Maria Jaramillo. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he is willing and ready to carry out whatever is ordered of him, but that he cannot enter and settle in the said kingdom in the month of April because it is too soon; however, if his Majesty gives him the necessary assistance he will enter and settle in the said kingdom. He says that he will enter alone to build his house and that later he will bring his family.

Francisco de Apodaca, married to Maria Lopez, without children.

Mathias Luxan, married to Francisca Romero, with nine children named Felipe, eleven years old, Juan, six years old, Pas-

qual, five years old, Miguel, two years old, Catalina, eighteen years old, Antonia, sixteen years old, Maria, thirteen years old, Juana, eight years old, and Manuela, one year old. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he will settle in the said kingdom when I, said governor and captain general, enter.

Domingo Martin, married to Josepha de Herrera, with eight children named Diego, twenty-two years old, Mathias, sixteen years old, Miguel, nine years old, Blas, six years old, Sebastiana, thirteen years old, Maria, twelve years old, Juana, four years old, Barbara, a babe in arms. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he will go and settle [in New Mexico] with his family if the necessary provisions are forthcoming. Also his mother-in-law named Juana de los Reies.

Francisco Romero, married to Juana Garcia, with five children named Joseph, twelve years old, Pablo, ten years old, Mathias, one year old, Theodora, three years old, and Petrona, two years old. He says that he will enter and settle in the said kingdom as a loyal vassal of his Majesty.

Luisa Garcia, with two daughters named Antonia, ten years old, and Felipa, twelve years old.

Pasqual Truxillo, married to Antonia Duran, without children. Also living in the said house are his aunt named Ana de Sandoval y Manzanares, her niece named Gregoria Truxillo with a daughter named Pasquala de Soto, and two sisters, one named Sevastiana de Sandoval y Manzanares, and the other Antonia de Sandoval y Manzanares, the latter with a daughter named Phe-lipa de Sandoval. Also the said sister Antonia has a son named Juan, twelve years old. Also noted were the children whom the said Ana de Sandoval later declared to be hers, three children named Feliciano de la Candelaria, sixteen years old, Francisco, twenty years old, Maria de la Rossa, fourteen years old. Also an orphan she has raised named Santiago, four years old. They say that they are loyal vassals of his Majesty and that they will go to settle in the said kingdom if they are given the assistance which will enable them to go.

Juan Truxillo, widower, with five children named Diego, fifteen years old, Antonio, eight years old, Manuel, six years old, Maria, twelve years old, Catalina, eleven years old, and a sister of the aforesaid named Antonia, thirteen years old, who has a daughter named Catalina. He says that he will enter and settle in the said kingdom with assistance from his Majesty.

Augustin de Salazar, married to Phelipa de Gamboa, with

two sons named Antonio, four years old, and Miguel, two years old. Also found living in the said house were his mother-in-law, named Lucia Martin, with an unmarried daughter named Petrona Dominguez, sixteen years old. He says that if he is given the necessary assistance with which to settle in the said kingdom, he will go there with his family.

Antonio Duran, bachelor, twenty-six years old. Also living in his home are his mother, Ysabel Duran, with three children named Manuel, nine years old, Ana Maria, fourteen years old, Juana, twelve years old, and a servant thirty-five years old with a son named Juan Antonio, four years old. Also living in his house is a niece named Francisca with four children: Pedro, five years old, Miguel, a babe in arms, Maria, thirteen years old, and Lucia, four years old. He says that he will go and settle in the said kingdom with his family.

The widow Ynes de Herrera, with three children named Carlos, seven years old, Joseph, four years old, and Getrudes, twelve years old. Also found in her house was her mother, Luisa de Herrera. She says that she will go gladly to settle in the said kingdom [of New Mexico].

Francisca de Abrego, widow, with an Indian woman named Juana Martin, [the latter] with three children named Antonio, twenty years old, Juan de Dios, nine years old, Maria, eighteen years old, and an orphan named Juana de Ojeda, eight years old.

Diego Truxillo, married to Catalina Griega, without children.

Ana de Abrego, with two nephews named Antonio, eleven years old, and Nicolas, eight years old.

Doña Ana Moreno de Lara, married to Xptoval Vaca, five years absent from these parts, now residing in Pasaxe with two daughters, who live with him, named Juana, eighteen years old, and Luisa, seventeen years old. She also said that she had two sons absent, one named Francisco, who is married and lives at the mines of Cusiguriache, and the other named Pedro Vaca, also married, and living at the *real* of Parral. Also she was found to have in her house two orphans named Pedro, five years old, and Elena, twelve years old. Also she showed me a grand-daughter named Josepha, five years old.

Ana Maria Montoya, widow, with two children named Matheo, thirteen years old, and Antonia, fifteen years old, and five orphans: Martina, twenty years old, Juana, eighteen years old, Felipa, seven years old, and Rossa, seven years old. She says that she will enter and settle in the said kingdom.

Socorro

Personal visit made and census list taken of the residents of this pueblo of Socorro, five somewhat short leagues distant from El Paso del Rio del Norte.

Captain Juan de Valencia, married to Juana Madrid, with six children in her house at present, named Antonio, eighteen years old, Miguel, twelve years old, Antonio, eight years old, Joseph, one year old, Maria, twenty-one years old, Maria Rosa, seven years old. Also thirty-two servants: Juan, fifty years old, married to Ysabel, with four children named Maria Magdalena, twelve years old, Baltasar, four years old, Josefa, eight years old, and Catalina, four years old; Juan Jiron, forty years old, [married] to Francisca, with three children named Mateo, fifteen years old, Rosa, seven years old, and Luis, two years old; Luis, married to Pasquala, with a son named Juan Antonio, twelve years old; Antonio, married to Juana, with two married children, Miguel, eleven years old, and Antonia, nine years old [In the margin of the document a hand is drawn with the index finger pointing to the preceding entry.]; Joan Tobar, married to Lucia, with two daughters named Lucia, three years old, and Magdalena, one year old; Domingo, married to Magdalena, age thirty; Bernardo, married to Maria, twenty years old, without children; Pedro, married to Juana, age twenty; Teresa, unmarried, thirty-six years old, with a daughter named Pasquala, ten years old; Juana, sixteen years old, and Antonia, fifteen years old. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he will settle in the said kingdom of New Mexico if given the assistance which will enable him to move his household, for it is very large and he is too poor to do so without aid.

Alonso Rodriguez, married to Juana de Valenzia, with five children named Carlos, twenty years old, Antonio, seven years old, Phelipa, two years old, Michaels, seven years old, Juana, four years old; also, Sevastiana, thirty years old, his wife's aunt. He says that as a loyal vassal of his Majesty he is ready to carry out whatever is ordered of him, provided he is given financial assistance, for he lacks even a single beast.

Xptoval Truxillo, married to Maria de Manzanares, with two children named Melchor, thirteen years old, and Michael, twelve years old; also, an orphan named Lorenzo, two years old. He says that he is willing and ready to go and settle in the said kingdom.

Juana de Arguello, widow, with five children named Antonio,

eighteen years old, Francisco, ten years old, Miguel, five years old, Michaela, fourteen years old, Josepha, twelve years old.

Maria Martin, married to Antonio Bejarano, absent, with five [sic] children: Simon, twelve years old, Maria, eight years old, Michael, one year old, and Josepha, three years old.

Maria Lopez, married to Salvador Romero, absent, with two sons named Diego, eight years old, and Joseph, six years old.

Juana de Leyba, with seven children named Antonio, twenty-five years old, Phelipe, twenty years old, and Diego, fifteen years old, all of whom are absent, and Sixto, eight years old, Maria, fifteen years old, Micaela, twelve years old, and Magdalena, nine years old.

Juan de la Paz, married to Pasquala de Archuleta, with four children named Thomas, twelve years old, Antonia, thirteen years old, Juana, eight years old, Estefania, two years old. Also found in his house is Ana de la Cruz, whom he said was his mother-in-law. He says that he is willing to settle in the said kingdom.

Thomas de la Cruz, married to Maria Gomez, with five daughters and one son named Anastasia, sixteen years old, Maria Magdalena, fifteen years old, Sebastiana, nine years old, Francisca, five years old, Ysabel, four years old, Manuel, one year old; also in his house, his brother Bartolome, bachelor, forty years old, and a nephew of the aforesaid named Joseph, fifteen years old.

Matias Francisco, married to Maria Gomez, with a child named Pedro, eight years ago. He says that he will go and settle in the said kingdom.

Juan de Archuleta, married to the Maria de la Cruz, with five children named Nicolas, ten years old, Catalina, eight years old, Nicolas, five years old, Maria, four years old, Antonio, one year old; a sister of the aforesaid named Juana, thirty years old, and the latter has four children named Diego, eight years old, Francisca, thirteen years old, Michael, seven years old, and Rossa, two years old.

Tomas, married to Vrsola Gomez, with four children named Marcos, twelve years old, Antonio, eight years old, Mateo, eight years old, Simon, a babe in arms.

Sevastiana, widow, with four children named Phelipe, twenty years old, Francisco, twelve years old, Joseph, two years old, Feliciana, a babe in arms.

Antonio, married to Magdalena, with one child named Ysidro, twelve years old.

Maria de Tapia, with four children named Alexo, fifteen years old, Lucia, thirteen years old, Maria, twelve years old, and Juana, ten years old. She says that she will go and settle in the said kingdom [of New Mexico].

General résumé of the said personal visit made and census taken, with the list of all the houses of the five pueblos:

According to the census list they number one hundred and twelve, and in them live seventy-three married couples, one hundred and fifteen widows, bachelors, and unmarried women, and four hundred and forty-eight boys and girls, the children of the above, of all ages. Also found living in the said houses were two hundred and fifty persons of all ages serving as domestics, whom they [their masters] have raised and continue to raise, and whom they designate as servants, as is of record in the said census with regard to the houses where they are found.

And in order that the said personal visit made, and census taken, with the said list, may be brought to the attention of his Excellency the viceroy, the Conde de Galve, I hereby send it to him, with a letter of transmittal to his Excellency, for which purpose I order my secretary of government and war to transcribe the testimony to the letter, so that upon seeing it, his Greatness may decide what is best.

And that the said visit and this said *auto* may be of record, I signed with my secretary of government and war. Done in this pueblo of El Passo del Rio del Norte, on the second day of January, the year sixteen hundred and ninety-three.

Don Diego de Vargas Zapata Lujan Ponze de Leon. Before me, Alphonso Rael de Aguilar, secretary of government and war.

TRANSLATED BY J. MANUEL ESPINOSA

Institute of Jesuit History
Loyola University, Chicago

Notes and Comment

Note must be made of the recently published *Guide to the Material in the National Archives*, (United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1940, pp. 303). This is a very good direction finder to 320,000 linear feet of documentary materials in our National Archives, giving as it does very satisfactory descriptions of the many blocks of records of the Federal Government. It is the result of two and a half years of labor on the part of the corps in the Archives, who have organized, inventoried, classified, and catalogued the materials received to January 1, 1940. The earlier *Reports* of the Archivist are hereby superseded, but future annual and quarterly *Reports* are promised for supplementation of the present book. The compilers offer apologies because the work lacks definiteness and is incomplete as to descriptions of the materials, but we must ignore the apologies in the presence of this adequate guide. A brief description of each agency and department of the Government precedes that of the materials grouped under the heading. An introduction gives ample information about how the records may be used or obtained in photograph, photostat, or microfilm. The indexing, general and particular, is excellently done to facilitate the finding of materials.

Papers in Illinois History, 1939, edited by Paul M. Angle, and published by the Illinois State Historical Society in 1940, contains for the most part papers read at the annual meeting of the society in May at Quincy. Among the papers we find "Floating Namesakes of the Sucker State," by William J. Peterson, a history from time immemorial of steamboat names gracing the colorful paddle-wheelers of the upper Mississippi. Quite a bit of steamboat lore is incorporated and indications are given of a great amount of research on boats, navigation, transportation, and excursioning. "Frances Willard as an Illinois Teacher," by Mary Earhart Dillon, gives in short but pertinent biographical outline, the result of long research on one of the three ladies who have this year been honored in the Famous American series of United States postage stamps. The longest of the papers is "Illinois and Her Indians," by Grant Foreman, a survey of the relations between the Indian tribes and British, federal, and local agencies, their land troubles and transfers. Other articles, the transactions of the society, and the index complete the 179 pages of the volume.

Anyone desirous of learning what went on in the merchandise marts of St. Louis between the years 1810 and 1820 will find plentiful information in a scholarly work by Sister Marietta Jennings entitled *A Pioneer Merchant in St. Louis* and published by Columbia University Press. The merchant was Christian Wilt; his partner was Joseph Hertzog. Sister Marietta makes a notable contribution to the already

vast amount of writing on fur trade and to the lead business and trade in the Ohio Valley.

Under the direction of Concha Romero James, chief of the Division of Intellectual Cooperation of the Pan American Union there appeared in 95 mimeographed pages *Latin American Studies in American Institutions of Higher Learning* for the academic year 1938-1939. This list of universities and professors offering courses on the history and culture of our "good neighbors" to the south is indeed imposing and is indicative of the great strides made during the past ten years toward developing understanding between the republics of the Western Hemisphere. Thousands of students are now working in the field plowed by the B historians—Bancroft, Bourne, Bandelier, Bolton. Old legends of backward Spain are disappearing under the microscopic scrutiny of hundreds of researchers and professors. The problems of World War II arising of necessity out of our economic interest in the nether half of the hemisphere are now being brought sharply to the attention of all Americans. Spanish, Portuguese, and the Brazilian-Portuguese languages are coming in for a great amount of study by lay folk and students. All this manifests a growing desire to know more about the land and the peoples, and when curiosity has given way to understanding the ideal of the good neighbor policy may be closely approximated.

Mariano Cuevas, S. J., in his *Historia de la Nación Mexicana*, Mexico, 1940, has written a detailed, very readable semi-popular history of Mexican civilization in all its various aspects. The author indicates that he is abreast of the latest scholarship in the field, and the work is of special value to the historian for its fresh viewpoints and synthetic treatment. It is a single volume work divided into three major parts: The pre-Hispanic Period, Discovery and Spanish Domination in Mexico, and Mexico Since Independence. The story is carried through the administration of Porfirio Díaz. In the prologue Cuevas describes the purpose of the work as follows: ". . . A happy medium, not for scholars, but for average educated men . . . has been our modest aim . . . to fill an urgent and general need for many educated persons who wish to know the history of Mexico. They have nothing to satisfy so laudable a desire, other than more or less superficial school textbooks . . . or else they are referred to hundreds of monographs, good but disconnected, or to certain unreadable works in many volumes." The dimensions of the present tome are 8" x 11¼", and it is two inches thick. It contains 1,027 pages printed in double columns, and is profusely illustrated. The documentation, with citations and notes, Cuevas promises in the near future in a separate collection of documents to be entitled *Oro Viejo*.

Father Guillermo Furlong, S. J., continues his investigations on

the cultural contribution of the Jesuits in the La Plata region. Since many of his publications have gone virtually unnoticed in this country, a list is given here of some of his more important works of the past fifteen years.

Scholarly Works.—Books: *Glorias Santafesinas: Buenaventura Suárez, Francisco Javier Iturri, Cristóbal Altamirano. Estudios bibliográficos*, Buenos Aires, 1929; ed., *Diario del viaje y misión al río del Sauce realizado en 1748*, Buenos Aires, 1933; *Los Jesuitas y la Cultura Rioplatense*, Montevideo, 1933; ed., *Florian Baucke: Iconografía colonial rioplatense, 1749-1767; costumbres y trajes de españoles, criollos e indios*, Buenos Aires, 1935; *Cartografía jesuítica del Río de la Plata*, 2 vols., Publicaciones del Instituto de investigaciones históricas, Universidad Nacional, Buenos Aires, 1936; ed., *Los indios pampas, puelches, patagones, según José Sánchez Labrador, S. J.*, Buenos Aires, 1936; *Bio-Bibliografía del Dean Funes*, Imprenta de la Universidad, Córdoba, 1939.

Articles: "Las bibliotecas jesuíticas en las reducciones del Paraguay y del Chaco," *Estudios*, Buenos Aires, 1925; "La personalidad y la obra de Tomás Falkner," Pub. del Instituto de investigaciones históricas, Univ. Nac., No. XLVIII, Buenos Aires, 1929; "El Padre José Quiroga," *ibid.*, No. LIV, 1930; "Domingo Muriel," *ibid.*, No. LXIV, 1934; "Alonso Barzana, S. J., Apóstol de la América Meridional," *Estudios*, B. A., 1933-1934; "Nuestra literatura católica colonial y premoderna," *ibid.*, 1939.

Semi-Popular Works.—Books based on early Jesuit relations: *Entre los Abipones del Chaco, Entre los Mocabies de Santa Fé, and Entre las Pampas de Buenos Aires*, published in Buenos Aires, 1938; *Entre los Vilelas de Salta*, Buenos Aires, 1939.

Juan Faustino Sallaberry, S. J., has just published a revised and enlarged edition of his book *Los Jesuitas en Uruguay, Tercera Epoca, 1872-1940*, Montevideo, 1940, pp. 208. Father Sallaberry, a native Uruguayan, has, through his many important published works, attained general recognition as the leading historian of the Jesuits of Uruguay. The present volume relates in detail all of the various activities of the Jesuits in Uruguay during the period designated in the title, a period of remarkable growth and influence. A very useful appendix contains a complete catalogue of all the Jesuits who have served in Uruguay during the period, each name accompanied by a biographical sketch.

Book Reviews

A History of Chicago: Vol. II. From Town to City, 1848-1871. By Bessie Louise Pierce. Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1940. Pp. xiii, 547, xxxiii.

The second volume of Miss Pierce's elaborate *History of Chicago* ranges through two decades which are a good deal of an organic whole in the story of that great center of population, covering as they do its transition from a town to an urban economy, its advance from the status of an overgrown village to that of the recognized metropolis of the imperial sweep of territory flanked by the Alleghanies and the Rockies. Chronologically, the decades are framed within two dates of dramatic import, 1848, which saw Chicago's first railroad, and 1871, which saw its entire business section and much of its residential quarters disappear in ashes in one of the greatest conflagrations of history.

History can be loosely written: it can show unconcern, deliberate or otherwise, for the accepted conventionalities in method which insure or help to insure scholarliness of treatment, accuracy of result. No such delinquency is chargeable to the present work. It measures up to the standards of history-writing of the most reputable and scientific sort, and supplants in authoritativeness all other treatments of the subject. The story it presents is based, not on the easy gossip, the hazy recollections of "old settlers," but on the firm foundation of authentic first-hand documentary evidence. The use made of newspapers is outstanding. Von Holst and McMaster broke new ground in historiography when they turned to the newspaper as a legitimate source of historical data. Miss Pierce follows in their footsteps. Probably the bulk of the vast quantity of factual items she and her collaborators have assembled are drawn from the contemporary Chicago press. Obviously unremitting critical caution and care are required in the historian who gathers material from so ephemeral and often irresponsible a medium of information as the public press; but due allowance being made for its limitations as an historical source, the contemporary press remains an invaluable and practically indispensable aid to the writer who attempts to recover past actualities in the American scene and portray them to the life. Certainly, the value as a more or less accurately reflecting mirror of the cross currents of public opinion on issues of the day, of the contemporary press to the historian is indubitable. In the use for such purpose of the entire gamut of the Chicago papers of the 'fifties and 'sixties the author of this work is particularly happy.

A record of the type of the present one is not one of local significance only. Chicago history during the period 1848-1871 is a fairly

representative cross-section of the play of forces political, economic, social, and cultural, that were operating during the same years in the country at large and with similar results. An instance in point is Miss Pierce's admirable treatment of the Civil War years and the approach to them as these were experienced in Chicago. Here on this restricted stage the same rifts in public opinion on the burning issues of the day were in evidence, the same reactions of social and religious groups to politics took place, the same political battles were fought out as could be witnessed in other sections of the country. Incidentally, it may be noted that the recent presidential campaign, deplored by many for the bitterness injected into it, appears to have been a love-feast compared to the incredibly rancorous party clashes occasioned by the slavery question. In this connection it may be pointed out that the author's reference to Douglas's Kansas-Nebraska bill leaves a little to be desired (pp. 205-208). Nowhere is it mentioned that the "Little Giant's" advocacy of his famous measure was motivated by the desire, not to curry favor with the South, as was contended by his enemies, but to promote the opening and settlement of the trans-Missouri West through the building of railroads. This fact, as established by the researches of the late Professor Hodder of Kansas State University, is now an admitted one among serious students of the subject.

Data on the Catholic Church which occur in the volume are recorded with accuracy. Only an exceptional slip or omission in this connection came under the reviewer's notice. Bishop Van de Velde's differences with some of his clergy was only one of several circumstances that led to his resignation, the major consideration determining the step being one of health (p. 360). Mention of the Catholic Institute and its impressive group of lecturers might have found place in the paragraphs (pp. 401-402) devoted to the contribution made by the lecture to Chicago cultural life.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

Institute of Jesuit History

Red Carolinians. By Chapman J. Milling. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1940. Pp. xxi, 438.

Altogether too little has been written concerning the smaller tribes of Indians which once inhabited America. If others, in neglected regions, would produce such volumes as Dr. Milling has in *Red Carolinians*, a more rounded concept of tribal America and a better understanding of the conflicts between the white and the red races would be soon available.

The introductory chapter treats in general of the ethnology of the various tribes inhabiting the region under discussion, before they were corrupted by the white settlers. The Red man was "in about the

same stage of cultural advancement as the Britons at the time of the Roman conquest," and, it is pointed out, they were misunderstood because they did not conduct themselves as the whites did. In succeeding chapters there is as complete a history as possible of several comparatively unknown tribes, namely the Cusabo, the Cofitachiqui, the Westo, the Savannah, the Yamasee, the Tuscarora, the Apalachee, the Catawba, and smaller tribes of Carolina. Separate accounts of each group are given, from the time of the first white explorers to the gradual dying out or dispersion of the tribes. Of importance in the study of these Indians are their relations with the early settlers and traders and the attempts of officials to put them under white man's law. Some government agents were kind toward the Indians and promoted their welfare; others were harsh and cruel in their dealings with them. The author writes of both types, indiscriminately giving praise or blame where it is due. In addition to the often friendly relationships, the various wars, intertribal and inter-racial are discussed in detail and the resultant movements of the tribes recorded.

Over one hundred pages are devoted to that best known tribe of the Southeast, the Cherokee, the most civilized of all the tribes of the region, which had developed a comparatively high culture at the time of its removal. Of all the black marks against the government of the United States in its dealings with the Indians, the treatment of the Cherokee during removal proceedings is, perhaps, the blackest. Dr. Milling does not enlarge upon this important episode for, as he states, many good accounts have already appeared, but he does present an outline which serves to stimulate interest in the more detailed histories to which he refers.

From the wealth of archival material in the South Carolina Historical Commission the author has drawn much of his source information. The Indian Books, the Journals of the Assembly, and other public records have been utilized and new facts are presented which aid in piecing together the story of the contact of the Indians with provincial South Carolina. Interviews with living members of some of the tribes discussed add color to the narrative and give evidence of the author's industry. Of the printed sources, Dr. Milling has drawn freely from the travelers' accounts, such as those of James Adair, John Lawson, William Bartram, and Henry Timberlake. The impressive bibliography covers sixteen and a half pages; it includes practically everything of value published on the subject and will prove very helpful to the student of the Southeastern tribes. The thirty-six page index also adds to the general usefulness of the volume.

Here, as in other books of late years, the Indian is treated sympathetically. This book will easily engross the layman, for it is entertainingly written and authoritative. The student will welcome it, for it brings together a wealth of scattered information. The author has accomplished his chief aim "to trace the history of all the tribes once

inhabiting a given commonwealth." It is to be hoped that he has set a precedent which others will follow.

BARBARA BOSTON

The Newberry Library

The Articles of Confederation. By Merrill Jensen. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin, 1940. Pp. vi, 284.

The author of this study, which has as an explanatory sub-title, "An Interpretation of the Social-Constitutional History of the American Revolution, 1774-1781," did not intend to be a history of the American Revolution. Hence, there is nothing included relative to the campaigns of the war. Instead, this book presents an account of the forces responsible for our first constitution, adopted in 1781.

Since this first constitution operated for only eight years, American historians have had a tendency to consider it a fundamentally weak organ of government. Professor Jensen maintains, in effect, that historians have uncritically accepted the Federalist condemnation of the Articles of Confederation without stopping to realize that ". . . the Federalist Party was organized to destroy a constitution embodying ideals of self-government and economic practice that were naturally abhorrent to those elements in American society of which that party was the political expression" (p. 3). Hence, it is argued, the non-democratic Federalists not only had no faith in the democracy envisaged by the Articles of Confederation, but wished so to malign that instrument of government as to make it appear that those who destroyed it, saved the country by their actions. Instead of accepting this point of view, the author, in studying the Articles, has taken into consideration the disturbances in the various states at the time, individual and group interests, social cleavages, and interstate conflicts. A full understanding of such problems is considered essential for a realization of the type of government necessary for that era.

The first chapters deal in documentary detail with the general fear of the conservative classes that democratic control might result in separation from England. In most of the colonies it was evident, even as late as 1775 and in the early part of 1776, that the aristocracy regarded themselves as Englishmen and feared hostile legislation if independence would be granted the colonies. Hence, as late as ". . . May 15, 1776, the Maryland convention instructed its delegation in Congress to oppose any declaration of independence and reiterated its belief in the desirability of the British connection" (p. 21). Likewise, "In June 1776, James Iredell [of North Carolina] wrote a pamphlet in which he urged that a just and constitutional connection with Britain 'in spite of every provocation, would be the happier for America, for a considerable time to come, than absolute independence'" (p. 27).

The chapter entitled "The Problem of Union" admirably presents the complex difficulties facing the jealous colonies. The very fact that the Revolution itself was a revolt against centralization of political authority, made it unwise and illogical for the framers of that first constitution to attempt the formation of a strong central government. The problems of deciding the method of voting in Congress, the bases of representation and of taxation, the control of the West, and many other acute problems had to be met and solved, often by compromises. Eventually each of the thirteen states was to emerge as an independent and sovereign member of the federal government, and unquestionably retained that status until at least 1789.

The difficulties of ratification, extending over three and one-half years, are dealt with in detail. It was made evident to all that the Articles of Confederation were intended to prevent the central government from infringing on the rights of the states and on the democracy within those states. The radicals had temporarily triumphed in preventing the conservatives from organizing a strong national government, which could interfere with the democracy within the states.

The chapters are well documented with eighteenth-century sources. A good index is provided. The volume is challenging and provocative, and represents a real contribution to the historical literature of the period.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University, Chicago

Pioneer Black Robes on the West Coast. By Peter Masten Dunne, S. J., Ph. D. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1940. Pp. xiii, 286. Maps and Illustrations.

In 1934 the United States Catholic Historical Society published Dr. W. Eugene Shiels's *Gonzalo de Tapia*. Four years later Dr. Jerome V. Jacobsen's admirable study, *Educational Foundations of the Jesuits in New Spain*, was published by the University of California Press. This was the first in a series of studies to be devoted to the work of the Jesuits in New Spain. Dr. Dunne's book is the second in this series, and others are promised. All are a product of that school of history which has received its inspiration from Herbert E. Bolton.

Dr. Dunne carries on from where Dr. Shiels left off. The first five chapters of *Pioneer Black Robes on the West Coast* contains a setting for the following sixteen chapters which are concerned with the labors of Father Tapia's immediate successors. And the story is a grand one. As Professor Bolton writes, "the author has brought forth from comparative obscurity a galaxy of notable pioneers, great figures in their time but neglected by modern historians. . . ." These figures—to mention just a few—were Fathers Andrés Pérez de Ribas, Pedro de Méndez, Hernando de Villafañe, Cristóbal de Villalta, Juan Bau-

tista de Velasco, Julio Pascual, Manuel Martínez, and the remarkable frontier captain Diego Martínez de Hurdaide, "the defender of the Faith."

Dr. Dunne's narrative does not proceed along strict chronological lines. The time element is not permitted to interfere with his determination to relate the beginnings of recorded missionary history in the valleys of the Sinaloa, Fuerte, Mayo and Yaqui. Spanish successes in these valleys were assured upon the arrival of Captain Hurdaide at San Felipe (Sinaloa) in January 1595. For thirty years thereafter the Indians came to respect this stern but pious man. *Hechiceros* or medicine men had at last found their match in "El Capitán." Hurdaide made it possible for Fathers Ribas, Méndez, and Villalta to plant the cross on the banks of the Fuerte among the Ahomes, Suaquis, Tehuecos, and Sinaloas in 1605. Ten years later the religious zeal of the padres carried the banner of Christ to the Indians of the Mayo, and by 1625 substantial beginnings had been made in the Yaqui country and among the Opatas. A school for native children had been established at San Felipe, and Hurdaide had, in 1610, founded the famous fort of Montesclaros among the Tehuecos. The story is brought to a close with the death of Hurdaide in 1624 and the martyrdom of Pascual and Martínez at Chínipas in 1632.

Dr. Dunne's book is more than a sympathetic account of these seventeenth-century sons of Loyola. It is also a careful study of Spanish Indian policy, frontier administration, and historical geography. All this speaks well for the author's mastery of his materials and the locale of his story.

The book shows care in preparation. No error of fact has been detected. Two maps and a dozen illustrations add to the merit of the book, as do the four statistical appendixes. Students of the field will also find the essay on authorities useful.

RUSSELL C. EWING

University of Arizona

Chronology of Failure. By Hamilton Fish Armstrong. Macmillan Company, New York, 1940. Pp. 202.

This is the story of the collapse of the French Republic. It is not surprising that such a speedy and thorough defeat of a supposedly impregnable nation should be the occasion of the writing of quite a few books. In addition to this book, there has appeared recently the explanations given in works by André Maurois, *Tragedy in France*, *Suicide of a Democracy* by Heinz Pol, and *J'Accuse* by André Simone. All of these men have undertaken the task of being diagnosticians. The trained student of history knows what a difficult task this is. Historians are still seeking final explanations for the disintegration of the Roman Empire, for the Religious Upheaval of the sixteenth

century, for the collapse of the French Monarchy in the French Revolution, and in our own day for the World Crisis of 1929. Political institutions are different from mathematical propositions. They have no exact answers. There is more the element of the debatable in the social sciences. It is no different with the phenomenon of more recent times in France. Different men give different reasons. Historians of the future evaluating the same problem will see more clearly than contemporary observers.

Mr. Armstrong analyses this very complex situation and gives us the following explanations. (1) France was divided politically and socially, even since 1789. "This created cliques in the French Army and diminished the national will to resistance" (p. 181). (2) France was served by mediocre politicians, often engrossed with personal feuds. (3) "France had a Maginot Line in the mind." This gave the French a false sense of security much as "the English Channel and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have given to the English and the Americans" (p. 183). (4) The German Army had superior resources, organization, and striking power. The victory of 1918 had made the French quite complacent. The desperate situation of the Germans made them more inventive and aggressive. "To the failure of the French imagination was added a failure of the French will" (p. 195). Armstrong warns his readers that too much blame must not be put on the Popular Front. Obviously Mr. Armstrong still has a great deal of faith in the French Republic.

Mr. Petain has given the world his own explanation for the failure of the French. "Not so strong as 22 years ago, we had also fewer friends, too few children, too few arms, too few allies. There is the cause of our defeat" (p. 129). Mr. Petain mentions "too few children," an argument not mentioned by Armstrong and yet quite important.

None of these writers take up the problem of the Freemasons in the history of France. It may be that one of the reasons for her unnatural collapse will be found in the work of this institution. The book is interesting reading and eminently worthwhile. But observers will have to wait until all the documents are available before a more adequate explanation can be given to this ever recurring historical phenomenon, *i.e.*, the rise and fall of nations.

EDWARD V. CARDINAL

Loyola University, Chicago

Frontiers of the Northwest, A History of the Upper Missouri Valley.
By Harold E. Briggs. D. Appleton-Century Company, New York,
1940. Pp. xiv, 629.

The American frontier advance went ahead on irregular lines from first to last. Ever since the Irish and Germans moved southwest from Pennsylvania through the Shenandoah Valley, the pioneer has fol-

lowed varying attractive forces in directions that would make a complete frontier map look like a crazy quilt. Though the general trend was westward, one finds that settlement went up the water-courses, reversed itself in cross-country farming treks, hurried over large gaps to the Columbia or the Sacramento and San Joaquin, and then turned completely about as men from the Pacific Slope rushed to get to the mining fields before the easterners arrived.

The Missouri Valley frontier was of all the most irregular in its development of habitation, although the basic pattern of fur trader and missionary, buffalo man and cattle herder, miner and townsman, reproduced itself in that area quite as faithfully as it did in other western sections. The states of the Rockies north of New Mexico and the two Dakotas formed the region under study in this volume, what might be called the last frontier in the language of Paxson. The chief interest in the story attaches to this "last" character, for of all the sections this one is least known and least appreciated. In giving us a detailed account of its history Professor Briggs has merited the thanks of a wide public.

The author offers generous gratitude to those who have furnished him with data for his book, but one cannot read the work without feeling that Briggs is a master of the geography and the documentation. The chapters fairly bristle with new and striking information, in such narratives as the Calamity Jane story and the sketch of the Ghost Town histories. The research student will henceforward use this as a standard reference. Although a few slips occur, such as the placing of Cherry Creek in the vicinity of Pike's Peak, the reviewer found what material he could check to be most carefully appraised and annotated. Numerous photographs give added color to the descriptions of western life. The bibliography is full and particularized. The index is thorough.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Loyola University, Chicago

Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies. By John Tate Lanning. Oxford University Press, London, New York, Toronto, 1940. Pp. ix, 149.

Professor Lanning here publishes five essays dealing with the universities of the Spanish colonies, the teaching of philosophy and medicine, and the development of public health services in the Americas. He disarms criticism by warning the reader that this little book is only the preliminary, the *avant-coureur* of a large work which is to cover ten topics more or less related under the general character of "academic culture." Yet it is possible that these brief essays take on an added importance just because they indicate the lines of the future ponderous work.

The author does not lack appreciation of the large achievement made by Spanish colonial universities; but he is also properly critical of their organization, their methods, and results. In his approach he aims at being friendly and intelligent. In addition, he is evidently well-trained in the modern techniques of historical research. A wealth of facts, evidence, documents has been assembled by him, and thus the first half of his great task is completed. The second part of his work will be to fit these together so as to bring out the truth behind the facts. To do this a balanced knowledge which we reverence as wisdom, will be required.

Professor Lanning has something of that balanced knowledge, but slips here and there in his book indicate a lack of fullness of knowledge, as might be expected from a glance at the vast fields he has under scrutiny. The tendency to weigh the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries exclusively in the scales of the twentieth is one such slip. He is, for instance (pp. 23-24), amused that Vergara in 1602 should see nothing incongruous in asking for a university for Los Charcas while at the same time asking that a tribunal of the Inquisition be set up there. If this amusement is a naïve confession that he envisages a modern eclectic, not to say anarchic, university confronting a completely repressive authority, the author has misunderstood extremely important facts about the seventeenth-century Spanish colony. Again, the longest of the five essays is labelled "The Last Stand of the Schoolmen," which impresses one as an announcement of the death of scholasticism, a report which, to quote Mark Twain, is at least exaggerated. Scholastic philosophy is still very much alive. The essay seems to accept the historical falsehood that scholastic philosophy relied upon authority rather than upon reason and that it was the enemy of scientific research. Undoubtedly, Professor Lanning will examine other of the traditional biases and expose them fully in his larger work, as he has done with some in this present contribution.

W. KANE

Loyola University, Chicago

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 23, NUMBER 2

APRIL 1941

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

APRIL 1941

VOLUME 23

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 12

NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

HENNEPIN'S <i>DESCRIPTION OF LOUISIANA</i> <i>Jean Delanglez</i>	99
INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE CAUSES OF THE PIMA UPRISING OF 1751 <i>Russell C Ewing</i>	138
NOTES AND COMMENT	152
BOOK REVIEWS	157
<i>KNOLLENBERG, Washington and the American Revolution; LOEWENSTEIN, Hitler's Germany; HAFEN AND RISTER, Western America. The Exploration, Settlement, and Development of the Region Beyond the Mississippi; FRITZ, Colorado, the Centennial State; DECORME, La Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos durante la Época Colonial 1572-1767; SCHAFFER (EDITOR), Memoirs of Jeremiah Curtin.</i>	

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN
WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON
RAYMOND CORRIGAN
PAUL KINIERY
JEAN DELANGLEZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

APRIL 1941

VOLUME 23

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 12

NUMBER 2

Hennepin's *Description of Louisiana*

A CRITICAL ESSAY

PART II

1. HENNEPIN IN FRANCE 1682

Hennepin, however, did not return with Duluth. M. Dudouyt wrote in his letter of March-April 1682: "Father Louis [Hennepin] and Father Georges [Harel] landed at Le Hâvre; [having crossed the ocean] on a fishing boat. From Le Hâvre they came [up the Seine] by canoe to Saint-Germain. . . ."¹ From these words of the letter, begun on March 9, and finished toward the end of April, and from the other passage of the same letter which has already been quoted, it is inferred that Hennepin left Quebec some time in December, went down the St. Lawrence, and boarded a fishing boat, probably in Newfoundland, toward the end of January. On his way down the St. Lawrence, against the explicit prohibition of the bishop, he heard confessions, a very serious transgression of ecclesiastical discipline which no bishop would tolerate. Hennepin was thus using the best means of precluding any subsequent return to Canada.

Before M. Dudouyt wrote his letter to Laval, it will be remembered, a letter of M. de Bernières to Dudouyt and another of Laval to Bernières had preceded Hennepin's arrival in France. In view of these letters, Dudouyt had consulted Father Hyacinthe Le Febvre, the provincial of the Recollect Province of St. Denis, and the latter had proposed to send Hennepin back to his own province in Artois. But when Hennepin appeared in Paris, the provincial changed his mind "because it was necessary for him to remain [in Paris] on account of the discoveries he had made, and because M. Colbert would not like it." In the second

¹ Dudouyt to Laval, March 9-April 25, 1682, Archives du Séminaire de Québec, *Lettres*, Carton N, n. 61, p. 14.

half of March, it is certain that Hennepin had not yet begun to write his *Description*; instead, he was busy composing a lampoon "against you [Laval], M. the Intendant, the Jesuits, and myself [Dudouyt]. . . ." As for sending him back to his province, although a companion had been sent to fetch him, "he manoeuvred so well by means of the friends of M. de Frontenac, especially by means of M. de l'Estrade, that he is still here." In another interview of Dudouyt with the provincial, the latter openly declared that the restrictions put upon the ministry of the Recollects in Canada by the Bishop of Quebec were caused by "the missions and voyages of Father Louis." The letter of M. Dudouyt, whence these details are taken, was begun, as said above, on March 9; exactly when he wrote the Hennepin passages cannot be ascertained, for he added to the letter as more news reached him; but the concluding words of this section indicate it was before the end of March. From these concluding words also, one can gather that the recall of Frontenac was being rumored, "it is believed that M. de Frontenac, M. the Intendant, and M. Perrot [the governor of Montreal] will be recalled; although the return of M. Duchesneau is not so certain. . . ." M. Dudouyt was certain of this on April 24, 1682, the day before he finished his letter.

These chronological details bear directly on the date of composition of the *Description of Louisiana*. The king's letter recalling Frontenac is dated May 9, 1682.² Dudouyt waited two weeks until he had all the details before sending an account of it to Laval. On May 26, he wrote:

M. de Frontenac had the strong support of his friends, of Mme. de Frontenac, of M. de Menar, M. de l'Estrade and many others. . . . Those who supported M. de Frontenac also supported Father Louis. . . . Father Louis will not return to Canada; he is leaving for his province. Father Provincial had already told me he would send him back [to his province] as soon as he arrived in France, but he didn't. I am pretty sure that M. de l'Estrade and others are behind this; they asked him [the provincial] that Father Louis remain in Paris for some time until the map of his new discoveries is finished, for his [Hennepin's] provincial long ago sent a companion with whom he was to return to his own province.³

Hennepin, however, was not to be so easily disposed of. One

² Louis XIV to Frontenac, May 9, 1682, in *Rapport de l'Archiviste . . . pour 1926-1927*, 141.

³ Dudouyt to Laval, May 26, 30, 31, 1682, Archives du Séminaire de Québec, *Lettres*, Carton N, no. 62, p. 1 and 4.

week later, on June 2, Dudouyt wrote: "He is doing his utmost to return to Canada, and I spare nothing to prevent him from going back, for he is extravagant, and will only create trouble."⁴ And in the following week:

Father Louis has given an account of all his discoveries and [has urged] that people [*i.e.*, settlers and missionaries] be sent to begin settlements. The mind of the Court is against such far-flung dispersion, and is rather that the colony should be strengthened in the places already settled. M. de Seignelay told this to M. de la Barre and to M. Tronson. The Gentlemen of the Seminary of Montreal had already offered to go to those far-away missions.⁵

This, however, was opposed by M. Tronson, who wished to establish Montreal on a firm basis, and therefore desired his subordinates to take care of the French in and around Montreal as well as the Indians of the Mission de la Montagne. Thereafter, the missionaries could go farther afield. In order to strengthen their center of operations the Sulpicians had given up the Kenté Mission.

This letter of M. Dudouyt is dated June 10, 1682. Regrettably, he was not more explicit, for the precise meaning of the sentence: "Le P. Louis a proposé toutes ses decouvertes," is not clear. It is translated above by "has given an account of." The meaning of the word "proposé" a few lines below, in the sentence: the Gentlemen of the Seminary of Montreal "avoient proposé d'aller dans ces missions eloignees . . ." creates no difficulty, for here it means "to offer." The account of the discoveries was certainly given to the Court, but it would be forcing the text to see in these words an allusion to the manuscript of the *Description of Louisiana*. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that Hennepin did present to the Court some sort of memoir about the Sioux country, although no such memoir of his has come to light.

Unfortunately, there are no details about Hennepin's activities subsequent to this letter of June 10. All we know from M. Dudouyt's correspondence is that on June 19, Hennepin was still "at Versailles or at Saint-Germain, doing his utmost to remain here, and apparently to carry out his plans and ideas, and if possible to return to Canada. . . ."⁶ In another letter dated July 3: "I haven't heard as yet that F. Louis, Recollect, has gone back to his Province. All I know is that he is doing all he can to cling to

⁴ *Id.* to *id.*, June 2, 1682, *ibid.*, p. 3.

⁵ *Id.* to *id.*, June 10, 1682, *ibid.*, no. 64, p. 1.

⁶ *Id.* to *id.*, June 19, 1682, *ibid.*, no. 65, p. 1.

this place; he will only make trouble as long as he remains here."⁷ The next extant letter of M. Dudouyt is dated April 28, 1683.⁸ Frontenac was still in Paris, he wrote, but although the *Description of Louisiana* had been in print for nearly four months, M. Dudouyt makes no mention of Hennepin or of his book.

From internal evidence, it may be established that the book was begun toward the end of May; from internal and external evidence that most of it was written at the end of August. The "writing" of the *Description* should not have taken long, for when it was begun two-thirds of it was ready at hand in the *Relation des decouvertes*. From the opening pages of the *Description* it is clear that the compiling was not begun until the recall of Frontenac had been confirmed and made public; and the *permis d'imprimer* is dated September 3, 1682. The manuscript whose printing was authorized by this necessary legal permit contained less than the book as we now have it; for the last pages of the *Description* proper and also those of the *hors d'oeuvre* tacked to the book were missing. These pages describe La Salle's voyage to the sea, which cannot have been known in Paris before October 1682, at the earliest.

In the last pages of the *Description* proper, we are told among other things: "I was nearly eight months a captive of the Issati," (more exactly three and a half months). Notwithstanding all obstacles, La Salle was able to build three barks; "to journey by canoe beyond the three great lakes . . . and to pursue his enterprise with Fathers Luc Brisset [Buisset] and Zénobe Membré, Recollects, and about fifty men." The information, if it was really received before this part of the *Description* had been printed, was inaccurate in one important point: Father Membré is the only Recollect who accompanied La Salle to the Gulf.

I had word from New France this year, 1682, that Sieur de la Salle seeing I had made peace with the nations of the north and northwest who dwell more than five hundred leagues up the Colbert River and who were waging war with the Illinois and other southern tribes, descended, last year, the great Colbert River as far as its mouth and the sea, with his men and our Recollects. He traveled among unknown nations some of which are civilized.⁹

It is somewhat startling to find Hennepin, who in the pre-

⁷ *Id. to id.*, July 3, 1682, *ibid.*, no. 67, p. 2.

⁸ *Id. to id.*, April 28, 1683, *ibid.*, no. 69, p. 1.

⁹ *Description de la Louisiane*, 310-311.

ceding paragraph has spoken of his "slavery," in this paragraph acting as an ambassador. While still a slave of the Sioux, he acts as peacemaker between Indian "nations of the north and the northwest who dwell more than five hundred leagues up the Colbert River," and "the Illinois and other southern tribes" with whom the former "were waging war." Indians living five hundred leagues up the Mississippi to the north would have their habitat on the shores of Hudson Bay; those five hundred leagues up the river to the northwest would be located in central Saskatchewan. How our enslaved ambassador could have filled the role of peacemaker between these tribes and the Illinois Indians is not clear. At any rate, there is no extant record of the peace treaty. More amusing still is the statement about La Salle beginning his voyage to the sea "voyant que j'avois fait la Paix"; as though the explorer had been anxiously waiting for our ambassador to make peace before daring to begin his journey down the Mississippi to the Gulf. Noteworthy too is the date of this voyage down the Mississippi, "l'année passée," namely, 1681, while Hennepin himself was still in Canada. The familiar contention that the *Description of Louisiana* is an accurate account of the beginnings of the interior of the United States, must in view of all this, be understood as applying to such parts as are faithful transcriptions of the *Relation des découvertes*.

The *hors d'oeuvre* above mentioned, entitled "Moeurs des Sauvages," has a pagination of its own, and is tacked onto the *Description*.¹⁰ Its last two pages clearly indicate that whoever their author may have been, he had a letter written to another member of the Order, by a Recollect at St. Bonaventure Island off the Acadian coast, on August 14, 1682.¹¹ This letter is a summary of the one written by Father Membré, under date of June 3, 1682.¹² The only names of the southern tribes which are enumerated in the "Moeurs des Sauvages" are found in this letter. Membré's letter has: "En cinquante jours le bled mûrit"; in the St. Bonaventure Island letter we find: "Le bled y vient en maturité en cinquante jours"; in the "Moeurs des Sauvages": "Le bled y vient en maturité en 50 jours." Membré: "C'est icy le pays des cannes, des lauriers, et des palmes; il y a une infinité de meuriers"; St. Bonaventure: "Il y a des cannes, des lauriers, des palmiers et des forests de meuriers . . ."; the "Moeurs des

¹⁰ "Les Moeurs des Sauvages," 107 pages, bound in with the *Description de la Louisiane*.

¹¹ Margry, II, 203-205.

¹² *Ibid.*, 205-212.

Sauvages": "Il s'y trouvent des Palmiers, des Cannes, des Lauriers, & des forests de Meuriers." The length of the Mississippi from the Illinois to the Gulf is not explicitly given by Membre. The distance, 300 leagues, must be computed from his letter; this is the distance mentioned in the St. Bonaventure Island letter. Now in one of the last paragraphs of the "Moeurs des Sauvages," we read: "The Colbert River . . . is more than eight hundred leagues long, five hundred of which we know through having ascended that distance, and three hundred covered by the Sieur de la Salle in his descent."

As these parallel passages clearly show, there can be no doubt about the interdependence of the three, the reasoning is as follows: the St. Bonaventure Island letter being dated August 14, 1683, cannot have reached Paris before the beginning of October. If Hennepin is the author of passages so obviously taken from the letter, then he must have been in Paris at that time; the length of the upper course of the Mississippi sounds very much like what he would say. However, we cannot know for certain where he was after July 3, 1682. Father Lemay wrote: "Father Hennepin likely went back to his Province shortly after" January 5, 1683, that is, after the book was printed.¹³ The date of his departure is not known. His presence was not required for the printing of the book. Thus, in 1684, when a new edition was issued in Paris, Hennepin was certainly not in the French capital.

Sometime in 1682, after September 3 (?), Hennepin wrote a few lines to Renaudot, the only autograph note of his in the French Archives, which has thus far come to light.¹⁴ From the address, "a M. l'abbé Renaudau, en sa maison a Paris," we deduce that Hennepin was still at Saint-Germain or at Versailles. From the address also, very likely Renaudot had given orders to answer Hennepin's inquiries by saying that he was not at home. In view of what has been said in the previous pages, a somewhat different interpretation of the note from the one given by Shea is in place here.

"Sir," reads the note, "you know I gave you the first intelligence of our discovery on my arrival." The intelligence thus given was certainly not the first. Bernou had received La Salle's

¹³ "Le Père Louis Hennepin, récollet, à Paris en 1682," in *Nos Cahiers*, III, 1938, 140.

¹⁴ Hennepin to Renaudot, BN, Clairambault, 286:244-244v; printed in Margry, II, 305-306; reprinted in Lemay, *Bibliographie du Père Louis Hennepin*, 37; translated in Shea's *Description*, 371-372.

letter of August 22, 1681, three months before Hennepin's arrival in Paris, and Renaudot had certainly seen this letter; Duluth and Auguelle had been in Paris since the end of the preceding year, several months at least before Hennepin. Hence neither Renaudot nor Bernou could have been given first intelligence by Hennepin, except for a few stories about the "cruelty" of the Sioux.

"And [you know] I took you as the arbiter of the hardships which have been my lot during the past four years," that is, during the period of his "great voyage," after the return of La Salle to Canada in 1678. Shea sees in these words and in the words which accompany the signature, "pauvre esclave des barbars," an indication that Hennepin's complaints were caused by La Salle's having denied that Hennepin was in captivity. But Hennepin was certainly not a captive during all these years; and he himself, in describing the events of this period, does not always refer to himself as "esclave," *i. e.*, a captive of the Sioux. This pathetic reference seems to have been determined by the need of the moment. Here in his note to Renaudot, it suited him to mention his slavery, hoping the abbé would relent.

"Nevertheless, I see that Abbé Bernou has not treated me as he should"; that is, Bernou knew by now what Hennepin had done. Owing to their connections with officialdom, neither Renaudot nor Bernou could have been unaware that a manuscript dealing with La Salle's voyages had been granted the legal *permis d'imprimer*. If they had seen this manuscript, they could not have failed to detect the fraud. But even had they done so, who were they to expose it? The book was issued under the aegis of Frontenac's supporters; in it, three great lakes were named after princes of royal blood, one after Prince de Conti, Renaudot's protector; it subtly praised the still all powerful Bellinzani, whom La Salle had to buy off to be allowed to leave France in 1678.¹⁵ It was sponsored by two men, specifically mentioned in the letters of M. Dudouyt, for whom it was not difficult first to secure a copy of the *Relation des decouvertes*, which had been presented to Seignelay, then to find a printer, and finally to obtain the *permis d'imprimer*.

Hennepin, indeed, had the support of Frontenac's true and lasting friend,¹⁶ M. de Menars, the uncle of Seignelay; he also had the full support of a man who had formerly been the spe-

¹⁵ Margry, I, 338-340.

¹⁶ Cf. Brisacier to Laval, May 10, 1689, Archives du Séminaire de Québec, *Lettres*, Carton N, no. 93.

cial envoy of Louis XIV on many diplomatic missions to England and Holland, the plenipotentiary, who with Colbert's brother, had negotiated the peace of Nymwegen, and had, in 1663, been appointed viceroy of the French possession in America: Godefroi-Louis, Comte d'Estrades.

About M. de Menars little is known besides his relationship with Seignelay, but much is known about M. d'Estrades. Moréri gives an outline of his career, which has been repeated by Michaud and other compilers of biographical dictionaries. But more illuminating is the sketch which the editors of his correspondence prefaced to the publication of his letters.¹⁷ They show how D'Estrades, ashamed of his humble origin, assumed the title of "Comte," and how he had Scipion Duplex invent a genealogy. This, however, did not deceive many of his contemporaries; d'Hozier, Tallemant des Réaux, Saint-Simon knew what to think of this ancestral glory. The editors of his correspondence then prove beyond cavil that the letters and documents dealing with the earlier part of his diplomatic career are forgeries or falsifications, except for a very few which are genuine. D'Estrades with his background would have no objection to Hennepin "editing" the *Relation des découvertes*. The following is the translation of the summary given by MM. de Saint-Léger and Lemaire at the end of their introduction. After noting that few of d'Estrades contemporaries were deceived by his "nobility," they continue:

It was easier for him to hoodwink his contemporaries when it came to negotiations, especially secret negotiations [in which he took part as envoy of Louis XIV]. D'Estrades could not be contradicted, could narrate what had taken place as he pleased and arrange everything so that it would redound to his honor. He fabricated or had his secretary to fabricate documents, just as others wrote or had some one write their memoirs. He communicated this correspondence to his friends, and his letters were spread among the public. He thus succeeded in imposing on his contemporaries and in handing down to posterity the picture he wanted them to have of him.¹⁸

"He [Bernou]," continues Hennepin in his note to Renaudot, "will know in time and eternity the sincerity of my intentions, and you, Sir, will one day see that I am, . . . *et cetera*." Hennepin seems to have thought that by allowing La Salle a share in

¹⁷ A. de Saint-Léger and L. Lemaire, ed., *Correspondence authentique de Godefroi comte d'Estrades de 1637 à 1660*, Paris, 1924, I, Introduction.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, xli.

his adventures he was doing the explorer a favor. A few words inserted about La Salle's ancestors in the last lines of the *Description* proper appear to be an afterthought,¹⁹ if, indeed, these lines were written by Hennepin. In his subsequent books, there is an indication of what Hennepin meant by the "sincerity of his intentions," namely, his intentions to help La Salle. In the *New Discovery* he noted: "My *Description of Louisiana* was very helpful to him, and enabled him to obtain great privileges from the Court."²⁰ In a passage of the *New Voyage*, he repeats this and says more specifically that it gained for the explorer the esteem of Seignelay, and the favor of the late Prince de Conti.²¹ Thanks to Renaudot, who managed an interview between the explorer and the prince,²² Conti had already known La Salle since 1678, long before the publication of the *Description*, and La Salle was writing to Conti three years before Hennepin returned to France.²³ One cannot help wondering how many of the statements in Hennepin's trilogy which are clearly his own, would turn out to be in conformity with the facts if they could be checked on independent evidence. But the general statement that the *Description* helped the affairs of La Salle is true, for we have the testimony of Renaudot, who, as we have seen, informed Bernou "of the good effect of the bad book."

2. THE AUTHOR OF THE "RELATION DES DECOUVERTES"

The personality of the author of the *Relation des decouvertes* is only a secondary consideration with regard to the purpose of this essay. The primary consideration is his work. His connection with La Salle has been discussed at length elsewhere.²⁴ All we know of Abbé Bernou, it was pointed out, is based upon such incidental remarks as occur in his writings.²⁵ To this information may now be added a few items which have been found since the earlier sketch was published.

First, however, a correction must be made. On the authority of De Villiers,²⁶ it was stated that Bernou's name was not to be found in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale. This is

¹⁹ *Description de la Louisiane*, 310.

²⁰ *Nouvelle decouverte . . .*, Avis au lecteur, 6v.

²¹ *Nouveau Voyage*, 9.

²² La Salle's letter of August 22, 1681, Margry, II, 236.

²³ *Ibid.*, 221.

²⁴ *Some La Salle Journeys*, 66-86.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 11-12.

²⁶ *La Louisiane*, 19.

erroneous. His name does appear in the *Catalogue Général*²⁷ as the translator from Portuguese into French of a relation by a Jesuit missionary in China.²⁸ The identification of the "Sr. B." on the title page of the said relation was made long ago by Barbier²⁹ and the De Backers.³⁰ How they ascertained his identity is irrelevant at present. But what is now known of Bernou's interest in geography, as well as the characteristic footnotes appended to the text of Father Magalhães, together with several statements in the dedicatory epistle to Cardinal d'Estrées and in the preface, would suffice to identify him as the author of the translation. This book, his first published work, was also his last as far as we know at present. Bernou did not discontinue his literary activities. In manuscript writings of a later date and in printed works we find references to him as busily engaged in writing memoirs, collecting documents, and making extracts.

One thing is rather surprising: his silence about La Salle after his return from Rome, especially when we recall his interest in the explorer's scheme for obtaining by conquest the rich mines of Nueva Vizcaya, which was then being put into effect. Besides, for all he knew, La Salle was at this time supposedly near these mines somewhere in the Mississippi Valley, and Bernou's writings before this date show how concerned he was about the geography of this region. His letters to Renaudot naturally cease after his return from Rome to Paris, in April or May, 1686,³¹ but before his departure for Rome in 1683, there are numerous memoirs of his recounting the advantage for France of having colonies in North America. Two possible reasons for Bernou's silence suggest themselves. The dismal outcome of La Salle's last expedition may have shown him how impracticable was the fa-

²⁷ *Catalogue Général des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Auteurs*, IX, 1902, col. 910.

²⁸ *Nouvelle Relation de la Chine . . . composée en l'année 1668 par le R. P. Gabriel de Magaillans [Magalhães] de la Compagnie de Jesus . . . Et traduite du Portugais en François par le Sr B.*, Paris, 1688. The work was reprinted in 1689 and in 1690; there are two copies of the first two printings in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and one of the third. The Library of Congress has one copy of the first printing, and one of the third. The book was translated into English from the French by [John Ogilby] the same year it appeared in Paris, *A New History of China . . .*, London, 1688; copies are in the Harvard University and Newberry libraries.

²⁹ A. A. Barbier, *Dictionnaire des Ouvrages Anonymes*, Paris, 1875³, III, col. 560; the name is spelled Bernout.

³⁰ A. and A. DeBacker, *Bibliothèque des Écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus . . .*, Liège and Lyons, 1872², II, col. 956; the bibliographical information is slightly augmented in C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1890, V, col. 307.

³¹ Bernou to Renaudot, April 16, 1686, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:313-313v. 313v.

mous "Peñalosa scheme" (which he devised), and consequently he washed his hands of the whole affair; or else his interest in the Far East may have taken his attention from the western hemisphere. It is much more difficult, however, to account for his later silence about the Mississippi when the Court decided to send Iberville to discover the mouth of the river by sea. Could it be that Bernou had by that time realized how deficient his *a priori* knowledge of the Gulf Coast was, and consequently preferred to say nothing further? Or is it not possible that Iberville rebelled against being the cat's-paw of a small clique in Paris? However we may explain it, the fact is that neither Bernou nor his friend Renaudot is mentioned as taking an interest in promoting this discovery which was to lead to the foundation of the Louisiana colony.

To return to our brief sketch of Bernou's activities after 1688. In a letter to a government official in 1698, Renaudot recommended Bernou as the man who could write memoirs on a governmental project.³² During La Salle's lifetime, Bernou had broken several lances with Villermont on the subject of the explorer's ability.³³ After the latter's passing, they remained friendly.³⁴ In spite of his disillusionment regarding the Peñalosa scheme, he still seems to have listened to weird tales about North America.³⁵ While Renaudot, as secretary to Cardinal de Noailles, was attending the conclave that elected Clement XI,³⁶ Bernou took charge of the *Gazette de France*. He overstepped the limits of discretion in writing about the king of England in this newspaper and was called to order by Louis XIV.³⁷ In the law suit which Delisle brought against Nolin for alleged plagiarism of his map, Bernou was one of the experts in geography chosen by the plaintiff³⁸ to identify the plagiarist.³⁹ He was still

³² Renaudot to [Pontchartrain?], March 16, 1698, BN, Clairambault, 1057:18v.

³³ Cf. *Some La Salle Journeys*, 85, note 85; 93.

³⁴ La Courbe to Villermont, March 29, 1700, BN, Mss. fr., 22809:95; and Margry, VI, 173.

³⁵ Cf. Bégon to Villermont, August 7, 1701, BN, Mss. fr., 22810:304-305v.

³⁶ Gros de Boze, *Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions*, Paris, 1729, V, 391.

³⁷ *Journal du Marquis de Dangeau*, Paris, 1854-1860, VIII, 182.

³⁸ A few years previously, Bernou had communicated to Claude Delisle several maps of Canada, a manuscript relation by Father Esteban de Perea and a map of New Mexico based "principalement sur les memoires du C^e de Pignalosse [Peñalosa]," Archives du Service Hydrographique (ASH), 115-10:n.17 M.

³⁹ Cf. Arrêt portant que les cartes des Srs. Nolin et Delisle seront examinées, BN, Mss. fr., 22119:182.

alive at the end of the War of the Spanish Succession. Some of his memoirs with regard to the subsequent peace are extant.⁴⁰ After the peace was established by the Treaty of Utrecht, he wrote a memoir which he sent, probably to the government, July 11, 1713,⁴¹ discussing article 12 of that treaty. The date of his death has not been ascertained. All that is known is that he made Pierre Clairambault the executor of his will; his heirs handed his geographical papers and notes over to Clairambault, in whose collection they can be consulted today.⁴²

Bernou's authorship of the *Relation des decouvertes* rests on the following evidence. We have first of all, his autograph memoir addressed to Seignelay in which he refers to the *Relation*. Secondly, there are extant a few pages of the autograph first draft of the *Relation*, with many erasures and corrections in his own handwriting. Thirdly, in his letters to Renaudot, he always refers to the *Relation* as having been written by himself. Fourthly the autograph letters of La Salle on which the *Relation* is based are all found, without exception, among his papers. Add to this the fact that the use of words and the style of the document are clearly and characteristically Bernou's, and there can no longer remain any reasonable doubt of Bernou's authorship.

3. THE "RELATION DES DECOUVERTES"

The composition of the *Relation des decouvertes* could be graphically shown by printing it in one column and the corresponding passages from La Salle's letters in the other; this would settle the question of its source for those who have neither the time nor the inclination for such a tedious comparison. The following analysis is the result of this comparison made to ascertain which letters of La Salle Bernou had when the *Relation des decouvertes*, "dont j'ay été le scribe," as he himself says, was composed.

The *Relation* opens with a preamble giving briefly La Salle's activities in Canada previous to his western journeys. A bare mention is made of the Dollier-Galinée expedition, and of La Salle's voyage to France in 1675, when he obtained from the king the proprietorship and governorship of Fort Frontenac. La Salle's second voyage to France in 1677-1678 is merely noted;

⁴⁰ Memoire sur les Pays de lamerique que la france doit ceder aux Anglois Par la paix prochaine, BN, Clairambault, 284:104-107.

⁴¹ Memoire sur les pays cedez aux Anglois Dans le Canada, *ibid.*, 90-91.

⁴² Cf. BN, Clairambault, 847, and the note prefaced to volume 848; Margry, III, 629; Leland, *Guide*, 159.

on this occasion he met Bernou for the first time;⁴³ then follows the return to Quebec, and the beginning of the Western adventure, up to the first months of 1679. All of this covering a little over three pages of Margry's printed text, is jejune and sketchy. It contains not a few errors and surmises, and clearly indicates that for these years, as Bernou himself was to write later, the author lacked dates and memoirs.

After this introduction there is a short digression on the geography of the Upper St. Lawrence River—that is, of the Great Lakes region—drawn mainly from the *Jesuit Relations* and from the Galinée's account of the 1669-1670 expedition;⁴⁴ next the building of the *Griffon* is briefly described; mention is made of the opposition of the Iroquois, and of La Salle's financial difficulties, which were due, says the narrator, to the envy of the explorer's enemies. It is interesting to note that, although the real cause of La Salle's difficulties is clearly stated in every letter which the chronicler used for his narrative, Bernou prefers to omit all reference to La Salle's strictly personal affairs.

The detailed narrative of La Salle's journeys in the Great Lakes region begins with the eleventh page of Margry's printed text. From this point on, Bernou had the letters of La Salle; hence from August 7, 1679, beginning with the voyage of the *Griffon* the *Relation des découvertes* enters into great detail. The letters of La Salle, as found in Bernou's papers, do not contain, it is true, a description of this voyage. The reason for this is as follows. The letters which Bernou had at his disposal for this part of the *Relation* cover the period between August 7, 1679, and August of 1681. But as was already noted, not all of these letters are complete. The opening part of the first is missing,⁴⁵ the earliest date encountered being January 1, 1680. The second letter is complete,⁴⁶ but the beginning of the third is also missing.⁴⁷ Now, we know that the voyage of the *Griffon*, as well as the trip by canoe down the west shore of Lake Michigan, the ascent of the St. Joseph River, and certain other details, all took place before January 1, 1680. That these items were all men-

⁴³ Cf. Bernou's autograph memoir, BN, Clairambault, 1016:49-50v. printed with errors, changes, and omissions in Margry, I, 329-336. From internal evidence the memoir should be dated after May 1678.

⁴⁴ Cf. Bernou's memoir in Margry, I, 330.

⁴⁵ La Salle to [Thouret], *post* September 29, 1680, BN, Clairambault, 1016:65-84v, printed in Margry, II, 32-93.

⁴⁶ La Salle to [Bernou], August 22, 1681, BN, Clairambault, 1016:170-187, printed in Margry, II, 212-262.

⁴⁷ La Salle to —, autumn of 1681, BN, Clairambault, 1016:53-64v, printed in Margry, II, 115-159.

tioned in the missing part of the first letter—or perhaps in some letter which has disappeared altogether—is quite certain; for in the second letter La Salle wrote as follows:

I am sending you [Bernou, a copy of] the one I wrote last year to M. Thouret [the letter of *post* September 29, 1680] in which you will see in detail what was done up to August 16, 1680, since our departure at the entrance of Lake Erie [that is, since August 7, 1679, when the *Griffon* set sail for Michilimackinac]. What took place before [August 7, 1679, namely, since the arrival of La Salle at Quebec, September 15, 1678], was written at length in the letters which my brother [Jean Cavalier] saw fit to intercept.⁴⁸

The contents of these three letters of La Salle were used by Bernou as a basis for that part of his *Relation* which fills the next hundred pages in Margry's edition. It may be well to note certain features of the abbé's editorial technique. He left out all that was of a personal and confidential character, as well as anything of a controversial nature.⁴⁹ He recast the three letters into a smooth-running narrative, not only rearranging and editing, but also combining passages from different letters in which the same occurrences are described, so as to secure the proper chronological sequence. Since his position was that of a chronicler, he changed La Salle's "I" into "he," and "we" into "they." As can be seen from parallel passages published elsewhere,⁵⁰ Bernou kept as many of La Salle's actual words as he could. Some of the details not found in the letters, and therefore inserted by Bernou, are mostly geographical, or else are based on his knowledge of subsequent events.

It is not to our purpose here to elaborate the assertion that Bernou derived ninety-five per cent of his *Relation*—about one hundred pages in Margry's edition—from these three letters of La Salle. Anyone with a fair knowledge of French may compare the relevant parts of Margry's first and second volumes, and so verify this statement for himself.

In connection with our main problem, namely, the plagiarism by Hennepin of the *Relation*, we must now proceed to prove that the *Relation* was written before the *Description of Louisiana*. In our review of opinions about this question at the beginning of this essay, we noted Shea's assertion that Bernou plagiarized

⁴⁸ Margry, II, 213.

⁴⁹ Cf. Bernou to Renaudot, May 26, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:108.

⁵⁰ "A Calendar of La Salle's Travels, 1643-1683," in *MID-AMERICA*, XXII (October 1940), 294.

Hennepin's book without acknowledgment; and also Lemay's statement that the author of the *Relation* pirated the manuscript of the *Description*. Such views are quite untenable unless we suppose that La Salle's autograph letters, found today among Bernou's papers, were first summarized, abridged, and edited by Hennepin, a task, it may safely be assumed, beyond his capabilities. This supposition becomes quite improbable when we remember that one of these letters, that of August 22, 1681, written at Fort Frontenac was addressed to Bernou himself, and that the abbé was unwilling to show it even to his close friend Renaudot.⁵¹ Moreover, on the evidence now available, the theory that Bernou's *Relation* is a copy which he made of the *Description* can hardly be considered plausible. For the first draft of the first pages of the *Relation* in Bernou's own handwriting can now be had, and one can see that it is full of his own erasures and corrections. How then can these be accounted for, if in writing this first draft of the *Relation*, he was merely copying the *Description*? It may be suggested that he could have written the uncorrected first draft on the basis of some unknown material—material, by the way, similar to that used by the author of the *Description*—and then added these corrections in order to make his account a copy as close as possible to the text of the *Description*. But after all, there are limits to one's credulity.

With regard to Shea's contention, there is another difficulty which can hardly be explained away: the covering memoir in the handwriting of Bernou, forwarded to Seignelay together with the *Relation*. If Bernou plagiarized Hennepin's book, he cannot possibly have finished the *Relation* until February 1683, at the very earliest, that is, *after* Hennepin's book was in print. To have sent the *Relation* and memoir to Seignelay at this time would have been undiplomatic; a shortcoming of which Bernou cannot be accused. Hennepin had paid homage to the minister and to influential people at Court by baptizing rivers and lakes with their names, whereas none of this nomenclature is found in the *Relation*. Besides Bernou was not so foolish as to have forwarded to the minister of the colonies a manuscript supposedly his own, whereof one-third would be recognized as a garbled copy of a book then known all over France. At this very time, also, February 1683, Father Membré who had accompanied La Salle to the mouth of the Mississippi, shortly before had passed through Paris, if indeed he was not there still. Knowing this—for Bernou

⁵¹ Cf. Bernou to Renaudot, May 26, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:108.

spoke to Father Membré⁵²—how could Bernou have written in the covering memoir that one of the objections against La Salle's undertaking is because "it is not certain whether the Colbert River empties into the Gulf of Mexico?"⁵³ Finally, it is absurd to suppose Bernou, writing in February 1683, should have told Seignelay in the *Relation* that the result of La Salle's search for the mouth of the Mississippi will be known "at the end of this year 1682."⁵⁴

It is perhaps because he realized the weakness of Shea's theory that Lemay claimed Bernou pilfered not Hennepin's book, but his manuscript. Even so, one must still explain where Bernou got the details of La Salle's adventures after February 29, 1680, *i. e.*, after Hennepin's had left La Salle. It cannot be seriously said that Hennepin was occupied with chronicling the events of La Salle's journeys while he was hundreds of miles away from the explorer. Hence the legitimate question: How does it happen that Bernou knew these details so well? How is it that after the departure of Hennepin Bernou's *Relation* is just as detailed, in fact even more so, than before? How will this be explained unless the *Relation* is derived from a source the same as the one used before the departure of Hennepin, that is, from the letters of La Salle?

Apart from these difficulties, the *Description* itself furnishes positive evidence to show that the theory of Bernou's plagiarizing Hennepin's manuscript is hardly more tenable than the view that Bernou plagiarized Hennepin's book. In the last third of the *Description*, when Hennepin was on his own, namely, when he no longer had Bernou's account as a guide, his narrative lacks both directness and precision, is full of contradictions, and finally manifests a complete lack of soberness as regards subject matter, expression, and style. This difference cannot be explained on the score that Bernou copied Hennepin, for the *Relation* contains no such discrepancies, whereas the *Description* does.

In all fairness to Shea, it must be noted that he never so much as suspected the existence of the first draft in the handwriting of Bernou. He did not have the documentation easily accessible today, and further, he does not seem to have been aware of the difference between the two parts of the *Description*. Lemay, on the other hand, is not so easily excusable. He dealt

⁵² Cf. *Id. to id.*, August 28, 1685, *ibid.*, 250.

⁵³ Margry, II, 283.

⁵⁴ Margry, I, 544.

ex professo with Hennepin in most of his literary productions. Several years before Lemay began to write on this subject, De Villiers had called attention to the heterogeneous character of the *Description*. Besides he had Leland's *Guide*, and the entry on page 172,⁵⁵ should have led him to investigate the matter rather than accept the ready-made opinion that Bernou plagiarized Hennepin.

