The Delaware Indians as Women: Were the Original Pennsylvanians Politically Emasculated?

In a stimulating and historically important article, C. A. Weslager has elaborately reviewed the much-discussed question of the motives that lay behind the event of the early 1700's (noted by Brinton as occurring around 1725) in which the Delaware Indian Nation of Pennsylvania was ignominiously reduced by the Five Nations Iroquois to the status of women. The incident is interesting and significant in the history of the eastern colonies, for it had a profound effect upon the destinies of the French and English in the struggle for supremacy.

Weslager examined the original sources that reported the affair sometime after its occurrence and the secondary sources that discussed upon the meanings attached to it in the minds of the Delawares, the Iroquois, and the contemporary historians. The section of his article in which he introduces and summarizes the source material deserves quotation, though it may seem somewhat lengthy at this time. It runs as follows:

Among the strange concepts in the social symbolism of the American Indian tribes of the East was the treatment accorded a vanquished enemy group by the victors. We have heard much repeated, analyzed, and even contradicted accounts in a century and a half of historical literature concerning the relationship between the Five Nations Iroquois and the Delaware Nation, culminating in the degradation of the latter. The Five Nations relegated the Delaware to a position of "women" by applying the symbolic attributes of the female to them as a nation of women, devoid of political or military power. This subjugation and lowering of status of the enemy were linked with sexual connotations, real and symbolical, which are fraught with mystery and which placed the Delaware tribe in a subservient social position. As women they could not go to war or negotiate peace treaties. In fact, their entire political organization by this act of humiliation was deprived of masculine prerogatives. They were compelled to accept the chiefs of the Iroquois Confederacy, the

2 The Indian policy adopted by the English was actually formed in Pennsylvania, as Paul A. W. Wallace has discussed so convincingly in Conrad Weiser, 1696-1760, Friend of Colonist and Mohawk (Philadelphia, 1945).
League of Five Nations, as their spokesmen, agents and overlords in the political family of nations.

Loskiel, the Moravian historian, was among the first contemporary observers to call attention in print to the Delaware in their status as women. The story related to him either directly by Delaware informants, or more probably to him through his fellow missionary Heckewelder, was that in the distant past the Five Nations met with the Delaware and convinced them that it was senseless for the Indians to war against each other as they had been doing. The Five Nations proposed, therefore, that the Delaware tribe accept an honorable, noncombatant position as peacemakers. In such a role they would not engage in combat and consequently as a neutral party could negotiate peace between warring tribes. The right was one that belonged to the “tribal matrons” as the position accorded women was regarded in their social policies, who could with impunity propose cessation of hostilities to their men fighters. Such subterfuge would permit their warriors to “save face,” since it would not be necessary for either of them to sue for peace. Yet both would be spared further bloodshed. The Delaware, so their story went, accepted this respected position as matrons. During a ceremony that marked the occasion, the Iroquois, according to the Delaware version, are supposed to have said: “We dress you in a woman’s long habit reaching down to your feet and adorn you with earrings,” meaning that they should not take up arms again. “We hang a calabash filled with oil and medicine on your arms,” meaning that they should use the oil to clean the ears of those who could not distinguish good from evil, and also use the medicine to heal those walking in evil. “We deliver unto your hands a plant of Indian corn and a hoe,” meaning that they should thereafter be as women.

Later the Delaware claimed that they had been duped, their independence forfeited, their autonomy humiliated. After accepting the pact in good faith, they said that they found they had sacrificed their individual rights and the Five Nations were exploiting them and that they were helpless to retaliate, having obligated themselves by their sacred word of honor which could not be broken.

The Five Nations told an entirely different story. They averred that the Delaware version was a complete fabrication to win sympathy. They maintained they had conquered the Delaware fairly in open battle and as a penalty had reduced them to the disgraceful position of women. Thus the impartial observer has found himself faced with two opposing views and is at a loss to settle on the correct one. Zeisberger presents the two sides to the controversy as does Heckewelder, although the latter’s conclusions are that the Delaware story was the authentic one. He deduced from information given him that the Dutch had instigated the scheme to weaken the Delaware.

Further consideration of the enigma arising out of the two unharmonized viewpoints as to the event described above requires that some backgrounds of Indian cultures in the East be examined, even if only briefly.

