

# The “Cloven Foot” Rediscovered: The Historiography of the Conestoga Massacre Through Three Centuries of Scholarship

by *Edwin Thomas Schock, Jr.*

In the preface to his 1987 text *Arguing With Historians*, Richard Nelson Current defined the pursuit of historiography as the business of separating the “historical” from the “unhistorical” in historical writing.<sup>1</sup> Faced with such a direct statement of purpose, the historian contemplating such an endeavor might therefore be inclined to ask, “Is it really that simple?” Doubtless, Current would be quick to reply, “No, it’s really that difficult.”

Such a definition would unite under the same umbrella a universe of disparate literary formats ranging from the book review on one hand to the thousand-page thesis on the other. Each of these entities, and all in between, share as a common denominator an element of criticism in the non-pejorative sense of the word. All that distinguishes one end of the spectrum from the other is the depth of inquiry.

Separating the historical from the unhistorical can be likened to removing blocks from a wall. An argument about the interpretation of a single event in a single work, while it can be said to tangibly alter the structure of discourse on that subject, is nevertheless generally superficial in its impact. Meanwhile, a detailed attack on the whole school that generated that interpretation can be considered a more substantial breach which, successful enough and pervasive enough, could bring down the wall altogether. Not to be forgotten, there will also always be those nihilists who will assault the very process of wall-building.

Therefore, there can be no typical process of historiographic analysis since the extent of remodeling varies directly with the individual’s perception of the wall’s integrity. The researcher chooses to employ subtle points regarding

periodization or semantics of an argument, or he/she may choose to freely bludgeon the existing historiographical framework on the grounds of endemic gender—or cultural—bias. Each of these scholars can rightfully claim to have written a historiographical essay even if they are linked only by the common belief that written history is different than history in the abstract (if such, indeed, truly exists), and that the framework created by an historian to interpret history is just that—a creation—and thus subject to revision.

To move yet another step further into the construction metaphor, the historian who wishes to renovate the body of work surrounding his subject must, like an architect, first survey the full dimensions of the structure itself as well as any additions made by a later owner. As the architect must understand the history of his building project, so must the historian know the history of history. In this respect it could be said that Andrew Elliott was never so ambitious in laying out plans for the entire city of Washington as Joyce Appleby and social historians have been in laying out the patterns of historical scholarship for the era following the Second World War.

In what will no doubt be lauded as a landmark 1993 *William and Mary Quarterly* essay entitled “A Different Kind of Independence,” Appleby has asserted that the primary theme in American historical scholarship since 1945 has been one of intellectual emancipation from the “thrust and parry” of consensus and conflict schools of political history.<sup>2</sup> In its place she consecrates the New Social History pioneered by the French Annals and Americans like Bernard Bailyn, a school which emphasizes social science methods and a grass-roots perspective.<sup>3</sup> It can be inferred from her presentation of these sweeping changes that the old schools have been razed, leveled for the sake of progress. A closer inspection however reveals that the new structure of American history is not quite so completely new as it might have at first appeared. By examining the historiography of the Conestoga Massacre, a particularly intransigent subject in our national history, it becomes exceedingly clear that the “old political history,” subsumed in the expansion of the 1960s and 1970s, is still to some extent intact if obscured behind a modern edifice.

The massacre of the Conestoga Indians by Scotch-Irish settlers on the western fringes of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in 1763 is fertile ground for such an analysis for several reasons. Prominent among these is the fact that the murders occurred during the proprietary period and that the historiography therefore spans the entire length of American national history. Just as important is the fact that the incident encompasses elements of race, class, and ethnicity, within both a social and political context: common sense dictates that these should be just the type of materials that “post-modern” scholars would find ideal for building social history. Nevertheless, while perspectives on the massacre have varied over the past 230 years, they have not reflected in recent years the type or intensity of study one might expect.

