

A FRONTIER DIPLOMAT: ANDREW MONTOUR

BY HOWARD LEWIN*

ANDREW MONTOUR'S career is closely identified with the frontier, that ill-defined fringe of population that separated the early American settlements from the Indian-infested and forested wilderness. Between the years 1742 and 1768 Montour played an important part in British-Indian relations, both as an interpreter and diplomat. He was, for the most part, employed by Pennsylvania, but furnished his services to New York and Virginia as well.

Today the name Montour is remembered not for diplomatic intrigues but rather for several geographical place names which are located in Pennsylvania and New York. Montour County, Pennsylvania, and Montoursville in Lycoming County, Pennsylvania, serve to show his family's past influence. The extent of Montour's personal landholdings has not been determined; however, Neville's Island in the Ohio River, just downstream from modern Pittsburgh, was named and once owned by Montour. Today the junction of Neville's Road and the mainland is called Montour's Junction. To show how Montour obtained such possessions and became a man of importance will, in part, be the purpose of this article. The other purpose will be to try to show Montour's place in the diplomatic struggle between the colonies and the Indians on the one hand, and the British and French on the other.

In the colonial period of American history, westward expansion was greatly facilitated by the Indian traders, scouts, and interpreters of the colonial governments and land companies. These hardy men became the diplomats of the frontier and played the role of mediators between the Indians and the colonial governments. Partially through their efforts, roads were opened and

*Mr. Lewin began this study while he was a graduate student at the University of California at Santa Barbara. He completed the writing and revisions while working with the International Voluntary Services in Laos.

land in the interior became available for settlement. Not only did these men prepare the way for the settlers who were to come, but once they had arrived, they helped to maintain the peace between the settlers and the Indians. Probably this service was their most important function. Through their endeavors between the years 1740-1776 the Iroquois were wooed from French influences and became the firm allies of British America. These efforts were not enough, however, for in spite of them, several other tribes allied themselves with the French cause and later became a serious frontier menace.

It was a rare character who would expose his life to the rigors of the frontier, enemy Indians, and the inimical French for the small rewards then offered. The list of men so dedicated is short. Among the most successful were the eighteenth-century frontiersmen Conrad Weiser, Christopher Gist, George Croghan, and Sir William Johnson.¹ During the years 1740-1775 these men were a kind of bulwark behind British-Indian relations. A contemporary of these men, Andrew Montour, was perhaps even more skilled in dealing with the Indians, for not only did he speak their various languages and know them and their customs, but he was also part Indian, the son of an Oneida war chief, and was therefore trusted as one of their own.

Montour's physical appearance, nevertheless, was very much that of a European. On one of Count Zinzendorf's² early sojourns he describes:

Andrew's cast of countenance [as] decidedly European, and had not his face been encircled with a broad band of paint, applied with bear's fat, I would certainly have taken him for one. He wore a brown broadcloth coat, a scarlet demasken lappel waistcoat, breeches, over which his shirt hung, a black Cordoven neckerchief, decked

¹ Paul A. W. Wallace, *Conrad Weiser, 1696-1760, Friend of Colonist and Mohawk* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945); William Darlington, ed., *Christopher Gist's Journals with Historical, Geographical, and Ethnological Notes and Biographies of His Contemporaries* (Pittsburgh: J. R. Welden and Co., 1893); Nicholas B. Wainwright, *George Croghan, Wilderness Diplomat* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959).

² Nicolaus Ludwig graf von Zinzendorf was a Moravian missionary who traveled extensively through the colonial frontier preaching the Gospel. See William C. Reichel, ed., *Memorials of the Moravian Church* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1870).

with silver bugles, shoes and stockings, and a hat. His ears were hung with pendants of brass and other wires plaited together like the handles of a basket.³

From this description it seems evident that Andrew Montour inherited the European features of his grandfather and mother, Madame Montour. But it is also evident that he was greatly influenced by his Indian upbringing.

An early source of information concerning the Montour family is found in a letter from Lord Cornbury to the New York Board of Trade, dated August 20, 1708:

There is come to Albany one Montour, who is the son of a French Gentleman, who came above forty years ago to settle in Canada; he had to do with an Indian woman by whom he had a son and two daughters; The man I mention is the son, he had lived all along like an Indian.⁴

The "French Gentleman" mentioned was probably the father of Madame Montour. In the year 1698 he was wounded by a Mohawk raiding party near Fort La Motte on Lake Champlain. Shortly thereafter one of his daughters, Madame Montour, was captured by an Iroquois tribe, probably Oneidas, and brought up as an Indian.⁵ Upon reaching her majority she became the wife of an Oneida war chief, Carondawanna (Big Tree) or Robert Hunter, a name he took to honor the governor of New York. Carondawanna fell in battle against the Catawbas in the spring of 1729. Madame Montour retained her maiden name, as was Iroquois custom, and it is therefore with this name that her reputation as a diplomat is associated.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 95.

⁴ Lord Cornbury to the Board of Trade, August 20, 1708, E. B. O'Callaghan, et al., eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York Procured in Holland, England, and France* (Albany, 1853-1857), V, 65. Herein cited as the *New York Colonial Documents*. The man mentioned as the son of "a French Gentleman" was Madame Montour's brother, and was later killed by order of the French Governor Vaudreuil for aiding the British in diplomatic activities.

⁵ Darlington, *Gist*, p. 152. See also Charles A. Hanna, *The Wilderness Trail or Ventures and Adventures, of the Pennsylvania Traders on the Allegheny Path, with Some New Annals of the Old West, and the Records of Some Strong Men and Some Bad Ones* (New York: Putnam, 1911), I, 193-200. In addition see Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., *Early Western Travels, 1718-1846* (21 vols., Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1904), I, 27-28.

Madame Montour occupied a significant role in British-Indian relations. So signally important did she become that Britain and France vied for her services; but she finally devoted her efforts exclusively to England, since the British treated her as a man in matters of salary and status. Witham Marshe, the secretary of the Maryland commission at the Treaty of Lancaster in 1744, described her as a "handsome woman, genteel and of polite address, notwithstanding her residence has been so long among the Indians."⁶ She used to accompany the several chiefs to the conferences that renewed treaties of friendship with New York and Pennsylvania. The first evidence of her influence and abilities as an interpreter was seen at the meeting between Governor Robert Hunter and the chiefs of the Five Nations at Albany in 1711.⁷ Her work as an active diplomat continued until her last influential appearance when the Treaty of Lancaster was drawn in 1744. At this conference she was about sixty years old, and, according to John Harris, one of the delegates to the conference from Pennsylvania, she had died by 1753.⁸

It is not difficult, then, to imagine why her son so easily adapted himself to this kind of diplomatic environment. He was gifted with a natural aptitude for languages, enabling him to learn the various dialects of the Ohio and Iroquois Indians. He could also speak French and English, even though technically he was illiterate.⁹ His signature was a mark, usually a crude Latin cross.

George Croghan, the Pennsylvania trader and deputy Indian superintendent under Sir William Johnson, held Montour in high esteem, as one of his letters to Governor James Hamilton of Pennsylvania shows. Montour, he said, is "not only very capable of doing the Business, but [is] look'd on amongst all the Indians as one of their Chiefs."¹⁰ That he was trusted and looked up

⁶ Witham Marshe, *Journal of the Treaty of Lancaster in 1744 with the Six Nations*, annotated by William H. Egle, M.D. (Lancaster: The New Era, 1884), p. 9.

⁷ *New York Colonial Documents*, V, 268, 273.

⁸ Marshe, *Journal of the Treaty of Lancaster*, Appendix, pp. 27-30.

⁹ Count Zinzendorf has written, "He was very cordial, but in addressing him in French, he, to my surprise, replied in English." Reichel, *Memorials of the Moravian Church*, I, 95.

¹⁰ George Croghan, "Croghan's Journal," in Thwaites, ed., *Early Western Travels 1748-1846*, I, 71.

to is attested by the speech of the Iroquois sachem Scarrooyady at the signing of a treaty in October, 1753:¹¹

And since We are here now together, with a great deal of Pleasure I must acquaint You that We have set a Horn on Andrew Montour's Head; and that You may believe what he says to be true between the Six Nations and You they have made him one of their Counsellors and a great Man among them, and love him dearly.¹²

It would seem that this was an honor not lightly undertaken, and also one that was seldom given.