3 G. H. Loskiel, History of the Mission of the United Brethren, etc. (London, 1794), 126.
4 David Zeisberger’s History of the Northern American Indians, ed. by A. M. Hulbert and W. N. Schwarze (Columbus, 1910).
One of the distinctive characteristics of the eastern woodlands tribes inhabiting the Atlantic slope from northern New England to the Delaware Bay region and inland south of the Great Lakes was the tendency to give each other ratings of relationship according to a kind of consanguinity that one would find in the extended branches of a large family. They observed the formalities of address as individuals and as political groups in referring to each other by the traditional kinship terms of younger or elder brothers, uncles or nephews, grandfathers or grandsons. These were used as reciprocal terms of designation among tribal groups who came under the sway of the “family tradition.” It is pertinent to our problem here as it applies to the Delawares, that the relationship terms were always on the male side; hence the tribes were classed as masculine.

The tradition of tribal consanguinity was widespread throughout the area mentioned, was generally recognized and followed by members of the tribes involved in the assumed family circle, and carried a certain prestige determined by the age-ratio of those classified as brothers, uncles, or grandfathers in ascending generations. Individually and collectively tribes known as “brothers” were treated as equals, those known as “uncles” (or in the father’s generation) with respect, and those known as “grandfathers” with veneration. Although the original source of such a system of rating cannot now be traced, it seems that the Delawares were generally accorded the superior status of grandfathers, as will shortly be shown. The legendary relationship among tribes may possibly have become diffused from this area. It requires more than simple thought to find an explanation for the familial outlook among tribes distantly related in language and culture to each other. This outlook was employed even between tribes alien in language and historical derivation, as were the

Masculine kinship terms were also used by the Indians and the authorities of Pennsylvania during their frequent conferences and councils. The term “father” was often used by the natives in addressing the governor, but the preferred term of address seems to have been “brother.” Of the scores of references found in the Pennsylvania documents, the following are illustrative. Sassoan, the Delaware chief, meeting with Thomas Penn at Philadelphia, Aug. 1, 1740, addressed the English as “Brethren” (Minutes of the Provincial Council, IV, 433). Canassatego, the Iroquois chief, at a meeting July 7, 1742, addressed Governor Thomas and the Council as “Brethren” (op. cit., 569). The Nanticoke, on April 22, 1743, used the same form when addressing Governor Thomas, compounding the governor’s Indian name, i.e., “Brother Onas” (op. cit., 647). The Indians also addressed the Governor of Virginia as “Brother Assaraquoa” (op. cit., 721).
Algonquin and the Iroquois. The uncertainty of solution has not barred some historians from interpreting the facts as an indication that the “oldest” members of the affinal series (those known as grandfathers) were the racial progenitors of the others in the order of descent given them by the legend. On the grounds of kinship name as applied to their tribes some of the Indians themselves granted this rationalization and accorded those they termed grandfathers the ancient and honorable status of being their earlier ancestors. This prestige fell invariably upon the group constituting the Delaware Nation of historic renown.

A study of the council records of Pennsylvania clearly illustrates the kinship terms used by the Delawares in their relations with other tribes. In addition, we learn how other tribes addressed them. For example, the Onondaga Council of the Iroquois on April 22, 1743, sent a message through Conrad Weiser in which they referred to “Brother the Governor of Pennsylvania . . . Cousins the Delawares . . . Brethren the Shawonese.” The Shawnee, in turn, addressed the Delawares and Six Nations in open meeting as “Grandfathers and Brethren.” The Iroquois chief Scarrooyady addressed the Delaware and Shownese as “Brethren and Cousins.” The Shawnee, it is of interest to note, addressed the Delawares as “Uncles,” while Garistage, a Seneca chief, called them “nephews.” Another Seneca chief, Tadashata, addressed the Delawares and Munsi as follows: “We your uncles . . . you our cousins and nephews.”

The English apparently had some feeling for the kinship terms used intertribally, for Governor Bernard once addressed himself to a group of Indians as follows: “Our Brethren the Senecas and Cayugas and your nephews the Minisinks.”