Factually, these accounts have remained fairly consistent.<sup>4</sup> The

Conestogas, just twenty in number, were the last remnants of the Susquehannock tribe. As per the terms of treaties made with the proprietor sixty years previous, they had been apportioned a small tract of land in what is today Manor Township where they engaged in small-scale subsistence farming, much of the small game having been flushed from the area by the encroachment of European settlement. Because their village was so close to the county seat in Lancaster, and because they lived very much in the midst of their white neighbors, the Conestogas traveled frequently throughout the region selling handicrafts to augment the mean living they were able to eke out of the land they had been promised.<sup>5</sup>

Until the French and Indian War, or, to be more specific, the Pontiac Conspiracy, these frontier living arrangements had proven to be minimally acceptable to the immigrant inhabitants of the frontier despite the close quarters. With the increased frequency of the Indian raids during and after the war though, sentiment concerning the proximity of the Conestogas radically changed. While the Conestogas maintained their loyalty to the province throughout the Indian campaigns, suspicions ran high among the Scotch-Irish settlers who predominated in that part of the frontier hardest hit by these raids that these Indians were not to be tolerated or accepted as neighbors. A request was made by the colonists to the provincial government to force the Conestogas off their land and relocate them to a venue where their presence would be less of a source of anxiety, the belief having been widespread that the Conestogas, if they were not directly involved in the attacks, were nonetheless abetting those Indians who were.<sup>6</sup>

Convention then has it that the government, citing the treaty and the need to maintain civil relations with the natives, denied this request, after which, on December 14, 1763, a number of rangers from Paxton and Donegal were prompted to set upon the village, killing six of the Indians. Following the removal of the remaining Conestogas to the work house in Lancaster and the issuance of a government order for the arrest of the persons involved in the massacre, a mob of close to fifty men marched into town, broke open the gates of the jail, and finished the job they had undertaken two weeks before.<sup>7</sup> Emboldened by this success, the Paxton Boys, as their contemporaries had dubbed them, threatened to also march on the Indians being housed in Philadelphia by the Quaker-led Assembly. In spite of the alarm that spread through the city, no further violence was propagated, the Paxton men having instead sent two representatives to the city with a "Remonstrance" which explained the reasons for, and perceived necessity of, those acts of insurrection which had previously been committed.<sup>8</sup>

On the role of the various actors in this particular historical tableau, authors writing in the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries have generated ideas of very little latitude. Two prominent exceptions have involved the portrayal of the Reverend John Elder and Benjamin Franklin. The former

is only of fleeting importance: the Donegal pastor had been credited with inciting the mob in some accounts and having prostrated himself before that mob in others.<sup>9</sup> In the larger scope, Franklin's portrayal is much more critical because it impacts so much more upon our understanding of the time period. Some histories of the period have placed the statesman firmly in the political camp of the Quakers in condemning the actions of the Paxton Boys, while others have suggested that he coached the latter in their development of those arguments elaborated by James Gibson and Matthew Smith in the "Remonstrance" presented before the Assembly.<sup>10</sup> It has been on the subject of resulting political sympathies among the leaders of the Proprietary party, the Quaker party, and the Presbyterian backcountry, that the bulk of the scholarship has therefore turned.

To the extent that Joyce Appleby ascribes the majority of American historiography before the Second World War to the pursuit of a narrowly-defined political history and the deeds of prominent individuals, nineteenth century historians of colonial Pennsylvania would hardly consider it a reproach. Indeed, Thomas Francis Gordon is far from apologetic where, in the preface to his 1829 *History of Pennsylvania*, he comments:

The principal arena of public action was the legislature hall and . . . in such details alone are to be found the sources of the public feeling of the province and the character of her most distinguished citizens.<sup>11</sup>

While the purview of early national scholarship may have been selective however, it does not necessarily follow that the work is quite so undifferentiated as Dr. Appleby implies by equating more than one hundred years of historiography before the Progressives as a lump sum as "the liberal Whiggish" or "filiopietistic" school.<sup>12</sup> The nuances which separate the several early- and middle-nineteenth century studies of the Conestoga Massacre may be a bit more subtle than the clearly-defined ideological divisions of twentieth century schools of study, but they are no less real. On the contrary, an examination of nineteenth century scholarship demonstrates that the two centuries are not so far apart in the content of their discourse as "A Different Kind of Independence" would suppose.

