

The Backcountry Plantation in a Regional Economy: Pocket Plantation, 1762-1785

WILLIAM W. HOEST*

Settlers of southwestern Virginia in the eighteenth century were far from the markets that had served Virginians in the Tidewater. Those settlers could not bind themselves to major Tidewater merchant-planters, who had agents in England to market their tobacco, nor could they travel easily to Norfolk or Williamsburg to market their crops. But backcountry settlers came to new areas with strongly commercial, profit-oriented motives and they actively sought trading connections in eastern Virginia that would enable them to sell their tobacco, obtain currency, and buy imported goods.¹ In this context, economic intermediaries — planters, merchants, and factors — quickly arose between the backcountry and the British metropolis to circulate currency and commodities, and transport tobacco to Tidewater Virginia, where it could be shipped to Britain.²

Stores and factorage firms have received scholarly attention, but the intermediary functions of backcountry plantations have been less systematically studied.³ Although this study is concerned primarily with one plantation, a backcountry trade system cannot be understood without reference to storeowners and factors. These groups were more specialized but less integrated into localities than planters. Generally, local artisans and laborers worked for planters and received cash, imported items, and local goods in payment. Planters often provided transportation to eastern markets for local goods and payments to other planters and merchants on behalf of local men. Planters were not being altruistic when they employed local artisans. Backcountry planters apparently had difficulty obtaining skilled slaves, who were purchased instead by wealthy Tidewater planters with better access to the slave trade. Deprived of skilled slaves, planters turned to local artisans for specialized work on their plantations. In their local activities, planters benefited from their close

* Mr. Hoest, winner of the second prize, received a B.S. from the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, and an M.A. from the University of Virginia. He is working towards a Ph.D. at Virginia in American colonial history.

connections with storeowners and factors — connections forged in the colonial period by tobacco sales — to obtain cash, imported goods and credit.

Backcountry trade patterns shifted markedly during the American Revolution. When the tobacco market collapsed with the cessation of trade during the conflict, planters turned to local resources. Factors, the traders tied most closely to the European market, went out of business or turned to other pursuits such as slave trading or farming. But with established networks of debt, credit, currency circulation and transportation, backcountry economies apparently became more self-sufficient as grains, which could be consumed locally, became the most important crops, and as local men took over the marketing tasks previously performed by factors. Thus, backcountry settlers lost their dependent, colonial economies not by integrating into a national market, but by withdrawing into localized systems of plantations and stores.

The unusually complete records for Pocket Plantation, in southwestern Virginia, owned by John Smith, Jr., and his son Ralph, combined with mercantile records and scattered references to other backcountry plantations suggest patterns of labor use and trade among plantations and stores in the second half of the eighteenth century.⁴ Virginia's plantations undoubtedly varied in the extent of their integration into regional economies, from the general self-sufficiency of great Tidewater plantations, to the extensive relationships of backcountry plantations like Pocket Plantation. Studies of other plantations and stores, if data can be found, may eventually record the full range of variation.⁵

John Smith, Jr., achieved a measure of prominence in county affairs but never entered the ranks of the provincial elite.⁶ From his arrival in southwestern Virginia early in the 1760's until his death in 1776, Smith belonged to the county gentry. Born in 1725, he married the daughter of a successful Goochland County official in 1747 and one year later moved to Albemarle County, where he became deputy sheriff. Finally, in 1762, Smith moved to western Halifax County — an area that became Pittsylvania County in 1767 when Halifax was divided — and Pocket Plantation, purchased from Peter Jefferson in the mid-1750's.⁷ Soon he was appointed a justice of the peace in Bedford County just north of Pocket Plantation, an indication that he owned land there as well as in Pittsylvania.⁸

Like other county gentry, Smith bought and sold land frequently. Such land speculation was a customary adjunct to political officeholding among the gentry. In 1749, Smith purchased a 400-acre tract in Albemarle County from his father, and in 1758 he obtained another 600 acres in that county from Bowker Smith, his brother. In the 1750's and 1760's at least 1,700 acres of land in Goochland passed through Smith's hands. In 1755 he purchased 520 acres in that county from Henry Martin for £100 and within one year he had sold that tract for the same price. In 1758 Smith sold 500 acres to Bowker Smith, and in 1764 he sold a 726-acre tract to John Grills for £254. The exact amount of Smith's landholdings at any time is difficult to determine because all records of land transactions have not survived, and because Smith probably held land in several counties, but his will specified that he held about 1,500 acres of land in the mid-1770's.⁹ Such holdings did not match those of the great Tidewater planters, but they marked Smith as a man of means in county affairs.¹⁰

Pocket Plantation itself included 713 acres of rich land on the south side of the Roanoke River, when Smith bought it. Named for a "pocket-like" 129-acre section of the plantation that lay within a sharp bend of the Roanoke on the northern border of Pittsylvania County, the plantation grew to 898 acres during Smith's tenure. Modern soil maps indicate that Smith had purchased a fertile piece of land. The Roanoke had deposited several sorts of rich alluvial soils near the river banks. Additionally, the residual soils of the area, those formed by decomposition of underlying rock, were fairly fertile. Only one section of the plantation seems to have been too steep for planting but that section probably provided firewood for heating and curing tobacco.¹¹

Smith produced a great variety of goods at Pocket that offered many opportunities for employing slaves and local laborers and artisans. Tobacco, the crop that most occupied Smith's slaves, hemp, corn, oats, rye, wheat, livestock, fruits, and brandy were produced at Pocket at various times. And, Smith probably maintained fish traps in nearby rivers.¹² Growing, processing, storing, or transporting these products certainly kept a number of laborers busy. Furthermore, buildings, wagons, and tools often needed repairs. Considering this variety of goods and labor requirements, the attraction of a backcountry plantation to white laborers and artisans is clear.

Although Smith was the third largest slaveowner in Pittsylvania in 1767, his slaves possessed only a limited range of specialized skills, leaving Smith dependent on local laborers and artisans for some of the work that had to be done at Pocket.¹³ The limitations of Smith's slaves seem evident from his attempts to hire or buy skilled slaves from others. In 1767, for example, Smith hired a slave girl from Guy Smith, his brother, for the skilled job of breaking hemp. In 1770 Alexander Stewart, Smith's factor in Rocky Ridge, near Richmond, recalled that Smith was "still much in need of a Negroe Cooper." "I have been [trying] this sometime past to procure one for you," he continued, "and the very first [one I] hear of or meet with shall buy him for you, [the one] I formerly mention'd am afraid is not to be got at any rate from the Gentleman he belongs to at present, at last April General Court [in Williamsburg] I made him a very great offer, but in vain, he told me he could not then possibly spare him."¹⁴ Additionally, when the executors of Smith's estate hired out four of his slaves late in the 1770's, those slaves were credited with growing tobacco and corn; they evidently did not perform skilled crafts. The relative absence of skills among Smith's slaves should not be surprising. Tidewater planters, who had greater wealth and greater access to the slave trade than backcountry planters, probably purchased those skilled slaves who became available in Virginia. Consequently, Smith needed local artisans to do work at his plantation.¹⁵