By ethnohistorians, nevertheless, a source of genealogical derivation based simply upon intertribal terms of consanguinity is not freely accepted, since it ignores the ramified Algonquian and Iroquois ancestry of unrelated cultural and linguistic classification. Pure
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7 Minutes of the Provincial Council, IV, 648–650.
8 Ibid., V, 311.
9 Ibid., 676.
10 Ibid., 670.
11 Ibid., VII, 515.
12 Ibid., VIII, 194.
13 Ibid., 179.
archaeology and ethnology are involved in any attempt to trace relationships of the past, and conclusions from their findings must be awaited in more definite form. Meanwhile, in the field of native social behavior some other line of explanation should tentatively be sought for motives underlying the practice of regarding unrelated aliens as members of divergent family extraction. The most rational proposal for contemplation of the question may indeed be in the direction of considering the principle of adoption, so marked as a characteristic of the eastern area where we find tribal kinship recognition widely accorded to neighboring tribal groups. Tribal consanguinities then appearing among artificial properties in the area of culture would not be historical shadows or evidences of former relationship, but rather symbols of a social idealism. The principle of adoption is too generally known as a fundamental of Iroquois and Algonquian social practice to need further discussion. It may hold a clue to the explanation of the question concerning the venerable status of the Delawares as grandfathers at one time and as women later on when subordinated and adopted into the League of the Iroquois following their conquest and dispersion. Speculation in this direction leads a step further. The symbols of a relationship, of age and generation, and of sex are inseparable, and those are what we encounter in an attempt to bring out what the Iroquois and Delawares meant in their conflicting viewpoints about the changed status of the latter group.\footnote{Flexibility in the use of the kinship terms applied to tribes is well illustrated in the Iroquois relations with the Nanticoke. At first, while in the status of a subjected and tributary tribe, the Iroquois chief Canassatego referred to them as “cousins” \citep{Minutes,401}. However, after the Nanticoke had been absorbed into the League, a Seneca chief referred to Robert White, the old Nanticoke chief, as “our son” \citep{Minutes,VIII,756}.}

A survey of records written during the period when the Delawares were independent of Iroquois control shows that they were endowed in the esteem of surrounding tribes with the honor of being the grandfathers of peoples. This honor carries with it the prerogatives of seniority, a high standing among Indians of the past and present. To Weslager’s quoted references on this point, other authorities have made observations that may be cited as evidence.

In several previous studies of the Delawares I have offered observations from the informants in the field showing how generously this
nation extended its feelings of relationship to other tribes in a manner acceptable to them, reserving for themselves the elevated status of elders in a graded kinship system of family inclusion on a wholesale scale. From these I draw the following brief summary. Among notes recorded from the lips of Witapanoxwe, a Delaware traditionalist of the Oklahoma division of the existing Delaware Nation, and carried on for several years beginning in 1928, a list was made of some twenty-one tribes, most of them belonging east of the Mississippi, to whom the Delawares assigned terms of relationship. Out of the list only the names of tribal bodies pertinent to this discussion need be mentioned. The Iroquois are known as brothers, younger or elder brotherhood not being specified, although this distinction would be important to Indians. According to accessible sources, the Delawares assume that they are older than those they designate brothers. The Seneca Iroquois (and the Iroquoian-speaking Wyandot or Huron and Cherokee) are, however, rated as nephews. Hence the Iroquois are given a junior standing in accordance with the preconquest classification. Needless to add, these tribes refer to the Delawares as uncles. In 1937 the text giving this information was published and some comment offered. This version of the account is more specific and corrects an error in the previous translation, changing the word of the text to denote the Seneca as "uncles" not "nephews." The correction alters the status of the Delawares and Seneca (Mengwe) Iroquois in respect to seniority and corresponds with the status of "uncle" given the Iroquois by that band of Delawares which has remained in close contact with the Iroquois in Ontario ever since its adoption into the Six Nations Confederacy in 1763. Tedyuskung, in 1755, also used the term "uncles" in addressing the Six Nations.

There is, to be sure, considerable discrepancy among early records in assigning these relationships to various tribes, and discrepancy is to be noted in the ratings assigned them by the modern Delawares in Canada and in the United States. The relationship ideas seem not to form a hard and fast tradition when records are compared. For instance, McKenney, over a century ago, as did Zeisberger and


Heckewelder still earlier, noted that the Wyandot addressed the Delawares as “grandfathers,” while the Delawares acknowledged themselves as the Wyandots’ “nephews” and the Oklahoma Delawares regarded the Wyandot later as “nephews.” The inaccuracy of Indian social tradition in these matters is either a trait in itself or an aberration from one. And perhaps it is through political circumstances that change in reciprocal status of peoples is brought about.