The first history of the circumstances surrounding the massacre was written by Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia in 1764 while the incident and its repercussions were still ongoing concerns. Pamphlets often appeared subsequent to events of broad interest and importance in the eighteenth century, especially when such an event might have legal ramifications and persons felt they needed to be vindicated in public. A similar contemporary example would be the history of the Whiskey Insurrection penned by Hugh Henry Brackenridge to defend his actions during the resistance to the whiskey excise in 1791.

In total more than sixty such documents were produced by the Paxton Boys and their detractors.<sup>13</sup> Franklin's "Narrative of the Late Massacres in Lancaster County," though written when he was not yet an actor in the developing drama of the threatened insurrection, entertains no illusions of objectivity, as can be ascertained from the following passage:

When the poor wretches saw that they had no protection nigh, nor could possibly escape, and being without the least weapons of defence, they divided their little families, the children clinging to their parents; they fell on their faces, protested their innocence, declared their love to the English . . . and in this posture they all received the hatchet.<sup>14</sup>

By the beginning of the next century, after the venomous partisanship contained in the earlier accounts had subsided and the institutions of proprietary government had been replaced by state and federal ones, Thomas Francis Gordon would reflectively approach the topic of the Paxton Boys in his aforementioned *History of Pennsylvania*. Not the first history of Pennsylvania to be published in the early national period, Gordon's work is significant because it remained in print into the twentieth century and it influenced the work of other mid-to-later-nineteenth century authors like Jacob I. Mombert (1869), William Mason Cornell (1876), and William Shephard (1896), whose works would largely retrace the steps of his own, making the Philadelphia scholar in effect the father of the consensus school as it regards the study of political development in southeastern Pennsylvania.

Gordon would characterize the insurgency as a tragedy of miscommunication. In his interpretation the Quakers as well as the Scotch-Presbyterians could be considered victims, and the villains, if there truly were any, were the Indians who had taken advantage of the Friends' willingness to "confide in the natural goodness of the unsophisticated tenants of the forest."<sup>15</sup> The Quakers, he argues, had simply failed to recognize that their professed goodwill for the Indians was undermining attempts to maintain order on the frontier by presenting the appearance that the white settlers were divided in their resolve to defend Lancaster and Cumberland counties.

Gordon also took great pains to distinguish those men who authored and presented the "Remonstrance" to the Assembly from those who had perpetrated the acts of barbarity, no matter how justified, upon the Conestogas. "These were not the ignorant and vulgar of the border counties, persons more likely to yield to their passions than to respect the laws of their country and humanity," he would write.<sup>16</sup> Rather, these were men of a like mind with Benjamin Franklin and the leaders of the Proprietary party, men who knew that enlightened discussion, not force, was the best means for satisfying a grievance.

The notion that the population of the western counties could therefore be separated into the democratic few who contributed in many sundry ways to the planting of civilization in the back country on one hand, and the ignorant masses prone to occasional outbreaks of violence on the other, would be a cornerstone of consensus historiography on this topic. Gordon's consensus interpretation would be more or less short-lived however, owing probably to the incompatibility of such wide-scale and calculated violence within a framework emphasizing a harmony of interests. As early as 1845, with the publication of Daniel I. Rupp's *History of Lancaster and York Counties*, other scholars would posit schemes for the historical relevance of the episode that highlighted the fundamental differences between back country settlers and Quaker politicians.

Rupp's study, more than possibly any other written about the massacre, can be called a unique product of the time period in which it was printed. Unlike Gordon, Rupp made a distinction between the leaders of the Paxton party and the rabble of its rank-and-file. By his account, leaders like the Reverend Elder and Matthew Smith were not to be seen as cool heads that had prevented the incident from turning into a full-blown insurrection, but rather as the very element that had incited the common folk to action in the first place.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, Rupp cannot be counted among the scholars of the "conflict" school since he maintained with Gordon that the motives of the Paxton mob had been apolitical.

