

## Research Notes & Maryland Miscellany

### Mathias de Sousa: Maryland's First Colonist of African Descent

DAVID S. BOGEN

**M**athias de Sousa has long been hailed as the first colonist of African descent in Maryland. But what do we know about him and how do we know it? He was not the first person of African descent in Maryland. At least four months before de Sousa arrived in Maryland, individuals of African descent worked on Kent Island. William Claiborne sued Clobery and Company for expenses for his Kent Island trading post, including 1 pound 5 shillings “ffor negers services some monthes” to November of 1633. Claiborne, however, did not have a royal grant to establish a province. Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, did. Thus, the settlers who came under Calvert’s aegis, including de Sousa, were the first colonists of Maryland.<sup>1</sup>

In a colony of Englishmen, de Sousa had a unique name. A few documents from the first days of the colony mention a person with that name or a variant thereof: headright claims, a reference in an estate inventory, a deposition, a mention in general assembly records, and several documents in debt litigation. The references are spare—a tantalizing glimpse that leaves most of his life to the imagination, such as when or where de Sousa was born or died, why he came to Maryland, what he thought of the land, what ideas he held, who his friends were, or how other colonists treated him. Nevertheless, these documents and the other records of the period provide a reasonable basis for a few inferences. Although none of the inferences are beyond doubt, they at least provide some basis for beginning to understand the man and his position in early Maryland.<sup>2</sup>

De Sousa appears to have been an “Atlantic creole”—a person of African descent with connections to the wider Atlantic world.<sup>3</sup> He had European as well as African ancestors, and he came to Maryland with the first colonists under very

*David S. Bogen is Professor of Law at the University of Maryland School of Law.*

different circumstances than other men and women of African descent. This short account presents what we know about this intriguing individual, how we know it, and what we may infer about his life.

### Headright Documents

The paucity of the written record is a perennial historical problem. Much is lost because it was never written down, and many written documents have been lost or destroyed.<sup>4</sup> Many records survived through copies despite the loss of the originals. For example, all of the headright documents mentioning Mathias de Sousa come from Liber F of the Maryland Proprietary records, a book which itself may have involved copies of material (the documents in the early pages were not in chronological sequence, indicating that at least the beginning of the book was put together after the fact). Land entries from Liber F were transcribed in 1717 into Liber AB&H, and much of the whole of Liber F was transcribed in 1724 into Land Office Records Liber 1.<sup>5</sup> However, the original Liber F has been lost, so some of the differences between the Liber 1 and Liber AB&H copies cannot be reconciled.

The first record of Mathias de Sousa is an undated entry by Thomas Copley in Proprietary Record Book F that lists “Mathias Sousa” among persons “brought into the province” in 1633.<sup>6</sup> That section of Liber F contains lists of people brought into the province of Maryland, probably written down to provide a basis for claiming land. Lord Baltimore had offered to grant land for a small annual quitrent to anyone who transported men between the ages of sixteen and fifty to the province. The offer varied according to whether the transportation was in 1633, 1634, 1635 or thereafter, decreasing in amount for arrivals after 1633.<sup>7</sup> Copley himself came in 1637 as the Father Superior of the Jesuit mission. His list treated almost everyone who arrived before him as having come in 1633, a mistake with the potential to benefit Jesuit claims.

Thomas Copley’s list has a number of other errors that indicate he compiled the list in a hurry, either before he was completely familiar with the facts or relying on faulty memory. The list repeats the name Robert Edwards, refers to Richard Thompson as John, and Benjamin Hodges as Thomas. Further, Copley did not distinguish between persons brought to Maryland by the Jesuits and those brought by others who assigned their rights to the Jesuits.<sup>8</sup>

Copley’s list recorded arrivals, but formal acquisition of land based on the Conditions of Plantation required several more steps. The person entitled to land had to “demand” a warrant for a survey of land in the amount to which he was entitled. The governor or the secretary of the province would then issue a warrant to the surveyor to lay out the boundaries for land, the surveyor would provide a certificate of survey, and the governor would sign a patent or grant for the land.<sup>9</sup>

Ferdinand Pulton filed a “demand” for warrants for land on October 9, 1639,

about nine months after he arrived in Maryland to succeed Copley as Father Superior of the Jesuit mission. Pulton's demand corrected some of the inaccuracies in Copley's list. He laid out the source of his claimed right, gave arrival dates for the colonists in 1633, 1634, 1635, 1637, and 1638, and corrected some first names. This document included a claim "As assignee of Mr. Andrew White brought into the province Anno 1633 . . . Mathias Sousa, a Molato."<sup>10</sup>

The record of Pulton's demand is the basis for the statement that Mathias de Sousa was a mulatto who came with the original colonists. It confirms the 1633 date given by Copley and specifies that de Sousa was a mulatto. It identifies Andrew White, a Jesuit priest who came on the *Ark*, as the person responsible for bringing de Sousa to Maryland.

The demand was recorded in Liber F (1640-43), folio 61-62, and later transcribed in Maryland Provincial Patents Liber 1, folio 37, and in Liber AB&H, folio 65. The two transcriptions are not identical: for example, Sousa appears as "Tousa" in Liber AB&H, which may reflect difficulties in distinguishing between an S and a T in the handwriting of the original scribe. Both Liber 1 and Liber AB&H contain the careful listing of names and sources of rights for the claim copied from Liber F folio 61. Both transcriptions of Liber F, folio 61, clearly label Sousa as "a molato," assuring that the designation did appear in the original Liber F.

