

1 1  
for Indian in the Park Bridge Hall.



*A Stockbridge Indian*

---

# The Nimhams of the Colonial Hudson Valley, 1667-1783

*Robert S. Grumet*

The Nimhams were once among the most influential Indian families in the colonial Hudson Valley. At least four of the men known by the name played important roles as culture brokers between their people and colonists in some of the most significant events of their day. Nimhams served as frontier diplomats, fought in colonial wars, and took part in notable land disputes. Rising to prominence after disease, deeds, and war had taken 90 percent of their people's lands and lives, they elected to remain in their ancestral homeland long after most other Indians left the region. Seeking support and protection for their people, Nimhams aligned themselves with powerful allies and influential interest groups. Ultimately betrayed by their associates, they nevertheless succeeded in buying the time needed to help their people survive the loss of their homeland and move elsewhere at a critical period in their history.

Colonial records written between 1667 and 1783 contain more than two hundred references to individuals identified by the name Nimham. Fewer than twenty of these are references to a man variously known as Nimham or Squahikkon (fl. 1667–1744) to Long Island, New Jersey, and Hudson Valley settlers. Several others chronicle a namesake who served as his successor from 1745 to 1762. A few documents record the career of Captain Abraham Nimham, the Stockbridge Indian patriot diplomat and military leader. Almost all of the rest record incidents in the life of his more notorious father, the Wappinger chief Daniel Nimham (b. 1724[?]-d. 1778).

---

Daniel Nimham was arguably the most prominent and certainly the most controversial Indian personality of his day in the Hudson Valley. Although his exact origins are unknown, extant records portray him as a leader of a small peripatetic group of from two hundred to three hundred displaced Mahican- and Munsee-speaking Indian people variously known as Wappingers, Opings, and Pomptons.<sup>1</sup> Like his people, Daniel Nimham was a wanderer in his own homeland. Descended from ancestors who had been forced to part with their best lands during the preceding century, he and most other Hudson Valley Indians had to travel from one place to another along the mountainous contested borderlands separating Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Trying to live and work quietly in the interstices separating contending provinces and powerful imperial rivals, they built their small bark houses and log cabins on vacant or sparsely settled lands in remote valleys far from colonial roads and towns.

Most of these people eked out a marginal existence as they moved from place to place along the Highlands between the Housatonic and Susquehanna river valleys. The majority made meager livings weaving baskets, crafting brooms and bowls, or peddling herbal remedies in the back settlements. More than a few of these people worked seasonally as laborers or servants on nearby farms. Paid in cash or in kind for their labor, they made ends meet by raising hogs, chickens, and cattle, planting apple, cherry, and peach trees, and scraping small subsistence gardens from the rocky ground surrounding their homesteads. Many married or had children by settlers of European and African descent. Ramblers who by their own account traveled lightly, they tried to live unobtrusively on an increasingly turbulent frontier. In the end, they failed. Swept up by events that transformed life everywhere in the region, Daniel Nimham and his people did what they could to eke out a living in what had become a violent, changing world.

Like his Biblical namesake, after whom he almost assuredly was named, Daniel Nimham was a man caught between two worlds. He grew up at a time when missionaries and farmers began moving to the Highlands in increasing numbers. A bright and articulate youth, he learned to speak English by listening to his new neighbors.<sup>2</sup> When he was cast later in life into a lion's den of war and intrigue, his multicultural skills ultimately took him to the halls of government in New York and London in pursuit of land and justice for his people. He became notorious among supporters and enemies alike as the energetic and assertive defender of his people's land rights who purveyed 999-year leases at rates beginning at two peppercorns per annum.<sup>3</sup> Betrayed and abandoned by Crown officials appointed to look after his interests, he subsequently took common cause with colonists struggling to free themselves from royal authority. Joining the rebel army in 1775, he met a soldier's death in a forgotten field in the north Bronx fighting on land already lost by his ancestors more than a century earlier.

---

---

Today, Daniel and the other Nimhams mentioned in colonial records are nearly forgotten.<sup>4</sup> Of Daniel himself, only fading memories and half-forgotten documents tell the story of a man whose other memorials include a pond and a mountain bearing his name in Putnam County, a battered roadside marker pointing to what is believed to have been his last home in New York below that mountain, and a small bronze plaque affixed to a stone near the place where he and his countrymen lie buried in unmarked graves.

A document chronicling an incident in a lengthy border dispute between Oyster Bay and Hempstead townspeople contains the earliest known written reference to an individual named Nimham. On March 22, 1667, a man placed his mark next to the name “Nimhan” alongside those belonging to two sons of Massapequa sachem Tackapousha (fl. 1643–1697). Nimham corroborated Tackapousha’s statement that Hempstead settlers unjustly claimed both Oyster Bay town lands and the Indians’ remaining lands in the township east of boundary lines originally established under the terms of earlier deeds.<sup>5</sup>

Careful examination of documents chronicling relations between Indian people and settlers on western Long Island shed light on some of this forgotten story. When Tackapousha formally relinquished all remaining Indian claims to land in the Queens County town of Flushing on April 14, 1684, a man placing his mark next to the name “Nunham” was one of three chiefs to endorse the document.<sup>6</sup> Nearly twenty years later, a person identified as “Wamhan” signed away three of four necks of land on the south shore of the island on March 25, 1703, as “Sachim” and principal signatory to satisfy debts owed to Stephanus van Cortlandt’s widow and son.<sup>7</sup>

By themselves, these and the thousands of other personal names of Indian people appearing in colonial documents are little more than tantalizingly ambiguous bits and pieces of information. Names rarely reveal age, sex, status, corporate identity, or personal affiliation. Few colonial scribes spelled any name the same way twice, and even identical orthographies cannot automatically be assumed to refer to single individuals. Regarding the collective mass of recorded Indian personal names as a largely intractable and incoherent welter of fragments blindly amassed by largely unskilled and often hostile European scribes generally unfamiliar with native languages or customs, most scholars focus their attention upon such macro-level phenomena as symbols and collectivities considered more amenable to ethnohistoric inquiry.

