"A Friend To Go Between Them": The Interpreter as Cultural Broker During Anglo-Iroquois Councils, 1740–70

Nancy L. Hagedorn, *College of William and Mary*

Abstract. Indian interpreters, as individuals who straddled the divide between European and Indian cultures, provide an excellent vehicle for studying cultural contact in early America. From their intermediate position between European and Iroquois cultures, these men and women interpreted more than languages. Engaging in activity behind the scenes as well as before the council fire, interpreters mediated an exchange of cultures beyond the domain of words and promises.

In recent years an interest in early American Indian history and an emphasis on ethnohistorical methods have led to new approaches to the study of cultural contact in colonial America. Several historians have chosen to use cross-cultural groups such as missionaries and white Indian captives as vehicles for analysis.[1] Another group that straddled the cultural divide, and in fact moved relatively freely back and forth across it, was that of Indian interpreters. From their intermediate position between European and Indian cultures, these individuals interpreted more than languages. Although linguistic skills were essential, successful mediation between Indians and Englishmen also required a knowledge of the culture and customs of both groups.

Nowhere was the interpreter's presence more obvious and prominent than in the formal conferences between Europeans and Indians. Most conferences between the Iroquois, their allies, and the English followed the same general pattern. Conferences opened with the "usual ceremonies" of condolence, brightening the chain of friendship, and the reiteration of significant past treaties and agreements. Following these initial exchanges of amenities, the conferences generally proceeded to the specific business at hand and consisted of a series of morning and afternoon sessions constituting a formal dialogue between the two sides of the fire.[2] Although

Ethnohistory 35:1 (Winter 1988). CCC 0014-1801/88/$1.50.

the roots of forest diplomacy can be traced to the Iroquois Condolence Council, a ritual for mourning dead chiefs and installing their successors, by the mid-eighteenth century it incorporated many elements borrowed from European practice. Gun salutes, toasts, the distribution of European trade goods as presents at the conclusion of councils, and especially the keeping of written records of the proceedings and treaties were European innovations.[3] In short, the Indian conference is a product par excellence of European-Indian contact, as well as one of the primary arenas in which contact occurred.[4] In order to be successful in their dealings with the Iroquois, English government officials found it necessary to operate within the established system of Iroquois council protocol, just as the Indians had to accept and adopt certain colonial practices. At the center of this process of adaptation and accommodation was the interpreter.

Interpreters, who were active behind the scenes as well as before the council fire, mediated the interchange of cultures as they facilitated the exchange of words and promises. Culture, the "idealized pattern of meanings, values, and norms differentially shared by the members of a society," is based on humankind's "ability to symbol." The arbitrary meanings and values that a society assigns to speech sounds, colors, objects, and activities find expression in its language, religion, customs, institutions, rituals, games, and material artifacts.[5] The English and the Iroquois brought different cultural perceptions, expectations, meanings, and values to the elaborate rituals and specialized oratory of Anglo-Iroquois councils. As interpreters translated and explained disparate languages and rituals infused with culturally based meanings and values, they mediated the exchange of English and Iroquois culture across the council fire.[6]

The delicate and important nature of the business of the Six Nations and the English required "a Friend to go between them"—a person of "Ability and Integrity" in whom both sides could "place a Confidence."[7] Failure to represent both the English and the Indians fairly and accurately could easily lead to misunderstandings. Although some historians have characterized interpreters as generally unscrupulous individuals who slanted translations for their own ends without any checks upon them, such a judgment is too harsh.[8] Undoubtedly, interpreters were motivated by self-interest, at least in part, and their trustworthiness was sometimes questioned. Rarely, however, did they operate completely without checks or restraints. When doubts about an interpreter's integrity or ability arose on either the Indian or the English side, others were employed, formally or informally, to "assist" and check the accuracy of his translations.[9] Still, the ideal interpreter was one known to be "equally faithful in the Interpretation of whatever is said to him by either of us."[10] Conrad Weiser was one interpreter who seemed to fit this image of an individual "equally allied to both" sides. Having adopted him, the Indians "divided him into

two equal Parts," keeping one for themselves and leaving the other for the Europeans.[11] Although the British Indian Department, and presumably the Indians, always tried to procure similar men "of the best Character, and Knowledge" to serve as interpreters, abilities and trustworthiness varied as much as the individuals filling the positions.[12]