Some of the best accounts of diplomatic activity on the fringes of settlement are written in the journals and letters of the frontier diplomats. Since they were continually in contact with each other and because of their experiences, they would be the best judges of the abilities of their contemporaries. Through their journals and letters it is possible to obtain a picture of Montour's character. Conrad Weiser, one of the most effective diplomats, thought Montour capable when he recommended him to the Pennsylvania Council "as a Person who might be of Service to the Province in quality of an Indian Interpreter & Messenger, informing them that he had employ'd him in sundry affairs of Consequence & found him faithful, knowing, & prudent."¹³

Weiser and Montour made many trips together. Weiser's written opinions of Montour, in his journals and reports, generally express respect and even esteem. At least once, however, Montour's drinking became a nuisance to Weiser, as he described in a letter to the Provincial Secretary of Pennsylvania, Richard Peters. "I bought 2 quarts of Rum," Weiser wrote, "to use on our Journey but he drunk most all the first day. he abused me very much

¹¹ Scarrooyady, who died in 1758, was appointed vice-regent over the Shawnees in 1747 by the Iroquois council at Onondaga. In 1754 he succeeded Tanacharison as Half-King to the other tribes of the Ohio who were in the Iroquois Confederation. A participant on the British side in the Braddock campaign, he was an enemy of the French and a strong ally of the British. See C. Hale Sipe, *Indian Chiefs of Pennsylvania* (Butler, Pennsylvania: Ziegler Printing Co., 1927).

¹² "Minutes of the Treaty at Carlisle," October, 1753, in *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania from the Organization to the Termination of the Proprietary Government* (10 vols., Harrisburg, 1851-1853), V, 683. Usually cited as *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*.

¹³ *Ibid.*, V, 290.

Corsed & Swore and asked pardon when he got Sober. did the Same again when he was drunk again. damned me more than a hundred times so he did the governor & Mr. Peters for not paying his troubles & Expences." Weiser continues: "I reprimanded him when sober he begged pardon, desired me not to Mention it to you. but did the same again at another drunken frolick. I left him drunk at Achwick, on one legg he had a Stocking and no Shoe on the other a Shoe and no Stocking."¹⁴ When Weiser asked Montour to accompany him he "Swore terrible," but when Weiser arrived at his destination Montour was already there, having ridden hard the previous day and having stopped for only an hour at his own house in order to catch him. "He wellcomed me with Shaking hands Called me a one Side [and] Asked pardon for offences given."¹⁵

This sort of conduct seems to have been frequent with Montour, and extravagance often plunged him in debt. Richard Peters, the Pennsylvania clergyman, thought him an unthrifty and untractable "fellow who kept low company of which he was more than likely to be the dupe."¹⁶ In a letter to a friend, Peters let his true feelings toward Montour reveal themselves:

He has been arrested for fifty Pounds and indeed I would have suffered him to have gone to Jayl for he is an expensive man having a Wife who takes up Goods at any rate and to any value, but as he is going to Onondago in a publick Character, and is lately chosen a Member of the Onondago Council for the Ohio Indians it may be dangerous to the Publick to suffer him to be imprisoned.¹⁷

No doubt Peters's clerical background contributed to his opinion of Montour.

Nevertheless, when he was sober Montour could be trusted and depended upon. The Ohio Company of Virginia was willing to pay a high price for his services, in attempting to clarify

¹⁴ Weiser to Peters, September 13, 1754, quoted in Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, p. 371.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 372.

¹⁶ Hubertis Cummings, *Richard Peters, Provincial Secretary and Cleric, 1704-1776* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944), p. 144.

¹⁷ Peters to Richard Hockley, 1753, "Notes and Queries," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XXXIX (1915), 239.

the Treaty of Lancaster of 1744 in their favor. In a letter of instructions to Christopher Gist, the explorer and scout for the company, George Mason, the company's treasurer, instructed Gist to employ Montour as interpreter,

and get him to assist you in making a purchase of the Indians, and as the Company have great dependence and confidence in the said Andrew Montour, they hereby not only promise to make him satisfaction for the trouble, but if he can make an advantageous bargain for them with the Indians, they will in return for his good offices, let him have a handsome settlement upon their land without paying any purchase money, upon the same Terms which the said Company themselves hold the Land, and without any other consideration than the King's Quit rents.¹⁸

Stronger evidence that Montour was a man to be depended upon is furnished by a letter from Colonel George Washington to Virginia's Governor Robert Dinwiddie, just before the former's capitulation at Fort Necessity. Washington requested the assistance of Montour, saying that he "would be of singular use to me here at this moment, in conversing with the Indians, for I have no Person's that I can put any dependence in."¹⁹

In his early years Montour played a minor role, serving first with Weiser, and then as assistant to George Croghan during the years when Croghan was deputy Indian superintendent under Sir William Johnson. One of his first tasks, under Weiser, was to act as a guide and interpreter for Count Zinzendorf, the avid Moravian apostle, in the fall of 1742.²⁰ A few months later, in February, 1743, he aided Weiser at a council with the Delaware Indians.²¹

In the next year, while his mother was attending the conference at Lancaster, he went to fight the Catawbias. He fell ill near the

¹⁸ Darlington, *Gist*, pp. 231-235.

¹⁹ Washington to Dinwiddie, June 3, 1754, in John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Writings of George Washington from the Original Manuscript Sources, 1743-1799* (39 vols., Washington: Government Printing Office, 1932-1944), I, 72. Will be cited as *Washington's Writings*.

²⁰ "J. Martin Mack's Recollections," in Reichel, ed., *Memorials of the Moravian Church*, I, 102.

²¹ "Conrad Weiser's Report on the Journey to Shamokin," *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, IV, 641.

James River and was compelled to discontinue his journey.²² Upon recovering, he returned to Shamokin, where he again met with Weiser. Later Weiser reported that Montour brought "two young Indians which are to Come agt the the [*sic*] time when the Indians in Philadia prison will be tried."²³ Accompanying Weiser, Montour set out in May, 1745, for a conference with the Six Nations at Onondaga.²⁴ Three years later he was once again under Weiser at the frontier Indian village of Logs Town, near the site of present day Pittsburgh, to attend another treaty with the Six Nations. During this year he was presented to the Pennsylvania Council as a man who "may be of service as an Indian Interpreter & Messenger."²⁵

In July, 1749, Montour is described as living on "ye Borders of Lake Erie," where he was instructed by George Croghan, "to find out if posable whether there be any French on Lake Erie or there Abouts."²⁶ Montour was also requested to meet Croghan at the Indian settlements on the Ohio, where a council was soon to take place.

In the same month, Montour informed Governor James Hamilton of Pennsylvania that two or three traders had been killed by the Indians. Montour advised Hamilton to censure the Indians living on the upper Ohio River. He feared that failure to do so might result in the shedding of "innocent Blood." The governor, following Montour's advice, composed a message and asked him "to deliver it, and to observe all the Forms and Ceremonies used in delivering such Messages, so that the Complaint might go with the greatest Force; and if any Expression be omitted necessary and usual on such occasions that he should supply it."²⁷

Later during the year Montour traveled with George Croghan, in the capacity of interpreter, to the Twightwees or Miami settlements on the eastern banks of the Miami River.²⁸ This trip was

²² Weiser to James Logan, September 29, 1744, *Pennsylvania Archives*, 1st series, I, 662.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ "Conrad Weiser's Report," May 19, 1745, *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, IV, 778.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, V, 290.

²⁶ George Croghan to _____, July 31, 1749, *Pennsylvania Archives*, 1st series, II, 31.

²⁷ "Governor Hamilton's Instructions to Andrew Montour," July 2, 1750, *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, V, 449.

²⁸ "Croghan's Journal," in Thwaites, ed., *Early Western Travels*, I, 90.

made in response to the Twightwee request that "a road be cleared" for traders and efforts be made to prevent French encroachments on their tribal lands, and by the colonies' desire to keep the Twightwees as their ally.²⁹ Returning by way of Logs Town in December, 1750, Croghan and Montour met a war party of the Six Nations going to battle against the Catawbias. This party reported that Philippe Thomas Joncaire Sieur de Chabert, an energetic French Indian agent, was proceeding 150 miles up the Ohio, to the forks, where he planned to build a fort if he could obtain permission from the Ohio Indians. Croghan said that those chiefs present at Logs Town suggested that "the English, *ought to have a fort on this river* to secure the trade."³⁰

The refusal of the Pennsylvania Council to follow up this suggestion to build a fort had serious consequences during the early phases of the French and Indian War. Indecision was caused partly by the testimony of Conrad Weiser and Andrew Montour. In August, 1751, they stated at a meeting with the Pennsylvania Council that the Indians would not allow a fort to be built at the forks of the Ohio.³¹ But the French gained control of the forks and with it control of the Ohio valley. The entire frontier was then wide open to attacks from the Indians and their French allies.

Some three months before the Council meeting, Montour had again accompanied Croghan on a trip into Indian country, this time to deliver a provincial present of goods to the Six Nations tribes settled at Logs Town.³² Croghan announced to the Indians that a price had been placed on his and Montour's heads by the French. Late that same year Montour returned once again to Logs Town from Lake Erie, where he was gathering information and reporting on the French movements.³³ His return enabled him to play a major role in the important conference at Logs

²⁹ Hamilton to Clinton, September 20, 1750, *New York Colonial Documents*, VI, 594.