Names certainly present formidable challenges to investigators interested in unlocking their secrets. Scholars employing intensive micro-level analytic techniques can transform such seemingly meaningless information into systematized and testable bodies of data capable of revealing potentially meaningful non-random replicable patterns. The process begins when scholars gather together

---

every surviving state of every manuscript and published document containing dated locatable references to named individuals and groups. Comparing all states, investigators must select the most complete version written closest to the event. All events, in turn, must be accurately located in time and space. Placed on maps and organized chronologically, all dated events must then be compared with one another to detect patterns or reveal ambiguities.<sup>8</sup>

These methods have been used to collect and analyze the more than 6,000 personal names of Indians preserved in records written by settlers in the lower Hudson and upper Delaware river valleys between 1630 and 1783. Charting all names on maps and tracing documented aliases, it was found that similarly spelled names tended to cluster in specific areas during particular periods of time. Employing findings made by other scholars studying Delaware Indian naming customs, some 3,000 of these names have been provisionally associated with 207 individuals.<sup>9</sup> Macro-level reconstructions of regional chronologies and social practices such as locality, lineality, or settlement-subsistence patterns suggested potential mechanisms capable of explaining how and why names associated with particular individuals moved across the Hudson and Delaware valley landscape during historic contact period times.<sup>10</sup>

Although micro-level analyses can provide data needed to test these and other macro-level constructs, they cannot conclusively verify connections between people, places, and dated events. Removed from events by time, space, and other circumstances, even the most rigorous of methodologies cannot allow scholars to irrefutably show that individuals named in one document are the same people identified by the same names in the same place in another source. Acceptance of this fact does not mean that we have to throw up our hands in futility. It does mean, however, that all investigators must continue to adhere to scholarly canons of evidence acknowledging that all findings are provisional and subject to future revision and reinterpretation.

Reflecting this dictum, all associations between names and individuals made in this paper reflect best guesses based on intensive analysis of all states of available documentation. Located in time and place, each name examined in this study has been compared with similar orthographies or documented aliases. All are associated with every available indicator of sex, age, status, or sociopolitical identity. Names or aliases appearing in the same document or chronicled in events occurring in different places on or about the same time are excluded from consideration. Interestingly, no known document in the study area contains names of two individuals bearing identical or similar names.

These operations show that individuals identified by variants of the name Nimham first mentioned on Long Island in 1667 appear ten years later in records documenting events in central New Jersey. Unlike references to Nimhams on Long

---

Island, two of these references note that this person also was known as Squahikkon. The appearance in central New Jersey of a name first chronicled in Long Island corroborates macro-level documentation recording a contemporary general movement of Indian people forced by war and dispossession to relocate from western Long Island to nearby New York and New Jersey.<sup>11</sup>

These documents indicate that the man first identified on Long Island as Nimham in 1667 was the same person noted in New Jersey records as Numham, Nymhimau, Squahikkon, or Quahiccon. References identifying Nimham as a sachem in New Jersey further indicate that he rose in status during the ten years between his first and second references in European records. On June 10, 1677, Quahiccon and another man named Shenotope (fl. 1674–1689) conveyed title to a small parcel of land in Monmouth County to Middletown resident Jonathan Holmes as “Sachems of Changaroras.”<sup>12</sup> Signing another deed to land nearby Changaroras as Quahicke and Shenotapo, they and three other men identified as “cheife Sachems of Wickatong” sold a small tract at Wickatunk to John Bowne of Middletown on October 8, 1679.<sup>13</sup>

On June 5, 1703, a man identified as Numham alias Squahikkon signed a deed conveying lands along the South Branch of the Raritan River to West Jersey Proprietary authorities.<sup>14</sup> Both this deed and a subsequent November 11, 1703, instrument conveying land between the South Branch of the Raritan and the Delaware River directly north of the earlier purchase to Proprietary agents state that Nimham lived at Noshaning somewhere along the Neshanic River on the border between Somerset and Hunterdon Counties.<sup>15</sup> Another document recording Proprietary efforts to secure additional acreage along the Delaware on February 14, 1704, identifies Nimham as “ye Raritan Sachema.”<sup>16</sup> Although the outcome of this effort is not known, Nimham put his mark on his last deed to New Jersey lands as the principal signatory Squahikkon conveying rights to three hundred acres exempted from an earlier sale of land on the western side of the South Branch of the Raritan to West Jersey Proprietors on October 7, 1709.<sup>17</sup>

As the aforementioned Long Island deeds show, Nimham maintained his connections with the Massapequa and Matinecock communities during his New Jersey years. Subsequent documents show that he also either activated existing ties or established new ones among Wappinger Indian people living in Highland valleys between the Hudson and Housatonic rivers.<sup>18</sup>

On October 8, 1712, a man identified as Nimham put his mark as principal signatory to the first of three deeds to Indian lands in Wappinger country known to bear the name. Along with four other Indian people, Nimham signed away rights to a substantial tract of land along Matapan Creek in Dutchess County, New York, to George Clark and Leonard Lewis.<sup>19</sup> He next appeared in colonial documents as Naunhamiss, one of twenty-one Indians of “Housatonack alias

---

Westonook” selling land in western Massachusetts along the New York border to Lower Housatonic Proprietary agents for “Four Hundred and Sixty Pounds Three Barrels of Sider & thirty quarts of Rum” on April 25, 1724.<sup>20</sup>

On October 13, 1730, Nimham and another “Principal Sachemache and Proprietor” named Acgans accepted “certain goods and merchandize” and 150 pounds in provincial currency on behalf of eighteen other Indian signatories for the rights of all but “some North Indians” to land on the headwaters of the Fish Kill in Dutchess County first patented to the Nine Partners on May 11, 1697.<sup>21</sup> Acquired in contravention of provincial regulations requiring that patents be issued *after* purchases from Indians, lands alienated by this and the earlier 1712 instrument ultimately became bones of contention in a land controversy that would later propel Nimham’s namesake Daniel onto the stage of history.

The fact that the Nimham signing deeds in the Hudson Highlands consistently did so as a sachem and principal signatory suggests that he was at least old enough to have been the same man earlier identified by the name in Long Island and New Jersey. His appearance in the Highlands also coincides with known relocations of other Munsee-speaking people from the lower river to new homes farther north after selling most of their remaining ancestral land around Greater New York by 1720.<sup>22</sup>

On May 21, 1744, Gottlob Buettner, a Moravian missionary working at the Shekomeko community established three years earlier among Wappinger Indian settlements in the Dutchess County highlands, wrote that “Nimham, King of the Highland Indians,” was a sorcerer.<sup>23</sup> Complaining that he spoke out against the Moravians and stopped his people from going to their meetings, Buettner noted on October 22, 1744, that the king tried to entice Shekomeko residents away from the mission.<sup>24</sup> These, the last known documents mentioning Nimham by name during his lifetime, indicate that he, like other elders before and since, had become a dedicated guardian of his people’s spiritual and cultural traditions in his later years.