Between 1740 and 1770 more than one hundred men and women of varied ethnic and occupational backgrounds served as interpreters in the British colonial territories north of Virginia. Approximately one-third of them worked at least partially, if not exclusively, among the Iroquois (see Appendix); only a handful, however, became prominent in the records of Anglo-Iroquois councils. Without exception, these people demonstrated a command not only of English and one or more Indian languages, but also of European and Iroquois "Methods of Business."[13] As one English observer noted in 1756, Europeans differed from native Americans "no less in our martial and political conduct and principles, than in our complexions and manners." In fact, the art of European diplomacy proved "very useless, indeed, . . . when transported to the banks of the Ohio, or applied to treaties with wild Indians."[14] The Iroquois also recognized these differences and encouraged potential interpreters to "learn the ways and manners of the Indians in propounding any matter" so that they would know "how negotiations were carried on, when conducted according to their method."[15]

The interpreters' language skills and sensitivity to culturally different methods of doing business were not easily acquired. *Métis,* as persons of mixed European and Indian parentage, were particularly well suited for the position of interpreter and came by the required knowledge most easily. Not surprisingly, two of the most prominent mid-eighteenth-century interpreters, Arent Stevens and Andrew Montour, were métis.[16] Those men not so fortunate to be born with a foot in each culture had to acquire the necessary skills in other ways. Most Euro-Americans who interpreted learned Iroquois languages and customs while living with the Indians for an extended period as guests, traders, missionaries, or captives. As Sir William Johnson told Lord Hillsborough in 1769, an intimate knowledge of Indian affairs was not to be gained "during the period of a Governor's residence at an American Capital, of a Commandant at an Outpost, or of a Traveller in the Country. . . . It is only to be acquired by a long residence amongst them, a daily intercourse with them, and a desire of information in these matters Superseding all other considerations."[17] Similarly, the few Iroquois, like Joseph Brant, who served the English as interpreters, seem to have become familiar with English language and customs during a sojourn among the British, often at one of the schools established for their education.[18] Relatively few men, European or Indian, ever attained the command of European protocol and the level of famil-

iarity with Iroquois custom and culture that were necessary for them to function effectively as council interpreters.

According to the pattern preserved in contemporary Iroquois oral tradition, a conference ideally consisted of four stages.[19] The first three involved the invitation process, while the resulting scheduled council constituted the fourth. Each stage of the sequence amounted to a council in its own right. Unfortunately, since substantive issues were taken up only at the final council, Europeans frequently neglected to record the earlier stages in detail. Nevertheless, examples of all of the different types of councils appear in the colonial records. Every phase of the sequence involved interpreters as translators, messengers, agents, and advisors for one side or the other, and in all of them interpreters played the role of cultural brokers.

All conferences opened with a series of ceremonies designed to "remove all Obstructions to a good Understanding" before taking up the issues at hand.[20] The first of these rituals commenced with the arrival and greeting of the visitors, Indian or English, "At the Wood's Edge." Focusing on the symbolic removal of obstructions that might have entered the travelers' eyes, ears, or throats during their journey, the ritual freed them to devote their full attention to the upcoming council discussions.[21] Similarly, scheduled conferences began with the "usual Ceremony of Condolence," a series of ritualized exchanges featuring the mourning of any deaths that had occurred on either side of the council fire since the participants' last meeting. The condolence was designed to clear the lines of communication between the participants and enabled them to speak "freely and candidly" to each other.[22] Although they are seldom fully described by English writers, these proceedings apparently took up an "abundance of time and consumed a large Quantity of Wampum." Most important, the ceremonies could not be dispensed with even though the English often found them "tedious" and "fatiguing." Until these courtesies had been received by both sides, the participants could not proceed to the business for which they had come.[23]

Once the opening exchanges began, interpreters assumed a central role in the proceedings as translators. Protocol entitled each party to speak in its own language, so all speeches had to be translated into the language of the listeners by an interpreter. If more than one group sat opposite the speaker, each was accorded the same courtesy of hearing the speech in its own language. In the nonliterate Indian cultures of the northeastern woodlands, the spoken word assumed great importance, and since memory constituted the primary historical record, it was imperative that everyone clearly understood all that transpired at treaty councils. Even when the parties involved were familiar with each other's languages, the repetition of a speech in the listener's tongue diminished the possibility of

misunderstandings and undoubtedly reinforced the message in his mind. In addition, the privilege of hearing a speech in one's own tongue was viewed as a sign of the speaker's respect for his listener. Because of the diversity and difficulty of the Indian languages involved, several interpreters might be needed at a single conference, each taking his turn on the floor to translate the message.[24]

Although the image of the interpreter as translator is dominant, a closer look reveals that more was going on than at first meets the eye. On the most basic level, translation required an interpreter familiar with the basic grammar and vocabulary of the two languages involved. Although the Iroquoian languages of the Six Nations were diverse, complex, and difficult for untutored English ears and tongues to master, many individuals, particularly traders and missionaries, achieved "a tolerable understanding" of an Indian language and could translate "common conversation." Most, however, could "only poorly comprehend a '*public*' speech delivered in an oratorical style and dress."[25] The distinction between "common conversation" and public oratory alludes to the significantly different levels of linguistic competence required of casual and council interpreters. The translation of a council speech required a great deal more than a rudimentary understanding of the language in which the talk was delivered; it involved the distinct yet deeply related elements of accuracy in content and accuracy in form and style. Prominent, competent council interpreters were masters of both.