³⁰ Croghan to Hamilton, December 16, 1750, in Israel D. Rupp, ed., *Early History of Western Pennsylvania* (Pittsburgh and Harrisburg, 1856), p. 25.

³¹ Isaac Norris to Governor Hamilton, August 21, 1751, *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, V, 547.

³² "Croghan's Journal," in Thwaites, ed., *Early Western Travels*, I, 59.

³³ Thomas Cresap to Governor Dinwiddie, December 23, 1751, in Lois Mukiearn, ed., *George Mercer Papers Relating to the Ohio Company of Virginia* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1954), p. 566. Herein cited as *Mercer Papers*.

Town in 1752, where the Ohio Company of Virginia made one of its final bids for control of the lands situated south and east of the Ohio and Allegheny Rivers. The Ohio Company's endeavors were based on the Treaty of Lancaster.

In the Treaty of Lancaster, the Indian chiefs of the various tribes that composed the Iroquois Confederation gave the king of England and the colonies of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania the right to the land "as far as it was then Peopled, or hereafter should be Peopled" for a consideration then agreed upon. The "consideration" was about £200 in goods and another £200 in gold. In addition, a further compensation was to be granted "when the Settlements shou'd increase much farther back."³⁴ This clause was adhered to when the colonies sent Weiser and Montour to deliver a "present" to a council called at Logs Town in 1748.

The Logs Town council of 1752 was called especially for the benefit of the Ohio Company of Virginia.³⁵ The company's petition to London for a large grant of land along the southern shores of the Ohio and Allegheny Rivers had prompted a patent from the Crown. The grant was to a large extent that of the original tract given to the king at Lancaster in 1744. Before the Ohio Company could develop any part of the enormous area, it had to obtain confirmation of the two previous treaties. Confirmation, then, was the purpose for calling the third Logs Town conference in May, 1752.

The company's principal representative was Christopher Gist. In his instructions, dated April 28, 1752, he was given, according to his Journals, "a commission [by Governor Dinwiddie] em-

³⁴ "Treaty of Logstown," *Public Records Office, Colonial Office*, 5/1327. 583. Louis Knott Koontz Collection, University of California at Santa Barbara Library. Hereafter cited as *P.R.O.C.O.*

³⁵ Darlington, *Gist's Journals*, p. 233. Gist was commissioned by the governor of Virginia, Robert Dinwiddie, to attend the conference, but George Mason, the company's treasurer, gave Gist additional secret instructions. On Gist's journey for the company in 1751-1752, he issued invitations for the Logs Town conference by the orders of James Patton, one of the chosen commissioners for the treaty. Gist was also instructed to obtain a deed from the Indians. This deed or treaty was to be drawn in the name of the company's stockholders. See *Gist's Journal*, p. 69. For additional information see Kenneth P. Bailey, *The Ohio Company of Virginia and the Westward Movement 1748-1792, A Chapter in the History of the Colonial Frontier* (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1939), p. 130. Governor Dinwiddie was one of the principal stockholders of the Ohio Company of Virginia.

powering and requiring [him] to go as an agent for the Ohio Company to the Indian Treaty to be held at Logs Town."³⁶ George Mason, in additional secret instructions, instructed Gist to tell the Indians at Ohio of the king's grant, "thereby to enable and to encourage the said company and all his Majesties subjects, to make settlement and carry on an extensive Trade and commerce with their Bretheren the Indians, and to supply them with Goods at a more easy rate than they have hitherto bought them."³⁷ The company asserted its right to the land but was "willing to make [the Indians] some further satisfaction for the same."³⁸

Mason further instructed Gist "to engage Andrew Montour the Interpreter in the Company's Interest . . . and as the Company have great dependence and confidence in the said Andrew Montour, they . . . promise to make him satisfaction for the trouble"; if Montour could make a satisfactory bargain with the Indians, the company promised to "let him have a handsome settlement upon their land without paying any purchase money."³⁹

Montour at that time was in the employ of Pennsylvania, and therefore asked Governor Hamilton for a leave of absence in order to attend the conference at the Ohio for Virginia.⁴⁰ Evidently Montour was to work for the Ohio Company while in the employ of the Virginia colony, and at the same time on leave of absence from Pennsylvania. Not only this, but Montour was looked upon as a chief in the Six Nations Council. At the conference, he was told by the Half-King, Tanacharison:⁴¹

Child remember that thou art one of our own people
and have transacted a great deal of business among us

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 231.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 232-233.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 235.

⁴⁰ Hamilton to Montour, April 18, 1752, *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, V, 568.

⁴¹ Tanacharison was an Oneida chief who became vice-regent for the Iroquois council over the Delawares and others in the Ohio Valley; this appointment came in 1747, at just about the time when the French began to move into the Ohio region. He was called Half-King because like Scarrooyady he was only a representative of the Iroquois Confederation. It was his request that the English build a fort in the Ohio valley to prevent the French enclave from growing. Tanacharison accompanied Washington during the Jumonville skirmish, and later at Fort Necessity he led the Indians away because he and Washington could not agree on the plan of battle. See Sipe, *Indian Chiefs of Pennsylvania*.

before you were employed by our brethren of Pennsylvania and Virginia, you are Interpreter between us and our brethren which we are well pleased at for we are sure our business will go on well and justice be done on both sides but you are not interpreter only for you are one of our council and have an equal right with us to all these lands and may transact any public business in behalf of us the six nations as well as any of us for we look upon you as much as we do any of the chief councillors and to confirm what we have said we present unto you this belt of wampum.⁴²

Supported by the colonies, employed in trust by the Ohio Company of Virginia, and esteemed by the Six Nations' council, Montour must have felt great confidence when he made his appearance at the treaty conference. He used this trust and esteem, rightly or wrongly, to persuade the Six Nations to confirm the previous Lancaster and Logs Town treaties of 1744 and 1748. Evidence indicates that through his influence the reluctant Tanacharison was brought to sign this new Logs Town Treaty.

The commissrs having drawn an Instrument of Writing for confirming the Deed, made at Lancaster, & containing a Promise that the Indians would not molest our Settlements, on the South East side of [the] Ohio, desir'd Mr. Montour to converse with his Bretheren, the other Sachems in private, on the Subject, to urge the Necessity of such a Settlement & the great Advantage it wou'd be to them, as to their Trade, or their Security. On which they retire'd for half an Hour, & then return'd, / & Mr. Montour said, they were satisfied in the Matter, & were willing to Sign, & Seal, the Writing; which was done, & Witness'd by the Gentlemen then present.⁴³

It is apparent that Montour persuaded Tanacharison behind closed doors, in a "smoke-filled-room," to sign the treaty at Logs Town in 1752.

The Ohio Company's strategy worked well. They successfully obtained acknowledgment of the Lancaster Treaty and were able to continue with their plans for settlement along the Ohio. With-

⁴² Mulkearn, *Mercer Papers*, minutes of the "Logs Town treaty 1752," p. 60. See also *P.R.O.C.O.* 5/1327, 588.

⁴³ "Logs Town Treaty of 1752," *P.R.O.C.O.*, 5/1327, 595-596.

out Montour's help the company's attempt might well have failed, for Gist, the company's representative, had difficulty with the Iroquois tongue. Recognizing this fact the company "resolved that Mr. Montour be allowed thirty pistoles for his trouble at the Loggs Town in May last on Account of the Company, and that if he will remove to Virginia and Settle on the Companys Land . . . that the Company make him a present of one thousand Acres of Land to live on, and make him legal title to the same."⁴⁴

The irony of the treaty's success is that it was of dubious validity even before it had been signed. James Patton, who brought word of the conference to the Indians and served as a commissioner for Virginia at the negotiations, did not couple the invitations with belts of wampum. The status of such invitations, when not accompanied by belts of wampum, was perhaps misunderstood by the Virginia officials. According to Thomas Cresap, the well-known and respected Indian trader, agreements reached were "not binding on the part of the Indians; if an invitation wampum belt were given by Patton, yet not delivered to the Onondaga Council, the agreement was like wise void."⁴⁵ In a letter written to Conrad Weiser, Cresap "relayed to Governor Dinwiddie Andrew Montour's interpretation of Patton's behavior, [for] Patton 'did not do it right or others since have Interpreted it otherwise: some telling [the Indians] one thing and others another, so that they are confused about it.'"⁴⁶ Patton "had told them his Business then, and therefore they had no occasion to come to a Council to hear the same thing over again."⁴⁷ In spite of Patton's *faux pas*, Governor Dinwiddie and the Ohio Company stockholders seemed to be pleased with the confirmation obtained at the conference.

Another reason why, for all practical purposes, the treaty was void can be found in a cursory examination of French aims in the Ohio valley. They wanted control basically for two reasons. The first was to maintain their monopoly in the Indian trade,

⁴⁴ Mulkearn, *Mercer Papers*, p. 143. A pistole was a Spanish coin or other European coin that had been debased. Its value was about \$4.00.

⁴⁵ Thomas Cresap to Governor Dinwiddie, October, 1751, *ibid.*, pp. 413-414.