Liber 1 also copied, from folio 62 of Liber F, Pulton's demand for a specific acreage (260 acres) of town land for transporting twenty-six able men in 1633. Each is named, including "Matthias Sousa," but the sources are not included. This additional listing omits the Jesuit priests and lay brother mentioned on the previous page and makes no reference to de Sousa's race. Pulton also demanded additional acreage "for transporting the foresaid five and twenty men in the year 1633." Unlike Liber 1, Liber AB&H does not repeat names of the persons transported, but it includes the description of surveys done for Pulton.<sup>11</sup>

Although Pulton filed the claim under the name Ferdinand Pulton, he intended to obtain rights to land on behalf of his religious order. Jesuit priests took a vow of poverty, and the claim of rights to land as assignee of his predecessors Andrew White and Thomas Copley indicate that he was acting on behalf of the order. Ownership by the Jesuit order directly would have posed significant difficulties, not only because the Anglican church was the established church in England but because perpetual existence of a landowner undercut the feudal relationship that Lord Baltimore was attempting to establish in Maryland. The records do not show any patent issued to Pulton, and records in the Jesuit archives show Baltimore in November 1641, following the English statutes of mortmain, attached a prohibition on a spiritual society making claims under the Conditions.<sup>12</sup>

After Ferdinand Pulton died in an accidental shooting in June or July of 1641,<sup>13</sup> Thomas Copley became Father Superior again. Copley entered another claim for the town land that had been laid out for Pulton "for transporting 26 able men into

the Province in the year 1633,” referencing Pulton’s demand without repeating the names of the persons transported. He only asked for a portion of the land beyond the town that Pulton had claimed to set up a manor. Copley simultaneously transferred his rights to Cuthbert Fenwick, a trusted Catholic layman, so that Fenwick could hold the title to the land in his name in trust for the Jesuits.<sup>14</sup>

Copley again filed a demand in 1650 after his return from England, presumably attempting to reestablish the Jesuit position that had been disrupted by Protestant control of Maryland during the English Civil War. This claim refers to the importation of “Mathias Zause” in 1633 along with Andrew White.<sup>15</sup> Copley’s claim does not mention de Sousa’s race, but beneath “Zause” is an entry for “ffra Molcto” i.e. “Francisco, mulatto.”<sup>16</sup> Copley had previously listed “Francisco” as being brought to Maryland in 1637.<sup>17</sup> Pulton had listed “Francisco, a malato” as brought to Maryland in 1635,<sup>18</sup> and Copley’s 1641 claim referenced Pulton’s claims as the basis for Jesuit rights, so 1635 is probably the correct date for Francisco’s arrival.

Copley’s 1650 claim was the last document to mention de Sousa by name, but Thomas Green gave an affidavit a few weeks later that asserted “certain men’s names lately delivered into the Secretary’s Office by Thomas Copley Esq. were the true and proper Servants of Andrew White.”<sup>19</sup> The headright and affidavit indicate that Mathias de Sousa came to Maryland as one of the servants to the Jesuit mission, but the meaning of “servant” is unclear. Copley’s 1650 list included priests and lay brothers of the order as well as individuals like Henry Bishop and Richard Lusted who worked on the Jesuit’s land.

### Inferences from the Headrights

All the documents concerning de Sousa’s arrival in the Province of Maryland agree that he came in 1633. This demonstrates that he was an original colonist, because only the *Ark* and the *Dove* were within the colony’s waters pursuant to Baltimore’s charter in 1633. Lord Baltimore’s settlers marked the commencement of colonization by coming ashore, erecting a cross, and celebrating mass on March 25, 1634.<sup>20</sup>

Ferdinand Pulton’s 1639 “demand” stated that de Sousa was a mulatto. That is the basis for inferring that de Sousa was at least partially of African descent. The inference rests on the assumption that Pulton made no mistake in his identification and intended the term “mulatto” to refer to ancestry rather than complexion.

Pulton had been in Maryland as the Father Superior for almost a year before filing his demand, so he is not likely to have misidentified de Sousa. It is not surprising that other documents did not mention de Sousa’s race. Headright claims normally mentioned personal characteristics only to prevent mistakes in identification. For example, Pulton’s demand identified John Price as Black John Price

and his son as White John Price to make it clear there were two different individuals for whom rights could be claimed.<sup>21</sup> Similarly, General Assembly records show John Hollis “Carpenter” and John Hollis “Planter” if both attended the same session, but most references to Hollis in other records make no mention of profession.<sup>22</sup> The designation of de Sousa as mulatto appears only on a document that also designates Francisco as a mulatto. Francisco’s race distinguished him from others who had a first name that could be abbreviated as *ffra* (such as Francis). In that event, Pulton may have designated de Sousa by both name and race to show there were two mulattos among the persons being listed and no confusion among them, i.e., that indeed Francisco was a separate person from Mathias.

The designation of Sousa as a mulatto demonstrates that his ethnic origin was considered significant. The word *mulatto* comes from the Spanish and Portuguese “*mulato*” meaning mule, hence a half-breed. It has been suggested that “*mulatto*” referred to complexion rather than parentage in the seventeenth century.<sup>23</sup> That is questionable.<sup>24</sup> The term is linked to status in Maryland toward the latter part of the seventeenth century, when it appears more frequently in colonial records. The first statutory mention of mulattos categorized “Negros, Indians & Molattos” together in 1678, and that same year Lord Baltimore referred to slaveowners who refused “to permitt their Negroes and Mulattos to be Baptised.”<sup>25</sup> Finally, the references to Francisco in the headrights as a mulatto support the conclusion that the word referred to persons who at least appeared to be of African descent. The absence of a last name in the records would be more common for one of African than of any other background. If “*mulatto*” meant a person of some African blood in the case of Francisco, it probably was used the same way in the same document for de Sousa. Thus, Matthias de Sousa, one of the original colonists of Maryland, was a man of African descent, at least in part.

As a mulatto, de Sousa also had some non-African ancestors. He was probably at least one generation removed from Africa, exposed from birth to some form of European culture.<sup>26</sup> Portugal dominated trade with Africa (including the slave trade) in the sixteenth century, but Portugal was united with Spain in 1580 for a period of about sixty years, making it likely that a mulatto born at the opening of the seventeenth century had some Spanish or Portuguese ancestor. De Sousa’s last name supports the suggestion that one of his ancestors was Portuguese, but the name is also found in Spain and among Spanish or Portuguese Jews.