Metaphorical speech was probably the most obvious and culturally circumscribed of the "Indian forms" interpreters encountered in translating council speeches.[26] Indian orators frequently spoke in symbolic, allegorical terms that conveyed their opinions, moods, and values to sensitive and culturally informed interpreters. The Covenant Chain, the Tree of Peace, the path, and the fire symbolically expressed Iroquois perceptions of the relationship between themselves and the British while subtly conveying broader implications about the nature of alliances and how to maintain them in Iroquois culture. Relational forms of address, such as "Father" or "Brother," also contained vital clues to Indian perceptions of the Anglo-Iroquois relationship and the responsibilities each party owed to the other.[27] In order to find linguistic equivalents, interpreters had to have a clear understanding of the hidden, culturally prescribed meanings and values that metaphors conveyed.[28] They used their knowledge not only in translating Indian speeches but also when called upon to advise their employers about how to respond to the Indians seated across the fire.

Adept at finding linguistic equivalents for unfamiliar forms and concepts, the best council interpreters also fluently duplicated the style, organization, and rhetorical devices employed by Iroquois and English

speakers. The method of translation allowed the interpreter the latitude necessary to adapt and duplicate a speaker's oratorical formula, since he usually waited until the end of a short speech or until the close of a section or proposal in a longer speech before giving a translation.[29] Not all interpreters were proficient enough to perform in this manner, however. At Albany in 1746, when the public interpreter was taken ill and could not fulfill his duties,

> several were employed, who had Knowledge sufficient in the Language of the Six Nations, to make themselves be understood, and to understand what was spoke to them; yet none of them were so much Masters of the Language, as to speak with that Propriety and Distinctness that is expected, and usual on so solemn an Occasion. It was thought therefore proper, to make one of the Sachems understand the speech, by the Assistance of the common Interpreters, that he might be able to deliver it Paragraph by Paragraph, as it should be spoke.[30]

The interpreter's ability to adapt disparate speech patterns and forms to rough equivalency during conferences demonstrated his skill as a cultural broker. It also made him an indispensable part of the basic communication process at Anglo-Iroquois councils.[31]

The proficient interpreter could also use the latitude given him by the paragraph-by-paragraph method of translation to exercise considerable discretionary power in rendering the content of speeches. By subtly altering the tone or style of a speaker's remarks, the interpreter could sometimes direct the course of a series of exchanges toward a desired end or away from misunderstandings. As William Johnson explained to Lord Hillsborough in 1757, he sometimes "softened" the translation of speeches "without deviating from their meaning, because I found them rather more animated than they often are, or than I desired." He believed that without his tempering of the Indians' "mode of Expression," their meanings "might be liable to misconstruction unless due allowance be made for them as Savages who have the most extravagant notions of Freedom, property, and independence."[32] Interpreters undoubtedly followed similar practices for similar reasons. Although such discretionary power could be abused by interpreters, most seem to have judged wisely, acting as true mediators interested in maintaining amicable relations between the two sides of the fire.

Errors in judgment or translation could be disastrous and easily arose "from not knowing the distinctions amongst the Indians, or how to express their Ideas from the uncommon mode of Stile they make use of."[33] Even skilled interpreters had difficulties on occasion. At a council in Philadelphia in February 1756, two interpreters, John Davison and Con-

rad Weiser, differed in their interpretations of part of a Seneca chief's speech. Unable to resolve the matter immediately, Weiser and Davison met with the Indians and settled between them the "true Interpretation," which was delivered by Weiser the following day.[34] In 1757 Governor Denny attempted to prevent such occurrences by asking the Indians to give their speeches to the interpreters before speaking them in public, "that they might understand their Meaning before they were to deliver them."[35]

In addition to adapting "Indian Forms" to English (and vice versa), the interpreter had to be familiar with the Indians' manner of speech and delivery, since he was frequently called on to act as the appointed speaker for one side or the other. As speakers, interpreters had to "observe and perform all the ceremonies expected by and in use among Indians, from persons when the[y] spake on publick matters."[36] Depending on the nature of the speech or the ceremony of which it was a part, the words might be sung, chanted, or spoken "with the air and Gesture of an Orator," the speaker walking to and fro "with much composure and gravity in . . . [his] countenance."[37] Even Cadwallader Colden, who was ignorant of their language, was struck by the Indians' "great Fluency of Words" and the "Grace in their Manner" when speaking. In a culture where no person had the power to compel obedience, the "Arts of Persuasion" alone prevailed. So high were the standards of elegant and fluent council speech, in fact, that few Indians "themselves are so far Masters of their Language, as never offend the Ears of their Indian Auditory. . . . They have it seems, a certain *Urbanitas*, or Atticism, in their language, of which the common Ears are ever sensible, though only their great Speakers attain to it."[38] To speak effectively, the council interpreter had to be familiar with these oratorical customs and the "ceremonials of publick meetings" and perform in the appropriate and expected manner.[39] If he could not, he employed someone else, usually an Indian, to speak for him.

