

The Leinster Bay Estate

A historical and archaeologically survey about the estate, its enslaved people and their run for freedom

Prepared for the Virgin Islands National Park
and the University of Copenhagen



(The casement of the Leinster Bay guardhouse.)

By Nanna Wienecke and Louise Rasmussen

2015

Contents

Preface.....	4
Introduction	6
Method.....	8
The history of the estate	11
Water Lemon Estate.....	11
Smith Bay	19
Leinster Bay Estate	23
The buildings and artifacts	29
Ruins of older structures at Leinster Hill.....	30
The factory site	33
Slave villages and living conditions.....	34
The guardhouse	37
The enslaved population.....	42
The rights of the enslaved.....	42
The agency of the enslaved	46
Reasons for enduring enslavement.....	48
Marronage	51
Cases of marronage at the Leinster Bay Estate	54
The 1818 case	54
The 1840 case	59
Concluding remarks.....	68
Archival sources	69
Literature	71
Appendix list	73
Appendix nr. 1:.....	73
Table of the estate owners and estate size from 1728 to 1862	73
Table of comparison: the enslaved at the Leinster Bay Estate and the total enslaved population of St. John, based on data from the land lists and tax records.	74
Appendix nr. 2: List of artifacts found at the Leinster Hill ruins.....	75

Appendix nr. 3: The factory site of the Leinster Bay Estate.....	76
Appendix nr. 4: Table of artifacts found at the Leinster Bay Estate.....	77
Appendix nr. 5: Percentage graph of enslaved at the Leinster Bay Estate	84
Appendix nr. 6: List of arrestees and deponents in the 1818 case	85

Preface

This report is the result of five months of research, in a combined internship between the US National Park Service's International Internship Program, the Virgin Islands National Park, St. John and the Saxo Institute at Copenhagen University. The first two months were spent in the Danish National Archive in Copenhagen, followed by a month of archaeological fieldwork with the National Park Service on St. John, US Virgin Islands, under the guidance and supervision of Ken Wild, NPS Cultural Resource Manager / Archaeologist. Following our return to Denmark we spent two months working with both the archeological data we had obtained on St. John and in the archive in order to finish our research for this report.

Before proceeding with our findings, we would like to express our gratitude to all the people and organizations who contributed both in making this internship possible, as well as providing valuable information, which enabled us to write this report. First of all we would like to thank the Friends of the Virgin Islands National Park, who funded our trip to St. John and our stay there. Without the Friends organization and all the people donating both time and money towards preservation of St. John history, we would not have reached as full an understanding of the island. Particularly of Leinster Bay which were necessary to complete this report and obtaining the ability to shed light on the historical events, which took place here. A special thanks to Linda Bennett, US Government Office of the Interior, for helping us with all the necessary forms and information for our visas, to Karen Jarvis for getting us there and to Ken Wild most of all for his efforts to give us the opportunity to learn and experience as much as possible of Leinster Bay Estate, and giving us a valuable insight into the archeological preservation and studies of the ruins, along with the efforts and functions of the National Park Service. A thank you to NPS's de facto curator Chela Thomas for her patience and help teaching us how to analyze and catalogue artifacts from surface collections. And to Joe Bomberger and Grant Gittus, the two archeology interns, who assisted us in our field surveys of Leinster bay Estate, the GPS mapping, identifying ruins and the company in addition to providing good company on the adventures.

Another special thanks to the St. Thomas University volunteer group, the REI volunteer group and the walkup volunteers for their hard work and good

spirits while clearing the ruins, their efforts made our work a lot easier. A thanks to Chuck Pishko for taking the time to look through his records and supply us with all the documents he had on the Leinster Bay Estate, to Erik Gøbel at the Danish State Archive for valuable advice on archival research, and to the Trimble Team and Cyark for their willingness to share information and giving us an insight into their fascinating work on scanning the ruin sites of Annaberg and Leinster Bay, which will be valuable in preserving the sites. Thanks to Anne-Kristine Larsen, one of the previous interns, who took the time to meet with us and answer our questions and provided us with unique insights. Also thanks to student adviser Benedicte Fonnesbech-Wulff and exam secretary Henrik Lerdam who helped us with advice and practical problems in relation to evaluation and exams. Last but not least thank you to our mentor/research counselor Gunvor Simonsen for her guidance on how to do a research study like this and for all her help and support with the report.

Louise Rasmussen and Nanna Wienecke, 2015.

Introduction

The research area for this report is the Leinster Bay Estate in the period 1718-1848. This estate was located on the north shore of the island of St. John, with Tortola in eyesight. The proximity of Tortola became increasingly significant after the British abolishment of slavery in 1834, which will be discussed later. Today the ruins are found after a 20 minutes hike down a trail starting at the Annaberg Estate. The factory complex and enslaved housing has been well hidden during the years by the vegetation, and no signs lead into the complex, thus preventing archeological study until this project was conducted.

Although there have been done a lot of research on the Danish West Indies and its estates and inhabitants, none has been done so far with the Leinster Bay Estate as area of interest.

The significance of the Estate, in term of the island history, is due to its size, meaning both physical in terms of land and in terms of inhabitants. The estate was considered as one of the bigger ones, with an area of 325 acres when it was on its utmost. Regarding the inhabitants or the enslaved population, it peaked in 1805 with a total of 228 enslaved persons living on this estate, those consisted both of; young, adults, old, men and women. This amount was substantial at the time, covering almost 9 percent of the entire population of enslaved on the island.

Another feature of the estate was a special building constructed on the estate land. This structure has been used as an extension of the governmental power, as it was a guardhouse. It was the living quarter of up to 17 soldiers. The purpose of the location was to keep an eye on the enslaved population. Placing guardhouses to protect ones property was common practice on the islands, although the central location on the estate was not. There was for example one placed on Whistling Key with the same purpose as the one located on Leinster Bay, though this was not on estate land.¹ The special thing about this building was the proximity, which was fairly close to the enslaved population living and working nearby.

With all these factors in mind, the focus of the research became: a mapping of the social and economic context, with particular focus on the guardhouse and the runaways of the Leinster Bay Estate.

¹ Whistling Key is a tiny island of the north coast, not far from Leinster Bay.

This focus point was not chosen solemnly because of the facts stated above, but it was a combination of these, personal preferences, and the challenge posed by choosing the enslaved as main subjects that made the case. In most cases the enslaved could neither read nor write, which is the reason that there no material produced only by their hands, no personal accounts. There is however one place where the enslaved are rather overrepresented: the police records, often when an enslaved did something wrong or ran away and the authorities was involved it would have been registered in these protocols and journals.

While working with this subject one must consider the terminology used in relation to the unfree population, whether to use the terms used in the original material such as slave and negro, or the terms unfree and enslaved. By using the term enslaved you clearly state that it is a condition the person is forced into and not a part of the person's identity. By using the term negro, you use a term that was used with a negative connotation, that linked status to skin color and a row of ideas about the negative implications of dark skin and therefore writes yourself into this negative discourse. Only in the cases where we have quoted sources, which uses the phrases slaves or Negro/Negroes will the words occur.

Regarding the translations; if nothing else is stated they have been done by ourselves, but the references will be to the Danish material.

The area of investigation has had several names during the time period: Water Lemon Bay, Smiths Bay and Leinster Bay with the latter having a different spelling, the early spelling was Linster Bay. For the sake of consistency, the area will be named Leinster Bay when dealing with the overall picture, this has been chosen because it is the current name of the area, except for directs quotes from source material and when dealing with the Estate before it got its current name. Another consistency regards the guardhouse, it has been called a battery, station and a bastion in the archival material, but the term guardhouse was chosen to encompass them all.

The terms used in the report are: busals, macaroon, maroon/marronage and capable. One of the purposes of these distinctions was for tax collection; the different categories signified an amount of taxes that should be paid, which varied due to work abilities. The busal was considered a newly arrived and not

yet instructed enslaved person; this state could last until a year. The macaroon on the other hand was a person that could not work either due to old age or illness. The capable person was one who could work till full extent.

Marronage was a term used for the act of running away, and either hiding in the bush with the intent of coming back or leaving the estate or island and not coming back and escaping enslavement altogether, respectively *petite marronage* and *grande marronage*. The maroon was the person who did the act, *marron* and *runaway* is used as equal terms.

Method

The basis of this report comes from a wide range of different source material, which includes archival sources, illustrative depictions, and surface collections among others.

One should keep in mind that working with archival sources from this time period does contain some difficulties. The text has been written in gothic Danish lettering and at that time, there was no consistent spelling either. Furthermore, the material bear marks from the wear during the years and from infestation that has left holes that interfere with the meaning.

The start of this research project consisted of establishing the owners of the Leinster Bay Estate(s), this was done through the tax records from 1755 to 1850 and the land lists from 1728 to 1739, tracing the list of owners backwards. Not all tax records named the estates, some only named the owner, but by comparing names and sizes of the estates in the cases where Leinster Bay Estate was not listed by name, we were able to piece together a reliable list of the owners. The tax records additionally provided the amount of enslaved people on the estates, type of crops, and number of free people. From 1739 till 1755 there are no records available about the owners of the island.

After establishing the ownership of the estate, by using the tax records, a much wider search was conducted. The broader search was used to find the minor cases involving the Leinster Bay Estate. The focus of this search was among others: the police records and in- and outgoing messages to the local government. This approach was used on the basis of the research subjects being the estate's enslaved population.

Another source used was the illustrative depictions of Leinster Bay. These consisted of two different contemporary accounts and one modern. The contemporary being Lieutenant Peter Lotharius Oxholm's map from 1780 of St. John and the other the sketches made by a Henry Morton in 1843/1844 of Leinster Bay Estate and guardhouse and the modern depiction being the map made by Wraae & Veisegaard in their NPS intern report from 2009.

The modern map from 2009 lists the owners along the north shore before the gap between 1739 and 1755. By placing this map against the current knowledge of where the Leinster Bay Estate was, it is possible to produce an owner list before the gap. The Oxholm map provided another type of useful information on the estate. It gives one of the best accounts of what the island looked like in the late eighteenth century.



(The modern map by Wrae & Weisegaard²)

In 1778 Oxholm was given orders to survey all three Danish West Indian islands to gather detailed information about defense against possible attacks by other nations or privateers. Oxholm was to document and evaluate the islands' fortifications. The result of his work was the detailed map of St. John, finished in 1780. Oxholm marked larger properties on the island, but did not mark

² The plot 5 was Leinster Bay Estate; the plot 6 and 7 later got incorporated to the Leinster Bay Estate.

property boundaries, as this would have been a near impossible task, requiring too much time and clearing of bush and had no impact on defensive strategies. Because of that, there consist no general idea of where one estate ends and others begin on his map.³ Nevertheless the Oxholm map provides an overview over the entire island, where the Morton Sketches provide a more artistic account of how the estate looked at the time from the seaside, for instance is the hillside marked as living quarter of the enslaved.

The Oxholm map was used in the field work. One of the markings on his map in the Leinster Bay Estate area had never been identified during the National Park Service's management of the Park and therefore some of the fieldwork consisted of trying to locate this place. With the help of the GPS-system and Garmin, we set out to investigate the area Oxholm had marked. This survey did not lead to any structures and we therefore decided to continue our search further east of the place Oxholm had mapped, as there was a possibility his marking could have been slightly inaccurate. This would also have been a remote place back in 1780, and he might not have visited the place himself, but marked it according to information provided by others. That would explain some slight inaccuracies. We took our search to the top of another hill crest, today named Leinster Hill as it was a likely place for an early 1800 century planter to have built a house, overlooking the area/island along the north shore to both sides. The change of survey area gave results as a ruin site was found.

Another part of the fieldwork was the identification of all the ruins at Leinster Bay, mainly the enslaved housing, and the surface collections. All the surface collections were done in the areas around the newly identified ruins, with the purpose of dating the time of inhabitation because surface collections can provide additional information about the timeframe of when the buildings were used and the residential pattern. This can be beneficial in a circumstance where an archival source do not state construction date of buildings or in the case where the sources are not available.⁴

³ Eleanor Gibney, David Knight, Bruce Schoonover and Robin Swank , *St. John: Life In Five Quarters*, 2010, p. 117.

⁴ The probates could not be accessed because of their fragile state.

The history of the estate

This chapter will attempt to establish the social and economic history of the estate, mapping the expansions that took place, the changes of ownership and the overall composition of the enslaved population in relation to the changes that occurred. External factors that influenced the daily life on the estate will be included as well, to give an overview of what events had consequences for the enslaved population at the Leinster Bay Estate.

In order to understand the significance of the Leinster Bay Estate and the reasons behind the many attempts at escape involving the enslaved population of this place, it is important first of all to clarify the changes the estate underwent during the eighteenth and nineteenth century. From being an uncultivated plot of land, obtained by one of the early settlers on the island, who could afford only a few un-free workers, the estate expanded, accumulated a vast number of enslaved workers, to become one of St. John's largest sugar producing plantations. This expansion had consequences; not only did it entail a huge investment for the owner, but it also affected the living conditions of the enslaved workers. Where the owners sought to protect their investment and maximize their profit, the enslaved workers sought instead to improve their general living conditions, by any means they could. In some cases their growing numbers proved to be an advantage to them, in other cases it meant extensive attempts to try and suppress and control them by the overseers and owners of the estate. The expansion of the production and growing numbers of enslaved workers on the estate, as well as the consequences that followed, is the focus of this chapter.

Water Lemon Estate

Jan Loison was the first owner of the plot of land that was in the eighteenth century referred to as Water Lemon Bay, later to become the Leinster Bay Estate. It was situated in an area of the island called the Maho Bay Quarter. It cannot be established for certain when Loison arrived to St. John and obtained his land letter, which gave him the right to own and cultivate land, as no land lists, recording the ownership and sizes of the various plots of land, were made until 1728. This lack of recording was partially due to the fact that planters were exempt from paying property tax for the first 7 years after settling on the island,

and partially because the West Indian and Guinea Company did not manage to complete the measuring and recording of all plots of land on the island until 1728.⁵

However, from the land list of 1728 it appears that the plot purchased by Loison was by then in the possession of his widow, Mariana, but that the land letter for the plot itself was obtained already in 1721. So it can be surmised that Jan Loison arrived on St. John around 1721. He was an inhabitant of the island in 1722, for certain, where he was recorded as one of the 39 white planters to have taken up land on the island. He was also recorded to be a French refugee, which establishes his nationality and possibly his religious beliefs.⁶

This last bit of information is not surprising, since the Danish West Indies were considered a safe haven for those religiously persecuted. After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 many Huguenots fled the French islands to St. Thomas.⁷ It is likely that Jan Loison was one of these religious outcasts. Out of 39 planters on St. John in 1720-1721 only 9 were Danes, 5 French Huguenots and the rest mostly Dutchmen. They came to obtain land on the island because of hopeless debts, unprofitable plantations on St. Thomas or to expand their landownership and invest money in new plantations. There were great opportunities for large production here, as the plot-size on St. John was nearly 50 per cent larger than the ones on St. Thomas,⁸

When Loison obtained his plot of land, he would have done as all other planters did, when taking up a piece of land for cultivation on the island. He had first to put his enslaved workers to clear the ground from vegetation, to make room for growing food provisions. How many enslaved workers Loison brought with him to St. John was nowhere recorded, neither was his intended purpose for purchasing Water Lemon Estate. Therefore it remains unclear what crop he planted, whether sugar cane or cotton, or what buildings he had built on the property. Sugar cultivation was the crop the Danish West India and Guinea Company intended all new land owners on St. John to engage in, but as this was

⁵ Kay Larsen, *Document relating to the early settlement of St. John, Danish West Indies 1718-1730*, V.I.N. Park Library, Cruz Bay, St. John, 1989. p.13.

⁶ Larsen, *Document*, 1989. p.8.

⁷ David W. Knight, *Understanding Annaberg. A Brief History of Estate Annaberg on St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands. With A Closer Look at the Annaberg Factory Complex and How Sugar Was Made*, Little Northside Press, 2002. p.3.

⁸ Waldemar Westergaard, *Danish West Indies under Company Rule 1671-1754*, New York: Macmillan, 1917. p. 129.

a type of production both very costly and difficult to start up, many new planters with few resources took up cotton cultivation instead as this was better suited for new settlers' purses, as it required less capital.⁹

Jan Loison died before his Water Lemon property could have begun to yield much of a profit. His wife, Mariana, inherited the estate after his death, though no official letter of transfer of the property to her ownership exists. This is likely also due to the lack of recording during the first decades of the colonization of St. John. That Jan Loison died some time before the summer of 1727 can be established for certain, given a note made in the evangelic church's record of 1727. Here was notated that a Lieutenant named Pieter Frøeling and his wife, a Madame Mariana Thomas, widow after Jan Loison, were wed on August 5 and for the service they paid 10 Rix dollars to the Company coffer. That she was in all honesty a widow was confirmed by a witness in the absence of a probate record. That the groom was a Lieutenant of the Island St. John was confirmed according to the protocol.¹⁰

In the first land list, of 1728, Mariana Loison was listed as the owner of plot nr. 79, in the Maho Bay Quarter, which was the Water Lemon plot her late husband obtained, while her new husband, Pieter Frøeling, was listed as the owner of another plot, nr. 70, in the Coral Bay Quarter. By marriage he became the owner of both plots of land.¹¹

This Lieutenant Pieter Frøeling appears to have been a man well on his way to making a position for himself. He was the first owner of the Water Lemon Estate to have some significance in developing the estate. His name occur in more records from these early years of colonization of the island, perhaps due to the fact that he was a Danish officer, and therefore often corresponded with the St. Thomas government. From this correspondence it appears that he was promoted from Sergeant to Lieutenant in 1724, and at the same time appointed commanding officer of Fort Frederiksværn and the Water Battery in Coral Bay, leading a small garrison of 10 soldiers and 1 junior officer.¹²

⁹ Jens Vibæk: "Dansk Vestindien 1755-1848 – Vestindiens Storhedstid". Vol.2. In: *Vore gamle tropekolonier*. Johannes Brønsted (ed.) Fremad, Denmark, 1966. p.125.

¹⁰ RA, Kol: Evangel, 1691-1795. Skt. Th. & Jan. https://www4.sa.dk/content/dk/ao-forside/find_kirkeboger?# Kirkebøger, Opslag 56, 1727-08-05, p.113.

¹¹ RA, VGK, 750. Bogholderen for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan. *Landlister for St. Jan*, 1728.

¹² RA, VGK, 516. Guvernemetet for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan. *Ordrebøger*, 1724-11-29, ordre nr.34.