⁴⁶ Cresap to Dinwiddie, *ibid.* For more see Wm. P. Palmer, ed., *Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts, 1672-1781, Preserved in the Capitol at Richmond* (Richmond, 1875), I, 245.

⁴⁷ Cresap to Dinwiddie, in Palmer, ed., *Calendar of Virginia State Papers* . . . , I, 245.

which they were rapidly losing because the Indians preferred the less expensive English goods. The second was to protect their inland communications from Montreal to New Orleans. The expansion of the British colonies westward threatened the tenuous grasp of the French in the Ohio valley and was soon to lead to war.

In partial fulfillment of the recently signed Treaty of Logs Town, Montour accompanied William Trent on a mission to deliver the king's present to the Twightwees or Miamis at Pickawillany on the Miami River.⁴⁸ They left on June 21, 1752, and returned a month or so later after covering many rugged miles through unmapped wilderness. Shortly after his return Montour notified Governor Hamilton that he was taking a message to Onondaga from the governor of Virginia, inviting the Six Nations to attend a conference at Winchester in the coming summer. Montour offered to deliver any dispatches that Hamilton might have for Onondaga. Montour's offer was politely put off because the governor decided to await the outcome of Virginia's request for a council before sending any message.⁴⁹

At the Onondaga conference Montour told the Six Nations about a council fire that had been kindled at Winchester, and said that a clear road had been made to facilitate their travel there to accept the present from Virginia.⁵⁰ Montour was also to inform the Six Nations that because of the increase of French troops in the Ohio valley there would be "a good Number" of British troops at Logs Town in the spring.⁵¹ The Indians pondered for a week and declared "that they desired the Governor to use his

⁴⁸ William Trent was an Indian trader and land speculator. He became a captain of Pennsylvania troops in the French and Indian War and was a participant at the Logs Town Treaty of 1752, at Easton in 1757, and at Fort Pitt in 1759. As part of the Treaty of 1752 he went to Pickawillany with Montour in the latter part of 1752. In 1754 Governor Dinwiddie asked him to construct a fort at the forks of the Ohio, and in 1758 he accompanied General John Forbes to Western Pennsylvania on his successful campaign against Fort Duquesne. For five years Trent was a partner with George Croghan in the Indian trade.

⁴⁹ "Memorandum," February 8, 1753, *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*.

⁵⁰ "Montour's Declaration," May 15, 1753, in H. R. McIlwaine *et al.*, eds., *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1752-1755, 1756-1758* (Richmond, 1909), VIII, 515-516. Will be cited as *Journals*.

⁵¹ Dinwiddie to Montour, in Robert A. Brock, ed., *The Official Records of Robert Dinwiddie, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, 1751-1758* (Richmond, 1883-1884), I, 58. Will be cited as the *Dinwiddie Papers*.

influence to prevent war with the French."⁵² Since their best hunting grounds were at stake they were of course concerned. War would destroy the area as a means of subsistence. After his return from Onondaga, Montour informed Peters that the Indians were against both the English and the French building forts and settling in the Ohio valley.⁵³

Meanwhile, seven Indians from the north reported that a large body of French troops had come to drive the British traders and their Indian allies from the Ohio. The Onondagas were somewhat "intimidated" and decided to boycott the council at Winchester in order not to offend the French.⁵⁴ After being subjected to much cajoling by Trent, the Six Nations' council decided to send a delegation to the French at Venango and one to the British at Winchester.

Soon afterwards, Governor Hamilton received a report from Montour regarding the kinds of assistance needed by the Indians at Onondaga in the event that war should break out. This message also stressed once again that the Ohio area was a hunting ground, "and we would have it reserved for this use only."⁵⁵ Throughout the following months French pressure increased, in the form of added activity, giving a feeling of urgency to the meeting at Winchester.

By September, 1753, the representatives of the Indians of the Ohio, the Twightwees, Shawnees, Delawares, Wyandots, and the Six Nations had gathered at Winchester for the coming council. The matters to be discussed concerned primarily the French threats against the security of the Iroquois-English position. The English feared a surprise attack. Other matters that warranted attention were the conflict between the Iroquois and the Catawbias, the distribution of the king's present, and the Six Nations' request that Montour, Trent, and Gist, three Ohio Company agents, be appointed "as the official representatives [of the Indians] to transact business between themselves and the English."⁵⁶ Yet

⁵² "Montour's Declaration," May 15, 1753, *Journals*, VIII, 515-516.

⁵³ *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, June 22, 1753, V, 635.

⁵⁴ Hamilton to Council, May 21, 1753, "Report from Montour at Onondaga," *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, V, 607.

⁵⁵ Montour to Dinwiddie, July 31, 1753, *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, V, 636-637.

⁵⁶ Kenneth P. Bailey, *The Ohio Company of Virginia and the Westward Movement, 1748-1792, A Chapter in the History of the Colonial Frontier* (Glendale: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1939). pp. 139-142.

another reason for the conference was the persistence of the Ohio Company in their desire for a reconfirmation of the Lancaster Treaty of 1744. The Executive Council of the Ohio Company, in spite of the French threats, desired a clear title to the land it claimed. But the Six Nations refused to discuss the matter, maintaining a neutralist posture.⁵⁷

It was probably this neutral attitude of the Indians that persuaded the Virginia commissioners not to give the king's gift of guns and ammunition to the various tribes that had assembled for the conference. The Indians, failing to receive that gift, went to Carlisle, Pennsylvania, to seek a treaty with that colony.

At this treaty conference Montour was again an interpreter; in fact, it was his influence that caused the Indians to assemble there.⁵⁸ Again the Indians were disappointed, because the commissioners of Pennsylvania, like the commissioners of Virginia at Winchester, refused to give them a present. Their disillusionment, first with Virginia and then Pennsylvania, gave the Indians reason to believe that the colonies were not acting in good faith, and caused a reluctance on their part to cooperate with the British which in the future hampered the war effort.

The French pressure on the Ohio, continually growing with the addition of French reinforcements, increasingly worried Governor Dinwiddie. Finally George Washington was called upon to lead the Virginia militia against the French, and the Seven Years' War in America began.

Before carrying this history of Andrew Montour through the war, it is first necessary to discuss briefly the problem of Montour's alias. Sometime in the early 1750's Andrew Montour began to use the first name Henry. There is no doubt but that Henry and Andrew are the same person. Proof can be found in many of the official Pennsylvania documents, Moravian files, and private papers. Therefore, it does not seem necessary to burden the reader with overwhelming evidence. However, it is necessary to give a sampling.

At the Treaty of Easton the Indians gave Henry Montour a tract of land of not less than 1,500 acres. The land was located

⁵⁷ Mulkearn, *Mercer Papers*, p. 433.

⁵⁸ "Treaty of Carlisle," *Indian Treaties Printed by Benjamin Franklin, 1736-1762* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1938), pp. 135-136.

and endorsed by Henry Montour, but Andrew Montour received it. The certification read, "paper given to Andrew Montour for 1500 acres of land."⁵⁹

Another instance of the Montour pseudonym comes from a document in the *Pennsylvania Archives*. "The Board taking again into Consideration & having inspected & considered the Deposition of Catherine Montour Wife of Andrew Montour and also a Certificate signed by Henry Montour who is also called Andrew Montour the husband of the said Catherine attested by Col'o Croghan and Major Smallman . . ." leaves little doubt that the two, Henry and Andrew, were one and the same.⁶⁰

The final evidence here presented comes also from a document in the *Pennsylvania Archives*. It is a land office certificate notarized by the surveyor general John Lukens and dated June 17, 1785. This paper recites that a land survey was made for Andrew Montour "and whereas, the said Andrew, by the name of Henry Montour, by deed dated 12th Augt., 1771, conveyed the same to Robt. Lettes Hooper."⁶¹

There does not seem to be evidence indicating just why Andrew Montour chose the alias Henry. Nor is there any indication why an alias was needed in the first place. Possibly it became expedient to change his name because of the large acquisitions of land he was gathering. It may have been connected with his marriage.

To return to the war, the first strategic move of the French was the taking of the partially constructed fort at the forks of the Ohio River. Recapture of the forks was a military necessity if the British campaign were to succeed. In the fall and summer of 1754 Washington was ordered to retake Fort Duquesne.

The outcome of Dinwiddie's call to arms for the enterprise proved very disappointing to Washington, for only a handful of men responded. It was imperative that these meager forces be augmented if success were to be won by the Virginians. Realizing the need for reinforcement, Washington wrote Governor Dinwiddie from his camp requesting the help of the Indians, and especially of Montour, for he "would be of Singular use to me

⁵⁹ Richard Peters to John Armstrong, July 11, 1761, Marshe, *Journal of the Treaty of Lancaster*, Appendix, Land Department of the Commonwealth.

⁶⁰ *Pennsylvania Archives*, Series 3, vol. I, 239-240.