As the conference proceeded and the appointed speakers exchanged words across the council fire, large quantities of wampum also changed hands, since the passing of a wampum string or belt punctuated each proposal or section of a speech. The subject and gravity of the proposal or statement represented by the wampum determined the size, color, and pattern of the belt or string. Black or predominantly black strings and belts generally accompanied topics relating to death or war. Figures or emblems might also be worked into the larger, more important belts.[40] Once a belt had been received across the council fire, protocol demanded that similar belts or strings accompany each portion of the respondents' reply. When responding, the speaker displayed the received belts and strings in the order they were delivered by laying them upon a table or hanging them across a stick and repeating what was said on each. At the end of

every article, he returned thanks, added his group's reply, and passed the new wampum across the fire.[41] The return of the original belt without another one in reply indicated a rebuke or the rejection of the petitioners' proposal.[42] Apparently, the motive in presenting wampum was to elicit a formal response, since without it none was necessary or expected. The Indians paid no attention to any "Message or Invitation be it of what consequence or nature it will, unless attended or confirmed by a String or Belt of Wampum."[43] The exchange of wampum thus served as the principal means of regulating and structuring the flow of the council's business and ensuring the orderly succession of speakers from the two sides of the fire.[44]

Wampum's importance in Iroquois council protocol required the interpreter to be familiar with its uses and significance. Since his English employers relied on his expert advice when planning the delivery of speeches and responses during conferences, the interpreter had responsibility for choosing the appropriate wampum. If none of suitable type or value was available in the government's council bag, the interpreter had to procure it, usually by employing some Indian women to make the needed belts or strings.[45] When the interpreter could not be present to make the selection himself, he sent his advice in writing to the governor or his representatives. Conrad Weiser, for example, wrote to Governor Hamilton in September of 1754 regarding a forthcoming council: "The Wampums are marked and your Honour will easily see to what Article they belong. The largest Belt of the Delawares is of very great Consequence and Importance, and ought to be answered in a very solemn manner by your Honour and the Council, including the House of Representatives, with a much larger Belt and a moving Speech." Weiser went on to assert that the Pennsylvania government "should give large Belts. The Wampums are cheap, and make, if worked into Belts and attended with proper Speeches, good Impressions."[46] Although the interpreters might not have fully understood the meaning placed on wampum by the Indians, they certainly knew what was required to make effective, proper impressions during Indian-European conferences. This information proved invaluable to the English colonial governments.

Beside the obvious necessity of being familiar with the Indians' language, manner of speaking, and the uses and functions of wampum, the interpreter also had to be sensitive to more subtle aspects of Indian behavior. One of the most difficult to deal with, given the impatience of the British, was the Iroquois' penchant for careful deliberation. Their extreme care and thoughtfulness manifested itself in several ways during public councils, the most obvious of which was their slow and deliberate manner of speaking. Before beginning a speech, an orator frequently walked around the assembly "with a mediative aspect, as if collect-

ing his thoughts."[47] Similar pauses often punctuated long proposals and addresses, as the speaker paced up and down for several minutes preparing himself to begin the next section of his talk. The interpreter had to be aware of the Indians' deliberateness of action so that he could present himself and his speeches with the proper decorum and avoid the possibility of misunderstandings caused by undue haste on the part of the English—or undue slowness on the part of the Indians.

While the English were frequently impressed by the gravity and poise of Indian orators and could perhaps appreciate their careful habits of speech, they were less understanding about the Indians' insistence on respites both before and during conferences. In 1768 Governor Henry Moore of New York arrived at William Johnson's house for a conference and was offended by Colonel Guy Johnson's failure to bring the Indians to meet with him immediately. William Johnson later explained that the situation had not arisen from the unexpectedness or unwelcomeness of his excellency's coming, but because the Indians "declined doing business on the day of your Arrival"; as it was, they felt that "every thing was Conducted with Rather too much rapidity."[48] Similar delays punctuated the business sessions once a conference began, since the Indians refused to return an immediate answer to a serious question, however obvious it was. Indeed, there was "nothing they contemn so much as precipitation in publick councils."[49] Cadwallader Colden asserted that "Every sudden Repartee, in a publick treaty, leaves with them an Impression of a light inconsiderate Mind."[50] Consequently, conferences lasted many days when a number of important points were to be raised and discussed, and private sessions, during which one side or the other considered its reply to a set of proposals, frequently interrupted the public councils.[51] The private councils provided the forum in which the principal issues were "first agitated, and the sentiments of the rest best known."[52] Even at these sessions, all deliberations were conducted "with Extraordinary regularity & Decorum," though debate could be quite animated.[53] Although the business transacted at these private conferences must have been voluminous, few English participants bothered to record them in detail, concentrating instead on the final results as revealed in public councils.