He obtained his land letter for the plot in the Coral Bay Quarter in 1725, the year after his appointment as commanding officer of the fort. When he became the owner of Mariana Loison's Water Lemon Estate across the island from Coral Bay in 1727, upon their union, he became a busy man. With two plots of land to manage and cultivate along with his duties as the commanding officer at the Fort, Fröeling was fully occupied. According to the land lists he and his wife lived with a daughter at the Water Lemon Estate, along with 9 enslaved workers in 1728. The crop was listed as sugar. An overseer was recorded as working on the plantation, which was common practice. On his plantation in Coral Bay Fröeling grew a little cotton, with only 2 enslaved listed as his workforce. This was a modest property, whereas the Water Lemon property was a unit of great size, situated in one of the quarters of the island, where the soil was considered best for sugar cultivation.¹³

Fröeling appears to have had ambitions to become a profitable planter, but with its modest workforce, his Water Lemon was quite a small undertaking in 1728, despite its size. A plantation and its growth were to be measured in the number of inhabitants occupying the unit, not merely by the size of the actual land. So the Water Lemon Estate's potential to become a large production depended on Fröeling's ability to purchase more enslaved workers to expand his sugar cultivation.¹⁴

While his plantation in Coral Bay seem to have been stagnating, with never more than 2 enslaved workers recorded living there at any time, Fröeling did his best to expand the production at his the Water Lemon Estate. In 1729 he bought two busal workers from the Company. The year after, another enslaved worker was listed at his Water Lemon property, giving him a total workforce of 12.¹⁵ In 1731, 19 enslaved workers were recorded as belonging to this property. Fröeling appears to have been expanding his production as fast as he could, but as most of the enslaved listed on the property were children under the age of 15, he clearly did not have the capital to buy full grown men, who would have provided more labor strength. Enslaved children would have been a lesser

¹³ RA, VGK, 750. Bogholderen for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan. *Landlister for St. Jan*, 1728.

¹⁴ Georg, F. Tyson, *A History of Land Use on St. John 1718-1950*, (Preliminary Report). Prepared for the Virgin Islands National Park Service, 1984. p.18.

¹⁵ RA, VGK, 750. Bogholderen for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan. *Landlister for St. Jan*, 1729.

investment, as they both cost less to purchase and were taxed less because of their reduced work-value.¹⁶

The total number of plantations on St. John grew rapidly during the first years of the colonization of the island, and the number of enslaved workers increased simultaneously; from 39 plots in 1720-21, to 87 plantations in 1728, listing a total sum of 677 enslaved workers. The number then expanded to 109 plantations in 1733 with 1087 enslaved workers listed. The number of white inhabitants did not grow as fast as the enslaved workforce, as the number of enslaved workers imported from Africa by far exceeded the number of white Europeans who chose to take up residence on the island. Many planters were in addition wealthy enough to own several properties and therefore preferred to stay on St. Thomas, and employ a manager on their St. John plantation.¹⁷

This was from the beginning a concern to the St. Thomas government, who had issued an ordinance on March 24, 1718, when colonization of St. John was first undertaken, ordering all planters to ensure at least one white man was present on each plantation in order to control and ensure order among the enslaved workforce.¹⁸

The land lists show that Pieter Fröeling obliged this command and engaged an overseer for his Water Lemon Estate, which appears to have also overseen his Coral Bay Estate, traveling back and forth across the island between the two places. A command Fröeling did not follow, that had more severe consequence, was the Governor's command that he, as the commanding officer of the island's soldiers, should arrange a maroon hunt for all the run-away enslaved.¹⁹

Prior to 1733 run-aways had become a serious problem on St. John, not only because it diminished the plantations' workforce, but also because it caused unrest and worry amongst the white inhabitants of the island, who were well aware that they were outnumbered 1 to 5 by the enslaved population. Attempts were made to prevent the enslaved population from realizing the danger they posed to the white population, should they decide to combine their numbers to resist their enslavement. The rule of having one white person present on each estate was one measure to try and prevent rebellion. Governor Gardelin's slave

¹⁶ RA, VGK, 750. Bogholderen for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan. *Landlister for St. Jan*, 1731.

¹⁷ Westergaard, *Danish West Indies*, 1917. p. 165-166.

¹⁸ Westergaard, *Danish West Indies*, 1917. p. 129.

¹⁹ J. O. Bro-Jørgensen: "Dansk Vestindien indtil 1755 – kolonisation og kompagnistyre." Vol.1. In: *Vore gamle tropekolonier*. Johannes Brøndsted (ed.). Fremad, Denmark, 1966. p.229.

code published in 1733 was another. This reflected the fear of the white population of their enslaved workforce. Much of this code dealt with slaves running away from their white owners. The code established the punishment for this offence according to the duration of the enslaved person's marronage, ranging from torture and a death sentence as the harshest punishment, to a sentence of 150 lashes of the whip and the amputation of ears or limbs as one of the more lenient punishments. The overall intent of Gardelin's code was to intimidate the enslaved population to serve their white masters respectfully and keep them from attempting marronage or any other forms of disobedience. Most important was that the code established what was considered the enslaved population's obligations to their masters, without giving one single right for them in return.²⁰

The slave code has later been blamed as the final straw that caused the rebellion in 1733 to break out. Two hurricanes followed by drought and a plague of insects had ruined the food supply grown on the estates, causing the enslaved population to starve since their white owners in most cases did not supply them with food-allowances in place of the ruined crop. Many had chosen to run away and hide in the forested hills on the island, where they had some chance of harvesting food for themselves while remaining hidden, rather than to stay on their owner's estate and starve, while forced to work long hours.²¹ Gardelin's code was an attempt to control the enslaved population by intimidating them with threats of harsh punishments, but was seen as provocation that pushed the conspirators behind the rebellion to take action.²²

The slave rebellion broke out on November 23, 1733. Pieter Frøeling had the good fortune not to be present at Fort Frederiksværn in Coral Bay, as all the soldiers here except one was killed by the rebels. Instead Frøeling was at home on his Water Lemon Estate. From here he learned of the rebellion and managed to escape with his wife and child in a canoe to Tortola. Two days later he made his way to St. Thomas, where he was arrested and accused of neglecting his duty by not being present at his post at the Fort when the rebellion started and for not making any attempts to stay and try to fight the rebels.²³ He spent 3 months

²⁰ Neville T. Hall, "Slave Laws in the Danish Virgin Islands in the Later Eighteenth Century", in: *Annales of the New York Academy of Science*, Vol. 292, New York, 1977. p. 174-175.

²¹ Bro-Jørgensen, *Vore gamle tropekolonier*, 1966. p. 226-229.

²² J. E. Petersen, *Slaveoprøret på St. Jan 1733*, 1988. p. 67.

²³ RA, VGK, 516. Guvernemetet for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan. *Ordrebøger*, 1733-11-30.

in prison, but due to illness and lack of witnesses to his neglect of duty he was released.²⁴ In April 1734 he was sent back to St. John as the leading officer of a small group of soldiers, who were to assist the French troops, which were by then engaged by the Danish authorities to fight the rebels.²⁵

When the last of the rebellion was overcome and control of the island had been fully restored to the Danish authorities a list of all the enslaved partaking in the rebellion was made. On this list figured no less than four enslaved persons belonging to Pieter Frøeling.²⁶ As he had only two enslaved workers listed on his Coral Bay plantation in 1733, prior to the rebellion, at least two of these supposed rebels must have come from his Water Lemon Estate. There is good reason to believe that these two were the slaves Frøeling had purchased in 1729, as it was later discovered, that the enslaved functioning as the leaders of the rebellion were mostly newly arrived enslaved from Africa.²⁷ As most of the remaining enslaved people on Water Lemon Estate were children, at the time of the rebellion, this would likely have prevented them from partaking actively in the rebellion.

What happened to these enslaved children during or after the rebellion remains uncertain. A consequence of the rebellion was that no Land List was made in 1734, and the planters appear to have been exempted from taxes the following year, in 1735, due to the financial hardship they suffered from the damages done by the rebels, as well as the lack of enslaved workers to repair and continue production.²⁸

Pieter Frøeling's name next occurs in the land list of 1736, where he was still listed as the owner of Water Lemon Estate as well as the Estate in the Coral Bay Quarter, and he was still recorded with the title of Lieutenant. His enslaved workforce in 1736 was greatly reduced, though, to 2 capables and 1 macaroon at his Water Lemon property. For his Coral Bay property there was listed no enslaved workers for that tax year. The following year, 1737, Frøeling's Coral Bay property was recorded as taken over by the Commander Sheriff, and an auction was held here for the sale of 7 enslaved workers belonging to the estate, sold to various buyers. Possibly these 7 enslaved were the total workforce of

²⁴ RA, VGK, 99. Direktionen. *Breve og dokumenter*, 1733-07- 23.

²⁵ RA, VGK, 516. Guvernemetet for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan. *Ordrebøger*, 1734-04- 24.

²⁶ RA, VGK, 99. Direktionen. *Breve og dokumenter*, 1734-02-20.

²⁷ Petersen, *Slaveoprøret på St. Jan 1733*, 1988. p. 64,71.

²⁸ Petersen, *Slaveoprøret på St. Jan 1733*, 1988. p. 77.

Fröeling's two properties. He was no longer listed as Lieutenant, so he had either been dismissed from service or had resigned. In the Land List of 1738 it was recorded that Pieter Fröeling had sold his Water Lemon property to a Pieter Duurloo on November 30, 1739, who was to take over ownership of the estate in 1740. The crop grown on the property was by then changed from sugar to cotton.²⁹

There the records of Pieter Fröeling ends; which leaves reason to assume that his time as a planter on St. John came to an end due to debt, since his enslaved workers were sold at an auction and his smaller property in Coral Bay taken over by a new official. The small number of enslaved workers and the change to cotton production prior to this reveal that Fröeling's finances were suffering after the rebellion, since he apparently gave up all attempts at continuing the expansion of his estate and sugar production. This corresponds with another archival source, an assessment of the conditions of the estates on St. John after the rebellion. Here it was noted that Pieter Fröeling's Water Lemon property had suffered severe damage. His boiling house, a dwelling house, and his mill had all been burned down.³⁰ This would have put an end to all sugar production on the estate for the time being, which explains the change to cotton production. Where Pieter Fröeling and his family went after selling the Water Lemon Estate remains unclear.

However, when tracing Fröeling's history as owner of the estate, one cannot help but to be stricken by the irony of the fact that Fröeling and his wife, being white landowners during the era of slavery in the Danish West Indies, managed to save their lives by escaping by boat to the British island of Tortola. This was the same route of escape many enslaved worker of the later Leinster Bay Estate turned to a century later, but for very different reasons. What were significant about Fröeling's time as owner of the Water Lemon Estate were not his achievements as a planter, which seems to have been that of a typical early settler. Rather it was the attempts of his enslaved workers to resist their enslavement by whatever means geography and circumstances offered them. Marronage and rebellion proved not to be the end of their enslavement in 1733, but this did not mean that the enslaved inhabitants of the estate ceased their

²⁹ RA, VGK, 751-753. Bogholderen for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan. *Landlister for St. Jan*, 1739.

³⁰ RA, VGK, 1.29.1. Samlepakke 1. *Conditions of the estates*, 1734.

attempts to gain freedom and resist the suppressing treatment of their white owners.

Smith Bay

From 1739 onwards there are no records of the Water Lemon Estate until 1755, when the Danish Crown took over government of the West Indian Islands from the West India and Guinea Company. When the Water Lemon Estate was next listed it was in the tax records of 1755. Here the estate appears to have grown. From its original size in 1728 measured to a width of 1500 feet, the estate was now measured to a width of 3650 feet.³¹ At some point during the missing records of tax years the estate had been expanded, possibly adding the plot right next to it to its total size. As the Water Lemon Estate grew from a width of 1500 feet to a width of 3650 feet sometime during the gap in tax records, it is reasonable to assume, that a plot with the width of 2150 feet was added to the property. Such a plot did exist, prior to the gap in the tax records. It belonged to Cornelius Stallard's heirs and was situated next to the Water Lemon Estate, which can be seen on the map of plots (page 9). As this area was by 1769, according to an assessment done by a later owner, Thomas Smith, part of the Water Lemon property, it can be concluded that this was the land added to the estate somewhere between 1739 and 1755.³² From 1755 until 1764 various men owned the estate for brief periods of time, keeping the number of enslaved workers at a modest level, despite this added land.³³

The next owner of the Water Lemon Estate whose ownership left traces of importance was Thomas Smith. Very little is known about his life other than that he was a St. Thomas planter. What makes Thomas Smith's ownership important was that he immediately after purchasing the Water Lemon property in 1765 set out to expand the number of enslaved workers. The previous owner, Jens Rasmussen, had 28 enslaved inhabitants listed for the property in 1764, hereof 15 capable workers³⁴. In 1765, the year Thomas Smith bought the estate,

³¹ The early Land Lists' and later tax records' way of measuring the estate by 3 sides presents some difficulties when attempting to establish the exact size of the estate. However, the expansion becomes clear when studying the following assessment of the property done in 1769.

³² RA, VGK, 751-753. Bogholderen for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan. *Landlister for St. Jan*, 1739.

³³ RA, RRVR, 83.1. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1755.

³⁴ RA, RRVR, 83.2. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1764.

he had 39 enslaved listed, hereof 23 capable workers.³⁵ Three years later, in 1768, he had expanded this to 30 capable workers.³⁶

Clearly, Thomas Smith had both the intention and the means to expand the production on the estate. The crop had since 1755 been listed once again as sugar, and this was also the crop which Thomas Smith chose to concentrate on. From an assessment Smith requested to be done of the property in 1769, July 15, some idea of the size and value of the property at the time can be established. The estate at that time was still named as Water Lemon Bay and consisted of two full sugar plantations, as seen from the expansion of the property in the tax records. These plantations were situated between the estate of James Hoorn in the East and the Sirs Schmalz and Baron of Schimmelmann in the West, in the Maho Bay district, with the sea on the north side. 50 acres was at that time cultivated with sugar, 50 acres used for provisions, stock and supply. The buildings at that time consisted of a boiling house, 40 feet long and 24 feet wide, containing 3 copper sugar kettles and all the tools necessary to cook the sugar, a horse drawn sugar mill, a still for 120 gallons, a trade house distillery with liquor barrels, a warehouse/storehouse 28 feet long and 14 feet wide, 12 cabins for the enslaved workers, and a residence 40 feet long and 20 feet wide.³⁷

Whether all of these buildings existed prior to Thomas Smith's purchase of the property, the records do not show, but it is reasonable to assume that Smith would have requested the assessment because he had new buildings made for the property, which would have added to its value since his purchase. While it remains unclear what he had built to add to the property value, it is certain that he continued to expand the number of enslaved workers on the estate. In 1773 he furthermore expanded his property by purchasing the small neighboring estate, then owned by the widow of James Hoorn³⁸. With this property came only 5 enslaved workers, but as Smith continued to purchase enslaved workers for the three, now conglomerated, properties he had a total workforce of over a 100 un-free people at his death in 1781 to work his 325 acres of land.³⁹

³⁵ RA, RRVr, 83.2. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1765.

³⁶ RA, RRVr, 83.2. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1768.

³⁷ Information from papers made available by Chuck Pishko, translated by D. Steenberger Jr.

³⁸ RA, RRVr, 83.3. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1773.

³⁹ RA, RRVr, 83.3. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1781.

This made his estate well above average sized for St. John, and of equal proportions with estates on St. Croix. In 1758 the Danish official Reimert Haagensen had estimated that a standard sugar plantation of about 148 acres would need 48 grown workers to carry out the production. With 325 acres of land, whereof only a small portion cultivated for sugarcane, the rest used for provision and grass, a workforce of a 100 seems to have been reasonable.⁴⁰

Smith's death in 1781, however, had consequences for the enslaved population, as the number of un-free workers was greatly reduced the years following his death, when the property came into the ownership of his heirs. From over a 100 un-free workers in 1781 the number was by 1784 reduced to 62. Possibly, many of the enslaved were sold to pay off debt, as they represented a great part of the property's overall value. This of course would have meant an extra workload for the remaining enslaved, if the same acreage of land was to be cultivated.⁴¹

What is also disconcerting is that where the tax record of 1783 lists 24 half grown enslaved on the property, the record of 1784 lists none in this category. It seems unlikely that all 24 of the half grown enslaved would have reach maturity a year later, which gives reason to believe that many of them were amongst the enslaved sold from the plantation. The number of full grown enslaved was reduced from 86 in 1783 to 59 in 1784. As it was common practice to allow enslaved mothers to keep their children with them until these had reached a certain age, it seems possible that the enslaved sold from the plantation in 1783 were women and small children, leaving mostly grown men as the workforce. The very small number of children under 1 year of age in the records from 1783 to 1792 supports this hypothesis, as very few un-free women on the estate would have resulted in very few childbirths. However, this cannot be established for certain, given the limited information from the tax record. The reduction in the enslaved population on the estate can have been due to death, but the scale of the reduction in numbers speaks against this.⁴²

Whatever the reason for the reduction in enslaved workers on the estate, this seemed to have been reversed slowly the following years as the number grew to about a 100 un-free workers. This could possibly be related to the ban on slave

⁴⁰ Ove Hornby, *Kolonierne i Vestindien*, Politikens Forlag, København, 1980. p. 130.

⁴¹ RA, RRVr, 83.3. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1784.

⁴² RA, RRVr, 83.3.-83.4-83.9. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1783-1792.

trade, which was passed in March 1792 and was to come into effect in 1803 after a 10 year transitional period.⁴³ This would have had an effect on the lives of the enslaved population at the Water Lemon Estate as the transitional period allowed the planters time to buy new enslaved workers, to ensure they had sufficient labor strength, which could reproduce itself when the trade ban came into effect.⁴⁴

For the enslaved population to be able to naturally increase their numbers after 1803, the ratio of women to men had to be equalized to establish better condition for natural reproduction. Previously, grown men had been preferred as workforce as they were physically stronger and could be put to harder work, but the Danish colonial administration encouraged the import of enslaved women from Africa by exempting these from import tariffs and the planters from paying tax on enslaved women from 1795. Instead, the tax on the enslaved men was raised to the double amount.⁴⁵

The effect this had on the Water Lemon Estate can be seen immediately; from the year 1793 the tax records started listing capable enslaved men and women separately. This provides a much clearer insight into the social composition of the enslaved population of the estate. It also shows that the issue of an unequal gender composition was not that pronounced on the estate, as there were 44 enslaved women and girls to 47 men and boys. If the large number of enslaved sold from the estate in 1783, as mentioned, were in fact women and children, then the workforce had since then been reinforced with more enslaved women, to balance out the gender composition.⁴⁶

In 1795, Thomas Smith's heirs sold the estate and the task of maintaining a stabile workforce fell to the next owner. The estate was never officially renamed during the Smiths' years of ownership, but it was listed one year in the tax records as Smith Bay. Later the place was by some also referred to by this name, which testifies to the impression the Smith family left on the estate during their many years of ownership.⁴⁷

⁴³ The Danish ban on slave trade did not in reality come into effect though until 1808, as the planters pushed for it post-ponance.