Although no known document chronicles his death or succession, several sources indicate that both events occurred soon after Buettner’s journal entry. On August 26, 1762, Catharyna Brett deposed that “Old Nimham has been Dead about Twelve Years” in a letter to British Superintendent of Indian Affairs Sir William Johnson complaining about a Captain Nimham’s questions challenging her claim that the old chief had given her the title to her Dutchess County land.<sup>25</sup>

Other documents more precisely fix the time of Nimham’s death and succession to the winter of 1745–46. On December 21, 1745, New York agents visited River Indians hiding out at their “Hunting Houses” on the upper Delaware at Cochecton.<sup>26</sup> The purpose of this unusual visit, made during the winter at the

---

height of King George's War, was to explore a rumored French and Indian invasion and find out why these people had fled precipitously from their homes in Orange County. A speaker welcoming the agents told them that they did not know anything about the rumor and explained that fear of attack by neighbors swept up in the anti-Indian hysteria spreading through the settlements had inspired the move. He then went on to say that "They had lost their Sachem, and as they Consist of two Tribes Vizt the Wolves & Turkeys, they were then debating of which Tribe a Sachim should be chosen to govern the Whole." Two weeks later, their new sachem and twelve of their chief men came to the Orange County seat at Goshen "with a Belt of Wampum to settle and renew their Friendship and Brotherhood."<sup>27</sup>

On October 21, 1758, the Delaware diplomat Teedyuscung held up a wampum belt bearing two reddish hearts and the figure 1745 on behalf of "Nimham the Eldest principall Chief of the Wappingers or Opings . . . living near Aesopus" at an important treaty conference held at Easton, Pennsylvania, where he and several other chiefs sold all but their hunting and fishing rights in northern New Jersey for one thousand Spanish pieces of eight.<sup>28</sup> Some three years later, "Nimeham, Chief of the Opies" held up the same belt as a token of his authority as he announced his people's plans to move with some Mohickons to Delaware towns in Pennsylvania's Wyoming Valley at a treaty conference held at Bushkill between October 1 and 11, 1761.<sup>29</sup>

These references show that the Wappinger chief representing his people at Easton and Bushkill bore the name of his predecessor. This in itself was not unusual; Munsee and Mahican people occasionally took the names of honored ancestors and respected foreigners. Several lines of evidence, however, suggest that Daniel Nimham was not this man. Very nearly every known reference mentioning Daniel Nimham by name includes his surname or places him in an identifiable context. Significantly, no known source written before 1767 mentions him as the Wappinger king or principal chief. The Nimham identified in the 1758 and 1761 documents as the Wappinger chief, on the other hand, is never referred to by any other name or title.

Other sources suggest further disparities. Admittedly not an unbiased witness, Catharyna Brett nevertheless took care to distinguish the aforementioned Captain Nimham from Old Nimham and his two sons. She further identified the old chief's eldest son by the name "One Shake."<sup>30</sup> The man identified as Nimham at Easton several years earlier, moreover, was reportedly sick, old, and infirm.<sup>31</sup> Daniel Nimham, by contrast, was said to have been thirty-six years old on August 2, 1762.<sup>32</sup>

By themselves, these data are not conclusive. Together, they indicate that for reasons still unclear, Daniel Nimham may not have risen to the top position of

---

leadership among his people until the late 1760s. Despite this fact, one thing is clear from the records: all sources agree that, whatever his position or status, Daniel Nimham became his people's most prominent advocate in colonial circles during what was perhaps the most dangerous period in their history.

Although Daniel was the most prominent man to bear the Nimham name during these years, he was not the only person using the surname. Extant records show that Nimhams identified with the surnames Abraham, Aaron, Isaac, Jacobus, and John were associated with the Stockbridge community, the six-mile-square mission laid out for Indian converts at a bend in the Housatonic River by Massachusetts authorities in 1736.<sup>33</sup> Other Nimhams named Henry and Coleus were noted among Mohicander expatriates from the Fish Kills area living with other exiled Indians along the upper reaches of the Susquehanna River during and after the Seven Years War.<sup>34</sup> Like other Indians converted to Christianity or living near colonial settlements, many Wappinger Indian people came to adopt names of respected elders as surnames. It is not known whether Daniel or the other Nimhams used the surname as a patronym, matronym, cognomen, or suffix of a new proper name form fashioned after the English style. Although Abraham is identified as Daniel's son, it is not presently possible to know if the term approximates our sense of the relationship.<sup>35</sup>

All Nimhams associated with the Stockbridge mission possessed first names clearly derived from Biblical sources. While we can guess that Stockbridge people still invested personal names with power, we do not know whether they used English names randomly or associated them with particular personal, social, or spiritual characteristics. The person or persons identified as Abraham Nimham, for instance, may well have been regarded as a patriarch. People addressed as Aaron may have performed priestly duties in the community. As mentioned earlier, the name Daniel may have been used to identify gifted personable visionaries living between two worlds.

No matter how he or his community regarded his name, Daniel Nimham, the first Nimham identified with an English surname, initially appeared under that name in records documenting the Seven Years War. Writing in 1767, lawyers endorsing Daniel Nimham's land claims wrote that he led his people against the French on behalf of his British allies as king or sachem of the Wappinger tribe of Indians on or about 1756.<sup>36</sup> While this made good reading in court, sources closer to the event suggest that Daniel may have been a less than enthusiastic supporter of the British war effort. Writing to Sir William Johnson on December 25, 1757, Lord Loudon complained that a man named Daniel detached "domiciliated Indian, that served under Captain Jacobs" from the British interest.<sup>37</sup> Other evidence suggests that Daniel Nimham may have mostly stayed at home in Stockbridge during much of the war. Minutes of Stockbridge town meetings reveal

---

that Daniel Nimham was chosen town constable on March 13, 1758.<sup>38</sup> Little more than a year later, he was among Stockbridge Indians complaining about settlers trespassing on Indian lands in western Massachusetts.<sup>39</sup>

Although Daniel was given a plot of land in Stockbridge, several documents show that he continued to move back to his old lands in Wikapy in the hilly Dutchess County back country and elsewhere.<sup>40</sup> This enduring desire to live on ancestral lands claimed by colonists soon embroiled Daniel and his people in one of the bitterest land controversies in the history of the province of New York.

Nimhams had been involved in land disputes ever since the first documented holder of the name sided with Tackapousha and the Oyster Bay men against Hempstead townfolk in 1667.<sup>41</sup> Daniel Nimham first became involved in such matters when he signed the above-mentioned memorial complaining about encroachments made by settlers on land claimed by his people in western Massachusetts as “Dannel Neemhum” on May 23, 1759.<sup>42</sup>

The struggle over the Highlands along the border separating New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts was joined during the early 1750s when small farmers settling on these lands refused to pay rents demanded by powerful manor lords belonging to the Philipse, Livingston, and other established Hudson Valley families. Forcefully resisting sheriffs sent out to evict them, these settlers and land speculators sympathetic to their cause (collectively known as “anti-rent rioters”) were soon embroiled in a series of increasingly violent confrontations that ultimately flared into a brief but portentous rebellion.<sup>43</sup>

Many of these settlers moved onto Wappinger lands in eastern portions of today’s Putnam and Dutchess counties when Daniel Nimham and his people moved to Stockbridge for protection at the beginning of the Seven Years War. Returning after the fighting ended, they discovered that Philipse family heirs claimed their lands and demanded rents from anyone living there. Rather than turn the new settlers out, Daniel Nimham offered leases to sympathetic squatters and made common cause with them against the manor lords.