In some cases, names are adopted or given in appreciation of heroes, leaders, or friends. For example, Mvemba a Nzinga, the sixteenth-century king of Kongo, was baptized as Afonso I. Afonso’s cousin, Pedro de Sousa, served as his ambassador to Portugal. Thus, Mathias could have taken or been given the name de Sousa at baptism. Even if his name came from his African ancestry, the close relationship between Kongo and Portugal would still point toward Portugal as the native land of his non-African ancestors.<sup>27</sup>

There is a possibility that de Sousa's ancestors were ethnically Jewish. De Sousa was a common name for Spanish-Portuguese people, both Jews and non Jews. Susan Falb noted that Jesuit historians invariably identified de Sousa as "the Jew" in conversations with her. But the historians, eager to show Catholic tolerance in the early days of the colony, may have confused de Sousa with Jacob Lombrozo, a Jew who came to Maryland several decades later. Jacob Marcus stated that de Sousa was recruited on Barbados as an indentured servant and noted that there were Jewish de Sousas on Barbados in the second half of the seventeenth century. There are, however, no records to show that de Sousa came from Barbados. Marcus may have relied on J. Thomas Scharf's *History of Maryland*, which stated that Richard Thompson brought "Mathias Touse, a 'mulatto' whom he no doubt brought from the island of Barbadoes."<sup>28</sup> But Andrew White, not Thompson, brought de Sousa. Indeed, White brought Thompson, which is why Thompson's name appears just before de Sousa's in one of the lists. Scharf was not only wrong about the circumstances of de Sousa's coming, but his assumption was probably based on the fact that most blacks brought to Virginia prior to 1680 were imported from Barbados.<sup>29</sup> These arguments for de Sousa's Jewish ancestry hinge on projecting events from the latter half of the century back into the first half. There are no records of de Sousas in Barbados during the first half of the seventeenth century and no records of anyone joining the first colonists' vessels from that island or any other.<sup>30</sup>

Father White wrote that Barbados authorities discovered a conspiracy by servants to kill their masters and free themselves just before the Maryland colonists arrived. Whether that was an environment to silently acquire a servant is debatable. When White wrote that English Catholics contributed servants to the mission who were important to its success, he appeared to imply that the servants came from England. The failure to mention de Sousa in the English records of those sailing on the *Ark* is not significant; Father White and others joined the ship at the Isle of Wight after its initial sailing to avoid taking an oath and were not listed in those records. White, a scholar who taught at schools throughout the continent, might have met de Sousa when he was in Lisbon. Wherever they met, de Sousa could easily have accompanied White back to England during the years White served as secretary to Lord Baltimore. Thus de Sousa could have boarded in England along with the Jesuit priests who paid for his transportation.<sup>31</sup>

Pulton's claim that Father White brought Sousa to Maryland suggests that de Sousa was Catholic. Catholic adventurers seeking to enlarge their estates seemed indifferent to their servants' religion, but the Jesuits had a religious mission. The English Province of the Society of Jesus wrote annual letters reporting on the Jesuits in Maryland. Although none of the annual letters mention de Sousa by name, they do refer to the work of servants. The 1634 letter stated "many Catholics showed great liberality, and contributed money as well as servants, these latter

being of the first necessity here.” One servant was redeemed from another vessel where he was being sold into the colonies because he professed the Catholic faith. The 1638 letter refers to conversions to Catholicism of a number of Protestants and includes among them four “servants” purchased in Virginia. These letters indicate that anyone brought in by a priest was likely either to be a Catholic or to be constantly pressured to become one.<sup>32</sup>

Several other factors indicate that de Sousa was Catholic. If earlier reasoning is correct, de Sousa’s non-African ancestors were likely Portuguese rather than English, and Portugal was a Catholic country. Further, the Jesuits would eventually give de Sousa a good deal of responsibility as their agent dealing with Indians. Since the priests were concerned with their role as missionaries to the Indians, they were unlikely to confide such trust in a Protestant.

In summary, the headright claims indicate that Matthias de Sousa was an original colonist whose costs of transportation were paid by the Jesuit order, that he was a Catholic who initially worked for the Jesuit missionaries, and that he had both African and Portuguese ancestors.

### **Records of the Estate of Justinian Snow**

By 1639, the year in which Pulton filed the headright claiming de Sousa had been brought to Maryland by Father White, de Sousa was able to enter into transactions independent of the Jesuits. The inventory of the estate of Justinian Snow, a wealthy St. Mary’s planter, filed May 24, 1639, showed a debt owing from “Mathias de Sousa” of “012 in roll.” At the time of the entry, the records showed payment of the debt of “mathias Sousa” had not been received.<sup>33</sup>

The value of Snow’s estate and the debts owed him were measured in pounds of tobacco. De Sousa’s debt was the smallest (12 pounds of tobacco), and the only one to specify the amount “in roll.” The debt to Snow suggests that de Sousa was a free man by 1639, for an indentured servant would be in a poor position to contract outside of the indenture.<sup>34</sup> Even if de Sousa had been indentured to the Jesuits, the indenture would have been satisfied by 1639. Although de Sousa’s debt indicates that he was able to contract and to earn money, it does not indicate whether he had ever been indentured or what kind of work he did.<sup>35</sup>

Garry Wheeler Stone has pointed out that de Sousa appears in the probate of Snow’s estate with a cluster of other names linked to the Indian trade—John Hallowes (Hollis), Thomas Boys, and Roger Oliver.<sup>36</sup> Perhaps the debts were incurred for supplies in that trade. But other names on the list, like the carpenter John Cook, were not linked to the Indian trade, so no definitive conclusion can be reached about the reason for de Sousa’s debt.

### Deposition

Matthias de Sousa's only recorded words show his involvement in trade with the Indians. He gave a deposition, dated November 3, 1642, before the Provincial Secretary, John Lewger, in connection with litigation over sums due to John Prettiman.<sup>37</sup>

Mathias de Sousa made oath that about March [1641] was twelvemonth he was appointed by mr Pulton to goe in his pinace as skipper & trader to the Sesquihanoughs & by him appointed to hire men at Kent for the voyage, & that he would write to mr Brent to assist him in it & that at his coming to Kent wth the knowledge & consent of mr Brent he hired John Prettiman to goe vpon the voyage, & that he hired him for 200 + tob. p month, and that accordingly John Prettiman was out upon the voyage 2 months (within 3 daies) & that by his meanes & presence he verily beleeveth the pinace & men were saved at that time from destruction by the sesquihanowes.

*About March was twelvemonth he was appointed by Mr. Pulton.* DeSousa's deposition supported the suit of John Prettiman against Thomas Copley for wages. "Mr. Pulton" was Copley's predecessor, Ferdinand Pulton,<sup>38</sup> who died in the summer of 1641. The reference to "March was twelvemonth" means that Pulton appointed de Sousa around March 24 or 25, when the old year ended and the new one began. DeSousa was still working as an employee of the Jesuits in 1641.