⁶¹ Hanna, *The Wilderness Trail*, I, 245.

here at this moment, in conversing with the Indians, for I have no Person's that I can put any dependence in." Washington continued by confessing that he was at a loss as to how he should treat the Indians:

I make use of all the influence I can to engage them warmly on our side, and flatter myself that I am not unsuccessful, but for want of a better acquaintance with their customs, I am often at a loss how to behave, and should be relieved from many anxious fears of offend'g them if Montour was here to assist me; and he is in the governm'ts employ't, I hope your Hon'r will think with me, his services Cannot be apply'd to so g't advantage as here upon this occasion.⁶²

Washington's request for Indian help and Montour was granted. Before joining Washington, Montour was given a special commission as captain to organize a company of Indians for scouting. The commission was also to serve as protection in case Montour was captured by the French, in view of the price on his head.⁶³ But the captain could not find enough Indians to fill his ranks; instead he recruited eighteen displaced traders from the Ohio area. This recruitment was later to cause a great deal of consternation for Montour.

On the way to meet Washington the company delivered a belt of wampum to the Half-King, Tanacharison, to confirm Dinwiddie's promise to protect the Ohio hunting grounds. Montour and his men met Washington at the Monongahela on June 9, 1754. With the trading goods Montour brought, Washington was able to deal more effectively with the Indians, as he indicated to Dinwiddie:

I am very thankful to you for ordering an assortment of Indian goods, which we daily find still more necessary. I shall take care, while they are under my direction, that they are judiciously applied, and shall be particularly careful in consulting Mr. Croghan and Mr. Mon-

⁶² Washington to Dinwiddie, June 3, 1754, Fitzpatrick, *Washington's Writings*, I, 72.

⁶³ Dinwiddie to Hamilton, June 18, 1754, *Dinwiddie Papers*, I, 215. See also Dinwiddie to Governor Sharpe, December 17, 1754, *ibid.*, 426.

tour, by whom I shall be advised in all Indian affairs agreeably to your directions.⁶⁴

Even though he could now deal with the Six Nations, Washington felt the need for still more Indians. On the 12th, upon the advice of Croghan and Montour, he requested the Half-King Tanacharison to invite the Shawnees and Delawares to join in battle against the French. But suddenly something happened. At a council, with Montour acting as interpreter, and Washington trying to woo the Indians, the tribes "notwithstanding all that Mr. Montour could do to dissuade them, the Delawares, as also the Half-King, and all the other Indians returned to the Great meadows."⁶⁵ One reason for this sudden withdrawal was that Tanacharison disagreed with Washington on how best to conduct the campaign. It is also evident that the Indians had little faith in Washington's small army. Clearly they would have been foolish to join in a futile effort, and the French greatly outnumbered Washington's force and controlled the Indians' homelands. Their suspicions were soon confirmed when Washington was forced to capitulate to a superior French force on July 3, 1754, at the Great Meadows, where Fort Necessity had hastily been constructed.

The colonies were now to pay the price for not establishing a fort at the forks sooner, as suggested by Croghan but not by Montour and Weiser. There was nothing to prevent the French and their Indian allies from raising havoc all along the frontier.

After the withdrawal from Fort Necessity, Montour's company was dissolved, but he did not receive the pay to which he was entitled. Governor Horatio Sharpe of Maryland wrote Dinwiddie that Montour's "private affairs & credit had received no small Detriment, wherefore I was induced to advance him £45."⁶⁶ Sharpe continued by expressing a favorable opinion of Montour. "His Behavior while I was at the Camp prejudiced me in his

⁶⁴ Washington to Dinwiddie, June 10, 1754, Fitzpatrick, *Washington's Writings*, I, 75.

⁶⁵ J. M. Toner, ed., *Journal of Colonel George Washington* (New York, 1893), p. 108. See also Fitzpatrick, *Washington's Writings*, I, 188.

⁶⁶ Sharpe to Dinwiddie, December 10, 1754, in William Hand Browne, ed., *Archives of Maryland, Correspondence of Governor Horatio Sharpe, 1753-1757* (Baltimore, 1888), I, 139. Hereafter cited as *Sharpe's Correspondence*.

favor & as I esteem him a very useful Person I will endeavor by all means to keep him firm in our Interests."⁶⁷

It was in this letter from Sharpe that Dinwiddie first learned Montour had organized a company of Ohio traders six months before. Dinwiddie maintained in his reply to Sharpe that "Montour's account" is very unfair, "because he had no orders to raise the men charged."⁶⁸ Once again Dinwiddie stressed the reason for giving the commission to Montour; it was for his protection should he be taken prisoner by the French.⁶⁹ Dinwiddie complained further saying that the accounts were made up by the backwoodsmen "who are a very bad sett of People. He may be a very useful Man if kept from these wretches."⁷⁰

In a return letter to Dinwiddie, Sharpe explained:

I did not know that what you mention was the Intent of giving Montour a Commission & indeed I question whether the Man did not misapprehend the purport of it himself, otherwise I think he would not have proceeded to raise any Men for the Service, which that He did Mr. Washington can inform you whose Orders Montour & his company were attendent on at the time of the Engagement, for this Reason I hope you will not be averse to considering the Man and satisfying the Expences he has been at in supporting his Company, . . . for my own part I cannot help thinking him as I before hinted a well-meaning well disposed Man & of all the Traders Interpreters or Woodsmen without Comparison the most promising & honest.⁷¹

It is apparent that, though Montour was successful in diplomatic maneuvers, his military and organizational abilities were limited. His help to Washington was important in British-Indian relations, and not because of his military aptitudes. But even Montour's tact and skill in handling the Indians had not been enough, for when

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Dinwiddie to Sharpe, December 17, 1754, *Dinwiddie Papers*, I, 426.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Sharpe to Dinwiddie, December 26, 1754, Browne, *Sharpe's Correspondence*, I, 151. See also John Harris's letter of December 28, 1754, *Pennsylvania Archives*, 1st series, II, 230, and Montour's letter of December 30, 1754, *ibid.*, p. 232. The latter is unsigned and wrongly attributed to Harris because it is in his handwriting. The originals of both are in the Papers of the Provincial Council, Division of Public Records, Harrisburg.

Washington needed the Indians most, they would offer no help.

Some three weeks after Washington's forced retirement from Fort Necessity, Montour sent Governor Dinwiddie a letter informing him that a large number of Six Nations Indians would settle at "Aughwich," where many others would join them as soon as they escaped from the French.⁷² On the first of the following month, Dinwiddie replied to Montour's letter by ordering him to proceed to Will's Creek, a branch of the Potomac River, with as many Indians as he could find and to take orders from Colonel James Innes, the governor general of Fort Cumberland. He also included the remark that the Indians who went to "Aughwich" would be supported by Pennsylvania or Virginia.⁷³ Dinwiddie then wrote to Colonel Innes telling him to treat Montour and the Indians with regard. Evidently Innes did not respect this order nor did he regard the Indians as essential, for he neglected them badly, which in the future hampered matters seriously and proved to have been a strategic mistake.

It took one year after Washington's defeat at the Meadows before the British had recovered sufficiently to send another large force against Fort Duquesne. Major General Edward Braddock was chosen to lead this new assault, and like Washington before him, he needed the Indians' help. George Croghan had managed to gather about fifty Indians at Fort Cumberland with their families. These were the Indians who had settled at "Aughwich," after Washington's capitulation, and had been so badly treated by Colonel Innes.

Upon his arrival at Cumberland, Braddock "asked me," wrote Croghan, "where the rest of ye Indians were."⁷⁴ Braddock had previously been told by Dinwiddie that there would be 400 Indians at Cumberland before he would arrive. Croghan replied that he did not know about that, but Montour was in camp and could inform "his Excellency" on the situation. Montour was then called into Braddock's tent, whereupon he informed the general that Christopher Gist's son had been "sent off sometime ago for

⁷² Montour to Dinwiddie, July 21, 1754, *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, VI, 130.

⁷³ Dinwiddie to Montour, August 1, 1754, *Dinwiddie Papers*, I, 262.

⁷⁴ "George Croghan's Statement," in Winthrop Sargent, ed., *The History of An Expedition Against Fort Duquesne*, in 1755 (Philadelphia, 1855), appendix IV, p. 407.

some *Cherokees* Indians, but whether they would come he couldn't tell."⁷⁵

Colonel Innes informed Braddock that he would need only ten Indian scouts on the campaign, because any more would be troublesome. What really worried Innes was his fear of having to care for the Indians that were requested for Braddock; Innes was not about to undertake any additional responsibility as far as caring for Indians was concerned. In spite of Innes's advice and Braddock's consequent refusal to have more than ten Indians, many Indians, out of their hatred for the French, followed Braddock's train for many miles. They still hoped to take part in the campaign. But Braddock's decision, influenced by Innes, to keep only ten of them helped doom his campaign to failure, and earned the resentment and finally the hatred of the Indians.