Isolation from important cash crop marketing centers, and the inability of ocean-going ships to reach the backcountry, strengthened regional interdependence. Settled only in the 1730's and 1740's, Pittsylvania lacked rivers with direct access to Atlantic ports. Both the Dan and the Roanoke, the county's major rivers, flowed into commercially undeveloped Albemarle Sound in North Carolina. Planters like Smith who wanted to engage in the trans-Atlantic tobacco trade had to haul their crops to the towns near the fall-line of the James River, around Richmond, nearly 100 miles northeast of Pocket. Such distances, travelled overland in wagons or down the James River from Lynchburg to Richmond, taxed the resources of backcountry dwellers and forced them to rely on the superior resources of wealthy local planters, or merchant specialists, to market their crops. Planters like Smith, and his neighbors along the Roanoke (Benjamin Clement, William Ward, Thomas Dillard, and Richard Walden), who owned major

plantations in northern Pittsylvania, maintained credit relationships with each other, shared wagons and merchants, and hired the same local men in some cases.¹⁶

In addition to these planters, merchants in local towns attracted some of Smith's trade. Smith, for example, did business with John Hook, William Callaway, and Robert Cowan, merchants in the Bedford County court town of Liberty, about ten miles north of Pocket. The three men represented firms with connections in Tidewater Virginia and Great Britain and could obtain some of the goods that Smith wanted.¹⁷ Smith also traded with Samuel Calland, who established a store about 20 miles southwest of Pocket Plantation and married Smith's daughter, Elizabeth, in 1776. Occasionally, especially in the 1770's, Smith dealt with merchants in Lynch's Ferry, modern-day Lynchburg, about 25 miles northeast of Pocket, who could float his tobacco to market. Nonetheless, Smith's volume of trade with these local merchants seems to have been much smaller than that with the major factors, representatives of Scottish mercantile firms, in Rocky Ridge.¹⁸

The number and complexity of Smith's transactions with local artisans, planters, and laborers, show that Pocket Plantation formed an important nexus of local economic activity. Smith's ties with planters, storeowners, and factors gave him access to goods and cash that other local men needed but could not obtain directly with their own resources. His advantages encouraged economic interdependence. Smith got the labor he needed while local men received the merchandise and cash they wanted.

Smith's business relationships with Benjamin Clement, Jr., illustrate the ways in which planters of nearly equal stature supported each other. Smith and Clement owned adjacent plantations on the Roanoke River. Clement had resided at his estate, "Clement Hill," since 1748. When Clement died in 1780 his estate was appraised at £27,604. His personal property was at least as valuable as Smith's, although no definite conclusions can be reached because the latter's appraisal has not been found.¹⁹ Clement and Smith apparently sold and shipped their tobacco through the same transportation networks and, occasionally, the same factor. In 1764 Smith hired out his wagon to Clement for carrying the latter's tobacco. Smith charged him the customary rate, £1 15s., per hogshead. Also in 1764, Alexander Stewart, Smith's factor, returned Smith's wagon to him with articles Smith

had ordered "pack't into a Rum Hogshead along with some [articles] belonging to Mr. Clements." In the following year, Smith's wagons carried at least two more of Clement's hogsheads to Rocky Ridge. Like Smith, Clement apparently used some of the services provided by Alexander Stewart, Smith's Rocky Ridge merchant. In 1766, for example, when Smith and Clement were settling their accounts with each other, the former noted: "The Ballance due to him [Clement] from me is two pounds twelve shillings and six pence which he had ordered me to pay Mr. Alexander Stewart merchant at Rocky Ridge."²⁰

Examination of Smith's transactions with local laborers and merchants in 1764 and 1765 clarifies the important distributive roles of the plantation in its local setting. Smith recorded transactions with nineteen men in 1764 and with fourteen in 1765.²¹ The complementary quality of relations between planters and local men emerges clearly from this examination. While Smith paid local men mainly with cash, rum, textiles, or miscellaneous imported goods, they paid Smith mostly with labor, and locally-produced livestock, grains, or hides. The specific distribution of goods and services during those years were as follows:

Table 1
1764, Paid by Smith to Local Men
(with percentage of total debt in parentheses)

Rum	£ 3	6s.	9 d. (15.7)
Textiles (all kinds)	£ 4	0s.	4 d. (18.7)
Wagoning	£ 2	2s.	6 d. (10)
Salt	£ 1	15s.	6 d. (8.4)
Cash, loans, bonds, etc.	£ 7	0s.	4½d. (32.7)
Corn	£ 1	4s.	0 d. (5.6)
Wheat	£ 0	6s.	0 d. (1.4)
Other *	£ 1	12s.	4 d. (7.5)
<hr/>			
Total	£21	7s.	9½d.

Table 2

1764, Paid by Local Men to Smith
(with percentage of total debt in parentheses)

Skilled work **	£11	0s.	2 d. (35.3)
Wagoning	£ 6	7s.	8 d. (20.5)
Livestock and meat	£ 7	19s.	3 d. (25.7)
Loans, bonds, cash, etc.	£ 1	12s.	3½d. (5.3)
"Retrieving horse"	£ 1	0s.	0 d. (3.2)
Corn and rye	£ 0	14s.	0 d. (2.2)
Rum	£ 0	16s.	0 d. (2.5)
Other ***	£ 1	13s.	2½d. (5.3)
<hr/>			
Total	£31	2s.	7 d.

Table 3

1765, Paid by Smith to Local Men
(with percentage of total debt in parentheses)

Textiles (all kinds)	£ 1	7s.	1 d. (2.5)
Wagoning	£ 4	15s.	0 d. (8.8)
Salt	£ 1	2s.	10½d. (2.1)
Cash, loans, bonds, etc.	£32	9s.	4 d. (60.3)
Corn	£ 6	5s.	3 d. (11.6)
Livestock and meat	£ 4	0s.	0 d. (7.4)
Surveying	£ 0	10s.	0 d. (1.0)
Other *	£ 3	7s.	9½d. (6.3)
<hr/>			
Total	£53	17s.	4 d.

Table 4

1765, Paid by Local Men to Smith
(with percentage of total debt in parentheses)

Skilled work **	£80	16s.	3 d. (86.75)
Wagoning	£ 3	15s.	0 d. (4.0)
Cash, loans, bonds, etc.	£ 4	16s.	9 d. (5.2)
Unskilled labor	£ 3	0s.	0 d. (3.2)
Other ***	£ 0	15s.	4½d (.85)
<hr/>			
Total	£93	3s.	4½d.

Source: Compiled from John Smith, Jr., Account and Day Book, Pocket Plantation Papers, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

* "Other" goods provided by Smith consisted mainly of imported goods such as ribbons, buttons, candies, hats, knives, leather, paper, books, spices, fine shoes, etc.

** Skilled work included blacksmithing, coopering, masonry, carpentry, weaving, brickmaking, etc.

*** "Other" goods provided by locals consisted mainly of locally-produced goods such as tallow, beans, hides, and coarse shoes.