*To go in his pinace as skipper & trader to the Sesquihanoughs.* The Susquehannock Indians were the prize partners in the Chesapeake fur trade, because they had the best access to furs. The Jesuit fathers were anxious to reach the various Indian tribes with the gospel, but had to get clearance from the highest authorities in the order to trade with them.<sup>39</sup> The Jesuit order prohibited its members from seeking profit. It justified trade as necessary when the community raised insufficient food to survive without barter, but the Susquehannocks were primarily a source for furs rather than food. Nevertheless, apparently it was acceptable to participate in the trade in order to have goods that ultimately could be traded for necessary items.

Lord Baltimore insisted that he license all traders. Father White and Father Copley protested that licensing was a bad idea in letters to Baltimore in 1638 and 1639, arguing that it would irritate the colonists. Father White even offered the Jesuits' boat for Lord Baltimore's use in the fur trade in order to dissuade him from creating a monopoly, but the ploy apparently failed.

The pinnace of Mr. Pulton that Sousa piloted in 1641 was probably the same boat the Jesuit fathers used in 1642. "We are carried in a pinnace or galley, to wit: the Father, the interpreter, and a servant — for we use an interpreter. . . . Two of

them propel the boat with oars, when the wind is adverse or fails; the third steers with the helm.<sup>40</sup> De Sousa was appointed skipper and placed in charge of the vessel for trading with the Indians. He had at least two crew members including John Prettiman, and he probably had more than two because he reported that Prettiman saved the “men.” De Sousa’s appointment as the person in charge indicates a person of responsibility who was familiar with sailing vessels, but he could have acquired sufficient sailing experience to be skipper of a small pinnace in the bay after his arrival in Maryland. It is possible that de Sousa’s work on ships and with the Indians kept him from becoming a planter and helped keep him largely out of the political process, but this is speculation. We do not know what work he did other than this single trading voyage.

*And by him appointed to hire men at Kent for the voyage, & that he would write to mr brent to assist him in it.* Pulton appointed de Sousa to hire men for the voyage at Kent Island. Kent Island is in the Chesapeake Bay some distance north of St. Marys and closer to the Susquehannock settlements. William Claiborne had originally settled the island as a base for fur trading operations and claimed to hold Kent Island independently of Lord Baltimore, who had obtained his charter after Claiborne had commenced operations on the island. After battles in 1635 with proprietary forces, Claiborne left the area for Virginia and then England to defend his interests. During his absence, Lord Baltimore secured control of the island. While Claiborne was away, the Susquehannocks traded with Peter Minuit in New Sweden rather than with Claiborne’s enemy.<sup>41</sup> Nevertheless, Kent Island still served as the jumping-off point for trading expeditions with Indians.

Because the island was some distance from Saint Mary’s and vulnerable to Claiborne and to unfriendly Indians, its governance was fairly autonomous. In March 1641, Governor Leonard Calvert appointed William Braithwaite “Commander” of the island, a position with both military and political power.<sup>42</sup> Giles Brent remained the most eminent person as owner of the thousand-acre Kent Fort Manor.<sup>43</sup> He had served as “Commander of the Isle of Kent” for several months in 1640 and would do so again in 1642. He also served in that capacity pro tempore in particular matters in 1641. Brent served as a member of the provincial council, and, when Leonard Calvert returned to England in 1643–44, Brent served as governor pro tem.<sup>44</sup> When Pulton wrote to Giles Brent, requesting that he aid de Sousa in hiring men for the voyage, he was asking for assistance from the man in that area most closely linked to the governor of the province.

*... at his coming to Kent wth the knowledge & consent of mr brent he hired John Prettiman to goe vpon the voyage, . . .* De Sousa sought Brent’s assistance and his consent. Giles Brent may have been given authority to license traders. In any event, it would have been the better part of valor to obtain his consent for any expedition.

*... & that he hired him for 200<sup>+</sup> tob. p month, and that accordingly John Prettiman*

*was out upon the voyage 2 months (within 3 daies) . . .* The price of the hiring and the time of service demonstrate that this deposition was given to support John Prettiman's claim for services against Pulton. When Pulton died, Thomas Copley succeeded to his obligations on behalf of the order as well as to its assets. Thus Prettiman demanded of "Tho: Copley Esq" three hundred weight of tobacco "for wages" and for tobacco paid for the said Mr. Copley.<sup>45</sup>

John Prettiman was usually the defendant rather than the plaintiff in debt litigation.<sup>46</sup> In May 1642 he had agreed to make over all his crop of corn and tobacco to John Hollis, a man who was involved in trading with the Indians. The deed for the crop was entered in court records in October 1642.<sup>47</sup> On December 5, 1642, by his attorney John Wortley, William Broughe stated that he had an execution against Prettiman, but Prettiman had no land or goods and therefore Broughe sought "that his person and future employment may be bound to the use of the execution according to law." The Court found that Prettiman's labor should be so bound.<sup>48</sup> Thus Prettiman got into debt to Hollis and Brough and ended up indentured to Brough because all his assets had been used to pay Hollis. Prettiman may well have been suing Copley to recover enough money to pay his own debts.

*And that by his means and presence he verily believeth the pinace and men were saved from destruction by the Susquehannas.*<sup>49</sup> The timing of Prettiman's hiring suggests he and de Sousa were on a trading mission in the late spring or early summer of 1641 when they were threatened by the Susquehannocks, who had a well-deserved reputation for fierceness. Indeed, the colonists were able to purchase land from the Yaocomico indians in 1634 because the Yaocomico were leaving to escape Susquehannock raids. The colonists sided with the neighboring Nanticoke and Piscataway tribes in resisting Susquehannock incursions.<sup>50</sup>

Before Lord Baltimore's settlers arrived, William Claiborne established a trading post on Palmer's Island to be near the Susquehannocks. But even Claiborne found that cultural differences and language problems made misunderstanding inevitable and trading dangerous. Claiborne reported:

Our trade with the Indians is allwayes with danger of our lives; And that we usually trade in a shallop or small pinnace, being 6 or 7 English men encompassed with two or 300 Indians. And that is as much as we can doe to defend our selves by standing on our guard with our armes ready and our gunns presented in our handes. Two or 3 of the men must looke to the trucke that the Indians doe not steale it, and a great deale of trucke is often stole by the Indians though we look never soe well to it.<sup>51</sup>

Whatever transpired on de Sousa's trip may have contributed to opposition to the Indians later in the year. On July 10, 1641, the governor issued a proclama-

tion to the inhabitants of Kent authorizing them to “shoot, wound, or kill any Indian whatsoever coming upon the said island.” Further, the governor proposed bills for an expedition against the Indians in October 1641 and March 1642. The Assembly did empower an expedition against the Susquehannocks in its September 1642 session, and John Prettiman was one of the soldiers who participated.<sup>52</sup>

### The General Assembly Records

The General Assembly proceedings for the afternoon of March 23, 1641[2] list “Assembled . . . Matt das Sousa.”<sup>53</sup> This is the only mention of de Sousa in connection with the legislative process. He was not listed as attending earlier in the session, nor do we have any record of his voting or giving a proxy at any other time.