The argument showing the *Relation* to be anterior to the *Description* is based partly on external, and partly on internal evidence. The text of the *Relation* clearly indicates that it was composed all at once; hence it must have been written at the time when Bernou had the three letters of La Salle, which account for ninety-five per cent of the document. And the latest letter did not reach Paris until January 1682.⁵⁶ We have also another memoir of Bernou, dated January 18, 1682,⁵⁷ in which, although we might expect some mention to be made of La Salle in view of what the abbé had written in 1680,⁵⁸ he says nothing whatever about the explorer. From this external evidence, it is argued that the earliest date which Bernou began composing the *Relation* was sometime in January 1682. Once he was in possession of the letters of La Salle, the actual writing of the *Relation* could not have taken very long, considering the memoirs he had already written and the maps he had already drawn. In any case, the *Relation* was certainly finished before April 1682, for although he speaks of Frontenac at the end of his composition, he says nothing of the governor's impending return. The argument from silence is here valid; for as was noted before, the return of Frontenac is mentioned at the beginning of the *Description* and is a clue to the date of its composition. The strongest argument, however, is from internal evidence, which, as will be seen shortly shows that the *Relation* was completed before

⁵⁵ Cf. Lemay, "Étude bibliographique et historique sur La Morale pratique du Jansénisme du P. Louis Hennepin, récollet," in Royal Society of Canada, *Proceedings and Transactions*, series III, XXXI, 1937, section 1, 127, note 2. This is repeated in *Nos Cahiers*, III, 1938, 342, note 2. If he had read Leland's preface to Margry's collection (*Guide*, 101), Lemay would have seen that he had hardly any "right to inveigh against the *Guide* and the poor annotator of the Margry manuscripts."

⁵⁶ The last paragraph of the *Relation* contains verbatim clauses of the letter of the autumn of 1681, and news about La Salle in a letter of Frontenac to Louis XIV, dated November 2, 1681, *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1926-1927*, 129.

⁵⁷ Margry, III, 44-48.

⁵⁸ *Memoire sur les decouvertes et Commerce de Lamerique Septent^{le}*, BN, Clairambault, 1016:647-647v.

Hennepin's arrival in Paris; that is, before the beginning of March 1682.

This argument from internal evidence is based on a few words which Shea made use of to prove that La Salle did not write the document. La Salle, reads the *Relation*, was reluctant to let Hennepin accompany Accault and Auguelle down the Illinois and up the Mississippi, but seeing the missionary's determination, he finally consented. "He was given a calumet, together with two men, one of whom, called le Picard, *is now in Paris*; the other Michel Accault by name had only a slight knowledge of the Illinois and of that of the Nadouessioux."⁵⁹

Bernou, who is here giving an abridgment of La Salle's letter, does so in a way that is somewhat misleading. For his words suggest that Hennepin was the leader of the expedition, whereas La Salle makes it quite clear that he entrusted the task of contacting the tribes down the Illinois River and up the Mississippi to Accault. This was common sense, for as he wrote in his letter of August 22, 1681, Accault was sent because "he knew fairly well their language and their manners."⁶⁰ He was not being sent to the Sioux, of whose language he in fact knew nothing, but to Indians who, as La Salle believed, were living along the Mississippi between the Illinois and the Wisconsin rivers. Accault "knew all their customs and was liked by several of the tribes whither I had already sent him; he had been very successful, for he is prudent, courageous and has a cool head" wrote La Salle in the same letter. And the explorer would surely not have sent Hennepin as the leader of the expedition, for Hennepin did not know Illinois and does not seem to have learned Algonquian during all his years in America. He was, moreover, entirely unknown to the Indians whom La Salle wanted to win over as potential customers and suppliers of fur pelts. Furthermore, from what Bernou himself wrote, it is evident that only after La Salle had determined to send Accault, was Hennepin allowed to accompany the leader.

In spite of these misleading features, the italicized words in the text of the *Relation* quoted above supply information which is of the utmost importance for our argument. Although Bernou had been warned by La Salle of Hennepin's fertile imagination, it is clear that when the abbé wrote the *Relation* he had nothing against the missionary. Otherwise he would not have interpreted

⁵⁹ Margry, I, 478.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 246.

La Salle's letter in such a way as to make Hennepin appear to be the leader of the expedition up the Mississippi. The references to Hennepin in the *Relation*, it is noteworthy, are very favorable to the missionary.

When on their way down the Illinois River they met a band of Illinois who shook the resolve of Auguelle, Accault, "animated by the example of Father Louis,"⁶¹ persuaded the Picard to push on. When at the mouth of the Illinois River, they were invited by the Tamaroa to go to their village six or seven leagues below on the Mississippi, "Father Louis and his companions preferred to continue their journey."⁶² Bernou is here giving Hennepin a prominence which is not found in the passage of La Salle's letter which he was editing.⁶³ When they came to the Falls "which Father Louis named [in honor] of St. Anthony of Padua,"⁶⁴ is Bernou's version of the following passage of La Salle's letter: "Which the men I sent named of St. Anthony."⁶⁵ When the three men were taken prisoners by the Sioux: "Father Louis at once offered [the Indians] the calumet,"⁶⁶ while La Salle had written: "Michael Accault who was the leader had the calumet presented to them."⁶⁷ Elsewhere, Bernou almost identifies the exploration of the upper Mississippi as a Hennepin undertaking: "During the voyage of Father Louis, M. de la Salle had new troubles and underwent hardships which will perhaps appear incredible."⁶⁸ Finally, where La Salle's letter to Bernou says: "We also heard [from the Foxes] of the return of those who had been sent to the Sioux country,"⁶⁹ the abbé made these words read: "These [Fox] Indians . . . told of the return of Father Louis and of the two other Frenchmen from the Sioux country."⁷⁰

All this shows plainly that Bernou was not in the least prejudiced against Hennepin when he composed the *Relation des découvertes*. Hence the argument: If Hennepin had been in Paris, at the time of its composition, would not Bernou have appealed to his testimony rather than to that of Auguelle to which he actually appealed? In seventeenth-century France the word of a missionary had more weight than that of a layman. For instance,

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, I, 478.

⁶² *Ibid.*, I, 479.

⁶³ Cf. *Ibid.*, II, 246.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 480.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 254.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 481.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 255.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 483.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 144.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 530.

sometime after March 1682, when Duluth wrote a memoir which was also presented to Seignelay, he appealed to the testimony, not of Auguelle, who was still in Paris, but to that of "Reverend Father Louis Hennepin, Recollect, now at the convent of Saint-Germain."⁷¹ And again, in 1684, when people were skeptical whether La Salle had gone down the Mississippi to the Gulf, doubters were given three different sources of proof: first, the notarial act drawn up at the mouth of the Mississippi; second, Father Membé, who was then in Bapaume; lastly, the three laymen who had also gone to the mouth of the river in 1682, and whom La Salle had brought to Paris.⁷²

The conclusion of the argument based on internal evidence then is that the *Relation* was written before Hennepin's return to Paris in March 1682.

Still a few objections might be raised. Perhaps, it may be said, both Bernou and Hennepin made an independent use of La Salle's letters. But would two men of such different intellectual ability follow exactly the same procedure in abridging, condensing, not to mention selecting the same details? A specific example will further show the absurdity of such an objection independently of the obvious answer to the preceding question.

From January 1, 1680 until February 29 of the same year, the *Relation* and the *Description* run parallel with the letter of La Salle of *post* September 29, 1680; after Hennepin's departure, the information contained in the same letter of the explorer is found in the *Relation* only. Now this letter of La Salle was written while he was on his way to Michilimackinac; it was hurriedly sent to Quebec to be dispatched by the last ships leaving Canada for France that year. Just at this time, Hennepin was somewhere in the West, either in the Mille Lacs region, or on his way to Michilimackinac; he cannot therefore have seen this letter while he was in Canada. Consequently he saw it, if at all, only after his return to France. Now if the author of the *Relation* plagiarized Hennepin, he surely did not get this passage from the *Description*. However, there is no other work of Hennepin from which the passage could have been copied, unless it be maintained that Hennepin himself is the author of that part of the *Relation*, which obviously parallels La Salle's letter. But in that case, Hennepin will have to be established as the author of the *whole Relation*; and this is quite impossible. For there is

⁷¹ HARRISSE, *Notes pour servir* . . . , 179.

⁷² MARGRY, III, 18-19.

no way of showing how he could have secured the letter of the autumn of 1681, as well as that of August 22, 1681; and unless he had these letters, he could never have been so specific when speaking of La Salle who was hundreds of miles away, and so vague when relating his own adventures.

Finally, how can we possibly explain the fact that Hennepin, supposedly able to write the *whole* of the *Relation des decouvertes* by means of the letters of La Salle, breaks down completely in the last third of the *Description*, once he no longer has Bernou's elegant prose as a model of style or as a store of specific data, such as dates and distances. It is doubtful whether anyone will contend that Hennepin would, even if he could, write for the minister an account which extolls La Salle as the *Relation* does, and which, except for the section found in the *Description*, shows the explorer, and not Hennepin himself or the vague "on," as the leader of the enterprise.

Again what explanation is there, except plagiarism, for the fact that Hennepin who supposedly gives an account of his adventures in the New World, has nothing to say about his own first four years in Canada? In the first pages of the *Relation* the little definite information given is all about La Salle and not about Hennepin, and Bernou noted the lack of dates and memoirs for these years. He may not have known in detail what La Salle did from 1675 to 1679, but are we expected to believe that Hennepin did not know what Hennepin did during these years? Why is it then that the detailed account of Hennepin's adventures begins in the *Description*, just where the detailed account of La Salle's adventures begins in the *Relation*? What has the Dollier-Galinée expedition, the demolition and the rebuilding of Fort Frontenac by La Salle, to do with the western expedition, if the the narrative is Hennepin's? It is no answer to say that Hennepin wanted to help La Salle, because throughout the rest of his book, he consistently relegates the explorer to the background, and he, Hennepin, assumes the leading rôle, while La Salle plays only a minor part.

4. THE "DESCRIPTION OF LOUISIANA"

A graphic proof that the first two hundred pages of the *Description of Louisiana* are a plagiarism of the *Relation des decouvertes* could be set forth typographically; the changes could be indicated by means of different types, brackets, parentheses, and other printing devices, while no end of footnotes

could explain why the changes were made and why made in this particular manner. And to make the proof adequate and final, the combined text of the *Relation* and the *Description* should be set up opposite the letters of La Salle. This typographical arrangement would show at a glance how Bernou edited the letters of La Salle and how Hennepin "adapted" the text of Bernou. One obstacle to such a critical edition is the very limited demand for it, and another, the real obstacle, is lack of funds necessary to finance a limited publication from which no adequate returns can be expected. All that can be done here after having submitted the text of the *Description* to just such a procedure and test, is to present the conclusions arrived at by the analysis with the more significant details.

The log of the *Griffon*,⁷³ as found in the *Description*, supplies a clear instance of plagiarism. As was said before the corresponding section in the *Relation*, owing to the loss of the beginning of the letter of *post* September 29, 1680, cannot be followed in this letter of La Salle. Hennepin's plagiarism of the account of the voyage of the *Griffon* in the *Relation* is no mere surmise, for when he can no longer copy Bernou, not only does he omit specific, definite details, but he seems to lose his sense of direction, of time and place. Another feature of this passage is the use of technical terms. La Salle had apparently built several sailing crafts at Fort Frontenac;⁷⁴ he had crossed the Atlantic five times; he was the owner and the captain of the *Griffon*, and it was he who was giving orders to the crew, conferring with the pilot, he consequently had to know these terms. All this was Greek to Hennepin; otherwise the egregious blunders made while copying this section are difficult to explain. Before pointing out a few of these blunders, there are two indications in the account

⁷³ Neither La Salle nor Tonti gives this name to the ship; nor does Bernou, who had the letter of La Salle narrating its launching. It is more than probable that the christening took place in Paris, in 1682, three years after the ship had foundered in the autumn gale of Lake Michigan. This name furnishes another clue to the identity of Hennepin's sponsors, cf. *supra*, 31-32. Fifteen years later Hennepin wrote: "Ce Vaisseau fût nommé le Griffon par allusion aux Armes de Monsieur le Comte de Frontenac, qui ont deux Griffons pour appui." It is not said where this christening took place. He adds "De plus le Sieur de la Salle avoit souvent dit de ce Vaisseau, qu'il vouloit faire voler le Griffon par dessus les Corbeaux." *Nouvelle Decouverte*, 99. While La Salle may have said these words, they sound more like some remark which Hennepin heard in Paris and which he remembered when he "recast" the *Description*. There are other assertions attributed to La Salle in the *New Discovery*, which are obviously sheer inventions, for instance, where the explorer is said to have been often pretending that he was a Parisian by birth.

⁷⁴ Cf. Margry, I, 334.

of the voyage of the *Griffon* showing that the letter which Bernou embodied in the *Relation* was really written by La Salle.

"Upon entering this strait [Detroit River], we found a current as strong as the tide before Rouen. . . ." Later, when the *Griffon* came near Lake Huron, the north wind was heavy enough to drive the waters of the lake into the strait with such force that the current was as strong as the tidal bore at Caudebec.

These two comparisons with the lower course of the Seine were either in the lost portion of La Salle's letter of *post* September 29, 1680, or in some other letter no longer extant. La Salle was born at Rouen; he lived in the town until he was fifteen, and hence it would more likely be he who made such a comparison, and not Hennepin who passed through Rouen once in his life, two years after the voyage of the *Griffon*. Shea wrote: "Gravier refers to this mention of Caudebec as proof that Hennepin took this matter from La Salle's report [*i. e.*, the *Relation des decouvertes*, which Gravier thought had been written by La Salle] . . . as though Hennepin publishing in Paris could not refer to a French river."⁷⁵ Of course Hennepin could have done so, but the question is whether he actually did. The comparison, we note, with the pull of the tide of Rouen is ignored by Shea. The comparison with natural phenomena in the same section of France further suggests a writer thoroughly familiar with Normandy, first by reason of reference to the tide at Rouen, and then to the much stronger bar at Caudebec. Gravier, who was also from Rouen, would naturally notice the comparison with a phenomenon just as familiar to himself as it had been to a townsman of Rouen two centuries earlier. La Salle does not specify which of the two towns bearing the name of Caudebec he has in mind, whether Caudebec-lès-Elbeuf, above Rouen, or Caudebec-en-Caux, below the capital of Normandy near the estuary of the Seine. He knew that his correspondent would understand, since the great violence of the *mascaret* makes itself felt at Caudebec-en-Caux, not at Caudebec-lès-Elbeuf.

In fact, when the *Griffon* was nearing Lake Huron, the current was so strong that La Salle, says Bernou in the *Relation*, sent twelve men ashore to tow the ship "for half an hour,"⁷⁶

⁷⁵ *Description of Louisiana*, 93, note; the reference is to G. Gravier, *Découvertes et Etablissements de Cavalier de La Salle de Rouen dans l'Amérique du Nord*, Rouen, 1870, p. 104, note 1, which reads: "Ces mots: devant Rouen . . . devant Caudebec, qu'Hennepin ne vit jamais, prouvent que le bon Père copiait alors de la Salle." Hennepin passed through Rouen at the beginning of 1682.

⁷⁶ Margry, I, 446.

after which time the craft was able to enter the lake. This is repeated in the *Description*, but instead of half an hour, we read "half of a quarter of an hour."⁷⁷

An example of blundering is the log of the *Griffon* for August 26, 1679. In Bernou it makes sense, in Hennepin it does not. What does "amarer les vergues sur le point de demeurer costé à traver" mean?⁷⁸ And Hennepin's insertion⁷⁹ of the story of La Salle's discomposure between the events which occurred at noon of that day and those which occurred at night proves conclusively that he was copying words, not ideas; that he did not keep a journal or any kind of record, in fact, with the text in front of him, did not even understand what he was copying.

This is confirmed by what we are told happened the following day, when the ship reached Michilimackinac. A southeast wind, wrote Bernou, brought the *Griffon* safely into the cove of the western post. This was not technical enough to suit Hennepin, and he changed the light southeast wind into "un petit alizé du sud Est."⁸⁰ One wonders at what latitude and in what hemisphere he must have thought he was. The word "alizé" is used exclusively for the trade winds which blow from the northeast between the tropic and the equator in the northern hemisphere, and from the southeast between the tropic and the equator in the southern hemisphere.

At this point, Hennepin thought a little digression was required. In three pages, however, he has not much to say, except to mention several times the "very good white fish," noted once, casually, in Bernou's narrative. Here, too, there is a peculiar omission. Bernou refers to the two Jesuit missions of Sault Ste Marie and Michilimackinac, and while Hennepin explicitly states that, at the latter post, "we went to say Mass to the Ottawa village" in a chapel which, peculiarly enough, just happened to be there, we are not told whether there were missionaries stationed among the Ottawa nor in the adjoining Huron village.

The passage concerning the six deserters found at Michilimackinac indicates which of the two texts is plagiarized. If, as Shea supposed, Bernou copied the printed book, or as Lemay

⁷⁷ *Description de la Louisiane*, 54.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 57.

⁷⁹ De Villiers, *La Louisiane*, 17, notes that the *Description* speaks at greater length of the storm than the *Relation*. Except for the inserted story, there are no more details about the storm itself in Hennepin than in Bernou.

⁸⁰ *Description de la Louisiane*, 59.

supposed, the manuscript of the *Description*, how will the following be explained? The names of the deserters not given in the *Description*, are found in the *Relation*. Where then did Bernou get these names, except that he read them in the letter of La Salle which he was editing? Unless, as has been suggested before, one would like to maintain that Hennepin wrote the *Relation*.

Another proof of plagiarism is the "adaptation" in the *Description* of what we read under the date of October 1, 1679. In Bernou's narrative, the cause of the storm is given: the northeast wind, well known to those who live or have lived on the west shore of Lake Michigan. How could Bernou have known this unless he read about it in La Salle's letter? He cannot have had it from Hennepin's book or manuscript, for the northeast wind is not mentioned. Instead, this passage is replaced in Hennepin by a few childish sentences about Potawatomi Indians rushing to the shore to "receive us," and about La Salle's fear lest his men desert or waste his goods in trade.

Just as during the voyage of the *Griffon* Hennepin suddenly becomes a navigator for a few days, so when fortifications are mentioned he becomes a military engineer. Technical terms are used twice, once with regard to the building of the redoubt near the mouth of the St. Joseph River; a second time at the building of Fort Crèvecoeur. For the first, there is no means of ascertaining what La Salle had written, because the redoubt opposite Benton Harbor was built in November 1679, and the first date met with in the extant fragment of La Salle's letter of 1680, is January 1; but for the building of Fort Crèvecoeur there is no need for conjecture. The technical details were in La Salle's letter; Bernou transcribed them almost word for word, and Hennepin copying the passage improved the text, as usual.⁸¹ La Salle had probably learned these terms when he rebuilt Fort Frontenac. His apt use of these technical terms so impressed Bernou that, in the covering memoir which he addressed to Seignelay together with the *Relation des découvertes*, he said of La Salle: "He has a fair knowledge of architecture, of military and naval engineering."⁸²

Another passage which, when set forth in parallel columns, clearly indicates which text is plagiarized, is the passage concerning the fertility of the land in the Middle West:

⁸¹ Cf. La Salle in Margry, II, 48-49; Bernou in Margry, I, 476; Hennepin in *Description de la Louisiane*, 166-169.

⁸² Margry, II, 287.

Enfin, par les essais que *le Sieur de la Salle* en a fait chez les Miamis au retour de son second voyage, *on* est persuadé que la terre est capable de produire toutes sortes de fruits, d'herbes, de grains et en beaucoup plus grande abondance que les meilleures terres de l'Europe.⁸³

Enfin par les essais que *nous* avons faits chez les Illinois, & les Issati; *on* est persuadé que la terre est capable de produire toutes sortes de fruits, d'herbes & de grains, & en plus grande d'abondance que les meilleures terres de l'Europe.⁸⁴

Other substitutions of the first person plural in the *Description* for "le Sieur de la Salle" of the *Relation* will be studied later in order to determine the reference of the pronoun. Here, however, "*nous*" means "I," at least as far as the Issati country is concerned. The queer use of "*on*" following the "*nous*" in the passage of the *Description* may also be overlooked. In the *Relation*, "*on*" makes sense, for it is clearly not La Salle who is persuaded, but Bernou, who infers the fertility of the land from what the explorer had written. In the *Description*, after the substitution of the first person plural for "le Sieur de la Salle," the "*on*" is poor grammar, and the sense is no longer clear. For if "we," that is, here, "I," have made agricultural experiments in the Illinois and in the Sioux countries, who is the "*on*" who is persuaded of the fertility of the land? The "plus grande abondance" of Bernou becoming the "plus grande d'abondance" is not only bad French, it is not French at all.

These remarks, however, are secondary; much more important are the places where the experimental farming is supposed to have been carried on. Bernou says that this experiment occurred at the mouth of the St. Joseph River after La Salle's second voyage to the Illinois country. He learned this from La Salle's letter of the autumn of 1681. The explorer arriving at the mouth of the St. Joseph at the beginning of April 1681, wrote: "As soon as I arrived at the River of the Miami, I had wheat, corn, peas, beans, cabbages, and other vegetables sown; and had the clearing extended."⁸⁵ Bernou's text then is based on definite evidence found in La Salle's letter. Hennepin with his mania for improving the text and thrusting himself forward, changed "Miami" into "Illinois" and added "Issati." The agricultural experiment in the Sioux country may have occurred at some time or other, if what he wrote in the *Description* is true, namely, that

⁸³ Bernou in Margry, I, 466.

⁸⁴ Hennepin in *Description de la Louisiane*, 133-134.

⁸⁵ Margry, II, 148.

Accault, had been given seeds of "tobacco, turnips, cabbages, and other vegetables;"⁸⁶ but we cannot be quite sure of this, for La Salle in his letter does not specify the nature of the "merchandise" which he gave to the party when it left Pimiteoui. With regard to the experimental farm in the Illinois country, considering Hennepin's leaving Fort Crèvecoeur on February 29, 1680, when snow was still on the ground, one would say it was rather early for sowing wheat, peas, beans, cabbages, and other vegetables. Not until the spring of 1683, that is, three years later, when the *Description* was being sold in France, did La Salle sow anything in the Illinois country.

A few lines below is an insertion giving a clue as to those who helped Hennepin put together the *Description of Louisiana*. The insertion is about "our French buccaneers and freebooters" who are visioned as slaughtering hecatombs of buffaloes in Louisiana. There was a certain coterie in Paris who looked upon these pirates as so many knight-errants capable of extending the French colonial empire. In 1682, Bernou himself had suggested that they be sent to conquer Mexico. Later, in 1684, La Salle, too, became a party to this mad scheme. This coterie flooded the minister with memoirs emphasizing the ease with which the plan could be carried out. Hennepin, we know, was in touch with these arm-chair *conquistadores*, and if he did not of his own accord refer to the rôle they had assigned to the freebooters, they may very naturally have "suggested" to make such a reference. To imagine these pirates foregoing their forays on the Spanish Main for such a prosaic occupation as hunting buffaloes in the Illinois country—which for Hennepin was "Louisiana"—was, of course, ridiculous.

The subsequent pages of the *Description* are nothing else than Bernou's narrative. The abbé abridged La Salle's letter, and Hennepin made the necessary changes so as to appear to the best advantage. By now the time to leave Fort Crèvecoeur was drawing near. A comparison of the two texts at this juncture makes it obvious that he wanted to introduce here the element of suspense. The bark with which La Salle intended to descend the Illinois and the Mississippi to the sea was on the stocks by the first of March. At this point Bernou begins at once to give the details of Accault's exploratory journey, "our great voyage," which he had from La Salle's letter of August 22, 1681. By way of impressing upon the reader the difficulties of his impending

⁸⁶ *Description de la Louisiane*, 287.

voyage, he here inserted the premonitions which La Salle expressed in his letter of September 1680—as are found in Bernou—regarding the formidable trek he, La Salle, was to make the following March from Crèvecoeur to Fort Frontenac. This undertaking, Hennepin would have us believe, was not on a par with his own, but rather less dangerous, less of a task to tramp through nearly one thousand miles of brush, swamps, snow, slush, and water than to descend the Illinois River in canoe and to go up the Mississippi to the Wisconsin. This was all that La Salle intended Accault to do; the only reason why he, Auguelle, and Hennepin went farther was because they were captured by a band of Sioux on a war expedition.

The impression given at this stage of the narrative is that Hennepin finds no words adequate to begin the account of his great voyage. The mere recollection of that adventure, it would seem, causes him such excitement that he falls into one contradiction after another. Bernou wrote: “[La Salle] took a resolution as extraordinary as it was difficult to carry out; namely, to go on foot all the way to Fort Frontenac, a distance of more than five hundred leagues.”⁸⁷ The parallel passage in the *Description* reads: “Both of us took a resolution as extraordinary as it was difficult to carry out. I would go with two men into unknown territory where one is constantly in great danger of his life, and he [La Salle] would go on foot to Fort Frontenac more than five hundred leagues away.”⁸⁸

This text, in this context, must mean that the resolution which “both of us took” was inspired by the same motive; namely, to get what news there was of the *Griffon*, and to get ropes, sails, iron, and so forth, needed for finishing the bark on the stocks at Crèvecoeur. What news of the *Griffon* might have reached the lower Illinois and the upper Mississippi, we have no means of knowing; and we are not told from what warehouses between Peoria and the mouth of the Wisconsin all these supplies were to be had. Apart from all question of a common motive, however, we have here a clear statement that *he* took such a resolution, and this statement is particularly interesting in the light of what follows. The next several pages are taken from La Salle’s letter *via* Bernou, as usual. Then comes an insertion to the effect that Father Membré was “beginning to be bored” with the Illinois Indians; thereupon “I offered myself to remain in the

⁸⁷ Margry, I, 484.

⁸⁸ *Description de la Louisiane*, 172.

Illinois country provided he would go in my place to the remote tribes." But immediately upon this, when La Salle "begged me to go ahead and explore the route he would follow down the Colbert river, on his return from Canada," we hear quite another story: "Since I had an abcess on my mouth which discharged matter continually, and had had it for a year and a half, I expressed my reluctance, and told him that I needed to go back to Canada to have it treated. . . ." This is somewhat different from the resolution "I and he" had taken shortly before. In fact it needed the threat of La Salle that he would write to Hennepin's superior, and it needed all the influence of Father de la Ribourde to overcome his reluctance. After Father de la Ribourde's speech, we again read: "I offered myself to make this voyage. . . ."

Still another version of Hennepin's departure is found in one of Tonti's letters. "He [Hennepin] was insupportable to the late M. de la Salle and to all of M. de la Salle's men. He sent him to the Sioux to get rid of him."⁸⁹ As has been previously stated, Tonti fares badly in the *Description*; and when he wrote the sentences above in March 1700 he had just seen the *New Discovery*, wherein he receives stronger censure. In his letter, then, he may well be exaggerating; but there are in the *Description* some passages, undoubtedly Hennepin's own, which seem to lend color to the charge of his having become "insupportable" to Accault at least. Auguelle and Accault, "two of my bravest men," wrote La Salle,⁹⁰ seem to have reacted differently to the presence of their companion. The first was less intolerant, less determined, less rough than the latter. Throughout the last part of his book Hennepin speaks patronizingly, yet kindly, of Auguelle, one reason being perhaps, because the "Picard, . . . a native of Amiens, and the nephew of Monsieur de Cauroy, procurator-general of the Premonstratensians, [were] both at present in Paris."⁹¹ Neither Accault nor Tonti, however, had such an uncle, and both were thousands of miles away; besides, Accault, unlike Auguelle, had not humored Hennepin, *inde irae*. The passages in question may now be briefly discussed.

The Indians seeing Hennepin's lips move while saying his breviary, were muttering among themselves as if they were angry. Auguelle asked him to say his breviary in secret lest the Sioux be further aroused. Accault, we are told, was very much

⁸⁹ "Tonti Letters," in MID-AMERICA, XXI (July 1939), 234.

⁹⁰ Margry, II, 54.

⁹¹ *Description de la Louisiane*, 257.

upset and thought that death was in store for the three of them, if the public recitation of office continued. What actually happened, in all probability, was that Accault told Hennepin point blank to stop saying his office altogether. Auguelle's less radical proposal was followed, but to little purpose, for the "more I hid myself the more the Indians followed me."⁹² On another occasion, Hennepin wanted to go to a neighboring village to baptize a little Indian girl who was in danger of death: "Michel Ako refused to come with me; only the Picard du Gay came along to serve as godfather or rather as witness."⁹³ And again, when the Indians were leaving for the buffalo hunt, Accault and Auguelle were given a canoe in which to follow them; Hennepin asked them to take him along, "but they refused to let me get into it, Michel Ako saying that he had taken me with him long enough." That night, "only the Picard apologized."⁹⁴ Accault is also said to have refused to accompany Auguelle and the missionary to the mouth of the Wisconsin to see whether La Salle had sent the promised reinforcement,⁹⁵ a refusal which Hennepin later calls sheer cowardice.⁹⁶ This is mere recrimination. Accault was no more a coward than Tonti, against whom the same accusation is levelled; for both were among the bravest of La Salle's men. These denunciations seem rather to indicate that Hennepin had indeed made himself "insupportable"; neither of them was the type to mince any words, and hence they are both pilloried in the *Description* and in the *New Discovery*.

After the long digression about the resolve, the refusal, the reluctance, and the offer, the *Description* finally comes back to the text of the *Relation*. The latter, as was said above, narrates the voyage from Fort Crèvecoeur to the Sioux country, the ultimate source of which is found in La Salle's letter of August 22, 1681. The voyage itself will be analyzed in the following sections of this essay which deal with the geography of the *Description*. In Bernou, the account of the capture, of the time spent among the Sioux, of the rescue by Duluth and the return to Michilimackinac takes only three printed pages of Margry's edition; these pages, in turn, are a résumé of what La Salle says in his letter to Bernou. To these three pages correspond one hundred odd pages, or the last third, of the *Description*. Clearly, Henne-

⁹² *Ibid.*, 212-213.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 256-257.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 261-262.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 266.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 281.

pin was not disposed to waste any material in the *Relation* which might be of use; for in his account we meet with clauses, sentences, and paragraphs taken verbatim from this section. For the rest, the contents of the last hundred pages are in sharp contrast with the first two hundred of the *Description*, and this contrast alone is a strong argument for asserting that Hennepin plagiarized Bernou.

A few of these typical and contrasting features may be noted. Nearly a score times we are reminded that Hennepin is continually on the verge of being killed. This is in keeping with what he wrote to La Salle "as though he had been all ready to be burned,"⁹⁷ but the explorer, in his letter to Bernou written when he knew the facts, added the comment: "although he was not even in danger." The Sioux during the voyage up the Mississippi seem to have spent most of their time crying sometime bitterly, sometime merely crying. Another prominent feature is his insistence on the cruelty of these Indians, but if we look for instances of such "cruelty" in the last third of the *Description*, we find nothing definite; only some general assertions about "bad treatment," and "incredible insults," which it would be fairer to construe as symptoms of self-pity and "moping" on Hennepin's part, than evidence of meanness on the part of the tearful Sioux. On the other hand, some acts of kindness which are mentioned specifically indicate just the reverse of cruelty. Thus the day they were taken prisoners:

Several of them gave us beaver meat to eat. They put the first three pieces in our mouths, according to the customs of the land, and blew on the meat, which was too hot, before placing the bark dish in front of us; they then let us eat as we pleased.⁹⁸

Again, when Accault and Auguelle were unable to keep pace with the Indians, "they gave us four or five men every day to increase the speed of our little canoe which was heavier than theirs."⁹⁹ These two incidents, mentioned a few pages apart, can hardly be taken to show cruelty. But Hennepin seems to have looked upon such considerate treatment as a right. He grudgingly admits in one place, however, "it is true that we sometimes made good cheer. . . ."¹⁰⁰ Upon their arrival at Mille Lacs, when Hennepin was exhausted by the journey on foot from the Falls,

⁹⁷ Margry, II, 260.

⁹⁸ *Description de la Louisiane*, 210.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 219.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 228.

the Sioux took such care of him by giving him massages, and steam baths, and whatever food they had, that after one week "I felt as strong as before."¹⁰¹ These few instances confirms what Accault told La Salle: "On the way, and as long as the Indians had food, the French got the best, although they often went hungry when the Indians ran out of food."¹⁰²

It was observed long ago by Parkman and by others since, that in the *Description*, Hennepin speaks of himself as though he were head of the enterprise not only during the voyage up the Mississippi but from the very beginning. Throughout the first two hundred pages, La Salle is relegated to the background; in one occasion, instead of leading, he is depicted as following his men when a party of Fox Indians threatened to attack the French. More than once La Salle is "tout décontenancé," but this is not true of Hennepin, whom, like the just man spoken of by the poet, *impavidum ferient ruinae*. Besides, there was a mechanical means of eclipsing La Salle. As was said before, Bernou changed the first person singular of La Salle's letters into the third person, and of course, changed all the other pronouns accordingly; naturally, too, in the *Relation*, which purports to narrate his adventures and his journeys, La Salle is given a prominence which rightly belonged to him. This, however, did not suit Hennepin, and he proceeded to replace the words "le Sieur de la Salle" of the *Relation*—which stand for the "I" of the explorer's letters—by the indefinite pronoun "on," or by the first person plural "nous." The results of these changes are startling; we are interested in only such of these incongruities as help to furnish evidence of plagiarism. At Niagara "on fit commencer un fort," and "on se contenta d'y faire bastir une maison fortifiée. . . ." It is not the tenacity of La Salle that brought the *Griffon* from its shipyard to Lake Erie, but the tenacity of "on." The navigation of the *Griffon* was not directed by La Salle but by "on" or "nous." It was not La Salle who decided to sail away from Michilimackinac without waiting for the return of Tonti, but rather "we," who fearing the coming of winter, "on" resolved to leave. "On," not La Salle, palavered with the Potawatomi on the west shore of Lake Michigan; and after the abortive attack by the Fox Indians, "on" accepted their apology, and so on.

It would have been rather tedious to substitute "on" wherever the *Relation* has "le Sieur de la Salle" or "il," hence the "nous"

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 248.

¹⁰² Margry, II, 257.

variant. If the change into "*on*" makes the text of the *Description* strange reading, the "*nous*" substitution renders it ridiculous. Moreover, in some places, the failure to change the possessive adjectives or pronouns as this change of the subject of the sentence demands, not only reveals that the copyist's attention was flagging, but also shows that the author of the *Description* copied the *Relation* and not *vice versa*.

Before citing specific instances, a few words must be said about Hennepin's use of the first person pronoun, singular and plural. He had no horror of "I," for he uses the pronoun quite freely; but at times there is room for hesitation as to what he means exactly by "*nous*" or "*nôtre*." "We" sometimes refers to the whole party, and takes the place of Bernou's pronoun "they"; in a few passages, "we" means the three Recollects who were with the expedition; but in many places "we" and "our" clearly mean "I," and "my" or "mine." Thus, during the journey on foot from the Falls to St. Anthony to Mille Lacs, whenever the party had to ford rivers and creeks, the Indians carried "*nostre habit sur la teste*." It still froze every night, he tells us. In the morning the water was covered with thin ice, so much so that in wading through rivers and lakes, "*nous avions les jambes toutes sanglantes*."¹⁰³ The Sioux stole "*nostre chasube de brocar, & tous les ornemens de nostre Chapelle portative*."¹⁰⁴ Later we are told that the son of Aquipaguetin "portoit en parade *nostre Chasube de brocart sur son dos tout nud*."¹⁰⁵ Obviously, this chasuble was not the common property of Hennepin, Accault, and Auguelle. The following passage shows beyond doubt that Hennepin uses the first person plural when he means "I." Before leaving the Sioux country for the buffalo hunt, he dug a hole in the ground "pour mettre *nôtre calice d'argent & nos papiers jusqu'au retour de la chasse, ne reservant que nôtre Breviaire, pour n'estre point a charge, je me mis sur le bord d'un lac que forme la riviere que nous avons nommee du nom de S. François, ou je tendois les bras aux Canots qui passoient fort vite les uns après les autres*."¹⁰⁶ Each instance in which the word "*nous*" is used should be studied in the context to find out exactly whether he means himself or the whole party. When he speaks of the *Griffon* as "our bark," of the expedition as "our discoveries" or "our undertaking," it is not always clear that he considers him-

¹⁰³ *Description de la Louisiane*, 234.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 237.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 243.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 261.

self the owner of the ship, or the leader of the expedition. It is not clear from the following passage, for instance, whether by "nous," he means "I," or "La Salle and I."¹⁰⁷ When the *Griffon* was ready to sail:

Le sieur de la Salle les fit tous embarquer au nombre de trente personnes avec trois mission- naires Recollects. ¹⁰⁸	Nous nous embarquâmes au nombre de trente-deux person- nes avec nos deux Peres Reco- lets. ¹⁰⁹
--	--

It would be beside the point to study more cases of this sort, for they do not help to clarify the plagiarism question. The following passage will suffice to show how our copyist's attention flagged, since he left in his manuscript pronouns and adjectives which in Bernou's text clearly refer to La Salle.

After the departure of Monso, who, according to La Salle, had come to spread evil rumors about the intentions of the explorer and his men, Nicanapé, the brother of an Illinois chief, invited all the French to dinner, "lors que tout le monde fut assis dans la Cabanne Nicanape prit la parole & [nous] fit (au sieur de la Salle) un discours bien different de ceux que les anciens [nous] (lui) avoient tenu a SON arrivée."¹¹⁰ The same lapse of attention is noticeable a few pages farther on. In a speech which La Salle reports in his letter of September 1680, and which Bernou transcribes almost word for word, a change of the first person singular into the first person plural makes this passage one of the most entertaining of the *Description*.¹¹¹

Another feature is the change which numbers underwent in being transcribed from the *Relation* to the *Description*. The changes follow a definite rule: the numbers are increased when Hennepin's fame is enhanced thereby; but they are lowered when there is question of La Salle. La Salle, says Bernou, built four barks; three, wrote Hennepin. In the *Relation*, La Salle is said to have sent some of his men ahead with goods worth from seven to eight thousand livres; Hennepin's figure is six to seven thousand. Deserters stole from La Salle, merchandise estimated at

¹⁰⁷ In neither of his memoirs does Tonti mention the exact number of men who sailed on the *Griffon*, cf. Margry, I, 578-579, and Kellogg, *Early Narratives of the Northwest*, 287.

¹⁰⁸ Bernou in Margry, I, 445.

¹⁰⁹ *Description de la Louisiane*, 49.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 154-155; the words in brackets are not in the *Relation*, Margry, I, 472, while the words in parentheses are in the *Relation* and not in the *Description*.

¹¹¹ La Salle in Margry, II, 45; Bernou in Margry, I, 473; *Description de la Louisiane*, 159.

more than four thousand livres; more than three thousand, corrects Hennepin. The ingratitude of one of the deserters, La Rousselière by name, was particularly villainous, for, wrote Bernou, at Montreal La Salle had paid his debts which amounted to 1,800 livres; the author of the *Description*, considering this too generous, lops off one-third, and brings the debts paid by La Salle down to 1,200 livres. La Salle, according to the *Relation*, made a present of ten hatchets and two dozens knives to the Potawatomi; "a few hatchets and knives," is all that was given them according to the *Description*. La Salle hailed an Indian in three or four languages, the *Relation* tells us; in two or three languages, says Hennepin, who was not there.

The converse procedure is just as amusing. On October 1, 1679, the party made ten leagues, fasting, before coming near a Potawatomi village (Bernou). A twenty-five mile row on an empty stomach while Lake Michigan was being lashed by the northeast wind, would seem to indicate of what stern stuff these pioneers were made. Hennepin, however, felt it necessary to add two more leagues; for even though the stamina of the rest of the party would hereby be enhanced, he too was fasting, and his own stamina would be still further emphasized, considering that besides assisting in landing the canoes during the storm, as he tells us in the *Description*, he went out into the lake and carried in Father de la Ribourde on his shoulders. Bernou wrote that the party ascended the St. Joseph River for twenty leagues in December 1679; in the *Description*, this distance becomes twenty-five leagues. On their way down the Illinois River, according to La Salle, Accault, Auguelle, and Hennepin met "une quantité d'Isinois" ascending it. This was interpreted by Bernou as "one band"; it becomes "several bands" in the *Description*. The distance from the Illinois village to the mouth of their river is given by La Salle as ninety leagues. Bernou repeats this figure, whereas Hennepin gives "about one hundred leagues." The Sioux who took Accault, Auguelle, and Hennepin prisoners, numbered one hundred according to La Salle who had this information from Accault; Bernou gives "one hundred or one hundred and twenty;" according to Hennepin, his captors were one hundred and twenty.

5. THE STYLE OF THE "DESCRIPTION" AND OF THE "RELATION"

The argument proposed in the preceding pages is, so to speak, a matter of quantity. In this section it is rather a question of

quality. Here a comparison will be made between the style of the whole *Relation des descouvertes*, (which is parallel to the first two-thirds of the *Description*) and the last third of Hennepin's first literary venture. This argument, though based on the analysis of a personal, humanistic experience which is to be had from reading the two works, is none the less valid for having an aesthetic basis. Anyone who reads the *Relation* will clearly realize its homogeneity, and the same homogeneity is apparent in the first two-thirds of the *Description*. This is in sharp contrast, however, with the intellectual reaction experienced upon reading the last third of the *Description*. If, as Buffon said, "le style est l'homme même," then two men composed the *Description*: one of them is the author of the whole *Relation*, and the other's name appears on the title page of the *Description*. Not only is there a striking difference in the contents of the two sections of the *Description*, but also in the manner in which the events are expressed in each. This stylistic difference is very marked, in spite of the evident changes introduced by the author of the *Description* in that part of the *Relation* which he made use of. The first part of the *Description* is obviously in the style of Bernou; there is no trace of this style in the second part.

Some of the changes brought about in the first part by adapting the text of the *Relation* cannot be considered mere misprints, but are of the type called "howlers." The second part contains examples of what Georges Courteline humorously labelled "moutons à cinq pattes," such as the following: "L'un de nos hommes voulant tuer un Cigne en volant, fit tourner son Canot, mais par bonheur il trouva fond."¹¹²

This question of style has already received some attention. De Villiers wrote that among the main modifications of the text of the *Relation*, there are

Quite a number of corrections either purely stylistic or necessary for the clearness of the text. Thus "Dans cette pensée" becomes "Dans ce dessein," p. 2. "Ensuite" takes the place of "Enfin," p. 49; and "Le gouvernement de ce dernier," since there may be ambiguity as to what "ce dernier" refers, is corrected thus "Le Gouvernement du Fort [de] Frontenac," [p. 6], etc. Hennepin was certainly incapable of this literary polish.¹¹³

The word "*dessein*" is undoubtedly a better word than "*pensée*" in the context, but in Bernou's vocabulary the two words

¹¹² *Description de la Louisiane*, 291.

¹¹³ *La Louisiane*, 16.

were practically synonymous and interchangeable, not only in the *Relation des descouvertes*,¹¹⁴ but also in his letters to Renaudot.¹¹⁵ The author of the *Description*, on the other hand, when he is not copying Bernou, uses "*dessein*" exclusively to express the idea of plan.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, in the very sentence selected by De Villiers, all that the copyist did was to transpose the two words which appear in the same passage of Bernou; thus, whereas the later used first "*pensée*" and then "*dessein*"; in the *Description* we have first "*dessein*" and then "*pensée*."

Dans cette *pensée* il acheta une habitation dans l'isle de Montreal . . . , il communiqua ensuite au sieur de Courcelles, gouverneur du Canada, le *dessein* qu'il avoit. . . .¹¹⁷

Dans ce *dessein*, il achepta une habitation dans l'Isle de Montreal . . . ; il communiqua ensuite sa *pensée* à Monsieur de Courcelles Gouverneur de la Nouvelle France. . . .¹¹⁸

De Villiers' first example then hardly proves what he intended to prove by it; and the style of this paragraph, in view of the other changes, is certainly more clumsy in the *Description* than in the *Relation*.

As for the second instance of De Villiers, there is no ambiguity possible in Bernou's text. The French critic seems to have overlooked the fact that the words "Fort de Frontenac" ought to be repeated in the *Description* for clearness' sake, since Hennepin or his helper has inserted a whole page of dithyrambic praise of the governor; and as a result, the words "Fort de Frontenac" are quite lost in the distance. As for the statement that "Enfin" is a better word than "Ensuite," it is simply not true in this instance. "Enfin" in the *Description* not only indicates temporal sequence, but it also includes a sigh of relief after the *Griffon* had been successfully brought from its shipyard to Lake Erie. Nor should we overlook the fact that in Bernou, the successful navigation of the *Griffon* is the work of La Salle, and although the last, it is really the second action recorded; whereas in the *Description*, the embarking of the

¹¹⁴ Margry, I, 439, 445, 460.

¹¹⁵ "On joindroit par la nostre grand dessein aux seins. . . . Il luy [La Salle] faudroit pour cela communiquer tous nos desseins. . . . Je vous dis tout cecy en l'air sans sçavoir ses [La Salle's] pensées. . . ." Bernou to Renaudot, January 25, 1684, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:86-87v.

¹¹⁶ *Description de la Louisiane*, 107, 211.

¹¹⁷ Bernou in Margry, I, 436.

¹¹⁸ *Description de la Louisiane*, 2.

party is managed by "nous," and it is "on" who brings the craft safely to Lake Erie.

To specify all the changes of words and expressions is manifestly impossible. In general, it may be stated that the clearer expression has been discarded. Thus "pourveu que la Cour voulut luy accorder le gouvernement et la propriété du Fort," instead of "de ce fort" as Bernou has it. "Sitost qu'il fut de retour en Canada," instead of "Sitost que le sieur de la Salle fust. . . ." The same holds true, throughout the next ten pages, where the repetition of La Salle's name in the *Relation* is clearer than the endless recurring of the pronoun "il," until we almost forget what the pronoun stands for. On the other hand, in cases where other nouns occur, the pronoun used by Bernou is ignored, and the noun is repeated, as in the following passage where La Salle tells Colbert "que ce fort [de Frontenac] luy donnoit de grandes commoditez pour faire des descouvertes [avec nos Recollets], que son principal dessein en (le) faisant construire [ce fort] avoit esté de (les) continuer [ces descouvertes] . . ."¹¹⁹ Such examples could be multiplied indefinitely. With regard to the tenses of verbs, in general the *Description* prefers the imperfect to the definite past tense of the indicative mood, and in certain contexts, the delicate nuance between these two tenses seems to have completely escaped the author of the changes.

With Bernou's punctuation as a guide, that of the first two-thirds of the *Description*, although much changed and quite haphazard, is still tolerable; but beginning with the words "Nos prières furent exaucées," on page 206, there is a continuous paragraph covering the next six pages, with not a period from the top of page 207 to the last word of page 211. Hennepin was then on his own. Also worthy of note is a passage beginning on page 263, which has already been referred to above in another connection. On the morning of the day when Hennepin had tried to enter the canoe which the Indians had given to Accault and Auguelle, "ils ne voulurent pas m'y laisser entrer, Michel Ako disant qu'il se contentoit de m'avoir mené assez de temps . . .," it looked as though Hennepin would be left behind; until two Sioux, cruel fellows, took him in their canoe. That night Auguelle apologized, but, as was noted, Accault did not. Hennepin's expostulations with his two companions are couched in his own style, which contrasts with the smooth prose of Bernou, as may

¹¹⁹ *Description de la Louisiane*, 14, as in note 110, the words in brackets are not in the *Relation*, Margry, I, 439, while those in parentheses are in Bernou's account and not in Hennepin's.

be seen by anyone who compares this with any passage whatever of the *Relation*. Here the relative clauses tumble over each other; in the middle of the passage, we read that, if they had been well received by the Sioux, Hennepin told Accault and Auguelle, "ce n'estoit qu'à cause des saignées que je faisois a quelques Sauvages Asmatiques, de l'orvietan & de quelques autres remedes que je conservois dans la mange, dont j'avois sauvé la vie a quelques-uns de ces Barbares qui avoient esté picquez par des serpens sonnettes." The last part of the *Description* contains many another passage of this sort which the curious reader may compare with Bernou's literary prose.

Enough has been said, it seems, to show that it is not the author of the *Relation* who plagiarized the *Description*, but that the author of the latter, Hennepin, with or without help, pilfered Bernou's account. The present writer is laboring under no illusions with regard to the acceptance of this conclusion. Those interested in the more colorful aspects of history, as well as those who are anxious to find "confirmatory" evidence for statements resting on the authority of one witness, will very likely ignore the demonstration. For such as these, this essay was not written. Anyone primarily interested in the validity of historical evidence, who will either take the trouble to analyze the two texts and compare the *Relation* with the autograph letters of La Salle, or who will be satisfied with checking the necessarily limited number of arguments and examples presented in this essay, will, it is confidently believed, agree with the above conclusion. There may be differences of opinion as to the demonstrative force of one argument or another, but a sufficient number of irrefutable proofs will remain to support this conclusion, either singly or collectively.

The next sections of this critical essay, in which the map that accompanied the *Description of Louisiana*, as well as the geographical information contained in the text, will present another kind of evidence which points in the same direction.

(These additional sections together with those which have already appeared in MID-AMERICA will be published in book form for the convenience of libraries and scholars. Editor.)

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Investigations into the Causes of the Pima Uprising of 1751

The northern frontiers of middle eighteenth-century New Spain witnessed a number of serious Indian uprisings. Indian revolts and depredations were not unknown in the life of New Spain, but seldom before had colonial officials been faced with so many native disturbances in so short a time.¹ And each disturbance left its scars. Aside from the loss of human life, the destruction of property, and the expenditures of vast sums of money to subjugate the Indians, attempts to place responsibility for uprisings often led to unfortunate quarrels between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities. Sometimes these quarrels became so bitter that the historian finds it almost impossible to sift fact from fiction.

The northwestern frontier of New Spain, the land of the Pimas, offers a typical example of Indian rebellions and the subsequent minute official investigations made in the attempt to remedy the problem. Since 1695, with the exception of minor uprisings in 1732 and 1748, Pimería Alta had been free from serious internal Indian trouble. Late in the year 1751 the attention of the authorities of Sinaloa and Sonora was suddenly drawn to Pimería Alta by native disturbances.

According to the Jesuit historian Francisco Javier Alegre, the Pima revolt of 1751 stemmed directly from the unfortunate dealings with the wild Seri tribe the year previous. Missionary work among the turbulent Seris, living along the Gulf of California between the Yaqui River and Pimería Baja, had been started in the time of Father Salvatierra. Of those reduced, the pueblos of Los Angeles, El Populo, and Nacameri were formed. But they and their pagan tribesmen drifted away, and were soon robbing and plundering the Christian pueblos surrounding their lands. To prevent this, as well as their union with the still uncertain Yaquis, in 1742 the presidios of Pitic and Terrenate were founded, and although the one was soon moved to the Apache frontier, the Seris resented the placing of the Pitic presidio in their lands. Nevertheless, attempts to pacify them were now carried forward with considerable success. A number

¹ See H. E. Bolton, *Texas in the Middle Eighteenth Century*, Berkeley, 1915; H. H. Bancroft, *History of the North Mexican States*, San Francisco, 1885, I, chapters XIX-XXI.

of families were again gathered at El Populo and Los Angeles, and there was reason to expect that all would be reduced eventually.²

Then a new governor took over in Sonora who adopted a different policy. In 1750, for the slightest misconduct on the part of those who had again gathered at El Populo, he took the women of the village and distributed them throughout New Spain. This destroyed all hopes of ever reducing the Seris. Those who had remained in the various pueblos angrily withdrew to the Isle of Tiburón. The governor of Sonora, with seventy-five soldiers, and some Pimas, led an expedition there. The enemy had withdrawn into the impregnable mountains, and none of the Spaniards were willing to go after them. Only a few Pimas dared do so. After a few women and children were taken captive the expedition withdrew. The foray was a military failure, and more, a complete moral failure in that the show of weakness on the part of the Spaniards emboldened Don Luis, the native governor and captain general of the Pimas, to carry out long harbored intrigues. Upon his return to Pimería he considered himself his own master, and began to plot rebellion. He knew that the padres would be the first to know his intentions and attempt to frustrate his plans by notifying presidio captains, so he attempted to discredit them. And his evil tongue found a hearing among some of those who were in control in Sonora. The presidio captains believed his fabricated stories that the padres were cruel, crafty, and tyrannical in their treatment of the Indians. With these auspicious beginnings, Luis openly stirred unrest among his people.³

The uprising was plotted in the greatest secrecy. Plans were laid by Luis in a talk with his people near Saric, a settlement lying close to the Altar River. Missionary, rancher, soldier, *gente de razón*, and all Spanish sympathizers were to be driven from the land. The natives were promised the loot of Pimería, Sonora, and even the mining camps. The plot was carried to the Papagos in the east. The Pimas felt certain of success since there were only a few hundred persons in all the Upper Pima country who were considered to be loyal to the Spanish crown. Of these, less than a hundred could offer armed resistance. Santa Ana, the largest of the settlements, had less than a hundred

² Francisco Javier Alegre, S. J., *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en Nueva España*, Mexico, 1842, III, 289-290.

³ *Ibid.*, III, 290-291.

Spanish and *mestizo* inhabitants, and the nearest presidios, Terrenate and Fronteras, were unprepared for hostilities. The Pimas could not have chosen a more propitious moment. Indian runners were sent out with the news to the rebels to wreak havoc on Spanish life and property and retire to the Baboquivari Mountains with their families and livestock.

An obstacle to Luis's plans were the continuous journeys of Father Sedelmayr among the tribes of the Gila and Colorado rivers, and also the fact that a missionary had recently been stationed at San Miguel de Sonoidag. They soon sensed trouble. Suspicion was aroused by the unusually large gathering of pagans at Saric, and Father Juan Nentvig was sent there to win them to the faith or at least to prevent sedition. Other Spaniards and their neighbors were also aware of impending danger⁴ to the entire area below present Arizona.

At Tubutama a loyal native informed the *vecinos* and partially frustrated plans. Sedelmayr, resident missionary there, notified as many of the soldiers and settlers as he could, and they took refuge in the mission. He then turned his thoughts to Nentvig, at the *visita* of Saric. He wrote telling him to hasten to Tubutama. The message was delivered and Nentvig arrived safely. He left just in time. Shortly after, Luis under the ruse that Apaches were about to attack Saric, offered refuge to some twenty persons. Before the occupants had gathered their wits together he had set fire to the abode. None escaped. Luis and his confederates now went in search of Nentvig, only to learn of his escape. Before the day was over about twenty-five persons had been slain.

At Tubutama Sedelmayr and his companions, behind the barricaded walls of the mission, awaited attack. On Sunday morning nearly a thousand hostile natives appeared from the region of Santa Teresa and the *rancheria* of Jonaniota. The building was set fire to, but the undaunted defenders withstood the siege until evening, when the rebels withdrew. The only hope was armed assistance, and so a soldier was sent to Santa Ana and a loyal Indian to San Ignacio. On Monday the rebels returned in larger numbers, but they were again held off successfully. That afternoon they suddenly withdrew. During the lull which followed, Domingo Castillo, a soldier of Fronteras, slipped out in an attempt to round up horses for an escape, but he was caught in ambush and killed. A desperate attack was

⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 291.

now made on those fortified in the mission. Two defenders died of wounds, and Father Sedelmayr was badly wounded before the natives desisted. That night the two padres and their companions made good their escape to Santa Ana, which they reached, by a circuitous route, two days later.

Meanwhile, the Indians had wrought havoc at the pueblos on the banks of the Altar and at San Miguel de Sonoita, the lone mission in the Papaguería. On November 20 Father Tomás Tello and eleven *gente de razón* were murdered at Caborca. On the following day some twenty other *gente de razón* were killed at Uquitoa. In the remaining settlements of the Altar valley some twenty-five persons perished at the hands of the Pimas. At Sonoita Father Enrique Rhuén (Rowen) and two others were killed. The region between Saric and San Xavier del Bac also suffered. The outbreak was relatively slow in spreading to Soanca and San Xavier, and Fathers Ignacio Keller at Soanca, and Francisco Paver at San Xavier, sensing danger, hastened off in the direction of Terrenate, thus escaping the fury of the natives. Within about a week's time the Pimas had laid the larger settlements in western Pimería Alta in waste. More than a hundred persons had perished at the hands of the rebels, and the property of the victims had either been burned or carried away. The churches had been looted or burned in the hostilized area.⁵

The governor tried to restore order by peaceful means. Emissaries were sent to Luis. He promised to restore the natives to their pueblos, rebuild burned churches, and return stolen property, and in good faith he was retained in his position as governor of the Pimas. He did not fulfil his promises, yet he was permitted to remain in authority. This paternal handling of the rebel only served to increase the insolence of the Pimas. Luis remained in full control of his people, and was the arbiter in all things. When he was certain that the padres had no authority over him or his people, Luis, furthering his own cause, "spent his time presenting so many calumnies against the missionaries that he succeeded in having it believed in Mexico and Madrid that the Jesuits had been the principal cause of the uprising, and that by their cruel treatment of the natives they were daily giving cause for further unrest."⁶

⁵ For a more detailed account of the Pima outbreak, see R. C. Ewing, "The Pima Outbreak in November, 1751," *New Mexico Historical Review*, XIII (October 1938), 337-346.

⁶ Alegre, III, 293.

The aftermath of the Pima uprising of 1751-1752 was notable for its civil-ecclesiastical disputes. The protagonists were the governor of Sinaloa-Sonora, Diego Ortiz Parrilla, Fathers Keller and Nentvig, and the Indians Pedro de la Cruz and Luis Oacpicagigua. The latter had led the Pimas against the Spaniards, and, supported by Parrilla, had complained of harsh treatment at the hands of the Jesuits.⁷

But before Luis had made his formal charges against the missionaries, a rift had begun between Parrilla and Keller. Early in the campaign against the Pimas the governor had come to grips with the Jesuit over the administration of affairs at the Pimería mission of Santa María Suamca. Keller had prevailed upon Captain Juan Antonio Menocal of Fronteras to use his troops against the hostile Indians north of Suamca.⁸ This had been contrary to Parrilla's orders. Menocal was to have proceeded to Terrenate, and later was called to the centrally located mission of San Ignacio.⁹ Shortly after the captain's arrival at San Ignacio, Parrilla learned that Pedro de la Cruz, one of the leaders of the revolt, had been executed at Suamca.¹⁰ Parrilla thought he saw the hand of Keller in this too, since the Jesuit was one of several who sat in at the trial of the Indian.¹¹ Perhaps Menocal's action in this instance was not in accord with Spanish law, at least Parrilla felt that way about it. But the responsibility was Menocal's, not Keller's. And as to the missionary's plans for using the troops north of Suamca, later events were to prove Keller right; for at that time most of the rebels were along the Santa Cruz River and in the Baboquivari Mountains. It was nearly three months later, March 1752, before

⁷ Luis, *Declaración*, San Ignacio, March 25, 1752, in *Testimonio de los Autos formados separadamente . . . con lo demas . . . de Sinaloa*. A. G. I., 104-3-5. (The citations to the Archives of the Indies are in accord with classifications prior to 1934. Photostatic copies of the documents used in this paper are in the Bolton Collection, University of California.)

⁸ Keller, "Consulta," in *Doc. Hist. Mex.* (Mexico, 1853-57), ser. 4, I, 28; Menocal, *Diligencia*, Suamca, December 3, 1751, in *Testimonio del Segdo. Cuaderno de Autos . . . sre Sublebacion, y Asonada de los Pueblos de la Pimería Alta*. . . . A. G. I., 104-3-5.

⁹ Parrilla to Menocal and Fontes, San Ignacio, December 2, 1751, in *Testimonio de la Quenta que dio . . . Parrilla . . . Contra . . . Menocal*. . . . (A. G. I., 104-3-5.); Menocal, *Respuesta*, San Ignacio, December 5, 1751, in *ibid.*

¹⁰ Menocal, *Declaración*, San Ignacio, December 7, 1751, in *ibid.*

¹¹ Keller to Menocal, Suamca, November 28, 1751, in *ibid.*; Parrilla to Padilla, Aguilar, and Rivera, San Ignacio, December 7, 1751, in *ibid.*

Parrilla finally concentrated his troops in the north. The rebels were then forced to give up the struggle.¹²

The viceregal capital was to hear echoes of the Keller-Parrilla affair, and innuendos that the Jesuits were responsible for troubles in Pimería. To refute the charge, Keller had gone to Mexico, where on August 25, 1752, he prepared a memorandum on the uprising for the viceroy's consideration.¹³ He wrote that Parrilla was to blame for the unhappy state of things in Pimería. In the first place, the governor had made a serious mistake in appointing Luis captain-general of the Pimas. According to the Jesuit, Luis was arrogant, so much so that "he [Luis] did not seem to subordinate himself to the military power, [and] he had less respect for the father missionaries." This was the opinion of most of those who were in a position to know. Secondly, Keller pointed out that Parrilla had blundered in withdrawing Menocal from Suamca. And he further accused the governor of exercising poor judgment in the choice of the members of the peace missions which had been sent to the rebels. One of the members, an Indian named Ococoi, was known to have a bad reputation, and the interpreter who accompanied him was not familiar with the Pima tongue. In short, Keller maintained that Parrilla had conclusively demonstrated his utter lack of ability to cope with the Pimas.

There was no immediate official reaction to Keller's statements. Viceregal concern over conditions in Upper Pimería only came after the Madrid government showed signs of interest in the uprising.

The court of Spain had learned of the uprising in the Spring of 1752. Viceroy Revilla Gigedo had reported the matter and he had forwarded to Madrid a *consulta* of Parrilla's relating to the Pima disturbance.¹⁴ These documents were studied by the *fiscal* of the Council of the Indies, and on June 26 he made his report.¹⁵ He stated that he had searched in vain for some clue to the causes of the uprising, and that before constructive measures

¹² Parrilla, *Decreto*, San Ignacio, March 24, 1752, in *Testimonio de los Autos formados separadamte . . . con lo demas . . . de Sinaloa*. A. G. I., 104-3-5.

¹³ Keller, "*Consulta*," *loc. cit.*

¹⁴ Revilla Gigedo to the king, Mexico, January 16, 1752. A. G. I., 103-5-20; *ibid.* to *ibid.*, Mexico, February 10, 1752. A. G. I., 67-3-31; Parrilla to Revilla Gigedo, December 1, 1751, in *Testimonio de los Auttos fhos. a consulta de don Diego Ortiz Parrilla*. . . . A. G. I., 67-3-31.

¹⁵ The *fiscal*, *Respuesta*, Madrid, June 26, 1752, in *Con Motivo de la noticia que se ha tenido de averse levantado tres mil Indios*. . . . A. G. I., 104-3-4.

could be proposed for Pimería it would be necessary to know why the Indians had struck at Spanish authority. The *fiscal* therefore suggested that measures be taken for determining the causes of the revolt, and advised that the audiencia of Guadalajara and the Jesuit provincial of New Spain be included among those who might be requested to submit their opinions on the possible causes for Pima discontent.

The Council of the Indies and the king endorsed the *fiscal's* recommendations.¹⁶ On October 4, 1752, Ferdinand VI prepared four *cédulas*, one of which was sent to Parrilla, one to the father provincial, one to the viceroy, and one to the audiencia of Guadalajara.¹⁷ Although Ferdinand's knowledge of the uprising was meager, he commended Parrilla and the viceroy on the measures which had been taken for the suppression of the revolt. Both were ordered to conduct an extended investigation into the causes of the revolt and to punish those who might be responsible for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in Pimería.

The tone of the *cédulas* addressed to the audiencia and the provincial was somewhat different. Since the tribunal had not advised the king of the uprising, which had occurred in the audiencia district, Ferdinand felt that the members of that body had been negligent in their duty. "It has been to my royal displeasure," he wrote, "that you have not made a report on the uprising of the Pimas Altos, who are in your district. I order and command that you do this . . . ascertaining, if possible . . . the cause [of the] uprising." But there was no reprimand for the provincial, Juan Antonio Baltasar. This high functionary were merely requested to submit an account of the revolt and conditions in Pimería Alta. The investigations of the audiencia and Baltasar were to be conducted with the greatest secrecy, and whatever plans the provincial might have for insuring the peace of northwestern New Spain were to be forwarded promptly to the king.

Baltasar was the first to heed the commands of the king. On August 15, 1753, he concluded a somewhat lengthy and impassioned *informe*.¹⁸ The causes for all the trouble were clear to him. The Indians on the Sonora frontier had been noted for their inconstancy. "At the close of the last century," he wrote, "these same Pimas rose in rebellion and killed their missionary,

¹⁶ The Council of the Indies to the king, Madrid, July 7, 1752, in *ibid.*

¹⁷ The king to Revilla Gigedo, the provincial, Parrilla, and the audiencia of Guadalajara, Buen Retiro, October 4, 1752. A. G. I., 104-3-4.

¹⁸ Baltasar to the king, Mexico, August 15, 1753. A. G. I., 104-3-4.

whose only fault was that he had dedicated himself to their conversion.”¹⁹ The father provincial exaggerated a bit with respect to the inconstancy of the Indians. Of the many tribes of Sonora, few had been so peaceful as the Pimas. Baltasar then went on to cite other rebellions in Sonora, which he attributed to the natural fickleness of the Indians. The present revolt, he continued, was due to the same reason, which had manifested itself in Luis. Referring to the native captain-general, he wrote: “Such is . . . the stupidity of those barbarians that, on seeing themselves favored, they become discontented . . . and aspire to throw off all control and subjection.”

Nor did Baltasar spare Parrilla. Like Keller, the provincial charged the governor with incompetency. Parrilla had been too lenient; and the assertion made by the governor shortly after his arrival at San Ignacio that the uprising was not serious enough for a prompt and forceful campaign was disputed.²⁰ “The death of more than one hundred settlers; the murder of two missionaries and the wounding of others; the burning of churches and homes; the plundering of property, and the apostasy and rebellion against your majesty’s rule” were matters which called for more than weak and dilatory action. It was difficult for Baltasar to find a good word for Parrilla, and he hoped that the new governor of Sinaloa-Sonora, Pablo de Arce y Arroyo, who had replaced Parrilla in June 1753, would be of better stuff.

The provincial also had something to say about the grave charges made against the Jesuits by the governor and Luis.²¹ According to the Pima chief, the missionaries had been responsible for the revolt because they appropriated tribal lands and abused the Indians. Baltasar denied all this, implying that such charges were placed in the records by Parrilla merely to discredit the Jesuits. “I, sir,” wrote the provincial, “judge that all this has been a deceitful artifice of the governor for covering up his own mistakes by putting all the blame on the missionaries

¹⁹ The revolt of 1695, in which Father Francisco Xavier Saeta was killed at Caborca. See H. E. Bolton, *Rim of Christendom*, New York, 1936, 288-318.

²⁰ Parrilla to Revilla Gigedo, *loc. cit.*

²¹ The accusations of Parrilla and Luis are to be found in the following: *Testimonio de lo primer Quano. de Autos . . . sobre sublevazion . . . de los Pueblos de la Pimeria Alta. . . .* Mexico, January 31, 1754. A. G. I., 104-3-5. *Testimonio del Quadno. de Auttos formados por Querda aparte . . . Contra . . . Menocal. . . .* Mexico, February 11, 1754. A. G. I., 104-3-5. A brief summary of the charges are in Nentvig to Utrera, Tecoripa, December 3, 1754. A. G. I., 104-3-5.

of the company." It was unreasonable to believe, Baltasar continued, that the natives would rebel against the missionaries, who supplied them with food; and the fact of the matter was that the Spanish settlers, bent on accumulating wealth at the expense of the Indians, were responsible for Pima disturbances. Nor did the settler encourage the Indian to obey the laws of the Church. As a result, wayward Indians were often punished. Baltasar did not believe that the fathers' corrective measures were cruel and unreasonable. "Like school children, some firmness . . . is necessary for the Indian."

Baltasar now outlined a plan of administration which he believed would guarantee peace in the Pima country. The plan was similar to that then in use in California. He would have the king adopt the following scheme: whenever a missionary penetrated a region inhabited by hostile Indians, he should be accompanied by an escort of soldiers, who were to be under the authority of the Church. The soldiers of the recently established presidio of Pimería Alta²² and of any other presidio which might be founded there in the future should be under the superior of the missions. The presidial officers should be appointed upon the nomination of the superior; captains should not permit soldiers to live in the presidio without the consent of the superior; and there should be two Jesuit *procuradores*, one in Mexico City and one in Pimería Alta, who would take charge of provisioning the presidios and paying the soldiers.

The *informe* reached Spain early in the following year, 1754. The *fiscal* was reluctant to endorse everything that Baltasar wrote.²³ He showed very little interest in the Jesuit's attack upon Parrilla; nor would he recommend the acceptance of Baltasar's administrative scheme. His was a suspicious nature. Despite the fact that Madrid had asked for a frank statement on conditions in Pimería, the *fiscal* interpreted Baltasar's remarks as an indication that the Jesuits were in possession of facts which they wished to conceal.

Meanwhile, the king's *cédula* addressed to the audiencia of Guadalajara had stirred that body into action. From the reply which the audiencia made to the king, it would appear that neither the king nor the audiencia were in agreement on the

²² Tubac, founded in April 1752.

²³ The *fiscal* to the Council of the Indies, Madrid, 1754. A. G. I., 104-3-4.

administrative jurisdiction of the *audiencia*.²⁴ Heretofore the governor of Sinaloa-Sonora had dealt directly with the court of New Spain in matters relating to Indian uprisings.²⁵ The *audiencia* had therefore not taken cognizance of the *sublevación* of the Pimas.

But an order from the king must be obeyed, even though the king be unfamiliar with customary administrative practices. Consequently, during the summer and fall of 1753 an investigation into the causes of the uprising was undertaken by the *audiencia*. On June 27 the *fiscal*, Falcón, set things in motion by suggesting that the president of the *audiencia* delegate a member of that body to search the city of Guadalajara for persons familiar with the uprising.²⁶ If found, they were to be interrogated. Falcón also recommended that five prominent citizens of Sinaloa be authorized to carry on investigations.

The *fiscal's* proposals, with the exception of those relative to the five inhabitants of Sinaloa, were favorably acted upon.²⁷ But the president met with some difficulty in finding a member of the *audiencia* who would consent to take charge of the investigation in the city of Guadalajara. Martín de Blancas, *oidor decano*, and the licentiate and *oidor* Francisco Gómez Algarín both declined the commission, the former because of illness, the latter on the grounds that he had not lived in the city long enough to become acquainted with persons familiar with the revolt. One suspects that Blancas and Gómez welcomed excuses for not taking part in the investigation. Perhaps they did not wish to participate in the verbal pyrotechnics which had burst forth on the Sonora frontier. The president finally succeeded in persuading Licentiate Francisco López Portillo, *oidor subdecano*, to accept the appointment.²⁸ But López evinced little taste for his job. He too may have wished to avoid involvement in a frontier quarrel. He considered his assignment completed when, after two days' work, he placed the written testimony of three local inhabitants before

²⁴ The *audiencia* of Guadalajara to the king, Guadalajara, October 11, 1754, in *Da cuenta con Testimonio de Autos . . . del alzamiento de los Pimas Altos*. A. G. I., 104-3-4.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Falcón, *Respuesta*, Guadalajara, June 27, 1753, in *Testimonio de los Autos formados en orden del Rl. cedula de 4 de Octre. de 1752*. A. G. I., 104-3-4.

²⁷ The *audiencia* of Guadalajara, *Auto*, Guadalajara, June 30, 1753, in *ibid.*

²⁸ The president, *Decreto*, Guadalajara, July 9, 1753, in *ibid.*

the audiencia.²⁹ Two of Portillo's witnesses had business connections in Sinaloa. The third was a *regidor* of Guadalajara. None, however, was able to shed any light on conditions in Pimería.

Failing to achieve satisfactory results in Guadalajara, the audiencia prepared instructions for Governor Arce of Sinaloa-Sonora.³⁰ He was to inquire into the origin and causes of the revolt and to enforce the strictest secrecy upon all those who should be called upon to testify. Failure to comply with the injunction of secrecy would entail a fine of two thousand pesos.

Arce received his instructions on September 14 at Los Alamos in southern Sonora.³¹ Two months later he had begun to gather testimony in the vicinity of Horcasitas.³² Another two months and he had taken thirty depositions, some fifteen of which were attested by Indians.³³ It would be pointless to record in detail the testimony of the witnesses. It is enough to say that all thirty were in accord in exculpating the Jesuits.