The story of Daniel’s struggle against the Philipse family heirs to regain his people’s land has been recounted at length in several places.<sup>44</sup> It began during the summer of 1762 when Daniel, encouraged by a provincial proclamation promising adjudication of outstanding Indian claims and supported by rent riot leaders, formally lodged complaints against the Philipse heirs in the New York Council. Lodging his complaint at a time when British authorities were concerned by growing incidences of frontier violence and provincial land fraud, Daniel was granted a hearing in New York City on March 6, 1765. Unable to find a lawyer willing to represent him, Daniel and a group of settlers serving as advisors presented convincing evidence showing that Adolphe Philipse, in the tradition of

---

other Hudson Valley manor lords, stretched the boundaries of a 1697 deed to 15,000 acres on the east bank of the Hudson into a vast domain of more than 205,000 acres extending eastward to the then-contested Connecticut border. Registering his title to this Highland Patent in 1703, the elder Philipse tried to quiet subsequent Indian complaints by purchasing tracts from Wappinger people from time to time. Two of these deeds, the aforementioned 1712 and 1730 conveyances, were signed by Daniel's predecessor and namesake.

Lawyers representing Philipse's heirs denied the charges. Drawing on a tactic effectively used by William Penn's heirs to obtain nearly all of the Minisink lands in Pennsylvania in 1737, the manor lords produced a hitherto unknown, unlicensed, and unregistered deed to the entire tract allegedly signed on August 13, 1702.<sup>45</sup> The Indian claim, presented in front of a court made up largely of landlords, was quickly thrown out by the council, which arranged for the arrest of the Indians' advisors. Daniel refused to back down. Funded in part through a subscription taken up by rent rioters and land speculators, he traveled to London, where he successfully presented his case to the Lords of Trade on August 30, 1766. The lords were convinced of the justice of the Indian claim and ordered New York authorities to reconsider the case. Daniel pressed his suit in front of the same council that had thrown out his previous claim exactly two years earlier. Sir William Johnson, the only man who could have interceded effectively on the Indians' behalf, declined to support Daniel's claim.<sup>46</sup> Abandoned by the principal Crown agent responsible for protecting Indian interests, the Wappinger petition was heard and again thrown out on March 11, 1767, after two days of hearings. Daniel immediately appealed the decision to Johnson but was rebuffed.<sup>47</sup> Soon afterward, those rent rioters not ejected from the Highlands were forced to negotiate new leases with victorious landlords.

Neither Daniel nor the rioters forgave or forgot the landlords or their friends in government. Calling themselves "Sons of Liberty," the rioters were forced to bide their time and wait for their opportunity to avenge themselves upon the landed aristocracy and their political cronies. Daniel himself evidently returned to Stockbridge. Town records indicate that he was among the many Stockbridge Indian residents compelled to sell his lot to one of the growing number of non-Indians who ultimately bought up most of the town by the opening of the Revolution.<sup>48</sup> Although the town's Indian proprietors subsequently granted him half of a lot owned by another Indian resident, Daniel evidently resumed his wandering ways.<sup>49</sup> On June 11, 1772, Sir William Johnson gave one pound and eighteen shillings worth of goods or currency "To Danl. Nimham & Party going to Onghquago [Ochquaga]."<sup>50</sup> He also may have been among the Indians noted as still living at Fish Kill later that year.<sup>51</sup>

---

Although Daniel continued to play a minor role in subsequent land disputes, his position as Wappinger chief did not afford him great status in Stockbridge during the years preceding the Revolution.<sup>52</sup> Both he and his son, Abraham, evidently maintained their ties with the Sons of Liberty as revolutionary fervor swept across the region. Undoubtedly encouraged by pro-American Stockbridge missionary John Sargeant, son of Stockbridge's first minister, both men were among the many Stockbridge Indian people joining the American cause when fighting broke out in 1775. Stockbridge Indian men participated in the siege of Boston, patrolled the frontier with Canada, and served with army units fighting in the Mohawk Valley and at Saratoga.<sup>53</sup> Commissioned a captain, he distinguished himself as a scout and served as a diplomat and messenger traveling to Caughnawaga and the Ohio Valley to secure the neutrality of Indians living in those places. Abraham subsequently petitioned for and received command of a detachment made up of Stockbridge and other River Indian people. Selling the lot at Stockbridge where he and his father lived on April 28, 1778, both men and their detachment joined Washington's army around White Plains.

Abraham's detachment of some sixty Indian riflemen soon found themselves skirmishing with British and Hessian troops alongside American militia units operating on the Bronx border. The detachment was outflanked and surrounded by a formation of British rangers, hussars, and Hessian jaegers during fighting near Mile Square Road on Cortlandt Ridge in today's Van Cortlandt Park on August 31, 1778. Outnumbered five to one, Abraham, Daniel, and at least fifteen other Stockbridge men were killed.<sup>54</sup>

Other Nimhams fighting on survived the war only to lose most of their last remaining lands at Stockbridge soon after the fighting stopped.<sup>55</sup> Denied bounty lands awarded to other veterans, most of these men and their families joined other members of their community moving to New Stockbridge among their Oneida friends. Ironically, both peoples, the only tribes to actively support the American cause during the war, were among the first Eastern Indians compelled to move west during the early phases of the Removal Policy.

Today, although the majority of people tracing descent to the Hudson Valley's original inhabitants can claim Stockbridge Indian ancestry, most bearers of the Nimham name now live on the Stockbridge-Munsee Reservation in Wisconsin. Like Daniel Nimham and his forebears, modern Stockbridge-Munsees live in two worlds. Educated in American schools, many work in the professions and live in cities. Most also support tribal archivists in their ongoing efforts to gather ancient documents and record traditions of their elders. In so doing, they, like the Nimhams in the colonial Hudson Valley, are working to make the best of both worlds.

---

## Acknowledgments

Volume editor Laurence Hauptman, an enduringly generous supporter of scholars and scholarship conducting ethnohistoric studies in the Hudson Valley, provided the inspiration for this article during a call asking for some information on Daniel Nimham. Patrick Frazier also extended particular significant assistance. Mary B. Davis, David J. Fowler, Roy Goodman, and Jack Rushing provided data, and readings by Eloise Beil, Colin G. Calloway, Scott Chapin, and C. A. Weslager helped to correct errors great and small.