Lord Baltimore had power to enact laws for the province “of and with the advise assent and approbation of the Free-men of the said Province.” By 1639, the burden of attending the assembly and the difficulty of conducting business with such numbers led the body to adopt an act creating a representative form. The governor issued writs ordering that elections be held for the October 1640 and August 1641 assemblies.<sup>54</sup> He initially issued similar election writs for the March 1641[2] assembly, but the 1639 election law, like other laws passed by the General Assembly, expired after three years. The governor, therefore, issued a call to all freemen to attend the assembly either in person or by proxy.<sup>55</sup> Any free man could vote as a member of the General Assembly that session.

It seems likely that geography explains de Sousa’s absence from other meetings of the March 1641[2] session. Assembly attendance was generally a chore, but for one session the Assembly might have come to de Sousa. Although earlier meetings were held in St. Mary’s, the General Assembly moved nearby to John Lewger’s estate to conduct business during the March 23 afternoon session. It is possible that de Sousa was working for Lewger at the time.<sup>56</sup>

De Sousa’s absence from the earlier meetings raises the possibility that he was merely a spectator or a witness in one of the cases decided by the provincial court, but the records contain no reference that might suggest persons listed as assembled were not freemen. Laws passed in the afternoon session were stated to be “passed by all.” Consequently, de Sousa’s recorded presence in the list of persons assembled on the afternoon of March 23 indicates his status as a free man voting on the laws passed at that time.

### Hollis-Lewger Litigation Over De Sousa’s Debts

The Susquehannock expedition may have proved costly for Mathias. When he gave his deposition on behalf of Prettiman in November, de Sousa was facing two suits for his labor. In August 1642, the Assembly had passed a law providing that a debtor whose goods were insufficient to pay a debt could be brought before a

judge and ordered to satisfy the debt through labor.<sup>57</sup> John Hollis, who had filed his rights to Prettiman's crops in October, obtained a writ of execution against the person of de Sousa to satisfy a debt of five hundred pounds of tobacco. The writ ordered the sheriff of St. Mary's to "Seise the person of mathias de Sousa to satisfie vnto John hollis 500<sup>+</sup> tob wth cask wch he hath recovered of him by iudgemt of Court: and what you shall doe herin certifie without delay after such yor seisure."<sup>58</sup>

Hollis was not only a trader but a planter who sought servants for work on his plantation. On December 11, Hollis entered into an indenture with John Hilliard (another person apparently brought over in 1633 by Father White) for him to work one year for Hollis in exchange for eleven hundred pounds of tobacco.<sup>59</sup> At that rate, Hollis was seeking only six months of labor from de Sousa.

The writ against de Sousa was entered in the books on December 1, 1642, but it must have been issued before that date because there is an entry by Lewger on November 3 seeking to stay Hollis' writs:

John Lewger alledgeth that the person of Mathias de sousa is bound to him the said John Lewger by an indenture of service for foure months & upward yet to come made bona fide and vpon good consideration, all wch he is ready & vndertaketh vpon him to averre whensoever he shalbe therevnto required, vpon his perill of being answerable to any person as shalbe damnified by this his allegation, in such manner as the Court shall adiudge vpon his default of prooffe, & therefore prayeth that a writt of supsedeas be granted to him vpon the exequution awarded agst the pson of the said Mathias at the suit of John Hollis.<sup>60</sup>

De Sousa was working for the Jesuits in the spring of 1641, but he was at Lewger's property when the General Assembly met there in the spring of 1642. By fall 1642 Lewger claimed de Sousa was bound to him by an indenture. Lewger filed this request on the same date as he filed de Sousa's deposition in the Prettiman litigation. As secretary of the province, Lewger was in charge of keeping the legal records and could enter in them matters involving his own litigation when it was convenient. He had no need to record the indenture until Hollis sought de Sousa's service. That triggered the request for the stay, and the governor promptly issued a warrant staying the execution until further notice.

whereas mr John Lewger alledgeth that the person of Mathias de sousa against whom you have an exequution in yor hands as yet vnserued is bound to him the said John Lewger by Indenture of service, & hath vndertaken to prove his said allegation at his perill These are therefore to will & require you to forbear to serve the said

exequution vntill further order in that behalfe. And this shalbe yor warrant.

To the Sheriff of St maries Signed Leonard Calvert<sup>61</sup>

On December 5, the Provincial Court found in Lewger's favor.

The allegation of mr Lewger touching the pson of Mathias de Sousa agst the exequution of John Hollis was found for mr Lewger & adjudged by the Court that the covenant of the said Mathias for disposing of his pson to the satisfaction of Mrs [sic] Lewgers iust debts was valid, & that exequution was to issue vpon his pson on behalfe of the said John hollis in the same order & to the same effect as other exequutions vpon goods.<sup>62</sup>

In other words, de Sousa must first serve his term for Lewger before serving Hollis. Both de Sousa and John Prettiman ended their voyage together with orders against their person for debts that bound them to labor. There are no further records of de Sousa.

With the exception of the designation of de Sousa as mulatto in the headright of Father White, no other recorded document of the period makes reference to his race. A free man who made contracts, led a trading expedition, gave a deposition for court proceedings, and voted, but whose debts led him into indentured servitude (possibly he and Prettiman borrowed from Lewger and Hollis to do some trading on their own), de Sousa was an equal member of society.