Arce had hardly completed his assignment, when the Jesuits instituted their own proceedings. Early in 1754 Miguel Quijano, *procurator* of the Jesuit province of New Spain, asked the viceroy for a transcript of the *autos* prepared under the direction of Parrilla.³⁴ The transcripts were forwarded, and a study of them was made by the Jesuit authorities.³⁵ It was noted that three specific charges had been made against the frontier missionaries: (1) the Jesuits had appropriated lands of the Pimas, (2) the missionaries had been unnecessarily severe in their punishment of wayward Indians, and (3) Fathers Keller and Nentvig had offended Luis by a refusal to recognize that Indian's leadership of the Pimas.³⁶

On March 1, 1754, Father Ignacio Calderón, the new Jesuit provincial, wrote Father Visitor José de Utrera of Sonora to

²⁹ Echegary, *Declaración*, Guadalajara, July 13, 1753, in *ibid.*; Pulgar, *Declaración*, Guadalajara, July 14, 1753, in *ibid.*; Parras, *Declaración*, Guadalajara, July 14, 1753, in *ibid.*

³⁰ The audiencia of Guadalajara, *Auto*, Guadalajara, July 19, 1753, in *ibid.*

³¹ Arce, *Notación*, Los Alamos, September 14, 1753, in *ibid.* Los Alamos was then in the jurisdiction of Sinaloa.

³² Arce, *Auto*, Horcasitas, November 7, 1753, in *ibid.*

³³ *Testimonio del Querda aparte . . . Contra . . . Menocal . . .* Mexico, February 11, 1754. A. G. I., 104-3-5.

³⁴ Quijano to the viceroy, Mexico, (January? February?), 1754, in *Testimonio del Segdo. Quaderno de Auttos . . . sre . . . Sublevacion . . . de los Pueblos de la Pimeria Alta.* . . . A. G. I., 104-3-5.

³⁵ Nentvig to Utrera, *loc. cit.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

check these accusations.³⁷ Utrera received Calderón's letter at the Ópata mission of Santa María de Bacerac. On August 1 the visitor and his notaries began a four months' tour of Sonora in search of information on the causes of the revolt. By the latter part of November he had in his possession forty depositions, twenty-six of which were attested by Spaniards and *gente de razón*, and fourteen by Pimas.³⁸ To these was later added a letter of Nentvig's, in which he explains the origin of some of the complaints against the Pimería fathers.³⁹ All these documents bear witness that the charges against the Jesuits were greatly exaggerated, if not patent untruths.

Nentvig's letter is of particular interest.⁴⁰ He had taken up his duties at Sáric in June 1751. Upon his arrival at the pueblo, he found wheat and maize growing in lands which the inhabitants of Sáric told him belonged to the mission. Later Luis accused the father of appropriating Indian lands. Nentvig denied this by pointing out that no crops had been planted for the mission during his five months' stay at Sáric, and that he had no need for the fields belonging to the Pimas. If there was cause for complaint on this score, it arose from Nentvig's comment that Luis held for himself the best lands of Sáric.

Returning one day from confessional, I was called to the fields. I asked the *fiscal* who accompanied me which fields belonged to whom. I understood from his replies that the greater part of them belonged to Luis and his children. I said that it did not seem well to me that one should own so much, since there was not enough good land for the pueblo. But even then I had no intention of taking them . . . neither for the many poor people . . . [nor] for myself or for the mission.

Nentvig also wrote about other problems he had had to contend with at Sáric.⁴¹ Shortly after his arrival at the pueblo, two Spaniards had called his attention to the scandalous life which the Indian Pedro de la Cruz had been living. Apparently Pedro had deserted his wife and family for the affections of an Indian woman of Sáric. Nentvig had then threatened Pedro with expulsion from the community. But despite the threats, Pedro continued to live as he pleased, and he was encouraged by Luis. It

³⁷ Calderón to Utrera, Puebla de Los Angeles, March 1, 1754, in an *expediente* of forty *declaraciones* sent to Mexico by Utrera, Ures, November 23, 1754. A. G. I., 104-3-5.

³⁸ *Expediente* of forty *declaraciones*, *loc. cit.*

³⁹ Nentvig to Utrera, *loc. cit.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

would seem that the Pima chief had done his best to annoy the fathers; and he had succeeded. Referring to Luis's practice of leading his people into the hills near Sáríc to engage in drunken orgies, Nentvig writes: "Such were the talents of Luis, so celebrated by Parrilla."

Nentvig's letter and the forty depositions provided Fathers Calderón and Quijano in Mexico City with an abundance of notable material for supporting their argument that the Jesuits had not been responsible for the Pima uprising. On March 15, 1755, Calderón wrote the king, stating that the depositions clearly showed that the Jesuits had not given the Pimas cause for their struggle against Spain's authority.⁴² If there were any blame, it lay with Parrilla. This also was the tone of an *informe* signed by Quijano.⁴³

Although it would seem that the investigations had pretty well proven that the Jesuits had not been responsible for the uprising, the authorities at Madrid and Mexico City had some difficulty in determining the merits of the conflicting arguments. This was due in part to the fact that the higher civil agencies of government, especially those at Mexico City, were not always so prompt as the Jesuits in obeying the commands of the king. Revilla Gigedo had, so far as is known, ignored Ferdinand's *cédula* of October 4, 1752. The Council of the Indies showed its displeasure at the viceroy's failure to comply with instructions,⁴⁴ and on October 18, 1755, the king ordered Revilla Gigedo's successor, the Marqués de las Amarillas, to conduct a secret investigation into the causes of the revolt.⁴⁵

Amarillas, upon the receipt of the *cédula*, asked several persons in Mexico City what they knew about the uprising. The opinions he received were so varied, that on August 1, 1757, he forwarded the *cédula* to the *fiscal* of the audiencia of Mexico, hoping that that functionary would have some sound and useful suggestions.⁴⁶ A week later the *fiscal* made his reply.⁴⁷ He recommended that no elaborate procedure be inaugurated to determine the causes of the revolt. Since 1755 the Pimas had been

⁴² Calderón to the king, Mexico, March 15, 1755. A. G. I., 104-3-5.

⁴³ Quijano, *Informe*, [Mexico], *Doc. Hist. Mex.*, ser. 4, I, 33-57.

⁴⁴ Recommendations of the Council of the Indies, [Madrid], September 1, 1755. A. G. I., 104-3-4.

⁴⁵ The king, *Cédula*, San Lorenzo, October 18, 1755, in *Da cuenta con Testimonio de Autos, sobre la sublevazon*. . . . A. G. I., 104-3-4.

⁴⁶ The Marqués de las Amarillas, *Decreto*, Mexico, August 1, 1757, in *ibid.*

⁴⁷ The *fiscal*, *Pedimento*, Mexico, August 7, 1757, in *ibid.*

peaceful, and to reopen the case now with formality would only arouse suspicion and fear in the hearts of the Indians. He suggested that the viceroy write the new governor of Sinaloa-Sonora, Juan de Mendoza, for a confidential report of the revolt.⁴⁸

The *fiscal's* advice was acted upon. Amarillas instructed Mendoza to present his views on the subject.⁴⁹ Six months later, after having traveled the length and breadth of Pimería, Mendoza sent the viceroy his opinion.⁵⁰ He wrote that the Pimas had not risen against the Spaniards because of a dislike for the missionary, but because of the Indian's "natural inconstancy, love of liberty, and savage passion for living unrestrained according to his appetites." Amarillas was satisfied with Mendoza's statements, and in 1758 he declared the dispute officially closed.⁵¹

The Council of the Indies approved of the viceroy's action, and in June of the following year the *fiscal* of the council advised

that this matter be placed in perpetual silence, approving of all the measures which were taken for the pacification [of the Pimas] and for the protection . . . of the missionaries. . . . [The *fiscal*] thinks it [would be] wise to inform the provincial of the company of Jesus of Mexico that the council is satisfied with the conduct, zeal, and work . . . of his missionaries, [and that the council is] sorry for the cruel murders of fathers Enrique [Rhuen] and [Tomas] Tello.⁵²

Hundreds of pertinent documents had been studied by the highest authorities in Mexico City and Madrid. The historian is inclined to agree with the conclusions of Governor Mendoza, Viceroy Amarillas, and the *fiscal* of the Council of the Indies.⁵³ Yet the impression is left that there were reasons for the civil-ecclesiastical friction which were not entirely explained by the results of the investigations. The theme of this paper warrants further study.

RUSSELL C. EWING

University of Arizona

⁴⁸ Arce had been relieved by Mendoza early in 1755.

⁴⁹ Amarillas to Mendoza, Mexico, August 12, 1757, in *Da cuenta con Testimonio de Autos, sobre la sublevazon*. . . . A. G. I., 104-3-4.

⁵⁰ Mendoza to the viceroy, Horcasitas, January 2, 1758, in *ibid.*

⁵¹ Amarillas to the king, Mexico, September 23, 1758, in *ibid.*

⁵² The *fiscal*, *Dictamen*, Madrid, June 28, 1759. A. G. I., 104-3-4.

⁵³ Meanwhile events on the frontier further justified the conduct of the Jesuits. The new governor of Sonora, not wishing to open old wounds, did not take measures against Luis. But he kept a close watch on him. Luis was soon causing trouble, was apprehended, and died in jail. Other Pima troublemakers who were at large were ordered to return to their pueblos, and peace and order were restored. The governor's reports of all this which were sent to Mexico and Madrid were a solemn testimony to the honorable conduct of the missionaries. Alegre, III, 297.

Notes and Comment

BIBLIOGRAPHIES, BOOK LISTS, GUIDES

The temptation to get out a bibliography on one or another subject is difficult to resist; the energy and persistence required to complete the project is frequently wanting. But confusion is likely to reign in the bibliographical field unless some force is organized to guide the progress of many who succumb in a determined way to the temptation and set themselves to compiling general, local, sectional, national, international, political, religious, and other lists of works. What with the *International Bibliography of Historical Sciences* in its thirteenth year and the *World List of Historical Periodicals and Bibliographies* both making great efforts to keep abreast of the steady output of historical literature, and numerous other guides and book lists, efficiency would seem to dictate some definite type of control of publication, or at least an advisory board to eliminate waste.

Much as standardization and bureaucracy are to be decried, these in the matter of bibliographical lists appear necessary for the sake of sweet sanity and economy. The correct and useful type of listing cannot be performed by inexperienced persons. Indexing and cross-indexing demand competency, and classification is no non-professional job. In fact, for the mere mechanics of book listing a sound historical background seems essential. Satisfactory calendaring is quite beyond the reach of ordinary compilers and should definitely be left to scholars. Lack of judgment regarding what books are significant or insignificant, scholarly or inconsequential, is regularly apparent among bibliographers. If the bibliographer feels incapable of estimating the value of specific items on his list, if he has not the time to read the book or article to be listed, if he is studiously striving for objectivity, he might like the editors of *Bibliografia Missionaria* refer his readers to the most scholarly review of the work listed. If no particular standards are followed and compilers compile lists for the sake of lists rather than for definite groups of students, the bibliographer's art deteriorates into mere book listing, and the product of his labor becomes a peculiar annoyance to scholars, for it can neither be ignored nor depended upon.

Praiseworthy indeed are the efforts of many of the recent compilers of bibliographies on specific subjects, but all efforts of theirs might well be harnessed toward definite and effective products and to great financial saving to publishers and libraries. A publisher such as the H. W. Wilson Company, printing up-to-date lists of books, should be given every aid toward making the annual list as complete as possible. With this as a basis, scholarly agencies, such as the American Historical Association and the Inter-American Bibliographical and Li-

brary Association might establish first a clearing-house to dispense information regarding any critical bibliographical project which is undertaken, and secondly, an advisory board of scholars to weigh the need and utility of specific projects submitted, and thirdly, to establish some arbitrary bounds or fields for individual workers. Sectional advisory boards might be established under the auspices of the Southern Historical Society, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, the Pacific Coast branch of the American Historical. So also, the central board might devise categories or periods into which the listed books would automatically fall for classification and judgment.

The publication of guides, catalogues, and inventories to archives has been attended by happy results, chiefly because the work has been entrusted to trained and capable historians and scholars, as Poore, Swanton, Bolton, Hill, Chapman, and the more recent and more particular guides to materials in the Newberry Library and in the University of Texas collection. In this connection mention should be made of *The Guide to Manuscript Collections in Louisiana*, edited by William R. Hogan, which was published this year in fifty-five pages by the Department of Archives of Louisiana State. A complete *Inventory of Federal Archives* for Texas and Oklahoma has also appeared, and two volumes on church archives in Mississippi give inventories of materials pertaining to the Protestant Episcopal and to the Jewish congregations and organizations. In many states similar projects are under way.

Gathering, sifting, listing, and cataloguing articles appearing in the many historical periodicals of this and foreign countries are for the bibliographer problems similar to those pertaining to books. Examples of the more painstaking and judicious listings of published articles and documents are found each four months in the *American Historical Review*. Other quarterlies, such as the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, the *Journal of Southern History*, the *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, and so forth, print guides to the periodical literature of their respective sections of the country. But, within the sections, few of the state or local historical magazines offer regular and specific lists. In summary there is a considerable amount of duplication of energy and expense in repeated listing of the same article. This duplication is tolerable in view of the policies of the different publications, which is to keep busy professors in touch with current research. Again, all of the important articles will again be listed in one of the several guides to periodical literature. The task of sifting the scholarly papers from those of an ephemeral nature and of publishing an annual or biennial guide and index needs consideration and some central direction.

In fine, if it were possible for the scholars of each of the state historical societies to submit annually a well-sifted list of publications pertaining to their respective states to a central agency for publication as a collaborative bibliography, a major problem of the research

student would be solved. An annual critical bibliography could then appear in volume form conveniently blocked out state by state, and under each state simple subdivisions could be arranged, thus: Archives, Documents, Monographs, Research Projects, General Works. Inspiration might lead the state bibliographers to prepare select bibliographies for the span of their state's existence, and others might more readily compile topical guides.

LINCOLNIANA

An attractive booklet describing one of the great treasures of Illinois history, the Lincoln Collection of the Illinois State Historical Library at Springfield, is now available to applicants without cost. This is the first of a series of brochures to be published on the resources of the Library, which has now more than two hundred letters and documents in Lincoln's handwriting and many thousands of other manuscripts relating in general to the life of the martyr president. In addition to these there are nearly 5,000 books and pamphlets, and numerous prints, paintings, and unique newspaper files. The collection is the joint property of the people of Illinois and owes its existence in great part to the public-spirited generosity of many individuals. It is perhaps the finest collection in the land.

J. V. J.

OLD STE. GENEVIEVE

"Early Ste. Genevieve and Its Architecture," by Charles E. Peterson, which appeared as an article in the January 1941 *Missouri Historical Review*, comes to us now as a reprint in the form of a brochure.

Probably no place in the United States which the reviewer is acquainted with retains more of a remote old-world atmosphere than Ste. Genevieve in Missouri. Starting up in the mid-eighteenth century or even earlier, this one-time Creole settlement reveals its colonial origin in the architecture of many of its houses. Though none of them, it appears, can be dated with certainty, they belong at the latest to the very early eighteen hundreds. Long objects of interest to visitors and students of pioneer Missouri economic and cultural life, the old French houses of Ste. Genevieve have awaited until now the attentions of a scholar capable of discussing them from the standpoint at once of the historical researcher and the professional architect. This service Mr. Charles H. Peterson has discharged in the monograph under review. A carefully documented and cautiously treated exposé of Ste. Genevieve's historical beginnings precludes discussion of the technical architectural problems involved. The year of origin of the place has long been debated, a date finding much favor being 1735. Mr. Peterson is inclined to place it later. "The writer believes that the date will be definitely determined between those years [1733, 1734-1755]

and that it probably was shortly before 1750." The various types of construction exemplified in the Ste. Genevieve dwelling-houses selected for study and their obvious relations to Canadian and even Norman patterns are discussed with accurate and informing detail, this being a particularly original and worthwhile section of Mr. Peterson's monograph, which, it may be noted, is based not only on documentary research, but on patient field work in Ste. Genevieve as also in Canada. Fresh data on the Ste. Genevieve houses, so the author hopes, will become available through further archival research, especially in the *Kaskaskia Manuscripts* of Chester, Illinois.

All in all, this study, however particularized its scope, is a contribution of interest and value to the history of the French colonial effort in Middle-America.

G. J. G.

SOURCE MATERIALS IN ARGENTINA

An important aid to sympathetic understanding between the United States and Hispanic America lies in a knowledge of their respective histories. In our continent there is clearly evident a growing interest in our southern neighbors. On their part they offer a large and significant library of their own story, such for example as is seen in the histories and documentary publications that emanate from the Republic of Argentina. Among the contributors in this documentary field is the Junta de Estudios Históricos de Mendoza, whose third volume of source materials, just off the press, is entitled: *Fuente Americana de la Historia Argentina. Descripción de la provincia de Cuyo*. (Mendoza, Argentina, 1940.)

Mendoza in western Argentina will best be remembered as the rendezvous of the army of José de San Martín before his famous crossing of the Andes and defeat of the Spanish forces in Chile. The Junta de Estudios Históricos recently repeated that victory in academic fashion. Under the leadership of their secretary, Juan Draghi Lucero, a commission of the Junta crossed over to Santiago to do honor to their Chilean colleagues and to bring back valuable copies of colonial documents from the Biblioteca y Archivo Nacional de Santiago. Selections from this material comprise the bulk of the present volume. The general subject treated is the colonial province of Cuyo.

Cuyo was a focal point in South American development. In the times before the revolutions the name applied to the district lying eastward and below the Uspallata Pass and as such it formed the natural gateway from the Plata region to Chile. Discovered in 1551 by Villagra, the lieutenant of the Chilean governor Mendoza, the Valle de Cuyo became the center for the upbuilding of western Argentina. Trade and travelers passed that way on their movements westward. Notable mission establishments civilized and Christianized the neigh-

borhood. Out of its villages grew the cities of Mendoza, San Juan, and San Luis which were to give their names to the later republican states.

The colonial story of this region has been written invariably from the papers of the religious orders or the public archives of Madrid, Seville, Buenos Aires, and Rio de Janeiro. An examination of Volume XXXIV of the *Documentos para la Historia Argentina*, or of Pastells' *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la provincia del Paraguay*, will corroborate that statement. To broaden the basis of their history, the Mendoza commission investigated the rich holdings of the Santiago deposit, said to be the best American collection dealing with the Jesuits of Hispanic America. Their present publication reproduces a group of letters and memorials written in the sixties, seventies, and eighties of the eighteenth century, shortly after the royal suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Spanish dominions. As scholars have recognized, that was an especially prolific time for historiography in the order, so sharply cut off from a flourishing career and left with its vivid retrospect of two centuries of vigorous activity. And the letters here printed show plainly the aspirations and longings of the missionaries. Though their communications are in the main personal and contemporary in content, there is frequent reference to the former days, and occasionally one finds—as in the letters of the two Fathers Godoy—a reflection of current opinion on the suppression and a forecast of the troublous times that await the Hispanic provinces. These Godoy letters, and the rest of the twenty-nine shorter epistles, are copied from originals in the archive of the Bishop of Mendoza.

Of highest importance are six long letters drawn from the Santiago collection and written by a mythical "Abbot of Genoa." They give a thorough description of life in old Cuyo and upon them Lucero has based his long and scholarly editorial introduction. These letters recount the political scheme, the farm economy, the minerals and plant and animal life, the native races and the society of Cuyo. Their author hid his identity for some unrecognized purpose under the abbatial title. In editing them Lucero footnotes his *Descripción* with citations from the colonial commentaries on the province. To supplement these six letters, he has incomplete lists of those Jesuits who resided in Cuyo at the time of their suppression and of those who died within the next twenty years in exile. This volume is first rate material for the history of that suppression as it is for this frontier in South America.

W. E. S.

Book Reviews

Washington and the American Revolution. By Bernhard Knollenberg. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1940. Pp. xvi, 269.

Although the title of this book suggests a focusing of attention on the role of Washington in the Revolution the prime purpose of this study is rather the rehabilitation of Generals Gates and Conway. To this end the author attempts to show that Congress' replacing of Schuyler by Gates was a popular move suggested by circumstances, that the work of Gates at Bemis Heights and Saratoga was of a high order, and that, far from betraying Washington, Gates actually depleted his own forces in response to appeals for aid by Washington. In addition he labors to prove that the elevation of Conway to the post of inspector general, with rank of major general, was prompted by the desire of Congress to influence France and enlist the cooperation of French officers, artillery and engineers in particular. Moreover an effort is made to demonstrate that Conway was the victim rather than the instigator or promoter of the cabal usually associated with his name, and that the whole affair was probably a myth. Incidentally, Washington's connection with all of these points is subjected to scrutiny and comment, and Lafayette's participation is not overlooked. To achieve all of these purposes in a satisfactory and convincing fashion in less than 170 pages of text, with space allotted for footnotes, would stamp any author a genius.

On the dust cover of this book Allan Nevins hails the volume as "one of the most important contributions made to the history of the Revolution since Van Tyne's two volumes appeared in 1922." "Scholars," he avers, "will take delight in its forthright criticism of conventional ideas, backed by full proof." In spite of this eulogy, or perhaps because of it, we find it difficult to arrive at a satisfactory appraisal. For we find difficulty in agreeing with Nevins's high praise; we believe it undeserved. Any correction of historical error should be gratefully received by scholars even if it results in a change of our estimate of Washington because his limitations and shortcomings are revealed. No doubt Mr. Knollenberg has read widely in his endeavor to correct "error" which has been accepted as truth, but we do not think his verdict should be accepted as final because his handling of evidence is at times most unimpressive.

A chapter devoted to the "New England Congressmen and Washington" insists that for various reasons these congressmen were critical of Washington's policy and tactics. In a seven-page appendix designed to add further confirmation letters of John Adams, Thomas Burke, Sam Adams, James Lovell, Elias Boudinot, and Steuben are cited. Now all of these critics except Steuben were civilians of the

type prone to assume that somehow they knew more about military affairs than those who made a profession of arms. Moreover Burke criticizes "our superior officers" in general; he does not mention Washington. Sam Adams' letter seems to exonerate Washington rather than criticize him inasmuch as he expresses fear that "our Commander in Chief may one day suffer in his own Character by means of these worthless Creatures" (a miserable set of general officers). After citing six letters of Lovell the author concedes that "even Lovell's strictures were apparently directed more against Washington's colleagues than against him individually." Finally, to Steuben is ascribed "one of the most severe criticisms of Washington as a military commander," but the author adds that such was Steuben's proneness to exaggerate his contributions to the cause that his remarks "must be read with a large grain of salt." Similarly on page 221 we are informed that the same condiment is to be applied to the remarks of Henry Laurens. New England congressmen may have indulged in criticism of Washington but these citations are no proof of it. Such handling of evidence does not indicate mature scholarship; it belies Nevins's claim for the book, and it weakens one's trust in the author's judgment and findings.

Another illustration is apt. "Washington and the Historians" is the subject of Chapter XV, just sixteen pages. The first paragraph is a blanket ascription of partiality, amounting to dishonesty, to the earlier historians. Then there are nearly five pages which thresh old straw in an effort to expose the unreliability of Sparks. They tell us nothing that scholars did not know. There follows a digression of more than ten pages on the expedition of the French fleet from Newport to Virginia. The remaining pages, or to be precise page and a half, are devoted to contemporary or near contemporary historians. In the final paragraph we are assured by the author that he entertains "the utmost respect for the insight as well as learning of most of the historians working today in the field of eighteenth century American history." Some of these are mentioned. The name of one is misspelled, an inconsequential typographical error, but mentioned here because elsewhere the author sees fit to devote a whole paragraph of his abbreviated text to an equally unavoidable error by Worthington C. Ford. In contrast to the kind words towards "most of the historians working today" Channing is accused in one place of being "shrouded in impenetrable mystery," and Sears is also taken to task (p. 166). And in the appendix, pages 186-91, we find W. C. Ford, Becker (previously praised), R. C. Adams, Monaghan, Albion, Burnett, Shryock, Fitzpatrick, Cox, and presumably Wharton, Hughes, and J. H. Smith, are all found wanting, but whether because of lack of insight or learning we are not told. We submit that this list represents a very respectable roster of contemporary scholars and that it is quite unlikely that they are all mistaken. At least we ask for proof,

definite and conclusive proof. In conclusion we would remark that to stoop to the device of composing a letter which Washington "should have written," as is done on page 137, is quite unworthy of a scholar.

West Baden College

CHARLES H. METZGER

Hitler's Germany. By Karl Loewenstein. New edition, revised. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1940. Pp. 240.

This volume traces concisely the underlying causes of Hitler's rise to power and the present functioning of the totalitarian state in Germany, but as a work of history or political science it must await the final judgment of scholars when the stresses of the present and the opening of archives will permit a fairer appraisal of the period. The scholastic background and the personal contacts of the writer with Nazi Germany render the book sufficiently authoritative and timely. Although brief, the work covers rather completely the activities and steps taken by the Hitler régime to entrench itself in power. It holds Germany responsible for the entire war and ends on a note of pessimism for the future of the world, and especially of the United States, in the event of a Nazi victory. The book is well written, instructive, and provocative of thought, although tinged with positiveness.

The methods employed by the Nazi are not original. The suppression of minorities has long been the practice of the totalitarian type of mind. Confiscations of property, bridling of thought, imprisonments, and exilings, however, have not hitherto been accomplished with the cold, machine-like precision of the Nazi. The tragedy of the matter lies in the fact that our modern thought has contributed an intellectual background by making possible a frame of mind conducive of basically false principles of political science. Certainly not all of the principles of the French Revolution, or of the more recent Russian revolution can be said to satisfy man's temporal and eternal needs or contribute to the orderly progress of the human race. Many lead directly to a repudiation of God, tradition, natural law, international law, the sacredness of contracts, and the dignity of man. They have produced the unfortunate conditions in Germany, which Professor Loewenstein graphically and eloquently describes.

Despite the encomiums written about the Weimar Constitution, the document was probably made designedly impractical, and, whatever may be one's opinion regarding the sincerity of its framers, contained rudiments of its own downfall. The lack of confidence of the framers is indicated in Article 48, the emergency provision, which authorizes the suspension of the constitution by anyone who may happen to seize power. This desertion of and distrust of any democratic ideal prepared amply for the debacle of the republic and the coming of the authoritarian state.

Loyola University, Chicago

JOHN A. ZVETINA

Western America. The Exploration, Settlement, and Development of the Region Beyond the Mississippi. By Leroy H. Hafen and Carl Coke Rister. Prentice-Hall, New York, 1941. Pp. xxvi, 698.

The title of this work gives its scope, the story of the trans-Mississippi United States. That in itself is sufficient reason for a new book, for the subject seen from this point of view is rather a new departure in American writing. Goodwin opened the field under a similar caption in 1922. The Boulder Conference of 1929 produced a number of research papers on the same matter. The single volumes of Paxson, Riegel, Branch, and Clark included it in their broad sweep over the westward movement. Nevertheless, one must agree that today there is a fixed region called "The West," as distinguished from the dynamic concept of "The West" as Turner saw it in his famous essay on the significance of the frontier. The present authorship has endeavored to describe the origin and character of this particular region, whose outlook is special and distinctive and vitally important for him who would appraise our American life.

The Trans-Mississippi West exhibits clearly the meeting of the three colonial groups, the Spanish, French, and Anglo-American, and their fusing of economic and cultural interests as well as their mixture of blood and of inherited tradition. On the grand panorama of these great spaces the student follows easily the forces that predominate in molding the American way of life. The discoverers make their broad sweeping expeditions. The colonizers follow the geographical lines and settle in the favored lands. The organizers unite the units among the successive economic groups. Different flags follow one another until at last the national emblem signifies that all the territory is embraced under the one sovereignty. The railroads then tie together the Indian country, the mining and the sodhouse frontiers, and states are erected in a solid continuity from the great river to the Pacific.

Especially commendable in this volume is the weaving of the mission story in all its phases into the complete narrative. This is the first book in the reviewer's recollection that gives an intelligible account of the part played by the missions in developing and modifying the West. The ample use of missionary biography explains very much of the social relations fundamental to successful settlement, and it also lends a humane touch to the book and makes its reading most attractive. The daring spirit and elevated ideals of the religious pioneers magnify rather than overshadow the hardy spirit of the colonist, the settler, and the western statesman.

Good illustrations and an index of thirty-two double column pages will certainly appeal to students who use this book as a guide for their selections of the best and latest general works, monographs, articles, and source materials. Critics will find blemishes which the most careful proofreader inevitably overlooks. Slips of this type are the confusion in citing Castañeda on pages 56 and 321, the use of the

dash to signify identity of authorship in several books listed on page 342, the omission of names of authors before a few articles on page 419, the Jesuit "fort" on page 24.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Loyola University, Chicago

Colorado, the Centennial State. By Percy Stanley Fritz, Ph. D. Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1941. Pp. xii, 518.

This is the latest volume in the Prentice-Hall series of state and regional histories. In the preface the author describes the pattern into which he has fitted his volume: "The history of the United States can be reviewed through the eyes of a single State; therefore particular attention has been given to the local events which have had national significance as well as to the way in which State affairs have been modified by national policy. Aiming to keep the true historical balance, I have emphasized mining and agriculture in proportion to their contributions to the history of the State." Twenty-five chapters are divided into four parts: the Background; the Pioneer Period, 1856-1861; the Territorial Period, 1861-1876; and the State, 1876-1940. Selective bibliographies may be found at the end of each chapter. It is the best one-volume textbook history of Colorado.

Colorado has had a short but dramatic history. It has played a unique part in the political and economic history of the United States. For example, Colorado was hastily made a state in 1876 in time to participate in the hectic presidential election of that year, and the "few hundred Colorado votes defeated Samuel J. Tilden of New York for President" (p. 238). After 1696, "prices in the United States, in spite of the improved methods of production, enjoyed a steady rise for which Colorado's gold production was a more important cause than the election of McKinley" (p. 360).

The ample space of ninety-six pages allotted to the "Background of Colorado History" could possibly have been better distributed, since seventeen pages are devoted to the Cliff Dwellers, twelve to Fur Traders, and only one paragraph to the pioneer Spanish-Mexican settlements in the San Luis Valley. The following statement (p. 30) seems to have no important connection with the topic described there: "The Nazis have no copyright on the swastika. The Cliff Dwellers used that emblem on their pottery 800 years before Hitler was born." In the careful list of early Spanish expeditions into Colorado, mention might have been made of Vargas' expedition in 1694, and his description of the San Luis Valley. Reference (pp. 61-62) to the *encomienda* system as a slave system, rather than the accorded right to collect tribute, is contrary to the best authorities on the question. On page 58, "six years" should read "eight years," and on page 13, "In 1801 by the Treaty of San Ildelfonso" should read "In 1800 by the Treaty of San Ildelfonso." There is no consistency in the use of

accents. Spanish names mentioned are frequently misspelled. For example, "Agapeta Vigil" (p. 245) becomes "Agipeta Vigil" (p. 247); on page 59, "Casteñeda" should read "Castañeda," etc. Without explanation, and in reverse chronologically, the Purgatory River (p. 51) becomes the Purgatoire River (p. 203). Howlett's life of Machebeuf should have been included in the bibliographical note on page 240.

J. MANUEL ESPINOSA

Institute of Jesuit History

La Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos durante la Época Colonial 1572-1767. By Gerard Decorme, S. J. Antigua Libreria Robredo, Mexico, 1941. Pp. 518, illustrated.

For several years Father Decorme has had in manuscript this history of the Jesuits of the Province of New Spain during the colonial period, but because of the turbulent internal conditions in Mexico he has been unable to see it through the press. He has, however, been generous in permitting scholars to use his manuscript, even placing copies in Berkeley, California, and in Chicago, Illinois. Consequently, the publication of the first volume of the story of the Jesuits beyond the Rio Grande is a welcome event, and it is hoped that the printing of the second volume on the widespread missions will not be unduly delayed.

The plan of *La Obra* has been amply fulfilled, namely, in bringing together in compendium form and with all the exactitude possible the voluminous history of the Society of Jesus in Mexico, for the benefit of those who wish to know the part played by the Company in the religious, social, political, and educational development of the land and its peoples. Father Decorme, long years an educator and missionary in the cities and lands about which he writes, has scrupulously avoided the pitfalls of popularized history, of propaganda, and of superficiality, and has adhered rigidly to a simple statement of the outstanding facts with commendable objectivity. Undoubtedly, each of the concise sentences could, as he remarks, have been footnoted by documents, by an article, or by a monograph, and so with due apologies to scholars he chose to cite authorities only where necessary and to refrain from producing a bibliographical guide. Nevertheless, his twelve pages of source materials and monographs will quite satisfy the scholar.

As to content, the volume treats in order the colleges and residences established during almost 200 years of the existence of the Province of New Spain, the social, spiritual, literary, and scholastic labors of the members, the ministry in the central part of the land, the religious life and spirit, the trials, suits, and martyrdoms, and the suppression of the Society with its consequences. Scattered throughout the narrative of *La Obra* are brief biographical sketches of the individual workers. Much of the factual material has been

derived from sources, and Alegre, probably the most outstanding of the Jesuit historians of Spanish colonial times is used as a guide. But the chronological arrangement of the facts adopted by Alegre is fortunately deserted in *La Obra* in favor of the topical. There is much drama in the book, although events are given in no dramatic style. Some forty plates, maps (not too carefully drawn), and lists, add to the attractiveness and value of the book, but two of the pictures of the ancient Black Robes indicate a rare sense of humor on the part of some unknown artist.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago

Memoirs of Jeremiah Curtin. Edited with Notes and Introduction by Joseph Schafer, Superintendent of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. *Wisconsin Biography Series, II*. The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, 1940. Pp. 925.

Jeremiah Curtin (1835-1906), born in Detroit of Irish immigrant parents, spent his earliest years in Wisconsin, whence he entered Harvard University at twenty-four. His outstanding talent was for languages, of which he is said to have mastered or become familiar with some eighty, ranging through such diverse linguistic groups as the Celtic, the Slavic, the Mongol, and the North American Indian. His philological studies, however, were pursued by him mainly as approaches to a subject that interested him more closely, the folklore and mythology of primitive peoples. Numerous monographic contributions of value to this branch of ethnological science were made by him under the auspices of the United States Bureau of Ethnology and the Smithsonian Institute, in which departments he was employed for several years. Curtin made contact with the general reading public through his great skill as a translator, his most important work in this regard being his excellent English versions of the historical romances of the Polish novelist, Henry Sienkiewicz.

The *Memoirs* cover the entire range of the linguist's career from his earliest recollections to a period immediately prior to his death. They would appear to have been compiled (actually they were dictated to his wife) with the aid of diaries or contemporary notes of some sort, though no such material has been found among the Curtin papers. The bulk of the *Memoirs* are descriptive of his travels, for he was a tireless globe-trotter, never having had a real home all his life. His estimates of men and things are of varying value in point of insight and penetration. On the nature of Communism, of which he had some first-hand knowledge from his residence in Russia, having been for a while secretary of the American Legation in St. Petersburg, he had positive views: "The atheistic Communism which rose in Russia soon after the accession of Alexander II is a curse for the entire world, for it has its disciples in every country" (p. 309). As a

result of his investigations, he was led to the striking conclusion that the account of the origin of things embodied in myths and folklore is substantially the same among the primitive peoples both of the eastern and western hemispheres (p. 502).

All in all, Curtin's *Memoirs*, though of no particular value from a scientific point of view, is a readable record of an unusually busy and productive life. Born a Catholic and in his earliest youth reared such, he later ceased to profess Catholicism, as he frankly admitted when questioned on the subject (p. 788).

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

Loyola University, Chicago

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 23, NUMBER 3

JULY 1941

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JULY 1941

VOLUME 23

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 12

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

THE FRENCH OF OLD MISSOURI (1804-1821): A STUDY IN ASSIMILATION	<i>Harvey Wish</i>	167
THE END OF A JESUIT LIBRARY	<i>W. Kane</i>	190
L'ENFANCE ET LA JEUNESSE DE PIERRE LE MOYNE, SIEUR D'IBERVILLE		214
THE "DE SOTO MAP"	<i>Barbara Boston</i>	236
BOOK REVIEWS		251
<i>SCHMITZ, Texas Statecraft, 1836-1845; DAVIDSON, Propaganda and the American Revolution; POULIOT, Étude sur les Relations des Jésuites de la Nouvelle-France (1632-1672); KINIETZ, The Indians of the Western Great Lakes, 1615-1760; WECTER, The Hero in America; WILGUS, The Development of Hispanic America.</i>		

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL

J. MANUEL ESPINOSA

W. EUGENE SHIELDS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON

RAYMOND CORRIGAN

PAUL KINIERY

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JULY 1941

VOLUME 23

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 12

NUMBER 3

The French of Old Missouri (1804-1821): A Study in Assimilation

The westward march of empire for the youthful American republic of Jefferson's day carried with it a missionary zeal for conferring democratic institutions even among people whose historic culture disposed them to paternalism. In Louisiana, where French and Spanish regimes had gracefully alternated in a benevolent despotism founded on considerations of expediency, traditionalism, and indolence, the coming of American political institutions struck apprehension in many hearts, apathy in others. The *anciens habitants*, unwitting pawns of Napoleonic imperialism, had displayed pleasure at the momentary revival of French authority in 1803, but the advance of the Anglo-Saxon found them dispirited. Several members of the United States Senate gloomily predicted French resistance if the American authorities attempted to obtain possession of Louisiana. A more general and optimistic viewpoint was expressed by Senator Robert Wright of Maryland, a staunch Jeffersonian:

Can it be supposed that the Louisianians, who so lately gave so demonstrative proof of their loyalty in their answer to the address of the Prefect of France, will be less disposed to loyalty to the United States, when they recollect that we have treated them as our children . . . by securing them in their property and in their civil and religious liberty, agreeably to the principles of our own Constitution? Can they be so unwise as to prefer being the colonists of a distant European Power, to being members of this immense Empire, with all the privileges of American citizens?¹

In upper Louisiana, where the French creole population had already experienced serious misgivings concerning the turbulent frontier spirit of their new masters, the ceremony of transferring allegiance was a pathetic one. Captain Amos Stoddard, the new

¹ *Annals of the Congress of the United States*, 8 Cong., 1 Sess., 43-44.

civil commandant of Upper Louisiana, appeared before the home of Charles Gratiot in St. Louis on March 10, 1804, to assure the assembly of French inhabitants that they were now American citizens and no longer merely subjects. Religion, local customs, language, and land titles were to be respected by the national administration. "You now form an integral part of a great community," he added, "the powers of whose Government are circumscribed and defined by charter, and the liberty of the citizen extended and secured."² Gratiot, a cultured creole who was among the few to understand English, interpreted the speech to the silent audience. As the American flag replaced the Spanish colors, he requested the French to cheer the ceremony. The cheers, however, were both faint and few. American observers later recalled that

. . . many, very many of the people shed bitter tears of regret at being transferred without previous knowledge, from the sovereignty of a government and language to which they had been accustomed and fondly attached, and under which they had been bred, to that of a strange government, with whose manners, habits, language, and laws they were not familiar.³

Well-to-do creole families whose immense landed properties had appreciated in value with the advent of the American, might look more indulgently upon the change than did the less fortunate; but even among this group there were men like Auguste Chouteau who preferred a centralized military government to the unpredictable ways of democracy. The local slaveholders, many of whom were emigrants from the Northwest Territory and had experienced the dangers of emancipation, felt little admiration for equalitarian principles. Former French colonists of Gallipolis had arrived in Missouri a decade previously, with unpleasant recollections of the sharp methods of American land companies in Ohio. Nor did religious differences facilitate any melting pot process as Protestant and Catholic were compelled to seek a common formula for mutual understanding.

Worst of all, from the standpoint of the farming community, was the Yankee threat of an inquisition regarding the validity of land titles acquired under the informal land cessions of the Spanish and French regimes. Many of the land concessions were

² "Address of Captain Amos Stoddard," in *Glimpses of the Past*, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, 1935, II, Nos. 6-10, 88.

³ John F. Darby, *Personal Recollections*, St. Louis, 1880, 223-224; see also a similar report in James H. Perkins and J. M. Peck, *Annals of the West*, St. Louis, 1850, 537.

neither registered nor surveyed; fully one-half of the lands of Upper Louisiana remained unsurveyed in 1804 and, according to Stoddard, nineteen-twentieths of the existing land titles were defective, being derived from the authority of a lieutenant-governor or a commandant, but unsanctioned by the higher representatives of the crown in the province.⁴ Among the poorer classes there were few who could afford the costs of securing official registration of land titles. When news arrived in 1804 that Congress had enacted legislation which challenged many of the nebulous titles held under local Spanish grants, there arose widespread agitation among the distressed *habitants*. This reaction had been correctly predicted by the territorial representative in Congress, Charles Lucas, who pointed out the folly of precipitate action in the midst of a delicate situation:

Louisiana has been held alternately by three or four nations; each of which in sequence has granted titles to more or less of the lands in question. An examination into those titles would at this time excite a high degree of sensibility among the inhabitants who ought in their youthful state to be treated by Congress with tenderness and delicacy.⁵

Subsequent congressional action in dividing Louisiana territory ended creole hopes that the growth of population in the Great Purchase would permit early statehood and hence autonomy. On January 4, 1805, a general protest was sent to Congress on behalf of the district delegates of St. Louis, Ste. Genevieve, New Madrid, Cape Girardeau, St. Charles, and dependent areas. The memorial denounced the federal land laws as endangering Missouri land titles and deplored the "endless territorial infancy" of Upper Louisiana. In the "artificial" union of this section with a portion of the Northwest Territory, the petitioners sensed a plot to destroy slavery since the governor of a free territory now obtained authority over slaveholding Upper Louisiana. Nor was the Indian policy of the United States to their liking; each new treaty of cession brought more Indians across the Mississippi into Louisiana. At the same time, they claimed, military protection had proved inadequate amidst repeated instances of Indian attacks. In addition, more concessions were asked for the French language in political and educational institutions; territorial officials, they declared, should be residents and possess a speaking knowledge of both French and English; court records should be

⁴ Amos Stoddard, *Sketches, Historical and Descriptive of Louisiana*, Philadelphia, 1812, 253; for certain other aspects of the land title dispute see the *Louisiana Gazette*, March 29, 1810, March 28 and April 11, 1811.

⁵ *Annals of the Congress of the United States*, 8 Cong., 2 Sess., 694.

kept in these languages, and special government funds set aside to build county schools in which the two tongues would be granted equality. Complaining of the "unusual spirit of severity" which characterized the provisional laws of Louisiana, they observed significantly, "Little as we are acquainted with the United States, we know by heart your declaration of independence."⁶

Rufus Easton, writing to Jefferson from St. Louis during the same month, remarked, "That the French inhabitants are in general enemies to the change in Government requires no argument to demonstrate. . . . When it was rumored thro' this country last summer that a recession to Spain would take place, joy gladdened in their hearts."⁷ American taxes and military service constituted another bone of contention. The gradual enlargement and extension of territorial garrisons under the new regime revealed the reluctance of the native French to serve as soldiers; on one occasion, only the personal persuasion of creole leaders like Pierre Chouteau and Bernard Pratte proved effective in carrying out a military order.⁸ Frederick Bates, territorial secretary, wrote that the French "know nothing of the duties of a soldier and could never be *dragged* into action either with Spaniards or Indians."⁹ Among the more powerful creole families there was no such aversion to the martial spirit. Captains Pierre Chouteau and Jonathan Buois commanded troops of cavalry; a De-launay was adjutant-general of territorial militia; and Jean Baptiste Vallé accepted the position of commandant at Ste. Genevieve.¹⁰ Appointments to West Point for the sons of such families were eagerly sought; and the American authorities readily appreciated the tactical advantages derived from dispensing such favors.¹¹

The tender plant of Anglo-Saxon liberty proved for a time an exotic growth amidst local traditions of paternalistic government. Bates complained of the French that

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1611.

⁷ Letter of January 17, 1805, published in Floyd Calvin Shoemaker, *Missouri's Struggle for Statehood, 1804-1821*, Jefferson City, Missouri, 1916, 13 *et seq.*

⁸ Frederick Bates to Henry Dearborn, September 28, 1807, *The Life and Papers of Frederick Bates*, edited by Thomas M. Marshall, St. Louis, 1926, I, 200.

⁹ *Id.*, May 30, 1807, I, 133. One of the Robidoux family of St. Louis was charged with fostering Indian hostility against the United States; Paul Allen, ed., *History of the Expeditions of Captains Lewis and Clark to the Sources of the Missouri*, Philadelphia, 1814, II, 455.

¹⁰ *Missouri Gazette*, August 31, 1808.

¹¹ Darby, *Personal Recollections*, 224-225.

Justice and liberty are words which they do not understand. . . . The summary decree of a military officer however tyrannical or absurd is much better suited to their ideas of the fitness of things, than the dilatory trial by jury and the glorious uncertainty of the Common Law.¹²

He concluded optimistically, however, that "a gleam of light, like the first blush of the morning has dawned on their bewildered imaginations." Courts and legislative bodies were staffed in part by members of the more cultured French classes and the *coutume de Paris*, hitherto dominant as a legal system for the *anciens habitants*, managed to survive alongside of Anglo-American law. The legal guarantees of local customs under the treaty of cession offered not a little perplexity to the judge or lawyer who was compelled to observe a dual system of procedure.¹³

The French-Canadian, who had migrated to Missouri after brief settlements in the Northwest Territory, brought with him institutions appropriate to a communal life. Bates observed, "The French people for the most part live in villages and cultivate a Common Field. They cannot bear the idea of separation. To live in the country without a neighbour in less than half a mile is worse than death, and almost as bad as purgatory."¹⁴ Individualistic Anglo-Americans, whose legal systems did not cover the feudal French institutions of land commons, looked upon this arrangement as injurious to urban growth and prosperity since it created in many instances a wasteland and prevented thorough agricultural exploitation of valuable resources.¹⁵ The frontiersman's insatiable land hunger could only view the generous Spanish and French privileges with distaste. Against the threat of the newcomer, French farmers of Carondelet published a warning to those outsiders who cut timber belonging to the village commons.¹⁶ The old settlers hoped that Congress would act to confirm communal rights to all lands claimed as commons.¹⁷ Anglo-American enterprise continued, however, to make inroads upon traditional economic institutions and the French began to rent or sell their holdings for the relatively large sums that the new-

¹² Frederick Bates to R. Bates, December 17, 1807, *Life and Papers*, I, 242.

¹³ Henry M. Brackenridge in the *Louisiana Gazette*, April 11, 1811.

¹⁴ Frederick Bates to R. Bates, December 17, 1807, *Life and Papers*, I, 243.

¹⁵ *Missouri Gazette and Public Advertiser*, October 2, 1818.

¹⁶ *Missouri Gazette*, December 14, 1816.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, August 21, 1818.

comers were able to offer.¹⁸ Some of the dispossessed went West as squatters upon the public lands; others found miscellaneous tasks as boatmen or guides.

French settlements in Missouri clung to the great river courses of the Mississippi and the Missouri. A Spanish census of 1799 claimed a population of 6,028 for Upper Louisiana of whom 883 were slaves, 161 free mulattoes, and 36 free Negroes.¹⁹ With the heavy influx of Americans and other groups the census reported 20,845 inhabitants in this area for 1810 and 66,586 by 1820. In 1799, a flourishing export trade existed in furs, lead, and flour which were sent to New Orleans, attaining an annual value of \$73,176; shippers of fine furs sought the advantageous Canadian market despite government prohibitions.

At the time of cession, the oldest settlement, Ste. Genevieve, on the Mississippi, appeared to be most flourishing and destined to future grandeur. This district accounted for the total annual output of salt in Upper Louisiana—965 bushels, 150,000 pounds of lead, and most of the horned cattle and horses; it was also important as a producer of wheat and corn.²⁰ Of its original 949 inhabitants under Spanish and French rule, one-third were slaves. During the American territorial period, the settlement declined in relative importance, although the population increased slightly. It remained the center of lead-mining activity—the “store town,” many of the villagers and slaves being engaged in carting lead, wood, and stone together with incidental tillage.²¹ A large inclosed common field along the river contained separate strips cultivated by each family in a system reminiscent of manorial Europe. Lots cultivated by Americans could be told apart by the absence of weeds and by their general productivity, which was at least a third more than that of the French holdings.²² American cabins differed from the French ones in that the latter were constructed of logs set vertically rather than the former's familiar horizontal arrangement. With the advent of the American, lead mining received a new impetus. The French had seldom gone beyond a greater depth than eight or ten feet; by 1811 they

¹⁸ *Louisiana Gazette*, April 11, 1811. The *Missouri Gazette*, first newspaper west of the Mississippi, changed its name frequently, sometimes known as *Louisiana Gazette* and occasionally bearing a lengthier title.

¹⁹ “Census of Upper Louisiana,” *Annals of the Congress of the United States*, Appendix, 8 Cong., 2 Sess., 1575-1576.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Christian Schultz, *Travels on an Inland Voyage*, New York, 1810, II, 56. Lead frequently did service as money in Upper Louisiana, especially at Ste. Genevieve. See *Missouri Gazette*, November 2, 1809.

²² *Louisiana Gazette*, April 11 and March 21, 1811.

were benefiting from American methods and descending fifty to sixty feet.²³ Despite the forces of assimilation, Ste. Genevieve remained predominantly French in culture even at the end of the territorial period.

The rapid rise of St. Louis since its founding in 1764, particularly from 1804 to the period of Missouri's statehood, soon eclipsed the progress of the older settlements; from a population in 1799 of 925 including 268 slaves and 50 free mulattoes, the district attained 5,667 by the 1810 census and 10,049 by 1820.²⁴ Situated at the Missouri gateway to the Far West, and occupying the Mississippi approaches, the town appeared less rural than Ste. Genevieve and more dependent upon the fur trade. The population consisted largely of French-Canadians, a few Spaniards and other Europeans, and an increasing proportion of Americans. Many of the leading French citizens were engaged in the fur trade; some like the Chouteaus were associated intimately with the famous Manuel Lisa and the Missouri Fur Company. Washington Irving has left us an extremely vivid account of his impressions of St. Louis in 1810:

Here to be seen, about the river banks, the hectoring, extravagant, bragging boatmen of the Mississippi, with the gay, grimacing, singing, good-humored Canadian *voyageurs*. Vagrant Indians of various tribes, loitered about the streets. Now and then a stark Kentucky hunter, in leathern hunting-dress, with rifle on shoulder and knife in belt, strode along. Here and there were new brick houses and shops, just set up by bustling, driving, and eager men of traffic from the Atlantic States; while, on the other hand, the old French mansions, with open case-ments, still retained the easy, indolent air of the original colonists; and now and then the scraping of a fiddle, a strain of an ancient French song, or the sound of billiard balls, showed that the happy Gallic turn for gayety and amusement still lingered about the place.²⁵

Irving gloried in the local color of the "mongrel Indians and mongrel Frenchmen" who were employed in the fur trade by the old French houses of St. Louis.²⁶ Anglo-Saxons were struck by the strange dress, the volatile temperament, and picturesque

²³ *Ibid.*, June 20, 1811. Particularly important for mining was the ash furnace, hitherto unknown to the French. The famous frontiersman, Moses Austin, was one of the most enterprising Americans in the lead mines; John Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior of America*, Liverpool, 1817, 253-254.

²⁴ "Census of Upper Louisiana," *loc. cit.*, 1575-1576; *Louisiana Gazette*, January 16, 1810; *U. S.: Fifth Census or Enumeration of the Inhabitants of the United States*, Washington, D. C., 1832, 22-23.

²⁵ Washington Irving, *Astoria*, New York, 1868, 154-155.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 201-206. Some of the colorful old French songs of the boatmen appear in Bradbury, 12-13.

vocabulary of the French river boatmen. In 1808, the murder trial of George Druillard, Manuel Lisa's employee, who had fatally wounded the deserter, Antoine Bissonnette, on instructions of his employer, took on added significance because of its challenge to the traditional fidelity of the French boatman and trapper. Bissonnette's desertion on a western trading expedition was regarded by a local jury as a threat to the entire community and Druillard was discharged.²⁷

Among the other colorful French settlements in territorial Missouri was attractive St. Charles, adjacent to St. Louis, with a district population of 3,505. In 1799 there had been 895 inhabitants of whom 55 were slaves. Few American families had arrived prior to 1804, but soon they came in such numbers as to reduce the French to a minority status. This area was primarily engaged in wheat and corn production; with considerable Indian trade; it was a center for the French *engagées* or boatmen.²⁸ Cape Girardeau, although established by the French, was said to have had no more than three or four Frenchmen during 1804 in a population of 1,470.²⁹ The earthquake devastation during 1811 of New Madrid, a settlement of 1,350 people, brought a large-scale trek of its inhabitants into the interior of Missouri and into Arkansas.³⁰ Small villages such as Carondelet, Belle Fontaine, Florissant, Vide Poche, New Bourbon, and other of the more isolated settlements remained predominantly French with a liberal Indian element to the end of the territorial period, attracting the traveler's attention to the hospitality and picturesqueness of their inhabitants.³¹

Henry Brackenridge, observing the influence of the American regime upon the humble folk of these villages, wrote in 1811:

It may be a question, whether the poorest class have been benefited by the change. Fearless of absolute want, they always lived in a careless, thoughtless manner; at present the greater part of them obtain a precarious subsistence. They generally possess a cart, a house or two, a small flock of cattle and cultivate trifling garden spots. At St. Louis

²⁷ *Missouri Gazette*, October 12, 1808.

²⁸ *Louisiana Gazette*, March 21, 1811; *History of the Expeditions of Captains Lewis and Clark*, I, 4.

²⁹ Stoddard, *Sketches*, 214.

³⁰ *Missouri Gazette*, September 6, 1817.

³¹ Daniel Blowe, *Emigrant's Directory*, London, 1820, 680-684; Stoddard, *loc. cit.*, 211, 219, 225; "Brackenridge's Journal Up the Missouri," *Early Western Travels, 1748-1846*, edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites, Cleveland, 1904, VI, 45; *Missouri Gazette*, March 7, 1811; Samuel R. Brown, *The Western Gazeteer*, Auburn, New York, 1817, 203-204.

they have more employment than in the other villages; they make hay in the prairie, haul wood for sale, and are employed in small jobs about town; some are boatmen. . . .³²

The Americans, he added, had communicated to the French some of their industry and spirit of enterprise; while the French reciprocated by teaching them their "more gentle and amiable customs." But the prestige of the boatman's trade, the pride of the French-Canadian heart, was sadly undermined by the indifferent attitude of the American.³³ Frederick Bates, writing in 1807, viewed the situation pessimistically.

A few of the Spanish and French inhabitants who enjoyed the patronage of the late government are wealthy. But the great body of that unhappy people whose situation has always been degraded and slavish is daily sinking into insignificance and ruin. Some of them are employed by the Merchants as Boatmen or Traders in the Indian country. This service sinks them every year more deeply in debt, until they are compelled by their unfeeling creditors to perform every servile drudgery with which humanity can be loaded. But it is a life to which they are accustomed, and they are seldom known to complain.³⁴

The old French ruling class, facing their twilight with leaders who had tasted the elegance and cultured atmosphere of Paris, yielded gracefully to their new masters. Of this group, however, Bates expressed his profound suspicions, "Civil, polite and courteous, they perform inviolably all the decorums of intercourse; yet when they are making to you all their professions of attachment and service, they have their mental reservations, and as no veil is deep or large enough to hide itself, we are generally aware of, and guard against the artifice."³⁵ The wealthy creoles especially those of St. Louis had come from Montreal and Quebec in Canada, the Old Northwest, New Orleans, the West Indies, and this class was strengthened by emigrés from France itself. Their palatial residences, some built in the true seigniorial tradition, remained landmarks in Missouri long after the owners had gone. Court records testify to the baronial estates of the Chouteaus, Robidoux, Labbadies, Soularde, Clamorgans, Gratiots, St. Vrains, and others of that class of princely merchants.³⁶ Amazingly large

³² *Louisiana Gazette*, April 11, 1811.

³³ Henry M. Brackenridge, *Views of Louisiana*, Pittsburgh, 1814, 136.

³⁴ Frederick Bates to Richard Bates, December 17, 1807, *Life and Papers*, I, 241.

³⁵ *Id.*, 242.

³⁶ "Saint Louis Land Owners of 1805," *Missouri Historical Society Collections*, III, No. 1, 183-192; The *Missouri Gazette* contains numerous items

personal libraries, rich in the classics and abounding with the works of the eighteenth-century *philosophes*, belied the common impression of frontier isolation and provincialism. Observers were impressed by the meticulous French pronunciation and fine manners of this backwoods' "society" contrasting sharply with the colloquialisms of the humbler classes. So far removed in fact were the cultured gentry of St. Louis from any suggestion of geographic detachment even in 1796 that they had then organized a *sans culotte* society, the symbol of revolutionary France!³⁷

Researches into the old creole libraries of St. Louis have revealed the dominant intellectual influence of the "Enlightenment" upon the wealthy French families. Auguste Chouteau, who had come to St. Louis as a fourteen-year-old boy with Pierre Laclède in 1764 to establish the settlement, had together with his employer plunged deeply into the writings of the French freethinkers and reformers. The Chouteau library of some six hundred volumes, which included much of the old Laclède collection, possessed the iconoclastic writings of Voltaire, Diderot, Rousseau, and Mirabeau; besides these were the tendentious works of Beccaria, Locke, Descartes, Buffon, de Mably, the Abbe Raynal, Montesquieu, and numerous others. Appropriately enough, the parlor clock of the Chouteau mansion was adorned with a bust of Voltaire.³⁸ Similar collections were owned by Dr. Antoine François Saugrain, pioneer in the frontier application of small-pox vaccine, who possessed not only a large medical library but the writings of Beaumarchais, Molière, Goethe, as well as those of scores of French freethinkers.³⁹ Many other libraries, whose well-stocked shelves revealed the unconventional spirit of the owners, existed in creole St. Louis among such men as Jacques Clamorgan, land speculator and judge of the court of common pleas, Charles Delassus, former commandant of St. Louis, and other well-known leaders.

Nor was St. Louis an isolated instance of French literary influence in the West. Canada, the major source of the Gallic emigrant stream to fill Missouri, is said to have possessed large French libraries of some sixty thousand volumes; and New Orleans, undoubtedly, contributed much to the literary collections

concerning the land operations of the wealthy creoles, e. g., in the issues of March 22, 1809, December 18, 1813, May 21, 1814, *et passim*.

³⁷ John F. McDermott, "Voltaire and the Freethinkers in Early Saint Louis," *Revue De Litterature Comparée*, XVI (1936), 725.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 726.

³⁹ John F. McDermott, *Private Libraries in Creole St. Louis*, Baltimore, 1938, 90.

of St. Louis.⁴⁰ Brackenridge declared that part of the classics possessed by Chouteau formerly belonged to the original collection of an old Jesuit library at Kaskaskia.⁴¹ A Protestant minister, Rev. John Mason Peck, observed of St. Louis in 1818 that "every Frenchman with whom I formed an acquaintance, of any intelligence and influence, was of the school of French Liberalists—an infidel to all Bible Christianity."⁴² This situation he attributed to

the casual correspondence held with France, where infidelity was demolishing the throne of political and religious despotism, . . . [and] led them to regard all religion as priestcraft, necessary perhaps for the ignorant, superstitious, and vicious, but wholly unnecessary for a gentleman—a philosopher.⁴³

Upon the pretentious estate of Auguste Chouteau, the elder, was a large stone edifice enclosed by massive stone walls and occupying an entire square, which towered impressively above the more humble dwellings of St. Louis. As a reservoir to supply his grist mill, Chouteau had constructed an attractive artificial lake.⁴⁴ This regal setting was indeed appropriate for one whose business and social affairs could scarcely be described in any other terms than princely. His home was a convenient place for confidential creole deliberations, whether they concerned land titles, local rights, or national problems.⁴⁵ The old files of the *Missouri Gazette* are replete with the many-sided activity of Chouteau, as a member of the St. Louis board of trustees, as a land speculator, a merchant in the fur trade (particularly through his son's enterprises), as a bank director, and finally as a public-spirited citizen helping to establish the early St. Louis school system.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ McDermott, "Voltaire and the Freethinkers," *loc. cit.*, 730-731.

⁴¹ Henry M. Brackenridge, *Recollections of Persons and Places in the West*, Philadelphia, 1868, 230.

⁴² Rufus Babcock, ed., *Memoir of John Mason Peck, D. D.*, Philadelphia, 1864, 87.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 88.

⁴⁴ Brackenridge, *Recollections of Persons*, 230; Anne L. Hunt, "Early Recollections," *Glimpses of the Past*, Missouri Historical Society, 1934, I, No. 6, 45.

⁴⁵ See for example the Chouteau notice in the *Missouri Gazette*, December 7, 1808.

⁴⁶ For mention of several of the activities of Chouteau and his son, Auguste, Jr., see the *Missouri Gazette*, August 26, 1807, November 23 and 26, 1809, January 11, March 3, and May 10, 1810, February 14, 1811, December 7, 1816, and September 13, 1817; also the St. Louis *Enquirer*, February 3, 1821.

The activities of other creoles furnished a counterpart to those of the Chouteau family, although they were somewhat less challenging in the range of their interests. The Vallé family of Ste. Genevieve, one of the oldest French families in Missouri, had earned a high reputation in colonial officialdom and under American rule, Jean Baptiste Vallé was appointed to the office of commandant at Ste. Genevieve and Justice of the General Quarter Sessions of the Peace.⁴⁷ Joseph de St. Vrain, wealthy landowner and merchant of Belle Fontaine, near St. Louis, laid the foundation in 1810 for subsequent prosperity in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages by introducing European methods in his elaborate brewery, particularly in the making of strong beer. A fellow citizen hailed this undertaking with the remark, "The lovers of Malt will now have an opportunity to foster an undertaking so much wanting in this territory."⁴⁸ Large plantations, worked by slave labor, belonged to some of the leading creole families such as the Labbadies, who possessed over seven thousand arpents of land, the Labeaumes of St. Louis, whose holdings included lead mines; the Robidoux, and other families.⁴⁹ The French slave-owners were generally credited with kind treatment of slaves although they punished severely any intimacy between whites and Negroes. Americans were struck by the sight of French-speaking slaves and occasionally dismayed by the propensity of these slaves for public disturbances.⁵⁰ Finally, there existed the numerous class of minor creole officials, particularly lawyers like Judge Bernard Pratte, St. James Bovais, and M. P. Leduc, whose names recur frequently in the contemporary press.

However indifferent the creole intellectuals might be in religious matters, other French classes retained their orthodoxy along traditional lines, although, as visitors observed who were familiar with Canada, the Church discipline was far more relaxed than in that country, being particularly weak before the

⁴⁷ Mary Louise Dalton, "Notes on the Genealogy of the Vallé Family," *Missouri Historical Society Collections*, II (1906), No. 7, 63.

⁴⁸ *Louisiana Gazette*, April 26, 1810.

⁴⁹ *Missouri Gazette*, April 26, 1807, February 15 and 22, 1809, January 18, 1810, September 12, 1812.

⁵⁰ When news came of the slave insurrection of 1811 near New Orleans, the slaveholders of St. Louis were able to enact a stringent slave police ordinance, regulating social relations between free Negroes and slaves, circumscribing slave gatherings, and severely punishing infractions of discipline by a prescribed number of lashes for each offense. *Ibid.*, March 14 and April 11, 1811.

epochal work of Bishop Du Bourg in 1818. Brackenridge wrote in 1811:

They are Catholics, but far from being bigoted or superstitious, as some travellers have said. They have been more justly charged with being difficult to please in their priests. They were generally strict observers of the rules and discipline of their Church, and of all the different holy days in the calendar. Their fetes were considered as the most interesting occasions. . . . Of late this attention to the ceremonies of their religion is much relaxed.⁵¹

Under the Spanish government, priests were supported by the king and no tithes levied. This policy showed its weakness, when, with the coming of American rule, the priests were transferred elsewhere save for the popular Father James Maxwell of Ste. Genevieve, an Irishman, who was left with the Herculean task of ministering to the spiritual needs of a widely scattered French flock. It had been the practice of the Spanish governor of Louisiana, Don Alexandro O'Reilly, to send over Irish soldiers and civilians as pioneers to the province; hence Irish priests, preferably those educated in Spanish studies at the University of Salamanca, were sent along with these. Besides, there was the hope of converting Protestant-American immigrants through the aid of English-speaking priests.⁵²

By an arrangement made in 1814, the French of St. Louis secured the services of Father Francis Savine of Cahokia every third Sunday until 1817. Father Savine's enthusiasm for the American cause was noted in the press when in March 1815 he celebrated a solemn Mass and *Te Deum* which was followed by a patriotic discourse on the victory of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans.⁵³ Curiously enough, the first formal application for a resident priest in St. Louis was made by Auguste Chouteau, Charles Gratiot, Gregoire Sarpy, and Bernard Pratte, all of whom were possessors of numerous volumes by French free-thinkers.

Prior to the American period, St. Louis had been under the spiritual ministrations of Don Pierre Joseph Didier, a Benedictine of the Congregation of St. Maur, who had fled Paris during the Terror because his support of the royal cause at the Abbey Church of St. Denis had brought down upon him the hatred of the radicals. His church burnt, he had first accompanied a group

⁵¹ *Louisiana Gazette*, April 4, 1811; also in Brackenridge, *Views*, 135.

⁵² John Rothensteiner, *History of the Archdiocese of St. Louis*, St. Louis, 1928, I, 198-200.

⁵³ *Missouri Gazette and Illinois Advertiser*, March 4, 1815.

of French Catholics to Gallipolis, Ohio; then upon the failure of this colony and its partial dispersion to New Madrid, New Bourbon, and St. Louis, he established himself in the latter town. Here he built a Calvary—a large crucifix erected upon a square stone platform set on the highest point of St. Louis where the devout could readily seek its comfort. Father Didier's Benedictine garden, which grew medicinal herbs as well as flowers of fragrance, added its beauty to the French settlement.⁵⁴ The brief ministry of Father Pierre Janin, a secular priest, had followed Father Didier's death in 1799, but as the American era began with the withdrawal of the Missouri priesthood, the existing church building fell into disrepair. Bishop Flaget wittily remarked in 1818, "The old Church, indeed, resembled the first Christian temple, the stable of Bethlehem."⁵⁵

Under the Spanish regime, despite official regulations aimed against Protestant penetration, tolerance had been the rule and many non-Catholic American families made special arrangements with the local priest for his services.⁵⁶ Other Protestants received ministrations from itinerant preachers and camp meetings, but each family was thrown largely upon its own resources until after 1814 when regular Protestant services began to replace the more informal worship.⁵⁷ One amusing incident illustrates the occasional friction which developed between the leaders of the various sects. Father Joseph Dunand, a Trappist, arrived in St. Louis in 1808 to find a criminal, nominally Catholic, about to be hanged and surrounded by six Protestant ministers (the number appears extraordinary for St. Louis of that day). Learning that the prisoner had never been baptized but desired the rite, the priest then began a heated argument with the ministers lasting some four hours in an effort to convince the latter that baptism was necessary in this case; finally finding arguments unavailing, Father Dunand, who had once served as a French grenadier, obtained the water and forcibly applied the baptismal rite over the protests of the ministers.⁵⁸ Sometimes,

⁵⁴ Rothensteiner, 210-213.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 270.

⁵⁶ Christian Schultz, *Travels on an Inland Voyage*, 40.

⁵⁷ *Louisiana Gazette*, April 4, 1811.

⁵⁸ Rothensteiner, 218. The Rev. Timothy Flint, a Protestant minister, deplored the indifference and peculiarities of his French congregation, "The French people generally came to the place of worship arrayed in their ball dresses and went directly from worship to the ball. A billiard room was near, and parts of my audience sometimes came in for a moment and after listening to a few sentences, returned to their billiards." Timothy Flint, *Recollections of the Last Ten Years*, Boston, 1826, 274.

the traditional French-Catholic mode of Sabbath observance shocked Protestants who observed that the French would attend Mass on Sundays devoutly but immediately thereafter gather for all sorts of entertainment and conviviality, playing billiards, dancing, and enjoying parties. Stoddard, describing the French attitude, wrote,

They are of the opinion that a sullen countenance, an attention to gloomy subjects, a set form of speech, and a stiff behavior, are much more indicative of hypocrisy than of religion; and they have often remarked that those who practice these singularities on Sundays will most assuredly cheat and defraud their neighbors during the rest of the week. Such are the religious sentiments of a people void of superstition; of a people prone to hospitality, urbanity of manners, and innocent recreation.⁵⁹

Agnostics and atheists of both groups, French and American, sometimes struck hands as self-styled "nullifidians," with the assumption that religion was only fit for women and illiterates. Visiting churchmen deplored the decline in popular morals which existed during the first decade of American rule.⁶⁰ Father de Andreis, visiting St. Louis in 1818, commented pessimistically:

The chief part of the population is French (creole as they call it) and consequently Catholic but without any religious culture on account of the long period which the place has been destitute of clergyman and of every means of instruction. One of the most respectable citizens said to me, 'If Bishop Du Bourg had not come in time to our relief, the last spark of faith would have extinguished in our country.'⁶¹

With the coming of Bishop William Du Bourg to St. Louis in 1818 a revival of Catholic religious life took place in Missouri. Elaborate religious pageants marked the ecclesiastical establishment in St. Louis and Ste. Genevieve. On March 29, 1818, after three months of the improvised "Cathedral," a decaying log building of 1776, a new edifice was established at St. Louis.⁶²

Among the striking religious influences in Missouri was a colony of Trappist monks who had been dispersed by the French Revolution. Desiring to convert the Indians, they had come to Kentucky, then moved on to Florissant on the Missouri side of the Mississippi during the early territorial period after success-

⁵⁹ Stoddard, *Sketches*, 316.

⁶⁰ Rothensteiner, 221; *Memoir of John Mason Peck*, 87-88.

⁶¹ Rothensteiner, 268.

⁶² *Missouri Gazette*, March 27, 1818.

fully petitioning Congress for preemption rights to several thousand acres near their original property of four hundred acres. Subsequent movements brought them to the opposite bank. Under the leadership of Father Urbain Guillet, the routine of the old Monastery of La Trappe was duplicated and a regime of industrial crafts and agriculture was instituted with its rule of silence which attracted the curious gaze of the traveler. Asylum was offered to the poor, the orphan, the cripple, and the blind.⁶³ Father Guillet advertised the colony's products in the *Missouri Gazette*, seeking to exchange the products of his shops such as watches, clocks, and other silversmith work for clothes and food.⁶⁴

Education, even more than religion, revealed the profound cultural gulf between the wealthy creole and the more humble *habitant*. Sons and relatives of the well-to-do, such as Silvestre Labbadie, nephew of Auguste Chouteau and Charles Gratiot, attended colleges in Paris or Montreal; some attended the Catholic college at Bardstown, Kentucky.⁶⁵ The large private libraries of St. Louis clearly indicated the versatile intellectual interests of these creoles; their cultural ties with France were further evidenced, as already noted, by the purity of their French pronunciation.

Against this brilliant background, the story of mass illiteracy prior to 1809 is rather drab. Stoddard observed that the native French were "extremely deficient in education; multitudes of them cannot either read or write their names."⁶⁶ This judgment is confirmed, not only from other contemporary accounts, but also from the pages of public notices in the *Missouri Gazette*; many documents are attested only by the individual's mark, rather than his name. Since these advertisements were offered either by village community representatives or by men of some moderate means at least, they justify the inference that illiteracy was widespread. St. Louis and Ste. Genevieve were among the first to maintain private schools, but at best these arrangements were sporadic and unsatisfactory.

In January 1809, St. Louis was enriched by the colorful personality of Christoph Friederich Schewe, who described himself

⁶³ Cf. G. J. Garraghan, *Chapters in Frontier History*, Milwaukee, 1934, 94-135, for an excellent study of these Trappists.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, January 16, 1811.

⁶⁵ McDermott, *Private Libraries in Creole St. Louis*, 14. McDermott contends that at least one-half of the adult whites were sufficiently literate to write their names.

⁶⁶ Stoddard, *Sketches*, 309.

as "formerly Professor in the Lycée Academy at Paris, lately Minister of the Gospel at Pittsburg" and announced the opening of a French and English grammar school with an optional offering of arithmetic, geography, geometry, drawing, and other subjects if requested.⁶⁷ Schewe taught both at his home and in the homes of his pupils, day and evenings, but despite his energies and abilities, the response was so slight that his advertisements soon combined the virtues of education and the sale of saltfish, beer, soap, candles, and other petty wares.⁶⁸ He had formerly been a pastor of a Dutch Lutheran Church and while in Pittsburg, his pupils in German had included the talented Henry M. Brackenridge, lawyer and author.⁶⁹

During 1812, a variety of educational enterprises budded forth in St. Louis for the customary brief period. A "Young Ladies Academy" offering reading, writing, French grammar, arithmetic, and geography with supplementary work in sewing and embroidering, was established at the home of the Sanguinets by a certain widow Pescay.⁷⁰ A similar enterprise for both sexes was begun by S. Septlivres and George Tompkins in August 1812; by June 10, 1814, an indignant note regarding public indifference to education appeared over the name of Tompkins, stating that he "declined keeping school any longer."⁷¹ Visiting Americans occasionally opened private schools, such as the Potosi Academy at Mine a Burton in Washington county which included French in the curriculum.⁷² More tangible results than these in the education of the French *habitants* came from the academy established by Bishop Du Bourg in St. Louis during 1818; Latin, English, French, arithmetic, geography, and other branches were taught by a faculty of clergy.⁷³ By 1821 St. Louis College had emerged as a result of the bishop's efforts, with a curriculum considerably in advance of the average frontier college and destined to future importance as St. Louis University.⁷⁴

The progress of the fine arts, although meager, was not totally neglected by the French of St. Louis. Madame Perdreau-

⁶⁷ *Missouri Gazette*, January 11 and February 1, 1809, January 4, 1810, November 27, 1813. For a graphic picture of Schewe, "that singular oddity," see Henry M. Brackenridge, *Recollections of Persons*, 230 *et passim*.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 265.