⁴⁴ Karen Fog Olwig, *Cultural Adaptation and Resistance on St. John: Three Centuries of Afro-Caribbean Life*, Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1985. p.28-29.

⁴⁵ Vibæk, *Vore gamle tropekolonier*, 1966. p. 179-180.

⁴⁶ RA, RRV, 83.4-83.9. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1793.

⁴⁷ RA, RRV, 83.4-83.9. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1795.

Leinster Bay Estate

There exists a great deal of information about the next owner of the estate, James E. Murphy, who was one of the most significant planters on St. John around the turn of the nineteenth century. He bought the Water Lemon Estate in 1795 and the year after he purchased all shares in the neighboring estate, Annaberg, which, at that time, had grown from the original 1718 plot to encompass the plantations Mary's Point and Betty's Hope also. Murphy renamed the Water Lemon Estate Leinster Bay, after his Irish ancestral province. He then began building a new sugar factory on the estate, immediately after taking over the property, and when Annaberg was purchased, he erected a new type of windmill here, after P. L. Oxholm's design. He also built a prominent great house on top of the hill overlooking Water Lemon Bay. In 1803 and 1807 he expanded his property again, by buying respectively the Munsbury plantation and the Brown Bay Estate. All combined, he was by then in possession of 530 acres of land on St. John, and had the largest production of sugar on the island with 662 enslaved workers, the largest workforce on the island at the time of his death in 1808.⁴⁸

Of course the huge investment in land and buildings would have meant little without enslaved workers to tend the sugar fields, mill and boiling house. With the end of the slave trade looming in the horizon, Murphy imported a vast number of busals to his Leinster Bay Estate. In 1799 alone, the place had an addition to its workforce of 40 busal men and 38 busal women.⁴⁹ It appears that Murphy attempted to balance the gender composition of his enslaved workforce, but in 1802 when the transatlantic slave trade was supposed to end for the Danish West Indies, there had developed a considerable disproportion between enslaved men to women on the Leinster Bay Estate, with only 61 women to 96 men.⁵⁰

This would have had consequences, not only for the natural reproduction rate amongst the enslaved workers of the estate, which the owner was from 1803 to rely on to maintain his workforce, but also for the enslaved people's general living conditions. The treatment of the enslaved workers was taken up to consideration by the colonial administration, in order to find ways to ensure a

⁴⁸ Knight, *Understanding Annaberg*, 2002. p.12.

⁴⁹ RA, RRVF, 83.10-83.15. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1799.

⁵⁰ RA, RRVF, 83.10-83.15. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1802.

higher birth rate, and working conditions for pregnant women and new mothers were improved a little. If this applied also to the Leinster Bay Estate, remains uncertain. Births and deaths on the estate were not recorded in the years from 1803 to 1817, so there is no way of knowing what the natural reproduction rate looked like on the estate. For St. John in general, the mortality rate among the enslaved population exceeded the fertility rate between 1793 and 1802, with no numbers recorded again until 1834 to 1844. Here, surprisingly, the rate of natural increase was positive, at 0.4 percent annually.⁵¹

There would therefore have been good cause to improve the living conditions for the enslaved population after the slave trade ended. Many ad hoc ordinances regarding the enslaved rights and conditions had been made since Gardelin's 1733 slave code, but one of the more important ordinances, that appears to actually have been carried out, was first proclaimed in 1817. This ordinance made the owners responsible for giving their enslaved workers a set amount of food allowances weekly, to ensure their health. Whatever bettering of the enslaved people's lives or allowances of food and clothing given them before then, had been dependent on the will to do so by the estate owner and the overseers.⁵²

James E. Murphy was not just another absentee planter, but preferred to residence on his impressive Leinster Bay property where he had concentrated his production. This had some influence on the daily lives of his enslaved workers. Where there had previously been little reason to keep house servants, as the Smith family appeared to have taken residence on St. Thomas, from 1802, where the Great House at Leinster Bay presumably was finished, the number of enslaved people on the estate engaged in house and skilled work increased to about 30 persons and was kept at that level until James E. Murphy's death in 1808.⁵³

The type of work these people were put to would probably have meant at bettering of their general work load as house work was considered less strenuous than work in the sugar field and factory, with less risk of injuries. Training in any

⁵¹ Svend E. Green-Pedersen, "Slave demography in the Danish West Indian and the Abolition of the Danish slave Trade." Eds. David Eltis og James Walvins. *The Abolition of the Atlantic Slave Trade: Origins and Effects in Europe, Africa and the Americas*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1981. p. 245.

⁵² Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p. 30.

⁵³ RA, RRVVR, 83.16. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1803-1808.

type of skilled work would have raised the value of the enslaved workers, and in addition given them a craft that offered the opportunity of earning money on their own time, if their owner allowed them to work outside the estate on their days off.⁵⁴

Because all the estates owned by Murphy was situated closely together this would have had some influence on the social lives of the enslaved population as well. The skilled workers would likely have been put to work on other plantations than Leinster Bay, allowing them some measure of free mobility and social interaction. With a lower number of women than men on Leinster Bay Estate, the enslaved would likely have been allowed to seek husbands and wives on Murphy's neighboring estates. In 1806 a commission investigating the results of the transition period, listed the numbers of enslaved couples on each estate. This showed that there were 11 married- and 10 unmarried couples at Leinster Bay Estate, with 11 males known to be married to women on other estates. The number of females at Annaberg known to be married to men on other estates was, not surprisingly, 11.⁵⁵

However, if the lives of the enslaved people on the estate in general were improved during Murphy's ownership can be questioned. With multiple estates and several hundred enslaved workers to manage there would also have been more control of the enslaved population, to ensure order and efficiency. The tax records show that there was at all times two, sometimes three, overseers living on the Leinster Bay Estate.⁵⁶

The sugar empire James E. Murphy conglomerated did not last. After his death in 1808 the properties were again divided, the Munsbury plantation sold and the Brown Bay Estate given back to its former owner due to unresolved debt. His heirs, Mary Murphy Sheen and Edward C. Murphy, were left with the still sizable Annaberg and Leinster Bay Estates.⁵⁷

When Edward C. Murphy died, his widow Catharina inherited the Leinster Bay Estate. She remarried the prominent Norwegian official H.H. Berg who became the owner of the property in 1818. When Edward C. Murphy's sister, Mary Murphy Sheen died in 1827, Catharina inherited Annaberg as well, and the

⁵⁴ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p.36.

⁵⁵ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p.58-59.

⁵⁶ RA, RRV, 83.10-83.15.-83.16. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1797-1808.

⁵⁷ Knight, *Understanding Annaberg*, 2002. p.14.

two properties were once more conglomerated under Berg's ownership. He remained owner of the two estates until 1862, well after the emancipation.⁵⁸

After Edward C. Murphy's death the number of enslaved people on Leinster Bay Estate seems to have declined again, from 205 in 1817 to only 109 in 1818. Again this could be due to settling of debt once the estate was assessed. Another explanation for this could be that an incident with an abusive overseer in 1818 caused 47 enslaved people from the estate to refuse work and flee the estate, causing their absence from the tax records this year.⁵⁹ When Berg took over ownership, through his wife Catharina, the number of enslaved workers rose again, keeping the Leinster Bay Estate as one of the largest operations on St. John with an enslaved population amounting to almost a tenth of the total enslaved population on the island until the emancipation.⁶⁰

During Berg's ownership of the estate, new ordinances initiated by the colonial government were enforced to better the enslaved population's living condition. It is quite possible that Berg himself participated in making these ordinances, as he was part of the government council on St. Thomas as well as one of Governor General Peter von Scholten's supporters. He was the Sheriff on St. Thomas as well as counselor of justice, so he would have had some influence on the decisions made by the colonial government. At the same time, though, Berg was also a planter owning two of St. John's largest estates, so he had an interest in prolonging the institution of slavery as long as possible, which was the only way to turn a profit from these estates. This meant that he, like most other planters, spoke against Peter von Scholten's suggestions from 1833 regarding an eventual emancipation: *"I regard it highly doubtful that the Colonies could exist without system of slavery, and I am convinced that there is yet absolutely no need for such a change,..."*⁶¹ Such was Berg's response to von Scholten's suggestions.

Though Berg had no interest in emancipating his enslaved workers, the ordinances giving them new rights and allowances do appear to have been enforced on his estates. A Mr. Wallace, the estate manager on Leinster Bay and Annaberg, wrote in a letter from 1841, that the new ordinances giving the enslaved a small payment each week, along with an additional half day off were

⁵⁸ Knight, *Understanding Annaberg*, 2002. p.15-16.

⁵⁹ Olwig, *Cultural adaptation*, 1985. p. 35.

⁶⁰ RA, RRVR, 83.21-83.25. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1817-1818.

⁶¹ RA, GTK, 429. Generaltoldkammerets Kontor. *Forestillinger fra kommissionen*, bog 1, p.119-123.

being followed. Mr. Wallace, however, did not see the benefit of these new allowances; on the contrary, he warned that cost of enforcing them simply put too much strain on the economies of the estates:

*“The additional expenditures of a five stivers in the week and of a large quantity of cornmeal than formerly, the measure having been altered is a heavy burden on the Estate, and with bad crops and poor prices it will be impossible to continue.”*⁶²

So some measures of bettering the living conditions for the enslaved at Leinster Bay as well as Annaberg were taken. The purpose of these ordinances appears to have been to encourage the enslaved to work more and harder, which, in Mr. Wallace opinion, had not happened, quite the opposite.⁶³ More work, however, was needed from the enslaved. The profit from sugar production was fast dwindling by the 1840s, the soil became exhausted and the new rights allotted the enslaved were an added expense. So while Berg did have the ordinances of allowances enforced at his St. John estates, he in return demanded as much labor as possible from his enslaved workers, putting them under hard physical strain. This had consequences: Berg’s years of ownership was characterized by conflicts between free and enslaved on both his estates. More detailed sources exist from this period, in the police court records, so from 1818 and onwards one gets a better insight in the lives of the enslaved people at Leinster Bay. The increasing number of conflicts was the results of the enslaved populations’ continuous resistance to their enslavement, which never ceased, only changed according to what means of resistance were available to them. The increasing focus on the conditions of the enslaved, harshly criticized by spokesmen for the abolition of slavery, had an effect on both owners and enslaved.⁶⁴ The owners relied on their enslaved workforce and were well aware that stability and healthy workers would offer the best results, whereas the enslaved people became increasingly aware of their own value and rights as human beings. This led to an increase in cases brought before the island court in Cruz Bay by enslaved who claimed to have

⁶² RA, STSJG, 35.3.2. St. Jan Landfoged. *Kopier af/ koncepter til udgående skrivelser til Guvernementet/præsidentskab på St. Thomas*, 1841-07-05.

⁶³ RA, STSJG, 35.3.2 St. Jan Landfoged. *Kopier af/ koncepter til udgående skrivelser til Guvernementet/præsidentskab på St. Thomas*, 1841-07-05.

⁶⁴ William Chapman, ” Slave Villages in the Danish West Indies: Changes of the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries”, *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, Vol. 4. 1991. p. 117.

been mistreated and in return had stood up to their abusers. The chapter about the enslaved people, in this report, will look further into these conflicts.

In general, the Leinster Bay Estate appears to have been a typical sugar producing estate, following a pattern of development that was influenced by circumstances, economy and governmental laws. It grew to a greater size than most St. John estates, which meant that the enslaved population also increased. This became problematic, as the vast number of enslaved at the estate became harder to control in the nineteenth century, due to their growing sense of worth. What made the Leinster Bay Estate especially vulnerable to the enslaved population's resistance to their enslavement was its location. Close to Tortola, only separated by a short stretch of sea, this came significant in the 1830s when British emancipation became a reality.

The buildings and artifacts

The buildings and artifacts left on the estate show that this was at one time, one of the greater estates on St. John. What is left today is a factory site with various buildings, several housing quarters for the enslaved population, a grand greathouse, a smaller structure on another hilltop and a graveyard. However the most unusual feature to an estate complex can be found here: a guardhouse.



(Image showing the research area, original map from 1982 and provided from the NPS)

This chapter seeks to explore the different groupings of ruins to map the date of construction and use. For that purpose the various sites have been divided into 3 groups: Leinster hill site, Factory site and Guardhouse site. The Leinster Hill site consist of some much-deteriorated ruins, whose use is difficult to determine, the factory site consists of the enslaved populations housing and the factory site, with the main area of interest being the enslaved inhabitant's quarter. The guardhouse site include the guardhouse that is facing the bay, a kitchen building, and some enslaved housing further down the hill. The enslaved peoples housing probably belonged to the grand greathouse further up the hill. The graveyard and grand greathouse will not be discussed in this chapter because no artifacts were collected in those two areas, the constructor is known and the areas has no direct relation to the enslaved population of the estate.

The guardhouse and the enslaved population housing will be the main focus, because it was in these areas the surface collections was conducted, but also because these areas were directly related to the enslaved population. Furthermore, it relates to everyday life and in choices that were made and sometimes obstructed in these areas, due to the control the military exercised.

Considering the artifacts found at the surveys, they have a general manufacturing date around the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The oldest artifact found may have been from 1490, but that type of artifact has been produced up until 1900. The youngest piece found had a manufacturing date from 1820-1900. This in general aligns with the use of the compound in the period of time where the estate was operating as a plantation, with a workforce consisting of enslaved.

Ruins of older structures at Leinster Hill

During the onsite internship two factors indicated that the Leinster Bay Estate ruins were not the earliest structures to have been built at the estate. The relatively well preserved state of the Leinster Bay ruins, along with the unidentified markings on the Oxholm map from 1780, suggested the possibility of two earlier constructed buildings in the area that belonged to the Water Lemon Estate from 1773.⁶⁵



(Section of the Oxholm map from 1780, showing the Water Lemon area)

The previously unidentified buildings on Oxholm's map from 1780 are marked with the white arrow on the map above. The ruins located during the survey

⁶⁵ RA, RRVR, 83.3. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1773.

⁶⁶ Map from the National Park Service resources, map-folder.

were situated further to the right /southeast of this point. The modern aerial map below show where the ruins are situated in relation to Oxholm's markings.



(Modern aerial map of the Leinster Bay Estate area, St. John, North shore)⁶⁷

As a survey of the area led to the location of these structures, it has been attempted to establish their origin. Based on the limited information of the archival sources and an onsite surface collection of artifacts, no certain identification of the site can be made. Compared to the map of plots done by Wraae and Veisegaard in 2009 (page 9), the structures could have belonged to the Eason Estate, the earliest mentioned owner of the area until 1739, and have had no relation whatsoever to Water Lemon Estate or its owners before 1773, when part of the area was purchased by Thomas Smith from James Hoorn's widow⁶⁸.

Given the location of the ruin site, it appears a likely place for an early 1800 century planter to have built a house, overlooking the area along the north shore to both sides. A house located here would have been remote from the most travelled roads of the island, but at the same time at a position to have plenty of warning, should anyone unwelcome approach the house. Some of the first owners of the area, possibly Eason, could very likely have built a home here, possibly after the 1733 rebellion, at a time where a remote location was deemed safer than an easily accessible one. All that remains today of the buildings

⁶⁷ Modern aerial map of the Leinster Hill ruins made by Grant Gittus, NPS intern, 2015.

⁶⁸ RA, RRVR, 83.3. Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan. *Matrikler for St. Jan*, 1773.

constructed here are a wall of an old, large structure, possibly an early type of greathouse, and a smaller wall structure, possibly from a cookhouse or slave house.

The archival sources do not reveal why this place was abandoned. If the buildings on the hill top were in fact owned by one of the Water Lemon Estate owners before Oxholm made his map in 1780, it seems reasonable to imagine that the living quarters of owner, overseers and enslaved workers were at some point transferred to the site of the Water Lemon Factory, later Leinster Bay Factory. The very modest number of structures and artifacts found on the hill indicates that the place was not inhabited by a large number of people, nor was it likely to have been inhabited throughout the colonial period. As the sugar production on the Water Lemon Estate increased in 1765, with a growing number of enslaved workers, this remote site on the hill would not have been convenient for production, when Smith took over the area in 1773. He would have preferred the current factory site for his production, where the harvested sugar canes could easily be transported to the mill and the raw sugar from here transported by road or boat to its place of shipment.

In a surface collection, several pieces of pipe stems were found at the hill top ruins, all dateable within a timeframe from 1680 to 1750, and one from 1750 to 1800. Some pieces of porcelain and an olive jar base was also found here, all with a dating-range too broad to give any accurate indication of when these pieces were used here, but all could be from the beginning of the colonization of the island. The dating of the pipe stems are the best indicators to support the hypothesis that the structures on the hill were made by some of the earlier owners of the area, which could only have been the first owner, Eason, or James Hoorn after him.⁶⁹

The surface collection at the site yielded very little diagnostic materials. This is probably due to the fact that there was no financial prosperity until after 1750, population numbers were small on these sites before 1750, and the early estate owners would likely have had limited access to commodities.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ List of the estate owners and table of number of enslaved at the estate compared to St. John's total enslaved population in appendix nr. 1.

⁷⁰ Kenneth Jr. Wild, *A problematic approach to ceramic dating of historic plantations on St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands*, unpublished thesis (submitted to the Department of Anthropology at Florida State University of Arts and Sciences). 1988.

Given that the area, where the hill top ruins are located, was first conglomerated with the Water Lemon Estate in 1773 and the fact that Smith's assessment of his property from 1769 do not mention these structures, it is certain that they were not part of the Water Lemon Estate before 1773. As mentioned, the remote locate of these structures would have given Smith little reason to continue to make use of them, after they became part of his property. His expansion of his enslaved workforce indicates an intensification of the sugar production in this time period, which would have been inconvenient if the production buildings and enslaved workers' houses were placed far from the factory. So it is reasonable to assume that the hill top buildings were simply abandoned when they came into Smith's ownership. As for a possible construction date for these buildings, sometime before 1750 seems most likely, if taking the dating of the majority of pipe stems into account.⁷¹

The factory site

This site has been used over a long period of time, possibly from Jens Rasmussen in 1755 up until the twentieth century. Buildings were added over the years, during the different owners. The factory with horse mill and boiling house existed in 1769 according to Smith's assessment of the property. The water tower was possibly built by Murphy when the estate was conglomerated with the Annaberg Estate, as it does not figure on Smith's list of buildings. That Murphy built a new factory to replace the old is also certain. From an assessment done after Edward C. Murphy's death in 1818, July 20, there is some information of what the estate consisted of at that time:

*“150 acres of cane, 25 acres of provision, 150 acres of pasture and woodland
A Boiling House, a Still House, a (...) House and Cellar under one Roof
Cattle Mill complete
Stills with (wells) and Cisterns
Mo(lasses) House
(Oven) room, a (...) House a one Store under one Roof
Mule Pen
A Dwelling House at the Hill
A Kitchen, Negro Rooms etc.*

⁷¹ List of artifacts found at the Leinster Hill ruin site in appendix nr. 2.