To understand Rupp's position regarding the "uncommendable activity" of the Paxton Boys and his preoccupation with the violence itself rather than the political context of that violence, one must consider the political context in which he wrote. Several years previously, the author's close friend and confidant Thomas Burrows had been the *de facto* Secretary of Education under Governor Joseph Ritner when the latter was engaged in the so-called "Buckshot War of 1838-1839."<sup>18</sup> The Buckshot War had started as a sectional dispute when the Anti-Masonic members of the General Assembly had contested the results of legislative elections in Philadelphia districts nominally won by Democrats. As each caucus attempted to seat its own candidates at the beginning of the next session in Harrisburg, the resulting confusion resulted in riotous chaos. With this memory in mind, it's easy to see why Rupp might have had a hair-trigger as it related to unruly mobs acting on sectional animosity.

The first true conflict theorist to write on the subject of the Paxton Boys was probably William Egle in his 1883 *History of Pennsylvania*.<sup>19</sup> Egle revolutionized discourse on the topic by presenting the Paxton disturbances as a struggle for democracy. Lumping the elements of the west together as Rupp had, this later scholar would nonetheless stake out new ground by idealizing the movement. Egle even went so far as to postulate bodies of the Indians at the Lancaster work house had been mangled *after* death by persons

in the employ of the proprietors who wished to exacerbate feelings against the border counties, and as such, he resolved to "glean the following facts, which, when properly considered, [would] in great measure remove the odium which prejudiced historians have thrown upon this transaction."<sup>20</sup>

In Egle's estimation then, the Paxton Boys were not hooligans restrained only slightly by the interference of the bulwarks of the community. They were all democrats (made democrats by the hardship of their combined frontier experience, F.J. Turner would later argue) whose actions were a necessary evil in the face of virtual abandonment by the ruling parties in Philadelphia. They were important not for what they had accomplished with the hatchet but with the pen, creating a Remonstrance which, in its critique of taxation without representation, had anticipated by thirteen years the sentiment voiced by the Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence.<sup>21</sup>

Charles H. Lincoln's *The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania, 1760-1776*, published in 1901 and considered to be the definitive work on the subject, agreed with Egle's hypothesis in type but not in degree. As Daniel Rupp had magnified the incipient negativism of Thomas Gordon's view of the Paxton Boys, so too would Lincoln magnify the positive aspects of his predecessor's interpretation. Whereas Egle had elevated morality of the border inhabitants to a level of equality with their cosmopolitan counterparts, Lincoln established its outright superiority and argued that the Paxton Boys were the harbingers of an "internal revolution" of the back country over the city which coincided with and culminated in the Revolution of 1776.<sup>22</sup> Others to take up the banner of the Paxton insurrection as the American Revolution "in small print" include Brook Hindle in his 1946 article "The March of the Paxton Boys," Theodore Thayer in his 1953 text *Growth of Democracy in Pennsylvania, 1760-1776*, and finally William Dunbar in his 1967 edition of the *Paxton Papers*.<sup>23</sup>

Because so many actors had been involved in the Conestoga Massacre—the frontiersmen, the Indians, the Assembly, and the Proprietary officials, to name just a few—it was inevitable that such a theory would not go unchallenged even among other conflict theorists. In 1897 Sydney George Fisher would publish his *Pennsylvania: Colony and Commonwealth* in which he turned Thomas Gordon's argument that the frontier was separable into progressive democratic and ignorant reactionary camps somewhat on its head. Instead of arguing that the frontier was divided, Fisher suggested that it was Philadelphia's population that could be separated along ethnic and religious lines with the Quaker Assembly on one side and the Proprietary party on the other.<sup>24</sup> It was the Proprietary party then, which would push for a reform of the Quaker-led government. As a middle road between conflict and consensus schools, the Fisher school projected that the frontier's undeniable spirit of democracy had been checked by the pragmatism of Philadelphians like Benjamin Franklin who were to constructively channel that latent aggression on the eve of the Revolution.