Smith's dealings with Stephen Wood, an appropriately named carpenter, offer a clear example of the sorts of complex debt and credit relationships that bound local men into a partially closed regional economy. Smith first hired Wood in 1765. From August of that year to September of 1766, Smith paid £32 14s., to Wood's creditors and 5s., to Wood himself. Smith also debited small charges for door locks, corn, and the hire of a horse. To repay his debts, Wood did carpentry work. Smith credited him with £6 for building a "dary and Meat house 12 feet square," and £49 for constructing a dwelling house. In early September 1766, Smith owed Wood £19 11s. 8d., but by mid-September Wood owed Smith money. The improvident carpenter had accumulated more debts than he could cover. In mid-September, a worried Smith wrote to Benjamin Clement: "Stephen Wood, is like to go to prison for about Eight Pounds and I have not the Money nor can't get it till my Tobacco or Hemp goes down; Should take it as a Very great Favour (if you have no present use for), if you woud let Stephen Wood have it, which I will be sure to repay you again with Interest." Clement obliged Smith. On September 16 Smith debited £8 from Wood's account for "cash paid you by Capt. Clement for me."²²

Smith's efforts on Wood's behalf were not yet finished. On September 7 Smith had written to James French, a merchant in Prince Edward: "Mr. Stephen Wood has almost finished Working for me, and tells me the money I shall owe him he intends for you and desired I woud let you know it, Therefore I will let you have. . . Either Tobacco or Hemp at the Market price to pay you what I shall Owe him in Settlement, which I expect will be very soon, or Money if the others don't suit." In mid-September Smith

charged Wood £8 15s. 5d., for the planter's "order on Mr. James French," and with that Wood went into debt to Smith for £5 15s. In 1767, to pay the debt, Wood made two cupboards, made and placed a window frame, constructed eighteen window sashes, built two tables and sawed 128 feet of plank. With those chores completed, the account balanced. Each man had provided the currency equivalent of £61 10s. to the other, by Smith's reckoning.²³

These episodes demonstrate the characteristics of the debt and credit relationships that Smith used to mobilize labor at his plantation. Smith's employment of Wood quickly involved other creditors: James French, the man who was apparently ready to send Wood to prison for £8, and Benjamin Clement, after he paid Smith for the carpenter. Interestingly, wealthy planters and merchants apparently circulated currency among themselves as a means of controlling artisans, who received little currency directly. Several planters who had no need for fulltime artisans on their plantations could share the local artisans with this method of exchange. Furthermore, the labor used at Pocket was usually specialized. Wood was a carpenter; others were teachers, brickmakers, or tailors.²⁴ In sum, Smith could use his position as a respected planter to secure cash from neighboring planters and merchants, sources not available to the less wealthy local whites. Smith's access to cash enabled him to attract white workers who lacked access to money but who had acquired debts.

Other plantations in the backcountry similarly used debt and credit relationships to mobilize local white labor. Michael Nicholls, studying southern Virginia before 1750, discovered records of a planter who owned about eleven slaves and who also employed free white bricklayers, saddlers, shoemakers, blacksmiths, tailors, carpenters and chair makers. John Mallory, owner of a plantation in Orange County, employed a blacksmith early in the 1760's to point a plow, sharpen a hoe, and make a plow, hoes, and two horseshoes. A study of Louisa County in the late eighteenth century found a full complement of free white artisans and day laborers, most of whom apparently worked for wages rather than goods.²⁵

While the "tissue of debt," as one historian has called it, linked individuals throughout the backcountry in economic relationships, the transportation system moved the goods that facilitated

exchanges and, less importantly, employed local men as wagoners.²⁶ Planters packed their cured tobacco leaves in hogsheads, barrels measuring 48 inches by 30 inches and usually weighing between 900 and 1,100 pounds, for transportation to market. Wagoning the hogsheads entailed simply loading the barrels onto wagons, while rolling necessitated driving stakes through the flat ends of the barrels and, in effect, using the barrels as wheels. Smith usually sent pairs of hogsheads, or multiples of two, to Rocky Ridge. Records of seventeen trips from Pocket to Rocky Ridge in which the weight and value of the tobacco were available indicated that two hogsheads were commonly rolled or wagoned at an average weight of 2,129 pounds per trip. Smith received an average of about £23 10s., for the tobacco sold on each of these trips. During the tobacco-growing season, from about June to October, Smith's wagons traveled the roads from Pocket to the falls of the James at a rate of more than one per month.²⁷

Local free men usually wagoned or rolled Smith's tobacco and apparently received £1 5s., or £1 10s., per hogshead for rolling and £1 15s., per hogshead for wagoning. The men who transported Smith's tobacco commonly had other dealings with Smith besides carrying his tobacco to market. They were not, in other words, professional wagoners. Smith provided the wagons, horses, and provisions for each trip. If materials had to be purchased on the road, Smith repaid the drivers for them, too.²⁸

Smith maximized the use of his teams by hiring them out to local planters when he was not using them and by insuring that his wagons would not return empty to Pocket. When Smith rented his horses and wagons to local planters, he charged them at the same rate he paid local hired wagoners, £1 15s., per hogshead. This rate probably represented Smith's calculations of wear and tear to wagons and horses on a trip, and a small profit for himself.²⁹ The other method for using tobacco wagons efficiently entailed "backloading." This consisted of loading the recently emptied wagons in the fall-line towns with goods that were ordered by backcountry settlers. One common backload consisted of Smith's factor using the planter's wagons to transport goods to the merchant's outlying stores. In 1769, for example, Alexander Stewart, Smith's factor in Rocky Ridge, wrote to Smith that the planter's "waggoner thinks he can carry about ½ a load for Mr. Cowan [Stewart's resident factor in Bedford County], tho he is a

little doubtfull of his horses, have given him some fodder for them and sent by him $\frac{1}{2}$ a load to Bedford Courthouse for which shall credit your account for waggoning 30 [shillings]." In 1769 and 1770, Smith's wagons brought at least six loads of goods from Rocky Ridge to backcountry stores.³⁰ Smith's wagoners sometimes brought goods for local men. In these cases, Pocket Plantation itself became a local distribution point. In 1764, for example, Smith's wagoner brought back 105 pounds of iron, 6 gallons of rum, 1 sack of salt, 6 ells of osnabrughs linen and 2,000 nails for Abraham Chandler, a local man. Finally, there was the backload of goods brought in Smith's wagons to Pocket Plantation for consumption on the plantation. Smith paid his factor for these goods but, since he used his own wagons, he did not have any charges for the transportation of the goods other than the hiring rate of the wagoners.³¹

In the 1740's Robert Rose, a minister in Albemarle County, developed a technique for lashing canoes together and arranging tobacco hogsheads on their gunwales to float the crop to market. In the 1770's Smith evidently began to use this method of transport. Wagoners carried Smith's tobacco for about 25 miles from Pocket to Lynch's Ferry on the James River, and professional boatmen floated the hogsheads from there to Westham above the falls of the James, a distance of about 75 miles. The tobacco was then wagoned a short distance from Westham to inspection warehouses in Rocky Ridge.³²