The interpreter often found himself involved in these private deliberations, particularly on occasions when the British and the Six Nations sat on the same side of the council fire. Protocol dictated that no one could speak for a tribe or group unless he had been mutually appointed by all he was to represent. Neither could anyone speak his private views during public sessions of the council. Rather, whenever a proposal required a reply, those involved retired to carefully consider the issue privately and consolidate their position.[54] When acting together, the English and their Indian allies had to agree on the content of speeches, wampum, and a suitable speaker prior to each public session. Reaching such agreement

could take a long time and required the participation of skilled diplomats and interpreters.[55] At these private sessions, the interpreter often served as the British government's representative and helped negotiate the details of the speeches and wampums to be delivered. On a journey to Onondaga in 1743, Conrad Weiser recorded that the Onondagas "held another Private Council, and sent for me and Shikellimo [an adopted Oneida]; every thing was discoursed over again, and we agreed that Canassatego [an Onondaga sachem] should speak in behalf of the Government of Virginia; and the Wampums were divided into so many parts as there were Articles to be spoken of."[56] On other occasions the Indians requested an interpreter's presence during their deliberations so that he could advise them or answer questions. Conrad Weiser, an adopted member of the Six Nations Council as well as an English interpreter, apparently served the Indians in this capacity a number of times.[57]

The interpreter's presence was even more evident during private English councils, where he acted as an advisor and consultant. One vital service he performed for his employers was the writing of speeches and replies to the Indians. In addition to putting the speeches into proper Indian forms, the interpreter often advised the governors and their councils about the content and tone of their messages. During the Lancaster Conference in 1757, for example, the Governor's Council met on May 14 to discuss the preceding day's events. "The Minutes of Yesterday's Conferences were produced by Mr. Croghan, and read, and it was then considered what shou'd be said to the Indians. . . . The Governor on this desired to know what might be a proper Answer to the Indians, And Mr. Croghan giving the Heads of Answers to the Indian Speeches, which were read Paragraph by Paragraph, it was referred to him and Mr. Weiser to put them into Form."[58] Disagreements between interpreters regarding the appropriateness of a response could complicate and prolong private council sessions. Just three days before this apparently amicable collaboration between George Croghan and Conrad Weiser, the two had disagreed on the tone that should be taken in another council speech. The address went through three drafts before they found an acceptable compromise.[59]

The interpreter also gave advice on a number of other aspects of the conference proceedings. Most important, he generally served as the primary source of information on Indian custom and protocol, advising English governmental representatives regarding the ceremonies and courtesies that were expected of them, the posture that should be assumed toward the Indians, proper procedures regarding wampum received, and even such fine points as who had the right to choose the place or time for an upcoming council.[60] Presents given to the Indians at the close of a conference were also chosen by "advising with the interpreter as to the Quantity and Quality."[61]

A skillful diplomat or interpreter could manipulate protocol to gain

the upper hand in council negotiations. The allocation of the roles of host and petitioner, for example, could be critical in the organization of a council, since the host group spoke first during the greeting phase of a council and gained a psychological "home field" advantage over their guests. Even more critical was the position of the petitioners in a council. Since they spoke first during the business portion of the conference, they set the agenda of the council meeting, forcing the other group to respond to their proposals before introducing new topics for consideration.[62] Aware of such fine points of protocol, a knowledgeable interpreter could foresee and forestall problems and thereby helped his employers operate effectively within the system to meet their goals.