This train of thought would be postulated by not just Fisher but also by George Donehoo in his *Pennsylvania: A History*, (1926) and William Hanna in his *Benjamin Franklin and Pennsylvania Politics* (1964). As an undercurrent to the more popular Egle-Lincoln school, this work created a great deal of confusion for later historiographers like James Kirby Martin who inappropriately labeled it as an alternative to the traditional school of Lincoln and Thayer, not realizing that the scholars had in fact developed their interpretation at roughly the same time and that both had been preceded by the Gordon interpretation.<sup>25</sup>

Understanding these to have been the major categories of scholarship on the subject of the Paxton Boys in the years before and just after the Second World War, their final fate in the face of revisionism of the 1960s and 1970s yet remains our most pertinent question. Did these interpretations successfully bridge what Joyce Appleby portrays as a Great Divide between the old intellectual, political history and the New Social History?

The apparent answer is that they have not only survived but have flourished in an environment which should have been inimical to them. The Gordon interpretation, in fact, has been drawn out of mothballs and revitalized to a position of prominence equal to that of its counterparts in the Egle-Lincoln and Fisher schools. A survey of the historiography from 1970 to the present reveals that while the names may be different many of the ideas remain essentially the same.

The most heralded work of this contemporary crop has been James H. Hutson's *Pennsylvania Politics, 1746-1776*. Despite its seemingly untraditional periodization and Hutson's own professed belief that his work had a different spin from that of earlier scholarships, the book is quite reminiscent of Sydney Fisher's 1897 study.<sup>26</sup> Like Fisher, Hutson saw the frontiersmen and the Proprietary party as inextricably linked in their political fortunes, the Philadelphians having used "the Paxton Boys as storm troops" and "conspired to intimidate the Assembly."<sup>27</sup> If Hutson differed from the Fisher school in his opinion, it was only to the extent that he believed the Philadelphians to be reluctant partners in the alliance—"most mechanics opposed the frontiersmen with bullets in February and ballots in October"—and that he saw the principal unifying factor as one of religion.<sup>28</sup>

Eight years later Joseph J. Kelley would draw the same conclusion in his voluminous *Pennsylvania: The Colonial Years*, writing:

Their venture was not an isolated uprising without inroads on [sic?] the future of the Province. It welded together the bulk of the Presbyterians into a political force. Split by the Great Schism of 1741 into "New and Old Siders," the denomination reached a tenuous truce in 1758, but the Paxtonnites provided a healing substance far more effective than formal statements.<sup>29</sup>



About this same time, the Gordon revival would commence with James E. Crowley's 1970 article on "The Paxton Disturbance and Ideas of Order in Pennsylvania Politics." Eschewing the interpretations of the competing conflict schools, Crowley chose to reach back for information that portrayed the Paxton incident as an aberration and not the beginnings of a grass-roots political movement. Turning to the text of the Remonstrance itself, he pointed out that the Paxton Boys viewed themselves as "loyal subjects of the King" and that they claimed that their recent actions protected the inhabitants from "His Majesty's cloaked Enemies."<sup>30</sup> The frustrations of the back country, as Crowley saw it, was less a system of insurgency among back country's inhabitants than a misunderstanding of the law, which they thought would be satisfied "if they presented affidavits that established the guilt of the slain Indians after the killing had taken place."<sup>31</sup>

In the following year James Kirby Martin would publish his article "The Return of the Paxton Boys and the Historical State of the Pennsylvania Frontier, 1764–1776," albeit handled without kid gloves; vilifying the Paxton Boys to a degree exceeded only by Daniel Rupp, Martin demonstrates quite convincingly that the leaders of the movement were not the cooler heads but those men most inclined to violence such as Lazarus Stewart—a Donegal ranger later killed in the Wyoming Massacre while trying to stake a claim to northern territory—and suggests that a consensus theory, viewing the Paxtoneers as an aberrant fragment of the otherwise law-abiding frontier population, may not be far off the mark.<sup>32</sup>

That Appleby's new generation of historians should choose to reiterate the arguments of their antecedents is more than, as one might suppose, a novelty. It illustrates the intransigence of many aspects of pre-war scholarship to change under the pressures of a new methodology or even to accept that methodology. A perfect example of this can be seen in Frank Cavaioli's 1983 article "A Profile of the Paxton Boys: Murderers of the Conestoga Indians."