Floating hogsheads had several advantages over carrying them by land. First, floating was less expensive than wagoning or rolling. Boatmen evidently charged from £1 to £1 2s. 6d., for floated hogsheads compared to a land rate of from £1 5s., to £1 15s. Second, more tobacco could be carried at one time by floating. Smith's records indicate that from 12 to 30 hogsheads were transported at once by water compared to a usual two per trip by land. Since more tobacco could be carried at one time, Smith could delay transporting his crop until October or later and could be sure that all of his tobacco was properly prepared. Despite the advantages of floating hogsheads, the method never totally supplanted wagoning as a means to get tobacco to market. Perhaps boatmen, who were professionals, were less accessible to backcountry planters than were the ever-present and dependent local wagoners.³³

The evidence of dealings between local men and merchants in Pittsylvania shows that the latter sold mainly imported goods. Smith's records of transactions with local merchants, such as those in Bedford County and Lynchburg mentioned above, are fragmentary at best, but records from one store in the county provide clues to the volume and origins of merchants' sales. In the early 1770's, the Scottish mercantile firm of James Murdoch and Company operated a store in the center of the county, near the Bannister River.³⁴ In late 1773 and early 1774, Donald McNicoll, the storekeeper, kept account of dealings with local men. From September 2, 1773 to March 30, 1774, one hundred fifty-six individuals bought goods from McNicoll's store. During that time, McNicoll recorded 731 transactions with the locals. That is, each individual came to the store an average of four or five times during those months to make purchases. From September 2, 1773 to November 10, 1773, McNicoll recorded that he had sold £228 10s. 9½d., worth of goods. Clearly, the merchant had a wider "sphere of influence" than did Smith, who distributed about £21 worth of goods to local men in 1764 and £53 worth in 1765.³⁵ But Smith distributed both local and imported goods, while the merchant concentrated in imported merchandise.

Table 5

McNicoll's Payments to 14 Local Men, 1773-1774

(with percentage of total payment in parentheses)

Textiles (all kinds)	£19	14s	0½d. (42.8)
Cash, loans, bonds, etc.	£ 7	8s.	6 d. (16.2)
Rum	£ 3	6s.	8½d. (7.3)
Salt	£ 3	5s.	2½d. (7.1)
Nails	£ 1	1s.	3 d. (2.3)
Sugar	£ 1	11s.	6 d. (3.3)
Iron	£ 0	10s.	0 d. (1.1)
Other *	£ 9	3s.	2½d. (19.9)
<hr/>			
Total	£46	0s.	5 d.

Source: Compiled from James Murdoch and Co., Account Book, Library of Congress. Accounts with Joseph Roberts, Thomas Dillard, Jr., William Wilkinson, Sr., Lewis Shelton, John Barbar, Joseph Bays, Spencer Shelton, Hall Hudson, Sr., John Clever, John

Payne, Sr., George Evans, John Doss, William Terry, and James Leak.

* "Other" goods consisted of finery: buttons, ribbons, needles, spices, lace, etc.

Although McNicoll's record of local men's payments to him has not survived, such payments would presumably have been primarily in locally-produced goods, tobacco, grains, cash, loans, and bonds. Notably, all of McNicoll's payments to local men consisted of some sort of imported item. Smith's transactions, on the other hand, dealt with a fairly high proportion of locally-produced goods or services, such as corn, livestock, and wagoning. Thus, although stores and plantations paralleled each other to a large extent in their transactions with locals, they also complemented each other in the origins of the items they sold. Local goods and services came from planters, and otherwise unobtainable exotic goods came from merchants. With their wide range of imported items, backcountry merchants resembled the major factorage firms of the Tidewater, which served backcountry Virginians as the essential link with the Atlantic economy.

Factors, usually representatives of Scottish mercantile firms, made up the third major element in the backcountry network. They provided an indispensable market for the tobacco of planters in Virginia's backcountry who lacked the resources to deal directly with merchants in England, as planters in the Tidewater had done. They established stores in the towns along the fall-line and in the court towns of the backcountry. After inspectors appointed by Virginia's Assembly certified tobacco as being of good quality, planters consigned the leaf to factors who kept it until ships arrived to export it to Scotland and England. Control then passed to the factors' superiors, usually the merchants of Glasgow. In return for tobacco, factors provided planters with goods and cash. Since planters could not present tobacco hogsheads every time they needed merchandise, the practice of carrying accounts on book credit developed. Factors kept an account with each of their clients, and at the end of the year the account was settled and, ideally, balanced. Usually, however, planters remained in debt to their factors even after the yearly settlements.³⁶

During his years at Pocket Plantation, John Smith, Jr., dealt mainly with two factors. From 1763 to 1772, Smith sent his tobacco

to Alexander Stewart, factor for the firm of James and Robert Donald and Company. Smith began dealing with Alexander Banks, a factor for Speirs, Bowman and Company, in 1771 and sent tobacco to Banks until the planter's death in 1776. Also in the 1770's, Smith dealt with the Rocky Ridge firm of Callaway and Trent.³⁷ In 1767, Stewart operated the store with the third highest valuation in Rocky Ridge, and just prior to the American Revolution, Banks' firm was the largest tobacco exporter in Virginia.³⁸ The volume of Callaway and Trent's business has not been determined.

Although Smith was often deeply in debt to his factors, thus suffering an onerous constraint on his resources, the latter did provide some useful services.³⁹ The planter received from factors some of the cash and loans that enabled him to hire other local men for various services, and some of the goods to operate his plantation and to trade to local men. For example, Smith's dealings with Stephen Wood, recounted above, showed that planters and merchants circulated currency among themselves to control local artisans. Evidence of transactions between Smith and his factors, displayed in Tables 6 through 8 below, suggests that factors were a major source of that circulating currency. Smith received, at the same time, a remarkably diverse variety of goods from his factors. An item-by-item listing would run to several pages, but by establishing several broad categories for the commodities, the contribution of factors to planters' operations and trade can be determined.

Table 6
1764, Commodities Provided by Alexander Stewart
to Smith⁴⁰

(with percentage of total in parentheses)

Cash to Smith	£12	2s.	6 d. (9.7)
Cash, bonds, loans, etc. paid to others	£22	1s.	9 d. (17.6)
Plantation management *	£29	1s.	4 d. (23.1)
Luxuries **	£19	15s.	7 d. (15.7)
Slave Maintenance #	£22	8s.	11½d. (17.8)
Necessities ##	£15	13s.	11 d. (12.4)
Sugar and Molasses	£ 4	13s.	8 d. (3.7)
<hr/> Total	£125	17s.	8½d.