A Manager House.
A draw Mill with Wheel.
A Smith's Shop and Lumber House.
*72 Negro Houses*⁷²

From this list of buildings it becomes clear that the Leinster Bay Estate had by 1818 in truth become a factory, with all the necessary equipment to maintain a large production of not only sugar, but also rum, as the listing of a still house indicates. All these buildings amounted to an enormous value, an investment that relied solely on the unpaid labor of the enslaved to yield a profit.⁷³

Slave villages and living conditions

As can be surmised from the above assessment list, the Leinster Bay Estate was a sizable production site in 1818. It listed no less than 72 houses for its enslaved workers, which for the 109 enslaved workers listed as belonging to the estate at the time would have meant at least one house per family. This seemed to have been the standard housing situation on St. John according to appraisals done in the 1830s and 1840s, where the average number of enslaved persons per house was from 1.9 to 3.0.⁷⁴

Several ruins that have possibly been used for housing for the enslaved at the Leinster Bay Estate can still be found in three different locations on the ruin site of the estate today. The assumption of their former use as quarters for the enslaved is based on four factors: their modest size, the artifacts gathered during the surface collections, the deterioration of the structures, and their situation in convenient nearness to the estate factory, where the inhabitants of the houses would have worked. The reason why so little remained of the structures is possibly due to the fact that less durable material were used for their construction, than for the production buildings and residences for the free, white inhabitants of the estate.

The construction and placing of the enslaved people's houses were decided upon by their owners and overseers, though the work of building these houses

⁷² RA, STSJG, 35.38.1. St. Jans Landfoged. *Registrerings og vurderings protokoller, sessions og testamenteprotokol*. No.128, 1818-07-20.

⁷³ Plan for the Leinster Bay factory can be seen in appendix 3.

⁷⁴ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p.69.

would have been left for the enslaved themselves. From the onsite survey it also appears that their houses were placed in line, ordered after European construction standards. According to an architectural study of colonial building methods this seemed to have always been the practice: *"A typical sugar estate (...) had as many as fifty to sixty houses, all arranged in rows. Those on 'the English plantations' were especially 'neat and trim'."*⁷⁵ This construction standard would have made the enslaved people's housing very uniform, and was possibly another way for the owner to enforce some kind of control of the enslaved. Certainly, they were not allowed to construct their houses where they pleased, but were likely allotted specific areas where they could most easily be supervised.

Architectural changes occurred in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century building methods, which had some effects on the enslaved population's living conditions. Up until the late eighteenth century cottages for the enslaved people were wattle-and-daub structures, impermanent and consisting typically of a single room. Inspiration from new European architectural ideas and building techniques led to the introduction of a more permanent building type, with masonry foundation and walls, and in some cases several rooms.⁷⁶ Masonry was used much earlier for the white population's residences, along with storage and production buildings, to ensure sturdy, cool and spacious buildings, while the enslaved population had to make do with cottages with dirt floor, build from less expensive materials, with less time given to the construction.

As the earlier type of buildings used for the enslaved population was of less durable material and design, the knowledge of what these structures looked like is based on written sources describing their features. The German Moravian missionary traveler C.G.A. Oldendorph wrote an account, in 1777, of the typical look of slave villages, from his visits to the Danish West Indian islands in 1767-1769. From his description a typical building was

"...constructed with four corner stakes driven into the ground. These were forked on the ends to receive "horizontal boards," on which rested pole rafters "which came together in a crest" to form the roof. Further vertical stakes were driven between the posts and "branches woven among these." The whole was plastered with mud and cow dung and covered with a further coat of lime plaster. Floors were unfinished earth, and roofs were covered usually with

⁷⁵ Chapman, *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, 1991. p. 110.

⁷⁶ Chapman, *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, 1991.p. 108.

sugarcane leaves. There were in most cases several small windows and a single door."⁷⁷

As slavery became increasingly criticized in the 1780s and 1790s, resulting in the Danish abolition of the slave trade in 1803, the need to ensure the enslaved population's natural increase turned the focus to the connection between housing conditions and health problems. Following this the Danish West Indies experienced a profitable period in sugar production from 1801-1817. These factors combined appear to have resulted in changes in building methods for the houses of the enslaved. This can be concluded based on the fact that most new types of slave houses are dated to have been built between the end of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century.⁷⁸ A general pattern in the locations of these new buildings was that often they were placed beside a road to the estate, well away from the great houses and close to the sugar factory. Also, they were often placed on a steep slope or rocky land, which was deemed too poor for sugarcane fields. The enslaved people's houses were almost always situated west of or downwind from the principal estate residence and were usually about 15 feet long.⁷⁹

These characteristics match some of the smaller ruins found at the Leinster Bay Factory site. Situated east of the sugar factory and west of the Great House, on a steep and rocky hillside, these structures appear to have been the living quarters for the enslaved workers of the estate. Little remains of these buildings but the cornerstones and some low walls, but their size and location gives reason to believe that they were used to house the un-free population of the estate. The structures appear to have been of modest size, with no more than one or two rooms in each, and as their location was on steep ground, they are not likely to have been used for production buildings or storage. A surface collection of the area between the structures and the sugar factory yielded numerable glass, ceramic and porcelain shards, ranging in date and use for the majority of pieces from the 1750s to the mid nineteenth century.⁸⁰ The variety of the artifacts support the likelihood of the area being used for living quarters for the enslaved

⁷⁷ Chapman, *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, 1991. p. 110-111.

⁷⁸ Chapman, *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, 1991. p. 117-118.

⁷⁹ Chapman, *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*, 1991. p. 113.

⁸⁰ List of artifacts found at the Leinster Bay guardhouse and factory Site in appendix nr. 4.

workers, as the enslaved workers were supplied with ceramic bowls made of cheap materials. Such ceramics were generally out of style or hand-me-downs.⁸¹

There existed other separately located slave villages on the estate. It could possibly have been due to the fact that as the enslaved population expanded from the late eighteenth century, so did the numbers of drivers. These would have lived very near or within the enslaved village to oversee and prevent escapes. The village for the enslaved could then be expanded or relocated further away from the owner's house. This corresponds well with the ruins found of other houses nearer the main house, which may have been used for house servants.

These other possible housing site for the enslaved population of the estate was found on the western side of the factory, as well as structures for the same possible use next to the ruins of the Leinster Bay guardhouse.

The guardhouse

The need of the guardhouse fell in the time of the estate's expansion. As land owned and sugar production increased so did the need for an increased workforce. The growth of the estate and the corresponding growth in the enslaved numbers meet with a few challenges. One of these was exercising control over the large group of unfree concentrated on a relatively small area. Thus increasing the need for local control and surveillance. This were done by construting a guardhouse. The accounts of marronage from the entire island have been plentiful and from the Leinster Bay Estate there are two significant accounts. One from 1818 and one from 1840, these are dated before the first known account of the guardhouse, which was from 1843. The construction date of the guardhouse has so far not been determined.

⁸¹ Kenneth S. Wild, Elizabeth A. Horvath, Douglas T. Potter, and Andrea C. Repp, 1987-89

Archeological

Investigations Conducted Along the North Shore Road, St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands. Tallahassee:

National Park

Service, Southeast Archeological Center, 1991. p.12.



(The guardhouse site, as seen spring 2015.⁸²)

Considering the purpose of the guardhouse there are several accounts mentioning it, one of the earliest was Henry Morton's. He was a reverend visiting the islands in 1843-1844; he arrived at the plantation with 16 soldiers intended as a replacement for the battery located on the estate. Morton writes the following in his diary about the guardhouse:

*"At this post, a guard of sixteen men under the command of an Officer is stationed, for the purpose of protecting the property of the Planters from the danger which results from the nearness of the British Island of Tortola."*⁸³

This danger against the property from Tortola Morton mentioned was the abolition of slavery on the island. The planters and government was concerned about the enslaved population running away. Another account mentions the same kind of danger, the writer writes on behalf on the burgher counsel in 1843:

"However, it is known that the guard-shift on the before mentioned day saw the necessity when seven slaves passed the guardhouse in broad daylight. Everybody acknowledges that the guards will be sufficient to deal with the

⁸² The nonprofit organization Cyark have made 3 D scannings in the area around Leinster Bay Estate, but at the deadline of this report the data have not yet been processed.

⁸³ Henry Morton, *Danish West Indian Sketchbook and Diary 1843-1844*, Dansk Vestindisk Selskab & St. Croix Landmark Society, 1975, p. 168.

*protection of the western- and northern coast, as soon as it joins with the Leinsterbay garrison.*⁸⁴

Because the protection of the coastline is mentioned together with the fact that 7 enslaved people went right by the guardhouse in a boat, when they should be working. Implies that protection refers to the protection of the property. This means that the account shows how people are concerned about the protection of their property (being the enslaved) and it shows the intended purpose of the guardhouses, keeping the enslaved from running away, but were unable to do so due to lack of manpower. In British Tortola the abolition of slavery occurred in 1834 followed by an apprenticeship of 4 years, after this period the enslaved people were considered free, and escapees from the Danish islands would also be regarded free upon arrival, furthermore the enslaved people did know about this circumstance.⁸⁵ It was therefore that danger the guardhouse was supposed to protect against and that protection constituted the purpose of the guardhouse.

Another account, that shows how exactly the soldiers acted on Leinster Bay when news of escaped enslaved reached them, is an entry in the journals for the police guard. As the start, the soldiers sought Thatch Island (a tiny island right next to the Leinster bay) and later that day one soldier went to Tortola to seek information of the escapees.⁸⁶ The choice of going to Tortola shows the determination to get the enslaved back, and how they saw Tortola as a more obvious choice than e.g. petit marronage on St. John.

The guardhouse was probably placed in this specific area because of the amount of enslaved workers that was present. In 1846, Leinster Bay Estate had a total population of 172 enslaved where the entire population of the island was 1790. Which means that 9,6 % of the enslaved population lived and worked on the Leinster Bay Estate. The rest was divided on 22 estates of various sizes, which leaves an average percentage of 4,1 for the rest or around 73 enslaved per estate. As seen in appendix 5, the percentage for the Leinster Bay Estate did not go under the 8 % mark after 1827, except for one occasion in 1842 due to a transfer between estates. It was a considerably amount of enslaved workers that


⁸⁴ RA, STSJG, 35.3.2. St. Jans Landfoged, *Kopier af/ koncepter til udgående skrivelser til Guvernementet/præsidentskab på st. Thomas*, 1843-11-28.

⁸⁵ Neville Hall, B. W. Higman (ed.), *Slave Society in the Danish West Indies*, The University of the West Indies Press, 1994, p. 135.

⁸⁶ RA, STSJG, 35.27.2, St. Jans Landfoged, *Journal for St. Jans Politivagt*, 1845-03-17.

were located on the estate prior to any knowledge of the guardhouse. Taking this into consideration it seems plausible that the need for the guardhouse, solemnly based on the amount of enslaved existed from 1827 and forward and although we cannot with certainty determine when it was constructed, the increased numbers of enslaved is probably part of the explanation for the necessity of military presence.

The physical ruins left on the guardhouse site testifies to the site being a guardhouse. One of the indications was the structure of the ruins that remained; those included the main building and a kitchen house situated apart from the main building. The location of a kitchen placed separately; correspond with a typical pattern of smaller fortifications. As shown on the situation plan below, the main building consisted of two rooms, both divided into two smaller rooms. The rooms are leveled differently, and you get the impression of two-storied structure. In the smaller room there was constructed an arch facing the bay. This architectural feature is typical for a cannon hole/casement, which indicates that the ruin was intended as fortification.⁸⁷



(Simple visual representation of the ruins left at the guardhouse site.)

The artifacts found at the site indicated a rather long period of residence. Furthermore, a total of 11 collections divided between 4 GPS points around the

⁸⁷ According to Ken Wild.

main building were collected, though some of those findings were insignificant pieces. These pieces could only be dated with a generic timeframe, which means a long period that often dates up until present time. When disregarding these pieces, the time period of the artifacts have the datable years 1762-1890, with only one piece dating up till 1890.⁸⁸ This means that the area could have been inhabited both before and after, according the evidence regarding the function of the guardhouse site.

If all these factors get considered when dating of the guardhouse, the construction date could possibly be before the uncovered archival sources. The amount of enslaved were steady since the 1828 and throughout the period and the artifacts found dates both before and after the 1840s, and the event of British emancipation and cease of apprenticeship in 1838. That makes the construction date and use possible before the 1840s, but if the case of 1840 is considered the date must be after this incident, as will be discussed in further detail later. In the 1840 case there was no mention of a guardhouse or any soldiers stationed nearby the estate, nor was there any soldiers interviewed after the escape. If there was a guardhouse and it was manned, with the purpose of hindering marronage, the soldiers would have been close to where the incident happened, and would have been possible witnesses, but because they had also failed in obstructing marronage. This makes the use of the guardhouse after 1840, as a center for hindering marronage, even more plausible, although the possibility of grand marronage had existed for 2 years prior to the 1840 case. The use as a center to control the enslaved activity were limited to the 1840s, but it is uncertain if there had been any kind of other governmental security in the area prior to this time period.

⁸⁸ These datable years, are the manufacturing dates, and do not tell anything about the use of the product.

The enslaved population

While many enslaved chose to try to make it to Tortola after the British emancipation, a greater part of the enslaved population at the Leinster Bay Estate chose to stay. Therefore it is equally important to try to clarify the conditions of those who chose to remain faced. Whether they chose staying or fleeing, what appear common for all of them was that they did not simply accept their enslavement passively. The enslaved population at Leinster Bay seems to have expressed an agency over their own lives at any opportunity, to better their conditions and rights, and when no opportunity presented itself to do so, they resisted their white oppressors by protests, complaints and by enduring the punishments this often led to. The consequences were ambiguous; added control with the enslaved population at Leinster Bay along with small bettering of their living conditions to try and give them reasons to accept their un-free lives peacefully and prevent them from running away.

This proved to become harder and harder during the nineteenth century for various reasons. The enforcement of the slave trade ban meant that no new enslaved workers could be imported to replace the old, disabled or death. Only natural reproduction could supply new workers, which made the colonial government take an interest in the enslaved population's condition to try and ensure population growth instead of decline. This meant new rights for the enslaved. The enslaved were aware of these rights and made use of them, demanding to have a say in their own daily life. The increasing creolization of the enslaved workers meant that relied less and less on the goodwill of their owner, and more and more on their resourcefulness, social network and industry.

The rights of the enslaved

After the slave trade ban the enslaved population became aware of their own worth, and just how much their owner depended on them, as their natural reproduction was the only way to maintain his workforce. Without them, his estate and all his investments would be of little worth. This new awareness caused the enslaved population to push for better conditions and rights, while the owners tried to avoid any initiative that would mean additional expenses. The reforms the colonial government enforced were not simply a result of

concerns over the financial difficulties a decline in the enslaved workforce would result in, but also a reflection of the increasing difficulties of controlling the enslaved, which was attempted solved by introducing small changes and compromises.⁸⁹

During the British occupation of the Danish West Indies, under the Napoleonic Wars in 1801-1802 and 1807-1815, the financial situation for the sugar industry had been good, with high sugar prices and good harvests, which gave the planters an opportunity to repay huge rates on their loans to the state.⁹⁰ After 1815 the situation changed and a financial stalemate for the sugar industry on St. Croix and St. John began that lasted until emancipation in 1848. Sugar prices in Copenhagen dwindled from 1817 as well, making the sugar production business less and less profitable.⁹¹

The result was that the colonial authorities took a bigger interest in controlling how the individual plantations were run and in the upkeep enslaved population in particular, as the workforce was the basis of the sugar production. This opened up the possibility of the enslaved to seek out the local authorities if they felt mistreated. Prior to this, they had had few options, if their overseer had been abusive to them or neglected their needs. This became clear during an incident in 1818 at Leinster Bay, where the alleged mistreatment of an enslaved worker caused 47 enslaved fieldworkers to protest. As the enslaved fieldworkers did not have the option of seeking out the authorities then, they intended instead to seek out the overseer at the Coral Bay Estate, to beg his help: "...as this was the normal practice of the negroes at Leinster Bay when they had been mistreated, to go to John Dam, to tell him what had transpired..."⁹² For some reason the enslaved changed their minds and chose to run off the estate instead, perhaps fearing that the matter was too grave for the mentioned John Dam to offer them any protection. What help he had been able to offer them in other situations, the source does not mention, but it appears that the enslaved did not consider seeking out the sheriff in Cruz Bay at this time, which resulted in the absence of 47 capable workers for an extended period of time.

⁸⁹ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p. 33.

⁹⁰ Jens Vibæk: "Dansk Vestindien 1755-1848 – Vestindiens Storhedstid". Vol.2. In: *Vore gamle tropekolonier*. Johannes Brønsted (ed.) Fremad, Denmark, 1966. p. 236-238.

⁹¹ Vibæk, *Vore gamle tropekolonier*, 1966. p. 300-313.

⁹² RA, STSJG, 35.17.1. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*, 1818, p.10.

Cases like the above and a declining enslaved population on St. John after 1808 led to regulations of the enslaved people's right, of which there had existed very few previously. In 1817 the right of allowances provided by their owner was established, though this was not enforced on St. John until 1821. In 1830 enslaved were allowed to function as reliable witness in court, if they were baptized, which was another acknowledgment of the enslaved people's rights to be considered human beings and to speak out for themselves.⁹³ This new practice reveals itself in the police court records, where the enslaved persons giving evidence all mentioned which church he or she belonged to, as well as asserting if he or she was baptized; a formality clarifying whether the witness was to be considered reliable or not in giving evidence in the case.

The issue of religion and baptism had some interesting aspects. It was not solely a matter of extending a religious belief to the enslaved workers, but rather yet another way to extend the control and exploitation of this population group. Before the law from 1830 allowed the baptized enslaved to give evidence in court no enslaved person's testimony had been considered evidence and the enslaved themselves had not been allowed to bring charges before the court.⁹⁴

Another matter involving religion was the free time granted the enslaved. From the beginning of the colonization of St. John the enslaved were allowed a day off on Sundays, even though very few of them were Christianized at the time. The reason for this was that the white population was not allowed to work that day given their religious belief and practices. With no white person to supervise and control the enslaved workforce, there could not be done any work on Sundays anyway. The enslaved were expected to work their provision grounds during this time off, so the day was not freely to their disposal, as they relied mostly on their own efforts to provide food for themselves.⁹⁵

Later, missionaries were allowed to preach on some plantations, if the owner allowed this. When more of the enslaved population converted to Christianity and were baptized the enslaved house servants were allowed to attend church, but not the entire enslaved population, as there was a fear of large groups of enslaved gathering in one place.⁹⁶

⁹³ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p. 30.