The Indians who did join Braddock were soon disillusioned. Washington's defeat at the Meadows, French strength in the Ohio Valley, and Braddock's personality are the underlying causes for the reluctance of more Indians to take part in the campaign. At a council held in Philadelphia during August, 1755, one month after Braddock's defeat, Montour told the assembly for Scarrooyady that,

we Six Nations must let you know that it was the pride and ignorance of that great General that came from England. He is now dead; but he was bad when he was alive; he looked upon us as dogs, and would never hear anything what was said to him. We often endeavoured to advise him and to tell him of the danger he was in with his soldiers; but he never appeared pleased with us, & that was the reason that a great many of our warriors left him & would not be under his command.⁷⁶

George Croghan was certain that if "we had fifty Indians instead of eight, that we might in a great measure have prevented the surprise, that day of our unhappy defeat."⁷⁷

In the fall of 1755 the British began to rebuild a new military force. Washington commanded for Virginia and was busily en-

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Montour to council at Philadelphia, August 22, 1755, *Pennsylvania Colonial Records*, VI, 588-589.

⁷⁷ Sargent, *Braddock's Defeat*, app. III, p. 408.

gaged in recruiting troops and organizing his command. Writing to Captain Montour in September from Fort Cumberland, he was

desirous of seeing you here; and the more so, because I have it in my power to do something for you in a Settled way which I hope will be agreeable to you. You have, much contrary to my inclinations been tossed about from place to place, and disappointed in your just Expectations which Inconveniences I will Remedy, as much as lies in my power.⁷⁸

Washington requested Montour to bring along with him a few Indians, promising that "they shall be better used than they have been, and have all the kindness from us they can desire."⁷⁹

That Washington believed Indian help important is indicated by the amount of his correspondence requesting Montour's assistance. In a letter to Gist, Washington asked him to use his influence to persuade Montour to bring some Indians:

Never were Indians more wanted than at this time; I have therefore sent to Montour, inviting him, and all he can bring, and should be glad that you would come that way, and use all your interest (as I know you have much with him) to engage his coming; I will promise if he brings many, to do something handsome for him.⁸⁰

He then informed Dinwiddie that Montour's assistance was needed.

Washington had heard that Montour commanded about 300 Indians, and if he could bring them into Washington's army they would greatly increase the Virginian's strength. Washington felt that even the use of flattery was "justifiable on such occasions."⁸¹ Washington then ordered Gist to hire an Indian to take an express requesting Montour to come to Fort Cumberland, promising Montour a captain's commission if he could raise a company of sixty

⁷⁸ Washington to Montour, September 19, 1755, Fitzpatrick, *Washington's Writings*, I, 180.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ Washington to Gist, October 10, 1755, *ibid.*, I, 197-199.

⁸¹ Washington to Dinwiddie, October 11, 1755, *Dinwiddie Papers*, II, 240 and 243. See also Washington to Dinwiddie, October 11, 1755, Fitzpatrick, *Washington's Writings*, I, 206. The letter to Montour is entitled Colo. Washington to Colo. Montour. No doubt this is part of the intended flattery.

men, and further promising him ten shillings a day, paid once every month.⁸²

The number of letters written by Washington requesting Montour's service seems to prove his usefulness. But the number of letters also suggests that Montour was rather reluctant to work with the Virginians. His misunderstanding concerning the commission given him by Dinwiddie; the consequent delay in receiving his pay, which caused him no small inconvenience; the defeat of Braddock and his maltreatment of the Indians, all must have contributed to a reluctance on Montour's part to join Washington, in spite of the latter's guarantees. Thus we find that Montour, by his own decision, was no longer directly employed by Virginia.

In November of 1755, Montour reported to Governor Robert Hunter Morris of Pennsylvania that the French were about to build a fort at Shamokin, a frontier village at the forks of the Susquehanna, about forty-five miles from Harris's Ferry. Another message to Morris came in January of the next year, this time from both Montour and Scarrooyady, who were at the Iroquois council at Onondaga. They reported that the Delawares were bent on the destruction of the English. Montour advised Morris to put the colony in a defensive position, but not to act offensively until after the council being held at Colonel Johnson's with the Six Nations, the Delawares, and the Shawnees. Johnson had hopes of changing the Delawares' minds.⁸³ Informing Governor Sharpe of Montour's dispatch, Morris told Sharpe that Montour had shown true friendship to the colony "and as such will deserve our best encouragements."⁸⁴

Evidence indicates that from 1756 until the end of Pontiac's War in 1765, Montour remained in the northern district under Indian superintendent Sir William Johnson. Most of Montour's efforts were spent as an interpreter at the various treaty conferences held at Johnson Hall. A series of conferences in 1756, with the Six Nations and the Delawares, resulted in an alliance of the two with the English, and by July Montour was given the

⁸² Fitzpatrick, *Washington's Writings*, I, 217.

⁸³ Morris to Sharpe, February 2, 1756, Browne, *Sharpe's Correspondence*, I, 343.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

rank of captain to lead a party of Indians north to see if the "hatchet" that Johnson had so carefully honed, would cut.⁸⁵

By the end of July Montour was once again at Fort Johnson. On the 29th he was interpreter for Johnson and the Delawares, Six Nations, Shawnees and others at a meeting at Johnson Hall.⁸⁶ In mid-August there was yet another conference with the Indians. Johnson outfitted forty-eight warriors for action against the French.⁸⁷ By the end of August Montour was leading a party of Indians through the wilderness to the "Great Carrying Place," the land route between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. Returning to Fort Johnson for a six-day conference in mid-November, Montour served as interpreter for the Six Nations and Edmond Atkin, the superintendent of Indian affairs for Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Georgia.⁸⁸

For the rest of the year and half of the next, little if anything is known of Montour's whereabouts, but in June he was once again at Johnson Hall for another series of conferences where he acted as interpreter, and passed the "pipe" to all present. In this capacity Montour completed the year 1757.

Evidence of his activities is lacking again until a letter dated August 28, 1758, from General John Forbes informed Richard Peters that "hitherto in spite of all the partys, I have sent out, I can learn nothing that is to be depended upon." Forbes continued with a plea for help:

I must therefore beg that Andrew Montour may be forthwith employed in getting me Intelligence of the Enemy's Strength in those parts [Fort Duquesne] by going himself . . . to pick up what [he] can learn, as to the number of French Canadians or Indians there at present, or expected, [and] whether they have thrown up any Entrenchments before the Fort betwixt the Ohio and Monongahela.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ O'Callaghan, *New York Colonial Documents*, VII, 172.

⁸⁶ James Sullivan et al., eds., *The Papers of Sir William Johnson* (Albany: State University of New York, 1921-), II, 175.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 187. There is a reference to Montour on November 4, 1756, in *Pennsylvania Archives*, 1st series, III, 42-43.

⁸⁹ Forbes to Peters, August 28, 1758, in Alfred P. James, ed., *Writings of General John Forbes Relating to His Service in North America* (Menasha, Wisconsin: The Collegiate Press, 1938), pp. 191-192. Herein cited as *Forbes Writings*.

Another letter, this time written by Croghan from a conference at Easton, informed Johnson that as soon as the treaty at Easton is over "I propose with Montour and them [a few Indians] to Joyne him [General Forbes] unless you Should want me or the Ginerall Give up ye. thoughts of attacking Fort Duquesne this year which I fear will be ye. case. A party of 2000 men has been within 40 miles of Fort Duquesne 10 Days ago." Croghan seemed to imply that Forbes's assault force could not move on without proper intelligence; he and Montour would provide that necessity. The letter closes with an interesting side note. "Capt. Montour Desiers me to make his Complements to you. he is very Industrouss and Dose nott Drink att all."⁹⁰ Evidently Montour and Croghan passed certain information on to Forbes, because in writing to his commander General James Abercromby, Forbes related that reports from Montour and Croghan suggested that French strength was greater than he had at first thought.⁹¹

The month of October was spent at Easton, where Montour served as interpreter for the Six Nations and the Delawares. With the conclusion of this conference a treaty was signed, and on the 26th Montour and Croghan journeyed to Fort Pitt. While on their way they encountered Christian Frederick Post, a missionary who had the Indians' interests close to his heart. Post joined them, and the three traveled together toward the fort, where they arrived on December 4.

Colonel Henry Bouquet was holding a conference with Indians when the group arrived. In the hours that followed it appeared that Montour and Croghan were guilty of some doubtful dealing: at least Post accused them of not telling the truth. Post said that Croghan and Montour failed to tell Bouquet that the Delaware chiefs wished all British troops to leave. When the Indians' desires were discussed, it was agreed that the English would maintain the fort with 200 men. But Post retorted that the chiefs wanted peace and the English out. "It was a d---d lie," Croghan countered.⁹²

Post's *Journal* records that the Indians said: "Mr. Croghan and

⁹⁰ Croghan to Johnson, September 21, 1758, *Johnson Papers*, III, 3.