⁶⁹ For more details on education see John F. McDermott, "Private Schools in St. Louis, 1809-1821," *MID-AMERICA*, XXII (April 1940), 96-119.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁷¹ *Missouri Gazette*, June 6, October 24, 1812; June 18, 1814.

⁷² *Ibid.*, April 27, 1816.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, October 23, 1818.

⁷⁴ Rothensteiner, 259; McDermott, "Private Schools," 117.

ville opened an academy for young ladies in September 1818 which offered lessons in vocal and instrumental music; a M. Durocher supplemented these subjects with private lessons in dancing, evidently of a classical variety.⁷⁵ A certain Deneaumoulin opened an academy of architecture at the home of M. Chenie with private lessons in drawing to those who could not attend the academy.⁷⁶ Another teacher, Pierre St. Martin, taught the waltz during 1809 in St. Louis, where its popularity evoked Anglo-Saxon condemnation in the press; besides lessons in the waltz, instruction was offered in the art of fencing.⁷⁷

Considering the grave problem of French illiteracy, it is scarcely surprising that all well-meant efforts to foster a French-language newspaper failed completely. When the publisher, Joseph Charless, set up his *Missouri Gazette* in St. Louis during 1808, he thought it necessary to offer three columns of the paper for the publication of all local and foreign news in French.⁷⁸ This proposal was never realized, except for the frequent bilingual advertisements and no serious protest seems to have resulted. In November 1809 a French notice appeared in the *Gazette*, regarding a forthcoming weekly to be called *Mouche du Ouest*, devoted to foreign and domestic news. Although the paper was to be issued as soon as one hundred annual subscriptions at three dollars each were obtained, surely a modest goal, nothing further was heard of it.⁷⁹ A similar prospectus in March 1810 of a French weekly to be published at St. Louis as *Gazette de la Louisiane* proved abortive.⁸⁰ The Jeffersonian politics of the *Missouri Gazette* fortunately put no great strain upon the loyalties of the French *habitants* and the paper, despite its predominantly English content, served the journalistic requirements of the territory particularly since the process of assimilation fostered a common tongue.

The social contrast between Frenchman and American attracted the attention of most visitors to the territory. Stoddard thought that "of all the people on the globe the French in Louisiana appear to be the happiest; . . . their minds are passive, ex-

⁷⁵ *Missouri Gazette*, September 25, 1818.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, November 6, 1818.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, September 20, 1809.

⁷⁸ Prospectus of the *Missouri Gazette*, C. July 1808.

⁷⁹ *Missouri Gazette*, November 30, 1809. *Mouche du Ouest* was advertised as a journal "dans la quelle on donnera connaissance des nouvelles politiques domestiques et etrangeres les plus interessante; ou le sentiment general de chaque citoyen sera recu lors quilz ne blessera ny l'honneur ny le devoir."

⁸⁰ *Louisiana Gazette*, March 29, 1810.

cept when roused by insult or imposition."⁸¹ He believed that indolence was a characteristic of these people, but that they were nevertheless, punctual in the performance of contracts and honest in their dealings.

While the English Americans are hard at labor and sweat under the burning rays of a meridian sun, they will be seated in their homes or under some cooling shade, amusing themselves with their pipes and tobacco, in drinking of coffee, and in repeating the incidents of their several perambulations over distant lakes and mountains.⁸²

Bates noted an intermediate class of *habitants*, whose social proclivities disposed them rather to "starve in town than live in the country."

They satisfy themselves with the externals of parade, unconscious of the approaches of Poverty, until that hideous Fiend with the appearance and brutality of a constable, finds an entrance at the back door and drives them into the streets.⁸³

Brackenridge saw in the French of the Mississippi a people whose original European traits had been modified by the new environment and who lacked the "restlessness, impatience, and fire" of the European:

There is even in their deportment something of the gravity of the Spaniard; yet extremely fond of every kind of gaiety and amusement. From the gentle and easy life which they led, their manners and even language, have become soft and mild; the work *paisible* expresses this characteristic.⁸⁴

He admired their hospitality which made taverns superfluous, an American innovation; their simplicity made the elaborate safeguards of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence seem misplaced and the measured tempo of their daily lives offered a sharp contrast to the ambitious life of the English-speaking groups. There was the static pre-capitalist ideal adrift in an ocean of dynamic capitalistic enterprise.

Few travelers failed to note the eternal dancing, balls, carnivals, fête days, and games which occupied the French settlements. Schultz wrote, "The balls are generally opened at candle-

⁸¹ Stoddard, *Sketches*, 310.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 310.

⁸³ Frederick Bates to Richard Bates, December 17, 1807, *loc. cit.*, 241. This judgment is tempered by the comment, "Notwithstanding the propensity to ostentation in some of the Old Inhabitants, I do by no means think that they are prodigal or profuse. On the contrary, they are rigid economists and some of them even narrow minded and niggardly." *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ *Louisiana Gazette*, April 4, 1811.

light and continue till ten or twelve o'clock the next day."⁸⁵ Another visitor, John F. Darby, remarked, "They [the French] believed in enjoying life. There was a fiddle in every house, and a dance somewhere every night. They were honest, hospitable, confiding, and generous."⁸⁶ *Cotillon* parties were sponsored by dancing academies whose managers were of the Gratiots, Guiberts, and other old families.⁸⁷ The colorful carnival season brought an orgy of *cotillons*, reels, and occasional minuets, with balls following each other in rapid succession; special balls were arranged for children; ceremonies, presided over by the annual carnival kings and queens, afforded the more well-to-do classes an opportunity to parade silk gloves and stockings, bracelets, and earrings.⁸⁸ "I never saw anywhere," declared Brackenridge in 1811, "greater elegance of dress than I have at a ball in St. Louis."⁸⁹ The French ladies received the admiring glances of visitors for their "beauty, modesty, and agreeable manners, as well as for their taste and the splendour of their dress."⁹⁰ Bates admired the "inimitable grace" with which the ladies danced but thought this to be "too much in the style of actresses." Thomas Ashe, a British visitor of 1806, described the summer gaiety of Ste. Genevieve,

Nearly every house had its group, and every group its guitar, fidler, story-teller, or singer. As the evening advanced and the heat diminished, walking commenced, and towards midnight the music of the village united, the little world crowded to the spot and danced with infinite gaiety and mirth till past one in the morning. The Waltz had most votaries; the *Pas de deux* next; and the Fandango was the favorite of the few remaining Spaniards of the village.⁹¹

Ashe heard the sound of vespers arising from the Catholic Church at Ste. Genevieve, long before he entered the town; as he arrived, the women were still at work while the men played music, sang, or told stories. But there evidently was not lacking a prosaic side to this joyful temperament. John James Audubon, famous ornithologist, became a partner with Ferdinand Rozier in a mercantile business of Ste. Genevieve during 1812. With an irrepressible penchant for the naturalist's life, he soon converted his home into a museum. Once when he displayed a drawing of a

⁸⁵ Schultz, *Travels*, II, 60.

⁸⁶ Darby, *Personal Recollections*, 12.

⁸⁷ *St. Louis Enquirer*, February 10, 1821, *et passim*.

⁸⁸ Schultz, II, 60-61.

⁸⁹ *Louisiana Gazette*, April 11, 1811.

⁹⁰ Schultz, II, 41.

⁹¹ Thomas Ashe, *Travels in America*, London, 1808, 289.

bird to an old creole, the latter retorted that "he had better be behind the counter attending to his business instead of running around like a crazy man."⁹² Audubon seems to have disliked his neighbors of Ste. Genevieve; he soon sold his business and left for the East.

The French Sabbath was indeed peculiar in Protestant eyes. Slaves drove horses and carts and general activity belied the notion of a day of rest. The billiard rooms were crowded and the card tables were filled as the day was converted into one of amusement. One of the most popular card games was *Vingt-un*. Schultz, visiting Ste. Genevieve, described the common preoccupation with it,

I have frequently known them [the French] to sit thirty hours at the same table without any other refreshment than a dish of miserable coffee, or a glass or two of sour claret; and I recalled one instance of an infatuated young man who could ill afford it, having lost eleven hundred dollars at one sitting.⁹³

Christmas and New Year's Day evoked new pageantry. Christmas Eve in St. Louis during the early territorial period meant a midnight Mass in the crowded old log church, with Father Savine officiating before an illuminated altar amidst a dramatic silence, broken only by the solemn music of the Gregorian chant or the voice of the priest. Thereafter followed *le Reveillon*, an ample breakfast which became a joyful reunion for each family; the remainder of Christmas day was given over to religious services and at night a family dance took place.⁹⁴ On New Year's Eve, young men in grotesque costumes sang *la Guignolée*, a burlesque tune, beneath the windows of the townspeople; this singing was accompanied by a basket collection of provisions intended for the community feast of Epiphany. The following day was consumed by visits in which traditional observances gave the social reunions considerable color.⁹⁵

Family solidarity revealed itself in the composition of the various gatherings, sometimes including everyone from the great-grandfather to the youngest child. This contrasted sharply with the individualistic groups of Americans who segregated the

⁹² Mrs. Charles P. Johnson in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, February 4, 1912, quoted in the *Missouri Historical Review*, XXXI (1936-1937), 478-479.

⁹³ Schultz, II, 61.

⁹⁴ *St. Louis Weekly Reveille*, January 1, 1849, quoted in *Glimpses of the Past*, Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, 1933, I, No. 1, 1-3.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 3-4; see the description of the festival of St. John the Baptist in the *Missouri Gazette*, June 21, 1809.

sexes sharply, presumably to protect the women from conversation that might become bawdy.⁹⁶ Towards the end of the territorial period, the social life of both groups tended to find a common denominator as Americans and French in equal number attended the same dancing assemblies.⁹⁷ Now came the day of "Old Dan Tucker," "Zip Coon," "Sailor's Hornpipe," and other American favorites.⁹⁸ Strangely enough, despite the Gallic propensity for merrymaking, the theatre had to await the Anglo-Saxon influence before it was established in Missouri.⁹⁹

Assimilation steadily took its toll of the unique French culture of Missouri. French geographic names became corrupted and in many instances were replaced by English names. Bois Brûle in the mouth of a frontiersman became Bob Rowley; Cape Cinque Hommes was Combs; Ste. Genevieve was transformed to Send Jimaway; and Vide Poche became Wheat Bush.¹⁰⁰ Even well-educated local historians like Humphrey Marshall and government surveyors contributed to the debasement of French terms.¹⁰¹ French speech continued to prevail upon the streets of St. Louis in 1821 but it was fighting a losing battle with English.¹⁰² The dress of the *anciens habitants* altered steadily as *capots*, moccasins, and headkerchiefs became an increasingly rare phenomenon. Politicians still appealed to the voter on the ground that they possessed a speaking knowledge of French, but French names on the lists of candidates became fewer.¹⁰³ Segregation between groups, because of language differences, now gave way to a new compound Americanism. Sometimes emigrants from Napoleonic France found their way to Missouri; but the powerful American stream almost buried the cultural identity of the newcomers.¹⁰⁴ The old French buildings, with an occasional

⁹⁶ Caleb Atwater, *Writings of Caleb Atwater*, Columbus, Ohio, 1833, 218-219.

⁹⁷ William G. B. Carson, "The Beginnings of the Theatre in St. Louis," *Missouri Historical Society Collections*, V, (1927-1928), 136.

⁹⁸ Monas N. Squires, "Merry-making in Missouri in the Old Days," *Missouri Historical Review*, XXVIII (1933-1934), 95.

⁹⁹ Noah M. Ludlow, *Dramatic Life as I Found It*, St. Louis, 1880, 180; Carson attributes the lack of a theatre to the influence of the "ascetic Gallican fathers," i. e., the attitude of such churchmen as Bishop Du Bourg, Carson, *loc. cit.*, 137.

¹⁰⁰ *Louisiana Gazette*, February 14, 1811.

¹⁰¹ *Missouri Gazette*, June 28, 1817.

¹⁰² Darby, *loc. cit.*, 5.

¹⁰³ *Missouri Gazette and Illinois Advertiser*, December 17, 1814; St. Louis *Enquirer*, August 2, 1820.

¹⁰⁴ *Missouri Gazette*, March 22, 1817, October 30, 1818, September 13, 1809. In 1818 came Gabriel Paul of Santo Domingo, architect, who designed the St. Louis cathedral. John A. Bryan, "Outstanding Architects in St. Louis Between 1804 and 1904," *Missouri Historical Review*, XXVII (1933-1934), 83.

Spanish structure, continued to shed the departed glory of another regime upon the Missouri frontier, but the new cities took on the dynamic aspect of Anglo-American civilization.

HARVEY WISH

De Paul University

The End of a Jesuit Library

Although the present paper touches upon a large subject, the suppression of the Jesuits in France, its scope is narrowed down to only one detail of the suppression: the fate of the library which the Jesuits had built up through two hundred years in their Paris College of Clermont. In fact, this paper is nothing more than a modest amplification of a footnote to an earlier brief account of that famous library.¹ The footnote summarily stated that the library of the College of Clermont² was taken from the Jesuits in 1762 and was put up for sale at public auction two years later. That bald statement tells the essential fact. But it also raises a number of obvious questions. Why was the library taken from the Jesuits? Under what circumstances was it sold? What became of the books and manuscripts? What were the proceeds of the sale, and who got the money? It is that sort of question which the present paper will try to answer.

1. THE BACKGROUND OF THE SALE

Back of the suppression of the Jesuits in France is a tangled skein of causes: echoes of the century-old Jansenist quarrel, which had thundered so loudly under Louis XIV, and which still rumbled with an impression of latent power; the persistent contentions of the various *Parlements*³ with the intelligent, but weak and uncertain Louis XV; the hostility of Louis XV's mistress, the Marquise de Pompadour, and her partyman, the Duc de Choiseul; some clerical rivalries and factions; envy of the success of the Jesuits, whose colleges had eclipsed the University of Paris; and the not inconsiderable blunders of the Jesuits themselves.

The rank and file of the Jesuits, of whom there were some 4,000 in France at the time of the suppression, plodded away at their teaching and preaching and academic writings, at best only

¹ W. Kane, "Jean Garnier, Librarian," MID-AMERICA, XXII (April 1940), 82.

² This had been named Collège Louis-le-Grand since 1683. In contemporary use, the word was Collège; after 1830 or so, it is written Collège.

³ The *Parlements*, of which there were thirteen in France, were not Parliaments, but courts of registry and appeal, not legislative bodies, not democratic, not even representative. The *Parlement* of Paris, numbering over two hundred members, was both jealous of the royal authority and strongly Jansenist in its sympathies. Since it had jurisdiction over a third of France, it had great influence over the other *Parlements*. For a popular account of its opposition to Louis XV, see Pierre Gaxotte, *Louis XV and His Times*, translated by J. Lewis May, Philadelphia, 1934.

vaguely aware of the extent of the intrigues that surrounded them. One may doubt that so many as two per cent of the French Jesuits had any active part in, or even intimate knowledge of, the attacks and counter-attacks which made up so large a part of Jesuit history in the eighteenth century. There was storm in the air about them, soon to burst in a destroying fury; they sensed that fact; but they did not know from how many caves of the winds the storm was gathering.

Fortunately, we do not here have to go deeply into the history of the suppression of the Jesuits, a history which has not yet been adequately written, or attempt to trace out the multitudinous causes which led up to the suppression. For our purpose, it will serve to lay hold upon one chain of incidents, centering around the legal action begun against the Jesuits late in 1759. But we must keep present, in the back of our minds, the fact that the legal action was at least as much a pretext as a cause, and that its effectiveness was built upon the whole complication of causes.

The civil suits against the Jesuits of France grew out of debts incurred by Father Antoine Lavalette, the superior and procurator of the Jesuit Mission of Martinique in the West Indies.⁴ Lavalette, who had entered the Society of Jesus in France at the age of seventeen, was sent to Martinique in 1742, when he was thirty-four years old. Five years later, he was appointed procurator, or treasurer, of the mission. He found the mission materially in poor shape, struggling rather futilely with debts. He carried out some bold plans to improve its revenues, including the purchase of a large plantation in Santo Domingo. In the course of the next five years, 1747-1752, he made a good deal of money for the mission. The governor of Martinique, de Bompar, was his good friend; and the intendant, Hurson, defended him when he was accused of illegal trafficking. The provincial of the Jesuits, back in France, had him made superior of the mission as well as procurator.

During those first five years of Lavalette's operations, some of the Jesuit procurators in France had been acting as his agents. But as his bills of discount mounted up, the French procurators shrank from carrying them; and one of the procurators, Father de Sacy, suggested in 1752 that Lavalette open an account with

⁴ Camille de Rochemonteix, S. J., *Le Père Antoine Lavalette à la Martinique*, Paris, 1907, recounts faithfully and skillfully the facts about Father Lavalette, using contemporary documents. One may be grateful for his full presentation of facts, without accepting all of his interpretations of the facts.

Lioncy Frères et Gouffre, bankers of Marseilles. Talk of Lavalette's large-scale investments alarmed the Government, and the Minister of Marine, Comte Rouillé, called Lavalette back to France in 1753, to answer charges that he was contravening the laws. The Jesuit superiors in France, as well as the authorities in Martinique, came to his defense; and he was cleared and sent back to Martinique, still superior and procurator.

In 1756, the year after his return to Martinique, disasters began to pile up. Lioncy and Gouffre failed, and hence Lavalette's paper was suddenly called in. The opening of the Seven Years' War brought the capture of some of Lavalette's ships by the English, with a loss to him of 2,000,000 livres. The creditors of Lioncy and Gouffre, and another creditor of Lavalette's, the widow Grou, brought suit, not against the far-off Lavalette, but against the Jesuits in France: the Lioncy suit for 1,500,000 livres, the widow Grou's for 3,000 livres. On January 30, 1760, the Consular Court of Paris gave judgment in favor of the Grou claim; and four months later a similar lower court of Marseilles granted the Lioncy claim.

The Jesuits protested against these decisions of the lower courts; and the manner of their protest was their greatest blunder at that perilous time. They took refuge in technical legal denials of responsibility, apparently unaware, or refusing to acknowledge, that no technical defense would avail against their real enemies. They displayed a slightly panicky resentment against Lavalette, court-martialed him, deposed him from his twofold office on November 8, 1761, and suspended him *a divinis* five months later.⁵ They had the right to appeal to the King and the Royal Council; but they chose instead to make their plea to the King's opponents, the *Parlements* of Paris and Marseilles.

By that appeal the French Jesuits put their necks in the noose. They had disclaimed accountability for the debts of the Mission of Martinique on the ground that their Institute made each Jesuit house or mission an independent fiscal unit. That ground of disclaimer gave the Paris *Parlement* an opening which it welcomed, to demand that the Jesuit Constitutions and other

⁵ Lavalette submitted so humbly to the sentences imposed on him that the Visitor empowered by the General to deal with him, Father Jean de la Marche, recommended clemency. Lavalette was sent to Amsterdam, where he was dismissed from the Society by the General, Lorenzo Ricci. De la Marche agreed to pay him a pension of 1,000 livres a year; but as the property of the mission was sequestered by the Government in 1763, the pension could not be paid. Lavalette, after two years at Amsterdam, went to live in Toulouse, where he died, December 13, 1767. Rochemonteix, 263-275.

writings be brought into court for official examination. From then on it was a field day for the *Parlement*.

On May 8, 1761, about a year after the Jesuits had lodged their appeal, the Paris *Parlement* decided that the General and the whole Society of Jesus were responsible for Lavalette's debts, which amounted to some 4,500,000 livres, and ordered them to pay up within a year. If they did not pay, their creditors could distrain upon the possessions of the Jesuits in France, which were estimated as then worth about 58,000,000 livres.⁶ Louis XV intervened on August 2, 1761, and ordered the sentence suspended for six months to allow of further examination. But the *Parlement* ignored his order; and he was too weak to enforce it.

The General of the Jesuits, Father Ricci, appointed Father Henri Griffet as his financial agent in France, and Father Griffet, who did not want the job, passed it on to Father Pierre Gatin, the procurator of the Mission of Martinique. By January 12, 1762, Father Gatin had raised 502,000 livres from the five provincial procurators in France. He borrowed another 860,000 livres in England. But his further efforts were halted by the *Parlement*, which in reality did not want the debts paid; what it wanted was to destroy the Jesuits.

By a decree of April 23, 1762, the *Parlement* of Paris sequestered all the property of the Jesuits, movable and immovable. It had already closed, three weeks before, all the Jesuit colleges; now it took them over entirely. Out of the sequestered properties, a pension of a livre a day was offered by a decree of August 6, 1762, to the priests (not the scholastics) who would take the Gallican oath.⁷ There remained then, at the most, only a few technicalities to be carried out before the destruction of the Jesuits in France would be complete.

2. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE SALE

On the face of it, the course of the Paris *Parlement* against the Jesuits was coldly legal, no matter how much sneering malevolence crept into the legal terminology. The Jesuits had got into debt, and the *Parlement* was judicially seeing to it that the debts were paid out of the property of the Jesuits. That was

⁶ J. Crétineau-Joly, *Histoire Religieuse Politique et Littéraire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Paris, 1846, V, 218, n. 1. He had set Lavalette's debts down as 2,400,000 *livres tournois*; but Rochemonteix, 214, indicates that they were 4,500,000 livres.

⁷ Crétineau-Joly, V, 218, n. 2, is bitter about the inadequacy of this pension of 365 livres a year. But on his own showing, the Jesuits had previously been spending only 300 livres a year for each man. In any case, the pension was soon discontinued.

the core of the legal contention put forward in the *Arrêt* of April 23, 1762: the efforts of the *Parlement* to safeguard the interests of the Jesuit creditors.⁸

Now the property of the Jesuits, even at Créteineau-Joly's conservative estimate, was worth some thirteen times as much as Lavalette's debts. That fact made it extremely difficult for the *Parlement* to keep up the pretense of justice. In plain language, the pickings were too rich, the opportunities for wholesale jobbing were too many. Nevertheless, the show of legality had to be maintained: a task made somewhat easier by the fact that the machinery of the law was useful for piling up "costs of court."⁹

We cannot here go into all the interesting shifts the *Parlement* was put to by the need of keeping up legal appearances. Take one instance as a sample, an instance which is closely connected with the sale of the library. By an *Arrêt* of August 30, 1763, confirmed by the King on November 21, 1763, four years after the suits against Lavalette were first begun, the *Parlement* of Paris turned over the buildings of the Collège Louis-le-Grand to the University of Paris, then only a tottering skeleton of the great mediaeval University. The University really was scarcely functioning as such at that time, and was in no position to make much use of the buildings. Hence the *Parlement* soon found it advisable to leave the University in little more than nominal possession, whilst keeping the use of the buildings for a new College, still under the old name,¹⁰ but with a new administrative staff. It was hoped that into this new College might be gathered the bursars of some of the rival small colleges of Paris (there were about thirty of them), who would be given scholarships out of the "immense wealth" of the Jesuits.

One cannot help asking: what had all this to do with paying the Jesuit creditors? It was obvious that the University of Paris

⁸ The collected decrees of the Paris *Parlement* dealing with the Jesuits from 1760 to the expulsion were published in nine quarto volumes, in Paris, 1766. One of the printed copies of the decree we are here concerned with, of April 23, 1762, is in the Howard Memorial Library, New Orleans.

⁹ A very pretty instance occurred in the sale of the library of the Jesuit house of noviceship in Paris. The books were sold, without an inventory or catalogue of sale, for 10,000 livres, and the "costs" came to 15,000 livres; A. Geoffroy, *Archives des Missions Scientifiques et Littéraires*, Paris, 1856, V, 383, quoting the *Journal* of Johann Heinrich Liden (1741-1793), the Swedish literateur, who had visited Paris and talked with Father Gabriel Brotier, the last Jesuit librarian of the College, in 1769.

¹⁰ The buildings of the Collège Louis-le-Grand were made national property in 1790, and the College was successively named *Collège Egalité*, *Prytanée Français*, and *Lycée Impérial*, until, after Waterloo, it became again the Collège Louis-le-Grand; G. Dupont-Ferrier, *Du Collège de Clermont au Lycée Louis-le-Grand, 1563-1920*, Paris, 1921.

and the new administration of the Collège Louis-le-Grand had no connection whatever with Lavalette's debts; but it was equally obvious that both were friends of the *Parlement* and were hungry for money. In fact, even in the *Arrêt* itself, of April 23, 1762, the *Parlement*, with all its virtuous talk of the interests of the Jesuit creditors, had let slip that it was looking for money to pay the new administration of the College.

The next step in the legal chicanery was clear enough. It was practically impossible to sell the buildings of the College; but it was easy to sell its library and collection of coins and curios. Hence it was that, a little more than three months after the decree confiscating the Jesuit property, another decree was issued ordering the sale of the library.

In the face of such thinly veiled robbery, the Jesuits unquestionably were not bound to be sticklers for the niceties of legal permission to dispose of their own property. In the beginning, they had foolishly entertained hopes built upon the supposed integrity of the *Parlement*. But after the decree of August 6, 1761, which ordered them to give up their religious garb, and to cease teaching in their colleges by April 1, 1762, they realized that they were doomed. During the nine months in which they were still left in possession of their property, they managed to sell some of their rare books to the Duc de la Vallière,¹¹ and the Comte de Lauraguais. But once the *Parlement* had taken over the College, such surreptitious sale of the books naturally came to an end.

In the *Arrêt* of August 6, 1762, which ordered the sale of the library, and in another decree of a month later, the *Parlement* had appointed commissioners to make an inventory and to arrange for a catalogue of sale. The chief commissioner was the Abbé Henri Philippe Chauvelin, a violent enemy of the Jesuits. His first act was to take over, seal, and cart away a number of "very important" manuscripts.¹² Then he assigned the task of

¹¹ The Duc de la Vallière (1708-1780) was a grandnephew of Louise de la Vallière, once the mistress of Louis XIV, who at thirty became a Carmelite nun and lived a holy life for thirty-six years more. He had built up one of the most famous libraries in France. After his death, the rarer books (their catalogue of sale filled three thick octavo volumes) were sold in 1783 for 464,677 livres, 8 sols. The much larger number of books remaining were sold first to M. de Paulmy, then by him to the Comte d'Artois, and finally became part of the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. *Biographie Générale*, XXIX, 991-992.

¹² Joseph Brucker, S. J., "Episode d'une Confiscation de Biens Congréganistes (1762), Les Manuscrits des Jésuites de Paris," *Études*, Paris, LXXXVIII (1901), 506-509. From the Professed House he took away a big box containing 19 bound volumes of MSS, and 156 bundles of MSS; from

inventory and cataloguing for the sale to two groups: for the books in the libraries of the College and the Professed House,¹³ the booksellers, Antoine Claude Saugrain and Laurent François Leclerc; for the manuscripts, the librarian of the Benedictines of St. Maur in the Abbey St. Germain-des-Prés, Dom Patert, who chose five other Benedictines to help him.¹⁴

The inventories and the cataloguing were both very sloppily done. As to the books, the combined libraries of the College (6,752 items) and of the Professed House (7,252 items) had shrunk immensely by the time they were offered for sale. The last Jesuit librarian of the College, Father Gabriel Brotier, told Liden in 1769 that the books listed in the catalogues of sale represented only a tenth of the actual contents of the two libraries.¹⁵ The manuscripts, after the depletion by the Abbé Chauvelin, were taken to the Abbey St. Germain-des-Prés, where 856 manuscripts of the College and 116 manuscripts of the Professed House were catalogued. A considerable number were not cata-

the College he took three smaller cartons, containing 17 bound volumes of MSS, and some loose pieces. Some of these were historical papers, others were title deeds, legal documents, "amongst which may be some that the creditors can find helpful." Although the president, Rolland, made a report of these MSS to the *Parlement* in 1768, the MSS remained in Chauvelin's possession until his death, January 14, 1770. Two days later, an *Arrêt* of the *Parlement* demanded the MSS. They afterwards became the property of the Bibliothèque Nationale, *Ibid.*, 509.

¹³ There were three libraries of the Jesuits in Paris, in the College, the Professed House, and the Novitiate. The looting of the Novitiate was in some ways the rawest performance of all. The library had a good collection of MSS, which had been given it by the Canons Regular of St. Victor. The Canons put in a claim for them, which was not allowed; they actually had to buy them back. It was this library which was sold for 5,000 livres less than the "costs" of the sale. A few years later, the building of the Novitiate became the headquarters of the Grand Lodge of Freemasons. *Ibid.*, 508, n. 1.

¹⁴ Of his own abbey, Dom Patert chose as helpers Dom Housseau and Dom Grenier. He also called in three Benedictines from the house curiously called *Blancs-Manteaux*, because it had once, before their suppression in 1298, been the monastery of the Servites who wore white habits. These three were Dom Ursin Durand, Dom Tassin, and Dom Clément. It was Dom Clément who finally drew up the catalogue, after the others had mulled over it for a month or so. *Ibid.*, 510. Brucker says (506, n. 1): "Malheureusement la célèbre congrégation de Saint-Maur était alors presque toute infectée de jansénisme."

On the *Blancs-Manteaux*, who were also of the Congregation of St. Maur, see P. Helyot, *Dictionnaire des Ordres Religieux*, Paris, 1847, I, 507-508, II, 432-440.

¹⁵ For Liden's report, see Geoffroy, *Archives des Missions, Scientifiques et Littéraires*, Paris, 1856, V, 384. Father Gabriel Brotier (1723-1789) left France for a time after the suppression of the Jesuits, but came back to Paris, where he lived with the bookseller, De la Tour, wrote and published scholarly works, was made a member of the Académie des Inscriptions in 1783, and died February 12, 1789. Besides some thirty published pieces, Brotier left a great deal of work in MS, which at one time was in the library of a later house of studies for the French Jesuits; C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, II, 206-217.

logged at all, yet were actually included in the sale; others remained at the Abbey.¹⁶ We shall look into the fate of these manuscripts later on.

The two catalogues were published, to be sold by Saugrain and Leclerc, early in 1764; and a third catalogue, with which we are not here concerned, was made of the coins and curios.¹⁷ With the catalogues of sale ready, and the date for opening the auction set for March 19, 1764, the administrators of the College thought they had a clear field before them. But before they could begin to touch the money, there were some obstacles in the way.

The first obstacle was the claim entered on July 29, 1763, by the Prince de Tingry, whose mother was the daughter of the de Harlay who had given his library to the College back in 1717; de Tingry claimed the books as the heir of de Harlay. The claim of the Canons Regular of St. Victor to the manuscripts they had given to the library of the Jesuit Novitiate had been refused; but the powerful de Tingry was heard graciously. On January 23, 1764, the *Parlement* decided that he could have any of the books and manuscripts which he could identify; and since the gifts of de Harlay had been shelved with the rest of the library, and could not be distinguished without a great deal of labor, the Prince de Tingry was to have in compensation for those books 25,000 livres from the proceeds of the sale of the library.¹⁸

¹⁶ Brucker, 511-513, goes into some detail regarding these MSS which did not appear in the catalogue of sale. In particular, he traces the MSS of the Jesuit, Pierre François Chifflet. Chauvelin says, in the *Procès-verbal*, which Father Brucker had thoroughly studied, that he had spent the whole of the first day of his inventory on these MSS of Chifflet's. They filled three big boxes; and there were 67 bundles of MSS in the first two boxes. They were sold with the rest of the MSS to Meermann, and were catalogued separately in the sale of Meermann's MSS in 1824, and in Valentin Rose's catalogue in Berlin. Most of the uncatalogued MSS were kept by the Benedictines, and after the Revolution (1793) were taken over by the Bibliothèque Nationale.

¹⁷ *Catalogue des Livres de la Bibliothèque des ci-devants soi-disant Jésuites du Collège de Clermont, Dont la Vente commencera le Lundi 19 Mars 1764*. A Paris au Palais, chez Saugrain, à la Bonne Foi Couronnée, Leclerc, à la Prudence, M.DCC.LXIV. Although this contained xviii+488 pages, it was no more than a check list of the books, under five main divisions: theology, jurisprudence, sciences and arts, literature, and history. *Catalogus Manuscriptorum Codicum Collegii Claromontani, Quem Excipit Catalogus MSSrum. Domus Professæ Parisiensis*. Parisiis in Palatio, apud Saugrain, etc. For the College MSS, this had xii+350 pages, and for the Professed House MSS 44 pages. The description of each MS is very summary, mentioning only its material (parchment or paper), its size, pagination, brief of contents when it contains a number of items, and author.

¹⁸ For the account of the Prince de Tingry's suit and judgment, see the *Mémoires Secrets* (supposedly written by Louis de Bachaumont), 6 vols., London, 1777, I, 258, II, 12. (The *Mémoires Secrets*, to which Pidansat de Mairabert and others added thirty volumes, were a collection of gossip, verse, news stories, etc., the equivalent of a modern newspaper.) Those

There was a little more pulling and hauling between the University and the new administration of the College, since these did not love each other very much, and were each jealously eager to get as large a share of the spoils as possible. But the *Parlement* settled that contention by allowing the Abbé Fourneau, the headmaster of the new administration, to choose what books he wanted by bidding them in at the sale.¹⁹ After these hitches were cleared up, there was an immediate bustle of preparation for the sale of the books, some of the details of which can be gathered from the final accounting made by the administrators of the College.²⁰

A classroom in the College, conveniently near the library, was selected as the place for the sale; a glazier, M. Bertin, was hired to repair the broken windows of the room; a carpenter, M. Monguin, built a few small tables to hold the books as they were offered for bidding; two men, Marque and Baudouin, pasted up 2,100 posters announcing the sale; a couple of carts and porters were hired to carry off the books written by Jesuits which the *Parlement* had condemned to be burned; an auctioneer was engaged to supervise the sales, at seven livres a day, and five assistants who were to get three deniers each for every volume sold; a crier, at 30 *sous* a day, to receive and announce the bids; a clerk, at another 30 *sous* a day, to keep the immediate records of the sales; and then the auction was ready to begin. The actual days of sale were 118, spread over a space of about seven months.

Using the commissions for sales, 15 deniers a volume, as a basis for calculation, the total payments to the five assistant auctioneers of 1,525 livres, 8 sols, 9 deniers, would indicate that there were 24,507 volumes actually sold. That indication, however, is not absolutely certain. Against it must be considered such facts as that the 29 periodicals, listed as items numbers 6517-

books that de Tingry got from the library, he promptly turned over to the University of Paris. A similar claim had been set up by M. de Charsigné, the heir of Daniel Huet (bishop of Avranches, and formerly tutor of Louis XIV) for the considerable library of books and manuscripts which he had given to the Professed House. This claim also was granted by the *Parlement*; and many of the items could be identified by Huet's book plates and other marks; Alfred Franklin, *Les Anciennes Bibliothèques de Paris*, Paris, 1867-1870, II, 260, n. 1. But Brucker, 513, n. 1, proves that five at least of the Huet MSS were sold with the 116 listed in the catalogue. A few of these MSS are in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, and Ste. Geneviève; the rest went later to the Bibliothèque Royale.

¹⁹ There is some uncertainty as to how much the Abbé Fourneau took from the library. The point will be touched upon later.

²⁰ This final accounting, which we shall also meet again, was printed by Franklin, *Anciennes Bibliothèques*, II, 263-265, from a MS in the National Archives.

6546 in the catalogue, alone represented 3,284 volumes, and that other items represented as many as thirty or forty volumes each. The suspicion arises that the periodicals may have been lumped in some way for the payment of the commissions. Hence it is not unlikely that the total number of volumes sold amounted to more than 24,507; but just what it was exactly, we have no way of knowing.

It had never been intended that the manuscript collections, both of the College and of the Professed House, should be included in the sale of the books. From start to finish, the handling of the manuscripts was very queer: not at all a mysterious fact, in view of their renown. In the Preface to the catalogue of the manuscripts prepared for the sale, it was announced that the manuscripts would be sold piece by piece at some date to be named later, "unless some one offered a lump sum to the Administrators of the Collège Louis-le-Grand before September 1, 1764." Father Brotier had tried to get the clergy of Paris to raise a fund for the purchase of all the Jesuit libraries in Paris, but with no success; they would not even make an offer for the manuscripts.²¹

Armand Jérôme Bignon, the King's not very competent librarian, offered 6,000 livres for his choice of 278 manuscripts,²² a sum shockingly small to the *Parlement*, which had dreams of the "Jesuit wealth."²³ A Dutch scholar, Gerard Meermann, made a flat offer of 15,000 livres for the entire 972 manuscripts, cash within thirty days. Father Brotier assured Liden that Meermann's offer did not equal one-fourth of the cost of materials and scribes' labor alone in producing the manuscripts. But the *Parlement* wanted money in a hurry, and it did not want too much looking into the whole business of the manuscripts; besides, it was happy in being able to thwart the King; it accepted Meermann's offer. Thus, the manuscripts went to Holland. We shall see later on what happened to them.

²¹ Brucker, 513, n. 5.

²² *Ibid.*, 514. Liden said of Bignon: "Plus brillant par ses titres et ses rubans que par son érudition"; Geoffroy, V, 383.

²³ In a copy of the *Catalogus Manuscriptorum*, in the Elizabeth M. Cudahy Library, Loyola University, Chicago, this marginal notation is written on the title page by the same hand that annotated the prices throughout the catalogue of books: "Ces MSS ont été vendus au roy 19000 #." The statement, of course, is incorrect. It was probably written whilst the offer of the King's librarian was vaguely rumored about and enlarged, especially as Meermann's offer was not closed with until December 6, 1764.

3. THE PROCEEDS OF THE SALE

The sources of information about the proceeds of the sale are chiefly these three: 1. *Recueil de toutes les délibérations prises par le bureau d'administration du Collège Louis-le-Grand*; 2. *Bref État pour compter de la Vente des Livres, Médailles et autres Curiosités du Collège Louis-le-Grand*, the final summary financial statement; and 3. a copy of the catalogue of the sale of the books, with the prices written in the margins opposite each item sold.²⁴ These three sources show considerable discrepancies, in spite of the fact that the first two are the work of the same group of administrators, headed by the Abbé Fourneau.

Consider first the gross proceeds of the sale as shown in the final accounting by the administrators.* This is given as amounting to 121,729 livres, 2 sols; of which 10,691 livres, 4 sols came from the sale of the coins and curios, and 111,037 livres, 18 sols from the sale of the books.²⁵ On the other hand, a careful addition of the detailed prices set down in the margins of the catalogue of the books yields only 91,588 livres, 14 sols. Even if we add to this sum the 15,000 livres which Meermann paid for the manuscripts, we still have only 106,588 livres, 14 sols, or 4,449 livres, 4 sols less than the sum which the administrators claim to have got for the books.

If we assume that the prices marked in the catalogue of sale are as carefully and exactly entered as they seem to be, there are two probable explanations of why the total proceeds set down by the administrators should differ so much for the total prices in the catalogue. The first explanation is just plain bad arithmetic on the part of the administrators. We shall see in a moment a striking instance of the bad arithmetic in the financial accounting itself. The second explanation, which gets its probability from what we know of the circumstances of the cataloguing and the sale, is that more books were sold than were listed in the sale catalogue.

²⁴ Alfred Franklin has used the first two documents, both in his earlier account, "Le Bibliothèque du Collège Louis-le-Grand," in Techener's *Bulletin du Bibliophile*, Paris, 1865, XXXI, 363-391, and in his later *Anciennes Bibliothèques*. In the latter, he calls attention to some of the manifest errors in arithmetic, but makes no attempt to explain the discrepancies. The marked copy of the catalogue is in the Elizabeth M. Cudahy Memorial Library, Loyola University, Chicago. Franklin, *Anciennes Bibliothèques*, II, 259, n. 4, says that there was another priced copy of the catalogue of books in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal.

* For the meaning of the monetary terms following, see the Note at the end of this article.

²⁵ The *Bref État* states definitely that this latter sum came from "la vente des livres" with no mention of the proceeds of the sale of the MSS; Franklin, *Anciennes Bibliothèques*, II, 263.

In any case, we still have only probabilities, not certainty, as to what really were the gross proceeds of the sale: something between 117,000 and 122,000 livres. We shall have to leave it at that. For the details of the sale, we obviously have to depend on the priced copy of the catalogue, which affords a good deal of information, both general and specific. But in a brief paper such as this, it is possible only to hint at the wealth of information which would be of interest to a bibliographer.

There are, for instance, suggestions as to the tastes of the bidders in the fact that the collection of books in history, which amounted to about two-thirds of the total number of items, brought in only some 46 per cent of the total proceeds; whilst the prices paid for books in the division of theology averaged just about twice the average prices paid for the books in history: 22 livres, 10 sols, against 11 livres, 12 sols.

Here we must recognize that the prices paid for old books are one of the major mysteries of economics. Not merely are such prices affected by the many and subtle influences which shape prices in general; they have also a host of their own special influences, of which the most powerful are the current enthusiasms of each particular period and place in our changing civilizations. Even in the few illustrations we have space for, we must keep that fact in mind.

Incunabula, for instance, were not so highly esteemed in eighteenth-century France as they are in twentieth-century America. Thus, even on the basis of ten livres equalling ten dollars, it is rather startling to a modern bookman to see a *Divina Comedia di Dante*, folio, with illustrations, published at Venice in 1491, sold for 10 livres (no. 2839 in catalogue), and still more startling to find a "*Claudii Ptolmaei Geographiae Libri VIII, Romae, 1482, in-fol., fig. enluminées*" going for 20 livres (no. 3082). When some bidder paid 150 livres for a Florentine 1494 edition of *Anthologia Graecorum Epigrammatum*, it brought this grumbling notation on the margin of the catalogue: "Belle impression et beau papier mais acheté le double de sa valeur" (no. 2579).

But in some of the commonly accepted rare books, the price paid was fairly high. The first book sold was a copy of Cardinal Ximenes' Polyglot Bible, 6 folio volumes, published at Alcalá, 1502-1517, which was sold for 619 livres. Dibdin says that the original price when the work was issued was 40 livres, that a copy was sold in England, in 1777, for £42, that "an exceedingly fine" copy was then (1827) on sale in England for £63, but that

a "very good" copy could be had for £36, 15s.²⁶ Brian Walton's Polyglot Bible, 6 volumes folio, London, 1657, together with the two volumes of Castell's *Lexicon Heptaglotton* (1669) sold for 302 livres; and a copy of the *Lexicon* alone sold for 34 livres. This compares with an original price of £2 for the Polyglot, a sale price in London, 1759, of 7 guineas, which Dibdin calls, "exceeding belief, on the score of cheapness," and a price in 1827 of £31, 10s for the Bible and *Lexicon* together.²⁷

Although there were plenty of Jansenists in Paris in 1764, it is odd that the forty items in the catalogue touching on the Jansenist controversy sold at quite low prices, the *Augustinus* of Jansen himself, published in 1640, two years after his death, selling for 3 livres, 2 sols (no. 718). To balance that out, the *Voyage de la Louisiane, fait par ordre du Roi en 1720*, by the Jesuit Antoine Laval, the man who set up the first astronomical observatory in what is now the United States, also sold for only 3 livres, 2 sols (no. 3213).²⁸

It is not so hard to understand why the *Systema Bibliothecae* of Jean Garnier (no. 6482), published by Cramoisy, Paris, 1678, should sell for the lowest price marked in the catalogue, 1 livre. The library which Garnier had classified was now going out of existence. Nor could anyone foresee that Garnier's *Systema* would become of great interest to future librarians, and would sell for \$30 in 1940. But it is strange that item no. 1721, "Gulliellmus Gilbertus de Magnete, Magneticisque corporibus, & de magno Magnete Tellure. Lond. Short, 1600, in-fol." should fetch no more than 1 livre, 8 sols. Quaritch offered it (no. 12,061) in 1868 for 25 shillings; and Goldschmidt of London offered it in 1940 (list 29, No. 85) for £65!

In 1764, men were not thinking much about aeroplanes or airships. One man who had some ideas about them was Francesco Lana-Terzi, S. J. (1631-1687). He published his theories, with illustrations, in *Prodromo, overo Saggio di Alcune Inven-*

²⁶ Thomas Frognall Dibdin, *Introduction to . . . the Greek and Latin Classics*, 4th edition, London, 1827, I, 8-9, notes. It must be noted that the Alcalá (Complutensian) Polyglot was scarce from the beginning, since only 600 copies were printed.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 35. Walton's Polyglot was printed in large numbers. As late as 1673, Dr. Castell told a friend that "he had at least 1,000 copies left"; Dibdin, I, 32, note. Bernard Quaritch's *Catalogue* of 1868 offered a finely bound copy of Polyglot and *Lexicon*, 8 vols. (no. 12,907), for £63, and a copy of the Bible alone, 6 vols., in old calf "neat, a bargain," for £16, and a copy "in the original old calf" of the Polyglot and *Lexicon*, 8 vols., for £24 (no. 9639).

²⁸ The only edition of the *Voyage* is that of Paris, 1728. A librarian in the United States considered himself fortunate to get a copy for \$40 in 1940.

tioni, etc., folio, Brescia, 1670. At the sale, a copy of that work (no. 2034) brought just 2 livres, although a copy of his *Magisterium Naturae et Artis*, Brescia, 1684, was sold for 31 livres. Yet in 1940, when curiosity about airships was great, a copy of a reprint of Chapter VI alone of the *Prodrómo*, published at Naples in 1784, twenty years after the sale, fetched \$60.

Bound sets of four of the great serial publications sold for prices that seem incredibly low today. No. 6517, *Journal des Sçavans*, an unbroken run of 93 volumes, 1665-1762, with the indexes, brought only 302 livres; no. 6525, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Sciences et des Beaux Arts*,²⁹ 1701-1761, 260 volumes, brought 267 livres; no. 6545, *Mercuré de France*, 1672-1762, lacking only eight issues of the 992 volumes, sold for 300 livres; and no. 6546, *Recueil de Gazettes de France*, 1631-1761, an unbroken 131 volumes, sold for 370 livres.

On the other hand, the 45 volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*, up to the 28th of September, together with three volumes of Papebroch's controversies about the work (nos. 3956-3958), brought the excellent price of 1,525 livres, or about 30 livres a volume; and no. 4297, Muratori's *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, Milan, 1723-1751, the 25 volumes bound in 28, sold for 381 livres.

There is no mention in the catalogue of the sale, of even a single copy of the *Jesuit Relations*,³⁰ or the *Lettres Edifiantes*, which after 1702 in some sort took their place. Were these some of the books withdrawn by the Jesuits themselves, when they knew that their property was to be taken away? Or were they "withdrawn" by the *Parlement*? "Retiré" is written in the margin against nine items, nos. 1168-1176, which are various editions of the *Jesuit Constitutions and Rules*. These were copies that had escaped the earlier withdrawal by the *Parlement*. For some unknown reason, the seven volumes of the *Encyclopedie* of Diderot and d'Alembert, 1751 sqq., are also marked as "withdrawn."

Two other items marked "retirés" are manuscript volumes, *Registres du Conseil et du Parlement*, one volume each for 1544-1566 and for 1620-1631, and nine volumes for 1648-1652. It is

²⁹ This is the famous *Journal de Trévoux*, edited by the Jesuits of the Collège Louis-le-Grand; see Gustave Dumas, *Histoire du Journal de Trévoux, depuis 1701 jusqu'en 1762*, Paris, 1936. The fairly large stock of "back numbers" on hand in the College, listed in the catalogue of the sale (no. 6526) as 1,200 volumes, bound and unbound, was sold for 61 livres, 1 sol.

³⁰ Between 1632 and 1673 there were 41 *Relations* published in 132 editions. See James C. McCoy, *Jesuit Relations of Canada*, Paris, 1937. How and why they came to an end is succinctly told by Jean Delanglez, S. J., *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, New Orleans, 1935, 375 et sqq.

possible that these had belonged to de Harlay's library; and therefore may have been taken by his heir, de Tingry. But they may have been taken for the King, since Louis XV was eager to get hold of manuscripts concerning the history of France, and particularly of the *Parlements*.

When one takes into account the circumstances and the time of the sale, just after the disastrous Seven Years' War, one realizes that the prices brought by the books were, on the whole, quite good prices. What may seem to us wild vagaries in the range of prices were inevitable in a sale spread out over 118 days, and attended by a great variety of bidders;³¹ they could easily be matched in many an auction sale before and since that time.

4. WHAT BECAME OF THE BOOKS AND MANUSCRIPTS?

When a fairly large library is broken up, as the Jesuit library was, by gift, filching, and sale, it is naturally impossible to trace the ultimate destination of its varied contents except by some vague and general indications. A few of these indications are offered here; but in presenting them, we must make a distinction between the fate of the books and that of the manuscripts. We know rather more about what happened to the manuscripts than about what happened to the books.

Here is the gist of what has been ascertained about the books. It is almost certain that some of the books were sold by the Jesuits themselves to de la Vallière and de Lauraguais; but how many, we do not know. It is quite certain that a considerable number of the books, perhaps one-fifth of all those listed in the catalogue of sale, were bid in by the Abbé Fourneau, to be kept in the new Collège Louis-le-Grand. Jean Capperonier bought some of the books for the Royal Library.³² Prince de Tingry gave

³¹ The man who marked the prices in the margin of the catalogue caught a particular instance of this variety in prices due to a difference in bidders. Item no. 5852, "Jornada do arcebispo de Goa Don Aleixo de Menezes, Primaz da India Oriental, por Antonio de Gouvea. *En Coimbra*, 1606, *in-fol.*" was sold for 29 livres, 19 sols. The marginal note says: "tres cher," and calls attention to no. 3492, another copy of the same book, which sold for 1 livre, 4 sols, which was only one twenty-fifth of the price of the second copy offered. The copy listed earlier appears in the section: Church History of Spain and Portugal. When that section was put up for bidding, the bidders were probably French ecclesiastics not particularly erudite in general history. When the second copy came to be sold, it was listed in the section: History of the East Indies. The men who came to bid in books in that section were well aware of the value of Gouvea's work. Quaritch, in his catalogue for 1868 (no. 3579), offered this book for £4, 4s; and implied in his annotation that he was offering it at a bargain price.

³² Jean Capperonier (1716-1775) began as a clerk in the Bibliothèque du Roi when he was seventeen years old, became Keeper of Manuscripts

the books which he got to the library of the University of Paris. It is most likely that many of the books were neither catalogued for sale nor actually sold at all, but remained in the possession of the new administrators. For the rest, the major part of the books sold were widely scattered amongst many purchasers, and in time passed through the hands of many owners; some of them even crop up today in the distant libraries of the United States.

We can follow most of the manuscripts with more definiteness. Those that the Abbé Chauvelin carted off, those that the Benedictines kept in the Abbey St. Germain-des Prés, and those that de Charsigné got on his claim, finally found their way into the Bibliothèque Nationale through one or other of the libraries that went to make up the Nationale. Gerard Meermann bought close on to a thousand manuscripts, of which nearly nine-tenths came from the old collection of the Collège de Clermont.³³ Just how large a part his purchase was of the total collection, it is hard to say; but at any rate we can trace the story of this last group with considerable detail and exactness.

Meermann's agent in Paris began packing the manuscripts for shipment, in fifteen large cases, within twenty-four hours of the purchase on December 6, 1764; but he was not to get them out of France for four and a half months. Louis XV hated to see them go. By royal order the shipment was held up at Rouen until April 16, 1765, under various pretexts, which really reduced to the fact that the King wanted his divvy. In the end he got it. Meermann, to avoid still further and more troublesome legal delay, offered to give some of the manuscripts to the King. A list of forty-two was handed to him as the King's choice of the lot, mostly French historical manuscripts. Meermann compromised by giving up thirty-five of those on the list, and five others not asked for. In return, he got the Order of St. Michael, which he never wore, and was allowed to go on his way with the rest of the manuscripts.³⁴

Meermann took the manuscripts to La Haye, where they

in 1759, and Keeper of Printed Books in 1760, under Bignon, the official librarian; *Biographie Générale*, VIII, 626.

³³ These had been known to scholars as the *Claromontana MSS*, and although dating from the eighth to the thirteenth century, had been mostly acquired by the Jesuits in the seventeenth century. Of the 972 MSS listed in the catalogue of sale, there were 375 Greek MSS, 367 old Latin MSS, 62 oriental languages MSS, 27 Chinese MSS, 116 French MSS, and 25 Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese MSS. Of these, it will be remembered, 116 came from the Professed House. Largely upon these manuscripts had been based the work of Fronton de Duc, Sirmond, Pétau, Labbe, Cossart, Garnier, and other Jesuit writers.

³⁴ H. Omont, in *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France*, 1891, 10-14.

formed the choicest and largest part of the collection known as Meermanniana, kept them and added to them until his death in 1771. His son inherited the collection, and again added to it, until he died in 1824. Then the son's heirs put the whole collection, numbering about 1,100 manuscripts, up for auction, June 8 to July 3, 1824. There was no lack of bidders at the sale; but there was one man there who had money enough, and eagerness, to buy practically anything he wanted, Sir Thomas Phillips, of Middle Hill, Worcestershire, England.³⁵ Phillips bought about three-fourths of the Meermanniana for 67,500 francs; and his purchase included the larger part of the *Claromontana MSS*.³⁶

Phillips at his death left Thirlestane House and his collection of manuscripts to his youngest daughter, Katherine, who had married an Anglican clergyman named Fenwick. Her son, Thomas Fitzroy Fenwick, sought permission of Chancery in 1885 to sell the manuscripts, and was permitted to do so on condition that he sell them to those who could pay to keep the large groups together, such as national or other large libraries. A catalogue of sale was drawn up in 1885; and the *Claromontana MSS*, 622 in number, were offered for sale to Leopold Delisle for the Bibliothèque Nationale, July 20, 1886. But Delisle could not get the French government to buy them.³⁷

The *Claromontana MSS* were then offered to the German government, which bought them in 1887 for 375,000 marks, or 468,750 francs. These manuscripts are now in the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin. In 1893, Valentin Rose published a catalogue of them.³⁸

³⁵ Phillips, born in 1792, inherited a fortune from his father in 1818, and was made a baronet, in the usual way for rich men, in 1821. He spent much time and money in amassing MSS, which became known as the Mediomontana MSS. He had welcomed the Benedictine, Dom Jean-Baptiste Pitra, who later became librarian of the Vatican and a Cardinal, when he visited England in 1849. But after he moved his residence to Thirlestane House, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, in 1862, for some reason he refused to allow priests access to his collection. At his death, February 6, 1872, his collection numbered some 40,000 MSS. Dom Henri Leclercq, *op. cit.*, col. 934. Father Brucker says that Phillips' daughter removed the ban on priests, and that he himself was warmly welcomed on his two visits to see the MSS in 1881-1882. Brucker, *loc. cit.*, 516-517.

³⁶ Phillips allowed Thomas Gaisford, the dean of Christ Church, to bid in forty Greek MSS for the Bodleian; he himself bought 241 Greek MSS. Brucker, 516; *Dict. Nat. Biogr.*, XV, 1079.

³⁷ In the *Bibliotheca Philippica*, Cheltenham, 1885, the Jesuit MSS are nos. 1388-2010. Leclercq, col. 935; Brucker, 518.

³⁸ *Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der K. Bibliothek zu Berlin*, XIIter Band. *Verzeichniss der Lateinischen Handschriften*. Berlin, 1893. In the Preface, Rose says that most of the Jesuit MSS are on parchment, and are of the eighth to the thirteenth century.

5. WHO GOT THE MONEY?

A year and a day after the date set for the opening of the auction sale of the library, the four new administrators of the College turned in their *Bref État pour compter de la Vente des Livres, Médailles et autres Curiosités du Collège Louis-le-Grand*. It puts down the total receipts from the sale as 121,729 livres, 2 sols. It presents an account of disbursements against this sum received, which is a curious blend of minute detail and bland reticence. The detail goes down to such items as 2 livres, 8 sols for some pieces of tin-plate on which to set up candles "to light up the sale." The quiet reticence is about what happened to the bulk of the money received, after it had been turned over to one of the administrators, the Abbé Fourneau, who was acting as headmaster of the College.

The total expenses connected with the sale amounted to 19,730 livres, 18 sols, 3 deniers, to which the administrators tacked on 455 livres they had paid to themselves, and 300 livres for 25 days of work in having an inventory made of the portable goods of fifteen other colleges: the whole adding up to more than 20 per cent of the gross proceeds.

The largest single item in the expense sheet is 10,327 livres, 13 sols, paid to the booksellers, Saugrain and Leclerc, who published the three catalogues of the sale. The next largest expense was for the "*procès-verbal de vente*," the complete official account of the sale, which listed 11,187 separate transactions in the sale of the books and museum pieces, all properly entered on stamped and tax-paid forms. This is set down as costing 4,632 livres; but it is noted that half of this sum is to go to the auctioneers (*huis-siers priseurs*), in addition to the daily fee of seven livres paid to the auctioneer-in-chief, which brought him 826 livres for the 118 days, plus commissions of 1,525 livres, 8 sols, 9 deniers, to be divided amongst the five assistant auctioneers, and another 172 livres, 10 sols apiece to a crier and a clerk of record.

Then the Abbé Grimod, who had charge of the sale of the coins and curios, received a commission of 7½ per cent of the proceeds of that sale, which netted him 801 livres, 6 sols, 6 deniers. Workmen of various sorts, bailiffs, a glazier, a carpenter, porters, and carters, were paid 1,142 livres, 4 sols.

All this is obviously connected with the sale itself. But there is a promising entry of pay for "a number of days put in by the auctioneer in making up several large lists of books allotted to Messieurs Fourneau and Capronnier and others, in collecting

sums owed, and various other unusual tasks, which are valued at . . ." And then, oddly enough, no sum is set down against this item. It is a provoking entry. What does it mean? Was it to have been an added rake-off for the auctioneer? Why did he not get it? Was he just forgotten? Or did he forfeit his *pourboire* in some way? There is no knowing the answer.

Finally, there was the matter of the books which the *Parlement* had graciously allowed the Abbé Fourneau to keep for his new college, but which he had to acquire by the formality of bidding them in at the sale. We do not know from this summary account anything about which books he chose, or how many, or at what prices he was given them. But the total is set down against the receipts as 17,449 livres, 8 sols.³⁹

When all these expenses and deductions and commissions had been taken care of, 81,432 livres were turned over, in five installments, to the Abbé Fourneau. The cost of sacking the silver, and the cab fares for carrying the money to him, came to 36 livres, 13 sols. Then the administrators sat down to make out their balance sheet. They added up the various expenses, the value of the books allotted to the Abbé Fourneau, the money actually turned over to him, and arrived at a total of 118,794 livres, 5 sols, 3 deniers. But their addition was badly done, as Franklin points out. The correct total should be 119,367 livres, 6 sols, 3 deniers, or the tidy little sum of 573 livres, 1 sol more than the administrators made it.

They carefully subtracted their false total of disbursements from the total receipts of the sale, and set down the balance as 2,934 livres, 16 sols, 9 deniers, whereas in reality the true balance was only 2,361 livres, 15 sols, 9 deniers. Out of their supposed balance, they then turned over to the Abbé Fourneau, on February 18, 1765, the additional sum of 2,605 livres, or 243 livres, 4 sols, 3 deniers more than they actually had, and still claimed to have cash in hand amounting to 329 livres, 16 sols, 9 deniers: *quod est absurdum*.

Any attempt to explain this sort of financial statement would have to be based on conjecture. We have evidence enough that there was reckless juggling with the inventory and the sale cata-

³⁹ In his monograph of 1865, Franklin had given the price of the Abbé Fourneau's books as 18,109 livres, 8 sols, a figure which he had copied from the *Recueil de toutes les délibérations prises par le bureau d'administration du Collège Louis-le-Grand*, 528. This is 1,360 livres more than the figure he later copied from another MS, *État des livres adjugés à Monsieur l'Abbé Fourneau*, one of the many bewildering discrepancies in the official accounts of the sale.

logue of the library. Was there further juggling with the proceeds of the sale? Perhaps the fantastic entry, never completed, for the special services of the auctioneer inclines one to think that there may have been. But even if we give the administrators the benefit of the doubt, and charitably suppose that they were entirely honest, we are at least forced to conclude that they were badly muddled.

That can mean no more than that they were incompetent accountants. But what meaning must we attach to the fact that such a muddled financial statement could be handed into the highest court in France, the *Grande Chambre* of the *Paris Parlement*, and be accepted as it stood? To put it as mildly as possible, that fact seems to imply that there was a confident recklessness all round in dealing with the property of the Jesuits. The Jesuits would soon be legally dead; their enemies could do pretty much as they pleased with the Jesuit library; any financial accounting was a formality, and nothing more; if such an accounting were scrutinized at all, it would be by friendly eyes. It is hard to see any other meaning in the facts.⁴⁰

In addition to this jumbling of the financial account itself, it has already been noted that there are discrepancies in the source evidence as to what were the gross proceeds of the sale. It is impossible to disentangle that snarl. Therefore in what little more we have to say in answer to the question: Who got the money? we may as well stick to the official figures of the final accounting. Taking the gross proceeds of the sale of the library, and the disbursements set down in the final balance sheet, as they stand, we find that there was turned over to the Abbé Fourneau the net proceeds of 84,037 livres in hard cash. The question, therefore, practically narrows down to: Who got this sum of money?

After the Jesuits had their colleges confiscated, and their revenues taken from them, but were not yet driven out of their houses, they wanted to know from the *Parlement* how they were going to live. The answer came within a week. An *Arrêt* of April 30, 1762, ordered the Paris sequestrator to pay over to the procurator of the Professed House 3,000 livres, and to the procurators of the College and the Novitiate 1,500 livres each. Did the sequestrator pay those 6,000 livres out of the 84,037

⁴⁰ It was not unnatural that this sort of recklessness should characterize most of the handling of the confiscated Jesuit properties everywhere. There is plenty of evidence of it in the Jesuit Archives. Victor Van Tricht, S. J., has studied some parallel instances in "Du Sort des Bibliothèques de la Compagnie dans les Pays-Bas," in *La Bibliothèque des Ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus et le P. Augustin de Backer*, Louvain, 1876, 243-257.

livres net proceeds of the sale? We know, moreover, that the Prince de Tingry, as grandson and heir of de Harlay, held a judgment of the court for 25,000 livres against the receipts of the sale. It is probable that de Tingry had influence enough to see that the judgment was paid. But supposing that both of these claims were paid, who got the remaining 53,037 livres?

Father Pierre Gatin, the Jesuit procurator of the Mission of Martinique, was watching the sale carefully, since it was he who had been given the task of paying off the debts incurred by Father Lavalette. On March 10, 1765, three weeks after the administrators had made their last payment (the impossible one) to the Abbé Fourneau, Father Gatin wrote thus to the General, Father Ricci:

Your Paternity would like to know how much is still owing to each creditor, and how much has been paid; but I can give you no proper statement of the affair. For there is no question now of the creditors, but only of *administrators, bailiffs, guardians*, etc. The costs of court are becoming immense. . . . Blood-suckers of this sort multiply with what they feed upon. From the time that we were deprived of the use and possession of our property, the creditors have not received so much as one farthing.⁴¹

The claims of the editors of the Jesuits were the origin of all the legal proceedings against the Jesuits, the basis of the order of the *Parlement* sequestering Jesuit properties, and the chief ground alleged by the *Parlement* for selling the Jesuit library. But there is not a word about these creditors in the final accounting of the sale. Whoever got the money, it is certain that it was not the creditors of the Jesuits.

A NOTE ON PRICES AND VALUES

**Livres, sols, and deniers* are baffling words to many readers. Moreover, even when one knows the nominal value of the monetary units represented by those names, there is still left the difficult question of their real value, their purchasing power in some equivalents that we can compare with present-day prices and values. Hence this note may be of practical service in helping us to understand the proceeds of the sale.

⁴¹ "Sciret Pas Va quid cuiquam debitum fuit, quid cuique solutum, negotii tamen verum statum non haberet. Neque enim jam creditorum sed *Procuratorum, apparitorum, custodum*, etc. res agitur. Crescunt in immensum forenses impensae. . . . Quo plures invadent eo plures exurgent ejusmodi hirudines. Ex quo bonis interdicti et spoliati fuimus, ne teruncium quidem acceperunt creditores." From the Jesuit Archives, quoted by Rochemonteix, 246, n. 3.

The livre links up with the Latin *libra*, a pound, both as a weight (livre de poids) and as a monetary unit, and with the English pound sterling. One may still see in the English £—s—d symbols allied to the livres, sols, deniers, of French money. Even the ratio of the two is the same: 20 shillings to the pound, 12 pence to the shilling; and 20 sols to the livre, 12 deniers to the sou or sol.

There had been several sorts of monetary livres: an ancient gold livre dating back to the Merovingians and to Constantine, which was once equal to 288 silver deniers (the Latin *denarius*); and various silver livres. But from Capetian times the silver livre most widely in use was that originally issued by the Abbey of St. Martin at Tours. This was the origin of the monetary unit *livre tournois*. The royal coinage was *monnaie parisise*, with 15 deniers to the sol, instead of 12 deniers to the sol *tournois*; which meant that the *livre parisise* was worth one and a quarter *livres tournois*. But the *livre parisise* was abolished in 1667, leaving the *livre tournois* the sole unit of coinage.⁴²

The livres mentioned throughout this paper are *livres tournois*, silver coins roughly equal to the later silver franc, or about twenty cents in U. S. coinage, and divided into twenty sols, roughly equal to our cents. But to know this tells us only the less important half of the story. What was the buying power of the *livre tournois*?

That buying power varied with changing circumstances. Thus, if we test it against the price of bread, the great staple of French food, we find it varying with good and bad harvests. The excessive rains of 1725, for example, brought the price of bread from three sous a pound to eight sous a pound within six months.⁴³ But there was one circumstance that affected the buying power of French money pretty steadily all through the eighteenth century; and that was the growing scarcity of hard money.⁴⁴ The money in circulation fell from 130 livres per capita in 1720 to 54 livres per capita in 1740; it was further diminished through the effects of the Seven Years' War until, on the eve of the Revolution, it stood at 41 livres per capita.⁴⁵

In the ordinary balance, when money gets scarce its buying power

⁴² St. Louis IX (1226-1270) made the *sou* a real coin, called a *gros*, and brought back a gold coinage, the unit of which was called by his name, *louis*, and was normally worth 20 francs or *livres tournois*. The name of *franc* was in use from mediaeval times, but it began to supplant the livre legally only in 1795, when it was decreed that 80 francs equalled 81 livres. Livres, however, continued in use until 1834, when they were withdrawn from circulation. There had also been a silver *écu*, worth three livres, and a gold *écu*, or crown, which varied greatly in value according to its weight and fineness, but which after 1600 equalled half a *louis*, or about 10-12 livres.

⁴³ Gaxotte, *Louis XV and His Times*, May's translation, 78. The whole of Chapter V has much data about finance.

⁴⁴ Law's wildcat schemes of 1716-1720 produced plenty of paper credits which pretended to take the place of money. For John Law, the Scotch financier (1671-1729), see L. A. Thiers, *Law et Son Système des Finances*, Paris, 1826; an English translation, New York, 1859.

⁴⁵ Alexander Del Mar, *A History of the Monetary Systems of France and Other European States*, New York, 1903, 466.

increases, and prices come down. Yet it is true that the balance between money and goods is disturbed by such an event as the Seven Years' War (1756-1763) which cost France Canada, and brought about a scarcity of goods almost equal to the scarcity of money. Prices began to rise after 1764. Still, in spite of some fluctuations, the prices of food, clothing, and housing, and the level of wages, continued in general much lower in eighteenth-century France than in England.⁴⁶

To take a few illustrations, consider these scattered facts: in the decade 1750-1760, engineers-in-chief in the Corporation of Roads and Bridges were paid 2,400 livres a year;⁴⁷ in 1777, field laborers in the Touraine got a wage of 10 sous a day and their bread and wine, but in Normandy they got 15 sous a day most of the year, and 24 sous in harvest time;⁴⁸ in 1775, in Morvan, the high country near Dijon, a horse could be bought for two *louis*, about 48 livres, and an ox for six livres.⁴⁹ Coming more nearly to the immediate time and circumstances of the sale of the Jesuit library, the two official bailiffs, Samson and Lancial, installed in charge of the library, each got two livres a day, and a helper, Marion, got 30 sous a day;⁵⁰ and it will be remembered that in August 1762, the pension offered the Jesuits out of their confiscated property was 20 sous a day.⁵¹

These are slight samplings from which to venture a conclusion about the relation between money and goods in 1764; but they are characteristic enough to serve our immediate purpose. Even on the basis of these samplings, it is not rash to point out that when Meermann paid fifteen livres for a manuscript from the Jesuit library, he was paying the equivalent of ten days' wages of the crier at the sale of the library, a week's wages of one of the bailiffs in charge of the library, or two days' wages of one of the civil engineers who planned roads and built bridges. Would it be rash to estimate that the buying power of a livre in 1764 was at least equal to that of a dollar in the United States in 1941? On a comparison of wages, the livre might even be considered equivalent to two dollars, or some ten times its face value. But the test of wages is not a safe test, since it must be checked against that mystery which we call the "standard of living." Wages in France in 1764 were balanced chiefly against food and clothing and shelter; wages in the United States today must also include

⁴⁶ James E. Thorold-Rogers, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, London, 1903, Chapter XIV, especially 404-410.

⁴⁷ Gaxotte, 296.

⁴⁸ Arthur Young, *Travels during the Years 1787-1788-1789*, London, 1794, I, 144.

⁴⁹ Letter of the Chevalier d'Éon to the Marquis de Prunevaux, in J. Buchan Telfer, *The Strange Career of the Chevalier d'Éon de Beaumont*, London, 1885, 229.

⁵⁰ Franklin, II, 263, from the MS of the final accounting of proceeds of the sale of the library by the four administrators of the College.

⁵¹ The *Parlement* of Grenoble made the pension 30 sous a day; but the *Parlement* of Languedoc cut it down to 12 sous a day. Créteineau-Joly, V, 218, n. 2.

the power to purchase telephone service, theatre and movie and baseball tickets, a radio, and an automobile.

At any rate, these brief considerations may throw some light on the meaning of livres, sols, and deniers in the prices got at the sale of the Jesuit library of the Collège Louis-le-Grand. It will be a convenience to most readers, and perhaps not too wild an error, to translate mentally livres into dollars and sols into five-cent pieces.

W. KANE, S. J.

Librarian
Loyola University

L'Enfance et la Jeunesse de Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville

Les faits d'armes de Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville sont célèbres. Il n'en est pas ainsi de son enfance, de son adolescence et de sa jeunesse, qui demeurent mal connues. Déterminer, sur ce point, les résultats des recherches historiques, parmi ces résultats, faire la part des faits établis et des hypothèses, et parmi ces hypothèses, distinguer celles qui sont admissibles de celles qui le sont moins ou qui ne le sont pas, tel est le but de cet article. Nous commençons par une esquisse de la vie de Charles Le Moyne, le père du marin canadien; les étapes de cette vie, nous semble-t-il, n'aident pas peu à faire connaître la famille et le milieu social où naquit Iberville. Nous nous arrêterons aux environs de 1686: cette date est un tournant dans l'histoire de Pierre Le Moyne. Sa jeunesse est finie, avec la première expédition à la baie d'Hudson, ses campagnes commencent. Elles dureront vingt ans, le nombre d'années qui lui reste à vivre.

1. CHARLES LE MOYNE

On a fait remonter la famille de Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville à Guillaume le Conquérant.¹ Voilà qui est, à notre avis, se donner beaucoup de peine, et sans grande utilité. Au vrai, le caractère de la famille Le Moyne est tout autre: ce qui constitue l'un de ses traits essentiels c'est précisément son ascension rapide.