⁹⁴ Hall, *Annales of the New York Academy of Science*, 1977. p. 178.

⁹⁵ Vibæk, *Vore gamle tropekolonier*, 1966. p. 144.

⁹⁶ Vibæk, *Vore gamle tropekolonier*, 1966. p. 148.

When it became more common for all the enslaved to be allowed to attend church on Sundays, it likely had to do with the effect the white population perceived this had on the enslaved. To belong to a congregation offered fellowship, inclusion and consolation to the enslaved, a spiritual and social refugee from their hard lives which appeared to have eased tensions that might else have led to physically expression of resistance to their enslavement. So installing Christian values in the enslaved became another, less obvious, way of controlling them.⁹⁷

Even though baptism did not come free of obligations it did give the enslaved some benefits. Attending church offered a small measurement of personal freedom, as it opened up the possibility of mobility beyond the estate's boundaries. It also meant a chance to interact with enslaved churchgoers from neighboring plantations.⁹⁸

In the matter of the marooning group of enslaved from Annaberg and Leinster Bay Estate in 1840, the actions of the implicated prior to their escape was investigated. The issue of attending church was brought up; as the overseer gave evidence that the enslaved workers on the two estates were always allowed to attend church on Sundays, but that they had to ask permissions to do so in advance. The reason for this was that even though Sunday officially was their day off, they still had to cut grass at the plantation for the livestock and had to make arrangement with another worker to perform this task while the churchgoer attended church. This reveals two things: one, that Sundays were not entirely free to dispose of as the enslaved themselves pleased, and two: that some attempts to control the enslaved population's whereabouts on their day off were made.⁹⁹

Another example, from 1841, reveals that the estate manager, Mr. Wallace, had at some point tried to offer the enslaved at Leinster Bay extra time off as a reward:

“Formerly when the Negroes had a Saturday at times given to them as a reward for good labour during the week they were thankful for it and they employd such free time with diligent labour in their grounds, now they only find fault that they have not got more time allotted to them, and they are more lazy

⁹⁷ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p. 25.

⁹⁸ Arnold R Highfield: “Patterns of Accommodation and Resistance: The Moravian Witness to Slavery in the Danish West Indies.” In: *Journal of Caribbean History*, Vol. 28 (2), 1994. p. 147-148.

⁹⁹ RA, STSJG, 712:35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*, 1840-05-30, p. 156.

*working for themselves than formerly. It is with them as with schoolboys the more holidays you give them, the less do they like returning to school.”*¹⁰⁰

This reveals that the enslaved at the estate kept on pushing for additional freedom, not satisfied with simply being rewarded for hard work, but demanding time off as a right.

In general ameliorative measures were enforced ad hoc from the 1820s and onwards, when it became apparent that the enslaved population was not naturally increasing as much as the colonial administration had hoped. These measures were taken as a response to social stability, high levels of production and a show of commitment from the enslaved workers, not as a means to achieve these things. When such conditions existed additional rights to the enslaved could be granted, for example the right to purchase freedom, trade, get married, own property, witness in court or be allowed greater cultural autonomy in religious practices. Most important was laws passed to give the enslaved sense of human worth, which in some case also meant punishing whites for mistreatment of the enslaved. Also allowing the enslaved greater mobility on and outside the estate which they belonged to, meant a chance for the enslaved to interact and express their independence.¹⁰¹

The agency of the enslaved

Sundays were important for other than religious reasons. This was the day were the enslaved on the estate had the free time to tend to their provision grounds. The amount of acres used for provisions on each estate was listed in the tax records for every tax year. This system of cultivating food for use on the estate was a common practice in the West Indies, releasing the estate owner from buying food to feed his enslaved workers. The practice on St. John, though, was rather more extensive than on other islands, as the island was more undulated than for example St. Croix, and a rather small part of the island's total areal was suitable for sugarcane production. As the steepest and rockiest ground could not

¹⁰⁰ RA, STSJG, 712:35.3.2. St. Jan Landfoged. *Kopier af/ koncepter til udgående skrivelser til Guvernementet/præsidentskab på St. Thomas*, 1841-07-05.

¹⁰¹ Franklin W. Knight (ed.), *General History of the Caribbean. Volume 3. The slave societies of the Caribbean*, Unesco Publishing, London, 1997. p.210.

be cultivated intensively for sugar, much of this ground was left for the enslaved population to produce their own subsistence in foodstuff.¹⁰²

This had been the practice from the very start of the island's colonization. Being self-sufficient was a necessity as few ships arrived with food supplies. The enslaved were to provide for themselves by tending these provision grounds and were only sometimes given allowances of food by their owners, usually salted meat or fish, in time of need caused by draught or hurricanes.¹⁰³ Until 1821, when the law of allowances for the enslaved were invoked on St. John, the planters and overseers in general were left to decide for themselves what and how much they allotted the enslaved and when.¹⁰⁴

Enslaved on big estates had more land available than enslaved on small estates, and were therefore relatively better off with the system of managing their own provisions. They would have had the perimeter of the estate ground for this purpose, the land deemed unusable for sugar production and situated in remote areas. This meant less supervision and control and often enslaved from the neighbor estate would also have provision grounds in the same area, at the perimeter of their estate, which meant the opportunity for social interaction without the knowledge and interference of the overseer.¹⁰⁵

The extensive system of provision grounds practiced on St. John seem to have led to a larger extend of autonomy and free time among the enslaved population then on the other islands. During his visit to the island in 1767-1768, the Moravian missionary Oldendorp noted of this practice that:

*"The Negro enjoys on his own plantation a form of freedom: He works as he pleases; and he owns everything that he acquires from it, this is quite encouraging and leads to greater industriousness."*¹⁰⁶

As Oldendorp observes, the enslaved owned everything he produced from the provision grounds, which gave the enslaved the chance of making a surplus that could be bartered or sold, adding another small measure of independence from the estate owner to his or her life.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p. 53-54.

¹⁰³ Westergaard, *Danish West Indies*, 1917. p. 158.

¹⁰⁴ Hall, *Annales of the New York Academy of Science*, 1977. p. 176-177.

¹⁰⁵ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p. 45-52.

¹⁰⁶ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p. 44.

¹⁰⁷ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p.52-53.

When the ordinance of allowance became practice on St. John in 1821 it was to ensure that the enslaved had enough food to keep them in good health and help the population growth. However, not all planters were interested in following the ordinance because of the added expense. This seems also to have been the case at the Leinster Bay and Annaberg Estates, where several of the enslaved in 1835 brought their complaints before the court in Cruz Bay over their overseers Mr. Smith and Mr. Edwards, who supposedly were keeping some of the enslaved people's allowances from them. The enslaved woman Venus had gone as far as calling the overseers "*damn thieves – Robbers – damn blood of whores*"¹⁰⁸ when she suspected them of not giving the enslaved their full allowances. The judge did not find the complaints valid, but he did not punish any of the implicated either. Instead he made a note to the owner of the two estates, H.H. Berg, that there had been a great deal of cases involving his enslaved and overseers and that the management of the estates should be taken up to evaluation.¹⁰⁹

Reasons for enduring enslavement

In all colonies control of the enslaved population strengthened or lessened in response to economic development and demographic development, which shaped the owners attitudes towards the enslaved. The more creolized a society became, the more difficulties the white owners experienced in controlling the enslaved, which in many cases forced compromises between the two population groups in order to ensure stability. Reforms therefore became a way to prolong the institution of slavery, because they also appeased the critics of slavery.¹¹⁰


Creolization, on the other hand, also meant that the enslaved developed a sense of belonging to the place where they lived. After the slave trade ended, the influx of Africans stopped, and the ties to African families, culture and tradition lessened. Family relations among the enslaved on Leinster Bay expanded, with many marriages with the enslaved on Annaberg Estate. Most of the enslaved inhabitants at Leinster Bay in 1841 were born on St. John, likely on the estate itself, as can be seen in the table below.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ RA, STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*, 1835-01-29, p.46.

¹⁰⁹ RA, STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*, 1835-01-29, p.47.

¹¹⁰ Knight (ed.), *General History of the Caribbean*. 1997. p.213.

¹¹¹ RA, RK, 6. Tabelkommissionen. *Folketalling*, 1841.



Therefore attachment to their home, provision land and kin were all factors that prevented many enslaved on the estate from escaping to Tortola, as fleeing would have meant giving up all of these things, with only the promise of freedom in return. Many of the enslaved who did flee were men, who had no families of their own.¹¹² Most women over the age of 20 in the population count from 1841 had between one and 6 children, some of them grown and likely to have had children of their own, which would have given them close family ties on the estate, and therefore reason to stay.¹¹³

One of the enslaved women who did escape in 1840 did so at a high price to the family member she left behind. Her mother, Marotte about 70 years of age, who lived at Annaberg Estate, was left with no children to take care of her in her old age. The escaping daughter, Ketura, chose to escape with her husband Charles.¹¹⁴

The enslaved Benjamin, from Leinster Bay Estate, chose to stand up for himself and his rights to be treated with dignity, rather than to attempt escape. His case was from 1834, before the British emancipation, so escaping to Tortola would not have been a likely alternative at the time, but neither did Benjamin chose to simply run of the estate and hide, when his disobedience brought trouble down on him. He was brought before the court because he had refused to obey the Leinster Bay overseer Sutherland's orders when working in the sugar

¹¹² Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p. 79-80.

¹¹³ RA, RK, 6. Tabelkommissionen. *Folketelling*, 1841.

¹¹⁴ RA, STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1840-05-25, p.155.

field. Sutherland dealt him a couple of strokes with a small whip for this, to which Benjamin responded by raising the cutlass in his hand in a threatening manner, saying: *“that he (Sutherland) should keep in mind, that he was not on Mr. Hill’s plantation – where he beat the Negroes like this even though they did their work.”*¹¹⁵ Benjamin also claimed that he would sacrifice his life to defend his rights and that: *“he would not keep his mouth for any blanc or black.”*¹¹⁶ His resistance caused another enslaved worker, Georg, to side with him. They were both sentenced to be whipped between 40 and 50 lashes and to spend 14 nights in prison.¹¹⁷ This rather severe sentence shows that punishment was still the authorities’ and overseers’ ultimate response to try and control the enslaved population.

¹¹⁵ , STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1834-05-22, p. 43.

¹¹⁶ , STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1834-05-22, p. 43.

¹¹⁷ , STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1834-05-22, p.44.

Marronage

In this chapter the marronage of Leinster Bay Estate will be described together with how the ordinances anno 1841 were perceived at Leinster Bay Estate regarding their purpose to prevent marronage and improve the enslaved's living conditions.

There are two accounts of marronage involving the Leinster Bay Estate's enslaved population, these were: the early in 1818 where 47 enslaved people ran away and the later incident in 1840 where 11 enslaved people committed marronage. These two cases had different characteristics. In the one from 1818, the enslaved people stayed in the bush and therefore on the island and later resumed their work. In the case of 1840 the enslaved people fled the island to Tortola, and never came back, regardless of how much the police force tried.¹¹⁸ As showed below in the cases, they not only had different characteristics and different outcomes, but the two cases were also examples of petit marronage and grand marronage. This kind of bipartition was a common trait of the marronage in general and on St. John. The main difference was, as shown in the two cases of Leinster Bay Estate, the act of escaping the island, and therefore escaping enslavement.

In the 1818 case a reason for the marronage was stated; the enslaved ran because of the threat of excessive punishment for a minor violation, after seeing a fellow unfree receiving a beating:

*"The prisoner denied that the gang had any prior plan of escaping. He claims that the threats of the overseer led them to do so. This was on the night that Peter Sailor were beaten with a [...]. Allegedly, the overseer stated that any complaints over Peter's treatment would result in a beating."*¹¹⁹

As showed in the case the enslaved ran, but stated that they had no intention of doing so beforehand. 47 people were a lot to just spontaneously run away, which implies that they might have coordinated the marronage beforehand. By using the spontaneous explanation they could avoid a harder punishment, as it would have been seen as a revolt if it were planned. In this case the marronage was used as a protective action, but also as a means to confront the issue about their conditions as will be shown later. This reason was common and were one of the

¹¹⁸ The characteristics and cases will be discussed further down.

¹¹⁹ RA, STSJG, 35.17.1, St. Jans Landfoged, *Politiretsprotokoller*, p. 10½.

many reasons for marronage, the enslaved were in general motivated by: harsh and excessive mistreatment of the enslaved, lack of food, exaggerated work hours and poor living condition and the sheer exploitation of the enslaved. In examples of successful grand marronage, the reasons are sometimes more elusive, as will be shown in the 1840 case.

As earlier stated the emancipation and the cease of apprenticeship on the British islands in 1838 brought a new opportunity for the enslaved population of St. John, Tortola began to represent a safe haven free from enslavement. This gave the enslaved people a reason to run away from the island, instead of hiding and hoping for an improvement of their conditions. It is important to note, that grand marronage also occurred before 1838, but it was in a much lesser degree.

The government was well aware of the marooning towards Tortola, and sought to dam up the trend, by constructing guardhouses and exercising naval control. At the Leinster Bay guardhouse the crew was divided into two shifts, one for the land and one for the sea. The procedures for both shifts were described on equal terms, which give the impression that both shifts were equally important.¹²⁰ This aligns with the idea of naval control, which had more than one format. The bigger format was the use of frigates and the other was the use of smaller boats appertaining to the guardhouses.¹²¹ For the Leinster Bay guardhouse the latter was the case. The Leinster Bay guardhouse was not only a guardhouse, but also a center of the naval control and played a role in hindering the grand marronage.

Another mean to keep the enslaved from committing marronage was the use of codes and regulative, especially the 1834 ordinance, but also the granting of property rights in 1840, both were done by Peter von Scholten. The underlying reasons for the codes and regulative, and whether they worked or not, becomes clearer if the material on Leinster Bay Estate is considered. The following is from a response from the overseer of Leinster Bay Estate in 1841 to an open letter addressed to the owners and overseers after a new regulation was implemented, it is important to note that this statement represent the overseer's own opinion:

"I own it to conscience and truth to say that the new regulatory, giving the negroes half a day in the week, and a five stivers, has not benne attended with

¹²⁰ RA, STSJG, 35.27.1, St. Jans Landfoged, *Journal for St. Jans Politivagt*, 1844-12-13 p. 3-4.

¹²¹ Hall, *Slave society*, 1994, p. 135.

any good effect, on the contrary, they are more unwilling to work than formerly, and they are not less inclined to desert to Tortola than formerly, if the guard placed to prevent desertion did not awe them."¹²²

As stated in the quote, the new privileges given to the enslaved had not prevented marronage towards Tortola, and made them more lazy and "*unwilling to work*". It is not stated if the guard was privately contracted or if it was a guard from the nearby guardhouse. The overseer did not state any of the other reasons for the bettering of their conditions, such as higher birth rate.¹²³ He only focused on whether or not it worked on marronage and how big the burdens were on the estate with the new ordinances. These ordinances were, among others, used with the incentive of appeasement of the enslaved so they would not commit marronage.¹²⁴ Whether the ordinances worked as intended on large scale is uncertain, but the opinion at the Leinster Bay Estate was that they did not appease the enslaved in a way that kept them from marronage and more orderly behavior in general.

In the 1840s just above 100 known persons fled the island and in the same period the garrison at Leinster Bay guardhouse held a small amount of soldiers. Which in 1844 only consisted of 10 persons, in spring 1845 14 and later in 1845 of 17.¹²⁵ This can be attributed to the government who, for some part did not recognize marronage as an overwhelming danger. The people, who advocated for this belief, stated that the enslaved people's ties to the land where they grew up, was too strong to abandon.¹²⁶ Furthermore, it is stated that it also was a matter of family ties.¹²⁷ Regardless of these beliefs the known amount that fled during the 1840s was just above 100 persons; this relatively low number can be attributed to either the kinship ties, the ties to the land, the presence of police force, or to all of them.

¹²² RA, STSJG, 25.3.2, St. Jans Landfoged, *Kopier af/ koncepter til udgående skrivelser til Guvernementet/præsidentskab på st. Thomas*, 1841-07-05. Original in English.

¹²³ Olwig, *Cultural adaption*, 1985, p. 33.

¹²⁴ H. Lawaetz, *Peter v. Scholten*, Gyldendal, 1940, p. 149-150.

¹²⁵ RA, STSJG, 35.27.1, ST. Jans Landfoged, *Journal for St. Jans politivagt*, 1844-12-13, and Morton, *Sketchbook*, 1975, p. 168.

¹²⁶ Olwig, *Cultural adaption*, 1985, p. 41.

¹²⁷ Olwig, *Cultural adaption*, 1985, p. 79.

Cases of marronage at the Leinster Bay Estate

The two cases from 1818 and 1840 have, as previously stated different characteristics; not only are they different, as they deal with different types of marronage, but because of the interviewing process as well. The 1818 case contains interrogations of the suspected instigators and interviews of persons that witnessed the attempt, whereas the 1840 case do not have any maroons to interview. The aim of this chapter will be to describe the two cases of marronage that involved the enslaved inhabitant of Leinster Bay Estate and put them in context.

The 1818 case

On the 22 of September 1818, the investigation began, concerning a marronage attempt on the 16 of July that same year. It began with interviewing the free deponents and proceeded with the interrogation of the alleged instigators and two unfree deponents. The instigators consisted of 12 persons partly of the 47 that ran away as well as two others. One who was visiting from another estate and another who claimed to not participate.¹²⁸ The incident occurred when the overseer (Peter Brady) mistreated an enslaved named Peter Sailor, and the gang complained about it.¹²⁹ This complaint was returned with the threat of whipping the next day. This scared the enslaved and they decided that they had had enough of the overseer's behavior, and needed to do something about it. It resulted in them running away and attempted to get another overseer to help them. They did not reach that person, and so they stayed on a hill and defended themselves with weapons (work instruments) and stone throwing. They later resumed their work, but fled again and were apprehended and imprisoned. The case deals with several subjects: why the 47 committed marronage, the recognition from the police of the value of the slaves, whether the enslaved were mistreated or not at the estate.

The reader should be aware that when dealing with these types of testaments that there exists an underlying intention, which often makes the validation of it difficult, as it may not be consistent with the truth. This can be seen in this case with the 47 runaways. In the following interviews two maroons

¹²⁸ See appendix 6 for a list of the arrestees and witnesses.

¹²⁹ The main workforce.

testified that they ran without a reason but only did it since others did it. This can be interpreted as an attempt to avoid speaking poorly about the overseer and the estate in an effort to avoid punishment. Taking this into account one might question the validity of their accounts since they would try to state no reason at all. By this logic one could state that all of the statements might be from false witness, but as 47 individuals were involved in the marronage it is plausible to assume that they had had a reason to which they could all concur. Whether this was to make trouble, an attempt for bettering of their conditions, as a protective matter or a bit of them all should not be assessed in this report. The key point that should be discussed is how their accounts correlate with each other, and what the focus were of the investigation.