## Notes

1. No single source presently completely documents the history and culture of these people. Important sources for Wappinger ethnohistory include Theodore J. C. Brassler, *Riding the Frontier's Crest: Mahican Indian Culture and Culture Change* (Ottawa, Ontario: National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Ethnology Division Paper No. 13); Laurence M. Hauptman and Jack Campisi, eds., *Neighbors and Intruders: An Ethnohistorical Exploration of the Indians of Hudson's River* (Ottawa, Ontario: National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Ethnology Division Paper No. 39); and Edward Manning Ruttenber, *History of the Indian Tribes of Hudson's River* (Albany, N.Y.: Munsell, 1872). A survey of what is known about Oping or Pompton people in northern New Jersey may be found in Robert S. Grumet, "We Are Not So Great Fools": *Changes in Upper Delawarean Socio-Political Life, 1630-1758* (Ph.D. diss., Department of Anthropology, Rutgers University, 1979).
2. Although no known document connects Daniel Nimham to a Christian mission, a document dated March 6, 1765, located in the Early State Records on file in the Library of Congress explicitly states that he spoke English.
3. Daniel Nimham extended several leases to supporters assisting him in his struggle to regain lands seized by Hudson Valley manor lords. All were made in 1764 and may be seen in Box 1 of the John Tabor Kempe Papers, New-York Historical Society, New York.
4. Daniel Nimham appears prominently in such accounts as Oscar Handlin and Irving Mark, eds., "Chief Daniel Nimham v. Roger Morris, Beverly Robinson, and Philip Philipse—An Indian Land Case in Colonial New York, 1765–1767," *Ethnohistory* 11(3) (1964): 193–246; Georgiana C. Nammack, *Fraud, Politics, and the Dispossession of the Indians: The Iroquois Land Frontier in the Colonial Period* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), 70–85; and Patrick Frazier, *The Mohicans of Stockbridge* (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, forthcoming). Despite this fact, Cyrus Thomas's brief, occasionally cited biographical sketch, containing a mixture of fact, folklore, and speculation, remains the only general account of Daniel Nimham's life in print. While Thomas presents most of the salient facts of Daniel Nimham's life, he conflates him with the two earlier Nimhams. Thomas also commits minor errors, such as identifying Daniel as a Mohegan and placing him in Samson Occum's Mohegan party during the year that both men journeyed separately to England. See Frederick Webb Hodge, ed., *Handbook of American Indians: North of Mexico*, 2 vols. (Washington D.C.: Bureau of American Ethnology), Bulletin 30 (1907–10), 2: 71–72.
5. A manuscript copy of the March 22, 1667, document is located in the New York Colonial Manuscripts—Endorsed Land Papers, New York State Library, Albany, N.Y. (hereafter, NYCM-ELP), 1: 30. A transcript of the document, employing the orthography Nimhai in place of the

---

spelling Nimham used in the original, has been published in the *Oyster Bay Town Records, 1653–1763*, 6 vols. (New York: 1916–31), 1: 677–78. Tackapousha is cited in the body of the document as “tackapouchie Sechem of massepage” and puts his mark next to the name “tacpouchs.”

The boundary dispute between Hempstead and Oyster Bay, which originated in differing interpretations of bounds first laid out in a deed dated November 13, 1643, and confirmed on May 11, 1658, is discussed in Bernice Schultz, *Colonial Hempstead* (Lynbrook, N.Y.: 1937) and Allen W. Trelease, *Indian Affairs in Colonial New York: The Seventeenth Century* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1960), 159–60, 195–97. Widely reprinted, transcripts of the 1643 and 1658 documents may be found in Edmund Burke O’Callaghan and Berthold Fernow, eds., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of New York*, 15 vols. (Albany, N.Y., 1856–87) (hereafter, NYCD), 14: 417, 530. Comparative analyses indicate that the other two witnesses, cited as “pamelaci” and “Womatapan,” were Matinecock sachem Pomwaukon (fl. 1643–1681) and Rockaway and Canarsee sachem Waumetompack (fl. 1655–1684). Identified in other documents as brothers, both probably were Tackapousha’s sons.

6. This since-lost deed is abstracted in Benjamin F. Thompson, *History of Long Island*, 3rd ed. (New York, 1918), 3: 27–28. Although the exact terms specified in the document are not known, Thompson noted that the sachems reserved “to themselves and their heirs for ever, the right of cutting bulrushes in any part of the said territory.”
7. NYCM-ELP, 3:11
8. Micro-level analysis is described in Billie R. DeWalt and Perti J. Pelto, eds., *Micro and Macro Levels of Analysis in Anthropology: Issues in Theory and Research* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1985). Also see Raoul Naroll, *Data Quality Control: A New Research Technique* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962). For a discussion and application of micro-level dated event analysis in ethnohistoric inquiry, see Margaret T. Hodgen, *Anthropology, History, and Culture Change*, Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, No. 52 (Tucson, Ariz., 1974).
9. These and other names noted by documented date range (fl.) in the text are among those compiled in the “Munsee File,” an unpublished flat-file computerized database in the author’s possession containing all known dated references to named individuals, places, and collectivities in documents chronicling relations between Indian people and colonists in the upper Delaware and lower Hudson river valleys during the colonial era. I have used micro-level Munsee File data to investigate such macro-level phenomena as Munsee sociopolitical organization (“*We Are Not So Great Fools*,” 23–97), track documented careers of individual Indian people (“Taphow: The Forgotten ‘Sackemau and Commander in Chief of All Those Indians Inhabiting Northern New Jersey,’” *Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of New Jersey* [1988], 43: 23–28), and indirectly assess relative impacts of epidemics, wars, and land sales on Munsee population (“A New Ethnohistorical Model for North American Indian Demography,” *North American Archaeologist* [1990], 11[1]: 29–41).
10. Working with old documents and Delaware elders such as the late Nora Thompson Dean, C. A. Weslager, the closest student of Delaware naming customs, showed that most Delaware people possessed several unique personal and public names that generally passed from this world with their owners. See C. A. Weslager, “Name-Giving among the Delaware Indians,” *Names* (1971), 19(4): 268–83; “Delaware Indian Name Giving and Modern Practice,” in Herbert C. Kraft, ed., *A Delaware Indian Symposium* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1974), 135–45. Weslager’s *Delaware Indians: A Critical Bibliography* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1978) is a useful guide to many of the more important studies of Delaware social and cultural institutions.
11. This movement is extensively documented in Grumet, “*We Are Not So Great Fools*,” *passim*.