Table 7

1769, Commodities Provided by Alexander Stewart
to Smith

(with percentage of total in parentheses)

Cash, loans, bonds, etc. paid to Smith	£12	12s.	0 d. (4.0)
Cash, loans, bonds, etc. paid to others	£204	17s.	9 d. (64.7)
Plantation management *	£28	8s.	5 d. (9.0)
Luxuries **	£22	7s.	5 d. (7.0)
Slave Maintenance #	£26	0s.	6 d. (8.2)
Necessities ##	£16	19s.	3 d. (5.3)
Sugar and Molasses	£ 5	10s.	3 d. (1.7)
<hr/> Total	£316	15s.	7 d.

Table 8

1774, Commodities Provided by Factors
to Smith ⁴¹

(with percentage of total in parentheses)

Cash, loans, bonds, etc. paid to Smith	£ 5	8s.	0 d. (3.5)
Cash, loans, bonds, etc. paid to others	£39	9s.	1½d. (25.2)
Plantation management *	£11	13s.	2¼d. (7.5)
Luxuries **	£44	10s.	7½d. (28.5)
Slave Maintenance #	£29	7s.	7¼d. (18.8)
Necessities ##	£21	3s.	6¼d. (13.5)
Sugar and Molasses	£ 4	14s.	9½d. (3.0)
<hr/> Total	£156	6s.	10¼d.

Table 9

Cash Value of Smith's Tobacco, 1764-1773

1764:	£126	14s.	4d.	1769:	£351	10s.	9¾d.
1765:	£123	10s.	6d.	1770:	£250	17s.	11d.
1766:	£165	5s.	6d.	1771:	£353	14s.	0d.
1767:	£239	19s.	0d.	1772:	£164	19s.	9d.
1768:	not available			1773:	£284	2s.	11d.

Source: Accounts books of Alexander Stewart and Alexander Banks, account with Callaway and Trent and Company, Pocket Plantation Papers, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

* Plantation management: inspecting, wagoning, or packing tobacco; tools, hoes, harnesses, livestock, nails, iron, fees paid to county officials, etc.

** Luxuries: fine fabrics, fine paper, spices, candy, fine hats, ribbon, lace, stockings, buckles, silk products, coffee, etc.

Slave Maintenance: coarse fabrics, rum, slave shoes, etc.

Necessities: grains, clothing, books, salt, shoes for family, thread, butcher knives, cotton cards, pins and needles, buttons, medicines, work hats, etc.

Smith's factors also provided him with market information, newspapers, and, occasionally, slaves, while the planter served at times as a sort of field representative for the factor, investigating prospective clients' credit, and pressing factors' debtors to pay up.⁴²

The many economic activities linking planters and factors accent the commercialized nature of the backcountry, for factors were specialized agents in the imperial trade network. If settlers had been interested only in subsistence agriculture, factors would have been unnecessary. But, ironically, factors promoted the commercial activity that established transportation, debt and credit, and trading connections between backcountry settlers and these connections remained intact after factors went out of business.

The regional economic system in the backcountry — namely, debt and credit relationships between planters and local men, mercantile activity by planters and local merchants, and an established transportation system — facilitated settlers' adjustments to the economic crisis of the American Revolution. The Revolution closed European markets for tobacco and initiated a major depression in the backcountry tobacco market. Many factors, who were often suspected of loyalism, went out of business, taking their connections to European firms with them. In Pittsylvania, as a result, planters turned to production of locally-consumed goods, and local storeowners took over the tasks of marketing goods that factors had handled previously.⁴³ In these

respects, Pittsylvania County fit the model of backcountry development elaborated by Julius Rubin, for early nineteenth-century Rochester, New York. Rubin reasoned that many backcountry areas underwent small-scale commercial revolutions, in which local marketing mechanisms, transportation networks, and credit facilities developed decades before the famous transportation revolution of the early nineteenth century. Such backcountry adaptations in fact explained the direction and rate of later economic growth after effective long-distance transportation techniques reached the backcountry. Of course, the backcountry South never urbanized and industrialized as the North did. Plantations, because they incorporated so many urban functions, limited the growth of towns and cities, which in the northern United States provided the nodal points of economic growth.⁴⁴

Ralph Smith, John Smith, Jr.'s successor at Pocket Plantation, quickly reoriented toward local ties using the already existing regional system during the 1780's. Since the Smiths had relied on extensive European demand for their tobacco, the cessation of external trade discouraged production of that crop. Confronted with the depression in the tobacco market, Ralph Smith turned instead to grain production. Smith grew 240 barrels of corn in 1782, 185 barrels in 1783, 232 barrels in 1784, and 102 barrels in 1785. The only record of a corn crop equal to these under John Smith, Jr., was that of 221 barrels produced in 1765. Conversely, Ralph Smith's tobacco production never reached the levels attained by his father. Smith recorded production of 4,833 pounds of tobacco in 1782; 5,775 pounds in 1784; and 10,415 pounds in 1786. All of these totals were notably lower than those achieved by John Smith, Jr., during the 1760's and 1770's.⁴⁵ Another indication of the increasing importance of grains at Pocket in the 1780's was the greater frequency of paying local laborers with grains rather than other commodities. In the account kept with seven, nonslaveholding, free men during the 1780's, Smith recorded payments to them of £14 3s. 9d. worth of grains; £3 4s. 9d., in cash; £2 17s. 11½d., in alcohol and small payments in goods like combs, shoes, hoes, and textiles. These sorts of payments contrast with those in the 1760's, when only about ten percent of John Smith, Jr.'s payments to locals during the sample years detailed in Tables 1 and 3 were in grains.⁴⁶

Merchants and planters turned toward one another during the 1780's to replace former ties between backcountry settlers and factors. John Smith, Jr., had prepared the way for his son to use local sources of marketing skills by ensuring that his daughters marry into successful local families. Ralph Smith's sisters, Elizabeth and Anna, married Samuel Calland and William Callaway. Calland had opened a store in Pittsylvania County's court town, southeast of Pocket in the 1770's, and William Callaway operated a store in Liberty, in Bedford County.⁴⁷ The successful Calland owned more slaves than Ralph Smith and also owned one of the few carriages in the county. Smith purchased items from these merchants that he had previously obtained from factors in Rocky Ridge.⁴⁸ In the late 1780's, Smith and his brother, Bowker, applied for and were granted a license "to retail their Goods, Wares and Merchandise" by the Pittsylvania County Court. With that license, Smith virtually became a merchant as well as a planter. Henceforth, he dealt with local men to buy their crops and to import merchandise into the area.⁴⁹ Thus, although the Scottish factors, the most immediate representatives of the export market for backcountry settlers during the colonial period, were no longer active in the 1780's, the planter at Pocket Plantation apparently suffered little hardship from their absence.