Given the complexities and subtleties of council protocol and custom, it is hardly surprising that breaches of protocol occurred. "The manner of saying things to Indians depends so much on Forms & a narrow Observation of them and their Dispositions at the Time of speaking to them" that it seemed impossible at times to avoid offending them.[63] Some mistakes engendered no more than laughter and mild embarassment, as an inexperienced interpreter filling in for Weiser at Albany in 1746 discovered. Following the expected procedure, he "returned the Yo-hah at the End of every Paragraph, and having done the same at the Time they [the Indians] declared War [on the French], it occasioned Laughter among them; upon which, observing his Mistake, he began the War-Shout, in which all the Indians joined."[64] Not all breaches, however, were so easily mended. On several occasions the English overlooked or forgot expected ceremonies, creating a temporary lapse in good relations and bringing the proceedings to a halt until the oversight was remedied. In 1755 the Mohawks complained to the governor of Pennsylvania that the governor of New York had failed to remove the hatchet from their hands at the close of hostilities against the French. According to Indian custom, before peace could be made between two offending parties and normal relations restored, the hatchet of war had to be removed from their hands and heads. New York's oversight kept the Mohawks from dealing with that colony and led them to approach Pennsylvania instead. At Easton in 1758 Conrad Weiser avoided a similar breach by convincing Governor Denny of the necessity of observing the ceremonial removal of the French hatchet from Delaware, Shawnee, and western Iroquois hands, as well as English heads, before proceeding to the business of peacemaking.[65] At other times Indians delayed meetings with the English because "Young Warriors and not Counsellors" brought the invitation message or because the wampum sent was "no more than Strings."[66] Ultimately, given the disparity of the cultures in contact, it is surprising that more misunderstandings did not occur, and the interpreters must receive a good deal of the credit.

One means of avoiding mistakes was the interpreters' frequent em-

ployment of Indians as advisors and speakers during councils. An interpreter sometimes found it personally advantageous to secure the services of a knowledgeable Indian to "serve him as his private Counsellor, and direct him what Measures to take" to ensure a desired result.[67] When unsure of the proper procedure or ceremony called for on a particular occasion, the interpreter generally engaged an Indian to act in his place as his representative. While attending a conference at Onondaga in 1743, Conrad Weiser was forced to ask Canassatego "to speak for me in Open Council, as I would tell him, Article by Article . . . because . . . it required some Ceremonies with which I was not acquainted."[68] Even after years of experience among the Indians, interpreters sometimes found themselves at a loss and had to engage surrogate speakers.[69] Under such circumstances, however, the interpreter carefully briefed the Indian speaker beforehand and closely monitored him for accuracy during the council to see that he "acquitted himself of his Trust faithfully, and had delivered the Sense of the Speech clearly and distinctly."[70]

A less ethical means of avoiding breaches of protocol and misunderstandings was the interpreter's use of his discretionary power to decide what to interpret. At Easton in 1758 Weiser and Montour avoided an open misunderstanding between the Six Nations and the Delawares by refusing to interpret a heated denunciation of the Delaware chief, Teedyuscung, by Nichas, one of the Mohawk speakers. If they had publicly translated the speech and entered it into the records, the Indians would have been forced to act upon it. Weiser and Montour, by choosing not to translate it in open council and by persuading the Indians to allow them to interpret it for the governor and his council privately the following morning, diffused a potentially disastrous situation and allowed the antagonists to clear the air.[71] On other occasions, while translating, interpreters may have used their power more subtly to smooth over or tone down potential points of discord or disagreement.

Although the majority of available information pertains to interpreters in the service of the English, the Iroquois and their allies also required the assistance of cultural brokers to "prevent Misunderstandings arising" between them and their English brethren.[72] Unfortunately, since written records were kept only by the European participants, the surviving information on interpreters serving the Indians consists primarily of observations made by Europeans. Although most of the individuals employed by the Indians as interpreters seem to have been Indians or métis, they sometimes employed Euro-Americans, usually interpreters, in much the same way that the English secured the services of Indians as speakers and advisors.[73] In addition, although there are few recorded examples of interpreters advising Indians on European diplomatic procedures and customs, Indian demands for written copies of deeds and

treaties, as well as the incorporation of gun salutes and toasts into council ceremonies, were undoubtedly due in part to the interpreters' experience and advice. Neither the Indians nor the English could function effectively in council without the assistance of interpreters.

Once the business of a conference was completed, the meetings were closed with yet another series of ceremonies in which the interpreter often played a central role. Conrad Weiser reported at Onondaga in 1743 that "after all was over, according to the Ancient Custom of that fire, a song of friendship and Joy was sung by the Chiefs, after this the Council fire on their side was put out. I with the same Ceremonee put out the fire on behalf of Assaryquoa & Onas [the governors of Virginia and Pennsylvania], and they departed."[74] Feasting, toasts, and the exchange of presents usually followed the extinguishing of the council fire.[75] Even during these festivities, the interpreter's presence was centrally felt and seen. During the great dinner at the Lancaster treaty in 1744, the interpreter, again Conrad Weiser, "stood betwixt the tables, where the Governor sat, and that, at which the sachems were placed, who, by order of his Honour, was desired to inform the Indians he drank their healths, which he did."[76] After all was concluded, the visitors took their leave of their hosts and departed on their homeward journey.