Le père de d'Iberville, Charles Le Moyne, arriva en Nouvelle-France, sans blason ni particule, en 1641. Il avait quinze ans.² Il venait de cette ville de Dieppe qui devait jouer un rôle si important dans le développement de la colonie et dont, fait significatif, l'une des rues devait recevoir, en 1647, le nom de Rue de la Pelleterie.³ A peine sorti de l'hôtellerie paternelle,⁴ il ne trouvait au pays où il arrivait sans le sou et presque sans nippes, que son oncle, Adrien Duchesne, chirurgien à "l'habitation de

¹ Cf. L. Goujeon, "Le chevalier d'Iberville," *Revue Canadienne*, XXV, 1889, 32; Frédéric de Kastner, *Héros de la Nouvelle France, Le Moyne d'Iberville*, Québec, 1902, 11.

² Il avait été baptisé le 2 août 1626 en l'église Saint-Rémy de Dieppe; il était fils de Pierre Le Moyne et de Judith Duchesne, E. M. Faillon, *Histoire de la colonie française au Canada*, 3 vols., Villemarie, 1855-1856, II, 54.

³ Faillon, II, 55.

⁴ En 1633, ses parents s'établirent dans la paroisse Saint-Jacques (Dieppe), où se trouvaient nombre de marins; ils y tinrent hôtellerie, Faillon, II, 54.

Québec," sur l'invitation de qui, il avait, dit-on, entrepris le voyage.⁵

En bon Normand,⁶ il ne fut pas long à se débrouiller avec l'adresse qui devait si bien le servir tout le long de sa vie. Il se mit aussitôt au service des Pères Jésuites dans les missions huronnes, et resta dans cet emploi durant quatre ans. Le 26 octobre 1645, il en sortait avec vingt écus en poche et des vêtements "honnêtes";⁷ mais, faits plus importants, il avait trouvé là l'occasion de se former à la vie dure, de connaître les sauvages et surtout d'apprendre leurs langues: aussi, lorsqu'après avoir passé l'hiver de 1645 aux Trois-Rivières⁸ en qualité de soldat et d'interprète, il arriva à Ville-Marie au printemps de 1645, la ville naissante accueillit-elle sa venue avec joie.

"Parlons un peu," écrit M. Dollier de Casson, "d'un appelé M. Lemoine qui fut envoyé ici pour servir d'interprète à l'égard les Iroquois qu'on y voyoit toujours sans les bien entendre, à cause que l'on avoit pas d'assez bons interprètes"; ce fut d'ailleurs, au dire du Sulpicien, "le principal sujet qui émut M. de Montmagny à nous l'envoyer."⁹ Mais il ne devait pas tarder à rendre des services d'une bien plus grande importance. Dès le printemps suivant, il commença à se distinguer contre les Iroquois.¹⁰ En 1651, il sauva Mlle. Mance au cours d'un raid de ces sauvages qui la menaçaient elle et son hôpital. Chargé par quarante guerriers, il se tira indemne de l'action, non sans qu'une balle eût toutefois traversé son bonnet;¹¹ cet acte d'audace lui valut, la même année, le poste de garde-magasin.¹²

⁵ C. de la Roncière, *Une épopée canadienne*, Paris, 1930, 10; F. de Kastner, *Héros de la Nouvelle France, Le Moyne d'Iberville*, 12.

⁶ On sait que les Normands avaient mauvaise presse, à cause de leur habilité naturelle. "Le Catéchisme d'un Normand qui quitte son pays pour venir s'établir en Bretagne" contient des passages comme celui-ci: "D. Qui est celui que l'on doit appeler Normand? R. C'est celui qui fait profession de s'enrichir à droite et à gauche, et de prendre à toutes mains. — D. Quelles sont les vertus nécessaires à un Normand et sans lesquelles il dérogerait à sa profession? R. Il y en a cinq principales. — D. Qui sont-elles? R. C'est d'être: premièrement traître, secondement gourmand, troisièmement pillard, quatrièmement flatteur, cinquièmement menteur." Cité dans "Bretons et Normands," *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques* (BRH), XXXVIII, 1932, 697-698.

⁷ C. H. Laverdière et H. R. Casgrain, eds., *Le Journal des Jésuites*, Québec, 1871, 9-10.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁹ F. Dollier de Casson, "Histoire du Montréal," dans *Mémoires de la Société Historique de Montréal*, Montréal, 1869, 60.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 66-67.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 77-78.

¹² A. Jodoin et J. L. Vincent, *Histoire de Longueuil et de la famille de Longueuil*, Montréal, 1889, 12; J. Marmette, *Les Machabées de la Nouvelle-France*, Québec, 1870, 36; [F. Daniel], *Nos gloires nationales*, Montréal, 1867, 149.

En même temps, il commença à prendre une importance de plus en plus grande dans la colonie montréalaise; sa signature, à cette époque, se rencontre de plus en plus fréquemment dans les actes des tabellions de Ville-Marie.¹³ En 1648, un acte du notaire Jean de Saint-Père exhibe la griffe de *Challe Moine*¹⁴ (évidemment, il signe son nom comme on le prononçait), se qui fait penser aux invraisemblables tours de force orthographiques dont Iberville fleurira plus tard ses lettres. En 1652, le *Journal des Jésuites* le donne pour "commis de Montréal."¹⁵ C'était aussi l'époque où il s'essayait à la diplomatie indienne et réussissait, par l'intermédiaire d'Anontaha—"le plus brave de tous" les Hurons¹⁶—à "sauver le pays . . . nommément les Trois-Rivières qu'on apprenoit être en grand danger" par suite de la menace iroquoise.¹⁷

Le 10 décembre 1653, il fit promesse de mariage à une jeune fille—il faudrait plutôt dire une enfant, elle avait treize ans¹⁸—connue sous le nom de Catherine Primot, mais qui s'appelait en réalité Catherine Thierry. Elle était, en effet, fille de Guillaume Thierry et d'Élisabeth Messier; née à Saint-Denis-le-Petit, bourg du diocèse de Rouen, elle avait été, en très bas âge, adoptée¹⁹ par son oncle et sa tante Antoine Primot²⁰ et Martine Messier et amenée par eux en Nouvelle-France, en 1642, alors qu'elle avait un peu plus d'un an.²¹ Le mariage, célébré par le P. Claude Pijart, Jésuite, eut lieu le 28 mai 1654, en l'église Notre-Dame de Montréal.²² À cette époque, Charles Le Moyne n'avait encore à offrir à sa jeune femme "qu'une maison de quarante pieds sur vingt-quatre." Nous ne croyons pas que l'on puisse ajouter, comme fait

¹³ Cf. E. Z. Massicotte, "Les trois premiers tabellions de Montréal," *Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada*, série III, t. IX, 1913, section 1, 192, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 202, 203.

¹⁴ C'était le 2 mai 1648, E. Z. Massicotte, *ibid.*, 192.

¹⁵ *Journal des Jésuites*, 19 avril 1652, 166.

¹⁶ Dollier de Casson, "Histoire du Montréal," 94.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 95.

¹⁸ Le recensement de 1666-1667 porte qu'elle était née en 1640, cf. E. Z. Massicotte, "Les colons de Montréal de 1642 à 1667," *Mémoires de la Société Royale du Canada*, série III, t. VII, 1913, section 1, 13.

¹⁹ Cette adoption ne fut légalisée qu'en 1660. A cette date, les Primots, de crainte que, faute de déclaration juridique, on ne vit contester ses droits d'héritage, firent dresser un acte d'adoption devant M^e Basset, le 20 mai 1660; cf. E. Z. Massicotte, *loc. cit.*, 13, et Faillon, II, 207.

²⁰ Mentionné comme ayant une terre, dans les actes de Maisonneuve, le 18 novembre 1650; E. Z. Massicotte, *loc. cit.*, 13.

²¹ Faillon, II, 204-206.

²² L'acte de mariage est reproduit dans Jodoin et Vincent, *Histoire de Longueuil*, 14.

M. Massicotte, qu'il était déjà "le plus riche marchand de la ville"; c'était encore trop tôt.²³

Cependant son patrimoine ne devait pas tarder à s'arrondir. Le 23 juillet suivant, M. de Maisonneuve lui concéda 90 arpents de terre à la Pointe-Saint-Charles "proche la Grande Anse," et y ajoutait un arpent "dans l'enclos de la ville, proche l'hôpital sur lequel il fait bâtir maison."²⁴ La première concession paraît à M. Faillon "sans exemple dans l'île de Montréal."²⁵ Mais il faut se rappeler que, de ces quatre-vingt-dix arpents, Charles Le Moyne devait en donner jouissance de quarante-cinq à ses beaux-parents.²⁶ La deuxième concession nous importe davantage: c'est là que devait naître Iberville. Le terrain mesurait 162 pieds sur la rue Saint-Paul et 198 sur la rue Saint-Joseph, et avoisinait la chapelle récemment construite auprès de l'église Notre-Dame.²⁷

Les Iroquois continuaient toujours leurs raids. "Incessamment nous les avons sur les bras et il n'y a pas de mois en cet été (1650-1651) où notre livre des morts ne soit marqué en lettre rouge par la main des Iroquois."²⁸ Aussi Charles Le Moyne continuait-il à les combattre.²⁹ Il se serait même joint, avec Pierre Picoté de Belestre, à l'expédition de Dollard, en 1660, si le héros du Long-Sault avait consenti à remettre son départ après les semailles.³⁰

En cette même année nous voyons Charles Le Moyne entrer en relations avec nul autre que Médard Chouart, mieux connu sous le nom de Des Groseillers.³¹ Naturellement, il s'agissait de

²³ E. Z. Massicotte, "Le prétendu château de Maisonneuve," BRH, XLV, 1939, 73.

²⁴ *Id.*, "Les premières concessions de terres à Montréal, sous M. de Maisonneuve," BRH, XXXIV, 1928, 402.

²⁵ Faillon, II, 406.

²⁶ Massicotte, "Les premières concessions," BRH, XXXIV, 1928, 402.

²⁷ *Id.*, "Où est né d'Iberville," *ibid.*, 234.

²⁸ Dollier de Casson, "Histoire du Montréal," 76.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 109.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 143.

³¹ Il est évident que le soi-disant "sieur des Groseillers" était un faux noble. Un acte du 19 mai 1659, qu'il signe "Medar Chouar," le mentionne sous le nom de "Medar Chouar dict des groseillers," Chicago Historical Society, Schmidt Collection, vol. I, 189. Puis le "dict" disparaît, ce qui lui donne un air de noblesse. Dans une pièce datée du 7 décembre 1661, on voit "Medard Chouart Sr desgroseillers," *ibid.*, Gunther Collection. Un document du 15 mai 1662 porte la même mention, *ibid.*, Schmidt Collection, I, 33. Dans les *Jugements et délibérations du Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle-France*, 6 vols., Québec, 1885-1891, I, 457, le "dict" n'apparaît qu'une fois. En deux endroits, on lit simplement "Medard Chouart," I, 493, 511. Ailleurs, on y a ajouté "Desgroyzeliers" ou "Desgroiseliens," I, 247, 273, 276, II, 184, 907. Ce n'est pas là un fait isolé. Le surnom se muait sans peine en titre de noblesse. Un procédé analogue est le passage du "dit" au "de"; le cas de François Dumont dit Montigny, dont le nom devint, avec le temps, Dumont de Montigny illustre bien ce procédé, cf. J. Delanglez, "A Louisiana Poet-Historian, Dumont dit Montigny," in MID-AMERICA, XIX, 1937, 32, note 7.

la traite du castor. Le célèbre coureur de bois était redescendu au Canada, au printemps de 1660, après avoir passé deux ans au pays des grands lacs, d'où il avait ramené un convoi de deux cent mille livres de fourrures. Le 22 juillet, ils s'associent tous deux, l'aventurier et le marchand montréalais, "pour tout généralement le castor gras et veule qu'ils traiteront aux Sauvages . . . pour . . . la traite étant finie, partager chacun par moitié après avoir préalablement frayé les marchandises qui auront été par eux achetées."³² C'est la première fois que l'on voit le nom de Charles Le Moyne mêlé au commerce du castor, qui était alors, et devait longtemps rester, le seul moyen de faire rapidement fortune en Nouvelle-France. Il faut ajouter que les affaires de Charles Le Moyne devenaient de jour en jour plus florissantes. Il était déjà associé avec Jacques Le Ber, son beau-frère, avec qui il reçut en concession, le 22 août 1660, un terrain de soixante-seize pieds sur soixante "proche l'hôpital Saint-Joseph," sur lequel ils firent bâtir une maison à frais communs.³³ Les affaires allaient si bien qu'en 1661, année de la naissance d'Iberville, la maison de Le Moyne avait grand air au point qu'elle "surpassoit toutes les austres" maisons de Montréal qui, pourtant, "quoy que en petit nombre ne laissaient pas destre belles spacieuses et agréables."³⁴ Le Moyne devenait un notable. Son élection à la charge de marguillier de Notre-Dame, qui eut lieu le 21 novembre 1661, suffirait à elle seule à illustrer ce fait.³⁵ Le 18 octobre 1663, et non pas en 1664, comme on l'a répété par erreur,³⁶ M. de Mézy, d'accord avec Mgr de Laval, le nomma procureur de Sa Majesté "en la seneschaussée de l'Isle de Montréal et lieux en dependans."³⁷

En 1664, comme le commerce de Charles Le Moyne et de Jacques Le Ber ne cessait de progresser, les deux associés devinrent, le 3 septembre, propriétaires d'un magasin à Québec qu'ils acquirent au prix de 500 livres tournois, "payé en castor gras, loyal et marchand."³⁸ Au mois de janvier précédent, Le Moyne avait allongé sa maison de 23 pieds, grâce à la concession que lui avait faite M. de Maisonneuve d'un "morceau de terre joignant

³² E. Z. Massicotte, "Charles Le Moyne et Médard Chouart," BRH, XX, 1914, 188.

³³ *Id.*, "Les premières concessions de terres à Montréal, sous M. de Maisonneuve," BRH, XXXIV, 1928, 461.

³⁴ Cité par E. Z. Massicotte, "Comment expliquer cela?" BRH, XLIV, 1938, 151.

³⁵ "Quittance de Charles Le Moyne," BRH, XXXVI, 1930, 434.

³⁶ L. Le Jeune, *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville*, Ottawa, 1937, 13.

³⁷ *Jugements et délibérations*, I, 34.

³⁸ P. Gagnon, "Une vieille famille canadienne," BRH, XVII, 1911, 281.

l'emplacement qu'il possède déjà."³⁹ Le 2 mars suivant, par suite d'une ordonnance du gouverneur de Montréal prescrivant aux habitants d'élire "cinq personnes notables qui auront le pouvoir de juger et régler toutes matières concernant la police nécessaire pour le bien de cette habitation," Charles Le Moyne était désigné à ce poste en compagnie de Louis Prudhomme, Gabriel Sel, sieur du Clos, Jacques Picot, dit Labrie et Jean Leduc.⁴⁰

Cependant une aventure qui eût pu tourner au tragique l'attendait. L'année suivante, en juillet, il fut pris par un parti d'Iroquois, alors qu'il était allé à la chasse à l'île Sainte-Thérèse. A Montréal on craignit qu'il ne fût mis à mort par les sauvages, qui avaient déjà tout tenté pour s'emparer de lui. Mais d'habiles menaces qu'il fit au bon moment inspirèrent aux Iroquois la crainte des représailles que pouvaient exercer les compagnies de soldats français qui, leur disait Le Moyne, débarquaient justement à Québec. Cela le sauva du poteau.⁴¹

On le retrouve ensuite dans l'expédition que M. de Courcelle dirigea contre les Agniers du 9 janvier au 6 mars 1666.⁴² A cette occasion, Le Moyne renforça les troupes du gouverneur d'un détachement de soixante-dix Montréalais qu'il commandait: le "général" fit à ces troupes "l'honneur de leur donner la tête en allant et la queue au retour . . . Aussi M. le gouverneur se reposait beaucoup sur eux tous, il leur témoignait une confiance particulière et les caressoit grandement, il les appeloit *ses capots bleus*, comme s'il les eût voulu nommer *les enfants de sa droite*."⁴³

Dans l'expédition plus considérable que M. de Tracy entreprit la même année, contre les mêmes Iroquois, du 14 septembre au 5 novembre,⁴⁴ les "Montréalistes" eurent le même "honneur"; ils étaient au nombre de 110 et combattirent sous les ordres de Le Moyne, secondé par Pierre Picoté de Belestre.⁴⁵ Cette dernière campagne, au dire de M. Dollier de Casson, terrorisa les Iroquois à tel point "que chaque arbre leur paroissoit un François et qu'ils ne savoient où se mettre."⁴⁶

³⁹ E. Z. Massicotte, "Les premières concessions," BRH, XXXIV, 1928, 465.

⁴⁰ E. Z. Massicotte, *Montréal sous le régime français, répertoire des arrêtés, édits, mandements, ordonnances et règlements conservés dans les archives du Palais de justice à Montréal, 1640-1670*, Montréal, 1919, 4.

⁴¹ Dollier de Casson, "Histoire du Montréal," 176-177.

⁴² *Journal des Jésuites*, 340, 342.

⁴³ Dollier de Casson, "Histoire du Montréal," 180.

⁴⁴ *Journal des Jésuites*, 350-351.

⁴⁵ Dollier de Casson, "Histoire du Montréal," 180-181.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 184.

Le 29 octobre 1667, l'intendant Talon demandait à Colbert de faire gratifier de lettres de noblesse Charles Le Moyne ainsi que les sieurs Godefroy, Denys et Amyot, "quatre habitans de ce pays des plus considerables et po. leur naissance et pour leur zelle au service de sa Ma^{te}."⁴⁷ En mars 1668, le roi anoblit notre Normand, désormais sieur de Longueuil, et lui conféra ainsi qu'à "ses enfants postérité et lignée" le titre d'écuyers et "tous honneurs et prérogatives, prééminences, autorités, privilèges, franchises, exemptions, immunités dont jouissent et ont accoutumé de jouir et user les autres Nobles de notre Royaume."⁴⁸ À ce propos, on a écrit que lorsque les lettres de noblesse furent expédiées au Canada, les quatre destinataires ne surent où les faire enregistrer, et que, comme Louis XIV abolit, en 1669, les titres non encore enregistrés, ces nouveaux nobles perdirent automatiquement les leurs.⁴⁹ Ce qu'il y a de certain, c'est que, le 10 novembre 1670, Talon demanda que les lettres fussent enregistrées au Conseil Souverain de Québec ou dans les cours souveraines de France, sans que les nouveaux nobles eussent à les présenter en personne.⁵⁰ Quoi qu'il en soit, Charles Le Moyne ne paraît pas avoir perdu son titre: trois ans plus tard, en 1673, Frontenac écrivait, à propos du sieur de Longueuil, que le roi l'avait déjà anobli "pour les services qu'il a rendus depuis trente ans dans le pays et de son épée et de son esprit."⁵¹

Il devait bientôt recevoir plusieurs concessions. Il possédait déjà, en plus des terres que lui avait données Maisonneuve en 1654, cinquante arpents de front sur cent de profondeur, qu'il avait achetés de Louis de Lauzon de la Citière en 1657, auxquels étaient venus s'ajouter, en 1664, l'île Sainte-Hélène et l'Islet Rond.⁵² En 1672, il reçut encore les terres qui s'étendent de Varennes à Laprairie.⁵³ Le 29 septembre, 1673, il obtint la seigneurie de Châteaugay.⁵⁴ Le tout fut couronné, en 1676, par la réunion, effectuée par Duchesneau, de toutes ces terres dans le seul fief de

⁴⁷ Talon à Colbert, 29 octobre 1667, Archives des Colonies (AC), C 11A, 2:324, publiée dans le *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1930-1931* (RAPQ), 1931, 88.

⁴⁸ Ce document est reproduit en entier dans Jodoin et Vincent, *Histoire de Longueuil*, 88.

⁴⁹ P[ierre]-G[eorges] R[oy], "Mathieu Amyot Villeneuve," BRH, XXV, 1919, 326-327.

⁵⁰ "Mémoire de Talon sur le Canada," 10 novembre 1670, AC, C 11A, 3:110, RAPQ, 1931, 138-139.

⁵¹ Frontenac à Colbert, RAPQ, 1927, 43.

⁵² Jodoin et Vincent, *Histoire de Longueuil*, 20, 629.

⁵³ L'acte de concession, du 3 novembre 1672, est reproduit dans Jodoin et Vincent, 41-42.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 43.

Longueuil "avec tous droits de seigneurie et justice haute moyenne et basse."⁵⁵

En 1673, Frontenac demandait qu'on créât "une charge de grand prévôt qui pourrait avoir le soin de courir et d'attraper tous ces fripons (coureurs de bois) ;" il proposa le nom du "sieur Lemoyne, qui est un homme très capable de cet emploi." Il est vrai qu'en juillet, il avait accompagné le gouverneur à Cataracoui et que, grâce à sa connaissance parfaite des idiomes hurons-iroquois, il avait bien servi celui-ci auprès des sauvages: c'est ce qui explique l'éloge que Frontenac se mit en frais de lui décerner.⁵⁶ Cette confiance durait encore l'année suivante, alors que le gouverneur demandait qu'on attribuât les deux cents écus affectés à la charge de grand maître des eaux et forêts—qui lui paraissait "fort inutile"—à deux interprètes, dont Le Moyne, qui le dispenseraient désormais de "passer par les mains des 212 (les Jésuites) quand on a à traiter avec les sauvages."⁵⁷ Mais la protection de l'impulsif gouverneur ne dura pas. En 1681, nous le voyons exhaler sa mauvaise humeur contre ces pelés, ces galeux, Le Moyne et Le Ber, "devenus fameux négociants de traite depuis qu'ils sont liés d'intérêt avec M^r l'intendant." C'était surtout, on le comprendra, cette dernière circonstance qui rendait la faute si odieuse aux yeux de Frontenac qui, pour sa part ne se faisait pas scrupule de traiter tout comme ses administrés. Et il terminait comme s'il n'avait jamais eu vent de l'affaire: "L'on apprend que le sieur Le Moyne ci-dessus marqué demande la charge de prévôt; ce serait un nouveau protecteur des coureurs de bois."⁵⁸

Mais peu après Frontenac retournait en France, remplacé par La Barre. Celui-ci arrivait prévenu contre les protégés de son prédécesseur, et disposé à donner sa protection à ceux qui avaient perdu celle de l'ancien gouverneur.⁵⁹ Aussi le 10 octobre 1682, voit-on Charles Le Moyne assister à l'importante assemblée de notables que La Barre convoqua dans la maison des Pères Jésuites à Québec dans le but de se renseigner sur l'état de la Nouvelle-France.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ Ce document, du 10 juillet 1676, est reproduit dans Jodoin et Vincent, 44-49.

⁵⁶ Frontenac à Colbert, 13 novembre 1673, RAPQ, 1927, 43.

⁵⁷ *Id.* à *id.*, 14 novembre 1674, *ibid.*, 76.

⁵⁸ "Mémoire et preuve de la cause du désordre des coureurs de bois, avec le moyen de les détruire," *ibid.*, 120-124.

⁵⁹ Cf. "Mémoire instructif de l'Etat des affaires de la Nouvelle France et de la conduite De Denonville depuis la campagne dernière de 1687," AC, C 11A, 10:65v.

⁶⁰ R. G. Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, 73 vols., Cleveland, 1896-1901, LXII, 156.

La même année, le gouverneur l'envoya demander réparation pour deux canots appartenant à Aubert de la Chesnaye par suite d'un malentendu durant l'hiver précédent. La Barre avait fait passer aux Iroquois l'ordre de piller les canots dont les conducteurs ne pourraient produire des congés de traite, et les conducteurs de ces deux canots avaient été dépouillés de leurs fourrures, n'ayant pu présenter de passeport régulier. À Le Moyne qui exigeait restitution, les Iroquois répondirent "qu'ils n'avaient point agi en jeunes gens puisqu'ils n'avaient rien pris que par ordre," et ils refusèrent de rendre quoi que ce fût. "Voilà," continue le narrateur, "le premier acheminement à la cruelle guerre que nous avons essayée par la suite, qui a pensé faire abandonner la colonie."⁶¹ Cette mesure était excessivement imprudente, sans compter qu'elle visait à assurer le monopole des profits de la traite aux marchands influents protégés par le gouverneur. Ceux-ci eurent d'ailleurs à s'en repentir bientôt, car les Iroquois ne devaient pas tarder à négliger la distinction établie entre les coureurs de bois qui faisaient la traite par contrebande et les détenteurs de congés réguliers. C'est ainsi qu'à quatorze Français dûment munis de "congez et permissions de Monseigneur le Général," les Iroquois demandèrent ingénument, tout en les pillant, s'ils ne savaient pas que M. Le Moyne leur avait dit "de faire la guerre aux nations de ce pays" et que, s'ils rencontraient des Français, "de les piller, et s'ils se mettaient en deffense de les tuer."⁶² C'est ce qui fit dire à l'abbé de Belmont que la guerre qui s'ensuivit, en 1684, "fut particulièrement excitée par l'avarice des marchands."⁶³

Toutefois, ce fut grâce à l'intervention de Charles Le Moyne que cette peu glorieuse campagne ne se transforma pas en désastre complet. En effet, peu après son arrivée à l'Anse de la Famine, en juillet, M. de la Barre qui voyait sa petite armée fondre à vue d'oeil, envoya Le Moyne avec la mission d'amener les Iroquois à parlementer.⁶⁴ On réussit à conclure une paix déshonorante, qui était tout de même la paix. À ce propos, on a

⁶¹ Gédéon de Catalogne, "Relation de ce qui s'est passé en Canada au sujet de la guerre tant des Anglois que des Iroquois," *Mémoires de la société littéraire et historique de Québec*, troisième série, Québec, 1871, 1-2. Le même point de vue est exprimé dans le "Memoire instructif . . .," de 1687, AC, C 11A, 10:66.

⁶² "Relation d'un voyage dans le pays des Isinois, par MM. Beauvais, Provost, des Rosiers," 28 mai 1684, dans P. Margry, *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, 6 vols., Paris, 1876-1888, II, 338-344.

⁶³ "Histoire du Canada," *Collection de mémoires . . . de la société littéraire de Québec*, Québec, 1840, 17.

⁶⁴ Gédéon de Catalogne, "Recueil de ce qui s'est passé . . .," 3-5.

avancé que ce fut pour le récompenser de ce service que le gouverneur demanda pour Le Moyne le poste de gouverneur de Montréal.⁶⁵ C'est une erreur manifeste: cette demande avait été adressée au ministre l'année précédente dans une lettre datée du 3 novembre 1683.⁶⁶ Mais même si cette faveur lui avait été accordée, Le Moyne n'eût pas pu en profiter longtemps: arrivé malade à Montréal, au retour de l'expédition de 1684, il ne devait plus se remettre. Il mourut au cours de l'hiver suivant, entre le 30 janvier et le 6 février.⁶⁷

Le jeune Normand qui, quarante-quatre ans auparavant débarquait en si petit équipage, mourait avec un titre de noblesse et des biens-fonds évalués à 125,868 livres.⁶⁸ Il laissait des fils qui allaient s'illustrer du nord au sud de l'Amérique française, de la baie d'Hudson jusqu'aux Antilles.

2. PIERRE LE MOYNE

Le troisième et le plus célèbre des quatorze enfants de Charles Le Moyne, Pierre d'Iberville, fut baptisé à Ville-Marie, le 20 juillet 1661.¹ Le "Mémoire succinct" place cet événement en 1662.² Cette erreur tient, croyons-nous, à la date et à l'auteur du document.

Cette pièce fut écrite au moins huit ans après la mort du marin montréalais, comme l'indiquent les protestations qui s'y élèvent contre les procédures relatives à la succession du défunt. On y lit que ces contestations duraient depuis huit années, ce qui reporte la rédaction de la pièce en 1714 ou peu après.³ À cette distance, quoi de plus naturel que l'auteur se meprît et reculât cette date d'un an?

Mais quel auteur? Le P. Le Jeune croit que ce fut le frère d'Iberville, Joseph de Sérigny.⁴ Ce n'est pas sûr; ce n'est même

⁶⁵ C. de la Roncière, *Une épopée canadienne*, 24, Le Jeune, *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville*, 14.

⁶⁶ E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, Albany, 1855, IX, 206.

⁶⁷ Le 30 janvier, il fit son testament. Le 6 février, sa veuve déposa l'acte de garde noble de ses enfants mineurs à l'étude de Bénigne Basset. Les deux documents sont dans Jodoin et Vincent, 74-76.

⁶⁸ Cf. l'inventaire de la succession de Charles Le Moyne fait par le notaire Basset, en mars et avril 1685; résumé dans Jodoin et Vincent, 77-79.

¹ Une reproduction photographique de l'acte de baptême d'Iberville est publiée dans RAPQ, 1926, 96.

² Mémoire succinct de la naissance et des services de défunt Pierre Le Moyne, seigneur d'Iberville, Ardillers, et autres lieux, chevalier de Saint-Louis, capitaine des vaisseaux du Roy." Archives du Service Hydrographique (ASH), 115-10:n. 1, reproduit dans L. Guérin, *Histoire maritime de la France*, 6 vols., Paris, 1851-1859, IV, 469-477.

³ *Ibid.*, 477.

⁴ Le Jeune, *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville*, 22.

pas probable. En réalité, Sérigny a fourni au dossier d'Iberville, dont le "Mémoire succinct" n'est qu'une partie, une autre pièce qui résume les services de la famille Le Moyne, et où Iberville tient la place d'honneur.⁵ Ce sont deux documents distincts qu'il ne faut pas confondre. D'autre part la critique interne du Mémoire apporte une conclusion différente. Les plaintes formulées au sujet des "chicanes sans fin," suivies de protestations contre "les procédures inouïes et injustes" qui frappèrent la veuve du marin portent à croire que si celle-ci ne rédigea pas de sa main le document, elle l'anima tout au moins de son inspiration.

Elle le fit présenter au ministre dans l'espoir qu'en lui rappelant les prouesses du héros, elle l'engagerait ainsi à rendre prompte justice aux siens.

Donc rédigé longtemps après la mort d'Iberville, et par sa veuve remariée depuis six ans,⁶ il est normal que le "Mémoire succinct" présente cette inexactitude. On y remarque également que la période de la vie du marin canadien qui s'étend de 1661 à 1683 n'est décrite que par des indications sommaires; au contraire, l'époque qui s'étend de 1683 à 1706 est traitée avec beaucoup plus de précision: c'est que, pour celle-ci, qui seule servait ses fins, l'auteur disposait de lettres et d'autres pièces citées à l'occasion; pour celle-là, en revanche, qui ne pouvait lui être que d'une mince utilité, elle n'avait guère que des souvenirs que tout conspirait à rendre vagues et lointains. Les lacunes que présente la première partie du "Mémoire succinct" ont permis aux historiens d'Iberville d'accumuler les conjectures, choses qui demeurent toujours très périlleuses, ainsi que l'indiquent maintes pages des biographies de M. Desmazures et de Mr. Reed.⁷ Mais avant de procéder à la critique de certaines de leurs affirmations, une question se présente au sujet du nom même d'Iberville:— d'où vient-il?

Ce qui est sûr c'est que ce nom est normand et que Pierre Le Moyne n'a pas été le seul à le porter; le Journal de Torcy parle en effet d'un seigneur d'Iberville qui fut envoyé résident à Genève

⁵ L. Guérin, *Histoire maritime*, IV, 469.

⁶ Le contrat de mariage entre le comte Louis de Béthune et Marie-Thérèse Pollet de la Combe Pocatière, veuve d'Iberville, fut passé le 29 octobre 1708. Cette pièce est reproduite par E. de Châtelineau, "Les beaux mariages d'une Canadienne," *Nova Francia*, VI, 1931, 168-175.

⁷ C. B. Reed, *The first great Canadian, the story of Pierre Le Moyne, sieur d'Iberville*, Chicago, 1910; [A. C. G. Desmazures], *Histoire du chevalier d'Iberville*, Montréal, 1890.

en 1688.⁸ Comment ce nom passa-t-il à Montréal? M. Faillon croit que Le Moyne l'emprunta "au chef-lieu de ce nom dans la châtellenie d'Hotot de Dieppe."⁹ M. P. G. Roy¹⁰ et le P. Le Jeune¹¹ se rangent à cet avis. B. Sulte, au contraire assure que Pierre Le Moyne emprunta ce nom d'un sous-secrétaire d'État à la marine qui remplissait cette charge lorsqu'il commença sa carrière et qui le protégea.¹² Telle est aussi l'opinion de F. Kastner.¹³ Une troisième hypothèse a été émise par M. Massicotte.¹⁴ Le 25 octobre 1661, Joseph Duchesne d'Iberville, parent de Charles Le Moyne, mourait de la main des Iroquois à l'Île-à-la-Pierre, près de Montréal. Or nous lisons dans le *Journal en abrégé* de M. Asseline de Ronval qu'il avait logé chez Charles Le Moyne où, du reste, lui et l'auteur du *Journal* furent reçus "en bons amis et comme gens du même pays." Charles Le Moyne aurait même voulu que son parent passât l'hiver chez lui, ce qui se serait sans doute produit, si le jeune Normand n'avait été massacré par les sauvages. Comment ne pas établir une étroite relation, comme fait M. Massicotte, entre le nom que Pierre Le Moyne devait illustrer plus tard et celui que portait son cousin? Rappelons-nous que Pierre Le Moyne était né trois mois avant le massacre de l'Île-à-la-Pierre. Il se peut fort bien que le nom d'Iberville ait été emprunté au chef-lieu dont parle M. Faillon; mais nous croyons qu'il passa à Pierre Le Moyne par l'intermédiaire de Joseph Duchesne.

Le marin canadien fit-il sa première communion un beau dimanche de juin, comme le supposent M. Desmazures et Mr. Reed? On n'en sait rien. Mais nous savons qu'Iberville fut confirmé le 12 mai 1669, à Montréal, par Mgr de Laval.¹⁵ Au sujet de la première communion, M. Desmazures entre dans les plus grands détails: "Voici," écrit-il, "les noms des enfants qui firent leur première communion, vers 1674, avec Pierre d'Iberville: Robutel de Saint-André, Aubuchon, Louis Descaries, Antoine de La Porte, Pierre, Paul et Jean Le Moyne, Paul et Nicolas d'Ailleboust de Manthet, Urbain Tessier, Gabriel de Montigny, Pierre

⁸ *Journal inédit de J. B. Colbert, marquis de Torcy, pendant les années 1709-1711*, Paris, 1884, 24.

⁹ Faillon, II, 350.

¹⁰ P. G. R[oy], "Les noms des Longueuil," BRH, VI, 1900, 350.

¹¹ *Le Chevalier Pierre Le Moyne*, 20.

¹² *Histoire des Canadiens français*, 8 vols., Montréal, 1882-1884, V, 105.

¹³ *Héros de la Nouvelle-France, Le Moyne d'Iberville*, 17.

¹⁴ E. Z. Massicotte, "Comment expliquer cela?" BRH, XLIV, 1938, 151.

¹⁵ Ce renseignement se trouve dans le *Registre des Confirmations* conservé aux archives de l'Archevêché de Québec, p. 58. Nous le tenons de l'archiviste de la province de Québec, M. Pierre-Georges Roy, qui a eu l'obligeance de nous le communiquer.

Cavelier, Benoît et Jean Barret, Jacques Le Ber, Zacharie Robutel, et Duluth.¹⁶

La galerie ne manque pas de splendeur. Elle semble avoir fortement impressionné Mr. Reed qui en détache subrepticement Maricourt (Paul), de Montigny, de Manthet et Jean Barrett (*sic*), et qui y ajoute Sainte-Hélène et même Charles, le futur baron, qui, en 1673, avait dix sept ans, ce qui ne témoignerait pas d'une excessive précocité.¹⁷ Quant à Duluth, il faut croire qu'on le prend pour un véritable arriéré mental, puisqu'à cette date il n'avait pas moins de trente-quatre ans. Il est vrai qu'il n'aurait cessé de marcher au catéchisme que pour répondre à l'appel aux armes, puisque l'année suivante (1674) il devait servir en Belgique sous Condé, où il prit part aux campagnes de la guerre de Hollande.¹⁸ Au sujet de Jean Le Moyne qui brille aussi dans la liste de M. Desmazures, s'il s'agit de Jean-Baptiste de Bienville, et il ne peut être question que de lui, il y de quoi crier au prodige, puisqu'il ne devait naître qu'en 1680.

Cela nous amène à un autre rêve de Mr. Reed, à propos de l'éducation d'Iberville cette fois. S'il fallait l'en croire, le futur conquérant de la la baie d'Hudson aurait fait ses classes au Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice, sous la direction de M. de Queylus. Là il aurait appris le catéchisme, le latin, la logique, les belles-lettres, et la haine des hérétiques, ce qui expliquerait son entrain à combattre les Anglais.¹⁹ La précision de ce dernier détail ne manque pas de saveur; celle de quelques autres, en revanche, manque de vraisemblance. Il est vrai qu'Iberville, comme tous ses compatriotes d'alors détesta cordialement les Anglais et ne perdit aucune occasion de leur faire la guerre, non pas toutefois à cause de leur hérésie, mais tout simplement parce qu'ils étaient anglais et ennemis du pays. Il ne paraît pas qu'il ait été en aucune façon un missionnaire botté. Quant aux autres matières du programme que trace le même biographe, elles s'enseignaient plutôt au collège des Jésuites,²⁰ à Québec, qu'Iberville ne fréquentait point.

Mais qu'elle fut la formation d'Iberville? Ici, il convient de

¹⁶ *Vie du chevalier d'Iberville*, 36.

¹⁷ Reed, *The first great Canadian*, 35.

¹⁸ Cf. le mémoire de Duluth à Seignelay, [1682], dans H. HARRISSE, *Notes pour servir à l'histoire . . . de la Nouvelle-France . . . 1545-1700*, Paris, 1872, 177.

¹⁹ Reed, *The first great Canadian*, 34.

²⁰ Le Collège des Jésuites fut fondé à Québec en 1635. On y donna bientôt un cours classique complet: grammaire, humanités, rhétorique. L'enseignement de la philosophie s'y ajouta avant 1666, cf. Amédée Gosselin, *L'instruction au Canada sous le régime français*, Québec, 1911, 247-254.

distinguer entre son éducation, son instruction et sa formation strictement maritime. L'éducation de la famille Le Moyne paraît avoir été excellente. Denonville l'a affirmé: "Diberville Monseigneur est un tres sage Garçon Entreprenant et qui scait ce qu'il fait. Ils sont huit freres enfans de feu le Moine tous les mieux elevés en Canada avec les Enfans de Le Ber leur oncle qui a toujours gouverné les deux familles dans une étroite union d'interais et d'amitié. Aussy ces deux familles sont-elles en aces bon etas et font honneur Au Païs."²¹

On a écrit des pages fort touchantes sur la formation familiale du marin canadien.²² Mais rien n'approche le tableau que J. Marmette brosse à grands traits, et où l'on voit Charles Le Moyne en patriarche et sa femme, "trempée à l'antique," verser l'héroïsme à doses massives dans l'âme de leur progéniture.²³ Tout ce que le témoignage de Denonville nous permet de conclure, c'est qu'Iberville a reçu l'éducation que pouvait alors recevoir un membre de la bourgeoisie coloniale.

Mais quelle fut, dans cette formation, la part réservée à l'instruction proprement dite? M. A. Roy parle de l'instruction familiale, de la lecture et du calcul appris sur les genoux de la mère, ou sous la surveillance du père.²⁴ C'est vraisemblable. Encore faut-il, dans le cas particulier d'Iberville, tenir compte de certains faits qui restreignent singulièrement la portée d'une telle supposition. Si l'on se souvient, d'une part, que le père d'Iberville a déjà signé *Challe Moine*, qu'il avait débarqué à Québec à l'âge de quinze ans — ce qui exclut l'hypothèse d'études avancées — et qu'ensuite ses fonctions multipliées, ajoutées aux préoccupations constantes de son commerce, ne durent pas lui laisser beaucoup de loisirs à consacrer à l'instruction d'une famille qui croissait avec une remarquable régularité; si l'on se rappelle, d'autre part, que la mère d'Iberville s'était mariée à la fin de sa treizième année ou au début de sa quatorzième année, qu'entre 1662 et 1674, dates entre lesquelles elle eût pu faire l'éducation de Pierre, elle n'eut pas moins de six enfants, sans compter les trois qu'elle avait déjà,—il est logique de conclure que les circonstances dans lesquelles aurait pu se donner cette

²¹ Denonville au Ministre, 31 octobre 1687, AC, C 11A, 10:94v.

²² Reed, *The first great Canadian*, 31-33; [Desmazures], *Histoire du chevalier d'Iberville*, 37.

²³ J. Marmette, *Les Machabées de la Nouvelle-France*, Québec, 1878, 75-76.

²⁴ A. Roy, *Les lettres, les sciences et les arts au Canada sous le régime français*, Paris, 1930, 8.

instruction furent extrêmement défavorables et la rendirent pratiquement impossible.

Reste l'école publique. Quelle était-elle à Montréal entre 1661 et 1675? Son enseignement ne pouvait être que rudimentaire. En 1661, il n'y avait que dix-neuf ans que la ville était fondée. Durant tout ce temps les raids continuels des Iroquois avaient paralysé son développement. Pourtant, c'est vers cette année 1661 que M. Gabriel Souart "qui a fait les premières écoles dans ce lieu," semble avoir entrepris d'instruire les petits montréalais.²⁵ On ne voit pas qu'Iberville ait pu faire ses classes ailleurs.

Mais cette école fonctionnait-elle avec beaucoup de régularité? Rien n'est moins sûr. En 1681, soit vingt ans après la date à laquelle on place la fondation de l'école de M. Souart, M. Tronson écrivait à celui-ci: "Ce serait assurément un des plus grands biens qu'on pût faire dans le païs que d'en établir une (école) bien réglée." Et encore l'année suivante: "S'il ne survient point de nouvelles tempestes et que l'on vous laisse en repos, comme il y a tout sujet de l'espérer, vous aurez l'année prochaine de quoy contenter vos désirs pour l'établissement d'une école paroissiale."²⁶ Il n'est pas étonnant qu'une telle école n'ait donné à Iberville qu'un enseignement strictement élémentaire. Un coup d'oeil sur sa correspondance suffit pour étayer cette conclusion, et cela même en un temps où les meilleurs écrivains ne se préoccupaient pas de mettre toujours l'orthographe.²⁷

Mais cela importe assez peu puisque, de son propre aveu, Iberville ne se destinait pas aux études, mais au métier des armes et plus particulièrement à celui de marin. Il ne faisait en cela que suivre un courant qui se dessinait très nettement en Nouvelle-France. Talon écrivait en 1671 que la jeunesse canadienne se jettait littéralement dans la marine.²⁸ Et cet engouement pour les choses et surtout pour les grades de la marine ne devait pas cesser de sitôt; pour la seule année 1693, par exemple, les "Ex-

²⁵ L'abbé Souart fut supérieur de Saint-Sulpice, à Montréal, de 1661 à 1668. Entre ces deux dates, il fit "plusieurs fondations, entre autres les avances d'un commencement pour l'établissement des petites écoles." On croit qu'il enseignait encore en 1672 et 1674. En 1666, deux Sulpiciens arrivèrent à Montréal pour s'occuper de l'instruction primaire. Peu après l'un d'eux fut chargé d'une autre mission. À partir de 1672, un sous-diacre, M. Rémy, s'occupa aussi d'enseignement. Cf. Amédée Gosselin, *L'instruction au Canada*, 79-81.

²⁶ Cité par L. Groulx, *L'enseignement français au Canada*, 2 vols., Montréal, 1933-1934, I, 33.

²⁷ Cf. C.-A. Sainte-Beuve, "Lettre sur l'ortographe," *Causeries du lundi*, 16 vols., Paris, s. d., XI, 426-431.

²⁸ "Mémoire au Roi sur le Canada," AC, C 11A, 3:168v-169, dans RAPQ, 1931, 161.

traits des lettres et demandes" révèlent qu'une trentaine de Canadiens sollicitent un emploi dans l'armée navale.²⁹

Iberville commença de bonne heure à préparer sa carrière de marin. "Dès l'âge de quatorze ans," lit-on dans le "Mémoire succinct," "il se forma à la navigation par plusieurs voyages qu'il fit dans le golfe de Saint-Laurent, tant à l'isle Percée qu'autres lieux, dans un bâtiment qui appartenoit au sieur Le Moyne, son père, et ensuite il fit plusieurs voyages en France sous d'habiles navigateurs."³⁰

Le marin montréalais reçut-il dans son adolescence une autre formation maritime? Voilà une question à laquelle M. Desmazures et Mr. Reed—qui, en cela, suit le premier biographe avec une remarquable fidélité—se sont hâtés de répondre par l'affirmative. Mr. Reed, une fois de plus, est très précis. À son dire, c'est vers 1673 que Sainte-Hélène, Iberville et Maricourt, sous la recommandation de Frontenac,³¹ furent reçus dans la marine royale comme élèves officiers. Après quatre ou cinq années d'études, après avoir étudié les mathématiques, l'artillerie, ainsi que l'hydrographie théorique et pratique, Iberville aurait alors complété son éducation sur les vaisseaux du Roi, sous les ordres de Tourville, du maréchal d'Estrées et de Jean Bart. D'ailleurs, coïncidence heureuse à la vérité, Colbert était justement occupé à bâtir la marine française.³² Coïncidence non moins remarquable, M. Desmazures avait longtemps auparavant, donné les mêmes précisions. Après avoir rappelé que Colbert s'efforçait justement, à cette époque, "de mettre la marine militaire sur le plus grand pied," et qu'à cet effet il s'appliquait à faire enseigner "les mathématiques, l'hydrographie, le service du canon," l'historien sulpicien avait affirmé gratuitement que Sainte-Hélène, Iberville et Maricourt—âgés respectivement de quatorze, douze et dix ans, en 1673, (le dernier aurait fait un bien petit mousse)—furent envoyés en France et que là "d'Iberville avec ses frères passa quatre ou cinq ans dans l'apprentissage de la vie de marin."³³ De nombreux auteurs ont répété, quoique avec moins de détails, cette même affirmation, G. M. Wrong,³⁴ F. Parkman,³⁵ F. Daniel,³⁶

²⁹ AC, C 11A, 12:329-358v. Le grade d'enseigne de vaisseau paraît avoir joui d'une singulière popularité.

³⁰ "Mémoire succinct . . .," dans Guérin, IV, 470.

³¹ Nous n'avons vu nulle part dans la correspondance de Frontenac, aucun indice d'une telle recommandation.

³² Reed, *The first great Canadian*, 38-39.

³³ [Desmazures], *Vie du chevalier d'Iberville*, 63-68.

³⁴ *The Canadians, the Story of a People*, New York, 1938, 116.

³⁵ *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV*, Boston, 1884, 388.

³⁶ *Nos gloires nationales*, 159.

L. Gougeon,³⁷ A. Jodoin et J. L. Vincent,³⁸ F. de Kastner,³⁹ J. Marmette,⁴⁰ et sans doute d'autres encore.

C'est cependant une erreur. L'école d'art maritime dont ces historiens veulent parler, et certains d'entre eux la mentionnent en termes exprès, est celle des gardes-marine. Établie à Rochefort, à Toulon et à Brest, elle était réservée à huit cents membres de "la jeune noblesse qui voudroit servir sur mer." On y donnait un enseignement théorique qu'un entraînement poursuivi sur les vaisseaux du roi devait compléter; et comme le corps des gardes-marine était exclusif, c'est-à-dire ouvert aux seuls gentilshommes, on n'y négligeait pas l'enseignement des arts d'agrément: le personnel comprenait, par exemple, des maîtres à danser. Or, fait qui réduit à néant les hypothèses de ceux qui avancent qu'Iberville y fut admis vers 1675, ce corps ne fut constitué qu'en 1683.⁴¹ Iberville avait alors vingt-deux ans.

Y entra-t-il à cet âge? Nous ne croyons pas. À cette date, Iberville pouvait déjà se passer de l'enseignement de la "belle école," car en 1683, La Barre écrivait "qu'il entendait fort bien la mer."⁴² De plus, il semble que les deux premiers Canadiens qui y aient été reçus, ne le furent pas avant 1685,⁴³ c'est-à-dire un an avant la première campagne d'Iberville à la baie d'Hudson; ce dernier n'aurait eu alors que le temps d'y passer.⁴⁴ Ajoutons que c'était une distinction réelle que d'y être admis: la Nouvelle-France ne pouvait prétendre qu'à deux candidats par année. Dans

³⁷ "Le Chevalier d'Iberville," *Revue canadienne*, XXV, 1889, 32.

³⁸ *Histoire de Longueuil et de la famille de Longueuil*, 86.

³⁹ *Héros de la Nouvelle-France, Le Moyne d'Iberville*, Québec, 1902, 15.

⁴⁰ *Les Machabées de la Nouvelle-France*, 80.

⁴¹ L. Moréri, *Le grand dictionnaire historique*, 10 vols., Paris, 1759, s. v. "gardes de la marine."

⁴² La Barre au ministre, 4 novembre 1683, cité par P. G. R[oy], "Le fils de M. de Saurel," BRH, XXVII, 1921, 29.

⁴³ E. Richard, *Report on Canadian Archives, 1899, Supplement*, Ottawa, 1901, 270.

⁴⁴ Iberville n'aurait pas eu besoin d'aller chercher dans la métropole les éléments de l'hydrographie. De bonne heure, en effet, on commença à enseigner cette matière au Collège des Jésuites, en 1665, selon M. l'abbé Gosselin. Cette chaire eut pour premier titulaire Martin Boutet, aussi connu sous le nom de Sieur de Saint Martin, *Jugements et délibérations*, III, 1011. Ce dernier exerça cette fonction jusqu'en 1677, BN, Clairambault, 1016:396. Le 13 octobre 1676, le Père Enjalran écrit que Saint Martin "à instruit la plus part des capitaines qui conduisent des vaisseaux en ce pays," *Jesuit Relations*, LX, 142. Iberville avait alors quinze ans. Suivit-il les cours de Martin Boutet? Rien ne l'indique, et nous ne le croyons pas. Le "Mémoire succinct," on l'a vu, fait consister toute son éducation dans la pratique. À ce sujet, l'inventaire de la succession de Charles Le Moyne nous apprend que celui-ci possédait un vaisseau qui faisait la traversée de l'océan, Jodoin et Vincent, *Histoire de Longueuil*, 77-79. Ne semblerait-il pas tout naturel qu'Iberville se fût initié à la manoeuvre et au commandement sur le navire de son père?

ce cas pourquoi les documents ne mentionneraient-ils pas l'admission d'Iberville, alors qu'ils rapportent celle de son frère Sérigny?⁴⁵ Pourquoi, en particulier, le "Mémoire succinct" ne rappellerait-il pas un fait de cette importance, alors qu'il fait état de choses aussi peu remarquables que deux lettres que le gouverneur de La Barre écrivit au marin montréalais le 23 février et le 3 juillet 1689, ou encore que deux lettres écrites au même par le ministre, le 18 avril et le 6 mai 1693? Pourquoi resterait-il silencieux sur ce fait, alors que, comme nous l'avons noté, c'est à partir de 1683 que les affirmations de ce document se font plus précises?

Du reste aucun de ceux qui ont affirmé qu'Iberville fut garde-marine n'en a apporté la preuve. C'est ce qui semble avoir autorisé le P. Le Jeune à écrire que cette affirmation lui "paraît gratuite et controuvée";⁴⁶ mais le principal argument sur lequel il s'appuie, qui est un acte notarié par Iberville à Montréal, le 15 mars 1678,⁴⁷ prouve simplement que celui-ci se trouvait au Canada à cette date, qui d'ailleurs, vient cinq ans trop tôt ou quatre ans trop tard.

Mais cela nous donne une idée de ce qu'il ne fit pas dans sa jeunesse plutôt que de ce qu'il fit. Une chose est certaine: il faut qu'il ait appris quelque part son métier de marin. Il devait y exceller au point que Charlevoix n'a pas craint d'émettre l'opinion qu'il n'y avait "peut-être pas en France de plus habile Manoeuvrier que lui."⁴⁸ S'il ne l'étudia pas dans une école, il l'acquit par la pratique. Ici, nous avons des indications plus explicites. Le "Mémoire succinct," nous l'avons vu, affirme très nettement qu'il "fit plusieurs voyages en France sous d'habiles navigateurs."⁴⁹ Affirmation corroborée par M. de la Barre, qui, dans la lettre citée plus haut, rappelle que le jeune marin "a mené et ramené déjà plusieurs navires en France," et demande pour lui un brevet d'enseigne de vaisseau.⁵⁰

A ce sujet le P. Le Jeune écrit: "Quant au grade de *garde de la marine* que quelques biographes lui ont décerné gratuitement, il n'est resté aucun document authentique qui en indique l'époque de la nomination. On peut la supposer avec une certaine vrai-

⁴⁵ Résumé des lettres de Denonville et Champigny, 31 octobre et 6 novembre 1688, AC, C 11A, 10:184v.

⁴⁶ *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville*, 22.

⁴⁷ O. L. Schmidt Collection, Chicago Historical Society, vol. I, 189.

⁴⁸ P. F. X. Charlevoix, *Histoire et description générale de la Nouvelle-France*, 3 vols., Paris, 1744, II, 206.

⁴⁹ "Mémoire succinct," dans Guérin, IV, 470.

⁵⁰ Cité par P. G. Roy, "Le fils de M. de Saurel," BRH, XVII, 1921, 29.

semblance et quelque fondement, puisque le gouverneur sollicite en sa faveur le brevet d'*enseigne de vaisseau*.⁵¹ Ce passage est étrange. Un tel grade n'existait pas. Comme nous l'avons vu, les gardes-marine étaient les élèves officiers des écoles navales du roi, et quatre pages plus hauts le même historien émet l'opinion que l'admission d'Iberville à cette école paraît être une "supposition . . . gratuite et controuvée." Profitons-en pour tâcher de marquer les étapes d'Iberville dans la marine française. Il reçut le grade de capitaine de frégate légère en 1692,⁵² et fut promu à celui de capitaine des vaisseaux du roi en 1702.⁵³ C'est tout ce que disent les documents. Rien au sujet des grades inférieurs. Ici deux hypothèses se présentent. Ou bien Iberville a sauté par dessus les premiers échelons du *cursus honorum*, ou bien l'auteur du "Mémoire succinct" a cru inutile de parler des premières promotions.

Nous savons que lorsque La Barre, en 1683, envoya le jeune marin porter ses dépêches, il demanda un brevet d'enseigne en sa faveur. Le P. Le Jeune croit que la requête n'eut pas de suite.⁵⁴ Cependant la commission de capitaine de frégate, obtenue neuf ans plus tard, porterait à croire que son titulaire avait déjà reçu les brevets d'enseigne et de lieutenant.⁵⁵

Mais il est sûr qu'Iberville ne passa pas toute sa jeunesse à bord. Même s'il avait déjà fait plusieurs fois la traversée de l'océan en 1683, il avait aussi travaillé au Canada à cette époque. Le journal de l'expédition du chevalier de Troyes, nous le montre comme l'un des meilleurs canoteurs du détachement qui chassa les Anglais du fond de la baie d'Hudson en 1686.⁵⁶ Le canotage ne s'apprend guère sur les vaisseaux du roi. Du reste, pourquoi n'aurait-il pas travaillé pour son père? Dans le mémoire de Frontenac sur les coureurs de bois cité plus haut, on lit que "le père et les enfants de ce Le Moyne . . . attirent les Sauvages" au bout de l'île de Montreal, "et traitent aussi avec des coureurs de bois."⁵⁷ L'habileté qu'Iberville devait plus tard déployer dans le

⁵¹ *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne*, 26.

⁵² "Mémoire succinct," dans Guérin, IV, 474.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 477.

⁵⁴ Le Jeune, *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne*, 26.

⁵⁵ En 1690, Denonville demandait un brevet de lieutenant de vaisseau pour Pierre Le Moyne, AC, C 11A, 10:340.

⁵⁶ "Relation et journal du voiage du nord par un detachment de cent hommes commandés, par le Sieur de Troyes en mars 1686," publié par I. Caron sous le titre *Journal de l'expédition du chevalier de Troyes à la baie d'Hudson en 1686*, Beauceville, 1918, 24, 26, 28-29, 57-58.

⁵⁷ "Mémoire et preuve de la cause du désordre des coureurs de bois, avec le moyen de les détruire, 1681," RAFPQ, 1927, 120-124.

commerce avec les sauvages, tant au nord qu'à la Louisiane, suffirait à faire croire qu'il était familier avec les méthodes qui avaient si bien servi Charles Le Moyne.

Tenterons-nous de tracer un portrait physique de Pierre Le Moyne? M. Desmazures l'a fait.⁵⁸ Mr. Reed n'y a pas manqué.⁵⁹ Leurs descriptions ne sont que des exercices de style. Quant au portrait qui est reproduit un peu partout,⁶⁰ on ne sait pas quelle en est l'authenticité. S'appliquer à y trouver, comme fait le P. Le Jeune, de "l'énergie" et de la "tenacité"⁶¹ est aussi facile que stérile. Tout ce que nous pouvons dire, c'est que Denonville trouvait que les fils de Charles Le Moyne étaient tous de "fort Jolis Enfants."⁶² Il décrivait aussi Iberville comme un "tres Joly homme."⁶³ Qu'il ait eu de l'allure et un air martial, on peut le supposer en s'appuyant sur le mot de Philippe Gaultier de Comporté, l'un des directeurs de la Campagne du Nord: "C'est un gentilhomme d'un tres grand merite et d'une conduite admirable et soldat comme l'espée qu'il porte."⁶⁴

L'esquisse d'un portrait moral présente des difficultés plus grandes encore. Cette figure extrêmement complexe ne se laisse pas aisément réduire en formules. Le P. Le Jeune écrit: "Il possédait la maîtrise de soi et il dominait à son gré ses inclinations inférieures qu'il savait soumettre aux puissances supérieures."⁶⁵ Cependant, deux pages plus haut, il raconte à demi-mots l'aventure qui arriva au marin montréalais peu avant sa première campagne à la baie d'Hudson, en 1686. Nous allons rappeler les faits le plus brièvement possible en nous appuyant sur les données que l'on peut trouver dans les pièces—toutes publiées—du procès.

Le 11 mai 1686, Jeanne Geneviève Picoté de Belestre accusa Iberville de l'avoir séduite. Le lendemain, le bailli de Montréal, devant qui elle "avoüe ingénument sa foiblesse," enregistra sa plainte dans la maison de Pierre Devanchy "où elle estoit, ayant

⁵⁸ [Desmazures], *Histoire du chevalier d'Iberville*, 37. Cette description se trouve dans un page où l'auteur nous apprend qu'Iberville était le digne fils du "baron" de Longueuil; or le premier baron de Longueuil fut Charles, son frère aîné, qui reçut ce titre le 26 janvier 1700; cf. l'acte d'érection en baronnie de la terre et seigneurie de Longueuil dans Jodoin et Vincent, *Histoire de Longueuil*, 179-183.

⁵⁹ Reed, *The first great Canadian*, 45, 46, 116.

⁶⁰ Margry, IV, frontispice.

⁶¹ *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne*, 29.

⁶² Denonville au Ministre, 10 novembre 1686, AC, C 11A, 8:129.

⁶³ "L'Estat des affaires avant et depuis l'arrivée de M^r de frontenac jusques au depart des Vaisseaux," AC, C 11A, 10:340.

⁶⁴ De Comporté à Villermont, 30 octobre 1687, BN, Clairambault, 1016:485.

⁶⁵ *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne*, 29.

esté abandonnée de ses Soeürs.”⁶⁶ La jeune fille paraissait singulièrement désespérée, comme l’indique la scène qu’elle fit devant le magistrat, “lui declarant qu’elle n’auroit aucun soin du fruit qu’elle auroit Et qu’elle mouroit plustost que de l’aletter,”⁶⁷ si bien qu’on dut charger quelqu’un de veiller de quinzaine en quinzaine sur la malheureuse et sur “la conservation de son fruit.”⁶⁸ L’affaire, portée devant le Conseil Souverain, traîna en longueur. On tenait à ce qu’Iberville remplît la promesse de mariage que, disait-on, et c’était très vraisemblable, il avait faite à la jeune fille.⁶⁹ Le marin risquait gros. Des procès de moeurs avaient entraîné, devant le même tribunal, des sentences capitales et des condamnations aux galères.⁷⁰ Et on ne l’accusait pas moins que de “Crime de rapt Et Séduction.”⁷¹

S’il s’en tira, c’est que, malgré les multiples défenses de quitter les lieux que le Conseil lui enjoignait, il paraissait littéralement insaisissable. D’abord, il ne revint de l’expédition du nord qu’en octobre 1687. Au moment où l’on crut l’atteindre, le tribunal reçut une “remontrance” du gouverneur Denonville, établissant la nécessité où était Iberville de passer en France “pour aller rendre compte à S. M. des affaires de la Baie du Nord.”⁷² Toutefois Jacques de Maleray de la Mollerie qui, depuis le 11 avril, avait remplacé sa femme, Françoise Picoté, comme tuteur de la jeune soeur de celle-ci, ne désarmait pas. Le 14 juin 1688, il parvenait à faire imposer au prévenu une défense de sortir de la ville “A peine d’estre atteint et convaincu des cas a luy imposez.”⁷³ Quoique Iberville, puis son procureur, Denis Riverin, eussent demandé enquête sur “la conduite Et la vye de la dite de Belestre,” et que l’accusé eût tenté, pour se justifier, de “faire informer de la mauvaise conduite de la Picotté,”⁷⁴ celui-ci n’en fut pas moins déclaré coupable, le 22 octobre 1688.

La sentence portait qu’il devait prendre son enfant—une fille qui avait été baptisée le 21 juin 1686⁷⁵—et l’élever à ses frais jusqu’à l’âge de quinze ans, en laissant à la mère l’entière liberté de la voir.⁷⁶ Quoique le P. Le Jeune déclare qu’on ne saurait dans

⁶⁶ *Jugements et délibérations*, III, 194.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 195.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 260.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 195.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 517-518, 575-576, 661-662.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, III, 258.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 234.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 238.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 234.

⁷⁵ *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne*, 27.

⁷⁶ *Jugements et délibérations*, III, 263-264.

de tels litiges, avoir "de certitude positive contre le véritable délinquant,"⁷⁷ il paraît bien difficile de ne pas donner entièrement tort à Iberville. En effet, le clan Le Moyne ne manquait pas de puissance à l'époque. Il fallait que l'évidence fût nettement contre le marin montréalais pour qu'il se vît condamner après un procès qui avait duré deux ans. Quoi qu'il en soit, et malgré l'inélégance de la conduite qu'il avait tenue en cette occasion, Jeanne-Geneviève Picoté qui, dans ce procès, semble bien s'être fait forcé la main par sa famille, parut toujours espérer qu'Iberville finirait par la marier. Ce n'est, en effet, que le 2 octobre 1693, soit six jours avant le mariage de Pierre Le Moyne et de Marie-Thérèse Pollet,⁷⁸ qu'elle se retira chez les religieuses de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Montréal, où elle mourut, à l'âge de 54 ans, en juin 1721.⁷⁹

La conclusion de cette affaire semble dépasser les limites que nous nous étions tracées. Mais l'évènement qui l'avait causée eut lieu à l'automne de 1685, quelques mois avant l'expédition du nord. Ce dernier acte de la jeunesse d'Iberville ne doit pas faire oublier ce qui l'avait précédé; une longue préparation au rôle de soldat des avant-postes de l'empire français d'Amérique. Combien cette préparation fut effective, vingt ans de campagnes brillantes allaient le prouver. Le jugement de Léon Guérin est classique :

C'était un héros dans toute l'étendue de l'expression. Si ses campagnes, prodigieuses par leurs résultats obtenus avec les plus faibles moyens matériels, avaient eu l'Europe pour témoin et non les mers sans retentissement des voisinages du pôle, il eût obtenu de son vivant et après sa mort un nom aussi célèbre que celui des Jean Bart, des Duguay-Trouin et des Tourville, et fût sans aucun doute parvenu aux plus hauts grades et aux plus hauts commandements dans la marine.⁸⁰

GUY FRÉGAULT

Loyola University
Graduate School

⁷⁷ *Le chevalier Pierre Le Moyne*, 28.

⁷⁸ Une reproduction photographique du contrat de mariage d'Iberville est publiée dans RAPQ, 1926, 128.

⁷⁹ Cabrette [E. Z. Massicotte], "Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville et Mlle. Picoté de Belestre," BRH, XXI, 1915, 224.

⁸⁰ *Histoire maritime de la France*, IV, 162.

The "De Soto Map"

In addition to the various accounts of Hernando De Soto's expedition a map is usually given as illustrating the journey of the conquistador through the southern United States. It may be described as a sketch map of the Gulf of Mexico, including the Florida peninsula. How far north it extends can only be deduced, for no latitudes are shown. If, however, the length of the Florida peninsula from 25° to 30° north latitude is taken as a standard, the 38th parallel will be found at the top of the map, that is approximately on a line with Evansville, Indiana, and Lexington, Kentucky. Neither are there any longitudes, but the westernmost portion of the map is very close to the Gulf coast. Many rivers and some mountain ranges are shown, and there are 127 different names or descriptive legends on it. There is no title on the face of the map, but according to HARRISSE, the map is labelled "Golfo y Costa de la Nueva España,"¹ which inscription, we conclude, is on the back of the map, since it is not on the face of the photograph examined. In 1881 the map was exhibited in Madrid and listed under the title, "Diseño de las costas de Tierra firme descubiertas por Diego Velazquez y Francisco de Garay, y de la Florida, que descubrió Juan Ponce de Leon.—1521." However, there is no information about the cartographer nor about the time when it was drawn. The opinions of writers who have tried to identify the maker of this map and to date it are briefly reviewed in the following paragraphs.

HARRISSE was the first to reproduce the map, which was found in the Archives of the Indies at Seville,² and to comment upon it. His reproduction is apparently made from a tracing containing errors of transcription.³ In his list of maps, he included it in the chapter pertaining to "Doubtful Maps," under 1521, the date given to it by those who prepared the Madrid exhibition. Har-

¹ H. HARRISSE, *The Discovery of North America. A Critical, Documentary, and Historic Investigation, with an Essay on the Early Cartography of the New World*, London, 1892, 643.

² *Archivo General de Indias*, 145-7-8. A photograph of the original is in the Karpinski Collection.

³ Since HARRISSE's publication of it, the map has appeared several times. These reproductions seem all to have been made from this tracing, with the exception of that which accompanies J. A. ROBERTSON'S translation of the account of the De Soto expedition by the Gentleman of Elvas. This latter is from a photograph of the original map, and a transparent sheet accompanies it on which there is a transcription of the nomenclature. No reproduction of the map is inserted in this study because of the lack of a satisfactory photograph from which it could be printed.

risse, however, in his discussion of the map says: "So far from being a map of the discoveries of Velasquez, Garay, or Ponce de Leon, and of the year 1521, it is more than twenty years later, and intended to describe the countries explored by Hernando de Soto and Luis de Moscoso, from May 30, 1539, until July 19, 1543." As to the authorship of the map, this writer merely observes: "Herrera mentions a map of that expedition given to him by one Antonio Boto, which may have been a copy of the present."⁴

Harrisse's statements were repeated by those who discussed this map in later years. Nordenskiöld, writing, in 1897, dates it 1543.⁵ His mention of the map is very brief and his references are to Harrisse. The De Soto nomenclature seems to have led Nordenskiöld to date the map as he does; apparently he overlooked the facts that the survivors of the expedition, though they reached Mexico in September 1543, did not return to Spain until 1544, and that the official report of Biedma was not turned over to the government until that year.

In 1900, Pedro Torres Lanzas, who examined the map personally, indicated its provenance.⁶ On the back, he wrote, is the following inscription: "De los papeles que traxeron de Seuilla de Alonso Santa Cruz," but he does not give Santa Cruz as the author. He listed it, without date, under the title, "Mapa del Golfo y Costa de Nueva España, desde el Rio de Panuco hasta el cabo de Santa Elena &." Two years later, in 1902, Theodore H. Lewis said that the sketch was compiled after 1543 and before the results of the Luna expedition of 1559-1561 were known. Had it been made after 1559, he reasoned, it is unlikely that the cartographer would have omitted geographical information derived from the accounts of the Luna expedition. He makes no mention of the author of the sketch and calls the reproduction which he published a "Copy of an original and the earliest known map of the De Soto expedition."⁷ It is, however, taken from the Harrisse reproduction. In his book on the *Islario* of Santa Cruz, Franz

⁴ H. Harrisse, 643-644.

⁵ A. E. Nordenskiöld, *Periplus, an Essay on the Early History of Charts and Sailing-directions*, Stockholm, 1897, 182a.

⁶ P. Torres Lanzas, *Relación Descriptiva de los Mapas, Planos, &, de México y Floridas existentes en el Archivo General de Indias*, 2 vols., Seville, 1900, I, 17.

⁷ T. H. Lewis, "Route of De Soto's Expedition from Taliepacana to Huasene," in *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society* (1902), VI, 449-467; reprinted in *A Symposium on the Place of Discovery of the Mississippi River by Hernando de Soto*, Jackson, 1927, 12-30. The De Soto map is discussed on page 13 of the latter volume.

von Wieser mentions that the sketch was found in the papers of Santa Cruz, but, according to him, it does not seem to have been made by Santa Cruz, and without giving a reason for his statement he asserts that it only belonged to him. Von Wieser merely combined what he found in Harrisse and Torres Lanzas; he ends his short reference to the map by expressing the wish that someone would publish and describe it.⁸

Lowery was the first to attribute the map to Santa Cruz.⁹ However, he qualified its entry under this name by saying, "the only supposable reason why this map should be placed under Santa Cruz is that on the back of the map is written 'Golfo y Costa de la nueva esp.^a De los papeles que Trugeron [*sic*] de Sevilla de Alonso de Santa Cruz.'" He listed the map under "1572?" Lowery gave this date because he supposed 1572 to be the year of Santa Cruz's death, whereas 1572 is the year in which Juan López de Velasco, then royal cosmographer, received the papers of Santa Cruz, and, as will be seen, in 1572, Santa Cruz had been dead five years.

The first photographic publication of the map accompanies J. A. Robertson's translation of the narrative of the Gentleman of Elvas.¹⁰ The editor's remarks concerning this map are few. He rejects Santa Cruz as the author. The legend on the back of the map, "De los papeles que traxeron de Sevilla de Alonso de Santa Cruz" is, he wrote, "by some archivist through some error."¹¹ Robertson makes no suggestion as to the identity of the cartographer, nor does he date the map. In the *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission*, where a discussion of the map might be expected, it is only briefly mentioned.¹²

Such are, briefly outlined, the opinions of writers who have mentioned this map. It is the purpose of this paper to ascertain the more probable author of the map, and, as nearly as possible, the date when it was made.

Before taking up these two questions, however, it will be well

⁸ "Eine Beschreibung bezw. Publicierung dieser Karte ist ein pium desiderium." F. von Wieser, *Die Karten von Amerika in dem Islario General des Alonso de Santa Cruz*, Innsbruck, 1908, xvi.

⁹ W. Lowery, *The Lowery Collection. A Descriptive List of Maps of the Spanish Possessions*, Washington, 1912, 78.

¹⁰ *True Relation of the Hardships Suffered by Governor Fernando de Soto. . . . Now newly set forth by a Gentleman of Elvas*. Translated and edited by James Alexander Robertson, 2 vols., Deland, 1933, II, 418.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, II, 427n.

¹² *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission*, Washington, 1939, 11.

to recall briefly the influence which the discovery and exploration in the New World had on the activities of Spanish mapmakers. Previous to the second voyage of Columbus, it was realized that a special agency for handling the affairs of the New World was necessary. The Council of the Indies was accordingly established. At the beginning this organization handled all problems, but soon, along with it, there grew up another administrative body, independent of the Council, which was organized at Seville in 1503. This was the *Casa de la Contratación*.¹³ All that pertained to the political administration of the Spanish territory in the New World was in the hands of the Council of the Indies; the *Casa* would supervise all things economical. The activities of the *Casa* increased in proportion with the establishment of profitable trade relations. As the administration of the commercial affairs of the colonies soon became a tremendous task, it was found advisable to organize the *Casa* into departments, one of which was the geographical division.