The regional economic activity visible in the records of Pocket Plantation suggests three observations about economic behavior in late eighteenth-century Virginia. First, those studies that attempt to determine economic growth and development of the colony through examination of imperial import and export figures omit a large and undoubtedly significant category of capital and enterprise localized in Virginia's backcountry.⁵⁰ Local trades in foodstuffs, hides, or free white labor simply do not enter into the statistics compiled by British officials in major ports. Although volume of trade between planters and local laborers and artisans seems exceedingly small when only one plantation is examined, the thousands of plantations throughout Virginia, all contributing a share to local activity, must be kept in mind. Second, the connections between local men and planters may explain in part the highly deferential character of eighteenth-century Virginia's social relations. Poor Virginians usually followed the lead of wealthy planters. Explanations for this acquiescence have concentrated on planters' displays of cultural and material superiority. While such

displays undoubtedly were important, the "tissue of debt" binding planters and nonplanters in a network of rights and obligations, may explain some of the social tranquility of the first three-quarters of the eighteenth century in Virginia.⁵¹ Third, the conventional emphasis of economic historians on urbanization as a key to economic activity is probably misplaced where the southern backcountry is concerned. Although backcountry towns often performed more "urban" functions than their small size would have suggested, plantations evidently performed an equally significant number of important functions, such as facilitating exchange of goods from distant merchants, providing credit to local men, and offering sites where craftsmen could use their skills.⁵²

Studies of economic activity in the colonial South have usually concentrated on either the broadest level, trans-Atlantic commerce, or the narrowest level, the plantation as a unit of production. This study has attempted to show that an intermediate level of economic activity existed in the colony, at least in the backcountry, where exchange and distribution of valued goods extended outward from plantations and stores, which were tenuously linked to the imperial import and export trades. Those regional networks, furthermore, facilitated employment of skilled craftsmen from local populations when slaves were mostly unskilled, and allowed rapid adjustments when an economic crisis like the Revolution disrupted one of the important exchange and distribution sites, the factorage firms. Examination of the local history of Virginia's plantations and stores has barely begun, but when it is further along it may illuminate the economic, social, and political history of the eighteenth-century South.

NOTES

¹ For the commercial characteristics of frontier settlements see Robert D. Mitchell, *Commercialism and Frontier: Perspectives on the Early Shenandoah Valley* (Charlottesville, 1977), 1-14.

² Throughout this paper the term "factor" applies to the Scottish merchants, field representatives of Scottish mercantile firms, who ran major stores near tobacco inspection warehouses and smaller towns in backcountry regions.

³ On stores see Calvin B. Coulter, Jr., "The Virginia Merchant" (unpublished Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1944); Lewis Atherton, *The Southern Country Store, 1800-1860* (New York, 1968). On factorage firms see James H. Soltow, *The Economic Role of Williamsburg* (Charlottesville, 1965); Jacob M. Price, "The Rise

of Glasgow in the Chesapeake Tobacco Trade, 1707-1775," *William and Mary Quarterly* (hereafter *WMQ*), 3d. ser., XI (1954), 179-199.

Studies of Chesapeake plantations do exist. For example, see Paul G.E. Clemens, "The Operation of an Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake Tobacco Plantation," *Agricultural History*, XLIX (1975), 517-531; Louis Morton, *Robert Carter of Nomini Hall: A Virginia Planter of the Eighteenth Century* (Charlottesville, 1964, first printing 1941). Clemens was concerned mainly with questions of soil exhaustion and diversification, and Morton examined a planter, Robert Carter who was wealthy enough to combine extensive planting, slave-holding and merchandising in the Tidewater. Aubrey C. Land's researches into economic behavior in the Chesapeake most closely follow the main concerns of this study. But Land, like Morton, studied Tidewater planter-entrepreneurs who dealt directly with English merchants or ran trading operations themselves. See Land's "Economic Base and Social Structure: The Northern Chesapeake in the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of Economic History*, XXV (1965), 639-654; "Economic Behavior in a Planting Society: The Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake," *Journal of Southern History*, XXXIII (1967), 469-485; and a book of primary documents that Land edited: *Bases of Plantation Society* (Columbia, S.C., 1969).

⁴ The Pocket Plantation Papers are in Alderman Library of the University of Virginia, Charlottesville. The first three boxes of the collection deal substantially with the eighteenth century. The records include John Smith, Jr.'s day book for roughly the period from 1749 to 1767, various letters from the planter's factors, assorted accounts with factors and kinsmen, and miscellaneous notes, bonds, and various fragments. Ralph Smith's records are mainly his three day books, which cover the 1780's, but are more fragmentary than his father's records.

⁵ Few plantation records from the eighteenth century have been found. On the other hand, stores' account books are quite common. Alderman Library has, for example, the William Strachey Commonplace Book and Anderson's Tobacco Letterbook — both merchant's records. Duke University has the John Hook Papers, and the Virginia State Library has the William Allason Papers. Other research centers such as the Library of Congress and Colonial Williamsburg hold merchants' records. If supplemented with county records available on microfilm from the Virginia State Library, Richmond, merchants' accounts would illuminate important aspects of economic behavior in the colony.

⁶ For the expansion of county-level positions in the eighteenth century see, D. Alan Williams, "The Small Farmer in Eighteenth-Century Virginia," *Agricultural History*, XLIII (1969), 91-101.

⁷ Although Pittsylvania County did not exist as a legal designation until 1767, that county name will be used throughout this study to refer to the county where Smith lived, regardless of the dates involved.

⁸ Maud C. Clement, "The Tobacco Lords of Glasgow and the Virginia Planter — As Shown by the Pocket Papers, 1763-1775," typescript in the Maud Carter Clement Papers, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, 11-14; H.R. McIlwaine and Edward Ingle, eds., "Justices of the Peace in Colonial Virginia, 1757-1775," *Bulletin of the Virginia State Library*, XIV (April, July, 1921), 81.

⁹ Albemarle County Deed Book No. 2, 1758-1761, 26; Albemarle County Index to Deeds, 1748-1819, I, 346; Goochland County Deed Book No. 7, 1755-1759, 7-8, 69, 262; Goochland County Deed Book No. 8, 1759-1765, 460-61. All sources in the Virginia State Library, Richmond (hereafter cited VSL).

¹⁰ The one hundred richest Virginia planters in the late 1780's, the first time when figures on property holding are available, owned about 80 slaves and at least 5,000 acres of land. About 2,000 planters owned at least a thousand acres and at least 20 slaves. Jackson Turner Main, "The One Hundred," *WMQ*, 3d. ser., XI (1954), 354-384.

All prices mentioned in this study are in Virginia currency, not in British sterling.

¹¹ Copy of surveyor's sketch of Pocket land grant, Maud C. Clement Papers, Box 2; "Receipt for Quitrents on the Pocket," Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 2; for soils in northern Pittsylvania see N.M. Kirk, "Soil Survey of Pittsylvania County, Virginia," in Milton Whitney, ed., *Field Operations of the Bureau of Soils, 1918* (Washington, 1918), 121-162; the map accompanying the above soil survey indicates that the area that would have encompassed Pocket Plantation had the following soils: Congaree fine sandy loam, Wickham loam, Altavista fine sandy loam, Cecil gravelly fine sandy loam, and Cecil fine sandy loam (steep phase).