The interpreter performed a vital service for both the Iroquois and the English as they confronted each other across the council fires of New York and Pennsylvania during the mid-eighteenth century. During public council sessions and behind the scenes, these men were actively involved in mediating the meeting and exchange of the cultures that came into contact during Anglo-Iroquois conferences. Satisfaction of the demands made upon them required special skills and an intimate knowledge of more than one culture. The image of the interpreter as translator, while important, represents only one facet of the variety of complex roles he played as go-between for the English and their Indian allies.

Appendix

Interpreters Among the Iroquois, 1740–70*

Baker, John. English(?). Interpreter at Niagara, 1767.

Barclay, Henry. English(?). Missionary at Albany & Ft. Hunter, 1738–41. Interpreter in private conferences for Cadwallader Colden, 1746.

Bleecker, Jacobus. (1716–c. 1747). Dutch. Son of interpreter, Johannes J. Bleecker; nephew of Albany recorder, Rutger Bleecker; grandson of interpreter, Jan Janse Bleecker. Sworn interpreter, 1742–47, replaced Lawrence Claese Van der Volgen.

Bleecker, John. Dutch. Interpreter at Niagara, 1767.

Brant, Joseph [Thayandanega]. (1742–1807). Mohawk. War chief; brother of

Molly Brant; protégé of Sir William Johnson; attended Eleazar Wheelock's school, 1761–63. Interpreter, 1763–75.

Butler, John. (c. 1728–96). English(?). Interpreter and agent, 1744–76; for the Crown under Sir William Johnson after 1755.

Chabert de Joncaire, Daniel-Marie. (c. 1714–71). French. Son of Louis-Thomas and brother of Philippe-Thomas, both French interpreters and agents. Interpreter and agent for French among Senecas and Ohio Indians; replaced his brother as principal agent after 1748.

Chabert de Joncaire, Philippe-Thomas [Nitachinon]. (1707–c. 1766). French. Son of Louis-Thomas and brother of Daniel-Marie, both French interpreters and agents. Soldier, trader. Interpreter and agent for French in western New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, 1735–48.

Claus, Daniel. (1727–87). German. Tutor to Samuel Weiser, lived with Mohawks, c. 1750. Deputy agent under Sir William Johnson, 1756–60; deputy superintendent for Canadian Indians, 1760–75. Interpreter, 1755–56.

Clement, Jacobus. (1718–?). Dutch(?). Interpreter and messenger, 1755–59.

Croghan, George. (?–1782). Irish. Trader and land speculator. Pennsylvania agent to Ohio Indians, 1752–56; deputy agent under Sir William Johnson, 1756–c. 1770. Associated primarily with Ohio Indians, though had ties to Mohawks through "marriage" to daughter of chief Nickas; his daughter, Catherine, married Joseph Brant. Interpreter, 1752–70.

Davison, John. English(?). Interpreter, 1755–56.

Girty, Simon. (c. 1741–1818). Irish(?). Captured and adopted by Senecas as a youth, c. 1756–59. Interpreter for Senecas at Ft. Pitt, c. 1760–74.

Johnston, John. English(?). Smith among the Senecas. Interpreter, 1764; at Cayuga, 1769.

Kirkland, Samuel. (1741–1808). English(?). Educated at Eleazar Wheelock's school; sent to Mohawks to learn language, 1761; taught among Mohawks, 1764; served among Senecas, 1765–66; missionary to Oneidas, 1766–c. 1808. Interpreter on many occasions, 1761–1808.

Lowry, James. English(?). Interpreter, 1756.

Meanner, John. English(?). Interpreter at Ft. Pitt, 1763–72.

Montour, Andrew [Henry Montour, Sattelihu]. (c. 1710–72). French-Huron/Oneida. Son of Madame Montour [Elizabeth Couc] and brother of Lewis Montour, both interpreters. Interpreter for Pennsylvania, 1744–54; for Sir William Johnson, 1755–65; and at Ft. Pitt, 1767–72.

Montour, Lewis. French-Huron/Oneida(?). Son of Madame Montour and brother of Andrew, both interpreters. Interpreter, 1756.

Montour, Madame [Elizabeth Couc, La Chenette]. (c. 1667–c. 1750). French/Huron. Captive of Iroquois, c. 1695. Mother of Lewis and Andrew Montour. Interpreter, c. 1711–44.

Perthuis, Louis [Ohoa]. (?–1775). French. Interpreter for French in Canada to 1763; appointed by Sir William Johnson as interpreter for Six Nations, especially Senecas, 1765.

Phillips, Philip. Dutch. Apparently captured by French Indians, c. 1747. Interpreter at Ft. Stanwix, 1768; mentioned as an interpreter, 1770–75.