This geographical or cosmographical department of the *Casa*, one of the first hydrographic offices to be established, was created in August 1508.¹⁴ By royal decree Amerigo Vespucci was named the first pilot major, that is, the head of the department. Later there were three chief pilots: a resident pilot of the Indian House, a pilot of the royal armada, and a pilot of the Spanish fleet. "It was the chief pilot of the Indian House, who in addition to his other duties passed upon the qualifications of the professors or teachers of cosmography, that is of geography, and who supervised the manufacture of all instruments of navigation. He was to direct the preparation or the revision of the Pattern map."¹⁵ The making of this Pattern map, or *Padrón Real*, as it was called, had been ordained in the royal decree founding the geographical division of the *Casa*; it was to be made jointly by the officials of the *Casa* and the experienced pilots. Upon returning from a voyage, each pilot was to report his findings marked on the chart

¹³ The founding, the jurisdiction, and the functioning of the *Casa* have often been discussed. Cf. M. F. Navarrete, *Disertacion sobre la Historia de la Náutica, y de las Ciencias Matemáticas que han Contribuido á sus Progresos entre los Españoles*, Madrid, 1846, 132 ff., H. HARRISSE, 256 ff., and B. MOSES, "The Casa de Contratación of Seville," in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1894*, Washington, 1895, 93-123.

¹⁴ On this department of the *Casa*, cf. HARRISSE, 256 ff., G. LATORRE, "La Cartografía Colonial Americana," in *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas*, año III (1915), no. 6, 1-10, no. 9 and 10, 1-14, and E. L. STEVENSON, "The Geographical Activities of the Casa de la Contratación," in the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, XVII (1927), 39-59.

¹⁵ E. L. STEVENSON, *loc. cit.*, 42.

he had carried with him. Findings approved by the pilot major and cosmographers were inserted in the *Padrón*.

This arrangement did not work out well in practice. By 1515 charts were found to be at variance with each other. It was apparent that the 1508 ordinance had not been followed, and a few years later a map by Andrés de Morales, not based on the *Padrón*, was considered the best. A junta of pilots of the *Casa* took action and were authorized to correct the charts. On October 6, 1526, Charles V ordered Diego Ribero and other members of the *Casa* to make an official map, and the following year, on August 2, 1527, he ordered that, from that time on, the *Padrón Real* should be known as the *Padrón General* and should be committed to the care of the president and judges of the *Casa*, and checked twice a year. The Ribero map of 1529 is the best known Spanish map to have been compiled in the few years immediately after this decree. Since Ribero was a member of the *Casa* and had the title of Cosmographer to His Majesty, his map may be considered a faithful copy of the *Padrón General* as it existed in 1529, for the *Padrón* itself is no longer extant.

A description of another map designated as a *Padrón* has been preserved by Oviedo. In his *Historia*, he speaks of "the recent map, made by the cosmographer Alonso de Chaves, in the year 1536, after the Emperor had ordered [the members of the geographical division of the *Casa*] to see and examine it."¹⁶ This map of 1536, described by Oviedo,¹⁷ is also lost. It may well have been a copy of the *Padrón* of that time, based upon that of Ribero and his co-workers, for a reconstruction from Oviedo's description shows that it closely resembled Ribero's 1529 map, with additional information received in the interval. Though the Chaves map of 1536 is no longer to be found, that made by Alonso de Santa Cruz in 1542 is extant,¹⁸ it resembles the map of Ribero, the description of the Chaves map, and the Sebastian Cabot map of 1544, an important and well-known map of the period. The similarity of these four maps is easily understood when it is remembered that their authors were contemporary cartographers, working together at the *Casa*, and all of them copying the then existing *Padrón General*.

¹⁶ G. F. de Oviedo y Valdés, *Historia General y Natural de las Indias, Islas y Tierra-firme del Mar Océano*, 4 vols., Madrid, 1851-1855, II, 150.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 141-149; translated in *Historical Magazine*, X (1866), 371-374; from this a map has been partially reconstructed by A. J. Hill for J. V. Brower, "The Mississippi River and Its Source," in *Minnesota Historical Collections*, VII, 28.

¹⁸ This map has been published and analyzed by E. W. Dahlgren, *Map of the World by Alonzo de Santa Cruz, 1542*, Stockholm, 1892.

The above remarks are deemed necessary for a better understanding of the following discussion of the date and the authorship of the De Soto map. While the sketch could have been made by Cabot or Chaves,¹⁹ there are several indications pointing to Santa Cruz as the more probable author.

Alonso de Santa Cruz,²⁰ the son of Francisco de Santa Cruz,²¹ was born in 1506 or 1507, probably at Seville. Little is known of his early years. It has been assumed that he studied at the University of Salamanca. This assumption is based on a manuscript statement found on the last page of an almanac belonging to a former professor of geography in that city, that "en el año de 1512 entró conmigo Alonso de Santa Cruz á San Miguel [Sept. 29] é presté de 1,800 maravedises."²² However, it is not until 1525 that definite information of his activities is available. In that year he was appointed treasurer of the expedition that left Seville in 1526 for the Moluccas under the command of Sebastian Cabot.²³ The expedition was sponsored by a committee of men who were interested in obtaining spices from these islands, and Charles V partially financed the expedition in the interest of geographic exploration. It is probable that Alonso de Santa Cruz joined in the venture because his father was on this committee. Cabot's route, it is supposed, was to be across the Atlantic, through the Straits of Magellan and on to the Moluccas. Cabot, however, went to Brazil. When the fleet of four ships reached Pernambuco, the Spaniards heard tales of great mineral wealth in the region of La Plata, and the commander determined to go there on his way to the Moluccas. The journey to La Plata was beset with disaster. The flagship and a great store of provisions were lost and upon arrival in the region of La Plata, the warlike attitude of the Indians seemed insurmountable. The expedition was a failure, and in 1530 one ship and a few worn out men returned to Spain.

The experience was of great importance to Santa Cruz. He became intensely interested in navigation and like many of his

¹⁹ Ribero died in 1533.

²⁰ Information on the life of Santa Cruz has been drawn from several sources, but principally from M. F. Navarrete, *Disertación*, 192 ff.

²¹ Francisco de Santa Cruz at one time held the position of *alcalde* in Seville; in 1511 he was a contractor for the Armada which the king planned to send to Africa.

²² M. de la Puente y Oleo, *Los Trabajos Geográficos de la Casa de Contratación*, Seville, 1900, 324.

²³ This expedition is fully discussed by H. Harrisse, *John Cabot, the Discoverer of North-America, and Sebastian his Son*, London, 1896, 185 *et seq.*

contemporaries tried to solve the all-important problem: the determination of longitudes at sea.²⁴ In 1535 he established himself permanently in Seville and in the same year he presented to the Junta an instrument he had invented for determining longitude. On July 7, 1536, the Emperor Charles V named him royal cosmographer of the *Casa de la Contratación*, and four years later, appointed him *contino de la Casa Real*. In 1545 he went to Lisbon to make a study of the Portuguese pilots' routes to India and of the variations of the magnetic needle as well as of the Portuguese observations in the distant seas.

Santa Cruz's interests were not restricted to problems of navigation or to cartography. In a letter written to the Emperor, November 10, 1551,²⁵ he says that notwithstanding ill health he had finished the *Crónica de los Reyes Católicos*, from 1490 to the death of Fernando V, the *Crónica de Carlos V*, from 1500 to 1550,²⁶ completed the rough draft of a book on astronomy and made a translation from Latin into Spanish of Aristotle's *Ethics*. He also mentioned in the letter several maps which he had drawn. In 1560, Philip II, whose favor he enjoyed, commanded Santa Cruz to compose an "Islario General." He was able to finish this work before his death, but the book remained in manuscript until 1918.²⁷

Santa Cruz remained a consulting member of the *Casa de la Contratación* until the year of his death. In July 1567, he was a member of a committee to determine whether the Philippine Islands were included in the agreement which the Emperor made in 1529 with the King of Portugal. Four months later, on November 9, 1567, he died in Seville. Until the publication of the passage from the document reproduced in a note,²⁸ the year of his

²⁴ Cf. his book, *Libro de la Longitudines*. This remained in manuscript until 1921, when it was published at Seville under the direction of Antonio Blázquez and Delgado Aguilera.

²⁵ M. F. Navarrete, *Disertación*, 194, summarizes this letter.

²⁶ A. de Santa Cruz, *Crónica del Emperador Carlos V*, 5 vols., Madrid, 1920-1925.

²⁷ *Islario General de Todas las Islas del Mundo . . . con un prólogo de D. Antonio Blázquez*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1918.

²⁸ "Una Real Cédula de 20 de Diciembre de 1567, dice así: Que agora por parte de doña Leonor de Benavides, hermana y heredera de dicho Alonso de Santa Cruz, ha sido hecha relación en este consejo que al dicho su hermano se le debe lo que habrá de haber de la dicha ayuda de costa, (se refiere á la concedida en 1563), que se le ha de pagar en esta Corte, desde fin del año pasado de 1566 hasta el 9 de Noviembre de este presente año de 1567, que falleció suplicándonos mandásemos se le diesen y pagasen para con ello cumplir su ánima y otras cosas que dejó ordenado, y visto por este Consejo se le pague . . ." G. Latorre, "Los geógrafos españoles del siglo XVI," in *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Americanistas*, año I, no. 2, June 1913, 37.

death was given as 1572. This error originated from the date of an inventory made of Santa Cruz's works. On October 12, 1572, Juan de Ledesma, a secretary, drew up the list of Santa Cruz's maps, manuscripts, and papers and forwarded them to Juan López de Velasco; the latter acknowledged receipt of the same two days later.²⁹ Consequently it has been taken for granted that the geographer to whose post Velasco succeeded had died in 1572; this belief was erroneous. It is not known what delayed the inventory of Santa Cruz's papers, unless it was because Velasco was unaware of their existence until 1572, or because Velasco was not appointed cosmographer major until that year.

The inventory of the papers and maps of Alonso de Santa Cruz contains no mention of the De Soto map. The rough sketch may not have been considered worth special mention or it may have been overlooked. That it was at one time with the papers of Santa Cruz may be surmised from the inscription written on the back of the map, "De los papeles que traxeron de Seuilla de Alonso Santa Cruz." The photograph of the original shows the sketch to have been folded, and perhaps left in that state for many years. The edges are broken, though the map is intact. On the original, a word here and there has been crossed out; on the reproductions made from the tracing first published by Harrisse these have been omitted and, as was said above, there are also errors in the transcriptions of the nomenclature.

The map shows the Florida peninsula and the eastern coast line. There are seven rivers flowing into the ocean on the eastern seaboard and in the northeasternmost portion is shown a lake, *Laguna dulce*. According to Harrisse this lake may have been intended to represent Ekanfanoka or Ouaquaphenogaw marsh, between the Flint and the Ockmulgee rivers in Georgia.³⁰ The Gulf coast, with many bays, inlets, and small islands is shown as far as Pánuco. Fourteen rivers, formed from many branches, flow into the Gulf and give the map an unusual appearance. Several mountain ranges are shown in the east and the northwest.

The De Soto map is important in the history of the cartography of America, for it is the first known graphic reproduction of the interior of the southern United States. On it is found for the first time the nomenclature of the interior; hence it is

²⁹ The inventory, as well as the receipts of Ledesma and Velasco, are published in M. Jiménez de la Espada, *Relaciones Geográficas de Indias*, 4 vols., Madrid, 1885, II, xxx ff.

³⁰ H. Harrisse, *The Discovery of North America*, 644.

interesting to inquire into the sources of this nomenclature. As in nearly all of the sixteenth-century maps there are numerous names along the coastline, many of which appear on earlier maps, for instance, on the Ribero map and in Oviedo's description of the lost Chaves map of 1536. The positions of the geographical features and the spelling of the names on the De Soto map, however, more closely resemble the Cabot map of 1544 than any other. In a comparison of the De Soto sketch with the corresponding portion of the known world map of Santa Cruz, dated 1542, the coastline and nomenclature is found to be very similar.

It is not the coastline nomenclature that is of particular interest here, but the inland names. That these names were the result of information brought back by the survivors of De Soto's expedition may be considered certain, but the question arises: from which of the narratives available to the cartographer was the information derived? In the first place, the account of Garcilaso de la Vega may be ruled out because the writing of it was not finished until 1591 and the first publication was in 1605.³¹ Though the accounts of Biedma,³² the *factor* of the expedition, and Ranjel,³³ De Soto's secretary, were not published until the nineteenth century, they had been turned over in manuscript form to the king as official reports of the expedition, and were undoubtedly available to official historians and to the cartographers of the *Casa* soon after the return of the survivors. The account of the Gentleman of Elvas was first published in 1557.³⁴

Thus, three accounts might have been available to Santa Cruz from which to draw the place names for his map. In comparing these place names, it may be noted that the inland places visited by De Soto during the first part of his journey are lacking on the map in question. As a possible explanation for this omission it might be suggested that this is due to the unfinished state of the map. Perhaps the insertion of the many villages visited by the Spaniards in the Florida peninsula and the land immediately north of it would unduly have crowded this section of the map. Again, cartographers did not always use all names available. As the accompanying table shows, the

³¹ Garcilaso de la Vega, *La Florida del Ynca. Historia del Adelantado Hernando de Soto*, Lisbon, 1605.

³² H. Ternaux-Compans, *Voyages, relations et mémoires originaux pour servir à l'histoire de la découverte de l'Amérique*, 20 vols., Paris, 1837-1841, XX, 51-106.

³³ Oviedo, *Historia General*, I, 544 ff.

³⁴ *Relaçam verdadeira dos trabalhos q. ho governador dõ Fernão de soto. . . . Agora nouamête feita per hũ fidalgo Deluas, Evora, 1557.*

comparison between the nomenclature of the map and that in the three accounts, begins with the places visited after the expedition had left the Florida peninsula.³⁵ There are a number of names on the map which do not appear in any known account. This may have come about because the mapmaker had not only the official reports but also the notes or diaries upon which those reports were based. Twenty-nine names are from Ranjel, twenty-four from Biedma, and thirty-nine from the Elvas narrative.

The following considerations explain, perhaps, the larger number of names found both on the map and in the Elvas account. First, these names, as may be seen from the table, are all found toward the end of the Portuguese version of the De Soto expedition. Secondly, the Ranjel account, as published, is unfinished, and tells of the journey only as far Utiangüe, and finally the Biedma report is very brief. None of the names on the map preceding *Chaguet* appear in the Elvas account alone and there is not a single instance of a name appearing in Biedma which is not also found in Ranjel or Elvas. Yet it is known that Santa Cruz was familiar with Biedma's account. In his *Crónica*, where he recounts the De Soto expedition,³⁶ the place names, though fewer in number, except for minor differences in spelling, agree more closely with those in the Biedma account than in any other accounts now extant. It is also quite certain that he had the Ranjel narrative. Two names on the map, *Guaquila* and *Itaba*, are found only in Ranjel. Furthermore, it may be noted that the spellings of the names on the map seem to agree more closely with those in Ranjel's report than in the other narratives.

Oviedo had the report written by Ranjel, upon which he based his account of the De Soto expedition. As this was finally published, the last chapters are missing. From the brief extant summary of these chapters, it is clear that Oviedo saw the report in its entirety. It is probable that the cartographer who drew the De Soto map also saw Ranjel's complete report and that he read in it the names which appear on the westernmost portion of the map, for all such reports of recent voyages had to be communicated to the *Casa* immediately upon the return to Spain of the members of the expedition. Exactly when Ranjel

³⁵ The names on the De Soto map as used in the table are taken from the transcription published by J. A. Robertson; those in the Ranjel column are from Oviedo's account; those in the Biedma narrative from B. Smith's first publication of the account in Spanish (in *Colección de Varios Documentos para la Historia de la Florida*, London, 1857, 47-64), and the names in the Elvas column are from Robertson's facsimile publication.

³⁶ Santa Cruz, *Crónica del Emperador Carlos V*, IV, 442 ff.

turned over to the government the report written from his diary of the journey is not known, but it seems likely that it was within a year or two after the return of the survivors in 1544.

The De Soto map, then, in which are found names so evidently derived from the Ranjel account, could not have been drawn before 1544 or 1545. Had it been made after 1561, as Lewis noted, it is unlikely that some geographical information obtained from the reports of the Luna expedition would not have been in-

NOMENCLATURE ON THE DE SOTO MAP

DE SOTO MAP	RANJEL	BIEDNA		ELVAS
		<u>Narrative</u>	<u>Crónica</u>	
chitala				
chalaq	Chalaque			Chalaque
abuymay				
guaqujlla	Guaquilli			
cotaq	Cofitachequi	Cofaqui	Cositaehique	Cofaqui
guazullj	Guasilli	Cofitaehyque	Guasuli	Cutifaehiqui
canegogas	Canasoga	Guasuli		Guaxule
capalar				Canasagua
chiaha	Chiaha	Chiha		Chiaha
finar				
coste	Coste	Costehe		Coste
aliun				
tallj	Tali			Tali
neter				
cosa	Coqa	Coca	Coza	Coqa
aytaba	Itaba			
vljbahalj	Ulibahali			Ulibahali
tuassi	Tuasi			Toasi
talissi	Talisi	Italisi		Talisse
tascalussa	Tascaluqa	Taszaluza	Trascaluza	Tascaluqa
tiachi	Piachi			Piache
illegible,				
nosco				
pafalaya	Apafalaya			Pafallaya
aljbano	Limamu	Alibanio		Alimamu
chicasa	Chicaqa	Chicaza	Dechicaza	Chicaqa
pacoa	Pacaha	Pacaha		Pacaha
mala				
quisquis	Quizqui	Quizquiz		Quizquiz
niculas				
quigualta	Quiguate	Quiguate	Quiguate	Quiguate
fušte de q haz ⁿ ₃₁				
coljma	Coligua	Coligua	Coligua	Coligoa
casqui	Casqui	Icasqui	Icazqui	Casqui

corporated on the map. From the preceding considerations it is concluded that the map was drawn after 1544 and before 1561.

After having thus narrowed within certain limits the date of the map, an attempt will be made to answer the other question: who is the author of this map? It might, of course, be assumed that the sketch was made by one of the survivors of the expedition. But when the nomenclature of the coastline of the Gulf

AND IN CONTEMPORARY ACCOUNTS

DE SOTO MAP	RANJEL	BIEDMA		ELVAS
		Narrative	Cronica	
cayasi	Cayase	Cayas	Cayas	Cayas
fancō				
palisma	Palisma			Palicema
catayet				
guechoya		Guachoyanque	Guacho	Guachoya
cayas	Cayase			Cayas
epavaquianqui c?				
focamaya				
vtianquj	Utiangüe	Viranque	Ucianque	Autlamque
qujsqualena				
tula	Tula	Tula		Tulla
quipana	Guipana	Quipana	Aquipana	Quipana
nauj				
yaie		Hais		Ayaye
fuēte de Sal				
tane				
chaguet				Chaguete
agucay		Aguacay		Aguacay
guant				
conoal				
palme				
pato				Pato
Cehocatin				
aznaoz				
guasco				Guasco
cenoa c?				
auimax c animay?				Amaye
maya				
lacone		la Came	Lacame	Lacane
aya			Hayo	Aays
aljel c?				
neguateix				Naguatex
mōdacan		Nandacao	Nandacao	Nondacao
njsone		Nisione	Demisiones	Nisschone


is examined, its similarity with the maps drawn by members of the *Casa* after the departure of the expedition rule out such an hypothesis. The map was made by some one well acquainted with the *Padrón General* kept in the *Casa*, and it is highly improbable that anyone other than an official would have access to the manuscript accounts of Biedma and Ranjel. Santa Cruz was certainly among those who, after 1544, had these two qualifications, and, as has been pointed out, there is an inscription on the back of the map to the effect that it was found among his papers.

Of themselves, these facts do not, of course, establish the authorship of the De Soto map; in fact, it is doubtful whether its authenticity will ever be settled beyond the possibility of debate. The following evidence, however, warrants considering Santa Cruz as the more probable author. His successor in office was Juan López de Velasco. The latter obtained the papers and sketches of his predecessor and made use of them in preparing his description of America.³⁷ In the section entitled, "Descripción del Golfo de la Nueva España ó la Florida," there is a list of places, rivers, bays, and ports along the Gulf of Mexico from Florida to Pánuco together with the distances between these various points, and some positions are given in terms of degrees of latitude. This description, says Velasco, is "according to the maps of Santa Cruz."³⁸ If the coastal nomenclature as given by Velasco is compared with that of the De Soto map, they prove to be almost identical. The accompanying sketch shows the few minor variations. In his description, it is true, Velasco does not mention any inland place names. His reason for this is, as he himself observes, because too little was known about the geography of the country beyond the coast itself.

As has been said above, no latitudes are shown on the De Soto map, whereas Velasco gives the latitude of several points along the coast. This would seem to militate against the contention that the De Soto map was made by Santa Cruz. The objection, however, loses much of its force, when it is considered that Velasco may be describing a no longer extant Santa Cruz map, of which the De Soto map was a first sketch. This is no mere surmise, for in no other Santa Cruz map does the coastal nomenclature of the Gulf coincide as closely with Velasco's description as do the coastal legends on the De Soto map. Furthermore, one legend, *Puerto del Copei*, at the mouth of the

³⁷ J. López de Velasco, *Geographia y Descripción Universal de las Indias*, Madrid, 1894.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 180 *et seq.*



The Santa Cruz Map
from Velasco's description
with place names from
the De Soto Map

Legend: The Names
in () are in Velasco only,
in [] are on De Soto's map only,
otherwise are common to both.

Scale: 1 degree lat. = 17½ leagues
1 Spanish league = 17mm.

JUL 1904

GOLFO de la NUEVA ESPAÑA

Rio de Pescadores, appears on no other map of the period except on the De Soto map. Since Velasco, in his description mentions this name, *Puerto del Copey*, which he read on a map made by Santa Cruz, locating it where it is found on the De Soto map, it seems legitimate to conclude that the two maps, that described by Velasco and the De Soto map, were made by the same cartographer, Alonso de Santa Cruz.

BARBARA BOSTON

The Edward E. Ayer Collection
Newberry Library, Chicago

Book Reviews

Texas Statecraft, 1836-1845. By Joseph William Schmitz. The Naylor Company, San Antonio, 1941. Pp. x, 266.

This book is not, and is not intended to be, a history of the Republic of Texas. Dr. Schmitz has held himself rather rigidly to a study of the diplomatic history of the Republic, touching domestic affairs only when an understanding of the local situation contributes to his theme. Within the scope of his intentions, he has written a useful and usable book. Practically all phases of Texan diplomatic history have previously received monographic study, but this is the first effort to weave the story into a unit. This is not to imply that Dr. Schmitz has depended upon these earlier studies for his facts or for his conclusions. Substantially all of the essential source materials for his subject are conveniently available, and he has studied them industriously and independently. Happily, he has done the job so thoroughly that no one is likely to be tempted to do it again.

The straightforward simplicity of the narrative is perhaps the chief contribution of the book; for the diplomacy of the Republic of Texas ranges far and is not inherently simple. J. Pinckney Henderson, James Hamilton, and James Treat stand out with greater distinctness than they have previously done in the story of relations with France, Holland, Belgium, and Mexico. Indeed, the book adds to our knowledge and appreciation of all three. Though Hamilton and Treat were actuated in some measure by the hope of financial reward, their efforts were also largely altruistic. Treat, particularly, deserves a biographical study.

Though the book deals sparingly with personal estimates, Dr. Schmitz takes time out to argue Sam Houston's sincere desire for the annexation of Texas to the United States—convincingly, this reviewer believes—and he explains satisfactorily the apparent hesitation of Anson Jones to call a convention in Texas to accept annexation. Houston's coyness increased the eagerness of President Tyler to hasten annexation in order to block British influence in Texas, danger of which was always more apparent than real; and Jones's delay in calling the convention was utilized by him to obtain a conditional recognition of Texan independence from Mexico.

The book is well indexed, and has a satisfactory bibliography. It should find a welcome reception in the rapidly-increasing number of Texas schools that are offering courses in state history.

EUGENE C. BARKER

University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Propaganda and the American Revolution. By Philip Davidson. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1941. Pp. xvi, 460.

This is a timely book, stimulating and fascinating. Its theme is the part played by propaganda in our war for independence. Presumably almost everyone is aware of the current use of propaganda, but most people look upon it as a modern phenomenon and few suspect the role of propaganda in the infancy of our nation. Most readers will be amazed by the character and prevalence of propagandist activity at that time.

How was it that a generation of American colonists witnessed a revolution in thought and sentiments, a shifting from unquestioned loyalty to England to a resolve to sever all ties? So radical a change could not have been due to mere chance; rather it was the fruit of a decade and more of virtually continuous propaganda. While American propagandists were not numerous they were men of standing in their communities, substantial and influential people such as governors, judges, ministers, writers, lawyers. Foremost among them was Sam Adams, the perfect Whig agitator because of his learning, determination, and untiring activity; and yet neither he nor his associates were true mob leaders or social incendiaries. What they launched was a home rule movement but the Declaration of Independence changed it into secession. Handicapped by lack of a central organization to direct and unify their work they had recourse at first to addresses, petitions, and instructions which they broadcast through the press which was predominantly sympathetic. Supplementing these measures were the support of the Sons of Liberty, and of the Daughters of Liberty whose contribution was a series of spirited resolutions and cooperation in enforcing the non-consumption and non-importation agreements. Moreover non-conforming ministers, in the words of a critic, "beat the drum ecclesiastic," while lawyers quoted authorities in defense of the cause.

Before 1776 the Whig propagandists were intent on arousing alarm over the menace to life, liberty, and property in general, and of religious freedom in particular; at the same time they stressed regard for the future and the advantages of victory. Conscious of the power of the "hate motive" they declared the British to be "frauds, tricksters, liars," whose ruling classes were immoral while their soldiery was noted for wanton cruelty. With sublime disregard for logic they reasoned that what was true of one must be true of all and therefore true of anyone. Tory propaganda they met by rebuttal of the charge that hostilities were begun by the colonists, by denial that independence was their goal, that the colonists were obligated to England, that defeat was certain and that revolution was always sinful. Censorship of the press, surveillance, even violence were resorted to. Demonstrations and parades, songs and plays were made use of. Printing presses

poured forth a torrent of pamphlets, and broadsides impressed the illiterate.

Tories were not inactive. Led by five well-known Anglican clergymen, and assisted by British officials and a few prominent colonists, they employed suggestion as well as direct attack. In addition to contesting all Whig claims they questioned the legality of the Continental Congress, and the representative character of the several associations to restrain trade. They contrasted the sinfulness of treason and ingratitude with the virtue of submission to authority, and they emphasized the inevitability of defeat and the economic chaos which must follow independence of England. Above all they belittled the character of the Whigs whose "common origin" they harped upon. Were they not the "illiterate, thwarted, and envious," "self-seeking debauchees," degenerate ministers of the gospel, the depraved members of society? After 1778 they ridiculed the French Alliance, made sport of colonial currency, distorted news, invented atrocities, indulged in deliberate slander.

With many former leaders in military or diplomatic service after 1776 a new group of Whigs, now become patriots, came to the fore. Theirs was the task of combating defeatism, discontent, and dissension, of arousing enthusiasm, of setting forth the justice of their cause and the certainty of victory, of extolling American commanders and revealing the depravity of the enemy. In short, so diversified were the charges and countercharges that, in the words of Dr. Davidson, the propaganda of patriots and Tories duplicates everything in the 1918 campaign of propaganda.

This is a scholarly treatment of a difficult subject. In gathering data the author has labored industriously as thirty pages of bibliography attest. A calm objectiveness pervades every page. Statements are supported by abundant references. So exhaustive is the inquiry that no facet of the movement has been overlooked. Perusal of this volume leads to the conviction that propagandists played more than a minor role in bringing our struggle for freedom to a successful issue. It reveals too that contrary to general belief they were conversant with all the angles and techniques of the trade, as versatile and ingenious as their present-day fellows. Perhaps there should have been more insistence on the sincerity of these agitators, for recent happenings have revealed how war hysteria can cloud the mind and warp the judgment and bring otherwise sane people to accept assertion as fact, and give credence to the incredible.

CHARLES H. METZGER

West Baden College
West Baden Springs, Indiana

Étude sur les Relations des Jésuites de la Nouvelle-France (1632-1672). By Léon Pouliot, S. J. (Collection des Studia.) Montreal, 1940. Pp. xii, 319.

This book is one of the contributions commemorating the fourth centenary of the approbation of the Society of Jesus by Paul III. It is divided into three unequal parts: the *Relations* themselves, their contents and their influence. The second part is the longest, while the third is treated in a single chapter. In the first part Father Pouliot explains the origin and nature of the *Relations*, and briefly narrates the events that determined the Jesuits to cease publishing them. This part is of particular importance, for most of what has been written by critics falls to the ground when one remembers what the purpose of the writers was. According to Father Pouliot, the *Relations* were "annual reports sent by the Superior of the Jesuits in Quebec to the Provincial in Paris, printed in the seventeenth century, and presented to the general public with the purpose of arousing sympathetic interest and of gaining spiritual and temporal benefactors for the missions of New France." Another remark with regard to the critics may be made here. In order to understand why the spirit of faith and the zeal of the writers was called "fanaticism" at the time when the *Relations* were "re-discovered" in the nineteenth century, we must remember that for these critics anything supernatural pertained to an unacceptable metaphysical conception of the universe, because it could not be measured with a two-foot rule. As for earlier criticisms, the writers of the *Relations* were far less gullible than many so-called "esprits forts" of their day, and they were more truthful than some of their contemporary critics who aired their views in print. They did not, for instance, palm off as their own the work of others; their names are not found on the title page of lampoons which were presented as truthful history; they did not claim to have made fantastic voyages; they indicated what they knew of their own knowledge, and called attention to the fact that certain information was second hand.

For several reasons one regrets that only one chapter, the third of the first part, could be devoted to the "historical value" of the *Relations*, to the credibility of the witnesses. The author refers to some texts of Le Clercq and of Hennepin which call in question the reliability of the accounts given therein. This external evidence, however, is worthless. It is fairly certain that the *First Establishment of the Faith in New France*, as we have it today, was not written by the Recollect whose name appears on the title page, but by a member of the Arnauld clique. As for Pouliot's citation from the *New Voyage*, it is a passage which Hennepin simply copied out of Le Clercq. The author of the *New Voyage* would have done much better not to mention his "great frankness and candor."

One of the modern objections against the *Relations* is that they do

not give a complete history of the colony; that they do not speak of everything and of everybody; in brief, that they are not the newspapers of their day. The critics who complain of the too limited scope of the *Relations* would do well to follow the advice given by Father Pouliot, which is to read the title: "Relation de ce qui s'est passé de plus remarquable dans les Missions des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus en la Nouvelle-France." Had the Jesuits not restricted themselves to the religious sphere of their own missions, had they spoken in their *Relations* of the petty squabbles of the self-seeking politicians of the day, Sulte and others of his ilk would have been the loudest in their denunciations.

The historical value of the *Relations* can be tested by ascertaining the credibility of the writers when they speak of matters which they regarded as purely incidental, but which today are looked upon as most valuable by the geographer, the historian, and the ethnologist. In view of the accuracy of their statements with regard to the customs of the Indians, the geography, the fauna and flora of the country, etc., all of which is now independently verifiable, we may presume that they are also truthful when they write of the principal subject matter of the *Relations*: their labors and hardships in connection with the evangelization of the Indians, of their successes and failures, of the results of their efforts, of the number of infants they baptized, of the number of the converts to the Faith.

In chapters III and IV of Part II, Father Pouliot speaks of the obstacles with which the missionaries had to contend, the intellectual and moral level of the men they had come to evangelize, the environmental conditions of their apostolate. Even if the Jesuits had succeeded after years of efforts in mastering the language of the Indians, in bringing them to such a stage of culture as would make them less opposed to accept the spiritual doctrines and moral precepts of Christianity, it would still be true that in so far as adults are concerned their conversion essentially depended on the supernatural gift of faith which God alone can give. This fact has to be taken into consideration when one wishes to evaluate the results of forty years of missionary labor in New France.

We believe that Father Pouliot's answer to the sneers of Le Clercq is inadequate, because of a wrong approach to the problem. Obviously, the technique of the author of Le Clercq's fifteenth chapter is that of a political pamphleteer. To decry the *Jesuit Relations*, he distorts, perverts, and burlesques the narrative, and then proceeds to criticize, not the real contents, but rather his own parody of the *Relations*. Hence he satirically refers to the "prodigious number of Christian Indians," who now—in the eighties of the seventeenth century—escape the knowledge of Frenchmen who go to their village every year. Instead of trying to refute this charge of exaggeration by means of statistical data available—data which are actually incomplete, and in any

case liable to be misinterpreted by nowadays apologists of Le Clercq's lampoon—it would have been better to ask the simple question, where in the *Relations* do the Jesuits speak of the “prodigious number of Christian converts?” As a matter of fact anyone reading the *Relations* will be astonished by the small number converted after so many years of effort.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Institute of Jesuit History

The Indians of the Western Great Lakes, 1615-1760. By W. Vernon Kinietz. (Occasional Contributions from the Museum of Anthropology of the University of Michigan, No. 10.) University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1940. Pp. xiv, 427.

The author says in the preface that his aim has been “to compile synthetic ethnographies of various tribes” of Michigan and the Great Lakes region, and that his book presents the “recorded ethnography of the contact period,” roughly one century, from 1660 to 1760.

Of the ethnographical merits of the work, this reviewer is incompetent to speak; hence the following comments will concern merely the historical value of some of the sources used. Mr. Kinietz is well aware of the varying value of these sources. His bibliography in which he appraises the trustworthiness of the witnesses, contains “only those works which are cited in the text.” He does not believe in the juvenile practice of listing innumerable titles of books, monographs, “theses,” and articles, often containing no relevant material, whose authors have contented themselves with repeating ready-made ideas without bothering to consult the sources.

“By inference those works not cited were tried and found wanting in one respect or other: the information was without tribal designation; the remarks were obviously made without any direct knowledge of the Indians; the information was so sketchy as to be worthless in itself; or extensive borrowing from other works was evident.” Yet, Mr. Kinietz did not always make the necessary distinction with regard to direct knowledge of Indians. He refers, for instance, to the letters of A. D. Raudot and to the compilation of La Potherie, although neither of these two authors had any direct knowledge of the various customs of the Western Indians. Neither of them came to Michigan, and they had direct knowledge of only those Western Indians who occasionally came to Montreal. Their authority, therefore, is on a par with that of Lafitau, and is certainly less direct than that of Charlevoix. The latter actually visited the West. He saw these Indians “at home,” and in his *Journal*—in contradistinction to his *History*—is the account of an eye-witness. True, he is often apt to attribute the custom of one tribe to another, to be chronologically inaccurate; but still he had an overwhelming advantage over La Potherie and Raudot.

The references to manuscript material would be less inadequate had the folios where the passages are found been referred to by number. What is listed as Cadillac's *Manuscript Relation on the Indians* is no longer a manuscript source, but appears in print in the fifth volume of Margry, pp. 75-132. The manuscript text used by Mr. Kinietz which formerly belonged to Margry and is now in the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, Chicago, is not in the handwriting of Cadillac. In fact, the question whether Cadillac's original manuscript is exactly represented by the Ayer Collection text is still debatable. The style of certain passages reminds one more of Lahontan than of Cadillac, but on the other hand, certain expressions are so clearly Cadillac's that there is no possibility of mistake. That he wrote a relation on the geography of the Great Lakes and on the Western Indians sometime before 1699, or perhaps in that very year, is certain from his letters to Pontchartrain and to Lagny. A close study of the Ayer manuscript, which is presumably a copy of Cadillac's original relation, and a comparison of it with the contents of his voluminous writings would enable one, we think, to determine with a fair degree of accuracy how much is genuinely Cadillac's, and how much was added by the unknown author of this manuscript, the date of which is July 21, 1718.

The reviewer did not find any reference in the text to the manuscript listed under AN, vol. K 1232. If the manuscript thus listed is, as seems likely, AN, series K, vol. 1232:n. 1, Mr. Kinietz was very wise not to make use of it; for this manuscript is merely a compilation made by someone who had not only no direct knowledge of the Indians, but who never came to America. For the same reasons, the manuscript found in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, which the author also lists without using, is equally unreliable. Students of the period will be glad to find, in the appendix, a translation of forty-seven letters of D. A. Raudot dealing with the tribes of the Great Lakes region, which till now have not been translated.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Institute of Jesuit History

The Hero in America. By Dixon Wecter. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1941. Pp. viii, 530.

The author of this volume makes it clear at the outset that he is not attempting to do in 1941 for the world of today substantially that which was done by Carlyle in 1841, when the latter contributed his work on heroes and hero-worship. There has been no attempt to even rewrite the lives of famous Americans, since this has already been done in a great many cases. Rather, the purpose was simpler, ". . . namely, to look at a few of those great personalities in public life—Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Lee, Theodore Roosevelt—from whom we have hewn our symbols of government, our ideas of what is most prizable as 'American.'" To the names here men-

tioned, a great many others have been added, living and dead. The result has been a collection of biographies in miniature, the value of which is very real. An effort has been made, consciously or unconsciously, to reveal the intrinsic meaning of the term "American." Today, with so much evidence of cheap and profitable "patriotism" in practically every walk of life, it is well to give some attention as to the meaning which our truly great men ascribed to "Americanism." They, it is evident, were not nearly so sure that they were true Americans as are many of the disgusting "patrioteers" of 1941.

This volume is a running commentary on the great and the near great in American life, from the time of John Smith to the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt. There is practically no effort at glorification, nor is there any effort to revive the "debunking" techniques which have now become outmoded. The author is consistently concerned with securing true appraisals and proper perspectives, although he is more inclined to dispel fanciful myths associated with former leaders than to add to the laurels of the nation's heroes.

The style is consistently brilliant and trenchant. Writing of the Puritans, for example, the author states: "The spirit of John Calvin—who had burned Servetus for disagreeing with him—did not foster much true charity. Too many of the first settlers came, not to set up an asylum of religious liberty for all men, but to establish their own brand of intolerance. Later, after Puritanism in evaporating left behind such crystals as Unitarian intellectualism, easy-going Congregationalism, and democratic evangelism, it became easier to read into the early spirit of Massachusetts the liberal virtues admired by modern times. But they were hardly there in the beginning. Of political and religious liberalism, as understood by the Republic of Jefferson and Madison, these Forefathers had few traces." This same truth has of course often been expressed before, but perhaps not much more clearly nor more bluntly.

Perhaps the great virtue of the volume lies in the fact that it includes a great many truths omitted from the official biographies. Dealing with Lincoln and the slavery issue, for instance, after stating that Lincoln favored gradual emancipation, but distrusted abolitionists, a quotation is given from one of Lincoln's speeches, made in Massachusetts before an audience apparently unfriendly to abolitionism, "I have heard you have abolitionists here. We have a few in Illinois and we shot one the other day." Likewise, the author includes a reference to Lincoln's action in condemning the 'violence, bloodshed, and treason' of John Brown, as well as a statement indicating Lincoln's belief that the execution of John Brown had been legally just. The entire treatment of Lincoln may be considered objective, although perhaps somewhat sympathetic, and the same thing may be said with reference to the evaluation of Lee. Grant does not fare so well. A real effort is made to be fair in discussing the contributions of Bryan, Theodore

Roosevelt, Edison, Ford, Lindbergh, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and scores of others who receive passing attention. The source material and the secondary works listed give convincing evidence that thorough research produced the volume. An excellent index is provided. This is perhaps the best volume of its type which has been written in this country, and this reviewer recommends it to anyone interested, or uninterested, in biography.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University, Chicago

The Development of Hispanic America. By A. Curtis Wilgus. Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1941. Pp. 941.

This textbook is dedicated to two great scholars and promoters of studies in Latin American affairs, Herbert E. Bolton and the late James Alexander Robertson. Each of these beloved directors of research was wont to tell students: "It is difficult to write a book, but it is easy to criticize one." The remark may be applied especially to textbooks, for the authors of these have necessarily to depend greatly upon the findings of others for statements and interpretations; and criticism readily comes when the writer banks too much upon superficial secondary sources or upon no authorities at all for his opinion in matters outside the field of his particular research. The basis of criticism of a textbook should be its reliability, exactness, and sanity of opinion, but unhappily selections of textbooks for schools and colleges are made almost universally from the viewpoint of the mechanics of the book.

Dr. Wilgus has studiously attended to the mechanics of textbook writing. One cannot quibble about whether he has or has not sufficiently amplified certain facts, trends, or approaches. His arrangement is logical, his chapters are as concise as possible and factual almost to monotony, and he has carried the facts down to the end of 1940. In fact, to some the text will appear to be an introduction to the reading lists. There are ample readings indicated, plentiful visual aids, and an excellent index. Four appendices include a glossary of terms, outlines of Hispanic American constitutions, a bibliographical essay, and, amusingly enough after 800 pages of description of the republics, a single page chart headed "The Americas at a Glance." There must be over 125 maps, graphs, and charts, and the space of roughly 90 pages is given over to lists, exclusive of the periodical literature in the footnotes and the 56 pages of bibliographical essay; surely more than 300 of the 900 pages pertain to aids well-culled from many sources. The book should prove very handy for everybody from "quiz-kids" to graduate students, to say nothing of diffuse professors.

As to reliability and exactness, the book leaves much to be desired. Anyone thinking logically will note the inconsistency of referring in the footnotes and bibliographies to specific writers while at the same

time favoring an altogether diverse opinion in the text. For example on page 208 we read: "The Jesuits held the natives in virtual slavery, reaping rich fruits from their labor"; and students are then directed to read the opposite opinion in cited works, say those of Bolton. "With increased wealth the members became worldly and often corrupt, forgetting their religious vows and the teaching of their faith. In a word, *they were accused,*" *et cetera*, "and, as Henry Morse Stephens has aptly said . . .," *et cetera*; such statements of statements are discrediting to the work, and symptomatic of an unweighed opinion, while the opinion of Stephens, profoundly revered though it may have been at "the round table," is here just another unwarranted generalization. Students seeking the truth are quite apt to be addled on reading Stephens, Bolton, and Wilgus; scholars will certainly want more truth and less opinion.

There is no appreciation of the work of Church and churchmen in the colonies and republics. Catholics in no part of the Americas wish private interpretations of their religious beliefs or criticisms of its moral and dogmatic motivation, much as they deplore the actions of some individual churchmen and some "professional," as opposed to "practical" Catholics. A far better approach than the typical New England one would have been to evaluate the ideals, the means at hand, the difficulties, the native abilities of assimilating religion and education, and the purposes of Inquisition, Index, universities, colleges, missions, churches, *aldeas*, *et cetera*, and to view these institutions in their times rather than in comparison to our times. Facts regarding the Church do not fare well. And other incidental errors of fact crop up, as on pages 241, 201, 171, where dates for printing presses are confused, and page 470 where there is apparently a seven-year-old president of Paraguay.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 23, NUMBER 4

OCTOBER 1941

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

OCTOBER 1941

VOLUME 23

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 12

NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

NON-ECONOMIC FACTORS IN THE FRONTIER MOVEMENT	<i>Gilbert J. Garraghan</i>	263
TOMÁS DE GUADALAJARA, MISSIONARY OF THE TARAHU- MARES	<i>Peter M. Dunne</i>	272
PÉNICAUT AND HIS CHRONICLE OF EARLY LOUISIANA	<i>Elizabeth McCann</i>	288
BOOK REVIEWS		305
<i>PAXSON, The Great Demobilization and Other Essays; ZUBILLAGA, La Florida, La Misión Jesuítica (1566-1572) y La Colonización Española; ROY, Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1939-1940; LANCTOT (EDITOR), New Documents by Lahontan concerning Canada and Newfoundland; DECORME, La Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos durante la Época Colonial. 1572-1767. Tomo II. Las Misiones; ESPINOSA, The First Expedition of Vargas into New Mexico; DOLL, The History of Saint Thomas Parish, Ann Arbor.</i>		
NOTES AND COMMENT		315
INDEX		323

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN
WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELDS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON
RAYMOND CORRIGAN
PAUL KINIERY
JEAN DELANGLÉZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

OCTOBER 1941

VOLUME 23

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 12

NUMBER 4

Non-Economic Factors in the Frontier Movement*

The secret of the vast interest stirred by Turner's frontier hypothesis is very probably the claim it makes to be the open sesame of our national history, to be the single key unlocking its mysteries, solving its problems. The attempt to reduce the multiplicity of details that fill out a highly complex block of history to the unity of a single, comprehensive, all-embracing formula in which the details find a common ultimate interpretation is instinctive to the human mind. And such a formula Turner gave us: "The existence of free land in the West explains American history." Unquestionably a simplification of this sort, even though it be an oversimplification, has its attractions for the hard-pressed historian seeking to get behind a welter of individual facts to the fundamental truth that binds them together and gives them meaning. Yet, for all its fascination, the urge to simplify in history can easily become an urge in the wrong direction. The fact of the matter is that no complex historical phenomenon is explicable by a single cause, a fact stated by no one more emphatically than by Turner himself, as shall presently be seen. In a discussion of the causes of the World War at the Urbana meeting of the American Historical Association in 1934, it was agreed that no single cause could be invoked to explain the epochal conflict; resort must be had to a combination of causes. So it is with the frontier hypothesis. It explains much in American history; it does not, it cannot explain everything, and this in the very nature of things, which postulates a plurality of causes for so intricate, so many-sided a phenomenon as the rise and growth of the American nation.

Turner's hypothesis was introduced by him to the public in a paper, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History,"

* Paper read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, Omaha, May 3, 1940.

read at a meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago, July 12, 1893. The concluding sentence of the first paragraph formulates the hypothesis succinctly: "The existence of an area of free land, its continuous recession and the advance of American settlement westward explain American development."¹ This doctrine was subsequently elaborated by its author at intervals in other articles and addresses, all of which, together with the original paper, were published in 1920 in his volume, *The Frontier in American History*. What is especially to be noted about the various expressions which Turner gave to his frontier speculation is that, while in his initial paper of 1893 he accounted for American development by a single factor and that a geographic-economic one, he later repeatedly declared that non-economic factors also had to be reckoned with in explaining the phenomenon in question. Thus, in a presidential address before the American Historical Association delivered at Indianapolis, December 10, 1910, which bears the caption "Social Forces in American History," he declared that the historian has

abandoned the single hypothesis for the multiple hypothesis. He creates a whole family of possible explanations of a given problem and thus avoids the warping influence of partiality for a single theory. Have we not here an illustration of what is possible and necessary for the historian? Is it not well, before attempting to decide whether history requires an economic interpretation or a psychological or any other ultimate interpretation, to recognize that the factors in human society are varied and complex; that the political historian handling his subject in isolation is certain to miss fundamental facts and relations in his treatment of a given age or nation; that the economic historian is exposed to the same danger; and so of all the other special historians?²

These words make it evident that Turner was not bent on interpreting history, American development included, from an exclusively economic point of view. Hence, when he took to writing history himself, as he did in his *The Rise of the New West*, in 1906, his horizon was not at all bounded by economics. He wrote in the preface: "In the present volume I have kept before myself the importance of regarding American development as

¹ Frederick J. Turner, *The Frontier in American History*, New York, 1920, 1. For a bibliography of the frontier hypothesis, see Everett E. Edwards, *References on the Significance of the Frontier in American History*, Washington, 1939.

² Turner, 331. "History is past literature, it is past politics, it is past religion, it is past economics." "The Significance of History" in *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner*, Madison, 1938, 57.

the outcome of economic and social as well as political forces" (p. xvii). In standard American histories written along conventional lines as those of Bancroft and Adams political influences are those mostly in evidence; in Turner's mind social and economic influences have also to be taken into account if the whole story is to be told, an ideal that found noteworthy expression in McMaster's *History of the People of the United States*.

Here it is pertinent to ask whether the Turner hypothesis can by any legitimate use of the term be labeled materialistic. By the materialistic is ordinarily understood something entirely in the realm of matter, something which by its very nature excludes non-material and especially spiritual or religious elements or factors. By a widespread convention the Marxian hypothesis is referred to indifferently as the materialistic or the economic interpretation of history. Parenthetically, it may here be noted that few historians have swallowed Marxism in its entirety as a philosophy of history. Scholarly opinion on the subject in recent years has become decidedly anti-Marxian. Thus, the late Edwin R. A. Seligman, editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*: "As a philosophical system of universal validity, the theory of 'historical materialism' can no longer be successfully defended."³ Again, the Harvard professor, Mandell Morton Bober: "Marx's theory is impotent to account for historical processes and the reason is that it fails to ascribe sufficient weight to the many non-economic agencies in history."⁴ Finally, Carl L. Becker has subjected the Marxian position to a searching analysis, reaching the conclusion that he "cannot accept the Marxian philosophy as a law of history."⁵ Yet, let it be noted, a qualified economic interpretation of history must necessarily be admitted. No one denies that physical and economic causes play a significant part in history. The mistake is to make them play the whole part.

Recurring now to the query of a moment ago, namely, whether the Turner hypothesis may be considered materialistic, one is led by a study of the evidence to the conclusion that it is not such *in se* and this for the reason that it is not solely and exclusively economic. As has already been pointed out, though the author's original formulation of it reduced the whole expla-

³ *The Economic Interpretation of History*, New York, 1902, 159.

⁴ *Karl Marx's Interpretation of History*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1927.

⁵ "The Marxian Philosophy of History," *Every Man His Own Historian*, New York, 1935, 124.

nation of American development to the single factor of free land in the west, a factor geographic-economic in nature, he later on various occasions so modified or interpreted the original formulation as to recognize the influence of non-economic factors as well. This was done virtually (and even at times explicitly) in his original paper also as when he touched on the influence exerted on the West by religious bodies from the East: "The various denominations strove for possession of the West. Thus an intellectual stream from New England fertilized the West."⁶ An explanation which allows for the play of intellectual and religious forces cannot be said to be intrinsically materialistic.

A further query is in order. Is the frontier hypothesis deterministic in the sense of excluding free will as an historical factor? To this it may be said in answer that nothing in the papers which make up Turner's volume, *The Frontier in American History*, can be interpreted, at least if his words are taken at their face value, as eliminating free human agency from the factors that operate in history. On the contrary, he recognizes in numerous passages the existence of such agency and the influence it has had on historical development:

The self-made man [was] the Western man's ideal, was the kind of man that all men might become. Out of his wilderness experience, out of the freedom of his opportunities, he fashioned a formula for social regeneration—the freedom of the individual to seek his own.⁷

One ideal was that of individual freedom to compete unrestrictedly for the resources of a continent—the squatter's ideal.⁸

One passage in Turner's "Social Forces in American History" is particularly significant: "We must see how these leaders of the sections [in the United States] are shaped partly by their time and section, and how they are in part original, creative by nature of their own genius and initiative."⁹ This is not the language of the determinist, to whom man is a mere automaton responding mechanically to forces over which he has no control.

The frontier, therefore, as Turner appears to have conceived it, is a laboratory of forces economic and otherwise, to which the pioneers reacted by the exercise of their own free wills. Men may be influenced by motives of an economic order, such as the quest of free land, and yet act freely.

⁶ Turner, 36.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 213.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 320.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 322.

It will be pertinent to note here that Marxian materialism and determinism have sometimes been charged against the frontier hypothesis. In 1925 Professor John C. Almack of Stanford University expressed this opinion: "The frontier hypothesis appears to be nothing more than a diluted type of Marxian determinism, its foundation an unmistakable materialism conceiving of men as the slaves of forces over which they have little influence and no control."¹⁰ That Turner himself would have accepted such an interpretation as at least implied in the idea he sought to convey in formulating the hypothesis appears to be an unwarranted supposition, and this in view of the statements cited from him which are incompatible with a materialistic or deterministic point of view. At the same time it cannot be gainsaid that in the typical presentation of the frontier hypothesis economic motivation in its classic expression of the search for free land has been so stressed and non-economic motivation has been so neglected or ignored as almost inevitably to convey the impression that the hypothesis is intrinsically something materialistic in scope and purpose.

But it is possible to present the frontier hypothesis in a manner to satisfy the demands of logic and historical fact. This may be done by reducing its essential constituents to three propositions: first, the most significant phenomenon in American history is the frontier or westward movement; secondly, the most tangible and effective factor causing this movement, explaining it, is the economic factor of free land in the west; thirdly, the movement was not caused exclusively, is not to be explained entirely by economic causes, but owed its existence, and this in appreciable measure, to non-economic causes also, in particular to missionary and educational endeavor. With these three propositions integrating it, the frontier hypothesis is placed on a logical and defensible basis. But this is not to say that it can be put forth as an altogether demonstrated truth. An outstanding expositor of it, Frederic L. Paxson, declared in 1933 that "it has not been proved and cannot be."¹¹ Turner himself propounded the theory modestly and tentatively as a concept which awaited further careful research before its final confirmation, if that was really to be expected. Certainly the attempt to make every major issue in the development of this nation, especially the growth

¹⁰ "The Shibboleth of the Frontier," *Historical Outlook*, XVI (May 1925), 197.

¹¹ "A Generation of the Frontier Hypothesis," *Pacific Historical Review*, I (March 1933), 37.

of democracy, find its ultimate explanation in the westward movement has not been a successful one, as the lively polemics centered around the frontier hypothesis in recent years are enough to indicate. At the same time, whatever be the merits or demerits of the hypothesis as an all-inclusive formula for the explanation of American history, there can be no doubt, and it is an obvious truism to say so, of the influence it has had in the shaping of American historiography. It has put the West on the historian's map, where before it had been conspicuous largely by its absence, and it has stimulated on a large scale research and authorship in the American history field. An unproved hypothesis, even a disproved one (witness the Ptolemaic), can serve the advancement of science, and this to a notable extent.

Here and there in the past few years the inadequacies of any philosophy of American history which makes no allowance for the play of non-economic forces in making that history what it is have been pointed out. Two instances may be noted. At a conference on the history of the Trans-Mississippi West held at the University of Colorado in June 1929, Dr. Colin B. Goodykoontz discussed the contribution made by the Protestant churches of New England to the frontier movement.¹² He called attention to the efforts made by these churches to control and direct the religious and moral life of the frontier and this mainly through the agency of education. There was in fact a settled policy on the part of both Protestants and Catholics in the country at large to use education as an instrument for serving the needs and promoting the influence of their respective churches.

The Protestant home missionary movement, stemming from the New England states, took shape educationally in two main projects, the dispatch to the frontier areas of women teachers for elementary schools and the establishment of colleges in the same areas. In particular, "the typical small western college usually owed its origin to religious interest and often to missionary zeal."¹³ As to the non-economically minded participants in the frontier movement whose services he recounts, Dr. Goody-

¹² "Protestant Home Missions and Education in the Trans-Mississippi West, 1835-60," in James E. Willard and Colin B. Goodykoontz, *The Trans-Mississippi West: Papers Read at a Conference Held at the University of Colorado, June 18-June 21, 1929*, Boulder, University of Colorado, 1930, 65-86. The content of this paper is elaborated by Dr. Goodykoontz in his volume, *Home Missions on the American Frontier, with Particular Reference to the American Home Missionary Society*, Caldwell, Idaho, 1939.

¹³ Goodykoontz, "Protestant Home Missions . . .," 84.

koontz comments: "They stood for idealism in the midst of materialism."¹⁴

Again, at the thirty-first annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association at Indianapolis in 1938, Dr. William W. Sweet of the University of Chicago, discussed "The Cultural and Educational Influence of the Frontier Churches." He criticized what he considered to be a high-handed dismissal of religion as a factor in frontier culture by historians who stress economic interpretations. He emphasized the fact that religion on the frontier was not only a cultural influence in itself, but deeply affected frontier education and the dissemination of literature. "Of 182 permanent colleges established in the United States before 1860, all except twenty-seven were founded by religious groups and even these exceptions were almost all institutions begun with religious cooperation."¹⁵

The part played by the Protestant groups in the Westward Movement was paralleled by the Catholic Church in the same movement. Here again the non-economic, specifically the religious motive, was the dominant one. The Catholic clergy, missionaries, nuns, who moved westward with the advancing lines of settlement did so, not to acquire free land, but to staff the parishes, missions, schools, of the church they represented. The social and cultural contributions they made to the shaping of western society into the distinctive thing it became belong to the imponderables of history. But the imponderables, though they escape measurement by any known standards of dimension and weight, are none the less actualities which have entered and continue to enter into the very soul of history. A significant instance of Catholic missionary effort on the American stage which issued in cultural gains of importance is afforded by the story of the Jesuit Order in the Middle West. The nineteenth-century activities of the Society of Jesus in this area began with the arrival in Missouri in 1823 of a group of missionaries whose main purpose was to labor for the social and religious uplift of the Indians of the Trans-Mississippi West. Their work for the Indians had behind it at its inception the encouraging support of the authorities at Washington, John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War, who secured for it a federal appropriation, saying of the first Jesuit workers to be dispatched westward: "It is believed that the missionaries will, besides preparing the way for their

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 86.

¹⁵ *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXV (September 1938), 243-244.

[the Indians'] ultimate civilization, be useful in preventing the commission of outrages and preserving peace with the tribes among which they may fix themselves."¹⁶ The story of the Jesuit missionary penetration of the Trans-Mississippi West gathers chiefly around the colorful figure of Father Peter De Smet. He traversed the Osage Trail as early as 1840 and the graphic accounts which he published of the frontier scene found thousands of readers on both sides of the Atlantic. He was repeatedly an ambassador of peace to the Indians, his services in this connection often yielding the happiest results, so as to elicit official praise from Washington. Thomas Hart Benton wrote of him that his influence with the Indians was worth more than "an army with banners." Probably his outstanding success as negotiator of peace was the Sioux Treaty of 1868, which saw the redoubtable Sitting Bull coming to terms with the government largely through the missionary's intervention. In fine, De Smet's sympathetic biographers, Chittenden and Richardson, have appraised him as "an august figure in our national history."

The most interesting missions sponsored by the western Jesuits were those set up by De Smet in the Pacific Northwest; but scarcely less interesting, probably more fruitful, were those established by his colleagues among the Potawatomi and Osage of Kansas. Yet missionary endeavor among the aborigines came with the years to be less significant in the work of this religious group than educational endeavor in the settled districts of the West. In 1829, six years after their arrival in Missouri, the Jesuits of the West opened an institution which developed into St. Louis University, the first school of university grade in the Trans-Mississippi West. Other colleges were later taken in hand by them, as at Cincinnati in 1840 and Santa Clara, California, in 1851. In the event, some ten institutions of collegiate grade had been established by a body of men, the advance-guard of whom had staged a westward movement of their own when they left their Maryland home to labor among the redmen of the Trans-Mississippi West.¹⁷

But the Jesuits by no means stood alone among the members of their Church in the contribution they made to the development of the West. Catholic missionaries and educators both of the diocesan clergy and of the religious orders and congrega-

¹⁶ Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J., *Chapters in Frontier History*, Milwaukee, 1934, 72.

¹⁷ *Id.*, *The Jesuits of the Middle United States*, 3 Volumes, New York, 1938, I, Chapters I-III.

tions in general were busy at work in the frontier area as it advanced towards the setting sun. The aid they lent to the making of the West and through this to the general process of American development, the aid lent to the same end by missionaries and teachers of whatever denomination, are factors which may not be ignored in any attempt to philosophize on the ultimate reasons which made this nation what it is.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

Loyola University, Chicago

Tomás de Guadalajara, Missionary of the Tarahumares

Tomás de Guadalajara was one of the notable missionaries of the southwest of North America in the days when New Spain was the largest unit in the Spanish empire and when its frontier was creeping slowly north. He began his missionary labors in June 1675, eight years before Eusebio Kino, and he survived his Jesuit confrère nine years, dying in the missions in 1720. But while Kino expended his energies to the west in the Pimería, Tomás worked on the eastern slope of the Sierra Madre Occidental, in what is now the state of Chihuahua, among one of the most distinctive groups of Indians in all of North America. Comparable in many respects to the Araucanians of Chile, the Tarahumares are still today a compact group in mountains practically unpenetrated by modern civilization.¹

Father Guadalajara can well be considered the founder of a unified block of missions called Tarahumara Alta, as distinct from the older unit farther south, Tarahumara Baja. Appropriately, he has been called the "great traveler of the sierras," and "the founder of Tarahumara Alta."² The padre was indefatigable; he had a marvelous way with the primitives, universally winning their hearts, his exploits were remarkable and often venturesome, his work was completely successful and wholly constructive.

Father Juan Fonte had made the first contacts with the Tarahumares by his *entrada* of 1608, but the beginnings of his organization were destroyed by the Tepehuan Revolt of 1616, which swept away into martyrdom eight Jesuit missionaries, Fonte among them. Though there were later passing contacts with the Tarahumares, a permanent organization was not set up until Andrés Pérez de Ribas, then Provincial in Mexico City, sent into the country Fathers Gerónimo de Figueroa and José Pascual. These two Jesuits, in 1639, eight years after the founding of Parral, began the mission unit called Tarahumara Baja and later Tarahumara Antigua.³

¹ Cf. Wendell C. Bennett and Robert M. Zingg, *The Tarahumara, An Indian Tribe of Northern Mexico*, Chicago, 1935.

² Gerardo Decorme, *La Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos en la Época Colonial*, Mexico City, 1941, II, 234.

³ Relación de José Pascual, Jesuit Archives, Ysleta, Texas.

As for the upper region, beginnings were made among the wilder Tarahumares by the founding of the Spanish Villa de Aguilar and near it a mission on the picturesque banks of the Río Papigochic called the Río Yaqui west of the sierras. Here on the site of the present Ciudad Guerrero a Belgian Jesuit Cornelio Beudin (renamed Godínez by the Spaniards) began a mission in 1649 which for a few months gave bright promise. But there was an uprising and Beudin was slain in June 1650. Another attempt was made the following year to found a mission on the same lovely spot. The Italian Antonio Jácome Basilio labored with high hopes of success, until a second native revolt occurred in 1652. Basilio with numerous Spaniards and loyal Indians was slain while the mission and the Villa de Aguilar were both destroyed.

Such calamities discouraged for the present all further efforts for the evangelization of the northwestern Tarahumares. Two decades passed. In 1673 the governor of Nueva Vizcaya, Don José García de Salcedo, called a meeting in Parral of Spanish frontiersmen, Christian Tarahumar caciques, and Jesuit missionaries. Plans were here laid and energized for another attempt at extending the frontier of Spain and of Christendom into the inhospitable northwest. The impulse thus given was decisive and enduring. Fathers Gamboa and Barrionuevo went north in the fall of 1673; the following year José Tardá was in the field, and in the summer of 1675 Guadalajara inaugurated his splendid career.⁴

Gamboa and Tardá had founded in 1674 a new Christian pueblo one hundred and twenty miles, as the crow flies, northwest of Parral, and sixty miles southwest of the present city of Chihuahua. They named it San Bernabé. It was beyond the Río Conchos and past the headwaters of its largest tributary, the San Pedro, at Cusi-huiríachic, where mines, still being worked, were later discovered. This and the territory around, a vast level plain and rolling hill marked by the single pointed peak of Cusi-huiríachic⁵ descried for miles, was probably the principal residence of Guadalajara, whence he traveled south, west, and northwest into and through the heart of the country of the upper Tarahumares. At times he put up at Santa Ana farther south.

⁴ Cf. Francisco Javier Alegre, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en Nueva España*, Mexico, 1842, II, 463-465, 469-470, 471-476.

⁵ This name is found with at least four different spellings in the sources. Numerous place names in the Tarahumar language end in "chi"; the Spaniards added the final "c."

Shortly after his arrival he and his companion José Tardá tried to cultivate the stubborn tribesmen along the Río Papigochic, a soil which had heretofore "sprouted only the poisonous and murderous weeds of rebellion."⁶ At the pueblo of Papigochic the missionaries were repulsed and some of the inhabitants swore to have the heads of the fathers should they try to enter. Cárichic, southwest and near the headwaters of a branch of the upper Conchos, was likewise cold and unresponsive. The Indians here would allow no father, they said, to come into their village. But Temechic, which even of old had been affectionately attached to the ministrations of Jácome Basilio, received the fathers, who entered among them and viewed the ruined chapel built by Basilio over twenty years before. Unfortunately most of the men were away on a deer hunt, consequently the fathers were invited to return at another time when all would receive the waters of baptism. At the end of August the two padres returned to San Bernabé at Cusihuiríachic.

A short while afterwards Guadalajara and Tardá were able to procure the cooperation of Don Pablo, an old Christian Tarahumar and cacique of large authority among his tribesmen. Don Pablo had taken part in the conference at Parral two years before, and had then promised to do all in his power to make the missionaries acceptable to his people. He had already facilitated matters much and now his services were again to prove invaluable. The two missionaries determined to win over Papigochic. They took the trail for the day's journey thither accompanied by a band of thirty Christian Tarahumares led by Don Pablo. On the morning of the second day Don Pablo went ahead to visit Papigochic and conciliate the suspicious minds of the natives. He was successful. They would receive the fathers. Indeed, as a gesture of cordiality the men of Papigochic put up *enramadas*, arches of foliage at the entrance to their pueblo. This was the first time that any Black Robe had entered Papigochic since the great rebellion of 1652. In the evening a *tlatole*, or meeting, was held to discuss what the continued attitude and policy of the village ought to be. Though the Indian governor and many of his men favored the fathers, inimical spirits were not wanting. In view of this divided frame of mind it might be dangerous for

⁶ The details of these early activities are found in a long report to the Provincial Francisco Ximenes, dated February 2, 1676. Cf. Archivo General y Público de la Nación (AGN Mexico), Misiones, t. 26, fol. 216-225. This document is printed in *Documentos para la Historia de Mexico*, 4th Series, Mexico, 1857, III, 272 ff.

the fathers to tarry longer on this particular visit, so the following day they departed.

Making believe to have lost their way the Black Robes, still accompanied by Don Pablo and his group, visited a *ranchería* not far from the pueblo and discovered many friendly natives.⁷ These averred that it was not dislike for the fathers, but fear of their own people which had kept them from manifesting a spirit of greater friendship. The missionary party continued leisurely downstream visiting one after another of the Tarahumar settlements perched on the banks of the *río*. They passed through Mátachic, which they named San Rafael, and threading up a tributary where the Papigochic turns south, they reached Yepómera, which they called Triumpho de los Angeles, because they arrived here on the feast of the Angels. The fathers were encouragingly received all along this populated district of upper Tarahumara. They performed a few baptisms and returning upstream stopped again at Papigochic. News of their long tour of the country and of the baptisms administered had already reached the pueblo. The natives observing no harm done by the sacrament, and witnessing the joy and happiness of those visited by the padres, were more ready with their welcome. The fathers on their part were encouraged; they named the pueblo La Purísima, and before leaving planted crosses as a promise of return. Thus did Guadalajara and Tardá insert the opening wedge into what was to become the important new mission unit of Tarahumara Alta.

This entrada happened before October 4, 1675, when the fathers dated the first portion of their report to the Provincial. In the meantime, the men of Cárichic, who had but a few months before repulsed the fathers, now sent successive groups to beg for a visit from the padre. They had heard of the happy results of the fathers' visit farther north. Guadalajara after three petitions finally went. He arrived on horseback and received a right royal welcome, of the kind that was repeatedly given the missionaries in these missions. The men of Cárichic had gathered fruits and had killed two lambs to regale him and the Indians who would accompany him. At his approach the Indians came out to lead him to their village. Soon he was busy with baptisms of children—a hundred the day of his arrival. A

⁷ Alegre, II, 473, says that the missionaries dismissed at this point their Indian companions and continued their journey with only an Indian boy. But in this statement he departs from the sense of Guadalajara's own report.

procession was formed of the men and women, many of the former on horseback, the leaders carrying two large crosses. They marched several miles along the arroyo with its flowing stream, tributary of the upper Conchos, to where their huts and *milpas* ended. They erected one of the crosses at the beginning of the march, the other where they halted. The padre, on horseback, occasionally ordered the procession stopped for the recitation of prayers, while on their way back, led by Guadalajara, they tried to chant the ancient and classic Christian hymn, the *Vexilla Regis*.

As the Indians arrived back into their village the crowd began to be carried away with emotion. They shouted, they waved their hands in joy, jumped and frolicked, calling out at the same time "*Gueua garaucu Pare,*" "the father is all right." Mounted on his horse, Guadalajara kept riding about, reciting psalms and giving thanks to God. Finally the crowd gradually quieting dispersed singing hymns. The father, moved to tears, promised to live permanently among them some day. But to assure for the present the continuance of the Christian spirit and to help prepare the adults for eventual baptism he appointed from among his followers fiscals and catechists to carry on a simple instruction in the truths of Christianity until his next visit. And before leaving the pueblo he changed its name from Guerucárichi, its longer Tarahumar form, to Jesucárichi, for it was the feast of the Basilica of our Savior.

These good people started to work immediately to build a chapel and a house for the missionary. Within fifteen days a *jacal*, or dwelling made of straw and the branches of trees, was ready to serve as a church. Thus was the beginning of the Christian pueblo of Cárichic. Within three years it would have its resident missionary, Diego de Contreras.⁸ Pícolo would build a beautiful church which Joseph Neumann would further adorn, and which the eighteenth-century Visitor, Juan de Guendolain would style the finest church in all these missions.⁹ The ancient fabric stands today, intact except for the modern roof of tin, and handsome within with its fine double row of bulging pillars. Its entrance looks out over the fertile vale along whose gentle slopes Guadalajara organized his procession, and the old walls

⁸ AGN Mexico, *loc. cit.*, fol. 246, in the *Relación de las Misiones . . .*, which is the noted official report of the Visitor, Juan Ortiz Zapata, made in 1678.

⁹ *Documentos para la Historia Eclesiástica y Civil*, MS., fol. 491. Cf. also *Documentos para la Historia de Mexico*, 4th Series, IV, 28.

still hear the catechism explained to little Tarahumares and the murmur of Indian prayer.

Other pueblos soon called for the Black Robes. The men of Napabecheic came to petition padres, as did those of Papigochic. Since the Indian governor here had just been baptized a delegation waited upon the fathers asking them to return. One of the fathers did go, but that night in celebration of the event a drunken carousal ensued; the padre's life was seriously threatened, and he had to depart the next day. But it was not long before Father Nicolás Ferrer, a newly arrived missionary, took up his abode at Papigochic.¹⁰

The most difficult of all the journeys was made early in 1676 by Guadalajara and Tardá to the far western edge of the Tarahumar frontier. The leaders at Tutuaca, hearing of the benign exploits of the fathers, had sent a delegation asking such visitors to come to them. The Jesuits decided to make the venturesome journey, ninety miles as the crow flies, but actually well nigh double that distance because of winding trails through the sierras and the ruggedness of those rocky defiles to be traversed. On the way the two missionaries planned to stop again in the pueblos already won over.

The fathers left headquarters, San Bernabé or Santa Ana, a few weeks before Christmas. They went first south to Cárichic where they spent a few days, baptizing and consolidating former success. Then they turned north northwest from the drainage of the Río Conchos over the divide and into the watershed of the Río Papigochic. They visited Tejirachic, passing through Tosaboreachic, Temechic, and Pachera, reaching Papigochic on the eve of Christmas. They were consoled to celebrate Mass on the very spot where twenty-five years before Beudin had fallen a martyr.

Three days were passed here before the pair turned almost due west, following their Indian guides, to round the great blue sierra which separates the valley of the Río Papigochic from the valley of the Río Tomochic. Continuing west they got into the rugged country where the going was difficult and dangerous. Nor were they impervious to the charm and perhaps to the terror of the scene as they neared the summit of a craggy range, and, like Salvatierra on the Río Urique, they gazed from dizzy heights down the precipitous ribs of the ravines. Here were the headwaters of the Río Tutuaca. "The heights from which we looked

¹⁰ AGN Mexico, *loc. cit.*, fol. 246.

into the abyss," reported the padres, "were so lofty that objects seemed to fade from view and the pines which are immense in the depths of the canyon seemed from the summit to be but the size of a man." Indeed, so perilous were certain portions of the trail that the missionaries suspected the guide of treachery. But Fathers Guadalajara and José Tardá arrived finally, dropping down to the level of the running stream, the Río Tutuaca, on whose banks sat the Indian pueblo of the name. As if in compensation for the perils and sufferings of the journey, the welcome given by the Tutuacs was warm and joyous. They had built a hut for the fathers' lodging and had gathered corn and fruits for their sustenance.

The missionaries almost immediately however had their joyous spirits dashed by unwelcome news. In honor of their arrival these primitives of Tutuaca had gathered jugs of their intoxicating liquor, *tesquino*, and had invited savages from around about to come for the celebration, a debauch of the kind the missionaries had seen before. The fathers protested. Had they known this would be the outcome they would not have entered the village. But the Indians said it was now too late: the guests were invited, the drink was ready. The padres, realizing the height of madness and murderous intent such drink can bring upon the savage, quietly withdrew after dark from the hut which had been given them and spent the night on the rocky ledge of a steep hill nearby, where they thought they would be safe. All night they heard the howls and yells arising from the orgy below. The Jesuits had suspected correctly. The Indians sought them out in their hut, but not finding them became angry and ransacked the little place.