#### NOTES

My thanks to Edward C. Papenfuse and Lois Green Carr who commented on the manuscript and rectified several errors. They bear no responsibility for those remaining. I also thank research assistants Brian Kobil and Scott McCabe.

1. "Claiborne v. Clobery et al. in the High Court of Admiralty," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 28 (1933): 39. See also Erich Isaac, "Kent Island: Part I: The Period of Settlement," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 52 (1957): 93.

Further, the workers at Kent Island may not have been the first persons of African descent in Maryland. A couple of months after the colonists landed, Cyprian Thorowgood took a trip to the head of the bay and mentioned meeting "a Negroe, which lived among them for to learne the language." There is no indication how long this unnamed individual had been there. See "A Relation of a Voyage Made by Mr. Cyprian Thorowgood to the Head of the Baye, April 25 to May 15, 1634," in G. E. Gifford Jr., ed., *Cecil County Maryland 1608-1850 as Seen by Some Visitors and Several Essays on Local History* (Rising Sun, Md.: George E. Gifford Memorial Committee, Calvert School, 1974), 13. This was probably not de Sousa, because de Sousa had just arrived, the Jesuits who brought him needed hands to build and plant, de Sousa would have been familiar by name to Thorowgood, and no document referred to him as a "negro."

2. St. Mary's City Commission, Career Files of Seventeenth Century St. Mary's County Residents, Manuscript 27 boxes (men), Maryland State Archives, Annapolis. Box 8 contains all mentions of de Sousa.
3. Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1998).
4. For example, Richard Ingle is said to have destroyed a number of the colony's records in his raids in 1645. John Leeds Bozman, *The History of Maryland, volume II* (Baltimore: James Lucas & E. K. Deaver, 1837), 290.
5. William Hand Browne, et al., eds., *Archives of Maryland* (72 vols. to date; Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1883–), 1:xv. See Carson Gibb, *A Supplement to the Early Settlers of Maryland* (Annapolis, Md.: Maryland State Archives, 1997). Liber AB&H extracted land records from among the court proceedings and other business in Libers A, F and H to make a single convenient volume for land records shortly after the proprietor regained his rights and the Land Office Judgeship was created. The General Assembly created a commission in 1722 that reported on the needs to preserve the records of the province, including rebinding and copying old records. Thus, in 1724, Liber 1 copied virtually the whole of Liber F along with much of Liber B. Maryland State Archives.
6. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber F, Folio 21 (transcribed in Liber 1, Folio 19), Maryland State Archives.
7. Father Andrew White, *A Declaration of Lord Baltimore's Plantation in Maryland, nigh upon Virginia: Manifesting the Nature, Quality, Condition and Rich Vtilities it Contayneth* (London, 1633), 2. Conditions of Plantation, *Archives of Maryland*, 3:47–48.
8. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 1, Folio 19–20, Maryland State Archives. The list also included John Hollis, though the Jesuits never claimed anyone by that name as a basis for a headright. Several persons in the colony were named John Hollis. Copley may have referred to the John Hallowes (Hollis) whom Thomas Cornwallis claimed to have brought to Maryland in 1635 and for whom Cornwallis claimed a headright. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber ABH, Folio 60, Maryland State Archives. Copley also stated that Mary Jennings and John Hilliard arrived in 1633. In 1650 he claimed that Andrew White brought them to Maryland in 1633, as well as James killed at Mattapanient and ffra, a mulatto. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 1, Folio 160; Copley's first list claimed Francisco arrived in 1637. The only James on the first list was James Thornton listed as coming in 1633. Pulton did not mention Jennings or Hilliard, and he listed Francisco and James Thornton as coming in 1635. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 1, Folio 37–38, Maryland State Archives.
9. Elisabeth Hartsook and Gust Skordas, *Land Office and Prerogative Court Records of Colonial Maryland* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1968), 23–25.
10. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 1, Folios 18, 37, 38. See Liber 1, Folio 19, 166; Liber ABH, Folio 65–66, Maryland State Archives; *Archives of Maryland*, 3:258.
11. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 1, Folio 37, 38, Maryland State Archives; Gibb, *A Supplement to the Early Settlers of Maryland*; Liber ABH, Folio 65, 66, Maryland State Archives.
12. New Conditions of Plantation. Provisions No. 5 and No. 6, against the tenure of land in mortmain. Thomas Hughes, *History of The Society of Jesus in North America: Documents Volume 1 Part 1 nos. 1–140 (1605–1838)* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1908), 162.
13. Edwin Warfield Beitzell states that Pulton, also known as Father John Brock, died in April 1641. Beitzell, *The Jesuit Missions of St. Mary's County, Maryland* (Abell, Md.: St. Mary's County Bicentennial Commission, 1960), 6. Pulton, however, wrote a letter dated May 3, 1641. Thomas Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America: Documents Volume 1*

*Part 1 nos. 1–140 (1605–1838)*, 119–21. B. U. Campbell states that he died on June 5, 1641. See Campbell, “Early Christian Missions Among the Indians of Maryland,” *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 1 (1906): 293. Pulton probably died before July 27, 1641, when Copley demanded land based on Pulton’s prior demand. A marginal note to an early transcript of a title to St. Inigoe’s history states “Perez Fedinando was shot in a boat, as Mrs. Doayne relates by tradition, from her father Matthews. Taken from the margin. Soon after Ferdinando Pulton dyes (or was shott by accident, as says Mrs. Doayne), and Mr. Copley, in whom the equitable right was, the said Poulton being only his Trustee, petitions for and obtains a second warrant.” Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal: Documents Volume 1*, 201–2. The Annual Letter 1642 stated that only three priests were in the mission for the year 1642, and Pulton (Brock) was not one of them. Robert Emmett Curran, ed., *American Jesuit Spirituality: The Maryland Tradition, 1634–1900* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 68.

14. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 1, Folio 115–16 (previously Liber F, Folio 134), Maryland State Archives.

15. Liber B (also missing now) as transcribed in Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 1, Folio 166, Maryland State Archives.

16. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber ABH, Folio 166, Maryland State Archives; *Archives of Maryland*, 3:258.

17. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 1, Folio 20, Maryland State Archives. Andrews suggested that Francisco was one of the four servants from Virginia mentioned in the 1638 annual letter of the Jesuits. Matthew Page Andrews, *History of Maryland: Province and State* (1965), 3. But Copley’s initial list cannot be trusted for dates since it labeled all others who came in 1634 or 1635 as having come in 1633.

18. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 1, Folio 37 and Liber ABH, Folio 66, Maryland State Archives. No further mention of Francisco has been found beyond these headright references.

19. *Archives of Maryland*, 3:258–59.

20. Until 1753 the new year began on March 25. The New Style or Gregorian calendar was promulgated by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582, but England and its possessions followed the Old Style calendar for another 170 years. In addition to beginning the year on March 25, the Old Style calendar was ten days behind the New Style, so Old Style March 25 was April 4 in the New Style calendar. The difference widened to eleven days in 1700. The English Calendar (New Style) Act of 1750 took effect in 1752 with the day following September 2 becoming September 14. The year 1753 began the following January 1. Barbara A. Chernow and George A. Vallasi, eds., *The Columbia Encyclopedia, Fifth Edition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 421–22. All references to dates in the rest of this article will use a bracket to indicate the year according to modern usage when that differs from the Old Style year, e.g. January 1, 1633[4] or March 24, 1633[4].

21. Price was noted as black to distinguish him from “White” John Price. Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber ABH, Folio 66, Maryland State Archives. Pulton’s claim specified at one point that John Price Senior was known as Black John Price and John Price Junior was known as White John Price. *Ibid.*, Liber 1, Folio 38. Thus “Black” John Price was probably Caucasian. Harry Wright Newman, *The Flowering of the Maryland Palatinate; An Intimate and Objective History of the Province of Maryland to the Overthrow of Proprietary Rule in 1654, with Accounts of Lord Baltimore’s Settlement at Avalon* (Washington, D.C.: Published by Author, 1961), 246–47.

22. *Archives of Maryland*, 1:117, 172.

23. Susan Rosenfeld Falb, “Matthias da Sousa: Colonial Maryland’s Black, Jewish Assemblyman,” *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 73 (1978): 397.

24. H. L. Mencken traced the word mulatto in English use to the sixteenth century where it was apparently a reference to the immediate offspring of a black and a white person. H. L. Mencken, *The American Language: An Enquiry into the Development of English in the United States: Supplement 1* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945), 630. In Portugal, "Mulato, meaning 'mule,' came into widespread use only in the sixteenth century and described persons of mixed descent." A. C. De C. M. Saunders, *A Social History of Black Slaves and Freedmen in Portugal 1441–1555* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982), xiii.
25. "An Act for keeping of Register of Birthes Marriages and Burialls in each Respective County," *Archives of Maryland* 7:76; Proceedings of the Council 1667–1687/8, *Archives of Maryland*, VOLUME 5: 267.
26. In Africa, some white middlemen or "factors" stayed on the coast and arranged for sales of slaves with native merchants. The children of the factors might be sold in the trade, but statistically the chances of finding a mulatto would be far greater in Europe or the West Indies. See Daniel P. Mannix and Malcolm Crowley, *Black Cargoes: A History of the Atlantic Slave Trade, 1518–1865* (New York: Viking Press, 1962), 32–33.
27. John Kelly Thornton, "Early Kongo-Portuguese Relations: A New Interpretation," *History in Africa* 8 (1981): 183; and Thornton, "The Development of an African Catholic Church in the Kingdom of Kongo, 1491–1750," *Journal of African History*, 25 (1984): 148n7. Edward F. Terrar noted that a number of Sousas were prominent in the Congo and concluded that de Sousa was a Portuguese-Congo mulatto. The coincidence of names is suggestive even if it is not conclusive. Terrar, *Social, Economic, and Religious Beliefs Among Maryland Catholic People During the Period of the English War 1639–1660* (Bethesda, Md.: Catholic Scholars Press, 1996), 280. On the other hand, Terrar's assertion that de Sousa immigrated from Portugal is mistaken. *Ibid.*, 109, 280. He confused de Sousa with Mathias de Costa. Mathias De Costa from Portugal immigrated in 1664 (Maryland Provincial Patents, Liber 8, folio 129) and was naturalized in 1671 (*Archives of Maryland*, 2:330).
28. Falb, "Mathias de Sousa," 398n4; Jacob R. Marcus, *The Colonial American Jew, 1492–1776*, 3 vols. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1970), 1:335; J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Maryland: From the Earliest Period to the Present Day, Volume I* (Baltimore: J. B. Piet, 1879), 66.
29. Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, 39.
30. Falb, "Matthias da Sousa," 397.
31. See "A Relation of Maryland" in Clayton Colman Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland 1633–1684* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910). Commenting on an earlier draft of this paper, Lois Carr noted that John Thornton thought there was a high probability that White met de Sousa in Lisbon, when White was assigned there, and de Sousa went to England with White and thence to Maryland.
32. "Annual Letter of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, 1634" and "Annual Letter of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, 1638" in Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland*, 118, 120.
33. *Archives of Maryland*, 4:84, 85. The notation of the debt in tobacco reflects the use of tobacco as the medium of exchange.
34. One of Snow's debtors was Thomas White, who was listed as a servant of Robert Wintour in the inventory of Wintour's estate in 1638. *Archives of Maryland*, 4:85. White was listed at a quarter of the value of the next least valuable servant, which indicates either that White's term of service was virtually complete at the time of Wintour's death so that he could have contracted with Snow after his freedom or that White was infirm and not valuable. A document in 1638 referred to "Thomas white of St Maries Esq aged 60 years and upwards," but the unlikely coincidence that Thomas the servant was exactly the same age as Father Andrew