¹² For grain production see Smith's account with Henry Snow in John Smith's Account and Day Book, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 1 (hereafter cited as JSAB); for tobacco see Table 9 below; for hemp see accounts with James Cooper in 1766 and with Guy Smith in 1767, JSAB; for livestock see account with James Flanagan throughout the 1760's, JSAB; for brandy see account with Henry Snow, 1766, JSAB; for evidence of the generalized nature of agricultural production and fish traps in Pittsylvania see, *Virginia Gazette* (Purdie and Dixon), November 5, 1767; December 13, 1770; July 30, 1772; May 5, 1774; November 7, 1777; November 6, 1766; *Virginia Gazette* (Rind), February 4, 1768; October 26, 1769; May 2, 1771.

¹³ Smith owned eleven slaves older than sixteen in 1767. One planter owned fourteen slaves at that time and another owned seventeen. See "First List of Tithables of Pittsylvania County, Year 1767," in Maud Carter Clement, *The History of Pittsylvania County, Virginia* (Lynchburg, Va., 1929), 276-286. In 1779, three years after Smith's death, his heirs divided his twenty-three slaves, ages unknown, among themselves, "Re. Sale of Slaves — Ralph Smith," Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 3.

¹⁴ Account with Guy Smith, 1767, JSAB; Alexander Stewart to John Smith, Jr., June 1770, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 2. The text of this letter is damaged and therefore words in brackets are editorial insertions.

¹⁵ "Judith Smith Papers, 1768-1780," Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 2. Tidewater planters, who often owned backcountry plantations, usually sent their unacculturated and unskilled slaves to the backcountry while keeping skilled slaves on their home plantations. Gerald W. Mullin, *Flight and Rebellion: Slave Resistance in Eighteenth-Century Virginia* (New York, 1972).

¹⁶ Clement is discussed in the text below; Ward lived at "Edge Hill" on the Roanoke, served as a justice of the peace, a member of the Committee of Safety in 1775, a captain of the militia, and as sheriff of the county in 1792, and his daughter married John Smith, Jr.'s son, Samuel; Dillard was a justice of the peace in 1769; and Richard Walden lived at "Manor Plantation" on the Roanoke and was a justice of the peace in 1769. Clement, *History of Pittsylvania*, 139n., 286, 287, 140n.

¹⁷ See accounts with Ross, Hook, and Company, with Callaway and Trent and Company, and with Robert Cowan in Pocket Plantation Papers, Boxes 1-3. Hook was associated with David Ross, one of the richest men in Virginia; Callaway's partner, Peter Field Trent, was a merchant in Rocky Ridge; and Cowan was the Bedford County representative of Alexander Stewart, Smith's factor in Rocky Ridge.

¹⁸ On Calland, see Clement, *History of Pittsylvania*, 101n.; Edward W. James, "Abstracts from Pittsylvania County Marriage Bonds," *WMQ*, 1st ser., XX (1911), 143. On Lynch's Ferry merchants see Receipts signed by Joseph Cabell, October 26, 1774, and October 22, 1775, in "John Smith Papers — Tobacco," Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 1.

¹⁹ Clement, *History of Pittsylvania*, 145n.

²⁰ Account with Benjamin Clement, 1764, JSAB; Alexander Stewart to Smith, July 1764, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 1; Stewart to Smith, March 26, 1765, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 1; note dated April 28, 1766, JSAB.

²¹ These figures include kinsmen and exclude overseers. Overseers generally received the sorts of payments and did the sorts of tasks that other free white men did, except for their close involvement with tobacco production, and payments in shares of crops. Inclusion of overseers into these compilations would have skewed the figures to an overemphasis of trade in tobacco and agricultural products, which were not central to transactions between planters and local men. For a more detailed examination of overseers' roles at Pocket Plantation see, William W. Hoest, "The Plantation in a Regional Economy: Pocket Plantation, 1762-1785" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Virginia, 1977), 29-32.

²² Account with Stephen Wood, 1765-1766, JSAB; Smith to Capt. Benjamin Clement, September 1766, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 1.

²³ Smith to James French, September 7, 1766, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 1; Account with Stephen Wood, 1767, JSAB.

²⁴ For dealings with a schoolmaster see account with Robert Townshend, JSAB; for brickmakers see account with Stephen Towns, JSAB; for tailors see account with Frances Holway in Ralph Smith's day books, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 3; for the importance of itinerancy in the Virginia economy see Richard R. Beeman, ed., "Trade and Travel in Post-Revolutionary Virginia: A Diary of an Itinerant Peddler, 1807-1808," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, LXXXIV (1976), 174-188. Note Beeman's observation that "our knowledge of the domestic aspects of economic life in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Virginia is unfortunately slight. . . . Calvin Coulter, Jr., . . . Jacob M. Price. . . and J.H. Soltow. . . deal with the international aspects of Virginia trade, but not with trade networks within the colony." (174n.)

²⁵ Michael Lee Nicholls, "Origins of the Virginia Southside, 1703-1753: A Social and Economic Study" (unpublished Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1972), 191; Mullin, *Flight and Rebellion*, 8-9; Ransom B. True, "Land Transactions in Louisa County, Virginia, 1765-1812: A Quantitative Analysis" (unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1976), 40-56.

²⁶ The phrase "tissue of debt" appears in Land, ed., *Bases of the Plantation Society*, 152.

²⁷ Figures on the weight and price of tobacco hauling are mainly from JSAB and Alexander Stewart's letters to Smith in Pocket Plantation Papers, Boxes 1 and 2. Smith's factors would often list dates in their accounts with the planter that correspond to the date when certain goods were ordered. At that time, the goods were generally transported to the backcountry by wagons. Assuming that the date recorded for filling orders from the planter is the date when wagons appeared at the factors' store leads to the conclusion that Smith was transporting tobacco to fall-line towns at a rate greater than one load per month.

²⁸ Since two hogsheads, amounting to about one ton, were usually wagoned at once, Smith paid a fee of about £3 10s., per ton for carriage of his tobacco. This rate is almost identical to that found by the author of *American Husbandry* in northern Virginia, £3 11s. 8d., per ton; *American Husbandry*, Harry J. Carman, ed. (New York, 1939; orig. pub., 1775), 210. On Smith's payments to wagoners for provisions bought on the road see account with Henry Snow, JSAB.

²⁹ Accounts with Benjamin Clement and Richard Walden, JSAB; paper labeled: The Estate of Bowker Smith Decd., in "Bowker Smith Papers and Estate," Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 1.

³⁰ Alexander Stewart to Smith, March 3, 1769, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 2.

³¹ Account with Henry Snow, 1764, JSAB.

³² Melvin Herndon, *Tobacco in Colonial Virginia: "The Sovereign Remedy"* (Williamsburg, 1957), 24; paper labeled: Judith Smith in Account with John Smith, Jr., January 1, 1775, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 2.

³³ See note 18 above.

³⁴ Most of the men who did business with McNicoll appeared on John Donelson's list of tithables in 1767, and Donelson owned a large estate on Bannister River. Presumably, Donelson would have been appointed to assess people in an area near his home. Clement, *History of Pittsylvania*, 276-277.

³⁵ Compiled from James Murdoch and Company Account Book, Library of Congress.