This case is an example of petite marronage, which is defined by the intention behind the running away. None of the free deponents stated any reasons as to why the enslaved choose to run, except for the overseer, whose only explanation of the event was that the unfree were evil and that he had not overstepped his authority. This means that the only testament to this came from the interrogation of the unfree instigators and the interview of two unfree deponents. Eight of the 12 and the 2 unfree witnesses stated that they did so, because they feared the overseer and his punishments, and felt mistreated. Two stated that they did not participate in the marronage, and therefore could not know anything, and the last two stated that they did so because the gang did it. This quote is from the questioning of the first of alleged instigators and one of the 8, John Oslev:

*" The overseer's treatment of the Negroes were severe and they were often beaten. Thus, they feared mistreatment and that is the reason they left. This took place at the night of Peter's punishment when they voiced concern over his treatment and were threatened with cart whipping on the following day."*¹³⁰

John Oslev stated that they all feared the overseer and his punishments. Furthermore, they felt that he misused his position and enforced to harsh beatings for minor offenses. Oslev further stated:

¹³⁰ RA, STSJG, 35.17.1, St. Jans Landfoged, *Politiretsprotokoller*, p.8.

“The entire group was threatened and they decided to elope in that moment. They did so hoping to avoid punishment and to await an opportunity to complain about the overseer.”¹³¹

By submitting a complaint about the overseer they were hoping for an improvement of their conditions. This means that the purpose of marronage in this case was to avoid excessive mistreatment during punishment, a bettering of their conditions and an attempt at creating awareness of their mistreatment; which aligns with this being a case of petite marronage.

Regarding the complaints about mistreatment, the police acknowledged it by re-interviewing the overseer about his treatment of the enslaved at the estate, despite already having testified to not having mistreated the enslaved:

“Peter Brady took the stand once more and explained that no Negro on the plantation were mistreated or punished to the extent of his knowledge.”¹³²

As is shown, Brady either knew nothing about the mistreatment, he did not think it was mistreatment or he did not admit that his treatment was excessive. Furthermore, every deponent and prisoner was asked about the treatment of the enslaved at the estate. Indeed the police actually took the statement of the enslaved seriously, and interviewed the deponents again, with the intent of clarifying if it was a case of mistreatment. Although the unfree had no legally rights.

The treatment of the enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate played a central role during the entire investigation, as it was a topic in all the interviews and interrogations of the persons who could have had any knowledge of such. As earlier stated were 8 of the arrestees unanimous about the mistreatment, but when asked if they had received a beating at any time, they could not recall any such. John Oslev stated the following on the question:

“The detained had not been beaten or cart whipped. However, several [...] were, but never to such a degree where they could not work or became ill.”¹³³

This answer was common amongst the alleged instigators and except for one occasion where there was used as an example of a severe beating when asked. Regarding the deponents, the advocates for no mistreatment were the overseer, the second in command at the estate, Felix Dagherly from the local military in

¹³¹ RA, STSJG, 35.17.1, St. Jans Landfoged, *Politiretsprotokoller*, p. 8 ½.

¹³² RA, STSJG, 35.17.1, St. Jans Landfoged, *Politiretsprotokoller*, p. 7 ½.

¹³³ RA, STSJG, 35.17.1, St. Jans Landfoged, *Politiretsprotokoller*, p. 9 ½.

the area, and overseer Joseph Speakman from Abrahamsfancy, the other witnesses could not make a judgement. The one unfree deponent stated the same as the prisoners. Felix Dagherly, a sergeant in the military specified the following: *‘There is nothing stated besides that overseer Brady acts in a fine manner towards the Negroes of Linsterbay and treats them well.’*¹³⁴ This statement resembles the one Speakman gave, which means that they concurred on the matter, and it also bears a resemblance to the statements given from the two overseers at Leinster Bay, except that Dagherly and Speakman had based their knowledge on hearsay. This implies that the only persons, who had seen the overseer’s treatment, were the enslaved and the assistant overseer at the estate. The focus on the matter of mistreatment or no mistreatment leaves the impression that the police wanted to determine if the enslaved had any justification for marronage or if it was just a pretext for not working. Regardless of which were the case, the overseer would not have been punished, because the enslaved’s testimony would not have carried any weight before 1830.¹³⁵

In the matter of the accusation of mistreatment, the investigation refers to two incidents that could shed light on the matter. The first incident was the one that lead the gang to marronage; the one about Peter Sailor, the other was about an unfree named Zuomina who were punished. In both cases the witnesses and the arrestees had different opinions on what happened and how many strokes the enslaved received.

In the case of Peter the events that must be established were the number of beatings he received and if it could be classified as mistreatment. The only deponents that were present from beginning until the end were Brady and Hacket, the two overseers, and two unfree. The overseers stated that Hacket administered a beating to Peter sailor consisting of 20 strokes after his offence, after which Peter said an insult to Brady. Brady ordered the arrest of Peter, and Peter ran for the beach and tried to escape into the water. After Peter’s apprehension, he received 35 whiplashes the following day. They did not state any other beatings and were not detailed about what happened after Peter’s apprehension. Of the unfree witnesses the one stated further beatings. After the apprehension Peter Stiller told the following: *‘The overseer started beating him [Peter]*

¹³⁴ RA, STSJG, 35.17.1, St. Jans Landfoged, *Politiretsprotokoller*, p. 5 ½.

¹³⁵ Olwig, *Cultural Adaption*, 1985. p. 30.

*in his head with a [...], but also in his neck with the butt of the pistol*¹³⁶ This aligns with John Oslev's statement about what happened after Peter's apprehension. Peter Stiller and John Oslev was the only ones present at the arrest, which meant that the police could not regard their statements with as much weight as they were unfree. The police did not interview the overseers again on the matter of Peter, but at the time of the investigation Peter was ill and therefore could not be interviewed. The information in the journal states that he had hernia, but not if it were related to his beating in any way. The overseers testament to the event, consisted of two well-considered beatings, were the testament from the unfree shows a more loosely use of beatings, which were the case the police did not arbitrate.

Regarding the beating of the second person, there were two persons who mentioned him in their interviews. Those were overseer Brady and John Dam. John Dam played a central role in making the 47 come back, and in his interview he told the following about Zuomina:

*"When he arrived Saturday, the marooned Negroes made him aware that bomba Zuomina had been cartwhipped and because of that, he wore no pants. However when Zuomina were examined he had no wounds."*¹³⁷

The important thing about this quote is the time frame and in which state John Dam finds Zuomina. The Saturday in mention was the day before the apprehension of the 12 instigators. Therefore, the beating might have taken place as early as the day after the incident with Peter Sailor, which means the 17 of July. That leaves a month for the wounds to heal, before John Dam sees them on the Saturday before the beginning of the interviews the 22 of September. Furthermore, John Dam noted that the enslaved at the estate felt mistreated. Brady states about this incident that Zuomina received a beating, but not severe enough that his work ability was impaired. Again it was a matter of word against word, and the police did not proceed with any further investigation on the matter of Zuomina. These two cases showed that the enslaved felt mistreated, because they reacted on their treatment and felt the urge to tell someone higher ranking than their overseers. It also showed that the police followed up on the accusations of mistreatment, but could not proceed because of lack of free witnesses that supported the unfree's accounts.

¹³⁶ RA, STSJG, 35.17.1, St. Jans Landfoged, *Politiretsprotokoller*, P. 15 ½.

¹³⁷ RA, STSJG, 35.17.1, St. Jans Landfoged, *Politiretsprotokoller*, P 6 ½.

Only 11 of the 47 people who did the marronage were accused as instigators. This was common practice in cases that involved a fair amount of the enslaved inhabitants of an estate or area.¹³⁸ It was done with the intent of avoid punishing too many people, that possible could lead to another marronage or even worse an uprising, and to avoid punishing important workforce. As in this case where one of the 47 was a blacksmith, and even though he admitted to have forged an iron spike, for a work instrument, he used as a weapon during the marronage, he avoided punishment. The singling out of the instigators was in this case the job of the overseer Brady, this way he could choose the ones he thought were the instigators or least significant and omit the ones important for the estate such as the smith.

The case of 1818 was complex; involving 2 incidents of what the enslaved involved said were mistreatment and the case itself about marronage. Whether or not the enslaved of Leinster Bay Estate were mistreated in 1818 by Danish West Indian standards is uncertain, because no testament to the impact of Peter's beating were recorded, and the one from Zuomina had no greater consequence, as he was able to work. Most of the alleged instigators testified to not have received any beating during their life at the estate. What was certain was the discontent of the enslaved, which lead to the case of petite marronage of 47 people.

The 1840 case

- The case of the 11 escaped enslaved from the Leinster Bay and Annaberg estates in May, 1840.¹³⁹

The night between Saturday 23 and Sunday 24, 11 enslaved from Annaberg and Leinster Bay Estate managed successfully to escape from St. John to Tortola. They used a small barge, without drawing any attention to their plans prior to the escape or during the act itself.

The case was of great importance, not only because the 11 enslaved managed to escape and gain their freedom, but also because it was the first major escape from St. John to Tortola involving a large group of people, following the British emancipation. Several enslaved had escaped to Tortola individually since the

¹³⁸ Olwig, *Cultural Apadition*, 1985, p. 35.

¹³⁹ RA, STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1840-05-25, p.154-156.

British end of apprenticeship in 1838, but the number of people involved in this case was alarming to the local administration as well as the overseers of Leinster Bay and Annaberg Estate. As were the seeming lack of motive behind the escape, when the case was investigated, because this seemed to indicate that despite the recent years of reforms bettering the living conditions of the enslaved, they still desired freedom.

The police court record do not reveal the names of all the 11 escapees, nor which of the two estate they belonged to, but from the different testimonies and accounts the identities of some of them can be established. From the Leinster Bay Estate, the married couple Charles and Ketura escaped. Both lived at Leinster Bay, though she belonged to and worked at Annaberg, while he was a carpenter at Leinster Bay. They left behind his mother, the midwife Cathrine, and his uncle Renard, as well as her mother Marotte, belonging to the Annaberg Estate. David, who belonged to the Leinster Bay Estate, and who was a watchman at Leinster Bay the night in question, escaped too. The records reveal the names of three other of the escaped, but do not provide information of which estate they belonged to. Adam alias Cato, whose work or position was not mentioned, James, who was the head cow driver, and Abraham, who was serving at the assistant overseer Simmelkjær's household. The record does not mention the age of any of the escaped, but given their various work duties, revealed by the testimonies, it is reasonable to assume that they were younger people, in physically good health and capable of hard work.

The accounts of the matter began, when the local police chief, acting also as judge, was called out to the Leinster Bay Estate on Monday, the 25th, to investigate the matter. Before doing so, he had implored a local missionary, Mr. Smithy, who was familiar with the enslaved at the estate, to travel to Tortola to attempt to persuade the escaped to return to St. John. Mr. Smithy agreed to do so, but asked to be given a full, signed pardon to take along to show the escaped. The police chief agreed that this would better the chances of Mr. Smithy's mission to succeed and obtained the pardon for him.¹⁴⁰

What appears to have been the main concern, from the accounts of the case, was to establish why the enslaved had chosen to escape, what reasons they had to do so and if anyone had known of their plans beforehand. Since all 11 had

¹⁴⁰ RA, STSJG, 35.23.2. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politijournaler*, 1840-05-25, p.133.

managed to escape successfully, there was no one to punish for the crime. However, one person was placed under arrest at Leinster Bay, under suspicion of having either aided the escapees or neglected to catch them in the act, as he was on sentry duty that night. The man, George, explained that he had been on watch duty at the gate to the estate, and that an enslaved called David, one of runaways, had been on watch duty elsewhere. George claimed not to have seen or heard anything suspicious during the night, which he had spent most of asleep in the smithy.

The escape happened somewhere after 9 o'clock at night, when all was dark, which can be established given the testimony of the enslaved woman Cathrine. She was the mother of the escaped Charles, and she had last seen him that very Saturday night, when she passed his house at Leinster Bay somewhere between 8 and 9 o'clock in the evening. He was at home then, and greeted her as she went by on her way to Annaberg Estate, where she was to carry out her duty as a midwife. She had not heard him speak of any discontentment prior to his escape, nor of the plan to run away.

That Cathrine spoke the truth about seeing Charles on Saturday night sometimes after 8 o'clock was confirmed by the overseer's testimony. He, Thomas Davis, explained that he had left the house of the estate manager at Leinster Bay, Mr. Wallace, at about 8 o'clock that evening and found everything in good order as he made his way home to Annaberg.

The fact that the escape was carried out between Saturday and Sunday night, with one of the escapees on sentry duty, was important for three reasons: first, as the enslaved were given time of Saturday and Sunday, not much control would have been taken with their whereabouts, and no one would have missed them early Sunday morning, as they were not to partake in any work on the estate. Secondly, they managed to escape from the estate unnoticed because one of their own was on sentry duty, preventing their movements to be reported. Thirdly, this last precaution shows that they had planned the escape well in advance, making sure of who was on sentry duty that night. The general consensus among the people called forth to testify was that no one had heard anything about the plan to escape before it was carried out, which also reveals that this was a well considered plan.

Another enslaved worker, who had had watch duty on the night in question, Johem, gave testimony. He explained that he was sentry aboard the slope Kitty Berg, belonging to the estate. During his sentry duty he stayed at the house by the strait where the vessel was tied up. He had spent the night out there between Saturday and Sunday, but he had not seen anything regarding the escape. Like everyone else, he could not give any reasons for the escapees' motives. He could have been speaking the truth, but his testimony, as well as those of the other enslaved, might also have been attempts to obscure what really happened. This could partially be done out of loyalty to the escaped, but it is just as likely that all the enslaved witnesses denied any knowledge of the escape to avoid blame and possible punishment.

One of the few witnesses, who spoke of any reasons behind the escape, was the mother of the escaped woman Ketura, the 70 year old Marotte. She could not give any reasons why her daughter had run away, except that Ketura, 14 days before, had been punished by overseer Davis for insubordination. Ketura had not, following that incident, revealed to her mother that she intended to escape. Marotte explained that she saw very little of her daughter since she had married Charles and moved to Leinster Bay.

Mr. Thomas Davis testified that he had been overseeing the estates for about 3 months, and had not amongst the enslaved population experienced any sign of discontentment. By his opinion they had little reason to be. Regarding the 11 escaped, only three had recently been punished for lesser matters; Cato alias Adam had been locked up for 24 hours some time ago, because he had let another enslaved he was supposed to guard run away. James, who was the head cow driver, had been locked up one night for some minor negligence. Ketura had been flogged 14 days ago with 4-5 lashes of the rope end and locked up because she came too late for work in the mill. Only her case was discussed further, as this had happened recently. Davis explained that Ketura's husband Charles sought him out when he learned of his wife's arrest, imploring Davis to release her. Davis claimed that he had at once been willing to do so, asking only in return that Charles had words with his wife:

“...explaining the wrongness of her behavior to her, and advice her to behave better in the future, as this was not the first time she had been insubordinate and he could no longer tolerate such conduct.”¹⁴¹

Charles had agreed to do so, which led to Ketura’s release the same day. Davis, apparently, had wanted to resolve matters peacefully, given neither Ketura nor Charles reason to give further complaints. Davis added that he had not had the slightest idea of a conspiracy between the enslaved about escaping, or noticed any suspicious behavior.

The following day, the 26 of May, Mr. Smithy returned from Tortola, without any of the escaped. He gave the following account to the police chief:

“The 11 refugees were sorely embittered at Mr. Wallace and Mr. Davis, and had unnanomeshly declared, that as long as these two men remained at the plantations none of them would return, and they further gave as reason for their escape, that that they could not work enough for Mr. Wallace and Mr. Davis – that for the smallest matter they were locked up and punished.”¹⁴²

From his encounter with the 11 escaped it would seem that the general treatment by the overseers were the reason behind the escape, as well as the amount of work the enslaved were ordered to do. From all the conflicts in the police court records, this seems to have been the problem behind most complains and matters of disobedience initiated by the enslaved. As the overseers were the people who carried out punishments, gave orders and enforced rules in the daily life on the estate, they became the targets for the enslaved population’s discontentment.

For some reason, though, the judge did not appear to have been content with this explanation for the reason behind the escape. The interrogations were continued at the Courthouse in Cruz Bay two days later. In between the judge had learned of a free colored woman living on the Leinster Bay Estate, who he had called in to witness in the hope that she could bring some enlightenment to the case. The reason why the judge was particularly interested in her testimony was that she apparently had said something to the missionary Schmity, about two of the escaped, which the police chief had found out about. The woman, Lydia, claimed that all she had said to Mr. Schmity was that Adam alias Cato had already run away once some months ago because he had deemed it safe to do so,

¹⁴¹ RA, STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1840-05-25, p.156.

¹⁴² RA, STSJG, 35.23.2. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politijournaler*, 1840-05-25, p.134.

and that the enslaved Abraham, who served in under overseer Simmelkjær's household, had been locked up, but released again by Mrs. Wallace request. She had never heard that either Mr. Wallace or Mr. Davis had treated any of the enslaved harshly or unjust.

The judge had by then received a full written account from Mr. Schmitz, of his encounter on Tortola with the escaped. When the case was resumed in court on Saturday, the 30 of May, the police chief brought this up. According to Mr. Smithy, he had spoken to Charles and found him to be very agitated and upset over the matter of his wife Ketura's punishment by overseer Davis. Therefore the judge called Davis back to witness again, in order to explain the matter of Ketura's punishment more thoroughly, perhaps hoping to find some reason why she and her husband had run away. Davis explained that the incident had taken place 11 days previously. He had been overseeing the work in the windmill at Annaberg. Two enslaved women, Big Helena and Ketura, had not returned to work after lunch and he had therefore sent the mill foreman Robert Sheen to find them. Robert had found Big Helena and ordered her back to the mill, giving her a punch with his tamarind stick on the way. Ketura had turned up by herself and had been berated for her lateness by Davis. Ketura then started to complain and shout in a very insubordinate manner, that she had not gotten her full allowance of lunch. Big Helena had arrived then and sided with Ketura in her complaints, throwing a measuring calabash, she had in her hand, at Davis feet. When none of them, after numerous of requests to do so, would be quiet and resume their work, Davis had felt obliged to send for the robe end and let them receive 5-6 lashes each. He had then gone to his house, but had kept hearing the women shouting and complaining from the mill, while they worked. This led him to order them taken to the arrest.