- White suggests that this was an instance in which Andrew was referred to as Thomas White.
35. Aubrey Land, *Colonial Maryland: A History* (repr. Millwood, N.Y.: KTO Press, 1981), 26–27.
  36. Garry Wheeler Stone, “Fur Traders and Field Hands: Blacks in Manorial Maryland 1634–1644,” Maryland State Archives web site, 3.
  37. *Archives of Maryland*, 4:138.
  38. The editors of the *Archives of Maryland* thought the “Mr Pulton” who hired de Sousa was Alexander Pulton. Alexander Pulton appeared as attorney for Mrs. Francis White in a lawsuit in November 1642 as noted in the records only a few pages after de Sousa’s deposition. This apparently led the *Archives* editors to index all references to a “Mr. Pulton” in court records from 1640–42, including the statement of de Sousa, as references to Alexander Pulton. In addition, Alexius Pulton served as “surgeon” in a three-week expedition against the Susquehannock indians that began on September 21, 1642. *Archives of Maryland*, 3:119, 122. Pulton’s activity as surgeon in 1642 suggests that he was the Mr. Pulton who was paid for “physick” in the accounts for the estate of Richard Lee in 1639. *Archives of Maryland*, 4:107.
  39. Helen C. Rountree and Thomas E. Davidson, *Eastern Shore Indians of Virginia and Maryland* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1997), 85, 86. See letter from The General Vitelleschi to Henry More, Provincial dated September 3, 1639, in Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal: Documents Volume 1*, 23.
  40. “We take with us a little chest of bread, butter, cheese, corn, cut and dried before it is ripe, beans and a little flour — another chest, also, for carrying bottles, one of which contains wine for religious purposes, six others holy water for the purpose of baptism; a box with the sacred vessels, and a slab as an altar for the sacred function; and another casket full of trifles, which we give the Indians to conciliate their affection — such as little bells, combs, knives, fish-hooks, needles, thread and other things of this kind.” “Annual Letter of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, 1642” in Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633–1684*, 136–37.
  41. Rountree and Davidson, *Eastern Shore Indians of Virginia and Maryland*.
  42. *Archives of Maryland*, 1:87 (warrant to Braithwait as commander of Kent October 12, 1640; Giles Brent as Treasurer summoned personally). *Archives of Maryland*, 1:103 (warrant to Commander of Kent dated July 16, 1641). *Archives of Maryland*, 1:104 (return of William Braithwait for Kent certifying election of Brent and Adams July 28, 1641). *Archives of Maryland*, 1:114 (Brent styled Councillor to the Province, January 12, 1641/2). *Archives of Maryland*, 1:127 (writ to Giles Brent to assemble freemen of Kent June 24, 1642).
  43. As the holder of the manor he had power to hold court and control inhabitants with respect to minor offenses. See Erich Isaac, “Kent Island: Part III: Kent Fort Manor,” *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 52 (1957): 226.
  44. Brent was summonsed as a councillor in January of 1638/9 (*Archives of Maryland*, 1:27). He took his oath as a councillor and was appointed treasurer for the colony on March 20 (*Archives of Maryland*, 3:85). He was commissioned as captain of the militia in May, apparently as part of a proposed expedition against the Susquehannocks (*Archives of Maryland*, 3:86–87). Brent was commissioned as Commander of Kent Island in February 1639/40 (*Archives of Maryland*, 3:88) and again in December 1642 (*Archives of Maryland*, 3:124) and a councillor and acting governor in April 1643 (*Archives of Maryland*, 3:130–31).
  45. *Archives of Maryland*, 4:139. This entry is on the same page of the court records as de Sousa’s deposition, but it is dated November 4, the following day.
  46. *Archives of Maryland*, 4:117–18 (suit by Cornwallis for 362 pounds tobacco and one and one-half pounds beaver); *Archives of Maryland*, 4:120 (suit by Calvert for 350 pounds); *Archives of Maryland*, 4:152, 158, 161 (suit by Fenwick for six hundred pounds for killing a steer calf).

47. At least two men had the same name, John Hollis carpenter and John Hollis planter. Prettiman's creditor was probably the planter, who lived in Saint Michaels, as did Prettiman. Hollis came with Cuthbert Fenwick in 1633. They were aboard a pinnace that fought with Claiborne's men in 1635, and in March 1639 they were both commissioned to search and seize all vessels trading illicitly with the Indians. Bozman, *History of Maryland*, 2:115, citing council proceedings from 1636 to 1657, 38. In March of 1643 John Hollis himself was warned for trading with the Indians without a license. See *Archives of Maryland*, 4:186. See also *Archives of Maryland*, 4:117 for acknowledgment of one thousand pounds tobacco debt to Hollis dated May 27, 1642.
48. *Archives of Maryland*, 4:162.
49. *Ibid.*, 4:138.
50. Father Andrew White, "A Briefe Relation of the Voyage Unto Maryland," in Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633–1684*, 42. "A Relation of a Voyage Made by Mr. Cyprian Thorowgood to the Head of the Baye, April 25 to May 15, 1634," 13.
51. "Claiborne v. Clobery et al. in the High Court of Admiralty," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 27 (1932): 344. See also J. Frederick Fausz, "Present at the 'Creation': The Chesapeake World that Greeted the Maryland Colonists," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 79 (1984): 17.
52. Bozman, *The History of Maryland*, 2:183 citing council proceedings from 1636 to 1657 at 52, 56. Bozman thought the Indians in question were the Ozines, and not the Susquehannocks. *Archives of Maryland*, 1:105, 107, 117–18. See Frances Jennings, "Indians and Frontiers in Seventeenth-Century Maryland," in Quinn, ed., *Early Maryland in a Wider World*, 216, 219, and Land, *Colonial Maryland: A History*, 44–45. In October John Lewger brought an information against Brent alleging that Brent had proposed the expedition against the Indians, got power to do it but did not follow through. (*Archives of Maryland*, 4:128–32, 135–36, 140–41, 151–52, 155–56, 159–61, 164.) Consequently Brent did not receive an appointment as a councilor in September 1642 (*Archives of Maryland*, 3:114). A jury found for Brent, and the court found for him on December 12 (*Archives of Maryland*, 3:156). Thus he was cleared to return to the council and was able to act as governor pro tem when Calvert left for England. See An Act for an Expedition against the Indians—September 1642, *Archives of Maryland*, 1:196. *Ibid.*, 3:119, 122.
53. *Archives of Maryland*, 1:119, 120.
54. *Ibid.*, 1:87–90, 103–5.
55. David W. Jordan, "Elections and Voting in Early Colonial Maryland," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 77 (1982): 238, 239.
56. See Stone at p. 8; *Archives of Maryland* 1:115–120.
57. *Archives of Maryland*, 1:152–53.
58. *Ibid.*, 4:155.
59. *Ibid.*, 4:173, 174.
60. *Ibid.*, 4:138.
61. *Ibid.*, 4:138.
62. *Ibid.*, 4:156. This is the last reference to de Sousa in the records. Whether he served his term, fled the province, or died is not known.