At daylight the two were spied high on their eirie. A delegation, still intoxicated, labored up to them and expressed their chagrin. Why had the fathers fled from the hospitality of Tutuaca? If their people wanted to kill the priests they could do so at any time. They desired only baptism. Guadalajara and Tardá stood their ground and would not descend until the effects of the brawl wore off. After they had waited on their rocky perch until the sun began to sink low over the hills of Sonora another committee came to wait on them. The people were now sober, they said, and since the fathers had come to baptize them, it was a most propitious time to begin, for another quantity of liquor, left untouched, had been got ready for another celebration that night in honor of the baptisms!

Common sense told the missionaries that sheer ignorance of the white man's ways led these primitives of far isolated Tutuaca to indulge thus on such an occasion. It would be better, they reasoned, to act now to avoid a repetition of the orgy. The pair descended from their height and met the cacique and a group of his braves surrounded by a motley crowd. One of the fathers, probably Guadalajara, now spoke: The missionaries had not come to encourage this sort of celebration. Rather had they come to do away with so evil a custom, for it was an offense against the God whose law they had come to preach. It was not fitting for priests to remain in a pueblo where so much sin was committed, nor could the baptisms begin under such conditions. The cacique and the rest of the crowd evinced sincere astonishment at the words. They had not known it was a sin; they would never return to the evil practice. Forthwith dismissing their barbarous guests "from out of town," they gathered the remaining jugs of the fermented juice of the cactus and, like King David of old pouring out upon the ground the water he could not share with his army, these savages made a libation of sacrifice to the God of the Christians whom the fathers were come to tell them of.

Now the real spiritual work could begin. Thirty of the best dispositioned were selected, and in the days that followed were instructed and baptized. These were to be the nucleus of Christianity, who would during the fathers' absence, prepare others of their tribe for the saving waters. They erected a cross at the entrance to the pueblo and promised to build a church. After many days of sojourn here the two Black Robes finally departed, having obtained valuable information concerning the surrounding country and people and resting satisfied that they had planted a seed which, given ordinarily fair conditions, would sprout in this seemingly fertile soil into genuine Christianity. Thus indeed it was. Tardá later was made superior, but Guadalajara kept up a contact with these primitives of the wild, and from his mission made the arduous journey time and time again. The year of Zapata's visitation, 1678, there were officially recorded 126 baptized Indians in Tutuaca and another hundred in near-by pueblos.

The year following the Tutuac *entrada*, 1677, saw Guadalajara at Mátachic. He had been ordered to build up and organize this whole region of the lower Papigochic which he and Tardá had visited with so great success two years before. Certain juris-

dictional difficulties had first of all to be settled with a Franciscan, Fray Alonso de Mesa. As is well known, the Franciscan missionaries preceded the Jesuits into most of this northern country and in the seventeenth century they had mission establishments among the Concho Indians in Nueva Vizcaya bordering Jesuit mission territory to the north and east. Now the Concho missions under Fray Alonso were not far north from where Guadalajara was working. He had baptized in Amiquipa, thirty miles northeast of Yepómera, and when Guadalajara with Tardá visited Yepómera in 1675, he received a letter of protest from Fray Alonso who claimed the village as his preserve.¹¹

Since there were no Conchos in Yepómera, Guadalajara referred the letter to superiors in Mexico City, for it had been understood for decades that the Tarahumares were to be under Jesuit supervision, and Conchos under Franciscan. When the Jesuit went to make his residence in Mátachic he had written to the Franciscan who had replied cordially. The disagreement was considered over, but during an absence of Guadalajara the Conchos had told the Tarahumares that their father would never more return and then tried to persuade the Tarahumares to refuse him admission if he came. Fray Alonso now claimed for his territory all lands north of Río Papigochic. The thing was again taken to Mexico City where the two provincials, Jesuit and Franciscan, had no difficulty in confirming the old arrangement by written agreement: Conchos under Franciscan care, Tarahumares under Jesuit. Nevertheless, Fray Alonso continued the dispute. The alarmed Black Robe saw the Indians becoming disturbed and restless. He feared conflict between the Indian mission groups, or a general uprising against both himself and Alonso, or worse "that my own Indians may murder him or that the hot spirits on the other side may murder me."¹² After Guadalajara's report reached the two provincials we hear no more of the trouble. Things were quiet the following year, when Zapata visited this portion of the Jesuit vineyard, and it is evident that Fray Alonso had either been removed or rebuked by his superiors. Yepómera became a flourishing Jesuit mission although in 1690 it had the doubtful honor of giving martyrdom to Juan Foronda.¹³ The ancient church stands yet today looking down

¹¹ Letter of Guadalajara, July 20, 1677, AGN Mexico, *loc. cit.*, fol. 237 ff.

¹² *Ibid.*, fol. 240.

¹³ Decorme, II, 297, following a report of Father Juan de Estrada, says Foronda fell in Nahuarachic. We follow Father Joseph Neumann who was

the arroyo south towards Río Papigochic and gazing to the east upon the long and lovely valley boxed north and south by its blue sierras.

When Visitor Juan Ortiz Zapata went to Mátachic in 1678 he found that its missionary had done well his work. Guadalajara had organized the region into a *partido*, or group of pueblos, of which Mátachic was the *cabecera*, or head, where he resided. The other pueblos, called *visitas*, he contacted from time to time, saying Mass, visiting his neophytes and baptizing. The *partido* of Mátachic, called Triunpho de los Ángeles, had four pueblos, the *cabecera* and three *visitas*. Mátachic, called San Rafael, had 335 baptized Christians; Yepómera, named San Gabriel, strung for miles along the arroyo, had 118 Christians; the other smaller *visitas*, San Miguel Temósachic and San Pablo Ocomorachic, had 64 and 91 respectively. During the days Visitor Zapata tarried in the district with Guadalajara baptisms were still going on, consequently Zapata could add: "After writing the above, the minister of the said pueblo visiting the settlement [Ocomorachic] in my company has baptized both children and adults, making thus another forty persons." The Visitor recorded the number of Christians in the whole *partido* as 648.¹⁴

Zapata had begun his visitation far south among the Xixime nation. He went north on the eastern slope of the Sierra Madre, thus passing through the Tepehuan and Tarahumar groups. He intended to return south on the western side of the mountains, having crossed the divide near where Papigochic's stream becomes the Yaqui River. His route would take him close to Tutuaca, and his visitation of the Tarahumar missions would not be complete without seeing this pueblo with its growing *visitas*, as Guadalajara had organized it since his first visit two years before. Our indefatigable "traveler of the sierras" had also journeyed into Jova country which lay directly west of Yepómera. No missionary of this district then knew the country so well as Guadalajara. Zapata, therefore, took him as companion on his trip to Tutuaca, over the trail which he termed "a rough and rocky road." He was pleased to find even in this isolated section between Tutuaca and its dependent pueblos 226 baptized Indians.

Now, the Indians of the Jova nation, hearing that the Visitor was at Tutuaca, sent delegations to him, begging him to visit

on the ground. He states in two different places, *Historia Seditionum . . .*, Chapter III, and in his letter of July 6, 1693, that Foronda was killed in Yepómera.

¹⁴ Zapata's *relación*, *loc. cit.*, fol. 249.

their country and to give them permanent missionaries. They wanted especially Father Guadalajara to come regularly to see them. The Visitor gave them what encouragement he could, whereupon they returned to their hills and river-banks, writes the Visitor, to raise crosses in their pueblos, to choose fiscals, and to build chapels for the divine service. He added significantly:

In fact, after I had written the above narrative, Father Tomás de Guadalajara, missionary at San Rafael Mátachic, made in my company a visitation of the *partido* of Tutuaca and then proceeded as far as the *partido* of Sahuaripa. We then returned by the lands of the Jova nation. Arrived back at his *partido* he drew up a report of this visitation, together with the things he had done and the arrangements he had made. . . .¹⁵

So then, these two Black Robes, Visitor and missionary, traveled the sixty miles (as the crow flies) northwest from Tutuaca to Sahuaripa, which belonged to the West Coast missions. On the way back to Tarahumara Guadalajara baptized some dozens of Jovas living in their more eastern pueblos, for the western Jovas were cared for by Jesuits of the coast missions. He gathered the Christians of these parts together into three pueblos nearer the Tarahumar frontier where he could the more easily attend them until their own padre could arrive. Hence our missionary, after establishing his own *partido* of Mátachic, and one at Tutuaca, now laid the foundations of a third among the eastern Jova nation. He thus forged the last link which connected the mission system of the eastern slope of the mountains with the system of the West Coast. Beginning in the west in 1591, in the east in 1598, and blending from the start south among the Xixime and Acaxée nations, these two groups of missions on each slope of the Sierra Madre, ran from the south now to meet in the north, completing an oval formation. The separation of the center was effected by the vast and lofty ranges of the great cordillera. When Zapata departed to inspect the western missions, Tomás de Guadalajara continued on at Mátachic, rounding out the baptisms of his *partido*, and keeping in touch with Tutuaca and with his more recently organized Jovas. Interesting things now came into the life of Padre Tomás before he left the missions to go south to Parral in 1684 or 1685.

Guadalajara had given such an impulse to Tarahumar Christianity from 1675 on that the earlier Visitor, Bernabé Gutiérrez,

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

had in 1676 urged the multiplication of missionaries for this apostolate. In 1677 four padres came up to Tarahumara Alta and in 1681 two more. These last were the Hungarian nobleman, Johann Ratkay, who was sent to Cárichic, and the German, Joseph Neumann, who was ordered to Sisoguichic.

Now some of these new arrivals had not pronounced their final vows in the Society of Jesus. This, then, had to be done in the missions. The time was fixed for the feast of the Assumption of Blessed Mary the Virgin, August 15, 1681, and the place was to be Mátachic. Neumann was the first to arrive and Father Guadalajara welcomed him warmly. Later four other Jesuits came, including the Father Visitor. Ratkay remained at central Cárichic to guard the routine of order. Spaniards came, too, to grace and enjoy the occasion; Captain García, an old friend of Guadalajara, with his sons, made a three days' journey to be there. On the eve of the feast bands of Tarahumares trudged in with their Indian governors from outlying pueblos.

Under these circumstances Guadalajara gave demonstration of those qualities which won for him such high prestige among Spaniards and primitives alike. It had been almost a famine year. Father Tomás, therefore, ordered three beeves killed and prepared for a feast in the evening, much to the joy of the Indian neophytes who devoured the meat and made merry. There was music, too, since Guadalajara had trained a skillful choir of Indian boys and the Father Visitor had brought with him three or four musicians. Thus vespers were chanted on the eve of the great day and the choir added to the ceremony of the Mass in the morning.

When the religious services were finished the Indians and guests again gathered around Guadalajara's festive board. The Tarahumar Governor of Mátachic staged for the entertainment of the fathers an exhibition of Indian horsemanship. On the plain which rises from the banks of the Río Papigochic, fifty Tarahumares, excellently mounted, deployed, galloped, and raced on the broad level; they evolved and configured on horseback, concluding their daredevil riding with a sham battle. Games consumed the whole afternoon. Nor was this all. The Indians celebrated throughout the night; they sang, they shouted, they danced. There was little sleep for the padres that night, while on the morrow they had to depart and the fiesta was over.¹⁶

¹⁶ Neumann's letter of February 2, 1682, Bolton Collection, Bancroft Library, Berkeley.

Guadalajara was now made superior of the whole mission unit of Tarahumara Alta.

Not long after these events clouds began to cast their shadow upon the serenity of the missionary's life at Mátachic. The padre began to notice signs of disaffection among his Indians. They discontinued coming for their customary instructions; they disobeyed his commands. They began to indulge openly and unashamed in the forbidden strong drink. Reports came in of large quantities of darts and arrows being made by many. Guadalajara was filled with the gravest apprehensions, especially when loyal Indians brought word that there was intent among a group of the disaffected to murder their padre and make off to the hills and mountains. Then an Indian woman hurried to him in trepidation and bade him flee, for within three days the fires of revolt would break out and spread.

This was enough. Guadalajara departed from his pueblo and traveled in haste southeast towards Parral, for he considered his whole *partido* to be on the verge of an uprising. He was probably not actuated by personal fear. Such as he were of the stuff of martyrs. But it was another matter rashly to expose one's life, and missionaries were hard to replace. His subsequent orders to his men showed that he had this in view. And he surely knew of the great rebellion in New Mexico little over two years before, in which twenty-one friars and hundreds of other Spaniards were slain. Passing through Papigochic, where the Belgian Juan Bautista Copart was resident, Guadalajara, though superior, seems to have left flight to the padre's own discretion. Copart followed shortly, however, upon himself receiving reports of impending murder and rebellion.

Soon Guadalajara sent orders to all the fathers to leave their respective mission pueblos and concentrate in San Francisco de Borja, a safe place in the wide plains of the east. Neumann came all the way in from Sisoguichic, surprised at the order, for he had noticed nothing. Nor did anything occur, nor did minute questionings of Indian governors from various pueblos reveal either revolt or plot. Neumann thought Guadalajara to be unduly alarmed, for, he wrote, even the governor of Mátachic "defended himself so skillfully and was so successful in explaining everything by the malevolence of certain foreigners, that he practically cleared both himself and the people of his mission from every charge, and left us wondering whether there was even a slight danger of the kind that the Father Rector [Guada-

lajara] had imagined."¹⁷ This skepticism about his judgment was a new trial for the rector.

But Guadalajara had not been mistaken. Father Nicolás de Prado in the far-off mountains of the Guazápar region belonging to the west enclosed in a letter to Neumann the key to the secret. One Carosia, rebel Guazápar chief, had tried but only partly succeeded in corrupting the neophytes contiguous to the *partido* of Mátachic, which approaches to the south the Guazápar region. The storm blew over, therefore, and soon all the padres and Indian governors went back to their respective missions. Neumann later converted rebel Carosia, and Mátachic remained a flourishing mission, residence of the superiors. It is today a quiet Mexican village, while the great ruins of its ancient church attest the spiritual vitality of its mission past.

During these very years Father Guadalajara was busy as a literary man and scholar. He wrote a grammar and dictionary of both the Tarahumar and Guazápar languages and their allied dialects. This was published in Puebla as early as 1683.¹⁸ Guadalajara thus joined the ranks of those other Jesuit missionaries to whom scholarship owes so great a debt, who "gained neophytes in places . . . where none of their compatriots had dared to set foot; [and who] preached and spoke in tongues of which no man born in the west understood a single word."¹⁹

The missionary days of Father Tomás were temporarily ended about 1685 when he was summoned south to Parral to take the superiorship of the Jesuit house there. Again his gift of winning friends and universal affection manifests itself. A wealthy citizen of Parral, a Portuguese, Don Luis de Simois, became so attached to the father that he donated a sum large enough for the Superior to begin the construction of the long-desired college in this northern mining town. So, Guadalajara was financed to build his college. The institution had a long career. After the expulsion of the Jesuits the building was used for various purposes and finally transformed. But the ancient shell stands yet in the old mining town off the Calle del Colegio, and the great wall of the apse looks down today on the Río del Parral.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Compendio del Arte de la Lengua de los Tarahumares y Guazapares . . . Año de 1683.* Cf. Carlos Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Brussels-Paris, 1890, III, col. 1897.

¹⁹ Lord Babington Macaulay, "Essay on Ranke's *History of the Popes*," *Edinburgh Review*, XIX (October 1840), 4.

No better illustration could be given of the success of this Jesuit missionary, "great traveler of the sierras" and "founder of Tarahumara Alta," than by referring to the words of an earlier official Visitor to Tarahumara Alta, just when this mission unit was taking definite shape thanks to the energies and the successes of Guadalajara. Father Bernabé Francisco Gutiérrez made an official report of what he saw under date of April 28, 1676. He writes in part :

Fathers José Tardá and Tomás Guadalajara are so ardent in their enthusiasm that the country seems to them an all too narrow place for their zeal. . . . It is impossible to describe the love and veneration the Indians have for the fathers. They are especially enthusiastic over Father Guadalajara whom God has reserved for his great glory in these lands.²⁰

And the Visitor goes on to expatiate upon the friendly and conciliatory personality of Father Tomás. Just two years later Visitor Zapata, speaking of the men and women of Mátachic, said that they had for their father a wonderful affection, and even the humble padre himself once remarked that the men of Papi-gochic seemed to love him greatly.

The available records do not disclose the length of time the now aging missionary lived in the mining town of Parral. If it was a wound to his spirit to be ordered from his beloved Tarahumares and his mission district of the north, the wound healed no doubt with time, while his spirit was later consoled, for he was ordered back to the mission, back to the direction of his Tarahumar children. Thirty miles west of Parral is a fertile vale watered by an arroyo which runs into the Río de San Juan. Here sits the little Mexican village of Huexotitlán, given permanence to by the ancient Jesuit mission of San Gerónimo. In this quiet spot Figueroa, founder of Tarahumara Baja, had lived for almost thirty years and here Guadalajara was to come to pass his declining days and to die, completing his fifty-second year as a Jesuit. The ancient church still stands, scarred and grey with time. In its quiet courtyard in 1720 our benign and valiant missionary was laid to rest. A tombstone with an inscription now worn with age marks the hallowed spot where long ago the missionary's mortal vesture was placed beneath the sod.

PETER M. DUNNE

University of San Francisco

²⁰ AGN Mexico, *loc. cit.*, fol. 225.

Pénicaut and His Chronicle of Early Louisiana*

THE MANUSCRIPTS

André Pénicaut was born at La Rochelle about 1680. A carpenter by trade, he embarked with Iberville on his first expedition to Louisiana in 1698. He left to posterity a narrative describing the discovery of the mouth of the Mississippi River by sea and a year-by-year account of the events which occurred during his stay in the colony to the year 1721.¹ His account, as the only extant continuous history of Louisiana told by a contemporary, would, supposedly, furnish a valuable source to those who have concerned themselves about the French foundations on the Gulf coast and the exploration of the great river. However, indications of muddled chronology, misstatements, and confused sequences have given rise to suspicions as to the trustworthiness of Pénicaut, and consequently, the only way to establish the value of his relation is by checking his statements with other available contemporary materials.

In his *Avertissement au Lecteur* the annalist informs his readers that his narrative is a yearly account of the events which took place while he was in the colony. However, his mistakes in chronology make it evident that the author was writing from memory or from very scanty notes. A seemingly straightforward, honest individual, his misstatements and muddled sequence of events seem to be the result of a failing memory and not a deliberate attempt to falsify or to befuddle.

The time limit of the present article will cover only the years from 1698 to 1704, although the complete narrative extends to

* This article is an abstract of the author's Master of Arts thesis. Editor.

¹ The complete title of Pénicaut's narrative reads as follows: "Relations ou annales véritables de ce qui s'est passé dans le pays de la Louisiane pendant vingt-deux années consécutives, depuis le commencement de l'établissement des françois dans le pais, par M. d'Iberville, et M. le comte de Surgère en 1699 continue jusqu'en 1721, ou il est fait mention des guerres des françois contre les Sauvages, et des Sauvages entre eux; du commerce des françois avec les Sauvages, et des Sauvages entre eux du cours et de l'étendu du Mississipi, des rivières qui tombent dans ce fleuve, des mines, de la religion et des moeurs des sauvages, de leurs obsèques; des concessions qu'y possèdent à présent les françois, avec l'histoire galante d'un capitaine françois et la fille d'un capitaine de cavalerie espagnole du Mexique." P. Margry, *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, 6 vols., 1876-1888 (hereinafter quoted as Margry), IV, 689.

1721. An examination of this first section, however, will give sufficient evidence concerning the unreliable character of the narrative. Moreover the year 1704 marks a natural division in the events of the Louisiana colony. Two years previously Mobile had been founded, Iberville had made his last visit to the colony; and for all practical purposes, Bienville had assumed the leadership of the struggling settlement on the Gulf coast.

The geographical area included in this article embraces the Gulf of Mexico from the mouth of the Mississippi to Mobile Bay and the course of the Mississippi from its mouth to the Arkansas River. Actually, the travels of the chronicler were more extensive than the geographical limits set herein, for he accompanied a mining expedition up the Mississippi as far as the present state of Minnesota, but the description of this trip is outside the scope of the present analysis.

Pénicaut's primary motive in writing his story was to raise money, for at the time of writing, he was getting blind; therefore to give his work human appeal he devoted much space to the romance of St. Denis. Because his handwriting was nothing more than a childish scrawl and because of his infirmity the author very likely dictated his relation to a professional copyist. A copy of his chronicle was sent to Diron Dartaguiette² to whom it was dedicated.³ Dartaguiette in turn gave this relation to Charlevoix.⁴ When the French Jesuits were suppressed in 1763 among the manuscripts sold at auction was the "Relations de la Louisiane, depuis 1699, jusqu'en 1721, par Pénicaut."⁵ It is probable, although not as yet certain, that it was this copy which was ultimately deposited in the Paris archives.

Be that as it may, there are three extant copies of the "Annals of Louisiana." The one printed in Margry⁶ is copied from

² There were three Dartaguiettes who served the Louisiana colony during the year 1710 to 1732, cf. C. W. Alvord, *The Illinois Country, 1673-1818*, Springfield, Illinois, 1920, I, 173, and the cyclopedia *Louisiana* edited by Alcée Fortier, 2 vols., Atlanta, 1909, I, 335. These authors list two of the Dartaguiettes as brothers and one as the son of one of the brothers. All three, however, were brothers, and it is to Bernard Diron Dartaguiette, who came to Louisiana in 1717, to whom Pénicaut dedicated his relation.

³ Margry, V, 698.

⁴ P. F. X. de Charlevoix, *Histoire et Description Générale de la Nouvelle France avec le Journal Historique d'un Voyage fait par ordre du Roi dans l'Amérique Septentrionale*, 3 vols., Paris, 1744, vol. I, lx-lxi.

⁵ *Catalogus Manuscriptorum Codicum Collegii Claromontani*, Paris, 1764, p. 314, n. DCCCXXVIII. An interesting example of the manner in which Jesuit libraries were confiscated, listed, and archived is given by William Kane "The End of a Jesuit Library," *MID-AMERICA*, XXIII, 1941, 190-213.

⁶ Pénicaut's narrative, Margry, V, 375-586.

the manuscript on deposit in the Archives at Paris.⁷ The second is in the Municipal Library at Rouen. A copy of this Rouen manuscript, made for Gabriel Gravier, is now in the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, Chicago. A third copy was purchased by the American Consul General in Paris in 1870 and given to Francis Parkman, as explained in a letter to the historian by the donor. This Parkman manuscript, together with the explanatory letters, is at present in the Library of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, and a film of the same is now available at Loyola University, Chicago.

A collation of the Paris manuscript with the Margry reproduction was made by the Library of Congress, and this collation was secured for the purpose of comparison. Hence, for all practical purposes, the writer can say that she had access to the text of the Paris manuscript itself; but the actual Rouen manuscript was not consulted.⁸ The supposition, however, is that this was made either by François Bouet or for him by a copyist.

In order to have as accurate a text of Pénicaut's narrative as possible a comparison was made of the three available manuscripts. Margry's printed reproduction was used as the basic text. This was checked, first, against the collation of the Paris manuscript made by the Library of Congress, secondly against the filmed Parkman copy, and finally, against the Gravier copy of the Rouen manuscript which is in the Newberry Library. Other than differences in capitalization, spelling, and word arrangements within sentences, all attributable to idiosyncracies of copyists or the editor, the facts narrated in the three manuscripts are the same, at least as far as the events up to the year 1704 are concerned. The differences and similarities in the spelling of Indian names argue strongly in favor of the priority of the Paris manuscript, and lead to the belief that the Boston manuscript was made from the Rouen copy. Consequently, it is probably safe to conclude that the relation contained in Margry, at

⁷ Bibliothèque Nationale (BN), Manuscript français, 14613.

⁸ Were it not for the troubled conditions in France at the present time, this manuscript could have been filmed and the handwriting compared with Bouet's signature on a map made and signed by him which is now in the Newberry Library, Ayer Collection. "Carte De la Louisiane et du cours du Missisipy sur la Relation d'André Pénicaut," by François Bouet, 1721. Although this map purports to be drawn from the information contained in Pénicaut's narrative, it does not follow the relation very closely nor does it show the numerous geographical land marks described by the author. Many of the contemporary and even earlier maps are much more detailed. However, lacking this Rouen manuscript it was not possible to determine how faithfully Gravier's copy was made.

least as far as the section considered in this article is concerned, is substantially as Pénicaut narrated it.

IBERVILLE'S FIRST VOYAGE

For more than ten years after the tragic attempt of La Salle to reach the mouth of the Mississippi by sea, France did nothing to explore, exploit, or colonize the vast territory over which dominion was claimed by reason of the explorer's descent of the great river. Continental wars kept the French occupied, but with the Peace of Ryswick in 1697, the crown again turned its attention to the colonial empire in North America. Louis XIV feared the encroachments of the rival English power.⁹

English interest in the Mississippi region had been whetted by the recently published account of Father Hennepin's, *The New Discovery of a Vast Country in America*, brought out in 1697 and dedicated to the British sovereign, William III. The Recollect's book popularized the fact that Louisiana could be reached by sea and by the Mississippi, and soon news reached France that the English were actively preparing to take advantage of Hennepin's suggestions. To anticipate the English, the French Crown appointed Pierre Le Moynes d'Iberville commander of an expedition to find the mouth of the Mississippi by sea, to hold it and the adjacent country in the name of France, and to investigate its commercial possibilities. Both the English and the French expeditions sailed in October 1698. The English, however, navigated to Carolina and remained off the coast of Charleston for the winter, only proceeding to the Gulf of Mexico in May 1699.¹⁰

Pénicaut begins his narrative with this first Iberville expedition. From the start, he manifests confused ideas in reporting details. He entered the King's service on board the *Cheval Marin*,¹¹ commanded by Count de Surgères, which, he claims, was a companion ship to the *Renommée*, thus indicating in his opening

⁹ Margry, IV, iv-xxxvi, discusses the activities which lead to the colonization of Louisiana and the influence exerted upon the Crown urging this project. Cf. also Jean Delanglez, S. J., *The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana, 1700-1763*, Washington, D. C., 1935, 4-6.

¹⁰ Delanglez, *French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, 6. For an account of the English version of these activities cf. D. Coxe, *Description of the English Province of Carolana, by the Spaniards call'd Florida, and by the French La Louisiane*, London, 1727.

¹¹ Generally referred to merely as the *Marin*, but the proper title was the *Cheval Marin*. It is thus referred to in an entry of August 19, 1699, Pontchartrain to Duguay, in N. M. Surrey, *Calendar of Manuscripts in the Paris Archives and Libraries relating to the History of the Mississippi Valley to 1803*, 2 planograph vols., Washington, D. C., 1926-1928, I, 55.

statements his uncertainty when recalling these early facts, for actually this latter vessel was commanded by Iberville on his two subsequent voyages. The *Badine* was the flag ship on the first trip. His confusion is likewise apparent when he reports the date and port of the expedition's departure, for he narrates that they sailed from La Rochelle in October, whereas, the date of departure from La Rochelle was September 5, 1698. However, adverse winds carried the expedition to Brest, whence they sailed on October 24.¹² These inaccuracies, although not important in themselves, show that all Pénicaut's statements must be critically examined before they can be accepted. The chronicler combines accurate facts with the inaccurate facts and before his relation can be relied upon, his statements must be checked against other contemporary sources. In general, the facts he narrates are true, but very often his sequence is awry; sometimes he omits important geographical details; and in one case invents a fourth voyage which has absolutely no foundation in reality. The most outstanding of these mistakes will be pointed out in this article.

The expedition's arrival at Santo Domingo is entered in the "Annals of Louisiana" in a very general manner.¹³ Neither the date of landing nor the first port of call are given. Iberville docked at Cap François, today Cap Haitien, Santo Domingo, on December 4, 1698, and although changing ports, he did not sail for the Louisiana coast until December 31. Pénicaut gives the date as the feast of St. Thomas,¹⁴ thus shortening the stay in Santo Domingo from twenty-seven to eleven days. The omission of Iberville's complicated activities while at Santo Domingo is not important. However, he could not have known much about the acquisition of the famous filibuster, Laurent de Graff, as

¹² The expedition was scheduled to depart from La Rochelle, Pontchartrain to Begon, July 16, 1698, Margry, IV, 70, but the ultimate departure was from Brest on October 24, and both the log of the *Marin*, *ibid.*, 213, and Iberville's letters designate Brest as the port of departure, Iberville to Pontchartrain, December 19, 1698, *ibid.*, 87. If Pénicaut considered La Rochelle as the port of departure, he should have given the date as of September 5, 1698, and not October, as he does.

¹³ Pénicaut's narrative, *ibid.*, V, 375.

¹⁴ There are two feasts of St. Thomas in December: the first of St. Thomas the Apostle, on December 21; and the second of St. Thomas à Becket, on December 29. In France at this time the feasts of the Apostles were holydays of obligation and for this reason Pénicaut would more easily remember the feast on the 21st. Shea, 118, n. 5, correcting Charlevoix says that Pénicaut, writing from memory gives the date of departure from Santo Domingo as December 29, although he has no more evidence for giving the date as the 29th than the 21st. P. F. X. de Charlevoix, S. J., *History and General Description of New France*, translated with notes by John Gilmary Shea, 6 vols., New York, 1871, V, 118.

pilot; and it was the knowledge and services rendered by de Graff which enabled the explorer to take such an accurate and sure course.¹⁵

Pénicaut's relation of the movements of the expedition after reaching the Gulf coast shows so many omissions, distortions, and abbreviations as to render his account practically worthless. Iberville's course, after rounding the western point of Cuba,¹⁶ was practically due north. He sighted land east of Pensacola on January 24.¹⁷ Sailing west he carefully explored every indentation as he went along so as not to miss, by any chance, the mouth of the river he was sent to discover. His log contains descriptions of the bays at Pensacola and Mobile, the discovery and naming of Massacre Island (today Dauphin Island), and the search for a suitable anchorage off Biloxi. Omitting all such details Pénicaut recounts that the expedition sailed directly from Santo Domingo to the anchorage between Cat and Ship Islands which he asserts was discovered on January 6. Actually this roadstead was not sighted until February 9, 1699.

The annalist's omission of a geographical description of the coast from Pensacola to Biloxi is serious, because this was the first official French exploration of the region. Iberville's observations concerning the location and topography of Pensacola and Mobile Bays were of utmost importance to the French during the next few years, Pensacola because of their attempt to secure it from the Spaniards, and Mobile because of the establishment of the French colony there.

As important as the geographical details are, however, the annalist's most serious omission is Iberville's discovery of the mouth of the Mississippi, which was the prime purpose of the expedition. The "Annals of Louisiana" recount in rapid succession the selection for the site of a fort, the erection of Fort Bi-

¹⁵ Chasteaumorant, captain of the ship which convoyed Iberville through the Gulf not only identifies de Graff, but also explains his importance to Iberville in aiding the explorer to find the mouth of the Mississippi. Chasteaumorant writes: "M. de Graff, capitaine de frégate légère estoit embarqué avec moy; il m'a esté d'un très grand secours; outre que c'est un parfaitement bon matelot, il connoist toutes les roches et tous les ports de ce pays là, jusques a l'entrée du Mexique, y ayant toute sa vie fait la course." Chasteaumorant to Pontchartrain, June 1699, Margry, IV, 103-104.

¹⁶ On January 15, Iberville rounded Cabo San Antonio, the westernmost point of Cuba. He calculated his longitude from this point which is 84° 55' west of Greenwich; log of the *Badine*, *ibid.*, 138.

¹⁷ Log of the *Badine*, *ibid.*, 141. The point where he sighted land Iberville called Cap Blanc (or Cap du Sable). Judging from the scale on Delisle's map of 1702, "Carte du Mexique de la Floride et des terres en Amerique avec les Isles Adjacentes," Archives Nationales (AN), JJ 75-253, it is located approximately fifteen leagues east of Pensacola Bay.

loxi at present day Ocean Springs,¹⁸ and the departure of Iberville for France, thus failing to include the leader's exploration of the river as high as the Huma village.¹⁹ Only the haziness which is almost inevitable when trying to recall distant events can account for Pénicaud's failure to relate such an important fact, for there are indications that he was a member of Iberville's party which discovered the mouth of the river, since he shows more than a chance knowledge of these details although he confuses them with those pertaining to Iberville's second exploration.

Pénicaud credits the discovery of the Mississippi to Bienville who led a party of explorers to the river during the interval between the first and second voyages of his brother. Bienville's route, however, which Pénicaud correctly describes, was not by way of the mouth of the river, but by way of Lake Pontchartrain, and therefore, according to the account in the "Annals of Louisiana," the mouth of the Mississippi actually remained undiscovered until Iberville's second voyage. Thus the chronicler fails to note a very significant historical point. Since La Salle had been unable to find the mouth of the Mississippi by sea, it was Iberville's explicit task to do so.²⁰ Accordingly, the explor-

¹⁸ Named after the Biloxi Indians whom Iberville encountered on February 15, 1699, in the vicinity of Biloxi Bay. Iberville himself did not give the fort this name and in the log of the *Badine* it is designated as the fort at the Bay of Biloxi. Its official name was *Fort de Maurepas* and was called thus by Iberville in his "Mémoire de la Coste de la Floride et d'une Partie du Mexique," Margry, IV, 313, as well as in Iberville's letter to Pontchartrain, August 11, 1699, *ibid.*, 328. After this date, however, the official letters refer to said fort as the "Fort des Biloxis," *ibid.*, 335, 336, 337, 339. Cf. Delanglez, *French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, 5, n. 33.

¹⁹ Iberville discovered the mouth of the Mississippi on March 2, 1699. He ascended the river first to the village of the Bayougoula Indians, and not satisfied that he had definite proof that he was actually exploring the Mississippi, he continued as high as the Huma village. He retraced his steps until he reached the entrance to a river, a little above the Bayougoula village on the east bank of the Mississippi, which later bore his name. Later it was renamed Manchac. Descending this river with a small party—the remainder were sent to the roadstead by way of the river's mouth—and after making numerous portages, he came to Lakes Maurepas and Pontchartrain. Passing through these lakes, he reached the Gulf and returned to the anchorage on March 31.

²⁰ It was rather difficult to find the mouth of the river by sea, for its appearance was not as imposing as at first expected. The Spaniards, as a matter of fact, found the mouth of the river so unimposing, they could not believe that this was the famous river over which three nations were vying for possession, and they did not even try to enter because "of the great quantity of trees and driftwood which choked its mouth." William Edward Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry in the Gulf Region of the United States, 1678-1702*, Austin, Texas, 1917, 62. Iberville described its entrance as cluttered with petrified wood and rocks, its current swift and loaded with floating trees, log of the *Badine*, Margry, IV, 162.

er's accomplishment was most noteworthy, and his geographical descriptions and observations were of vital interest to the French court of that period.

By May 1 the fort at Biloxi was practically completed and Iberville left for France two days later. Pénicaud's list of the officers appointed to serve the fort include Sauvolle,²¹ commandant; Boisbriand,²² major; Bienville,²³ with no specific title; the Jesuit Father Paul Du Ru, chaplain. This enumeration furnishes another example of the author's confused memory, for the said major and chaplain only came to Louisiana on Iberville's second voyage; the incumbents at this time were Lévassieur-Roussel and M. Bordenave.²⁴

During the interval between Iberville's first and second voyages Bienville headed several exploratory expeditions. These are recounted in the "Annals of Louisiana" with a good deal of accuracy as to many details, but the sequence is characteristically muddled.²⁵ The most glaring mistake in chronology, however, concerns Bienville's encounter with the English frigate a hundred miles up the Mississippi at present-day English Turn on Sep-

²¹ Many authors erroneously claim that Sauvolle was Iberville's brother, cf. Delanglez, *French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, 7, n. 44.

²² Pierre Dugué, sieur de Boisbriant, a Canadian, was a cousin of Iberville's, cf. Alvord, I, 153.

²³ Jean-Baptiste Le Moyne de Bienville was born in 1680. He was made garde-marine in 1692. Gardes-marine were "midshipmen," or young men selected by the King to be trained in the navy; D. Rowland and A. G. Sanders, editors, *Mississippi Provincial Archives*, French Dominion, 3 vols., hereinafter referred to as MPA, Jackson, Mississippi, 1927-1931, II, 41, n. 1. He served with his brother on the Hudson Bay expedition, and was not yet twenty years of age when he sailed from France on the Louisiana expedition. From 1704 to 1726 he was the most prominent figure in Louisiana colonial history. In 1733 he was appointed governor of that colony and died March 7, 1767.

²⁴ Log of the *Badine*, Margry, IV, 196. Father Anastasius who had accompanied La Salle on his expeditions also served as chaplain on Iberville's first voyage, but by the end of this expedition, the Recollect was weary of the mission field and asked to return to France with the explorer, stating that he never again wished to leave his convent. M. Bordenave was the chaplain from the *Badine*, and remained with the colony until the arrival of Father Du Ru.

²⁵ Sauvolle's letter of May 1, 1700, Margry, IV, 451, states that on June 9, 1699, he sent a group to reconnoiter Mobile Bay. Pénicaud recounts this eastward exploration, but makes no reference to the sounding of Mobile Bay; in fact the chronicler fails to make any reference to Mobile Bay until the colony was established there in 1702. The second expedition which went to the Pascagoula village took place during the latter part of June (*ibid.*, 451), although the chronicler post-dates it by two months, thus confounding it even in his own narrative with Bienville's expedition to the Mississippi, which also occurred toward the end of August; *ibid.*, 455. Bay St. Louis, Pénicaud narrates, received its name in honor of the feast of St. Louis, celebrated on August 25, the day upon which Bienville's expedition camped there on its way to the Mississippi River.

tember 15, 1699.²⁶ Pénicaut, although correct with reference to other details of the encounter, states that the meeting occurred during Iberville's second voyage, describing an erroneous set of circumstances in order to make his account plausible.

IBERVILLE'S SECOND VOYAGE

The return of Iberville early in January 1700²⁷ brought new energy to the struggling colony at Biloxi. The chronicler's account of this second voyage is important because it contains his first and only description of the lower course of the Mississippi and identification of the landmarks along its banks. In itself, his description, the identification of places, the estimation of distances, and the names of participants are quite accurate, but, typically, the sequence in which he relates the events of the second voyage is unreliable and utterly confused.

Besides Iberville's letters and the log of the *Renommée* there are two extant journals which furnish important documentary means of comparison. The first is the letter written by Le Sueur²⁸ from the Natchez village, April 4, 1700;²⁹ and the second is the journal of Father Paul Du Ru, the Jesuit missionary, covering the period from February 1 to May 8, 1700.³⁰ These documents supply valuable information by which to test Pénicaut's chronicle, and enable the historian to piece together the story as the annalist should have told it.

The cause of Pénicaut's greatest confusion concerning this voyage is due to the fact that he recounts two independent, but

²⁶ English Turn is about eighteen miles below New Orleans or about 100 miles from the Gulf, Delanglez, *French Jesuits*, 6; cf. "Tonti Letters," MID-AMERICA, XXI, 1939, 215, n. 1. The bend in the river, where the little French detachment met the English man-of-war was named *Détour des Anglais* or *Détour aux Anglais*. For an enumeration of the various dates given by the contemporary writers for this event, cf. Delanglez, *French Jesuits*, 6, n. 43.

²⁷ Iberville landed at Ship Island on January 8, Iberville to Pontchartrain, February 26, 1700, Margry, IV, 361; log of the *Renommée*, *ibid.*, 395. Pénicaut gives the date as January 5 (la veille des Rois), 1700. Perhaps he was not relying entirely upon his memory when narrating this event, but upon hasty jottings which he claimed to have made throughout his stay in the colony, for his dating of this second voyage is more accurate than that of the first journey.

²⁸ Pierre-Charles Le Sueur (b. 1657), a Canadian fur trader, received a mining concession in the Upper Mississippi Valley in 1698, which was revoked a year later. He returned to France, had his license renewed and joined Iberville's expedition the following year. Alvord, I, 114 and 129.

²⁹ "Extrait d'une Lettre du Sieur Lesueur qui est allé faire un établissement sur des mines du cuivre à 5 ou 600 lieues dans le Mississippi. Aux Natchez sur le Mississipi le 4 Avril 1700," Bibliothèque Nationale. Manuscrit français, nouvelles acquisitions (BN, Mss. fr. n. a.), 21395:5-11v.

³⁰ *Journal of Paul Du Ru*, translated by Ruth Lapham Butler, The Caxton Club, Chicago, 1934.

simultaneous trips, as though he were a member of both. The first is Iberville's trip up the river, in which he claims to have participated, and the second is Le Sueur's expedition to the copper mine in Minnesota, which he mistakenly places at the conclusion of Iberville's second voyage, and in which he actually participated.

Consequently his narrative of Iberville's exploration of the river is quite full of inaccuracies. In some instances he confounds Iberville's first and second trips up the Mississippi, attributing to this second voyage facts that actually occurred on the first.³¹ In other cases his statements are erroneous and his chronology confused. For instance, the circumstances connected with the building of the fort on the Mississippi as related in the "Annals of Louisiana" are entirely unreliable. When Iberville heard of the English intrusion into French territory, he determined to take steps to fortify the mouth of the river against further incursions. Accordingly, while on a reconnoitering trip to Lake Pontchartrain, the commander dispatched his brother on January 15, 1700 to the Bayougoula village to seek the aid of the Indian chief in selecting a site for a fort near the mouth of the river. Iberville himself did not go to the river until February 1, 1700. He entered the river at its mouth and met Bienville eighteen leagues above. Approving the site which the latter had selected, he immediately set about the building of the fort. When the construction was well under way, he took a portion of his men with him to explore the course of the river as high as the Taensa village.

Pénicaud, on the other hand, narrates the facts concerning the building of Fort Mississippi quite differently. In the first place, he makes no mention of Iberville's preliminary excursion,³²

³¹ For example, the details given by the chronicler of the voyage from the roadstead to the mouth of the Mississippi are those pertaining to first voyage. The time which it took the expedition to travel from the roadstead to the mouth of the river, Pénicaud says, occupied four days, which is the time it took the explorer to make the same journey on his first visit to the Mississippi; log of the *Badine*, Margry, IV, 157-159. Likewise Pénicaud gives the impression that the force landed each night, while from Du Ru's journal it is quite evident that on the second voyage the expedition did not land or camp, Butler, *Journal of Paul Du Ru*, 2-4. Likewise, the annalist's identification of Mardi Gras Bayou, ten leagues from the river's mouth, gives further evidence that he confounded the two voyages, for this stream was so-named on the first exploration because it was Iberville's camp site on Shrove Tuesday, March 3, 1699; log of the *Badine*, Margry, IV, 160.

³² Although Pénicaud makes no reference to Iberville's Lake Pontchartrain expedition, he describes the topography of the Lake when recounting Bienville's excursion through the lake and his portage to the Mississippi in August 1699. His account is in substantial agreement with the other

stating that the leader set out directly for the mouth of the river. While ascending the Mississippi, he continues, Iberville noted a suitable site for a fort which he planned to have erected upon his descent.³³ When he reached the Natchez village, he sent his brother to Biloxi to secure the necessary materials for the erection of the proposed fort. It was on this return trip, the narrator tells us, that Bienville met the English vessel, but, as already explained, this encounter actually occurred during the preceding September under entirely different circumstances. Also, as shown above, the building of Fort Mississippi was begun before Iberville explored the river, and not, as Pénicaut states, after his descent from the Taensa village.³⁴

At the Taensas an incident occurred which is related in all the early accounts, but is most exaggerated in the "Annals," probably because the author got his facts second hand, though he tells them as an actual eye-witness. In his account the annalist relates that seventeen children were thrown into the burning Taensa temple to appease the angry gods, whereas all other accounts place the figure at four or five.³⁵ Furthermore, he confidently asserts, more than 200 children would have been burned if Iberville had not persuaded them to cease their bloody sacrifice. At the time of the fire, however, Iberville was three leagues away, camping on the bank of the Mississippi, when news of the temple incident was brought to him by some Frenchmen.

These are but a few of the most obvious incidents which illustrate Pénicaut's general confusion in narrating the events connected with Iberville's second exploration of the Mississippi.

sources regarding most of the geographical particulars. This is particularly true with reference to his description of present-day Bayou St. John, from which point the early travelers made the portage to the Mississippi. Compare Pénicaut's narrative, Margry, V, 385; log of the *Renommée*, *ibid.*, IV, 399; Le Sueur's letter, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 21395:7; and *Journal of Paul Du Ru*, 16.

³³ Iberville met his brother at the site of the Fort on February 4 and from the fourth to the nineteenth he was engaged in the building of the new fort, log of the *Renommée*, Margry, IV, 400. Du Ru gives the distance of the fort as seventeen leagues from the sea, *Journal of Paul Du Ru*, 6. All other authorities give eighteen leagues, cf. Delanglez, *French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, 12, n. 82. Its location was about forty-five miles from the sea, Jean Delanglez, "Hennepin's Voyage to the Gulf of Mexico," *MID-AMERICA*, XXI, 1939, 40.

³⁴ The Taensa village was located on Lake St. Joseph which is a little more than 400 miles from the Gulf, *ibid.*, 64.

³⁵ Du Ru who heard the account as the Frenchmen relayed it, said that four or five children were thrown into the fire, *Journal of Paul Du Ru*, 40-41. For the variations given in these early accounts, cf. Delanglez, *French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, 15, n. 99.

Numerous other examples could be pointed out,³⁶ but these would only give further evidence for the conclusion that all Pénicaud's statements must be verified before they can be accepted as authoritative.

As already stated, the author, in order to explain his participation in both Iberville's and Le Sueur's expeditions, post-dates the latter,³⁷ but this is not the only error he makes when narrating the details of Le Sueur's trip. His confusion is even more apparent when he asserts that Le Sueur's detachment ascended the river from its mouth, stopping at Fort Mississippi on the way, whereas Le Sueur entered the Mississippi River, not by way of its mouth, but by way of Lake Pontchartrain and Bayou St. John, forty leagues from the sea, making the difficult portage from the bayou to the river.³⁸ By this route he missed the fort which was located only eighteen leagues from the mouth of the river.

Pénicaud begins his account of Le Sueur's trip with a description of the Mississippi River from the Taensa village, where Iberville's exploration left off, since, as he remarks, it would be a useless repetition to give another account of the course of the river below the Taensas. In describing Le Sueur's ascent he minimizes his slow and tedious progress,³⁹ but describes the landmarks from the Taensa to the Arkansas River quite accurately. The remainder of the trip up the Mississippi to the copper mine in Minnesota and the sojourn of Le Sueur's party there during the winter months are outside the scope of this paper. The important consideration here is the question of chronology, and when compared with other contemporary accounts, it is obvious that Pénicaud's sequence of events is unreliable.

³⁶ Such as his failure to mention the arrival on February 16, 1700, of Henry de Tonti, the famous Italian traveler and friend of La Salle, near the mouth of the Mississippi where Iberville was erecting his fort, log of the *Renommée*, Margry, IV, 404; Pénicaud's use of knowledge acquired at a much later date when he identifies Iberville river as Bayou Manchac, the name this stream bears today.

³⁷ Le Sueur left the roadstead on February 8 and arrived at Bayou St. John on February 13, Le Sueur's letter, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 21395:6-6v, and 7. Pénicaud states that the Le Sueur expedition did not leave Biloxi until April 1700.

³⁸ While Le Sueur was engaged in transporting his goods over the portage to the Mississippi River, Father Du Ru, who was in Iberville's party, passed the miner on his way to the Bayougoula village; *Journal of Paul Du Ru*, 16.

³⁹ Because of his heavily loaded pirogue, Le Sueur's ascent was so slow that Iberville, on his return trip from the Taensas, passed this group which had advanced only six leagues above the Huma village; *ibid.*, 45; Le Sueur's letter, BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 21395:11v and 12.

IBERVILLE'S THIRD VOYAGE

The Le Sueur expedition returned to Biloxi on July 16, 1701.⁴⁰ Here, Pénicaud narrates, he found Iberville engaged in unloading his vessels. In this regard, and indeed, in regard to the entire third voyage, the chronicler has so misrepresented the facts that it is almost impossible to reconcile the events he narrates with the actual circumstances.

In the summer of 1701, Iberville was still in France making preparations for his third voyage. Moreover, confined to his bed by an abscess in his side, the colonizer was forced to put into harbor at Pensacola on December 15, 1700,⁴¹ and, in fact, did not go to Biloxi during the third voyage. Consequently the activities Pénicaud attributes to Iberville during this period, such as the soundings made around Massacre Island, the exploration of Mobile Bay, and the selection of the future site of Mobile fort, do not pertain to Iberville's third voyage. The annalist's chronology is still more upset because he includes Sauvolle as an active participant in the events of the third voyage, when as a matter of fact the commandant died during the interval between Iberville's second and third voyages, actually on August 22, 1701.⁴²

The purpose of the third voyage was to supervise the transfer of the base from Biloxi to Mobile Bay. From his sick bed at Pensacola harbor Iberville sent instructions to Bienville who began the transfer of the garrison early in January 1702. Pénicaud on the other hand states that this work was not begun until after Iberville's return to France, claiming that it was accomplished under the supervision of Boisbriand. Even though the chronicler places the transfer of the fort later than it actually occurred in the sequence of events, when he assigns a year to this incident he dates it one year too early.

Iberville himself did not visit the new fort until March, at which time the work was well under way. He sailed for France on April 27, 1702, and thus ended his last visit to the colony which he had established in Louisiana.

The most astounding inaccuracy in the "Annals of Louisiana" is the author's narration of an imaginary fourth voyage which Iberville is supposed to have made in the spring of 1702.⁴³ Subsequent writers, making an uncritical use of the narrative,

⁴⁰ Sauvolle to Pontchartrain, August 4, 1701, MPA, II, 13 and 16.

⁴¹ Iberville's journal, December 15, 1701 to April 27, 1702, Margry, IV, 503.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 504.

⁴³ Pénicaud's narrative, Margry, V, 424.

have repeated this error.⁴⁴ As a matter of fact in the early spring of 1702, the explorer was still at Mobile.

In recounting the activities which Pénicaut ascribes to this imaginary fourth voyage facts are recorded that obviously could not be put in their proper sequence. For instance, the construction of warehouses on Massacre Island was begun during the commander's third voyage,⁴⁵ while the changing of the names of Massacre and Surgères Islands to Dauphin and Ship Islands respectively first appears in Bienville's letter to the Minister of October 27, 1711.⁴⁶

THE MOBILE COLONY, 1702-1704

As the "Annals of Louisiana" proceeds, the general impression is that the author is merely jotting down isolated statements regardless of sequence, rather than relating a consecutive narrative. In addition to the confusion caused by muddled chronology, many of these statements are difficult to check due to the paucity of contemporary material covering the period from 1702 to 1704.

The narrator's recital of the treachery of the Alabama Indians and the subsequent revenge sought by the French is the only complete and orderly narration found among his sketchy statements for this two-year period. His account of this affair is graphic and many of the details are more particular than any of

⁴⁴ Notably Charlevoix, II, 414, and Peter J. Hamilton in *Colonial Mobile*, Cambridge, 1910, 56. The latter says Iberville came in the *Loire*, with ever needed supplies and oversaw for a while the affairs of the colony.

⁴⁵ Log of the *Renommée*, Margry, IV, 505.

⁴⁶ Bienville wrote: ". . . As I have had the honor of informing your Lordship by a brigantine from Martinique, to draw near to Massacre Island, which we now call Dauphine Island and the establishment that is beginning to be made there . . ." MPA, III, 159.

To trace the change of the names of these islands on the maps of that period, we have a map dated 1710, "Cours du Mississipi, depuis les sources de Mississipi aux environs de 48° jusqu'à son embouchure," Bibliothèque du Service Hydrographique (SHB) C 4040-27, on which Ship Island is still inscribed "Surgeres Island" and likewise the name of Massacre Island remains unchanged. A map of Le Maire's, "Carte nouvelle de la Louisiane et pais circonvoisins," SHB C 4044-46A, dated 1716, gives both the latter names for these islands, namely Isle Dauphine and Isle aux Vaisseaux. In the Delisle sketches, pertaining to this early period, Ship Island is consistently named *Isle du Mouillage*, and likewise Isle Massacre. Cf. "Carte des Environs du Mississipi, Donne par M. d'Iberville," SHB, C 4040-4; "Carte du Mexique de la Floride et des terres en Amerique, avec les Isles adjacentes," Archives Nationales (AN), JJ 75-253; "Carte des Environs du Mississipi," AN, JJ 75-553; "Embouchure de la Mobile," AN, JJ 75-239 (on this map, however, Ship Island is not shown); cf. "Embouchure du Mississipi," AN, JJ 74-244. The change in nomenclature for both islands appears on these sketches simultaneously. It is first noted on "Embouchure du Mississipi," AN, JJ 75-244.

the other extant reports. Characteristically he sets the event in September 1702, while Bienville, in his report to Pontchartrain, gives the date as the summer of 1704.⁴⁷

Pénicaut relates two subsequent skirmishes against the Alabama, but since these incidents are not contained in any contemporary account, at least up to 1704, it is impossible to check their authenticity. A probable explanation is that these occurred later than 1704. This explanation is certainly the case with reference to the assassination of M. de St. Cosme which the chronicler places early in the year 1703. The missionary's death occurred toward the end of the year 1706, and news of it was brought to Mobile early in January 1707.⁴⁸

The sequence in the "Annals of Louisiana" becomes even more involved when Pénicaut ascribes to the year 1704 the economic expedient of quartering part of the Mobile garrison among the neighboring Indian villages in times of famine. As far as can be ascertained, the first time this policy was employed was in 1710; at least this is the first reference to such a practice found in Bienville's letters.⁴⁹ Previous to 1710 Bienville was able to re-

⁴⁷ The killing of the Frenchmen by the Alabama Indians which precipitated the incident probably took place during the year 1703, since the Minister refers to the affair in his letter of January 30, 1704, and in his letter of September 6, 1704, Bienville does not relate the circumstances that caused the difficulty with the Alabama Indians, the supposition being that he had reported the affair previously. Le Harpe gives the date as May 1, 1703, and attributes the animosity to the activities of the English, whom, the latter claims, excited these Indians to plot against the French Bénéard de La Harpe, *Journal Historique de l'Établissement des Français à La Louisiane*, Nouvelle Orléans, 1831, 76-79.

⁴⁸ Delanglez, *French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, 63, n. 88; MPA, III, 38. Jean François Buisson de St. Cosme, a Seminary priest, was one of three missionaries sent from Quebec in 1698 to the Mississippi valley. The other two were François Jolliet de Montigny, the superior and Antoine Davion. During the summer of 1699, these priests visited the fort at Biloxi. M. de Montigny began a mission among the Taensa. Father Du Ru induced him to transfer his mission to the Natchez when he met the missionary on Iberville's second voyage, March 20, 1700, *Journal of Paul Du Ru*, 42. MM. de Montigny and Davion both returned to Biloxi to visit Du Ru in May 1700. Montigny then returned to France by way of New York; M. Davion returned to his mission, and M. de St. Cosme, who had first established himself at the Tamarois, near modern St. Louis, took up the mission at the Natchez; Delanglez, 22-25, 34.

⁴⁹ Bienville to Pontchartrain, June 21, 1710, MPA, III, 1515. In his letter Bienville writes: "We had some [corn] until the month of March after which, seeming myself obliged to buy some from the individuals of this place, who had very little since they had assisted the Spaniards with one hundred and eighty barrels this last autumn, I decided to send for the chiefs of several nations and I distributed soldiers to each of their villages for them to feed. I reserved only thirty soldiers to guard this fort." D'Artaguette, in his letter to the minister of June 1710, also recounts the plight of the colony and the expedient to which Bienville resorted. He confirms the latter's statement, asserting that thirty-five of the sixty-five soldiers at Mobile fort were thus distributed, *ibid.*, II, 55.

lieve the stress of his colony by sending to Vera Cruz or Havana for supplies, or by borrowing from the Spaniards at Pensacola.⁵⁰ Despite this faultiness in his chronology, Pénicaut's description of the customs, government, marriage and funeral rites of the Natchez Indians among whom he wintered gives us a first-hand account of Natchez culture, upon which writers have put a great deal of reliance.

The news of the arrival of the supply ship, the *Pélican*, in 1704, Pénicaut says, brought the scattered colonists back to Mobile. In this incident, the narrator's chronology is accurate for the *Pélican* anchored off Mobile in July 1704,⁵¹ bringing with it a contingent of marriageable girls.⁵² And with the arrival of this cargo, the important events for the year 1704 come to an end.

CONCLUSION

In this brief survey it is impossible, of course, to indicate in minute detail all the discrepancies that a careful comparison of the "Annals" with contemporary accounts makes evident. Only the most glaring inconsistencies have been pointed out in an effort to show the general unreliable character of the whole narrative. From this study it is apparent that Pénicaut's statements can be accepted only after they have been verified against authoritative sources. For this reason it is interesting to note just what use historians have made of the "Annals of Louisiana."

Charlevoix was the first to make use of the narrative. This author uncritically accepted the annalist's misstatements and errors. This is true, in particular, with regard to the incorrect date for Le Sueur's voyage to the Sioux country and in regard to the fictitious fourth voyage.

Until the publication by Margry of Pénicaut's relation the writers who followed Charlevoix did not have access to this narrative. As Heinrich points out, the authors succeeding Charlevoix made use without acknowledgment of the latter's history. Such are François-Xavier Martin, John W. Monette, Charles

⁵⁰ Cf. Bienville to Pontchartrain, September 14, 1706, *ibid.*, III, 31; *ibid.*, February 20, 1707, 35; *ibid.*, June 30, 1707, 47.

⁵¹ Delanglez, *French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, 52. This date is also given in La Harpe, 84.

⁵² Pénicaut gives the number of girls as twenty-six. In the contemporary accounts the number varies from twenty-one to thirty. In his appendix, Hamilton, 527, lists a total of thirty girls, but in a footnote states that on September 6, Bienville reported that only twenty-seven women landed. On the other hand, Delanglez, *French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana*, 53, n. 37, quoting the official list made in Paris, gives the total as twenty-one girls in all; while La Harpe, 84-85, says the *Pélican* brought twenty-three girls.

Gayarré, and Albert James Pickett. Since these historians did not have recourse to reliable documentary sources, many details contained in their works relating to this early period are inaccurate, but they do not, strangely enough, repeat Pénicaut's predominant errors as they are contained in Charlevoix's work.

After the publication of this narrative by Margry in 1887, a rather extensive use of Pénicaut's work might be expected since it is a continuous history of Louisiana for the first twenty years. This, however, is not the case. For reasons which do not concern us here, subsequent writers were satisfied with merely copying the works of their predecessors without giving the sources for their statements. Some of these authors are Henry E. Chambers, John R. Spears and A. H. Clark, J. F. H. Clairborne, Grace King, and Alcée Fortier.

An examination of the historical literature for the beginnings of Louisiana shows that only two authors made an extensive use of Pénicaut's narrative. Hamilton found the annalist a valuable guide for his *Colonial Mobile*, because the colonist lived in Mobile for many years and knew its environs very well. Hamilton, however, repeats Pénicaut's most glaring mistake and ascribes a fourth voyage to Iberville. Heinrich, on the other hand, making full use of all the documentary material at his disposal, was more discerning and is critical in his acceptance of Pénicaut's statements.

The comparison of Pénicaut's text with contemporary evidence makes one wonder what led Margry to publish this defective relation rather than the more accurate and more authoritative materials which he had at his disposal.

ELIZABETH McCANN

Book Reviews

The Great Demobilization and Other Essays. By Frederic Logan Paxson. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1941. Pp. 206.

This volume contains seven other essays written by Professor Paxson, in addition to the one which gives the book its title, "The Great Demobilization." The last mentioned essay was presented by Professor Paxson as his presidential address at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Chicago, in 1938. The others, as they appear in the volume, are: "A Generation of the Frontier Hypothesis" (1932); "The Cow Country" (1916); "The Pacific Railroads and the Disappearance of the Frontier" (1907); "The Admission of the 'Omnibus' States" (1911); "The Rise of Sport" (1917); "The Agricultural Surplus: A Problem in History" (1931); and "The New Frontier and the Old American Habit" (1935). These titles are given to make it clear that the essays deal in general with the contribution of the frontier to American development. Those acquainted with the work of Dr. Paxson will recall that his writings and his teachings have made him the foremost exponent of the point of view originally presented by Frederick Jackson Turner, with reference to the frontier influence in American life. Never an extremist, Dr. Paxson has avoided an effort to make the frontier influence explain everything in our historical development. He has simply insisted that it be given proper consideration as a vital influence in shaping what we call the American way of life. These essays deal in scholarly detail with various ramifications of the frontier theory. Like his lectures, they are concise, at times cutting, and continually characterized by a directness of phrasing definitely associated only with the author under consideration.

The papers themselves offer a pleasing variety, so far as basic materials are concerned. In the essay "The Pacific Railroads and the Disappearance of the Frontier" we find a detailed treatment of the involved and hectic history of the early western railways; in "The Admission of the 'Omnibus' States" the confusing political strategy of the late 1880's is clearly presented; in "The Rise of Sport" we have much revealing social history; and in "The Agricultural Surplus: A Problem in History," we have a penetrating study of a perennial problem in American agriculture. As a background for each essay, one senses a tremendous amount of research, and a painstaking effort to present clearly and frankly the results of much study and thought. All in all, the essays represent American historical writing at its best.

The volume includes a bibliography of the writings of Professor Paxson, and also a list of the writings of students who completed their work for the doctorate under Dr. Paxson's direction. The format of

the volume is attractive, the editing has been carefully done, and the book is a credit to its sponsors as well as to Dr. Paxson.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University, Chicago

La Florida, La Misión Jesuítica (1566-1572) y La Colonización Española. By Félix Zubillaga, S. J. Biblioteca Instituti Historici, S. I., Vol. I, Rome, 1941. Pp. xiv, 473.

The history of the Jesuit effort in early Florida has long awaited adequate treatment. The problems are enormous, but considerable essential source materials have been uncovered since the days of Shea, Lowery, and their contemporaries, not least of which are those in the Jesuit archives of Italy and Spain which have been delved into in recent years. Astrain and Kenny made some use of them. Now, based in great part on these documents, we have the volume of Father Zubillaga, the most detailed history of the subject which has yet been published. The author is one of the editors of the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* in Rome. A second volume of illustrative documents is to be published in the near future.

The first 179 pages of the present work constitute a historical introduction covering the early general history of Florida, and based for the most part on Lowery and Ruidiaz y Caravia. For the ethno-history of the region Hodge is frequently cited as the authority. A fresh study of these matters based more fully on the findings of the past thirty years would have been a welcome contribution here. Pages 179-432 deal directly with the Jesuit story. This story falls into two major parts, the official direction of the Jesuit enterprise in Italy (Rome) and Spain, and the developments in America. The former aspect is fully set forth from the documents in the Jesuit archives; and anyone who has worked in early Jesuit history knows how complete such precious historical records are wherever they have escaped the ravages of political enemies in times past. The picture presented reveals the superficial character of previous writings on the subject. The Florida side of the story, however, is lamentably lacking in quite essential geographical details. It is impossible to point out these problems here, as they would require a lengthy presentation. Indeed, a well digested study of the cartography of the region, which could be made from the archival materials now available, a difficult task to be sure, would help to clarify many of these problems.

Unfortunately no effort has been made by the author to point out and clarify the plethora of contradictions to be found in previous writings on the subject. The basic causes for the failure of the Jesuit effort in Florida have not been fully explained. The rôle of Governor Menéndez de Avilés as a great sea captain and defender of Spanish outposts against covetous international rivals, has long been quite

adequately set forth by Ruidíaz y Caravia, Lowery, and others, but no detailed study has been made of Menéndez as a colony builder on a barren frontier, his conception of the mission as a frontier institution, his general policy as a colonial governor, and his relations with the Jesuits. These matters all have a direct bearing on the fate of the Jesuit mission. All in all, however, Zubillaga has done a great service in bringing forth from the Jesuit documents, some of them hitherto unexploited, new evidence which should inspire further investigation; and his promised documentary volume will undoubtedly shed additional light on this revealing chapter of Spanish American colonial history.

J. MANUEL ESPINOSA

Institute of Jesuit History

Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1939-1940. By Pierre-Georges Roy. Quebec, 1940. Pp. viii, 486.

This is the twentieth report submitted by the Archivist of the Province of Quebec to the Secretary of the Province. It contains, first, the nominal census of the parish of Quebec taken in 1744; secondly, an inventory, by the Abbé Caron, of the documentation relative to the Church in Canada from 1610 to the end of 1699; and finally, the second installment of the official letters of Governor Vaudreuil to the Paris government, as well as the letters which the king and the minister of the colonies sent to Canada. This correspondence covers one year and a half, from May 18, 1707 to November 14, 1708. In this review we wish to say a few words about the second part of the report.

The compiler of the inventory, the Abbé Caron, divides the ninety years which it covers into two periods, from 1610 to 1659, and from 1659 to 1699. The bulk of the documentation for the first period, *i. e.*, up to the coming of Bishop Laval, is taken from the *Jesuit Relations*. The source materials for the second period are more diversified. They comprise the correspondence of the Bishops of Quebec with the Vatican, the documents found in the various registers in the Archives of the Archbishopric, and "everything in the correspondence of the king, the ministers in France, and of the governors and intendants in Canada, which is related to the history of the Church in the colony." Whenever a document is in print, a mere mention of it is made; if the document is still in manuscript, there is a short résumé of it.

This inventory is rather of the nature of a guide than of a calendar. For instance, all the titles to lands granted to the Jesuits from 1626 to 1678 are brought together, on pages 159-161; so, too, are all the titles pertaining to the foundation of the Hôtel-Dieu including the land grants made to the sisters, pages 166-173. The first of these latter titles is dated December 1, 1637, and the two documents

which follow immediately are dated September 14, 1646, and November 3, 1672, page 167. There are advantages in this procedure, but there are also inconveniences. The last mentioned deed, for instance, is not found under its date, and there is no indication in the Index that one would find mention of the Intendant Jean Talon on this page.

Since this inventory is clearly intended to be what M. Caron would call an "instrument de travail," a different typographical presentation would have been preferable with the dates placed in the margin. Students are well aware how very useful it is to know the number of pages in a manuscript document; yet, except in very few cases, this information is not given. Moreover, with regard to certain documents, the reference is not to the original, but to a copy. The "Mémoire d'un missionnaire," for example, listed under 1671 is said to be in the Archives of the Archbishopric; and no reference is given to the original, which is in the Archives des Colonies, C 11A, 3:192-211. Finally, quite a few documents indicated in manuscript are also in print, a detail which the inventory does not always mention.

Two sources for the history of the Church in Canada are not listed, namely, the historical letters of Marie de l'Incarnation, and the letters of M. Tronson to the Sulpicians of Montreal. Besides, M. Caron does not seem to have had access to the documents or the calendar in the Archives of the Séminaire of Quebec. These remarks, however, are not made with the intention of detracting from the usefulness of this inventory, for there is no doubt that it will prove to be very helpful indeed. Those who have been forced to gather materials for the history of a protracted period realize what a painstaking and tedious work it is to prepare the all-important calendar of relevant documents.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Institute of Jesuit History

New Documents by Lahontan concerning Canada and Newfoundland.

Edited with an Introduction by Gustave Lanctot. [The Oakes Collection.] Ottawa, 1940. Pp. 69.

Of the five documents published in this book by the Dominion Archivist, the first two, a gift of Lady Oakes to the Canadian Archives, are the more important: an "Instructive Summary of the Affairs of Canada," and an "Outline of a Project to Capture Quebec and Placentia." The other three comprise a deed of gift by Lahontan, now in the Archives of the Palais de Justice of Montreal; an autograph letter of Lahontan dated Hamburg, June 19, 1694, which is reproduced in facsimile for the first time, though the text appears in print in Margry, IV, 6-8; and finally, the 1692 census of New France.

All these documents are printed in French and English on opposite pages, and the introduction is also bilingual. In this introduction, Major Lanctot bases his outline of the career of Lahontan on the study

of Joseph-Edmond Roy. The two first documents are not signed, but as the editor avers, there can be no doubt as to their author: ideas, style, autobiographical details fit nobody else but the notorious Baron Lahontan. The present reviewer may add that, thanks to a photographic reproduction of the first page of both memoirs, he is able to confirm this conclusion through having compared the handwriting with that of another long Lahontan manuscript: two autograph letters signed and an autograph copy by Lahontan of the Journal of Jean Cavelier. This manuscript was published in 1938 by the Institute of Jesuit History from a photograph in the Ayer Collection of the Newberry Library, Chicago. As a result of this comparison, the conclusion of Major Lanctot is established beyond cavil, "the same characteristics, the same peculiarities, the same mistakes are found" in all these manuscripts.

The editor writes that after September 1698, "history possesses no further details on the baron's wanderings." This is not quite correct. The two letters referred to above, dated Lisbon, September 1 and September 9, 1699, show that Lahontan went to Portugal shortly after he had approached Bonrepaus, the French ambassador at The Hague, and that while in Lisbon, he offered to sell his services to Spain, the country on which, the year before, he had offered to spy for the French government. In these Lisbon letters, too, we find him inciting a foreign power, Spain, against his own country. In the documents under review which were drawn up by Lahontan for the information of the British government, we find him, two years before he approached Bonrepaus, urging the English to seize Newfoundland and New France. "While reading these documents," the editor pertinently remarks, "we must not forget that Lahontan always remains Lahontan," a *raté*, as Professor Chinard branded him for all time. The service record of this French army officer is indeed remarkable. He twice deserted his post in the New World; in 1696, he incited the English to seize Newfoundland and New France; in 1698, he offered to become a French spy in Spain for the modest sum of "four hundred *écus*" a year; in 1699, he urged the Spaniards to take action against the usurpation of the French in Louisiana; and in 1703, he published in Holland a book, dedicated to the King of Denmark, in which he vents his spleen against his fellow countrymen.

While reading the introduction to these documents, one is struck by a double coincidence which seems to have escaped the notice of Major Lanctot. He correctly deduces that the two memoirs were written in 1696, and convincingly reasons that the addressee of both documents was the English Secretary of War, William Blathwait. The first of the two coincidences here referred to is apparent from the following passage of Hennepin's *New Discovery*. We read in the preface that in this same year, 1696, "God Who always takes care of oppressed innocence, raised up for me Monsieur de Blathuâyt, first Secretary of

War of William III, King of England"; and that, in the same year, "I went . . . to The Hague, where I was most favorably received by the said Sieur de Blathuâyt." The second coincidence is no less striking. We know from a letter of the French ambassador at The Hague that in September 1698, Lahontan offered his services to France as a spy; a step which can only be "explained by his frantic desire to return to France." Less than three months earlier, the same French ambassador had received several visits from the self-styled protégé of the said Blathwayt, who also wished to return to France, and in whose *New Discovery* published the preceding year, William III of England, as is well known, is invited "to lay the foundation of one of the greatest empires in the world, . . . to make plantations in a country, which is so fertile as to afford two crops every year," *i. e.*, in Louisiana which, by virtue of the *prise de possession* by La Salle in 1682, was French territory. This double coincidence partially supports the statement of J. E. Roy, that Hennepin and Lahontan "make a perfect pair," but not entirely, for Hennepin at least was not a French subject.

It may not be out of place here to thank Lady Oakes, in the name of all those interested in the early history of North America, for her gracious generosity in allowing these valuable documents to be placed at the disposal of students; and we may venture to hope, in the interests of scholarly research, that her example will be followed by others who possess similar treasures. Even though the publication of such documents will but rarely lead to a modification of opinions based on previous documentation, it may well serve, as in the present instance, to confirm previous judgments of history beyond the possibility of further reasonable appeal.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Institute of Jesuit History

La Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos durante la Época Colonial. 1572-1767. Tomo II. Las Misiones. By Gerard Decorme, S. J. Antigua Libreria Robredo, Mexico, 1941. Pp. xxii, 640.

The appearance of this second volume of his colonial history brings to a conclusion the work planned some thirty years ago by this distinguished historian of the Mexican Jesuits. His first major effort resulted in the *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la República Mexicana*. The first part of this work, *Restauración y Vida de Secularización, 1816-1848*, appeared in 1914, and the second, recounting the events from 1848 to 1880, in 1921, both volumes issuing from the "El Regional" press of Guadalajara. During the present year the two volumes of the colonial narrative have been published. (On Volume I see the review in MID-AMERICA, XXIII, April 1941.)