³⁶ Soltow, *Economic Role of Williamsburg*, 125; Price, "Rise of Glasgow in the Chesapeake Tobacco Trade," 179-199.

³⁷ Account books of Alexander Stewart and Alexander Banks, accounts with Callaway and Trent and Company, Pocket Plantation Papers, Boxes 1-3.

³⁸ Soltow, *Economic Role of Williamsburg*, Table VIII, following p. 50; *Virginia Gazette* (Purdie and Dixon), July 23, 1767; T.M. Devine, "A Glasgow Tobacco Merchant during the American War of Independence: Alexander Speirs of Elderslie, 1775 to 1781," *WMQ*, 3d. ser., XXXIII (1976), 505.

³⁹ After the yearly settlements with his factors, Smith carried the following debits in his accounts to them: 1764: £77 15s. 1¼d.; 1765: £58 0s. ½d.; 1766: £127 19s. ¾d.; 1767: £110 5s. 8¾d.; July, 1770: £371 14s. 6¾d.; November, 1770: £236 5s. 11¼d.; 1771: £274 7s. 4¾d.; 1772: £198 1s. 9d.; 1773: £16 4s. 2¾d. Compiled from Smith's Accounts with James and Robert Donald and Company, and Speirs, Bowman and Company, Pocket Plantation Papers, Boxes 1-3. Note that debts were established when accounts were settled, usually in September, October, or November of a given year. The data displayed in Tables 6 thru 9 were computed on a January to December year. Consequently, the debts apparent in the Tables, based on comparisons of factor's sales of goods, and Smith's sales of tobacco, do not correspond to those noted above.

⁴⁰ Smith's factors applied an "advance" to all imported goods that had sterling values. The advance was a charge that converted sterling into Virginia currency, which was always less valuable. Advances were applied in the following ways during the sample years:

1764	Sterling			Advance	Currency		
Plantation management	£ 2	3s.	6d.	100%	£ 4	7s.	0d.
Luxuries	£ 8	3s.	6½d.	100%	£16	7s.	1d.
Slave Maintenance	£11	4s.	5¾d.	100%	£22	8s.	11½d.
Necessities	£ 5	1s.	1½d.	100%	£10	2s.	3d.
1769	Sterling			Advance	Currency		
Plantation management	£ 4	19s.	9½d.	75%	£ 8	13s.	10d.
Luxuries	£ 9	16s.	3½d.	75%	£17	3s.	6d.
Slave Maintenance	£ 9	2s.	11½d.	75%	£16	0s.	2d.
Necessities	£ 6	1s.	1½d.	75%	£10	18s.	8d.
1774 (Speirs and Bowman)	Sterling			Advance	Currency		
Cash paid to Smith	£ 3	0s.	0d.	80%	£ 5	8s.	0d.
Cash paid to others	£ 0	13s.	6d.	80%	£ 1	4s.	4d.
Luxuries	£18	19s.	7d.	80%	£34	3s.	3d.
"	£ 5	4s.	1d.	75%	£ 9	1s.	10¾d.
Plantation management	£ 4	14s.	6¼d.	80%	£ 8	10s.	1d.
Slave Maintenance	£12	5s.	5¼d.	80%	£22	1s.	9¼d.
"	£ 4	8s.	11 d.	75%	£ 7	15s.	7¼d.
Necessities	£10	9s.	9d.	80%	£18	17s.	7 d.
"	£ 1	1s.	9d.	75%	£ 1	18s.	¾d.
Sugar and Molasses	£ 2	14s.	d.	75%	£ 4	14s.	9½d.
1774 (Callaway and Trent)							
Luxuries	£ 0	10s.	2d.	75%		17s.	9½d.

⁴¹ Smith dealt with Speirs, Bowman and Company and Callaway and Trent in 1774.

⁴² Hoest, M.A. thesis, "Plantation in a Regional Economy," 16-22.

⁴³ For trade figures between Virginia, Scotland, and England, see Jacob M. Price, "New Time Series for Scotland's and Britain's Trade with the Thirteen Colonies and States, 1740 to 1791," *WMQ*, 3d ser., XXXII (1975), 319, 321, 323, 325.

⁴⁴ Julius Rubin, "Urban Growth and Regional Development," in David Gilchrist, ed., *The Growth of Seaport Cities, 1790-1825* (Charlottesville, 1967), 3-21.

⁴⁵ Little is known about Ralph Smith. He inherited Pocket Plantation when his father died in 1776, and operated it until his death in 1827. In August 1781, Smith was named receiver of provisions for the county militia of Pittsylvania. After the war, Smith apparently returned to life as a planter. He never married, and he apparently never held another county office. See Clement, "Tobacco Lords of Glasgow," in Clement Papers.

For Ralph Smith's tobacco and grain production, see Day Book of Ralph Smith (marbled cover), Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 3. John Smith, Jr., averaged 23,800 pounds of tobacco per year, 1764-1775, with a low year of 8,530 (1771) and a high year of 40,065 (1773). See Hoest, M.A. Thesis, "Plantation in a Regional Economy," 67.

⁴⁶ Accounts with James Mellon, Thomas Robinson, Thomas Frazer, David Russell, John Shackelford, Vachell Clement, and Samuel Poe in Day Books of Ralph Smith, Pocket Plantation Papers, Box 3.

⁴⁷ Clement, *History of Pittsylvania*, 109n.

⁴⁸ On Calland's property holdings, see Pittsylvania Personal Property Tax Lists (VSL): 1782, 12; 1783, 2; 1784, 10; 1785, 6; 1786, 16; 1787, 4; 1788, 4; 1789, 4; 1790, 4.

⁴⁹ Pittsylvania County Court Order Book (VSL), VI, 70.

⁵⁰ For examples of studies emphasizing the imperial component of the American colonial economy see, James F. Shepherd and Gary M. Walton, *Shipping, Maritime Trade, and the Economic Development of Colonial North America* (Cambridge, 1972); James A. Henretta, *The Evolution of American Society, 1700-1815: An Interdisciplinary Analysis* (Lexington, Mass., 1973), 41-81; and Marc Egnal, "The Economic Development of the Thirteen Colonies, 1720 to 1775," *WMQ*, 3d ser., XXXII (1975), 191-222.

⁵¹ For studies that attempt to analyze social deference in cultural or symbolic terms, see Rhys Isaac, "Evangelical Revolt: The Nature of the Baptists' Challenge to the Traditional Order in Virginia, 1765 to 1775," *WMQ*, 3d ser., XXXI (1974), 345-368; Timothy Breen, "Horses and Gentlemen: The Cultural Significance of Gambling among the Gentry of Virginia," *WMQ*, 3d ser., XXXIV (1977), 239-257.

⁵² For a study stressing the role of backcountry towns, see, Joseph A. Ernst and H. Roy Merrens, "'Camden's Turrets Pierce the Skies!': The Urban Process in the Southern Colonies during the Eighteenth Century," *WMQ*, 3d ser., XXX (1973), 549-574.