From the foregoing, a generalized inference may be drawn, namely, that the Delaware Nation as a loose confederacy of related subdivisions in eastern Pennsylvania, northern Delaware, New Jersey and southern New York (known tribally as Unami, Unalachtigo, Munsee and Mahican), stood high during the early colonial period in the estimation of Algonquins as a patriarchal people. Mooney (1907) concisely expressed the views of historians regarding their status in saying: “By virtue of admitted priority of political rank and of occupying the central home territory, from which most of the cognate tribes had diverged, they were accorded by all the Algonquian tribes the respectful title of ‘grandfathers,’ a recognition accorded by courtesy also to the Huron.” This level of self-esteem was ingrained in Delaware thought and was maintained by the people themselves from an early period through to the present.

In what esteem the Five Nations Iroquois held them is another matter which we shall now consider. Neither the colonial records of negotiation between the Iroquois and the Delawares nor the oral testimony of the Six Nations officials of later times reveals evidence that they shared the attitude of other tribes in addressing the self-complacent Delawares as “grandfathers.” In formal speeches, often accompanied with wampum belts or strings, delivered by their chiefs to the leaders and council bodies of Delawares and related Algonquian tribes, the term of address was “brothers” or “cousins.” Apparently the equality of brotherhood was the extent of admission granted to foreign tribes adopted into the fraternity of their League for enforcing peace.

As an example, I would refer to the action of the Mohawk in their treatment of delegates from the Wabanaki Confederacy of Algonquian bands in Maine and the Maritime Provinces who held periodic meetings at Caughnawaga, P. Q., to celebrate and strengthen the founding of peace on the Indian frontier. The Wabanaki Confederacy, it
may be noted, was an alliance of the far eastern Algonquins for defense against the depredations of the Iroquois, the "whole fabric of which was manifestly modelled after the pattern of the Iroquoian League" and subsidiary to the Mohawk. The "council fire," as it was called, was lighted every seven years to cement the friendship formed between anciently hostile peoples. An account of its procedures printed in 1896 by Joseph Nicolai of the Penobscot describes how the attending tribes were given kinship classification—Ottawa being the "father," Wabanaki the "eldest son," and Micmac the "youngest son" and how the status was pleasantly symbolized by undressing the oldest Micmac representative and putting him in a cradle-board where he was kept all day and fed like a baby. Every time the delegates met at the grand council fire this performance was repeated.

It seems scarcely necessary to quote further references to show that the Algonquins were assigned by the Iroquois to a lower position than "grandfathers." The accounts we possess all apply to a period after the subjugation of the Algonquins. As a final observation in support of this conclusion, note that the Delawares (adopted about 1763 by the Six Nations now in Ontario), have since that time considered, and still do consider, the latter as "uncles," and are known to them as "nephews," recalling the early relationship status of Delawares and Seneca mentioned before.

It has now been brought out that two aspects of regard have characterized the Iroquois and the Algonquian Delawares. The Iroquois never seem to have conceded the hegemony of superior age and venerability to the Delawares or to subdued and adopted nations.

The transfer of the relationship status to one of sex comes next under consideration. In the next step of inferiorization, or "degradation" as some historians have arbitrarily termed it, the Delawares were made "women" by the Five Nations. With this action they were forced to concur because of their waning power to resist the


18 Resentment among the Canadian Delawares adopted into the Six Nations has never been tacit. As recently as the later quarter of the preceding century the band of Delawares, on the Six Nations Reserve disapproved of its hereditary chief, Joseph Montour, for admitting a subordinate position to the band in the Six Nations registry of tribes (F. G. Speck, The Celestial Bear Comes Down to Earth, The Bear Sacrifice Ceremony of the Munsee-Mahican, Reading Public Museum, Reading, 1945).
will of the Iroquois. Their acceptance of a feminized role in frontier policies appears, however, to have been won through an interpretation of the concept common to both themselves and the Iroquois that women were "matrons," and as matrons were superior social and political forces in respect to the making and keeping of peace. To the Iroquois it meant that the Delawares were deprived of autonomy in certain transactions and could not make war without the sanction of their overlords. A contest over the meaning of the symbol of feminism arose after the deed was accomplished, and each party acted in accordance with its own view of the matter. That the Iroquois regarded the act they perpetrated as forcing the Delaware Nation to retreat into the obscurity of woman's background in society is indisputable, in view of their long-established principle of denying superiority in any guise to subdued and adopted tribes. That the Delawares persisted in interpreting the symbol as a mark of the respect they expected from all peoples is also clearly evident.  