Cavaioli attempted a prosopographical study [a study that relates a group of persons within a particular historical context] of those men clearly identified in contemporary documents as leading the riots, i.e., Smith, Gibson, Elder, etc.<sup>33</sup> Surveying a handful of biographical sketches on each figure, he reached the following conclusion:

The relationship between the Paxton Uprising and the American Revolution is clear upon the available data. The sample is small but significant. The revolutionary statement as summarized in [the Remonstrance] signaled the drive for justice, democracy and due process in the movement of internal change and inevitably for independence in 1776.<sup>34</sup>

If the sentiment sounds familiar, it is because this statement almost

quotes, verbatim, a page from Lincoln's study mentioned earlier. Using the new social science methodology then, Cavaoli nevertheless replicates the most conservative of interpretations. Moreover, it should be pointed out that Cavaoli was distinctly in the minority among modern Paxton scholars in embracing the methodology at all. It is in the nineteenth century studies by Rupp and Egle that the most details about the massacre and its preconditions appear (even though these are conceded the most social, if aberrant, phenomena to be addressed in this historical example), the *entirety* of post-war scholars having been satisfied to summarize the incident in a page or less on their way to discussing its political repercussions.

Also revealing is the fact that neither of the other two sub-disciplines that might readily intersect the Paxton/Conestoga debate, those being ethnohistory and the history of violence, has produced a study of the incident in its own terms. Based on Crowley's ideas of order in colonial Pennsylvania, one might be inclined to believe that Paxton was fertile ground for a study of vigilantism, but Richard Maxwell Brown, very much the pioneer in that subject, has excluded the episode from his work by limiting his purview to those vigilante organizations with greater staying power like the Carolina Regulators. The same can be said for Sheldon Levy, whose study of 150 years of political violence in America eliminates the Paxtoneers by beginning its periodization for such activities in the years just before the Revolution. No ethnographical study of the Susquehannocks and their relations with Europeans culminating in the Conestoga Massacre has been forthcoming from Gary Nash, James Axtell or any of their disciples either, at least to date.

One explanation for this situation could be that the circumstances of the massacre defy any definition other than a political one. The incident may not easily fit into the mold of that scholarship readily being pursued by the majority of social historians, the grievances shaping the massacre having been apparently as direct as the massacre itself."<sup>35</sup>

Whatever the rationale, the effective result is that the dominant themes in pre-war scholarship on this topic have survived apparently unscathed to the very turn of the 21st century. The house that Gordon, Egle, and Fisher built from 1826 to 1897 still stands, even if its new neighbors would have you believe it was an eyesore.

## Endnotes

1. Richard Nelson Current, *Arguing With Historians*. (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), p. 3.

2. Joyce Appleby, "A Different Kind of Independence: The Post-War Restructuring of the Historical Study of Early America." *William and Mary Quarterly* (April 1993), p. 245-247.

3. *Ibid.*

4. The following is a synthesis of the common points of those accounts written by Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Francis Gordon, Jacob Mombert and Daniel Rupp. The contribution made by each of these men to the historiography of the massacre is discussed in detail later in this work.

5. Edwin Thomas Schock, Jr., "Home of the Brave?: The Conestoga Massacre 230 Years Later." *Lancaster County Magazine*, vol. 8 (December 1993), pp. 10–12. The ever tactful Sidney George Fisher would write the following about the tribe's arrangement with the provincial authorities: "The Conestoga Indians were the degenerate descendants of some of the clans that met the first settlers, supplied them with game and made treaties with William Penn: they had left the war-path and even the chase and were devoting themselves to basket and broom-making . . . their offenses were usually no worse than continual begging from the government." *History of Pennsylvania*, pp. 233–234.

6. Schock, p. 11.

7. *Ibid.*

8. James Kirby Martin, "The Return of the Paxton Boys and the Historical State of the Pennsylvania Frontier, 1764–1774." *Pennsylvania History*, vol. 38 (April 1971), pp. 117–120.