⁹¹ Forbes to Abercromby, September 21, 1758, *Forbes Writings*, p. 215.

⁹² "Christian Frederick Post's Second Journal, 1758," in Israel Daniel Rupp, *History of Western Pennsylvania* (Pittsburgh, 1846), Appendix, pp. 99-126, esp. p. 123.

Henry Montour had not spoke and acted honestly and uprightly. . . . We have told them three times to go back, but they will not go, insisting upon staying here."⁹³ In contrast, the official minutes of the conference report the Delaware chiefs in agreement to the maintenance of the British force at the fort and, furthermore, that they offered to act as scouts for its protection.⁹⁴

This disagreement between Montour and Croghan, on the one hand, and Post, on the other, seems not to have created ill will, for the new year found Montour at Carlisle, where he "was so kind as to take" a very tired Post "in his room."⁹⁵

Working closely with Croghan, Montour had several meetings with the Indians in 1759. He was sent through the woods late in May to gather as many Indians as he could for a meeting at Fort Pitt which Croghan hoped would enable him "to divide the Indians, at least with the Enemy."⁹⁶ Croghan also hoped that some would be "inclined to join his Majesty's troops."⁹⁷ Early June found Montour meeting with Croghan at Fort Ligonier, on Loyalhanna Creek, not far from Bedford on Forbes's Road, with a party of thirty Indians. This was still another parley.⁹⁸ Fort Pitt, then under the command of General John Stanwix, became the western center for discussions with the Indians. A conference in July informed the Indians of the Easton treaty, and another in October informed them that Quebec had fallen to the British. At these two consultations Montour served as interpreter, handing the lighted pipe of peace to the participants present and observing the customs necessary on such occasions.

Writing early in December to General Jeffery Amherst, the British Commander in Chief in North America, William Johnson reported that:

Mr. Croghan, My Deputy, & Capt. Montour, have been this year past, and are still to the Westward with Genl.

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, Appendix, p. 127.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

⁹⁶ Croghan to Captain Horatio Gates, May 25, 1759, S. K. Stevens and D. H. Kent, eds., *The Papers of Colonel Henry Bouquet* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical Commission, 1941-1942), Series 21644, I, 155. Herein cited as *Bouquet Papers*.

⁹⁷ "George Croghan's Journal," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 71, 315-316.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

Stanwix, & I have deferred giving them any Orders lately, untill I knew whether your Excellency would Choose to Continue them there, or not; I hope they have been Serviceable, they are long acquainted with, and much Esteemed by them Nations of Indians around that Quarter.⁹⁹

Amherst's reply to Johnson's letter was that Brigadier General John Stanwix

has not as yet mentioned anything to me relative to the destination of Mr. Croghan and Mr. Montour. I cannot say anything to you on that head with certainty; So Soon as I am informed you shall be acquainted with it, meanwhile if you have any orders to give them for the good of the Service, that should not prevent you.¹⁰⁰

For the next six months, Montour again seems nearly to disappear. At a meeting with the Indians Montour acted as Croghan's interpreter and delivered a speech. Concluding this conference one Indian asked to have the kegs opened in order to drink because they "loved" it. Montour replied that he loved it too! This set the Indians to laughing.¹⁰¹

Two months later, Major Robert Stewart, the commander at Venango, "embraces" the suggestion of Colonel Bouquet "for the opportunity of Capt. Montour and his Indians to send [Stewart] a Convoy of Flower & some ammunition."¹⁰²

In the fall of 1760 Major Robert Rogers led a party of soldiers and Indians to receive the capitulation of the French forts in the West. This expedition was taken against the advice of many "old hands," and in spite of the approaching winter. Rogers and his small band set out from Fort Pitt and reached Presqu'Isle on Lake Erie by the end of October. Sailing west along the southern shore of the lake, the small flotilla was led by Rogers, with Croghan in the next whaleboat. A Captain Brewer, with forty rangers, and Montour with twenty Indians went overland

⁹⁹ Johnson to Amherst, December 8, 1759, *Johnson Papers*, III, 183.

¹⁰⁰ Amherst to Johnson, December 18, 1759, *Johnson Papers*, III, 185.

¹⁰¹ James Kenny, "Journal of James Kenny," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XXXVII (1913), 429.

¹⁰² Stewart to Bouquet, September 4, 1760, *Bouquet Papers*, series 21645. I, 149.

herding forty oxen. The Indians were from the Six Nations, Delawares, and Shawnees, to protect the party "from the insults of enemy Indians."¹⁰³

Winter was approaching rapidly, but Rogers felt that he could make Michillimakinak and complete his task. The company for this last effort consisted of thirty-five rangers, five or six inhabitants, and about as many Indians, led by Montour, who were well acquainted with the country. Striking out on December 25, 1760, the party faced very severe weather which forced them to turn back about two weeks later.¹⁰⁴

Shortly after the failure of Rogers's mission, Montour returned to Fort Pitt. Here he spent at least two weeks before he was again on the trail, this time to Fort Johnson, with at least one letter from Croghan. It was an account of money advanced to Montour out of Croghan's own pocket.¹⁰⁵ There was some doubt in Croghan's mind as to his being reimbursed for this expenditure.

Montour returned to Fort Pitt by March and, together with Croghan, received instructions to return to Cumberland in order to attend a general meeting of all the western Indians and the Six Nations at Detroit in the following spring.¹⁰⁶ Johnson himself journeyed to Detroit in September, 1761, and just before he returned to Fort Johnson, told Croghan to retire toward Sandusky with Montour, "who you will use as you judge best for the service." Evidently Croghan believed Montour would serve best as an interpreter for Lieutenant Elias Meyer. But by the 30th, Meyer was forced to report that "Mr. Montour, whom Mr. Croghan left here in the neighborhood to act as interpreter for me has already tired of his post, and left today for Pittsburg."¹⁰⁷

Where Montour was after he returned to Fort Pitt is difficult to determine. Word of his whereabouts comes again in the following year, when in March, accompanied by one of his sons, he

¹⁰³ Robert Rogers, *Journals of Robert Rogers*. See also Victor Hugo Paltsits, "Journal of Robert Rogers the Ranger on his Expedition for Receiving the Capitulation of the Western French Forts, October 20, 1760-February 14, 1761," *Bulletin of the New York Library*, XXXVII, No. 4 (April, 1933), 261.

¹⁰⁴ Amherst to Johnson, February 1, 1761, *Johnson Papers*, III, 315-316. See also "Rogers Journal," *Bulletin of the New York Library*, p. 261.

¹⁰⁵ Croghan to Johnson, February 10, 1761, *Johnson Papers*, III, 329-330.

¹⁰⁶ Johnson to Daniel Claus, March 10, 1761, *Johnson Papers*, III, 354.

¹⁰⁷ Meyer to Bouquet, September 10, 1761, *Bouquet Papers*, series 21647, I, 140-141.

delivered a message from Croghan to Fort Augusta, at the forks of the Susquehanna. They returned to Augusta in April, and "announced their intention of setting up a trading post at the adjacent 'Bloody Spring.'" This pronouncement created much consternation for both the commandant of the fort and James Irvine, the Indian agent. Both stated that they could not allow the Montours to start a store there, while the Montours contended that since they were Indians, they could settle anywhere on Indian land. Montour's son wanted to go to the governor for final adjudication, but if he did, no more was heard of the matter.¹⁰⁸

A letter from Croghan to Johnson complains that Montour's whereabouts again became a mystery. In May, Croghan had not seen Montour since he was sent to Fort Augusta. Croghan also took pains to point out Montour's financial problems, telling of money advanced and money owed by Montour.¹⁰⁹

A conference at Easton came in June, 1762, with Montour serving as interpreter. When the conference opened, Teedyscung surprised everyone by remarking that he could not trust Croghan or Montour to interpret for him the treaty papers of past Indian land transactions. He wanted copies and time for his own personal staff to check them over. He concluded:

This is all I have to say to you, unless you will let me have Copies of the Papers, which you know is my Right; and if I can have them, I will, with the Assistance of the Assembly-men, who are now here, give you such further answer, as I may think proper; but I do not think your wanting to do things in the dark, looks well.¹¹⁰

Later, as the meeting progressed and more evidence was produced, Teedyscung felt obliged to retract his remarks and say that there had been no dishonesty involved at the conferences he had attended concerning land transactions. Although Teedyscung did not trust Montour in dealing with land matters, he did respect Montour as an able interpreter.

Reading excerpts from Croghan's and Johnson's letters during

¹⁰⁸ Graydon to Hamilton, March 5, 1762, Shippen Family Papers, V, 145, as cited in William Hunter, *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1960), p. 539.

¹⁰⁹ Croghan to Johnson, May 10, 1762, *Johnson Papers*, III, 734.