- 
12. Bearing an endorsement misdated June 10, 1707, a registered copy of this document is on file in New Jersey Deeds (New Jersey State Library, Trenton, N.J.), Liber I: 402–3.
  13. Monmouth County Deeds (County Hall of Records, Freehold, N.J.), Liber B: 35–36. A brief abstract of this deed, keyed to an evidently earlier filing framework, appears in Edwin Salter and George C. Beekman, *Old Times in Old Monmouth* (Freehold, N.J., 1887), 251. Deed signatories are listed as “Quahicke, Jonathan, Perorack, Shenotapo, and Pandam.” Perorack, an orthographic variant of the name of the prominent Navesink leader Peropay (fl. 1648–1684), first appeared in colonial records as an Indian signing a deed to land north of Jericho, Long Island, on May 20, 1648 (Oyster Bay Town Records, 1: 625–27).
  14. Signed by Nimhamaw, Noummihamen, Wawaleerseed, and Pokehuutos, the deed document begins by listing “Numham alias Squahikkon, Noammishanaman, Pokohawas, Taulaman [fl. 1699–1744], and Wawaluasoo” as owners and sachems. As yet unpublished, a copy of the original manuscript is filed in West Jersey Deeds (New Jersey State Library, Trenton, N.J.), Liber AAA: 443–45. The June 25, 1703, registration of this deed appears in *West Jersey Proprietary Records, Minutes of the Council*, 2 vols. (Special Collections, Alexander Library, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.), 2: n.p.
  15. The November 11, 1703, deed is filed in West Jersey Deeds, Liber AAA: 434–35. The Indian signatories reserved the right to hunt, fish, and fowl on unimproved land in this and the June 5, 1703, instrument.
  16. Records documenting these negotiations appear in *West Jersey Proprietary Records, Minutes of the Council*, 2: n.p.
  17. Identified as Squahikkon, Pokehauets, and Nishulokis in the document body and signed under the orthographies Squahikkon, Pokehauets, and Neshulokes, they received “one Gunn, three white Blankets, 4 matchcoats, 6 lb. of Gunpowder, 20 lb. of Lead, 20 quarts of rum, 6 Tomahikons, 10 knives, & 5 pound in silver money from John Revel” for the land. An endorsed copy of this document may be seen in West Jersey Deeds, Liber BB: 323–24.
  18. “The marke of a young Indian Amhan” on the June 15, 1696, deed to the 100,000-acre Kakiate Tract in Orange County, New York, astride the hotly contested boundary with New Jersey may represent the earliest evidence of connections between Nimham and Hudson Highland Indian people. An incomplete manuscript copy of this document may be found in the Kakiac Patent Papers on file in the Goshen Library, Goshen, N.Y. A published transcript of another fragmentary copy has been published in George H. Budke, comp., *Indian Deeds: 1630 to 1748* (New City, N.Y.: Library Association of Rockland County, 1975), 75–76. Discussion of the movement of Indians from Connecticut to this area appears in Grumer, “*We Are Not So Great Fools*,” passim, and in “Taphow.”
  19. The deed was signed by “Nemham [Nimham in the body], agand, agtapyhout, Sekomeck, and Aloram.” A copy of the deed may be seen in NYCM-ELP, 5: 124.
  20. This deed, whose principal signatories included Conkepot, Poneyote, Patarwake, and Naurnaquin, also listed John VanGilder as a minor participant. Westonook is more commonly known as Westenhuck, a district in northwestern Connecticut along the Housatonic River in the vicinity of the Schaghticook Indian community. On file in the County Land Office in Springfield, Mass., a transcript of the deed has been printed in Harry A. Wright, ed., *Indian Deeds of Hampden County: Being Copies of All Land Transfers from the Indians in the County of Hampden, Massachusetts, and Some Deeds from Other Sources* (Springfield, Mass., 1905), 116–19.
  21. A transcription of this deed was first published in the *Dutchess County Historical Society Yearbook* (Poughkeepsie, N.Y., 1923), 29–32. It has recently been reprinted in William McDermott and
-

---

Clifford Buck, comps., *Eighteenth Century Documents of the 9 Partners Patent, Dutchess County, New York* (Dutchess County Historical Society, 1979), 109–13.

22. See C. A. Weslager, *The Delaware Indians: A History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1972) and Theodore J. C. Brasser, *Riding the Frontier's Crest*, for two of the more prominent studies tracing early eighteenth-century movements of Hudson Valley Indian people to Susquehanna Country. Movements of lower Hudson Valley native people to the Hudson Highlands are discussed in Edward Manning Ruttenber, *History of the Indian Tribes of Hudson's River*, and more recently in Grumer, "We Are Not So Great Fools."
23. Moravian Archives (hereafter MA), Moravian College Library, Bethlehem, Pa., Box 112, Folder 2, Item 3. I have Patrick Frazier to thank for alerting me to the existence of this citation.
24. MA, Box 112, Folder 2.
25. The fullest transcription of this letter appears in *The Letters and Papers of Cadwallader Colden*, 9 vols. (New York: New-York Historical Society, 1917–35), 6: 190–92. An abridged version of this letter appears in James Sullivan et al., eds., *The Papers of Sir William Johnson* (hereafter, *PWJ*), 14 vols. (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1921–65), 10: 493–95. Sung Bok Kim points out that Brett's land was located near the Hudson River in the Rumbout Patent, not in the Highlands as several authors have thought. See his *Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York: Manorial Society, 1664–1775* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), 377.
26. This visit is described in the "Report of Colonel De Kay, Major Swartwout, Ensign Coleman, Adam Wisener, and Interpreter Benjamin Thompson of their Journey to Cashightonk in Company with Two Indians from Minisink as pilots," dated January 17, 1746, in New York Executive Council Minutes (New York State Colonial Manuscripts, New York State Library, Albany, N.Y.), 21: 71–72. Identified in the document as Cashightonk, Cochection town was located around the present village of Damascus, Pennsylvania.
27. New York Executive Council Minutes 21: 71–72. Analysis of names of Cochection Indian people signing two deeds later that year alienating remaining Indian title to much of the Catskill region in New York indicates that most were Wappinger and Esopus Highland Indians (Grumer, "We Are Not So Great Fools," *passim*). Sadly, De Kay did not further identify the deceased sachem, his successor, the Wolf and Turkey tribes, or the new chief's tribal affiliation. An interpretation of these events based on the possible familial ramifications of the term "tribe" during the eighteenth century may be found in Robert S. Grumer, "That Their Issue Not Be Spurious: An Inquiry into Munsee Matriliney," *Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of New Jersey* (1990), 45: 19–24.
28. Proceedings of this treaty conference may be found in New Jersey Deed Books, Liber I–2: 89–94 and Liber O: 438–69, and in transcripts published in Samuel Hazard, ed., *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania, from the Organization to the Termination of the Proprietary Government* (cited on the binding as *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania* and hereafter cited as *CRP*), 16 vols. (Harrisburg, Pa., 1851–53), 8: 175–223, and Samuel Smith, *The History of the Colony of Nova-Caesaria, or New Jersey* (first published in 1765; Burlington, N.J., 1877), 455–83. Teedyuscung reported "that the belt was given them by the government of New-York and represented their union, which was to last as long as the sun should continue in the firmament."
- Teedyuscung's life and times are summarized in Anthony F. C. Wallace, *King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung, 1700–1763* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949; reprinted by Syracuse University Press, 1990). The Aesopus area referred to in Teedyuscung's statement is located in today's Ulster and Orange Counties in southern New York.
29. A transcription of the document recording this event, which locates the meeting locale at Bush-Hill (an early orthography for the modern village of Bushkill, Pennsylvania, ten miles north of the

---

Delaware Water Gap), may be found in *CRP*, 8: 667–70. Wappinger loyalty was attested to in two since-lost certificates signed by New York governors George Clinton (1743–1753) in 1745 and Charles Hardy (1755–1757) in 1756 displayed at this meeting and the earlier October 21, 1758, conference.