9. Frank J. Cavaoli, "A Profile of the Paxton Boys: Murderers of the Conestoga Indians." *Journal of the Lancaster County Historical Society*, vol. 87, no. 3 (1983), p. 324; J.I. Mombert, *An Authentic History of Lancaster County in the State of Pennsylvania*. (Lancaster, PA: J.E. Barr and Company, 1869), pp. 188–189; Joseph P. Kelley, *Pennsylvania: The Colonial Years*. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), pp. 188–191.

10. William Hanna, *Benjamin Franklin and Pennsylvania Politics*. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1964) pp. 150–153; Kelley, p. 92.

11. Thomas Francis Gordon, *History of Pennsylvania*. (Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, and Carey, 1829), p. i.

12. Appleby, p. 247.

13. Cavaoli, p. 78.

14. Benjamin Franklin, *A Narrative of the Late Massacres in Lancaster County of a Number of Indians, Friends of this Province*. (Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1764), p. 1–2.

15. Gordon, p. 410.

16. Gordon, p. 407.

17. Daniel I. Rupp, *History of Lancaster and York Counties*. (Lancaster, PA: Gilbert Hills Publishing, 1845), p. 356.

18. Burrowes' name appears prominently within the list of Rupp's acknowledgements and may have contributed to the book.

19. James Kirby Martin's 1971 historiographic article in *Pennsylvania Magazine* (p. 118–119) mistakenly attributes the first use of conflict theory to address the topics of the Conestoga Massacre to Frederick Jackson Turner in his 1908 commentary

on the "Old West," but it would be difficult to characterize Engle's work, printed three full years before Turner's initial frontier thesis, as being in any way derived from the latter school of thought.

20. William Henry Egle, *A History of Pennsylvania*. (Philadelphia: E.M. Gardner, 1883), p. 120

21. Egle, p. 116

22. Martin, p. 170n.

23. Martin, p. 120n; also of importance would be William R. Jacob's *The Paxton Riots and the Frontier Theory* (Chicago, 1967), but as it traces this line of thought back no further than Turner, it does not quite so easily fit into the above school as those works written primarily by Pennsylvanians for Pennsylvanians. This confusion is best resolved by dividing the works distinctly into an Egle-Lincoln school and a Turner school, the former having inductively reached the same conclusions that the latter had posited in the abstract.

24. Sydney George Fisher, *Pennsylvania: Colony and Commonwealth*. (Philadelphia: Henry T. Coates and Company, 1897), pp. 246-247. Fisher had ample information on which to build such an assumption.

The allegiance of the bulk of the Philadelphia's non-Quaker population had been doubted in varying degrees by authors dating back to Daniel Rupp who published the following quote by a city native (p. 363) in his *History of Lancaster and York Counties*: "It was a pleasing though melancholy sight to view the activity of our men—'What not one—among us?!' Instead of joining with others, they would sneak into corners and applaud the 'Paxton Boys.' Their behavior on this occasion makes them blacker than ever."

25. Martin, p. 118.

26. James H. Hutson, *Pennsylvania Politics, 1746-1776*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972). Hutson's impression that his work was breaking new ground is perhaps a perfect example of how confused most Paxton scholars are about the historiography of their own field (only one brief and error-riddled historiographic essay having ever been authored): Hutson attempts to establish the uniqueness of his work by using Lincoln's as a foil, unwittingly attributing to that author the scholarship of Sydney George Fisher (p. 171).

27. Hutson, p. 112.

28. Hutson, p. 111.

29. Hutson, p. 111.

30. James F. Crowley, "The Paxton Disturbance and Ideas of Order in Pennsylvania Politics," *Pennsylvania History*, vol. 37 (October 1970), p. 319.

31. Crowley, p. 329. Rupp printed a number of such affidavits in the text of his 1829 history: one read "Abraham Newcomer, a Mennonite . . . declared that several times Bill Soc and Indian John, two Conestoga Indians, threatened to scalp him for refusing to mend their tomahawks, and swore that they would as soon scalp him as they would a dog."