The two viewpoints have remained irreconcilable in the subsequent career of the two peoples. To this day the Delawares adopted by the Six Nations and residing with them on their reserve in Brant County, Ontario, uncompromisingly preserve their dignity in the estate of matronship in the League, as peacemakers beyond whom there is no higher authority. This is their interpretation of the historical episode in which they once took part. With them this is a matter of vital significance even now in the reputation they hold among other Indian tribes. Among their Iroquois associates it seems a matter of indifference, except as a humorous memory of a conquered nation once having had skirts put on its warriors.

A recent trip to the Six Nations Reserve in Ontario, made possible by a grant of the Faculty Research Fund of the University of Pennsylvania (Grant 556, 1945), provided me with an opportunity to question some of the learned men of the Sour Springs Cayuga Long  

19 A recent communication from M. H. Deardorff furnishes an interesting insight into the manner in which the Delawares of the late 18th century had become reconciled to feminine classification. I quote the passage, "Perhaps you will recall from the Zeisberger MS diaries . . . how he debated whether to address a council of Ohio Delawares as 'Dear Brothers' or 'Dear Sisters'; and finally decided for the latter on the ground that it might offend them to call them Brothers. Of course, Zeisberger always had an eye out for the Seneca in whose jurisdiction he was at the time; but, in his debate with himself over this point, I do not recall that how they were going to feel about it was a consideration" (M. H. Deardorff, Warren, Penna., 6/5/45).
House group in reference to the tradition of making women of the Delawares. Memories of the episode do not seem to be vivid among the Iroquois authorities consulted on tribal history. After the lapse of two centuries since the subjugation of the Delawares to the dictates of the League it appeared that little testimony could be added to the material now on record in published colonial narratives. Indeed it has often been noted by ethnologists, Lowie and Sapir in particular, that Indians are not historically minded. Yet an echo of the event was caught in the course of inquiry into the ceremonial procedures of the Cayuga midwinter festivals taking place in the Long House. It came from Deskaheh, one of the life-chiefs of the Canadian Cayuga.

Without entering into a discussion of the different classes of songs which constitute the musical repertoire of the Iroquois, who perform an extensive routine of rituals in the periodic gatherings in their Long Houses on reservations in Canada and New York, I shall have to mention one dance and song in particular. This is known in Cayuga as kaddrot, and in reservation English as the Round Dance. It is purely a social dance, having no religious symbolism, but serving to promote the spirit of amity among those who take part in the Long House festivals, by relieving the tension of the more serious and devout rites. The Round Dance is introduced at times in any series of day or night ceremonies or at social gatherings, and is approved as such by the hierarchy of the Long House faith. When the ceremonial leaders see fit to call for its enactment, a man in the audience known for his ability to conduct it is requested to come forth with a shot-filled cow's horn rattle to accompany his voice in the singing and to beat time for the dance step. The Round Dance is a source of pleasure for all those in attendance at group gatherings, for which the Iroquois are noted. Dancers of both sexes, young and old, proceed in single file behind the leading singer as the string of followers circle around the building toward the left. The words of Round Dance songs are old and traditional, as the music also is, yet some leaders are versatile enough to introduce phrases of their own wording to produce amusement among the participants.

Now that we understand the context of the occasion, the following section of such a song derived from Mohawk sources in which reference is made to the Delawares wearing skirts may be given. It
reveals one of the few remaining memories among the Cayuga of the
time when the Delawares as a tribe were divested of their male
atire and, as we observe, it is couched in humor. While now sung
at Cayuga and Onondaga festivals, and well known among the Six
Nations people, the old song still retains its Mohawk wording which
reflects its tribal origin.

The song begins like other Round Dance lyrics with a repeated
series of meaningless syllables rendered by the leader with responses
by the male dancers, leader and followers in alternation: to wit, leader singing kayu, chorus, wihe. Shortly now the song proper is
commenced, the leader singing the first word of the line, the chorus
responding with hayi (double underlined):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rh\textsuperscript{nats'}} & \text{ ha\textsuperscript{gana}} \quad \text{hayi} \\
\text{Stammering people} & \quad \text{(repeated at the option}
\text{r\textsuperscript{6}tikare} & \text{hayi} \\
\text{of the leader)} & \\
\text{They have skirts}
\end{align*}
\]

Sometimes the singer will vary the verse with the phrase r\textsuperscript{6}watikare, “they have put skirts on them.”