This Nimham, also identified as Nuntian at the Bush-Hill meeting, was probably the same man of the same name noted earlier in Moravian chronicles as the head of a family wishing to move to Gnadenhutten on the upper Lehigh on May 9, 1751 (MA, Box 114, Folder 3). He also was almost certainly the Nemeham listed with other Indian leaders evidently living in the Wyoming Valley on Teedyuscung's June 22, 1762, petition to Sir William Johnson demanding appointment of a scribe to make an Indian record of discussions involving the Walking Purchase dispute held at Easton from June 18 to 28, 1762. See *PWJ*, 3: 771.

30. *PWJ*, 10: 493–95. The elder Nimham is referred to as “old Capt. Nimham” in Hendrick Wamash’s complaint that Mrs. Brett and others had never paid his people for the lands they now occupied at Fish Kills to Sir William Johnson on September 20, 1763 (*PWJ*, 10: 853–54).
31. On October 21, 1758, Teedyuscung told treaty commissioners that the Wappinger chief was old and infirm. He further “requested the favour of a horse to carry him home; which was readily granted” (Smith, *History of the Colony of Nova-Caesaria*, 477). Noted as being too sick to attend the deed signing on October 23, 1758, Nimham subsequently separately acknowledged that he was a party to the bargain and attested to his acceptance of his share of the payment two days later (New Jersey Deeds, Liber I–2: 469; Liber O: 94).
32. This information is included in a deposition made during a dispute over land in the Rensselaerswyck Manor on file in Land Papers, Misc., New York, Columbia County, 1761–1762 (Library of the New-York Historical Society, New York), n.p.
33. People identified as Aaron, Daniel, Isaac, and John Nimham are listed on Revolutionary War rolls published in James A. Roberts, ed., *New York in the Revolution as a Colony and State*, 2 vols. (Albany, N.Y., 1898-1904), 1: 95. An undated document in the Dwight Collection on file in the Norman Rockwell Library in Stockbridge, Mass., noting that Aaron Nimham also was called Waunaguin contains the only documented instance associating a person using the Nimham surname with a more traditional name.

Although some Wappinger people periodically settled in and around Stockbridge, most did not stay there for any appreciable length of time until the outbreak of the Seven Years War forced many to move there for safety in or about 1756. See Handlin and Mark, eds., “Chief Daniel Nimham *v.* Roger Morris,” 197.

The Stockbridge Indian community has attracted its share of scholarly interest. Studies such as Sarah Cabor Sedgwick and Christina Sedgwick Marquand, *Stockbridge, 1739–1939: A Chronicle* (Great Barrington, Mass., 1939) and Daniel R. Mandell, *Change and Continuity in a Native American Community: Eighteenth Century Stockbridge* (M.A. thesis, Department of History, University of Virginia, 1982) provide necessary background. A useful account of the early Stockbridge Indian schools may be found in James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 196–204.

Several works-in-progress examine other aspects of Stockbridge Indian life. Patrick Frazier’s forthcoming book, *The Mohicans of Stockbridge*, gathers together much of the extant documentation relating to the eighteenth-century Stockbridge Indian community before and during the Revolutionary War. Colin G. Calloway investigates Stockbridge Indian participation in the Revolution in his forthcoming volume, *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities*. Sheila C. Brennan, a graduate student in anthropology at

---

the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, presently is examining the formation of Stockbridge Indian ethnic identity. Her paper *Recreating Ethnicity: Native Americans and Stockbridge, Massachusetts*, presented at the 25th Annual Conference on Historical and Underwater Archaeology (Kingston, Jamaica, 1992), assesses the impact local historians have had on awareness of the Indian presence in the township.

34. Margery West deposed on September 24, 1756, that "Henry Nimham, a Fishkill Indian, that she had been acquainted with" was among Delaware and Hackinsack Indians who had captured her at the Minisinks on February 26 of that year and carried her off to Tioga, Shamokin, and other Susquehanna Valley Indian towns. See *The Letters and Papers of Cadwallader Colden*, 5: 95. Coleus Nimham was the only Mohikander living on the Susquehanna mentioned by name during Sir William Johnson's meeting with forty-eight Stockbridge Indians at Albany on November 10, 1763. Noting that all Indian people living on the Susquehanna ran the risk of being drawn into the struggle formerly known as Pontiac's War or Rebellion and today revisionistically called the Defensive War of 1763–64 then raging farther west, Stockbridge speaker Captain Jacobs asked that Johnson "call them all from thence . . . least they may be brought in to do what is wrong." See *PWJ*, 10: 932.
35. A reference dated April 28, 1778, records Abraham Nimham's sale of the lot he and his father Daniel Nimham lived on. See Berkshire County Register of Deeds, 13: 156.
- Although most sources regard the Stockbridges as matrilineal (i.e. Axtell, *The Invasion Within*, 197; Brassier, *Riding the Frontier's Crest*, 40), no known source clearly identifies their kinship system during the middle years of the eighteenth century. Analysis of patterns identified in historic documents indirectly chronicling Munsee kinship indicates that many Munsee families may have begun to employ a matri-centered bilateral or double descent system during these years (Grumet, "That Their Issue Be Not Spurious"). Bilateral aspects of family structure and increased adoption of bilateral descent among the Iroquois during historic times is described in William N. Fenton, "The Iroquois in History," in *North American Indians in Historical Perspective*, ed. Eleanor Burke Leacock and Nancy Oestreich Lurie (Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press, 1988), 129–68 (reprint of the first edition published by Random House in 1971) and in "Northern Iroquoian Culture Patterns," in Bruce G. Trigger, ed., *Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 15, Northeast (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 310–14.
36. This memorial, which also noted that the Wappingers had "Removed their Females, their aged men, and such as were unfit for Duty to a Place called Stockbridge" around 1756 also cites other documents dated in 1766 and 1767 that show Captain Nimham and Daniel Nimham to be the same man and explicitly identify him as "the King, Head, and Sachem of the Tribe of Wappinger." See Handlin and Mark, eds., "Chief Daniel Nimham v. Roger Morris," 197, 210–15.
- A contemporary reference to a Mohikander messenger named Emham, dispatched by Sir William Johnson with another Mohikander Indian named Jeremiah to carry a message to the Stockbridge Indians condemning their involvement with rent rioters who killed a man at Claverack and threatened to burn the landlord's house at Livingston Manor on December 8, 1756, may represent the earliest direct citation to Daniel Nimham. See *PWJ*, 9: 567–68.
37. As noted in n. 32, Captain Jacobs was the military leader of the Stockbridge Indian community. A transcript of this letter appears in *PWJ*, 2: 764.
38. Subsequent records show that he was nominated town hog reave on March 10, 1760, and voted town warden on March 18, 1766. See Stockbridge Town Meeting Records, n.p.
39. A copy of this document, dated May 23, 1759, is on file in the Massachusetts Archives (Boston), 32: 773.