The same night, when Davis had been at Leinster Bay, Ketura's husband Charles had come to ask him to release his wife. Davis had agreed to do so. Both women were released the very same night. That was the whole of the matter and he had not heard anything further of it neither from the implicated nor from others on the plantation. Davis further claimed:

“No one else have had complaints or spoken of discontentment on the two plantations, where the Negroes, as he was sure it was known, were better feed, dressed and housed than most other places on the island.”¹⁴³

The overseer seemed to believe, given this last statement of his, that there was no reason why any enslaved at the two estates would want to escape and that they were treated as well as any enslaved person could hope for.

That the enslaved at the two estates were given their weekly allowances and that the other initiatives to better their general living conditions were followed does not seem to have been questioned. Rather the strenuous amount of labor they were to carry out in return, seem to have caused discontentment, and the cases of punishment when they objected to the workload. That no one could think of any other specific reason for the escape indicates that there was no severe incident behind it. This makes this case very different from the 1818 case, where the enslaved had a specific cause for complaints and reject the harsh treatment they felt they were exposed to. What seems to be the point of this incident, in 1840, was not that the enslaved had reason to escape, but rather that they had the opportunity to do so. As the free colored Lydia pointed out, Adam alias Cato had already run away once *“because he had deemed it safe to do so.”¹⁴⁴* Since he was able to succeed his second attempt of running away, the consequences of his first attempt cannot have been very severe, which may have given him the courage to try again. This changed later in the 1840s, likely because of this very case, as the Leinster Bay guardhouse was manned with an increasing number of soldiers, to prevent further escapes of this sort.

For the 11 escaped in this case, though, there appeared to have been very little stopping them from running away. The watchmen on the estate, who were enslaved workers, seemed to have been put out with the purpose of guarding the property rather than the people of the estate, and were apparently also, at the time, trusted by the overseers to keep things in good order. The barge, on which the 11 escaped, seemed to have been easily attained. Of that overseer Davis remarked to the court that a slop from Tortola, on its way to St. Thomas had arrived at Leinster Bay on May the 28. It brought with it *“the taken barge”*, and on the barge *“a piece of broken chain with lock, which was poor and aged, along with an old ore*

¹⁴³ RA, STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1840-05-25, p.156.

¹⁴⁴ RA, STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1840-05-25, p.155.

of a kind, which belonged to the plantations."¹⁴⁵ So the barged had apparently been very poorly secured and the ore had been stored in it as well, making it very easy for those trying to escape to take the vessel.

With British emancipation by then a reality, the enslaved at Leinster Bay and Annaberg had a safe haven to flee to, where they would be free upon arrival. What the judge and the overseer, Davis, do not seem to have realized was, that it was the purpose of the escape, that was important, not the reasons behind it. The 11 escaped simply wanted to be free, to have control over their own lives and to be paid for their work instead of being punished. The one place where they could achieve that was Tortola, as Danish emancipation would have seemed a very distant maybe even impossible prospect for the enslaved at St. John in 1840. Charles, being a carpenter, would have had good prospects of finding work on Tortola to support himself and his wife. No children were mentioned, neither to have escaped with them nor been left behind.

Charles and Ketura did, however, leave behind other family members, both their mother and an uncle. This seemed to have affected Ketura's mother Marotte the most, as Charles mother would still have had his uncle, who was possibly her brother, to support her. The relationship between Ketura and her mother appear to have been rather untypical, as Marotte herself admitted "*that she saw very little of her daughter since she had married Charles and moved to Leinster Bay.*"¹⁴⁶ Furthermore it is worth noticing that Ketura had moved to Leinster Bay to live with her husband, he had not moved to live with her at Annaberg. This is peculiar, as historical and anthropological studies have shown that it was common amongst the enslaved on St. John to have households based on matrilateral ties.¹⁴⁷ If a married couple were from the same estate the man would typically take the woman to live in his house, but if they were from two different estates, as was the case with Ketura and Charles, the man would built a house for them on her estate and visit her there.¹⁴⁸ The couple in question did therefore not follow the general pattern, perhaps because Ketura did not have a very close relationship with her mother, Marotte. This would certainly explain why she was willing to leave her behind, when she escaped to Tortola.

¹⁴⁵ RA, STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1840-05-25, p.156.

¹⁴⁶ RA, STSJG, 35.17.3. St. Jan Landfoged. *Politiretsprotokoller*. 1840-05-25, p.155.

¹⁴⁷ Olwig, *Cultural Adaptation*, 1985. p.56.

¹⁴⁸ Vibæk, *Vore gamle tropekolonier*, 1966. p.142.

Some general things about the living conditions for the enslaved at Leinster Bay can be concluded from this case. The treatment of the enslaved in some regards had improved on the two estates since 1818, with overseers willing to respond to the requests of the enslaved, and who also gave them the allowance that the ordinance of 1817 prescribed and who did not punish them excessively. In return, they appear to have been forced to work harder than previously, which was the only solid reason given by the 11 refugees to Mr. Smithy for their escape. The enslaved on the estates were allowed their Sundays off and also seem to have been trusted enough to be allowed a certain measure of freedom of mobility on and between the estates, along with duties such as night watchmen. Last, but not least, that the enslaved seized the opportunity to escape when it presented itself, carrying out their plan with a quiet efficiency that indicate that they had timed and prepared their escape well. As a magistrate on St. Croix had noted almost a century prior to their escape, “*the desire for freedom is an inseparable part of the human condition*”¹⁴⁹ Following this case the local authorities apparently came to the same conclusion, as the consequences of the 11 people’s escape was a higher level of military presence at the Leinster Bay area, as an attempt to forcefully prevent other enslaved from fleeing to Tortola. The success of this approach was doubtful, but as no larger group of enslaved from the Leinster Bay or Annaberg escaped after 1840, the military presence at the guardhouse seems to have had some effect. Its ruins are today a monument to the hardship, endurance and efforts of the enslaved at the estate to gain their freedom in any way they could.

¹⁴⁹ Hall, *Slave Society*, 1994. p. 137.

Concluding remarks

When mapping the social and economic context of the Leinster Bay Estate up until the beginning of the nineteenth century there is very little information about the actual everyday conditions of the enslaved population at the estate. Only the numbers from the tax records give a general, quantitative insight into the composition of the enslaved at the estate. First with the police court records and police journals, a more complex and thorough understanding about the lives of the enslaved revealed.

In the same century, economic incentives impelled the development of initiatives to improve the enslaved populations rights and conditions, but the enslaved was as much a driving force, pushing for this development. The un-free population's continuously resistance against their enslavement forced both the colonial authorities and the management of the Leinster Bay Estate to negotiate with them for more tolerable living conditions. The enslaved expressed this resistance by using the options that the circumstances gave them. Amongst these were petit marronage, which was one of the few options available to them up until the 1830s. From that point forward the right to bring their complaints before the court, involving the colonial government in the disputes, became an opportunity to extract small measures of concessions from their owners.

When British emancipation became a reality the possibility of escape to Tortola caused a case of grand marronage at Leinster Bay. This clearly shows that the diplomatic ordinances initiated by Peter von Scholten to make the enslaved population endure their enslavement had not been sufficient to keep them on the estate. During the 1840s the colonial government sought to prevent incidents like this by placing military presence at vulnerable locations. The Leinster Bay Estate was one of these locations, due to its proximity to Tortola and because of the number of enslaved in the area at and around the estate. The Leinster Bay guardhouse was a military outpost with the purpose of hindering marronage; the physical evidence of the white authorities' difficulties maintaining the institution of slavery, but at the same time it was also a testimony to the enslaved population's attempts for freedom.

Archival sources

Rigsarkivet

(GTK) Generaltoldkammer- og Kommercekollegiet Indiske (ost- og vestindiske) Kontor (Chamber of Customs)

371:429 Forestillinger fra komm. ang. negrenes stilling i Vestindien.
1834-1843

(RRVR) Reviderede Regnskaber, Vestindiske Regnskaber (Audited Accounts, West Indian Accounts)

571:83.1 Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan 1755-1915, 1755-1760
571:83.2 Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan 1755-1915, 1761-1768
571:83.3 Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan 1755-1915, 1769-1785
571:83.4-83.9 Matrikler for St. Thomas og St. Jan 1755-1915, 1786-1796
751:83.10-83.15 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan 1755-1915, 1797-1802
751:83.16 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan 1755-1915, 1803-1813
571:83.17-83.20 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1814-1816
571:83.21-83.25 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1817-1821
571:83.26-83.31 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1822-1827
571:83.32-83.36 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1828-1832
571:83.37-83.39 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1833-1835
571:83.37-83.39 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1836-1838
571:83.43-83.45 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1839-1841
571:83.46-83.48 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1842-1844
571:83.49-83.51 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1845-1847
571:83.52-83.54 Matrikel for St. Thomas og St. Jan, 1755-1915, 1848-1850

(RK) Rentekammeret, Danske Afdeling, Tabelkommissionen

303: 6 Folketælling 1841, Vestindien, St. Jan

(STSJG) St. Thomas og St. Jan guvernement mm., St. Jan Landfoged (St. Thomas and St. John government, St. John Sheriff)

712:35.17.2 Politiretsprotokoller, 1818-1904, 1825-1832
712:35.23.1 Politijournaler, 1829-1892, 1829-1836

712: 35.17.1	Politiretsprotokoller, 1818-1825, 1818-1825
712: 35.17.3	Politiretsprotokoller 1818-1904, 1832-1841
712: 35.27.1	Journal for St. Jans politivagt, 1844-1847.
712: 35.3.2	Kopier af/koncepter til udgående skrivelser til Guvernementet/præsidentskab på St. Thomas, 1837-1845
712:35.38.1	Registrerings og vurderings protokoller, sessions og testamenteprotokol 1807-1836

(VGK) Det vestindisk-guineiske kompagni, Bogholderen for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan (The West India and Guinea Company, The bookkeeper for St. Thomas and St. John)

446:1.29.1	Samlepakke I, 1733-1755, 1733-1745
446:99	Direktionen, Breve og dokumenter fra Vestindien. 1674-1754, 1733-1734
446:516	Guvernementet for Skt. Thomas og Skt. Jan, 1724- 1740,ordre-,brev- og plakاتبøger for St. Thomas og St. Jan
446:750	Landslister for St. Jan, 1728-1739, 1728-1733
446:751-753	Landslister for St. Jan, 1728-1739, 1734-1739

Archival sources online

RA, Kol: Evangel: Skt. Th & Jan, Diverse Menigheder, Kirkebøger,

https://www4.sa.dk/content/dk/ao-forside/find_kirkeboger?#

1691-1795	Kol: Evangel: Skt. Th & Jan, Opslag 56
-----------	--

Literature

Bro-Jørgensen, J.O, "Dansk Vestindien indtil 1755 – kolonisation og kompagnistyre." Vol.1. In: *Vore gamle tropekolonier*. Johannes Brøndsted (ed.). Fremad, Denmark, 1966.

Chapman, William, "Slave villages in the Danish West Indies: Changes of the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries." *Bondmen and Freedmen in the Danish West Indies*, edited by George Tyson. St. Thomas, USVI: Virgin Islands Humanities Council, 124-141, 1996

Franklin W. Knight (ed.), *General History of the Caribbean. Volume 3. The slave societies of the Caribbean*, Unesco Publishing, London, 1997.

Gibney, Eleanor, David Knight, Bruce Schoonover and Robin Swank, *St. John: Life In Five Quarters*, St. John Historical Society, 2010.

Green-Pedersen, Svend E., "Slave demography in the Danish West Indian and the Abolition of the Danish slave Trade." Eds. David Eltis og James Walvins. *The Abolition of the Atlantic Slave Trade: Origins and Effects in Europe, Africa and the Americas*. s.231-248. (Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1981.)

Hall, Neville T., "Slave Laws in the Danish Virgin Islands in the Later Eighteenth Century", in: *Annales of the New York Academy of Science*, Vol. 292, New York, 1977.

Hall, Neville, *Slave Society in the Danish West Indies*, edited by B.W. Higman. The University of the West Indies Press, 1994.

Highfield, Arnold R., "Patterns of Accommodation and Resistance: The Moravian Witness to Slavery in the Danish West Indies." In: *Journal of Caribbean History*, Vol. 28 (2) , 1994.

Hornby, Ove, *Kolonierne i Vestindien*, Politikens Forlag, København, 1980.

Knight, David W., *Understanding Annaberg. A Brief History of Estate Annaberg on St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands. With A Closer Look at the Annaberg Factory Complex and How Sugar Was Made*. Little Northside Press, 2002.

Kay Larsen, *Document relating to the early settlement of St. John, Danish West Indies 1718-1730*, V.I.N. Park Library, Cruz Bay, St. John, 1989.

Lawaetz, H, *Peter v. Scholten*, Gyldendal, 1940.

Morton, Henry, *Danish West Indian Sketchbook and Diary 1843-1844*, Dansk Vestindisk Selskab & St. Croix Landmark Society, 1975, p. 168.

Olsen, Marie Veisegaard and Agnes Elbæk Wraae: *The Brown Bay Area: The Plantations and its Inhabitants throughout Approximate 90 Years*. Unpublished paper (Submitted to the Department of History at Copenhagen University), 2009

Olwig, Karen Fog, *Cultural Adaptation and Resistance on St. John: Three Centuries of Afro-Caribbean Life*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1985

Petersen, J. E., *Slaveoprøret på St. Jan 1733*. Speciale, Århus Universitet, 1988.

Tyson, Georg, F., *A History of Land Use on St. John 1718-1950* (Preliminary Report). Prepared for the Virgin Islands National Park Service, 1984.

Vibæk, Jens, "Dansk Vestindien 1755-1848 – Vestindiens Storhedstid". Vol.2. In: *Vore gamle tropekolonier*. Johannes Brønsted (ed.) Fremad, Denmark, 1966.

Westergaard, Waldemar: *The Danish West Indies under Company Rule 1671-1754*. New York: Macmillan, 1917.

Wild, Kenneth Jr., *A problematic approach to ceramic dating of historic plantations on St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands*, unpublished thesis (submitted to the Department of Anthropology at Florida State University of Arts and Sciences). 1988.

Wild, Kenneth S., Elizabeth A. Horvath, Douglas T. Potter, Andrea C. Repp and:
1987-89 Archeological Investigations Conducted Along the North Shore Road, St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands. Tallahassee: National Park Service, Southeast Archeological Center, 1991.

Appendix list

Appendix nr. 1:

Table of the estate owners and estate size from 1728 to 1862

Year	Owner	Size*
1728	Mariana Loison, married to Pieter Fröhling	Width 1500feet
1729-1738	Pieter Fröhling	Width 1500feet
1739-	Pieter Duurloo	Width 1500feet
1740-1754	No tax records. Owner(s) unknown	Sometime during this period an additional plot of land with the width of 2150 feet was added to the estate, bringing the estates width to 3650 feet.
1755-1757	Jens Rasmussen	Width 3650feet
1758-1759	Jesper Wülf	Width 3650feet
1760-1764	Jens Rasmussen	Width 3650feet
1765-1770	Thomas Smith	Width 3650feet
1771-1772	Joseph Harrigan	Width 3650feet
1773	Thomas Smith	Width 3650feet
1774-1781	Thomas Smith	An additional small plot of land was purchased from the neighbor James Hoorn's widow, 350wide, bringing the estate to a total width of 4000feet. The equivalent of 325 acres.
1782-1794	Thomas Smith's heirs	325 acres
1795-1807	James Murphy	325 acres
1808-1821	Edward Murphy	325 acres
1822-1862	H.H. Berg	325 acres

*The size of the estate was measured by the plot's width in feet, in the Land Lists and Tax Records until 1803. Thereafter the estate size was measured in acres. There is no reliable way of converting the early measures of the estate size to acres, as the plots at that time were measured on three sides. This was possibly due to the shape of the plots, which by no mean would have been square, or perhaps because the shore-side length was not measured.


Table of comparison: the enslaved at the Leinster Bay Estate and the total enslaved population of St. John, based on data from the land lists and tax records.

Year	Leinster Bay	St. John total	Year	Leinster Bay	St. John total	Year	Leinster Bay	St. John total
1728	9	no data	1784	62	2306	1816	184	2317
1733	19	1087	1785	82	2258	1817	205	2322
1739	No enslaved listed	1414	1786	85	2322	1818	109	2402
1755	40	2031	1787	85	2293	1819	168	2316
1756	43	2041	1788	86	2289	1820	175	2310
1757	33	1991	1789	87	2200	1821	171	2273
1758	41	2077	1790	89	1994	1822	177	2269
1759	41	1983	1791	94	1864	1823	176	2221
1760	29	1991	1792	100	1917	1824	177	2237
1761	29	2020	1793	91	2004	1825	181	2255
1762	29	1969	1794	92	2008	1826	178	2259
1763	29	1986	1795	87	2006	1827	185	2207
1764	28	1974	1796	99	2109	1828	179	2108
1765	39	2024	1797	110	2145	1829	219	2131
1766	40	2164	1798	106	2247	1830	224	2021
1767	no data	no data	1799	187	2503	1831	218	2063
1768	44	2303	1800	186	2430	1832	173	1955
1769	63	2215	1801	160	2435	1833	170	1988
1770	71	2302	1802	169	2531	1834	157	1921
1771	78	2432	1803	109	2430	1835	180	1809
1772	71	2431	1804	181	2604	1836	187	2004
1773	70	2324	1805	228	2541	1837	178	1973
1774	70	2293	1806	no data	no data	1838	210	2007
1775	94	2355	1807	199	2598	1839	188	2003
1776	85	2398	1808	216	2588	1840	166	1923
1777	107	2482	1809	210	2516	1841	199	1999
1778	90	2426	1810	207	2420	1842	169	1965
1779	99	2497	1811	200	2456	1843	171	1913
1780	102	2285	1812	200	2404	1844	173	1779
1781	106	2388	1813	201	2402	1845	165	1746
1782	114	2371	1814	185	2291	1846	169	1775
1783	110	2229	1815	215	2445	1847	171	1703

Appendix nr. 2: List of artifacts found at the Leinster Hill ruins

Accession #	Catalog #	Finding Aids, Fld Specimen #	Key Descript	Description	Manufact. Date	Measurements	Within Site
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57311	46.0001	Porcelain	Chinese Export Porcelain	1600-1880	___4.2g	Leinster Hill Ruin, Surface Collection (319083.28 E, 2031262.16 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57312	47.0001	Pipe Stems	Pipe Stems (5/64 Diameter)	1720-1750	___1.9g	Leinster Hill Ruin, Surface Collection (319074.87 E, 2031262.97 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57313	47.0002	Pipe Stem	Pipe Stems (6/64 Diameter)	1680-1720	___1.2g	Leinster Hill Ruin, Surface Collection (319074.87 E, 2031262.97 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57314	48.0001	Pipe Stems	Pipe Stems (4/64 Diameter)	1750-1800	___1.3g	Leinster Hill Ruin, Surface Collection (319089.48 E, 2031266.15 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57315	49.0001	Pipe Stem	Pipe Stem (5/64 Diameter)	1720-1750	___0.8g	Surface Collection (319068.56 ME, 2031259.48 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57316	49.0002	Coarse Earthenware	Olive Jar Base	1490-1900	___226g	Surface Collection (319068.56 ME, 2031259.48 MN)