A note of explanation concerning the first word referring to the
Delawares will bring out the humorous and somewhat derogatory
sense associated with the proper name of the Delaware Nation in
the Mohawk tongue. While the name given applied to the Delaware
Nation as a whole, it specifically designated the Mahican of the
Hudson Valley. The name Stammerer or, as explained by Deskaheh,
one-whose-tongue-is-stuck-fast, refers to the sounds of the Algonquian
idiom spoken by these tribes which the Mohawk Iroquois could
neither comprehend nor reproduce. At most we can only consider
this item of Iroquois tradition as a minute contribution to the his-
torical puzzle, one showing the continuance of the attitude through
time which the Six Nations held toward the Delawares as being a
subjugated and emasculated people.

The vagueness of what meanings are implied in these records of
events that swayed the fortunes of Americans of both native and
European lineage eight generations ago will only be dispelled by
painstaking study of native concepts and their expression in meta-
phors. The records, however, were made by chroniclers who wrote
principally of what had happened without discussion of causes. Opinions on the nature of transactions between the Delawares and the Six Nations were construed differently, as we infer from the commentators of the time who expressed their views. By European judgment the feminization of a Nation of Indians could be nothing else than a form of social and political degradation, and so it passed into the literature of the day and was repeated in later treatises. Now at almost the twelfth hour while memory of the event is still a sentient one in the minds of the Delawares at least, the ethnohistorian has an advantage that colonial historians lacked. He possesses a sufficient background knowledge of Iroquois and Algonquian ways to approach the problem through ethnological analysis. By this approach it may be suggested that a fixation of grandeur was so firmly lodged in the group sentiment of the Delawares at large that nothing could dispel it—not even the reluctance of the Iroquois to regard them as ancient and honorable grandsires or the later humiliation of being symbolically emasculated.

Whereas the status of women involved two different aspects in eastern Indian folk-tradition, one according them social supremacy, the other political impotency in a military state, each party in the series of negotiations apparently took its own meaning of the climax transaction and held to it without compromise thereafter. It was the Delawares who suffered the “ignominy of feminization” in the eyes of the colonial world, and they took drastic measures to protest against that. By the act of defiance, bold and diplomatic, for which Tedyuscung was largely responsible, they succeeded in 1755–6, as the records show. The anti-climax came with celerity and force. Following Braddock’s defeat the Delawares, having long nurtured their resentment against the English, especially the Pennsylvanians, for accumulated wrongs suffered and for encroachments, broke forth with determined opposition to the advancing whites. “They revealed themselves as ruthless warriors and not the peaceful women they were reputed to be.” Demonstrating the vehement masculinity of men rearmed they cast aside the metaphorical petticoats and corsets, setting the Pennsylvania frontiers aflame and indirectly serving the purposes of the French. Negotiations, however, were soon

20 See also C. Hale Sipe, Indian Wars of Pennsylvania (Harrisburg, 1929).

21 Weslager, op. cit., 385.
opened with the English for a permanent peace with settlement of land disputes in the east, and hostilities ceased. The Delawares, now accorded the status of "cousins" by the Six Nations, became allies of the English and turned the edge of their tomahawk against the French.

Yet the supposed stigma of femininity was not erased entirely from historical memory among either Indians or English as subsequent records show. One solution of the persistent enigma seems to me finally to lie in acceptance of a two-way interpretation of native concepts concerning the female in the social universe as just stated; a dual interpretation not too difficult to harmonize with an old Algonquian philosophy, but one with uncompromising qualities to foreign minds.

The words of the ethnic-historian, E. M. Ruttenber, seem worthy of quotation in summarizing the poignant episode that fixed the relationship between the Delaware Nation and the Six Nations of Iroquois after the English came into possession of the Country.

That the subjugation of the Lenapes was complete, there is no denial. The famous speech of Canassatiego, at Philadelphia, 1742, "We conquered you, we made women of you; we charge you to remove instantly; we don't give you liberty to think about it," is not more conclusive than the admission of Tedyuscung: "I was styled by my uncles, the Six Nations, a woman, in former years, and had no hatchet in my hand but a pestle or hominy pounder." But through the thick gloom which surrounds the history of their subjugation, through all the degradation and reproach which was heaped upon them as a "nation of women," there runs a thread of light revealing their former greatness, pleading the causes of their decay, promising that their dead shall live again. Not in the eternal darkness which shuts in the Eries is that light lost, but from its prison house breaks in brilliancy, redeeming the past, and wringing from their ancient subjugators, shivering under adverse fortune, the greeting—Brothers.²²
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