- 
40. No records presently document Daniel's initial settlement in Stockbridge. Several documents chronicle his itinerant ways. On May 19, 1762, for example, Stockbridge town proprietors voted to return a plot to him even though he "had gone off and left the same." See Indian Proprietors Records, 32, on file in the Stockbridge Town Hall, Stockbridge, Mass. His unsuccessful attempt to return to his land at Wikapy after the end of the War is recorded in Handlin and Mark, eds., "Chief Daniel Nimham *v.* Roger Morris," 200. Another document chronicles one of his journeys to the Susquehanna Country Indian town of Ochquaga on June 11, 1772. See *PWJ*, 12: 999.
41. See n. 4.
42. See n. 38. Massachusetts Archives, 32: 773.
43. See Irving Mark, *Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1711–1775* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940), and Kim, *Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York*.
44. Extensive accounts of the Wappinger Indian land claim may be seen in Handlin and Mark, eds., "Chief Daniel Nimham *v.* Roger Morris," 193–246; Kim, *Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York*, 376–80, 408–10; Mark, *Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York*, 34–36, 131–35, 155–58; Nammack, *Fraud, Politics, and the Dispossession of the Indians*, 70–85; and William Smith Pelletreau, *History of Putnam County, New York* (Philadelphia: W. W. Preston and Company, 1886), 69–84.
45. Basing their claim on a similarly unregistered deed allegedly signed in 1686, the Pennsylvania Proprietors pressured the Delaware people into signing the 1737 Walking Purchase, granting all the land encompassed within a day and a half's walk north from Wrightstown in Bucks County. Constructing a road and hiring the province's fastest runners, Penn's heirs managed to seize all of the lands owned by Minisink people closely related to the Wappingers. This event remained a *casus belli* between Indians and settlers for nearly half a century. See Francis Jennings, "The Scandalous Indian Policy of William Penn's Sons: Deeds and Documents of the Walking Purchase," *Pennsylvania History* (1970), 37(1): 19–39; see also *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from its Beginning to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1984).
46. In an unusually candid letter written on August 26, 1765, assuring Philipse heir Roger Morris that he would not intercede on behalf of the Indians, Johnson wrote that he:

" . . . considered the Claims of Indians so near the Sea, as verry different from the rest, & verry difficult to be proved, besides I have laid it down as an invariable rule, from wch. I never did, nor ever shall deviate, that wherever a Title is set up by any Tribe of Indians of little consequence or importance to his Majestys Interest, & who may be considered as long domesticated, that such Claim unless apparently clear, had better remain unsupported than that Several old Titles of his Majestys Subjects should thereby become disturbed.—and on the contrary, Wherever I found a Just complaint made by a People either by themselves or Connections capable of resenting & who I knew would resent a neglect, I Judged it my Dury to support the same, for an Indian Claim may be verry Just tho' otherwise pronounced by Law, the Opinion of which is founded on a Parent, which may have been obtained in a most iniquitous manner, & cannot be supported, whilst any Virtue or sound policy remains amongst us."

A state of this often-quoted letter appears in its entirety in *PWJ*, 11: 911–12.

Reporting the final results of Daniel Nimham's second hearing to the Earl of Shelburne on April 3, 1767, New York Governor Moore wrote, "Sir William Johnsons ill state of Health did not permit him to be present at the examination [of Nimham's case] but Captn. Guy Johnson his son in Law was deputed by him to attend on this occasion and was perfectly satisfied with the whole

- 
- transaction" (NYCD, 7: 915). Also see Johnson's own account of his handling of the affair in a letter to Shelburne dated April 1, 1767, in NYCD 7: 913–15.
47. See Johnson's journal entry dated April 6, 1767, in *PWJ*, 12: 303.
  48. Daniel's sale of his lot for debt, dated August 1769, is recorded in the Stockbridge Indian Proprietors Records, 85.
  49. This grant, which noted that Nimham and his family were not Housatonics and affirmed his subjection to the same restrictions prohibiting unauthorized alienation of land in the township, is dated February 7, 1772, and may be found in the Stockbridge Indian Proprietors Records, 110.
  50. See Sir William Johnson's Accounts Against the Crown in *PWJ*, 12: 999.
  51. As noted in Johnson's account book in *PWJ*, 12: 1001.
  52. A man named Daniel accompanied another Stockbridge man named Solomon (perhaps Solomon Unhaunauwannutt, who became Stockbridge chief in 1771) to a meeting with Johnson to discuss proposed sale of their rights to land along Wood Creek at the southern headwaters of Lake Champlain around the modern town of Whitehall, New York, on August 23, 1771. See *PWJ*, 12: 925 for a note on this visit and *PWJ*, 8: 256 for Mohekin Abraham's September 16, 1771, assertion of his own continuing rights to those lands despite the fact that he had moved away from them forty years earlier.
  53. These and other aspects of Stockbridge Indian support of the American cause in the Revolution are examined in Thomas F. Devoe, "The Massacre of the Stockbridge Indians, 1778," *Magazine of American History* (1880), 5(3): 187–95; and Frazier, *The Mohicans of Stockbridge*.
  54. Although the engagement was hardly mentioned in dispatches, it was clearly memorable enough to those at the scene. Several journals provide conflicting accounts. The most complete of these are Captain Johann Ewald, *Diary of the American War: A Hessian Journal*, ed. John P. Tustin (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1979), 144–45, and John Graves Simcoe, *Simcoe's Military Journal: A History of the Operations of a Partisan Corps called the Queen's Rangers* (New York: Bartlett and Welford, 1844), 81, 85–86. More recent accounts based on these and other contemporary sources include Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country*; Devoe, "The Massacre of the Stockbridge Indians"; and Frazier, *The Mohicans of Stockbridge*.
  55. Daniel and Abraham are the only Nimhams listed in a return enumerating the seventeen Stockbridge Indians killed in battle during the war in the Pickering Papers (Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston), 62: 167. Muster rolls showing that Aaron, John, Isaac, and a younger Daniel Nimham survived the war may be seen in Roberts, ed., *New York in the Revolution as a Colony and a State*, 2: 209–10. A certificate written by Washington on July 8, 1783, attesting to the loyalty and patriotism of the Muhhekunnuk tribe in the late war appears in the *Writings of George Washington*, 27: 53.