Appendix nr. 3: The factory site of the Leinster Bay Estate



SITE DIAGRAM LEINSTER BAY PLANTATION

Appendix nr. 4: Table of artifacts found at the Leinster Bay Estate

Accession #	Catalog #	Finding Aids, Fld Specimen #	Key Descript	Description	Manufa ct. Date	Measure-ments	Within Site
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57188	10.0001	Pearlware	Blue Hand Painted Pearlware	1783-1830	___13.6g	Surface Collection (318318.37 E, 2031168.11 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57189	10.0002	Porcelain	American Porcelain	1769-Present	___2.4g	Surface Collection (318318.37 E, 2031168.11 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57190	11.0001	Bright Green Bottleneck	Bright Green bottleneck with tooled finish	1885-1920	___28.5g	Surface Collection (308321.60 E, 2031166.62 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57191	11.0002	Delft	Plain Delft	1600-1802	___5.6g	Surface Collection (308321.60 E, 2031166.62 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57192	12.0001	Slipware	Yellow Lead Glazed-Combed	1670-1795	___11.1g	Surface Collection (308305.24 E, 2031171.22 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57193	13.0001	Stoneware	White Salt Glazed Stoneware (Bead and Reel Pattern)	1740-1770	___9g	Surface Collection (318329.18 E, 2031166.11 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57194	13.0002	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___3.6g	Surface Collection (318329.18 E, 2031166.11 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57195	13.0003	Pipe Stem	Pipe Stem (5/64 Diameter)	1720-1750	___0.2g	Surface Collection (318329.18 E, 2031166.11 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57196	13.0004	Pipe Stem	Pipe Stem (4/64 Diameter)	1750-1800	___1g	Surface Collection (318329.18 E, 2031166.11 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57197	14.0001	Porcelain	Underglazed Blue Chinese Porcelain	1660-1880	___2g	Surface Collection (318325.75 E, 2031165.64 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57198	15.0001	Porcelain	Chinese Export Porcelain (No Design)	1550-Present	___4.4g	Surface Collection (318329.18 E, 2031162.54 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57199	15.0002	Quartz Chunk	Quartz Chunk		___27.8g	Surface Collection (318329.18 E, 2031162.54 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57200	16.0001	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___8.9g	Surface Collection (318335.58 E, 2031159.02 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57201	17.0001	Stoneware	19th Century Brown Salt Glazed Ink and Ginger Beer Stoneware	1820-1900	___35.2g	Surface Collection (318306.40 ME, 2031183.23 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57202	17.0002	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___3.3g	Surface Collection (318306.40 ME, 2031183.23 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57203	17.0003	Mortar with Wattle Impressions	Mortar with Wattle Impressions		___56.5g	Surface Collection (318306.40 ME, 2031183.23 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57204	18.0001	Creamware	Creamware with Brown Decorations	1762-1820	___1.1g	Surface Collection (318309.15 ME, 2031189.17 MN)

VIIS-00337	VIIS 57205	19.0001	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___1.8g	Surface Collection (318312.88 ME, 2031187.46 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57206	19.0002	Pipe Stem	Pipe Stem (4/64 Diameter)	1750-1800	___3g	Surface Collection (318312.88 ME, 2031187.46 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57207	20.0001	Stoneware	White Salt Glazed Stoneware	1720-1820	___0.6g	Surface Collection (318314.90 ME, 2031189.81 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57208	20.0002	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___0.5g	Surface Collection (318314.90 ME, 2031189.81 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57209	20.0003	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___0.3g	Surface Collection (318314.90 ME, 2031189.81 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57210	20.0004	Stoneware	19th Century Brown Salt Glazed Ink and Ginger Beer Stoneware	1820-1900	___5.7g	Surface Collection (318314.90 ME, 2031189.81 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57211	20.0005	Coarse Earthenware	Brown Lead Glazed Coarse Earthenware	1650-1900	___4.5g	Surface Collection (318314.90 ME, 2031189.81 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57212	20.0006	Pearlware	Blue Hand Painted Pearlware	1783-1830	___4.7g	Surface Collection (318314.90 ME, 2031189.81 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57213	20.0007	Possible Flint	Possible Flint		___10.9g	Surface Collection (318314.90 ME, 2031189.81 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57214	21.0001	Stoneware Tankard	Stoneware, Fulham Brown Stone Tankard with Gray Bottom	1722-1755	___21.7g	Surface Collection (318314.01 ME, 2031175.97 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57215	22.0001	Dark Green Bottleneck	Dark Green bottleneck with a cracked off top and flattened string rim.	1765-1785	___60.3g	Surface Collection (318368.13 ME, 2031202.86 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57216	22.0002	Bottle Base	Free Blown Bottle Base	1700-1860	___164g	Surface Collection (318368.13 ME, 2031202.86 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57217	22.0003	Whiteware	Plain Whiteware	1815-Present	___27g	Surface Collection (318368.13 ME, 2031202.86 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57218	22.0004	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___13.5g	Surface Collection (318368.13 ME, 2031202.86 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57219	22.0005	Coarse Earthenware	Brown Lead Glazed Coarse Earthenware	1650-1900	___11g	Surface Collection (318368.13 ME, 2031202.86 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57220	22.0006	Pearlware	Blue Banded Annular Pearlware	1810-1830	___2.1g	Surface Collection (318368.13 ME, 2031202.86 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57221	22.0007	Pearlware	Polychrome Pearlware (Early Style)	1795-1830	___2.2g	Surface Collection (318368.13 ME, 2031202.86 MN)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57222	22.0008	Pearlware	Polychrome Pearlware (Late Style)	1830-1840	___0.5g	Surface Collection (318368.13 ME, 2031202.86 MN)

VIIS-00337	VIIS 57223	23.0001	Pearlware	Polychrome Pearlware (Late Style)	1830-1840	___1.5g	Surface Collection (318373.40 E, 2031198.87 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57224	23.0002	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___1.6g	Surface Collection (318373.40 E, 2031198.87 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57225	24.0001	Pearlware	Polychrome Pearlware (Early Style)	1795-1830	___4.1g	Surface Collection (318368.30 E, 2031188.13 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57226	24.0002	Whiteware	Light Blue Transfer Print Whiteware	1830-1992	___0.8g	Surface Collection (318368.30 E, 2031188.13 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57227	25.0001	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___16.7g	Surface Collection (318368.47 E, 2031209.96N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57228	25.0002	Creamware	Mocha Creamware	1795-1820	___2.8g	Surface Collection (318368.47 E, 2031209.96N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57229	25.0003	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___5.8g	Surface Collection (318368.47 E, 2031209.96N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57230	25.0004	Pearlware	Polychrome Pearlware (Early Style)	1795-1830	___1.3g	Surface Collection (318368.47 E, 2031209.96N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57231	25.0005	Pearlware	Blue Shell Edge Pearlware	1780-1830	___10.7g	Surface Collection (318368.47 E, 2031209.96N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57232	25.0006	Pearlware	Green Shell Edge Pearlware	1800-1840	___1.6g	Surface Collection (318368.47 E, 2031209.96N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57233	25.0007	Whiteware	Light Blue Transfer Print Whiteware	1830-1992	___10.3g	Surface Collection (318368.47 E, 2031209.96N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57234	25.0008	Whiteware	Banded Annular Whiteware	1830-20th Century	___0.4g	Surface Collection (318368.47 E, 2031209.96N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57235	25.0009	Coarse Earthenware	Coarse Earthenware (El Morro)	1550-1825	___15.9g	Surface Collection (318368.47 E, 2031209.96N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57236	26.0001	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___23.2g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57237	26.0002	Pearlware	Blue Transfer Print Pearlware	1783-1830	___7g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57238	26.0003	Pearlware	Flow Blue Pearlware	1820-1850	___0.2g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57239	26.0004	Pearlware	Blue Hand Painted Pearlware	1780-1830	___0.4g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57240	26.0005	Pearlware	Polychrome Pearlware (Early Style)	1795-1830	___2.2g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57241	26.0006	Pipe Stem	Pipe Stem (5/64 Diameter)	1720-1750	___1.4g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57242	26.0007	Pipe Stems	Pipe Stems (4/64 Diameter)	1750-1800	___5.5g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)


VIIS-00337	VIIS 57243	26.0008	Whiteware	Plain Whiteware	1815-Present	___1g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57244	26.0009	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___6.4g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57245	26.0010	Pearlware	Finger Painted, Variegated Dipt Pearlware	1790-1820	___5.5g	Surface Collection (318365.56 E, 2030201.61N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57246	27.0001	Pearlware	Blue Hand Painted Pearlware	1783-1830	___3.5g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57247	27.0002	Whiteware	Sponged/Platterware Whiteware	1830-1865	___0.4g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57248	27.0003	Pearlware	Transfer Printed Pearlware	1783-1830	___3.2g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57249	27.0004	Porcelain	American Porcelain	1769-Present	___4g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57250	27.0005	Porcelain	Chinese Export Porcelain	1660-1880	___3.9g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57251	27.0006	Pearlware	Blue Shell Edged Pearlware	1780-1830	___2.1g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57252	27.0007	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___1g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57253	27.0008	Pearlware	Sponged Pearlware	1770-1830	___19.8g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57254	27.0009	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___32.2g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57255	27.0011	Pearlware	Wormy Finger Painted Pearlware	1790-1820	___1.1g	Surface Collection (318363.72 E, 2031216.79 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57256	28.0001	Green Bottle base	Square Cup Mold Base	1850-1920	___55g	Surface Collection (318369.13 E, 2031221.16 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57257	28.0002	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___16g	Surface Collection (318369.13 E, 2031221.16 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57258	28.0003	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___2.2g	Surface Collection (318369.13 E, 2031221.16 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57259	28.0004	Pearlware	Transfer Printed Pearlware	1783-1830	___6.5g	Surface Collection (318369.13 E, 2031221.16 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57260	28.0005	Pearlware	Embossed Pearlware	1823-1835	___3.1g	Surface Collection (318369.13 E, 2031221.16 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57261	29.0001	Aqua Medicine Bottle	Aqua Medicine Bottle with an Irregular Polygon Base	Pre 1920	___22.3g	Surface Collection (318377.19 E, 2031222.31 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57262	29.0002	Pearlware	Blue Transfer Print Pearlware	1783-1830	___0.7g	Surface Collection (318377.19 E, 2031222.31 N)

VIIS-00337	VIIS 57263	29.0003	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___6.8g	Surface Collection (318377.19 E, 2031222.31 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57264	30.0001	Rickett's Mold Base	Rickett's Mold Base	1820-1920	___366g	Surface Collection (318389.19 E, 2031232.98 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57265	30.0002	Porcelain	Underglazed Blue Chinese Porcelain	1660-1880	___2.5g	Surface Collection (318389.19 E, 2031232.98 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57266	30.0003	Pearlware	Transfer Printed Pearlware	1783-1830	___1.3g	Surface Collection (318389.19 E, 2031232.98 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57267	31.0001	Pearlware	Even Scalloped Impressed Bud Pearlware	1813-1835	___48.5g	Surface Collection (318367.99 E, 2031246.88 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57268	31.0002	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___6g	Surface Collection (318367.99 E, 2031246.88 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57269	31.0003	Pearlware	Green Shell Edged Pearlware	1800-1840	___10.9g	Surface Collection (318367.99 E, 2031246.88 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57270	31.0004	Pearlware	Polychrome Pearlware (Early Style)	1795-1830	___11g	Surface Collection (318367.99 E, 2031246.88 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57271	32.0001	Black Bottleneck	Black Glass Bottleneck with a Down Tooled Lip and String Rim	1819-1840	___120g	Surface Collection (318376.20 E, 2031256.24 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57272	32.0002	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___2g	Surface Collection (318376.20 E, 2031256.24 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57273	32.0003	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___1g	Surface Collection (318376.20 E, 2031256.24 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57274	32.0004	Porcelain	Chinese Export Porcelain	1660-1880	___1.6g	Surface Collection (318376.20 E, 2031256.24 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57275	33.0001	Pearlware	Polychrome Pearlware (Early Style)	1795-1830	___10g	Surface Collection (318399.51 E, 2031205.30 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57276	33.0002	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___4.2g	Surface Collection (318399.51 E, 2031205.30 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57277	33.0003	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___6g	Surface Collection (318399.51 E, 2031205.30 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57278	34.0001	Pearlware	Mocha Pearlware	1795-1840	___4.5g	Surface Collection (318407.72 E, 2031209.96 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57279	35.0001	Bottle Base	Bottle Base (Removable Type)	1820-1920	___119.6g	Surface Collection (318221.26 E, 2031469.15 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57280	36.0001	Bottle Base	Bottle Base (Circular Dip Mold)	1730-1870	___232g	Surface Collection (318198.55 E, 2031481.92 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57281	37.0001	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware (Blue Line on One)	1780-1830	___4.7g	Surface Collection (318196.50 E, 2031483.90 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57282	37.0002	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___15.5g	Surface Collection (318196.50 E, 2031483.90 N)

VIIS-00337	VIIS 57283	38.0001	Solarized Glass Base	Solarized Drinking Glass Base	1880-1920	___90.3g	Surface Collection (318183.23 E, 2031472.99 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57284	38.0002	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___13.4g	Surface Collection (318183.23 E, 2031472.99 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57285	38.0003	Pearlware	Transfer Printed Pearlware	1783-1830	___0.8g	Surface Collection (318183.23 E, 2031472.99 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57286	38.0004	Shell Bead	Shell Bead		___1.1g	Surface Collection (318183.23 E, 2031472.99 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57287	39.0001	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___7g	Surface Collection (318179.27 E, 2031478.80 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57288	39.0002	Pearlware	Blue Hand Painted Pearlware	1780-1830	___5g	Surface Collection (318179.27 E, 2031478.80 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57289	39.0003	Whiteware	Green Transfer Printed Whiteware	1828-1900	___0.5g	Surface Collection (318179.27 E, 2031478.80 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57290	40.0001	Clear Tumbler Fragment	Clear Tumbler Fragment (Cut Finger or Fringe Fluted Design)	1812-1814	___2.8g	Surface Collection (318176.43 E, 2031481.28 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57291	40.0002	Porcelain	Chinese Export Porcelain	1660-1800	___2g	Surface Collection (318176.43 E, 2031481.28 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57292	40.0003	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___0.3g	Surface Collection (318176.43 E, 2031481.28 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57293	40.0004	Pearlware	Transfer Printed Pearlware	1783-1830	___7.5g	Surface Collection (318176.43 E, 2031481.28 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57294	40.0005	Pearlware	Willow Pattern Pearlware	1795-1830	___2.3g	Surface Collection (318176.43 E, 2031481.28 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57295	40.0006	Pearlware	Banded Annular Pearlware	1785-1840	___2.2g	Surface Collection (318176.43 E, 2031481.28 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57296	41.0001	Cooking Pot Fragment	Metal Cooking Pot fragment with Ear Shaped Handles	18th Century	___172.2g	Surface Collection (318175.33 E, 2031474.21 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57297	41.0002	Pearlware	Pearlware "WOOD" Embossed on the bottom	1780-1830	___4.3g	Surface Collection (318175.33 E, 2031474.21 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57298	41.0003	Whiteware	Blue Transfer Printed Whiteware	1830-1865	___1.8g	Surface Collection (318175.33 E, 2031474.21 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57299	41.0004	Porcelain	Plain Porcelain	1550-Present	___1.1g	Surface Collection (318175.33 E, 2031474.21 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57300	42.0001	Porcelain	American Porcelain	1769-Present	___0.5g	Guardhouse (In Front of Casemate), Surface Collection (31196.35 E, 2031461.53 N)

VIIS-00337	VIIS 57301	42.0002	Whiteware	Plain Whiteware	1815-Present	___0.7g	Guardhouse (In Front of Casemate), Surface Collection (31196.35 E, 2031461.53 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57302	42.0003	Minton Majolica	Minton Majolica	1851-1890	___9.3g	Guardhouse (In Front of Casemate), Surface Collection (31196.35 E, 2031461.53 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57303	43.0001	Porcelain	American Porcelain	1769-Present	___4.4g	Guardhouse (In Front of Casemate), Surface Collection (31819.68 E, 203145.97 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57304	43.0002	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___3.4g	Guardhouse (In Front of Casemate), Surface Collection (31819.68 E, 203145.97 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57305	43.0003	Pearlware	Blue Banded Annular Pearlware	1810-1830	___1.7g	Guardhouse (In Front of Casemate), Surface Collection (31819.68 E, 203145.97 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57306	43.0004	Pearlware	Sponged Pearlware	1770-1830	___3.3g	Guardhouse (In Front of Casemate), Surface Collection (31819.68 E, 203145.97 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57307	43.0005	Whiteware	Transfer Printed Whiteware	1830-1865	___2.8g	Guardhouse (In Front of Casemate), Surface Collection (31819.68 E, 203145.97 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57308	43.0006	Creamware	Banded Annular Creamware	1785-1815	___0.9g	Guardhouse (In Front of Casemate), Surface Collection (31819.68 E, 203145.97 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57309	44.0001	Pearlware	Plain Pearlware	1780-1830	___2.8g	Guardhouse (South Side), Surface Collection (318203.10 E, 2031449.04 N)
VIIS-00337	VIIS 57310	45.0001	Creamware	Plain Creamware	1762-1820	___0.3g	Guardhouse (Inside 2nd Room Off Casemate), Surface Collection (318207.82 E, 2031454.82 N)

Appendix nr. 5: Percentage graph of enslaved at the Leinster Bay Estate



Appendix nr. 6: List of arrestees and deponents in the 1818 case

Arrestees:

No. 1, John Oslev: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 2, Timoth: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 3, Jeremy: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 4, John: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 5, Leinon: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 6, Lorn: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 7, Plato: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 8, Time: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 9: Mary: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 10, Eva Maria: Enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

No. 11, Lettie: Enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

Nr. 12, Billy: enslaved at CoralBay Estate.

Deponents:

Unfree Dublin: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

Unfree, Peter Stiller: enslaved at Leinster Bay Estate.

Free, Peter Brady: overseer at Leinster Bay Estate.

Free, John Hacket: second overseer, or under overseer at Leinster Bay Estate.

William Knot: overseer at Annaberg Estate.

Felix Dagherty: sergeant in the military.

Joseph Speakman: overseer at Abrahamsfancy.

John Dam: overseer at Coralbay Estate.