32. Cavaoli, p. 78.

33. Cavaoli, p. 78.

34. Cavaoli, p. 93.

35. With sincerest apologies to James Davies, no element of rising or declining expectations has factored into the scholarship surrounding the massacre save that of an expectation not to be scalped. That a study of the economic causes hasn't been written is especially ironic considering that Quaker charity toward the Indians (and not the frontier widows and orphans) was specifically listed among the complaints in the Remonstrance. It would appear that there is a good Ph.D. dissertation topic there somewhere but one that has yet, to my knowledge, to be pursued.

## WORKS CITED

- Appleby, Joyce. "A Different Kind of Independence: The Postwar Restructuring of the Historical Study of Early America," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3 (April 1993), p. 245–267.
- Brown, Richard Maxwell. "Historical Patterns of Violence in America," in *History of Violence in America*. New York: Praeger Publishing, 1969.
- Brown, Richard Maxwell. "The American Vigilante Tradition" in *History of Violence in America*. New York: Praeger Publishing, 1969.
- Cavaoli, Frank J. "A Profile of the Paxton Boys: Murderers of the Conestoga Indians," *Journal of the Lancaster County Historical Society*, vol. 87, no. 3 (1983), p. 74–98.
- Crowley, James E. "The Paxton Disturbances and Ideas of Order in Pennsylvania Politics," *Pennsylvania History*, 37 (October 1970), p. 317–339.
- Current, Richard Nelson. *Arguing With Historians*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1987.
- Davies, James C. "The J-Curve of Rising and Declining Satisfaction as a Cause of Some Great Revolutions and a Contained Rebellion," in *History of Violence in America*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishing, 1969.
- Donehoo, George P. *Pennsylvania, A History*. Vol. I. Harrisburg, PA: Lewis Historical Publications, 1926.
- Egle, William. *A History of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: E.M. Gardner, 1883.
- Franklin, Benjamin. *A Narrative of the Massacres in Lancaster County of a Number of Indians, Friends of this Province*. Philadelphia: Matthew Carey, 1764.
- Gordon, Thomas Francis. *A History of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea, and Carey, 1829.
- Hanna, William. *Benjamin Franklin and Pennsylvania Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1964.

- Hindle, Brook. "The March of the Paxton Boys," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (October 1946), 461-486.
- Hofstadter, Richard, and Michael Wallace eds. *American Violence: A Documentary History*. New York: Alice A. Knopf, 1970.
- Hutson, James. *Pennsylvania Politics, 1746-1770: The Movement for Royal Government and Its Consequences*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Kelley, Joseph K. *Pennsylvania: The Colonial Years*. Garden City., NJ: Doubleday, 1982.
- Levy, Sheldon. "A 150-Year Study of Political Violence in the United States," in *History of Violence in America*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishing, 1969.
- Lincoln, Charles. *The Revolutionary Movement in Pennsylvania 1770-1776*. Philadelphia: Ginn and Company, 1901.
- Maier, Pauline. "Popular Uprisings and Civil Authority in Eighteenth Century America," in *Riot, Rout, and Tumult: Readings in American Social and Political Violence*. Roger Lane and John Turner eds. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Martin, James Kirby. "The Return of the Paxton Boys and the Historical State of the Pennsylvania Frontier, 1764-1774," *Pennsylvania History* 38 (April 1970), 117-133.
- Mombert, Jacob I. *An Authentic History of Lancaster County in the State of Pennsylvania*. Lancaster, PA: J.E. Baer and Company, 1869.
- Rupp, Daniel I. *History of Lancaster and York Counties*. Lancaster, PA: Gilbert Hills, 1829.
- Schock, Edwin T. "Home of the Brave?: The Conestoga Massacre 230 Years Later," *Lancaster County Magazine* vol. 8 (December 1993), 12-14.
- Shephard, William R. *The History of Proprietary Government in Pennsylvania*. New York, 1896.
- Thayer, Theodore. *The Growth of Democracy in Pennsylvania: 1740-1776*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1953.
- Treese, Loreth. "To Kill Us All and Burn the Town," in *The Storm Gathering: The Penn Family and the American Revolution*. State College, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.
- Turner, Frederick Jackson. *The Frontier in American History*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1921 ed.