¹¹⁰ "Treaty of Easton," *Johnson Papers*, III, 778-7783.

the next few months, it seems clear that Montour once again was plagued by whiskey and debts. To make matters worse, his salary was reduced because his services as a captain were ended and he was maintained only as an interpreter.¹¹¹ This reduction cut his income a little more than half. The consequent shock may have been the reason for his illness at his home near Fort Augusta during October. "Capt. Montour lives abt. six miles from Ft. Augusta [he has been] ailing but is recovered."¹¹²

From this last report in November, 1762, until May of 1763, Montour again seems to disappear. He returned to view and focused his attention on the Indian discontent that led to Pontiac's Rebellion during the summer of 1763. Following instructions from Johnson in May, 1763, Montour proceeded up the Susquehanna River and in that vicinity was to "use all of [his] Endeavours to increase His Majestys interest amongst the Indians." Montour was further instructed to aid Thomas McKee and George Croghan in affairs relative to Indian business.¹¹³ The most important point in Johnson's letter of instructions was his urgent appeal to Montour "to use every method of satisfying the Inds. concerning. their present fears about their Lands by assuring them I shall use my utmost efforts to prevent their being unjustly deprived of their property."

While carrying out Johnson's orders, Montour traveled through the territory along the banks of the Susquehanna attending many conferences. Here he learned, and reported toward the end of the month to McKee, that the Indians "Seem Verry Inveterate Agt. us and are Generally Inclined for Warr."¹¹⁴ Pontiac's Rebellion was about to begin.

On July 4 Bouquet wrote that as "Montour was coming from the Six Nations, I sent for him to get Intelligence of their intentions; He says that when he lefft Sif William Johnson he knew nothing of this Insurrection, nor has he heard anything of it till he came to the Susquehanna."¹¹⁵ It seems strange that Montour did not know anything about what was happening. It is very pos-

¹¹¹ Johnson to Amherst, September 5, 1762, *Johnson Papers*, III, 877.

¹¹² Thomas McKee to Johnson, November 2, 1762, *Johnson Papers*, III, 925. Thomas McKee took over Montour's military duties and also became assistant deputy agent of Indian Affairs.

¹¹³ Johnson to Montour, May 5, 1763, *Johnson Papers*, IV, 110.

¹¹⁴ John Harris to Bouquet, July 3, 1763, *Bouquet Papers*, 21649, I, 193.

¹¹⁵ Bouquet to Hamilton, July 4, 1763, *ibid.*, 21653, I, 193.

sible that he was feigning ignorance, because during the first week of August he went up the Susquehanna "and Seems So much displeased with the Government, and us, that we have the greatest reason to believe, both from his Words and actions, that he intends Joining the Indians."¹¹⁶

Montour's disgust may have been directed against the Pennsylvania commissioners because of their refusal "to invite [him] and all the other Indians that may be desirous of standing neuter during the present trouble, into the inhabited parts. . . ." The reason for this rejection was the Quaker fear of having to pay for the maintenance alone without the general financial support of the Crown or of the other colonies.¹¹⁷

For the rest of the summer and all of the fall, Montour is again only a spirit. By February of 1764 his ruffled feathers had been smoothed over and he was in command of a loyal war party on its way to battle. On the 21st Johnson sent Montour a message pleading: "for Gods Sake exert yourselves like Men whose Honour & everything dear to them is now at Stake."¹¹⁸ Much was expected of Montour's expedition and he did not fail, for on the 28th, Montour sent word that seven chief warriors, including a "captain Bull," had been captured.¹¹⁹

By April Montour was far up the Susquehanna, where he reported yet another success. Several houses were destroyed in addition to large stores of corn and livestock. The mission was a partial failure, however, because several warriors of the enemy escaped.¹²⁰ Thomas Gage worded it this way: "it's a Pitty Capt. Montour was not able to destroy those Hornets [Delawares], as well as destroying their nests."¹²¹

Further instructions caught up with Montour on the 28th, ordering him and his command to Oswego on Lake Ontario, where he was to obtain provisions and then proceed to Fort Niagara. Once there the commanding officer would employ Montour and his men as scouts and guards of the "carrying place," the trail connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, around the

¹¹⁶ Robert Callender to Bouquet, August 2, 1763, *ibid.*, 21649, II, 3.

¹¹⁷ Hamilton to Bouquet, July 12, 1763, *ibid.*, 21649, I, 217-218.

¹¹⁸ Johnson to Montour, February 21, 1764, *Johnson Papers*, IV, 336-337.

¹¹⁹ Montour to Johnson, February 28, 1764, *ibid.*, pp. 344-345.

¹²⁰ Montour to Johnson, April 7, 1764, *ibid.*, V, 392-394.

¹²¹ Thomas Gage to Johnson, April 22, 1764, *ibid.*, IV, 401-403.

Niagara Falls, and the naval yard.¹²² Montour sailed from Fort Ontario on the 17th of May and arrived safely at Niagara on the 22nd, with the first contingents of his force.¹²³ While at Niagara, he had a close call. The Indians got drunk and threatened to kill him. Suffering from aching heads the next morning, they all but forgot their mutinous actions of the night before.¹²⁴

The commander at Fort Niagara was Colonel John Bradstreet. He was somewhat confused as to the best way to deal with the Indians. This confusion was probably caused by a lack of communications from Johnson. On the 29th of September, Montour was "duly Sworn" by Bradstreet to tell what Sir William Johnson had said was to be the policy concerning the rebellious tribes. Bradstreet was in need of support concerning his actions against the Indians. Montour reported that the British were to offer peace to all the tribes who would cease fighting and turn over their prisoners. But, Montour stressed, Britain would continue the war against those who would not.¹²⁵

By the time Montour made his report to Bradstreet, the war was all but over. Montour once again becomes a shadow in the forest. In March of 1766 Johnson wrote Croghan saying: "I shall send Montour off for Fort Pitt in a day or Two, where you may dispose of him, or take him with you as you shall judge best. I have done my utmost for these 2 years past to keep him out of Debt, and he goes now pritty clear of ye. World."¹²⁶ The phrase "or take him with you as you shall judge best," seems to refer to Croghan's proposed journey down the Ohio and Mississippi river systems to New Orleans. There is no direct evidence to support saying that Montour accompanied Croghan. Johnson's letter only hints of the possibility.

Not until the eve of the Fort Stanwix treaty conference, called in 1768 to settle the problem of the Indian lands, does Montour again make an important appearance. On an invitation by Johnson, Montour traveled to Fort Stanwix accompanied by a band of twenty Indians to participate in the drawing of the treaty. This

¹²² Johnson to Montour, April 28, 1764, *ibid.*, pp. 411-413.

¹²³ Alexander Duncan to Johnson, May 26, 1764, *ibid.*, pp. 430-431.

¹²⁴ "Journal of Captain John Montresor to Niagara, 1764," *New York Historical Society Collections*, 1881, p. 263.

¹²⁵ "Examination by Israel Putnam and others," September 29, 1764, *Johnson Papers*, IV, 549-550.

¹²⁶ Johnson to Croghan, March 28, 1766, *ibid.*, V, 120.

treaty resolved the land question by the Indians' acknowledgment of the purchase of their lands south and east of the rivers Ohio, Allegheny, and Susquehanna.¹²⁷

After the Fort Stanwix conference of 1768, word of Montour and knowledge of his whereabouts is almost non-existent. The last information on Montour is recorded in a letter written by Major Isaac Hamilton from Fort Pitt on January 22, 1772, reporting that "Captain Montour the Indian interpreter was killed at his own House the Day before Yesterday by a Seneca Indian who had been intertained by him at his House for some Days; he was buried this Day near the Fort." This time Montour's drinking companions really did kill him!

As a final tribute to their lost friend, "the Indians who came to the funeral beg'd a few gallons of Rum to drown their Sorrows for the Life of their friend." The cost of the spirits for the Indian's lamentations was pegged at a little better than £7.¹²⁸

For his efforts as a diplomat, Montour was highly rewarded, albeit he dissipated much of the reward. The remunerations he gained were large tracts of land in western Pennsylvania, some of which still bear his name, reminding us today of his past influence. Holding the confidence of both the Six Nations council and the colonies of Virginia and Pennsylvania, Montour was able to secure for himself a position of esteem in Indian diplomacy. His importance stems from the influence he had at Onondaga and in Virginia and Pennsylvania as an intermediary between the colonies and Indians. Montour's services were also sought as an interpreter because his personality, honesty, and ability were widely known. The greatest tribute to him, however, was perhaps that, in spite of the fact that he could not read or write, so much was written by his contemporaries about him. All the information we have concerning Andrew Montour, a frontier diplomat, comes from sources written about him, not by him.

¹²⁷ David Zeisberger, "Moravian Records," II, *Ohio Archeological and Historical Publications*, XXI, 71.

¹²⁸ Major Isaac Hamilton to General Thomas Gage, January 22, 1772, in C. E. Carter, ed., *Correspondence of General Thomas Gage* (2 vols., New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931-1933).