The span of years covered by the republican history indicates that this study is detailed and highly documented, and its value is in direct contrast with its rareness and lack of recognition among American

historians of Mexico. In particular it offers a unique insight into the struggles of the Mexican people to build a stable constitutional government, a most vexing problem to students in the United States.

The *Obra* on the other hand covers two centuries of history that was made during the period when a rich and powerful nation, using the traditional culture of Europe through the medium of a mature administrative system, directed the activities of this its choicest colony. In this present work, then, the problem of the historian, while it offers him an immense quantity of organized data, forces upon him the necessity of compression and of careful arrangement.

The volume on the Missions illustrates this point clearly. Those familiar with the Bolton-inspired publications are aware of the vast quantity of materials at hand for a study of those missions, as well as the broad extent of the institutions themselves and their importance in American history. Father Decorme deserves their thanks for his admirable ordering of this multiform and complex narrative. His "Ojeada General," or overview, examines the territory and populations of the missions, the steps in their conquest, the missionaries, their methods and their achievements. He then devotes a chapter to each successive mission foundation, its organization, support and supply, development, vicissitudes and successes, and—where this took place—its incorporation into ordinary secular life. The end of the system of missions is not treated in this volume, for it had already been studied in the former volume under the general heading of the destruction of all Jesuit work in New Spain in 1767.

The unembellished account of the author cannot conceal his very deep knowledge of his subject. The extensive bibliography alone will certify this point. But to one acquainted with the field the skill of Father Decorme in exact analysis, in sharp characterization, in utmost fairness and objectivity, brings complete reliance on his narrative. Undoubtedly the researches now proceeding in American scholarly circles will qualify or expand his picture in some or other circumstance. His titles in the book lists are defective in some minutiae. His maps, while extremely helpful to the casual reader, would profit from greater attention to detail. Nevertheless he has done a thorough piece of work, and in some points, such as the large and brilliant account of Father Kino, he has written history of the highest order. A sixty-page index (and a list of *errata*) complete the book.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Loyola University, Chicago

The First Expedition of Vargas into New Mexico. By J. Manuel Espinosa. The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1940. Pp. x, 319.

This work is Volume X of the Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, 1540-1940, which are under the general editorship of Dr. George P. Hammond. When the Coronado Historical Series will have come from the press twelve highly important volumes will stand on the shelves as scholarly monuments to the great explorer and as outstanding contributions to the colonial history of the southwestern States. These with the volumes of the Coronado Bandelier Series on anthropological developments may be considered as one of the major scholarly undertakings of this country. In plan and scope the series leaves nothing to be desired, while the collaborators could scarcely have been better chosen. Herbert E. Bolton, "the master historian of Spanish exploration," and the inspiring guide of many explorers in Spanish American history, has the first and twelfth volumes. The other ten books will bear the names of George P. Hammond, Agapito Rey, Arthur S. Aiton, Benjamin W. Wheeler, Lansing B. Bloom, Frederick Webb Hodge, France V. Scholes, Charles W. Hackett, Alfred B. Thomas, and J. Manuel Espinosa. In all the set will be a history of colonial New Mexico, containing most of the fundamental documentary sources covering the period from 1540 to 1778. A more interesting project will be hard to find.

Dr. Espinosa's volume records the early days of Don Diego de Vargas Zapata Luján Ponce de León on the New Mexican scene. In an introduction smoothly written in forty-two pages we find New Mexico placed in its proper setting in the Spanish scheme of imperialism and in relation to Old Mexico. The author finds that for a period of fifty years after the foundation of New Mexico by Juan de Oñate Spanish civilization took deep root, and he attributes much of the progress to the great flowering of Franciscan missionary activity especially after 1620. Between 1645 and 1675 signs of rebellion appeared; medicine men in the kivas, political vicissitudes, economic exploitation, and other causes undermined the strength of the missions and colonies. Popé led an elaborately planned revolt in 1680, designed to blot out every vestige of Spanish rule, and well did he succeed. Fugitives from the great scourge congregated at El Paso, which became at once an outpost of Spanish control and a taking-off place for excursions attempting to reconquer New Mexico. At length when fear of French occupancy was great and the desire of Franciscan missionaries to return to their former children was strong Diego de Vargas was sent to reconquer the land for Spain and Christianity. He took charge as governor at El Paso in February of 1691. Carefully he planned expeditions into the land of the Pueblos. By the end of 1693 Vargas with soldiers, colonists, and missionaries was established in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

The detailed story of this phase of the reconquest is told in the seven documents translated and edited by Dr. Espinosa. The first document is the official authorization for Vargas' reconquest. The second document is his campaign journal and correspondence from August 21 to October 16, 1692. Document III is the translation of the journal from October 16, 1692 to January 12 of the following year. These two documents are of course the backbone of the book and require about 230 pages. They are followed by a letter, two reports, and an announcement to Vargas by Conde de Galve, that his deed would be brought to the attention of the king.

The constructive work of the reconquering governor is briefly indicated. Fortunately, Dr. Espinosa is about to continue his basic work with another publication describing the progress of New Mexico under Vargas. The present volume is well translated, and many will be grateful for the editing, the uniformity of spelling, the excellent printing and format, and the indexing. The documents thus presented give a graphic picture and an accurate report of stirring days on the frontier.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago

The History of Saint Thomas Parish, Ann Arbor. By Louis William Doll. With a Chapter on Athletics by Edward F. Engle. Ann Arbor, 1941. Pp. vi, 291.

The author of this volume, Louis William Doll, Ph. D., University of Michigan, writes in the preface that it was his purpose to treat his subject "exhaustively," as far as this could be done "with the materials at hand." No one who examines however cursorily the product of his labors will be inclined to question the fact that he has realized his purpose. An impressive body of factual data is spread before the reader and it is done with meticulous discrimination and otherwise according to the most approved canons of scholarly historiography. Not only is the heuristic, as indicated in the well-made bibliography, most commendable, an immense amount of source-material, both published and unpublished having been searched out, but the source-material has been dealt with critically and with refreshing discrimination. The sources drawn upon are of such various types as chancery and civil records, parish registers and account books, archival material, books, articles and newspapers. As an instance of the happy use to which newspapers are put, it may be mentioned that the ministerial itinerary for 1835 of Reverend Patrick O'Kelly, Ann Arbor's first resident priest (he was later also Milwaukee's first resident pastor) is reconstructed in detail (pp. 12, 13) from notices appearing in the Ann Arbor paper, the *Michigan Argus*.

Though Father O'Kelly was the earliest priest to minister to the Catholics of Ann Arbor, the real organization of Saint Thomas parish

was effected by Reverend Thomas Cullen, under whom the first church was dedicated, 1845. His activities and those of his successors in the pastorate to the present incumbent, Very Reverend G. Warren Peek, are duly chronicled, a chapter to each successive pastor, while the cooperation of the laity in the development of the parish, a factor often somewhat neglected in the conventional parochial history, is set out in proper relief. The book is topped off with a remarkable chapter of forty-three pages by Edward F. Engle on the history of athletics in Saint Thomas parish. Nowhere else, it is safe to say, has the athletic side of organized parochial life been portrayed with such abundant and informing detail.

All in all, Dr. Doll has given us a very excellent type of parish history. Here are revealed in illuminating fashion the processes by which the great parochial units of the Catholic Church in the United States were built up during the period of immigration and after. Accuracy and other aspects of historical scholarship feature the work, which may be commended on the whole as a pattern to future chroniclers of parish history.

The statement (p. 101) about Father Maurice (not Morris) Sullivan, S. J., needs correction. He was born somewhere in Michigan, October 22, 1860, and died in India, January 3, 1899.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

Loyola University, Chicago

Notes and Comment

PSEUDO-SCHOLARSHIP

Occasionally it becomes necessary to assume the unpleasant task of revealing the real character of a book disguised in the trappings of scholarship. Historians of this country have been quite shocked during the past few years over several instances of plagiarism by persons whom they had every reason to trust because of previous qualifications and university connections. Historians have noted, too, with considerable chagrin an outcropping of pseudo-scholarship, or to speak more plainly, of cheating, in books whose authors violate, consciously or not, basic principles of scholarly research taught to them and fundamental principles of ethics governing publications. Perhaps the few offending authors are unaware of the laws respecting copyrights; perhaps they are of a peculiar caste of mind which supposes that anything already in print or anything in manuscript or thesis form or any collection of materials may be used by them as they please; perhaps the itch to see their names on book covers, or the urge to beat somebody else to a field has something to do with the "forgetfulness," but clear it is to all editors and publishers that many pseudo-historians lack all sense of the rights of others to their findings and to their writings.

The most recent of the glaring examples of pseudo-scholarship comes in the form of Jessie B. Bailey's *Diego de Vargas and the Reconquest of New Mexico*, published at Albuquerque in 1940. As might have been expected it has been almost unanimously condemned as research by competent reviewers; only one superficial reviewer slipped up to the extent of an innocuous but not condemning notice. Anyone curious to have the opinions of the capable reviewers may find them in the *Pacific Historical Review* (March 1941, pages 100-101), *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June 1941, pages 80-81), and in the *American Historical Review* (July 1941, page 958). In these reviews the characterizations of the book as a "rehash," "a running summary," and "badly below par," stand out. The reviewers mention some inaccuracies, but in the brief spaces allotted to them were unable to build up a case against pseudo-scholarship.

First off, the incomplete documentation of the Bailey volume, written as a doctoral dissertation in 1936, presents itself immediately upon examination of the preface, footnotes, and bibliography. The work is based exclusively on documents contained in the Archivo General y Público de la Nación (AGN) Mexico, *Historia*, tomos 37-39, and *Provincias Internas*, tomo 37. The listing of these manuscripts in the bibliography presents a curious coincidence: it is either taken bodily from a thesis written on the same subject at the University of California in 1934, which, incidentally, was a preliminary study based

on virtually the same limited documentation, or else it is purely accidental that the listing, including explanatory comments, have the same wording and sentence structure almost throughout. The latter is, of course, within the realm of possibility. The fragmentary original documents for the period in the Santa Fé Archives do not appear to have been consulted directly. The all important original and certified copies of documents for the period, including official reports and correspondence, mission records, etc., over and above AGN, *Historia*, tomos 37-39, and *Provincias Internas*, tomo 35, as contained in several archives in both Spain and Mexico, were not consulted by Bailey. Thus the limitations of Bailey's documentation even as listed in the bibliography of the book, precluded any serious investigation of the subject from the outset.

Other lapses may be pointed out in the text. Pages 10-12 of Bailey's book consist of a sketch summary of Vargas' lineage and early years based on Espinosa, "Notes on the Lineage of Don Diego de Vargas," *New Mexico Historical Review*, X (April 1935), 112-120. Although this article is not cited in a footnote as the source for her statements, the author reproduces footnote citations from the article with practically no change of wording. Several of these citations could not possibly have been consulted by Bailey. Thus to the stranger to the field she gives the impression of having consulted sources that she merely recopied from the investigations of others. This inexcusable lack of scholarship is frequent throughout the volume. Similarly, pages 12-20 are an uncritical paraphrasing of Espinosa, "The Legend of Sierra Azul," *New Mexico Historical Review*, IX (April 1934), 125-132, 139-147, often with little or no change of wording in both the text and footnotes. Where the author has translated documents independently, that is, where she has not merely incorporated such translations from previously published works, they are frequently almost unintelligible.

Dealing with Vargas' visit to the western pueblos in 1692, the return to El Paso, etc., pages 74-87 are based almost entirely on Bancroft and Twitchell, and Leonard's edition of the Sigüenza y Góngora pamphlet of 18 folio pages on the expedition published in 1693; these are slender sources indeed for this, hence the presentation is fragmentary and sketchy. A complete account was only possible by correlating the damaged and inadequate originals in Santa Fé, and the certified copies of them as filed in Mexico and Spain. Since this part of the diary is found in complete form only in the Archive of the Indies copy, which Bailey did not use, she could add nothing to Twitchell and Sigüenza. The complete diary for this expedition, based on the various original sources mentioned above, since has been published in the Coronado Historical Series, X, Albuquerque, 1940.

Pages 88-186, which cover Vargas' second entrada, present little more than a running narrative of Vargas' campaign journal from

1693-1694, with no clear indication of the progress in developments, and based almost exclusively on what is found in AGN, *Historia*, tomos 38 and 39. Some passages, even consecutive pages, are so similar in language to parts of the previously mentioned unpublished thesis written on the whole subject at the University of California in 1934, as to challenge the possibility of mere coincidence.

The piece-meal account for the period from 1693 to the Pueblo Revolt of 1696, pages 186-225, is wholly inadequate; it is founded for the most part on AGN, *Historia*, tomo 39. For example, two pages are devoted to the important preparations for the expeditions of 1693. Essential documentation for this story is to be found in the Biblioteca Nacional (BNM) Mexico, legajos 3 and 4, which the author did not consult.

The account of the Revolt of 1696, one of the great turning points in the story, adds nothing to Bancroft and Twitchell, who based their accounts exclusively on the fragmentary Santa Fé Archives; 19 pages are devoted to the entire story, including the preliminaries and final outcome. The mission phase of the incident, which was a crucial matter, is scarcely touched upon, although a fairly complete story could have been told from BNM, legajos 3 and 4, which Bailey did not use. These legajos contain, among other things, much of the original correspondence of the Franciscan missionaries for this period. Consequently, the rôle of the missions in the story is sadly neglected, due to the bibliographical deficiencies of the book as indicated above.

The important and revealing Vargas *residencia* is discussed in two pages. Much of the story is contained in the Archivo General de Indias (AGI), *Guadalajara*, legajos 141-142, AGN, *Vinculos*, tomo 14, and BNM, legajo 4, none of which Bailey consulted.

In the matter of secondary works the bibliography is incomplete. The volume is open to especially severe criticism in view of the numerous sentences and footnotes taken almost bodily from other secondary works, with little or no change of wording, and falsely posed as the original statements and footnote citations of the author.

FOR LITTLE PEOPLE

Worthy of high recommendation is the charmingly written *Illinois Grows Up*, by Frances L. Blatchford and Lila W. Erminger. This book, a history of Illinois from A to Z in 115 pages, is designed for children from eight to twelve years of age, but adults will find it very instructive and interesting, just as so many grown-ups do with children's games and playthings at Christmas. The writers present in an unostentatious way a good method for classroom teaching of history to youngsters, and hence add pedagogical to informational value to their work. Sponsored by The Colonial Dames of America the book is published by A. C. McClurg and Company of Chicago at the list price of two dollars. The illustrations by Louise Parsons Stanton are excep-

tional in color and artistry and quite in taste with the fine printing. Added to its quality of style the book has about it a note of genuinity and is inspirational in a Christian and American way.

PERIODICALS

Under the auspices of the Franciscan Educational Conference for years past two serial publications have been coming forth, *Franciscan Studies* being a series of twenty-one monographs and *Franciscan Reports* containing papers read at annual meetings of the Conference. Now these two publications have been merged into a new quarterly named *Franciscan Studies*, whose first number is dated March 1941. The quarterly will have Reverend Marion Habig, O. F. M., of Quincy College, Quincy, Illinois, as editor-in-chief.

William R. Konrad's "The Diminishing Influences of German Culture in New Orleans Life since 1865" appeared in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* for January 1941. Herein is given the beginning and rise of German life and culture in the southern seaport from 1840 to 1865 and its subsequent dwindling. An estimated 273,000 Germans landed in New Orleans between 1847 and 1880. In 1870 the largest single national group in the city was German. German churches, asylums, and schools were opened, newspapers and periodicals printed, and plays produced. The origin, progress, influence, and decline of each is traced in an interesting manner.

The North Carolina Historical Review, April 1941, carried an excellently written biographical sketch of "William Gaston: Southern Statesman," by Joseph H. Schauinger. William Gaston (1778-1844), born in New Bern, North Carolina, was the first student to enter Georgetown University. Illness prevented his continuance at college, but after private study he passed the bar examination at twenty. Thereafter by steps he became a highly respected figure in the North Carolina legislative, judicial, and political fields. In an address of two days in 1835 Judge Gaston made a famous plea for religious tolerance, specifically for the amendment of the 32nd article of the State Constitution, "which provided that no person could hold an office in the State who did not believe in the truth of the Protestant religion." After his plea the word "Christian" was substituted for "Protestant." Mr. Schauinger in summary says of the great North Carolinian: "His many public services, culminating in his ten years in the supreme court, place him in the first rank of her statesmen. His decisions . . . concerning the status of the slave and the free Negro give him the right to be considered as a great humanitarian; other decisions attest his right to be called a great jurist." His works "must be classed as the highest form of literature in the State."

"Contributions of the Slovenes to the Chippewa and Ottawa Indian Missions," by Joseph Gregorich, appeared in the *Michigan History*

Magazine of the Spring, 1941. This article deals mainly with the missionary and episcopal life of Bishop Frederic Baraga, who was born in Carniola, studied at Laibach and Vienna, entered the seminary in 1821, was ordained, and finally began his missionary labors in 1831 at the present Harbor Springs, Michigan. He supported most of his missions by donations begged from relatives and from the Leopoldine Society. Other Slovenes, many of whom are mentioned, aided the Michigan bishop. . . . In the same number "La Salle's Trip across Southern Michigan in 1680," by Clifford H. Prator, is accompanied by a map showing that the probable route of Robert Cavalier led through the site of Ann Arbor.

The Pacific Historical Review, March 1941, printed three papers on hemisphere defense read at the previous December meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association. Walter N. Sage of the University of British Columbia traced "The Historical Peculiarities of Canada with regard to Hemisphere Defence" down to the statement of the terms of the Ogdenburg Agreement, indicating the agreeable relations existing between Canada and the United States. W. Stull Holt spoke of the constant initiative of the United States in taking steps to prevent the intrusion of any European system into the American scene. Octavio Méndez Pereira, formerly president of the University of Panamá, presented "The Significance of Hispanic American Defence of the Continent."

AIDS

Among the various useful helps recently produced is *An Encyclopedia of World History*, a revised and modernized version of Ploetz's "Epitome," compiled and edited by William L. Langer and fifteen collaborators, and published last year by Houghton Mifflin Company; this is about the fiftieth refurbishing of the famed dictionary of dates. . . . The *Inter-American Statistical Yearbook*, edited by Raúl C. Migone for 1940, was published in 612 pages and four languages; containing 312 tables it is very useful. . . . A *Bibliography of Latin America 1935-1940* came from the Latin American List and Information Service. . . . A *Select Bibliography of British History 1660-1760*, by Clyde L. Grose, is offered by the University of Chicago Press; sixty scholars have assisted in making 8,000 selections from 18,000 references to manuscript collections, important printed collections, contemporary, and later writings. . . . Dr. Oscar O. Winther of Indiana University should soon have out his guide to the periodical literature pertaining to the West; he has arranged lists of articles which have appeared in journals during the past 130 years. . . . "A Survey of Pacific Northwest Anthropological Research 1930-1940," by Melville Jacobs, appeared in the January 1941 *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*. . . . "List of Doctoral Dissertations in History Now in Progress," appeared as a supplement to the April 1941 *American Historical Review*. . . . The

Ohio State Archeological and Historical Quarterly for April-June 1941 has in 33 pages "A Select List of Materials on Ohio History in Serial Publications," as compiled by William D. Overman. . . . *The North Carolina Historical Review*, April 1941, has "North Carolina Bibliography, 1939-1940," compiled by Mary L. Thornton.

Sponsored by The North Carolina Historical Commission and prepared by The Historical Records Survey, a *Guide to the Manuscripts in the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina* has recently come forth as Volume 24, Number 2, of The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science. There are 809 titles of manuscript collections listed and the majority of these are rather completely calendared. A very helpful index completes the volume of 204 pages.

ON LATIN AMERICA

Two notable contributions to the history of the Spanish Southwest which have appeared in recent months are Dr. Alfred B. Thomas' documentary volumes entitled *The Plains Indians and New Mexico, 1751-1778*, Coronado Historical Series, XI, Albuquerque, 1940, and *Teodoro de Croix and the Northern Frontier of New Spain, 1776-1783*, Norman, 1941. The fine introduction in the first mentioned work will be especially useful to historical students. Many writers, it seems, are not fully aware of the fact that recent research into the history of the Spanish Southwest has greatly modified previous notions based on an insufficient knowledge of the sources. Indeed, as regards the history of colonial New Mexico, so much of the source material remained unexploited in foreign archives until recent years that very little can be correctly evaluated from what was published prior to the late 1920's. In the above works, along with his earlier volume entitled *Forgotten Frontiers, A Study of Don Juan Bautista de Anza, Governor of New Mexico, 1777-1787*, Norman, 1932, Dr. Thomas has broadened our knowledge of the vast changes which took place on the continent of North America in the second half of the eighteenth century.

To the special Latin American periodical lists which have appeared in recent years have been added two useful general lists: *List of Latin American Serials, A Survey of Exchanges Available in U. S. Libraries*, Studies of the A. L. A. Committee on Library Cooperation with Latin America, Number One, Chicago, 1941, pp. 70; *Latin American Periodicals Currently Received in the Library of Congress, Preliminary Edition*, The Hispanic Foundation, The Library of Congress, Washington, 1941, pp. xv, 137. Both are described as tentative, the latter mimeographed, and with a final edition to be published shortly. The *List of Latin American Serials* should be generally useful, as it is a list of such periodicals available in seventeen important libraries in

this country, with some 1,500 titles arranged by country, city, publishing agent, title, and name of U. S. library where available. The Hispanic Foundation list contains 915 titles, with brief descriptive notes in some cases; other recent, current, or projected special Hispanic American periodical lists are separately listed on pp. ix-xv. The Hispanic Foundation, incidentally, has given much fresh impetus to the accession of Hispanic American books and periodicals to the fine Library of Congress materials. The first annual report of the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress, which was opened July 1, 1939, reprinted from the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940, Washington, 1941, p. 18, describes the work and ambitious publication plans of the Hispanic Foundation. One project is a biennial Record of Investigations in Progress in the Field of Hispanic Studies; the most ambitious of these projects is to prepare a master Hispanic catalog containing cards on all Hispanic books in the Hispanic Room of the Library of Congress and other Washington libraries.

The National University of Mexico recently distributed, as a "means of more effective understanding of the Mexican viewpoint" and improved relations between the United States and Mexico, *The Bucareli Agreements and International Law*, by Antonio Gómez Robledo, translated by Salomón de la Silva. This is all about the Mexican oil and agrarian question from what was until the new election the Mexican official and legalistic viewpoint. The attack on exploiters of Mexico is clear; their properties were "expropriated" in March 1938, and Robledo's work attempts to lend justification for the official Mexican act of confiscation. He could not at the time of his writing "foresee the outcome of the diplomatic aggressiveness of the Empires, but the deluge of insults dubbed diplomatic notes that has fallen upon us will have the virtue of awakening us from recent dreams, from the dream of the Good Neighbor, and from the dream of British influence serving us to balance the influence of the United States." Needless to say, other dreams might have been added.

VARIOUS PUBLICATIONS

The Loyola University Press, Chicago, has just published *History of Europe*, a textbook for colleges, by Reverend W. Eugene Shiels, S. J., of the Department of History of Loyola University. This work is a summary of the entire span of European civilization from the earliest times to the present, broken into convenient lectures for two semesters.

A popular biography, *Father De Smet: Priest of the Rockies*, by Helene Margaret, was published last year by Farrar and Rinehart. The book is interesting throughout, although it does not attempt to supply citations of authorities. It serves to commemorate the hun-

dredth anniversary of the arrival of the Jesuit pioneer in the far west. *The Pacific Northwest Quarterly* remembered the same event with an article, "Peter John De Smet," by W. L. Davis, S. J., in its April 1941 number.

Francis Norbert Blanchet and the Founding of the Oregon Mission 1838-1848, by Sister Letitia Mary Lyons, became Volume 31 of the *Studies in Church History*, published in Washington in 1940.

Recently Volume 10 (1940) of the *Contributions to the Historical Society of Montana* appeared, containing "The Fort Benton Journal 1854-1856," and the "Fort Sarpy Journal 1855-1856."

The Fourth Volume of *The Writings of Sam Houston, 1821-1847*, edited by Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker, has just come from the University of Texas Press, Austin. The materials for the noteworthy publication were turned over by the grandchildren of Houston.

While Carter G. Woodson's *The Negro in Our History* has been going through its seventh printing and edition, three other books of merit on Negro history have appeared. These are *Drums and Shadows: Survival Studies among the Georgia Coastal Negroes*, edited by Virginia Thorpe, published by University of Georgia Press, Athens; *New Haven Negroes: A Social History*, by Robert A. Warner, published by The Institute of Human Relations at the Yale University Press, New Haven; and *The Negro in Tennessee, 1865-1880*, by Alruthus Ambush Taylor, published by The Associated Publishers, Washington.

Calendar of Joel R. Poinsett Papers in The Henry D. Gilpin Collection, prepared by The Pennsylvania Historical Survey, Division of Community Service Programs, Work Projects Administration, and edited by Grace E. Heilman and Bernard S. Levin, was recently brought forth by The Gilpin Library of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. A preface by J. Knox Milligan gives the scope of the activities of The Historical Records Survey and of this one in particular. An introduction by Miss Heilman places the calendared letters in their setting in the life of Poinsett. The next 240 pages are given over to as complete a description as possible of 613 letters. A bibliography and very serviceable index complete the volume, which is well edited and nicely printed.

INDEX

MID-AMERICA

VOLUME XXIII

INDEXER'S NOTE

Names of contributors are in small capitals; titles of articles in this volume are in quotation marks; titles of books and periodicals reviewed or mentioned are in italics. Book reviews are entered under author and title of book, and under the name of the reviewer; no entries are made for subject of the book except in the case of biographies. The following abbreviations are used: tr., translator; ed., editor; revs., reviews; revd., reviewed. Clerical titles and titles of honor are found only when the forename is lacking.

- Abrego, Ana de, 81
Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies, by J. T. Lanning, revd., 95-96
Acaxée Indians, 283
Accault (Ako), Michel, 20, 21, 25, 33, 36, 37, 116-17, 125-26, 127-28, 129, 130, 131, 133, 136-37
Acta Sanctorum, 203
Aguilar, Alphonso Rael de, 62, 84
Ako. See Accault
Alabama Indians, 301-02
Albanel, Charles, 35
Alegre, Francisco Javier, 138
Alembert, Jean Le Rond d', 203
Algarín, Francisco Gómez, 147
Almack, John C., 267
Almazán, Francisco de Anaya, 62, 71
Amarillas, Marqués de las, 150-51
American Historical Review, contents of noted, 153, 319
Amiquipa, 281
André, Louis, 35
Andreis, Father de, 181
"Annals of Louisiana," 289-91, 292-95, 297-304
Anontaha, 216
Anthologia Graecorum Epigrammatum, 201
Anza, Juan Bautista de, 48, 54, 56-57, 58, 59-60
Apache Indians, 45, 60
Apodaca, Francisco de, 79
Aquipaguetin, 131
Arce y Arroyo, Pablo de, 145, 148
Archives du Service Hydrographique, 13
Archives of Paris, 289, 290
Archives of the Indies, 236
Archuleta, Juan de, 68, 77, 83
Argentina, source materials in noted, 155-56
Arizivi, 60
Arjo, Ignacio, 51
Arjo, José, 47
Arkansas River, 299
Armstrong, Hamilton Fish, *Chronology of Failure*, revd., 93-94
Articles of Confederation, by M. Jensen, revd., 91-92
Ashe, Thomas, 186
Aubuchon, 225
Audubon, John James, 186-87
Auguelle, Antoine (Picard du Gay), 20, 21, 23, 33, 36, 105, 116-17, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 133, 136-37
Augustinus, 202
Avertissement au Lecteur, 288
Ayer, Edward E., Collection, 290
Badine, 292
Baltasar, Juan Antonio, 144-46
Barba, José, 48, 52
Barbier, Antoine-Alexandre, 108
Bardstown, Kentucky, 182
BARKER, EUGENE C., revs. Schmitz's *Texas Statecraft, 1836-1845*, 251
Barret, Benoît, 226
Barret, Jean, 226
Barrionuevo, Father, 273
Bart, Jean, 229, 235
Basilio, Antonio Jácome, 273, 274
Bates, Frederick, 170, 171, 175, 185, 186
Bayougoula village, 297
Bayou St. John, 299
Becker, Carl L., 265
Belestre, Jeanne Geneviève Picoté de, 233, 234, 235
Belestre, Pierre Picoté de, 217, 219
Belle Fontaine, 174, 178
Bellinzani, 105
Belmont, François Vachon de, 42-43, 222
Benedictines, 196
Benton, Thomas Hart, 270
Bernières, Jean de, 41, 42, 99
Bernou, Claude, 4-5, 6-10, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 29-32, 33, 39, 104, 105, 106-26, 128-32, 133-37
Beudin, Cornelio (Godinez), 272, 278
323

- Bibliographical field, publications in noted, 152-54
Bibliography of Latin America 1935-1940, publication of noted, 319
 Bibliothèque Nationale, 107, 205, 206
 Biedma, 237, 244, 245, 248
 Bienville, Jean-Baptiste Le Moyne de, 225, 226, 289, 294, 295, 297, 298, 300, 301, 302-03
 Bignon, Armand Jérôme, 199
 Biloxi, 293-94, 295, 296, 298, 300
 Bissonnette, Antoine, 174
 Blancas, Martin de, 147
 Bober, Mandell Morton, 265
 Bois Brûlé, 188
 Boisbriand, Pierre Dugué, sieur de, 295, 300
 Bompar, Governor de, 191
 Bordenave, M., 295
 BOSTON, BARBARA, "The 'De Soto Map,'" 236-50; revs. Milling's *Red Carolinians*, 89-91
 Boto, Antonio, 237
 Bouet, François, 290
 Bovais, St. James, 178
 Brackenridge, Henry, 174, 177, 183, 185, 186
 Brandy trade, 43
 Brazil, 241
 Brest, 292
 Briggs, Harold E., *Frontiers of the Northwest, A History of the Upper Missouri Valley*, revd., 94-95
 Brotier, Gabriel, 196, 199
Bucareli Agreements and International Law, publication of noted, 321
 Buffon, Georges-Louis Leclerc de, 134
 Buisset (Brisset), Luc, 102
 Buois, Jonathan, 170
Bursting of Pierre Margry's La Salle Bubble, 17
 Cabot, Sebastian, 240, 241, 244
 Cahokia, 179
 Calderón, Ignacio, 148-49, 150
Calendar of Joel R. Poinsett Papers, publication of noted, 322
 Calhoun, John C., 269
 Campos, José Agustín de, and Captain Anza, 45-60
 Canada, libraries in, 176
 Cape Cinque Hommes, 188
 Cape Girardeau, 174
 Capperonier, Jean, 204, 207
 "Captain Anza and the Case of Father Campos," by PETER M. DUNNE, 45-60
 CARDINAL, EDWARD V., revs. Armstrong's *Chronology of Failure*, 93-94
 Cárichic, 274, 276, 277, 278, 284
 Carolina, 291
 Carondelet, 171, 174
 Carosia, 286
 Cartier to Frontenac, 15
Casa de la Contratación, 239-40, 242, 244, 245, 248
 Castell, Edmund, 202
 Castillo, Domingo, 140
 Catholics, 179-81, 268, 269
 Caudebec, 121
 Cauroy, M. de, 127
 Cavelier, Pierre, 225-26
 Chambers, Henry E., 304
 Chambly, 41, 42
 Champlain, Fort de, 38, 40
 Charles V, Emperor, 240, 241, 242
 Charless, Joseph, 184
 Charleston, 291
 Charlevoix, P. F. X., 231, 289, 303-04
 Charsigné, M. de, 205
 Chauvelin, Henri Philippe, 195, 196, 205
 Cháves, Alonso de, 240, 241, 244
 Chenie, M., 184
 Chesnel, Paul, 9
Cheval Marin, 291
 Chihuahua, 272, 273
 Choiseul, Etienne-François de, 190
 Chouteau, Auguste, 168, 173, 176, 177, 179, 182
 Chouteau, Pierre, 170, 173
Chronology of Failure, by H. F. Armstrong, revd., 93-94
 Clairambault, Pierre, 110
 Clairambault Collections, 13
 Clairborne, J. F. H., 304
 Clamorgan, Jacques, 176
 Clark, A. H., 304
Claramontana Manuscripts, 206
Claudii Ptolemaei Geographiae Libri VIII, 201
 Clement XI, Pope, 109
 Clermont, College of, 190, 205
 Cocospera mission, 46
 Colbert, Jean Baptiste, 4, 9, 28, 99, 106, 136, 220, 229
 Colbert River, 114, 127
Colonial Mobile, 304
Colorado, the Centennial State, by P. S. Fritz, revd., 161-62
 Concho Indians, 281
 Condé, Louis de, 226
 Congress, 171, 182
 Conti, François Louis, Prince de, 105, 107
 Contreras, Diego de, 277
 Copart, Juan Bautista, 285
 Council of the Indies, 143, 144, 150, 151, 239
 Courcelle, Daniel de Rémy, 135, 219
 Courteline, Georges, 134
 Créteineau-Joly, J., 194
Crónica de Carlos V, 242
Crónica de los Reyes Católicos, 242

- Cucurpe, 49, 51, 54, 56, 57
 Curtin, Joseph, memoirs of, revd., 163-64
 Cusihuiríachic, 273, 274
 Daniel, François, 229
 Darby, John F., 186
 Dartaguiette, Bernard Diron, 289
 Davidson, Philip, *Propaganda and the American Revolution*, revd., 252-53
 De Backer, Augustin and Alois, 108
 De Graff, Laurent, 292-93
 De la Cruz, Pedro, 142, 149
 De Smet, Peter, 270
 "The 'De Soto Map,'" by BARBARA BOSTON, 236-50
 Decorme, Gerard, *La Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos durante la Época Colonial 1572-1767*, revd., 162-63; *Tomo II. Las Misiones*, revd., 310-11
 DELANGLEZ, JEAN, "Hennepin's Description of Louisiana," 3-44, 99-137; revs. Kinetz' *The Indians of the Western Great Lakes, 1615-1760*, 256-57; Lanctot's (ed.) *New Documents by Lahontan concerning Canada and Newfoundland*, 308-10; Pouliot's *Étude sur les Relations des Jésuites de la Nouvelle-France (1632-1672)*, 254-56; Roy's *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1939-1940*, 307-08
 Delassus, Charles, 176
 Delisle, Guillaume, 109
 Delisle, Léopold, 206
 Denonville, Jacques René de Brisay, marquis de, 227, 233, 234
 Denys, Simon, 220
 Descaries, Louis, 225
Description of Louisiana, 3-44, 99-137
 Desmazures, A. C. G., 224, 225, 226, 229, 233
 Devanchy, Pierre, 233
Development of Hispanic America, by A. C. Wilgus, revd., 259-60
 Dibdin, Thomas Frogall, 201, 202
 Diderot, Denis, 203
 Didier, Pierre-Joseph, 179-80
Diego de Vargas and the Reconquest of New Mexico, inaccuracies in noted, 315-17
 Diron, Dartaguiette, Bernard, 289
Discovery of the Great West, 10-11, 12
Discovery of the Mississippi Valley, 16-17
Divina Comedia di Dante, 201
 Doll, Louis William, *The History of Saint Thomas Parish*, Ann Arbor, revd., 313-14
 Dollard, Adam, 217
 Dollier de Casson, François, 42, 44, 215, 219
 Dollier-Galinée expedition, 110, 119
 Dolores mission, 45, 46, 47
 Druillard, George, 174
Drums and Shadows: Survival Studies among the Georgia Coastal Negroes, publication of noted, 322
 Drunkenness, among Indians, 43, 279-80, 285
 Du Bourg, Bishop, 179, 181, 183
 Du Clos, Sieur, 219
 Du Ru, Paul, 295, 296
 Duchesne, Adrien, 214
 Duchesne, Joseph, 225
 Duchesneau, Jacques, 41, 44, 100, 220
 Dudouyt, Jean, 33, 41, 42, 99-102, 105
 Dugay-Trouin, René, 235
 Duluth, Daniel Greysolon, 12, 17, 20-21, 34-37, 44, 99, 105, 118, 128, 226
 Dunand, Joseph, 180
 DUNNE, PETER M., "Tomás de Guadalupe, Missionary of the Tarahumares," 272-87; his *Pioneer Black Robes on the West Coast*, revd., 92-93
 Dupleix, Scipion, 106
 Durán y Chaves, Fernando, 69
 "Early Ste. Genevieve and Its Architecture," publication of noted, 154-55
 Eaton, Rufus, 170
 Echagoian, Julio de, 54
 Education, in Missouri, 182-84; of Iberville, 226-32; on the frontier, 268, 269, 270
 El Paso district, population of in 1692, 61-84
 El Populo, 138, 139
 Elvas, Gentleman of, 238, 244, 245
Encyclopedia of World History, publication of noted, 319
 "The End of a Jesuit Library," by W. KANE, 190-93
 "L'Enfance et la Jeunesse de Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville," by GUY FREGAULT, 214-35
 English, in America, 291, 295, 297
 Enjalran, Jean, 36
 ESPINOSA, J. MANUEL (tr.), "Population of the El Paso District in 1692," 61-84; revs. Fritz's *Colorado, the Centennial State*, 161-62; Zubillaga's *La Florida, La Misión Jesuítica (1566-1572) y La Colonización Española*, 306-07; his *The First Expedition of Vargas into New Mexico*, revd., 312-13

- Estrades, Godefroi Louis, Comte d', 100, 106, 108
 Estrées, Jean d', 229
Étude sur les Relations des Jésuites de la Nouvelle-France (1632-1672), by L. Pouliot, revd., 254-56
 EWING, RUSSELL C., "Investigations into the Causes of the Pima Up-rising," 138-51; revs. Dunne's *Pioneer Black Robes on the West Coast*, 92-93
 Fafard, Jean, 35
 Faillon, Étienne-Michel, 217, 225
 Falcón, 147
 Falls of St. Anthony, 34, 117, 131
Father De Smet: Priest of the Rockies, publication of noted, 321-22
Favores Celestiales, 46, 47
 Fenwick, Katherine, 206
 Fenwick, Thomas Fitzroy, 206
 Ferdinand VI, King, 144, 150
 Fernando V, King, 242
 Ferrer, Nicolás, 278
 Figueroa, Gerónimo de, 272, 287
Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition, 238
First Establishment of the Faith, 5, 10, 14, 22
First Expedition of Vargas into New Mexico, by J. M. Espinosa, revd., 312-13
 Flaget, Bishop, 180
Florida, La Misión Jesuitica (1566-1572) y La Colonización Española, by F. Zubillaga, revd., 306-07
 Florissant, 174, 181
 Fonte, Juan, 272
 Foronda, Juan, 281
 Fort Crèvecoeur, 17, 19, 22, 33, 123, 125, 126, 128
 Fort de Champlain, 38, 40
 Fort Frontenac, 19, 21, 37, 38, 40, 110, 113, 119, 120, 123, 126, 134, 135, 136
 Fort Mississippi, 297-98, 299
 Fortier, Alcée, 304
 Fournau, Abbé, 198, 200, 204, 207, 208, 209, 210
 Fox Indians, 35, 130
 France, Jesuits in, 190-213
Francis Norbert Blanchet and the Founding of the Oregon Mission 1838-1848, publication of noted, 322
Franciscan Studies, publication of noted, 318
 Franciscans, 280-81
 Franklin, Alfred, 208
 FREGAULT, GUY, "L'Enfance et la Jeunesse de Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville," 214-35
 French, in America, 3-44, 99-137, 167-89, 214-35, 288-304
 French language, in Missouri, 169-70, 184
 "The French of Old Missouri (1804-1821): A Study in Assimilation," by HARVEY WISH, 167-89
 French-Canadians, in Missouri, 173
 Fritz, Percy Stanley, *Colorado, the Centennial State*, revd., 161-62
 Frontenac, Louis de Buade, Comte de, 31, 38, 39, 40, 44, 100, 102, 105, 115, 220, 221, 229, 232
 Fronteras, 58-59, 60
 Frontier hypothesis, 263-64, 265-68
Frontier in American History, 264, 266
Frontiers of the Northwest, A History of the Upper Missouri Valley, by H. E. Briggs, revd., 94-95
Fuente Americana de la Historia Argentina. Descripción de la provincia de Cuyo, publication of noted, 155-56
 Furlong, Guillermo, publications of noted, 86-87
 Galinée, René-François de, 111
 Gallardi, Luis Maria, 49, 50
 Gallegos, Joseph, 64
 Gallerati, Constanco, 51
 Gallipolis, Ohio, 168, 180
 Galve, Conde de, 61, 70, 71, 84
 Gamboa, Father, 273
 García, Alonso, 65, 68
 García, Captain, 284
 García de Salcedo, José, 273
 Garnier, Jean, 202
 GARRAGHAN, GILBERT J., "Non-Economic Factors in the Frontier Movement," 263-71; revs. Doll's *The History of Saint Thomas Parish, Ann Arbor*, 313-14; Pierce's *A History of Chicago: Vol. II. From Town to City, 1848-1871*, 88-89; Schafer's (ed.) *Memoirs of Jeremiah Curtin*, 163-64
 Gatin, Pierre, 193, 210
 Gaultier, Philippe, 233
 Gayarré, Charles, 303-04
Gazette de France, 109
Gazette de la Louisiane, 184
 Gigedo, Revilla, 143, 144, 150
 Godefroi-Louis (Comte d'Estrades), 106
 Godefroy, Jean-Baptiste, Sieur de Linctot, 220
 Godinez. *See* Beudin, Correlío
 Godoy, Francisco Luzero de, 76
 Godoy, Juan Luzero de, 63
 Goldschmidt, Mr., 202
 Gonzáles, Manuel, 46
 Gonzalez, Sevastian, 72
 Gonzalvo, Francisco, 46
 Goodykoontz, Colin B., 268-69
 Gougeon, L., 230

- Goyens, Jérôme, 24, 26, 27
 Granillo, Luis, 70
 Gratiot, Charles, 168, 179, 182
 Gravier, Gabriel, 9, 121, 290
Great Demobilization and Other Essays, by F. L. Paxson, revd., 305-06
 Great Lakes, 37, 111, 112
 Green Bay, 32, 35
 Griffet, Henri, 193
 Griffon, 13, 111, 120-22, 123, 126, 130, 131-32, 135
 Grijalva, Juan José de, 48
 Grimod, Abbé, 207
 Groseillers, Médard Chouart des, 217
 Grou, Lionel, 192
 Guadalajara, Tomás de, 272-87
 Guazápar Indians, 286
 Guendolain, Juan de, 277
 Guerard, N., 28
 Guérin, Léon, 235
Guide to Manuscript Collections in Louisiana, publication of noted, 153
Guide to the Manuscripts in the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina, publication of noted, 320
Guide to the Material in the National Archives, publication of noted, 85
 Guillet, Urbain, 182
 Gulf of Mexico, 114, 118, 289, 291, 293
 Gutiérrez, Bernabé, 283-84, 287
 Hafén, Leroy A., and Rister, Carl Coke, *Western America. The Exploration, Settlement, and Development of the Region Beyond the Mississippi*, revd., 160-61
 Hamilton, Peter J., 304
 Harel, Georges, 99
 Harlay, M. de, 197, 204, 210
 HARRISSE, Henry, 10, 236-37, 238, 243
 Harveau, Cesarée, 33
 Heinrich, Pierre, 303, 304
 Hennepin, Louis, 3-44, 99-137, 291
 "Hennepin's Description of Louisiana," by JEAN DELANGLEZ, 3-44; 99-137
Hero in America, by D. Wecter, revd., 257-59
 Herrera, Domingo de, 66
 Herrera, Juan de, 69
 Herrera y Tordesillas, Antonio de, 237
 Hispanic Foundation, publications of noted, 321
Historia de la Nación Mexicana, publication of noted, 86
 Historical Society of Montana, publications of noted, 322
History of Chicago: Vol. II. From Town to City, 1848-1871, by B. L. Pierce, revd., 88-89
History of Europe, publication of noted, 321
History of Saint Thomas Parish, Ann Arbor, by L. W. Doll, revd., 313-14
History of the People of the United States, 265
Hitler's Germany, by K. Loewenstein, revd., 159
 Hozier, René de la Garde d', 106
 Hudson Bay, 230, 232, 233
 Huexotitlán, 287
 Huidobro, Manuel Bernal, 48, 51
 Huma village, 294
 Huron Indians, 216
 Hurson, 191
 Hurtado, Andres, 65, 69
 Iberville, Joseph Duchesne d', 225
 Iberville, Pierre Le Moyne d', 109, 214-35, 288, 289, 291, 292, 293-95, 296-98, 299, 300
 Illinois country, 124-25, 127
Illinois Grows Up, publication of noted, 317-18
 Illinois Indians, 39, 126, 133
 Illinois River, 8, 33, 116-17, 133
 Imuris mission, 45, 52, 55, 56, 57
 Indian House, 239
 Indian rebellions, 138-51
 Indians, 39, 40, 43, 46, 49, 52, 53-54, 55-56, 57, 59, 76, 102-03, 116, 126, 127, 129-30, 131, 133, 137, 138-51, 169, 173, 181, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 222, 225, 228, 232, 241, 269-70, 272-87, 301-02, 303
Indians of the Western Great Lakes, 1615-1760, by W. V. KINNETZ, revd., 256-57
Inter-American Statistical Yearbook, publication of noted, 319
International Bibliography of Historical Sciences, publication of noted, 152
 "Investigations into the Causes of the Pima Uprising in 1751," by RUSSELL C. EWING, 138-51
 Iroquois Indians, 39, 111, 215, 217, 219, 222, 225, 228
 Irving, Washington, 173
 Jackson, Andrew, 179
 JACOBSEN, JEROME V., revs. Decorme's *La Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos durante la Época Colonial 1572-1767*, 162-63; Espinosa's *The First Expedition of Vargas into New Mexico*, 312-13; Wilgus' *The Development of Hispanic America*, 259-60; Editor, Notes and Comment
 Jamisque, Daniel, 45
 Janin, Pierre, 180

- Jansenist heresy, 190, 202
 Jansenists, 202
 Jaramillo, Maria, 79
 Jefferson, Thomas, 170
 Jensen, Merrill, *The Articles of Confederation*, revd., 91-92
 Jesucárichi, 277
 Jesuit library, end of a, 190-213
Jesuit Relations, 111, 203
 Jesuits, 31-32, 33, 35-36, 41, 43, 45, 47-48, 49-50, 56, 57, 59-60, 100, 141, 142, 145-46, 148-50, 151, 190-99, 203, 204, 209-10, 212, 215, 216, 221, 226, 269-70, 272, 273-74, 276-87, 289, 296
 Jodoin, A., 230
 Jolliet, Louis, 8, 35
 Jorge, Antonio, 64
Journal des Sçavans, 203
Journal of Southern History, contents of noted, 153
 Joutel, Henri, 22
 Jova Indians, 282-83
 Jurado, Francisco, 72
 KANE, W., "The End of a Jesuit Library," 190-213; revs. Lanning's *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies*, 95-96
 Kaskaskia, 177
 Kastner, F. de, 225, 230
 Keller, Ignatius Xavier, 49, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 60, 141, 142, 143, 148
 King, Grace, 304
 KINIERY, PAUL, revs. Jensen's *The Articles of Confederation*, 91-92; Paxson's *The Great Demobilization and Other Essays*, 305-06; Wecter's *The Hero in America*, 257-59
 Kinitetz, W. Vernon, *The Indians of the Western Great Lakes, 1615-1760*, revd., 256-57
 Kino, Francisco Eusebio, 45, 46, 47, 272
 Knollenberg, Bernhard, *Washington and the American Revolution*, revd., 157-59
 La Barre, Joseph-Antoine Lefebvre de, 101, 221, 222, 230, 231, 232
 La Chesnaye, Aubert de, 222
 La Haye, 205
 La Hontan, Louis Armand, baron de, 14
 La Mollerie, Jacques de Maleray de, 234
 La Plata, 241
 La Porte, Antoine de, 225
 La Prairie, 220
 La Purísima, 276
 La Ribourde, Gabriel de, 39-40, 127, 133
 La Rochelle, 288, 292
 La Rousselière, Jean, 133
 La Salle, Robert Cavalier, sieur de, 3, 5, 6-9, 10-11, 12, 13, 15-17, 19-23, 24, 28, 29, 30-31, 32, 37, 39, 40, 44, 102-03, 104, 105, 106-09, 110-30, 132, 133, 135-37, 291, 294
La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West, 10-11
 Labbadie, Silvestre, 182
 Laclède, Pierre, 176
 Lake Huron, 121
 Lake Michigan, 123, 133
 Lake Pontchartrain, 294, 297, 299
 Lana-Terzi, Francesco, 202
 Lancial, 212
 Lanctot, Gustave (ed.), *New Documents by Lahontan concerning Canada and Newfoundland*, revd., 308-10
 Land titles, in Upper Louisiana, 168-69
 Lanning, John Tate, *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies*, revd., 95-96
 Lanzas, Pedro Torres, 237, 238
Latin American Periodicals Currently Received in the Library of Congress, Preliminary Edition, publication of noted, 320
Latin American Studies in American Institutions of Higher Learning, publication of noted, 86
 Lauraguais, Comte de, 195, 204
 Lauzon de la Citière, Louis de, 220
 Laval, Antoine, 202
 Laval, François de Montmorency, 33, 38, 40-41, 42, 99, 100, 218, 225
 Lavalette, Antoine, 191-95, 210
 Le Ber, Jacques, 218, 221, 226, 227
 Le Clercq, Chrestien, 5, 8-9, 11, 14, 17, 22
 Le Febvre, Hyacinthe, 99
 Le Jeune, Louis, 223, 225, 231, 232, 233, 234
 Le May, Hugolin, 24, 25-27, 104, 113, 114-15, 122
 Le Moynes, Charles (Sieur de Longueuil), 214-23, 220, 221, 225, 227, 233
 Le Moynes, Jacques Sainte-Hélène de, 229
 Le Moynes, Jean. See Bienville, Jean-Baptiste Le Moynes de
 Le Moynes, Joseph Sérigny de, 223-24, 231
 Le Moynes, Paul Maricourt de, 225, 226, 229
 Le Moynes, Pierre. See Iberville, Pierre Le Moynes d'
 Le Sueur, Pierre-Charles, 296, 297, 299-300, 303
 Leal, Antonio, 46
 Leclerc, Laurent François, 196, 197, 207

- Ledac, M. P., 178
 Ledesma, Juan de, 243
 Leduc, Jean, 219
 Leiba, Pedro de, 73
 Leland, Waldo G., 115
 Lemaire, L., 106
 Leroux, Valentin, 5, 12, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44
Lettres Edifiantes, 203
 Levasseur-Roussel, M., 295
 Lewis, Theodore H., 237, 246
Lexicon Heptaglotton, 202
 Leyba, Juana de, 83
 Libraries, in Missouri, 176-77
 Library, end of a Jesuit, 190-213
 Library of Congress, 290
 Liden, 196, 199
Life of La Salle, 9
Life of Marquette, 14
 Lincoln Collection of the Illinois State Historical Library, publication of booklet describing noted, 154
 Lioncy Frères et Gouffre, 192
 Lisa, Manuel, 173, 174
List of Latin American Serials, A Survey of Exchanges Available in U. S. Libraries, publication of noted, 320-21
 Livres, value of, 211-12
 Loewenstein, Karl, *Hitler's Germany*, revd., 159
 Longueuil. *See* Le Moyne, Charles, sieur de
 Lopez, Francisco, 75
 Louis XIV, King, 43, 106, 109, 190, 220, 291
 Louis XV, King, 190, 193, 204, 205
 Louis-le-Grand, Collège of, 194-99, 204, 207, 213
 Louisiana, 167, 169; Hennepin's description of, 3-44, 99-137; Pénicaut's chronicle of, 288-304
 Louisiana colony, 109
Louisiana Historical Quarterly, contents of noted, 318
 Lowery, Woodbury, 238
 Lucas, Charles, 169
 Luis, Juan, 65
 Luis Oacpicagigua, 139-40, 141, 142, 143, 145, 148, 149-50
 Luna, Diego de, 79
 Luna expedition, 237, 246
 Luzero, Antonio, 62
 Madrid, Lorenzo, 71
 Madrid, Pedro, 73
 Magalhães, Gabriel de, 108
 Magdalena mission, 45, 46
Magisterium Naturae et Artis, 203
 Maisonneuve, Paul de Chomedey, sieur de, 217, 218, 220
 Major, Justicia, 54
 Mance, Jeanne, 215
 Manje, Juan Mateo, 45, 46
 Manthet, Nicolas d'Ailleboust de, 225, 226
 Manthet, Paul d'Ailleboust de, 225, 226
 Map, De Soto, 236-50
 Marciana, Luis Maria, 48, 49-52, 53, 54-55, 56, 57, 58, 59
 Margry, Pierre, 4-13, 15-16, 17-19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 42, 111, 112, 128, 289, 290, 303, 304
 Marion, M., 212
 Marmette, J., 230
 Marque, M., 198
 Marquette, Jacques, 8
 Marshall, Humphrey, 188
 Marshall, O. H., 13
 Martin, François-Xavier, 303
 Martin, Luis, 64
 Martinique, 191-93, 210
 Marxism, 265, 267
 Massacre Island, 300, 301
 Massicotte, E. Z., 217, 225
 Mátachic, 276, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287
 Maxwell, James, 179
 MCCANN, ELIZABETH, "Pénicaut and His Chronicle of Early Louisiana," 288-304
 McMaster, 265
 Meermann, Gerard, 199, 200, 205, 212
 Membre, Zénobe, 5, 6, 22, 39, 40, 102, 103-04, 113-14, 118, 126
 "Mémoire succinct," 224, 229, 231, 232
Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Sciences et des Beaux Arts, 203
 Memoirs of Joseph Curtin, ed., by J. Schafer, revd., 163-64
 Menars, M. de, 100, 105-06
 Mendoza, Juan de, 151
 Menocal, Juan Antonio, 142, 143
Mercure de France, 203
 Mesa, Alonzo de, 281
 Messier, Elisabeth, 216
 Messier, Martine, 216
 Mésy, Charles-Augustin de Saffroy, sieur de, 218
 METZGER, CHARLES H., revs. Davidson's *Propaganda and the American Revolution*, 252-53; Knollenberg's *Washington and the American Revolution*, 157-59
 Mexico, 237
 Micault, Innocent, 33
 Michaud, Joseph-François, 106
Michigan History Magazine, contents of noted, 318-19
 Michilimackinac, 21, 32, 35-36, 44, 118, 122, 128

- Mille Lacs region, 25, 34, 118, 129, 131
- Milling, Chapman J., *Red Carolinians*, revd., 89-91
- Minnesota, 289, 297, 299
- Minutuli, 45, 46
- Mississippi River, 8, 9, 12, 21, 22, 24, 33, 103, 113-14, 116, 117-18, 130, 172, 173, 288, 289, 291, 293, 294-95, 296-99
- Mississippi Valley, 6, 14, 17, 108
- Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, contents of noted, 153
- Missouri, French in, 167-89
- Missouri Fur Company, 173
- Missouri Gazette*, 177, 182, 184
- Missouri River, 172
- Mizquia, Lazaro de, 64
- Mobile, 289, 301, 303, 304
- Mobile Bay, 293, 300
- Moluccas, 241
- Monette, John W., 303
- Monguin, M., 198
- Monso, 132
- Montaño, Antonio, 65
- Montigny, Gabriel de, 225, 226
- Montmagny, Charles de, 215
- Montreal, 37-38, 218, 219, 223, 228, 232, 233
- Mora, Francisco Xavier, 60
- Moraga, Lazaro de, 79
- Morales, Andrés de, 240
- Moréri, Louis, 106
- Moscoso, Luis de, 237
- Muratori, Ludovico Antonio, 203
- Napabechic, 278
- Narrative and Critical History of America*, 15
- Natchez Indians, 303
- Negro in Our History*, new edition of noted, 322
- Negro in Tennessee, 1865-1880*, publication of noted, 322
- Nentvig, Juan, 140, 142, 148, 149-50
- Neumann, Joseph, 277, 284, 285
- New Bourbon, 174, 180
- New Discovery*, 3, 9, 10-12, 14, 16, 18, 25, 38, 39, 41, 107, 127, 128
- New Discovery of a Vast Country in America*, 291
- New Documents by Lahontan concerning Canada and Newfoundland*, ed. by G. Lanctot, revd., 308-10
- New France, 216, 218, 221, 228
- New Haven Negroes: A Social History*, publication of noted, 322
- New Madrid, 174, 180
- New Orleans, 176, 179
- New Spain, Indian uprisings in, 138-51
- New Voyage*, 3, 16, 18, 41
- Nicanapé, 132
- Nieto, Juan, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 58
- Noailles, Louis-Antoine de, 109
- Nolin, Jean-Baptiste, 109
- "Non-Economic Factors in the Frontier Movement," by GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN, 263-71
- Nordenskiöld, A. E., 237
- Noriega, Juan Garcia de, 62
- North Carolina Historical Review*, contents of noted, 318, 320
- Northwest Territory, 168, 169
- Nouveau Voyage*, 5. See also *New Voyage*
- Nouvel, Henri, 36
- Nouvelle découverte*. See *New Discovery*
- Nueva Vizcaya, 281
- Nymwegen, Peace of, 106
- Oacpicagigua, Luis, 139-40, 141, 142, 143, 145, 148, 149-50
- Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos durante la Época Colonial 1572-1767*, by G. Decorme, revd., 162-63; *Tomo II. Los Misiones*, revd., 310-11
- Ohio River, 8
- Ohio State Archeological and Historical Quarterly*, contents of noted, 320
- Old Ste. Genevieve, publication of brochure on noted, 154-55
- Opatas Indians, 54
- O'Reilly, Alexandro, 179
- Osage Indians, 270
- Oviedo, Juan Antonio de, 59, 60
- Oviedo y Valdés, G. F. de, 240, 244, 245
- Pablo, Don, 274
- Pacific Historical Review*, contents of noted, 319
- Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, contents of noted, 153, 319, 322
- Padilla, Joseph de, 78
- Padrón General*, 240, 248
- Padrón Real*, 239-40
- Papers in Illinois History*, contents of noted, 85
- Papigochic, 274, 276, 278, 285, 287
- Paris, Archives of, 289, 290
- Paris, University of, 190, 194-95, 198, 205
- Parkman, Francis, 8, 10-12, 15, 130, 229, 290
- Parlement, Paris, 192-95, 197, 198, 199, 203, 208, 209, 210
- Parra, Pasqual Covos de la, 66
- Parral, 272, 273, 274, 283, 285, 286, 287
- Parrilla, Diego Ortiz, 142-43, 144, 145, 146, 148, 150
- Pascual, José, 272
- Patert, Dom, 196
- Pattern map. See *Padrón Real*

- Paver, Francisco, 141
 Paxson, Frederic Logan, 267; his *The Great Demobilization and Other Essays*, revd., 305-06
 Paz, Juan de la, 83
 Pechera, 278
 Peck, John Mason, 177
 Pedraza, Bartolome Romero, 74
 Pedraza, Francisco Romero de, 64
Pélican, 303
 Peñalosa scheme, 109
 Pénicaud, André, 288-304
 "Pénicaud and His Chronicle of Early Louisiana," by E. MCCANN, 288-304
 Pensacola, 293, 300, 303
 Pensacola Bay, 293
 Perdreauxville, Marie Antoinette Adèle, 183-84
 Perera, Nicolás de, 49, 51, 52-54, 57, 58
 Perkins, J. H., 14
 Perrot, François-Marie, 100
 Pescay, Angélique La Grange, 183
 Philip II, King, 242
 Philippine Islands, 242
 Phillips, Thomas, 206
 Picard du Gay, 116, 117, 127, 128.
See also Auguelle
 Pickett, Albert James, 304
 Picolo, M., 277
 Picolo, Francisco, 46
 Picot, Jacques, 219
 Picoté, Françoise, 234
 Picoté, Jeanne Geneviève. *See* Belestre, Jeanne Geneviève Picoté de
 Pierce, Bessie Louise, *A History of Chicago: Vol. II. From Town to City, 1848-1871*, revd., 88-89
 Pierson, Philippe, 36
 Pijart, Claude, 216
 Pima Indians, 46, 49, 52, 54, 56, 57, 59, 138-51
 Pimeria, 272
 Pimeria Alta, 47, 138-41, 143, 146
Pioneer Black Robes on the West Coast, by P. M. Dunne, revd., 92-93
Pioneer Merchant in St. Louis, publication of noted, 85-86
Plains Indians and New Mexico, 1751-1778, publication of noted, 320
 Point-Saint-Charles, 217
 Pollet, Marie-Thérèse, 235
 Pompadour, Antoinette Poisson, marquise de, 190
 Pontchartrain, Louis, comte de, 302
 "Population of the El Paso District in 1692," by J. MANUEL ESPINOSA (tr.), 61-84
 Portillo, Francisco López, 147-48
 Potawatomi Indians, 40, 123, 130, 133, 270
 Potosi Academy, 183
 Pouliot, Léon. *Étude sur les Relations des Jésuites de la Nouvelle-France (1632-1672)*, revd., 254-56
 Prado, Nicolás de, 286
 Pratte, Bernard, 170, 178, 179
 Primot, Antoine, 216
 Primot, Catherine. *See* Thierry, Catherine
Prodómo, overo Saggio di Alcune Invention, 202-03
Propaganda and the American Revolution, by P. Davidson, revd., 252-53
 Protestants, 180-81, 268, 269
 Prudhomme, Louis, 219
 Pseudo-scholarship, note on, 315-17
Puerto del Copei, 248, 250
 Quaritch, Bernard, 202
 Quebec, 39, 41, 118, 218, 219, 221, 226, 227
 Queylus, Gabriel de Thubière de Lévy de, 226
 Quijano, Miguel, 148, 150
 Randin, Hugues, 35
 Ranjel, Rodrigo, 244, 245-56, 248
Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1939-1940, by P.-G. Roy, revd., 307-08
 Ratkay, Johann, 284
 Recollects, 22, 32, 40, 42, 43, 99-100, 102, 131, 136
Rectorado de los Dolores, 49
Recueil de Gazettes de France, 203
Red Carolinians, by C. J. Milling, revd., 89-91
 Reed, C. B., 224, 225, 226, 229, 233
Registres du Conseil et du Parlement, 203
Relation des découvertes, 4-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-24, 26-31, 39, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 110-21, 123, 128-37
Relations de la Nouvelle-France, 31
 Religion, in frontier culture, 268, 269-71
 Renaudot, Eusèbe, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 104, 105, 106-07, 108-09, 110, 113, 135
Renommée, 291, 296
Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, 203
 Reyes, Augustina de los, 79
 Rhen (Rowen), Enrique, 141, 151
 Ribas, Andres Perez de, 272
 Ribero, Diego, 240, 244
 Ricci, Father, 193, 210
 Rio, Alonso del, 71
 Rio, Juan del, 73
 Río Conchos, 274, 276, 278
 Río Papigochic, 273, 274, 276, 278, 281, 282, 284
 Río Tomochic, 278

- Río Tutuaca, 278-79
 Río Yaqui, 272, 282
Rise of the New West, 264
 Rister, Carl Coke. *See* Hafen, Leroy H., jt. auth.
 Rivera, Juan de, 66
 Riverin, Denis, 234
 Robertson, James Alexander, 238
 Robledo, Bartolomé Gómez, 63
 Robutel, Zacharie, 226
 Rond, Islet, 220
 Ronval, Asseline de, 225
 Rose, Valentin, 206
 Rouen, 121, 290
 Rouillé, Comte, 192
 Rowen, Enrique. *See* Rhuen, Enrique
 Roxas, Carlos de, 51, 52
 Roy, A., 227
 Roy, P.-G., 225
 Roy, Pierre-Georges, *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1939-1940*, revd., 307-08
 Rozier, Ferdinand, 186
 Ryswick, Peace of, 291
 Sacy, Father de, 191
 Saeta, Francisco, 45, 47
 Sahuaripa, 283
 Saint-André, Robutel, 225
 St. Charles, 174
 St. Cosme, Jean François Jolliet de, 302
 Ste. Genevieve, 172-73, 178, 179, 181, 182, 186-87, 188
 St. Germain-des Prés, Abbey, 196-97, 205
 Sainte-Hélène, île, 220
 St. Joseph River, 123, 124, 133
 Saint-Léger, A. de, 106
 St. Louis, 173-74, 175, 176-77, 179-86, 187, 188
 St. Louis College, 183
 St. Louis University, 270
 St. Martin, Pierre, 184
 Saint-Père, Jean de, 216
 Saint-Simon, Louis de Rouvray, duc de, 106
 Saint-Sulpice, Séminaire de, 226
 Sainte-Thérèse, île, 219
 St. Vrain, Joseph de, 178
 Salamanca, University of, 179
 Sallaberry, Juan Faustino, publications of noted, 87
 Salvatierra, Juan María, 138
 Samson, M., 212
 San Bernabé, 273, 274, 278
 San Francisco de Borjia, 285
 San Gabriel, 282
 San Gerónimo, 287
 San Ignacio mission, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52-55, 58, 142, 145
 San Miguel Temósachic, 282
 San Pablo Ocomorachic, 282
 San Rafael, 276, 282, 283
 Santa Ana, 139-40, 273, 278
 Santa Cruz, Alonso de, 237-38, 240, 241-44, 245, 248, 250
 Santa Cruz, Francisco de, 241
 Santa María Suamca, 142
 Santo Domingo, 191, 292
 Sáric, 140, 141, 149
 Sarpy, Gregoire, 179
 Saugrain, Antoine Claude, 196, 197, 207
 Saugrain, Antoine François, 176
 Sault Ste. Marie, 122
 Sauvolle, 295, 300
 Savine, Francis, 179, 187
 Schafer, Joseph (ed.), *Memoirs of Jeremiah Curtin*, revd., 163-64
 Schewe, Christoph Friederich, 182-83
 Schmitz, Joseph William, *Texas Statecraft, 1836-1845*, revd., 251
 Schultz, Christian, 185, 187
 Scott, H. A., 24
 Sedelmayr, Jacobo, 60, 140-41
 Sedillo, Pedro, 71
 Seignelay, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, marquis de, 5, 28, 43, 44, 101, 105-06, 107, 110, 113, 114, 123
 Sel, Gabriel, 219
Select Bibliography of British History 1660-1760, publication of noted, 319
 Seligman, Edwin R. A., 265
 Septlivres, Isaac, 183
 Seven Years' War, 192, 204, 212
 Shea, John Gilmory, 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16-25, 26-27, 104, 105, 112, 113, 114, 116, 121, 122
 SHIELDS, W. EUGENE, revs. Briggs' *Frontiers of the Northwest, A History of the Upper Missouri Valley*, 94-95; Decorme's *La Obra de los Jesuitas Mexicanos durante la Epoca Colonial, 1572-1767. Tomo II. Las Misiones*, 310-11; Hafen and Rister's *Western America. The Exploration, Settlement, and Development of the Region Beyond the Mississippi*, 160-61
 Simois, Luis de, 286
 Sioux Indians, 34-35, 37, 103, 116, 126, 127-28, 129-30, 131, 133, 270
 Sisoguichic, 284, 285
 Sitting Bull, 270
 Slaves, in Missouri, 178, 187
 "Social Forces in American History," 264, 266
Some La Salle Journeys, 3
 Sonora, 139-51
 Sonora missions, 48, 54, 60
 Sosa, Mariano de, 56-57
 Souart, Gabriel, 228
 Spanish, in America, 45-60, 61-84, 138-51, 272-87, 303; in Upper

- Louisiana, 167, 169, 172, 173, 180
 Spanish Succession, War of, 10
 Sparks, Jared, 9, 10, 14, 17
 Spears, John R., 304
 Staatsbibliothek, 206
 Steiger, Gaspar, 55, 57, 58
 Stoddard, Amos, 167, 169, 181, 182, 184-85
 Suamca. *See* Santa María Suamca
 Sulpicians, 42, 43, 101
 Sulte, B., 225
 Surgères, François de La Rochefou-
 could, marquis de, 291
 Surgères Island, 301
 Sweet, William W., 269
Systema Bibliothecae, 202
 Taensa village, 297, 298, 299
 Tallemant des Réaux, Gédéon, 106
 Talon, Jean, 220
 Tapia, Cristoval, 72
 Tarahumara Alta, 272, 276, 284-85, 287
 Tarahumara Antigua, 272
 Tarahumara Baja, 272, 287
 Tarahumara Indians, 272-87
 Tardá, José, 272, 274, 276, 278-80, 281, 287
 Tejirachic, 278
 Tello, Tomás, 141, 151
 Temechic, 274, 278
Teodoro de Croix and the Northern Frontier of New Spain, 1776-1783, publication of noted, 320
 Tepehuan Revolt, 272
 Terán, Domingo de, 45
 Tessier, Urbain, 225
Texas Statecraft, 1836-1845, by J. W. Schmitz, revd., 251
 Thierry, Catherine, 216
 Thierry, Guillaume, 216
 Thouret, M., 112
 Thwaites, Ruben Gold, 16, 25
 Tingry, Prince de, 197, 204, 210
 Tobar, Joan, 82
 "Tomás de Guadalajara, Missionary of the Tarahumares," by PETER M. DUNNE, 272-87
 Tompkins, George, 183
 Tonti, Henri de, 6, 12, 14, 39-40, 127, 128, 130
 Toral, José, 48, 55, 56-58, 59
 Torcy, Jean-Baptiste Colbert, marquis de, 224
 Tosaboreachic, 278
 Tourville, Anne de Cotentin, comte de, 229, 235
 Tracy, Alexandre de Prouville, marquis de, 219
 Trappists, 181-82
 Triumpho de Los Angeles, 276, 282
 Trois-Rivières, 215, 216
 Tronson, Louis, 42, 43, 101, 228
 Troyes, Pierre, chevalier de, 232
 Tubutama, 60, 140-41
 Turner, Frederick J., 263-64, 265, 266, 267
 Tutuaca, 278, 279-80, 282, 283
 Upper Louisiana, 167-68, 169
 Utera, José de, 148-49
 Utrecht, Treaty of, 110
 Valencia, Juan de, 82
 Vallé, Jean Baptiste, 170, 178
 Vallière (Duc de la), 195, 204
 Varela, Diego, 64
 Varennes, 220
 Vargas, Diego de, Governor 61, 62, 84
 Vega, Garcilaso de la, 244
 Velarde, Luis Xavier, 49, 50
 Velasco, Juan López de, 238, 243, 248, 250
 Vespucci, Amerigo, 239
 Vide Poche, 174, 188
 Villa de Aguilar, 273
 Ville-Marie, 215, 216, 223. *See also* Montreal
 Villermont, Esprit Cabart de, 28, 109
 Villiers du Terrage, Marc de, 27-30, 32-33, 107, 115, 134, 135
 Vincent, J. L., 230
Voyage de la Louisiane, 202
 Walton's Polyglot Bible, 202
Washington and the American Revolution, by B. Knollenberg, revd., 157-59
 Wecter, Dixon, *The Hero in America*, revd., 257-59
 West Point, 170
Western America. The Exploration, Settlement, and Development of the Region Beyond the Mississippi, by L. H. Hafen and C. C. Rister, revd., 160-61
 Wieser, Franz von, 237-38
 Wilgus, A. Curtis, *The Development of Hispanic America*, revd., 259-60
 William III, 291
 Winsor, Justin, 15
 Winther, Oscar O., work of noted, 319
 WISH, HARVEY, "The French of Old Missouri (1804-1821): A Study in Assimilation," 167-89
World List of Historical Periodicals and Bibliographies, publication of noted, 152
 Wright, Robert, 167
Writings of Sam Houston, 1821-1847, publication of noted, 322
 Wrong, G. M., 229
 Xaramillo, Lucia, 76
 Ximenes' Polyglot Bible, 201
 Xiron, Joseph Tellez, 63, 67
 Xixime Indians, 282, 283
 Yepómera, 276, 281-82

Zapata, Juan Ortiz, 280, 281, 282-83,
287

Zubillaga, Félix, *La Florida, La
Misión Jesuítica (1566-1572) y La*

Colonización Española, revd., 306-
07

ZVETINA, JOHN A., revs. Loewen-
stein's *Hitler's Germany*, 159

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION



3 0311 00147 6576

BX 940 .I342 v.23

Mid-America: an historical
review.





3 0311 00147 6576