Pickett, John. English. Nephew of Conrad Weiser, taken to live with the Mohawks, c. 1750. Interpreter to minister at Canajoharie, 1758–59.

Printup, William, Jr. [Saggudderiaghta]. (?–c. 1789). French Huguenot(?). Smith among Mohawks, Onondagas, and Senecas. Son of William Printup, Sr., a smith and interpreter among the Mohawks. Interpreter, 1750–63.

Sherlock, James. Possibly a runaway slave or "deserter" mentioned as a smith among the Senecas at Chenussio, c. 1764. Interpreter at Easton, 1761.

Smith. English(?). Interpreter at Mt. Johnson, 1755.

Stevens, Arent. (1702–58). Mohawk/English. Son of Lea Stevens, a Mohawk and an interpreter. Interpreter for New York, c. 1738–57; for Sir William Johnson, 1757–58.

Stevens, Arent, Jr.(?) Son of Arent Stevens(?). Interpreter, 1770.

Stevens, Jonathan. (?–1755). Soldier, killed at Lake George. Son of Arent Stevens(?). Interpreter at Mt. Johnson, 1755.

Van Eps, John Baptist. Dutch. Trader. Interpreter, 1768.

Weiser, Conrad [Tarachiawagon, Siguras]. (1696–1760). German. Lived with Mohawks as a youth, c. 1712. Father of Samuel Weiser, uncle of John Pickett. Interpreter, 1756–61.

Weiser, Samuel. (c. 1730–?). German. Lived with Mohawks as youth, c. 1750. Son of Conrad Weiser. Interpreter, 1756–61.

Wells. English(?). Interpreter, 1757.

Wemple, Andrew. Dutch. Smith at Ft. Ontario, 1769–70. Interpreter at Ft. Ontario, 1769–70.

Wemple, Barent. (c. 1732–71). Dutch. Trader. Son of Myndert Wemple, smith among the Senecas. Interpreter, 1757.

Wemple, Hendrick. (c. 1730–c. 1790). Dutch. Son of Myndert Wemple(?), smith among the Senecas. Interpreter for Samuel Kirkland.

Wendell, Abraham. (?–1755). Dutch. Interpreter, 1743–44.

Zeisberger, David. (1721–1808). German. Moravian missionary, lived with Mohawks to learn their language, 1745. Interpreter, 1745–63.

* Compiled primarily from information in *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*; *The Documentary History of the State of New-York*; *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New-York*, 15 vols. (Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons, and Co., 1853–87); *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*; "Persons Participating in Iroquois Treaties," in *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy*, 229–55; the *Dictionary of American Biography*; and *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Much of this information is very sketchy and subject to future revision.

Notes

1 For example, see James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); James Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 32 (1975): 55–88; and James P. Ronda, "'We Are Well As We Are': An Indian Critique of Seventeenth-Century Christian Missions," *WMQ*, 3d ser., 34 (1977): 66–82.

2 Michael K. Foster, "On Who Spoke First at Iroquois-White Councils: An Exercise in the Method of Upstreaming," in *Extending the Rafters: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Iroquoian Studies*, ed. Michael K. Foster, Jack Campisi, and Marianne Mithun (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984), 183–84.

3 Samuel Hazard, ed., *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania, from the Organization to the Termination of the Proprietary Government*, Colonial Records of Pennsylvania (CRP), vols. 1–10 (Harrisburg, PA: Theo. Fenn & Co., 1851–52), 5: 313. Michael K. Foster, "Another Look at the Function of Wampum in Iroquois-White Councils," in *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy: An Interdisciplinary Guide to the Treaties of the Six Nations and Their League*, ed. Francis Jennings, William N. Fenton, Mary A. Druke, and David R. Miller (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1985), 100, 111 n. 4; William N. Fenton, "Collecting Materials for a Political History of the Six Nations," American Philosophical Society, *Proceedings* 93 (1949): 235; William N. Fenton, *American Indian and White Relations to 1830: Needs and Opportunities for Study* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957), 22–24; William N. Fenton, "Iroquoian Culture History: A General Evaluation," Bureau of American Ethnology, *Bulletin* 180 (1961): 272; William N. Fenton, "The New York State Wampum Collection: The Case for the Integrity of Cultural Treasures," American Philosophical Society, *Proceedings* 115 (1971): 446.

4 Foster, "Another Look," 100.

5 James L. Axtell, "Ethnohistory: An Historian's Viewpoint," *Ethnohistory* 26 / 1 (Winter 1979): 2; William W. Newcomb, Jr., "Introduction," *North American Indians: An Anthropological Perspective*, Goodyear Regional Anthropology Series (Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), 18.

6 How well the interpreter mediated between the different meanings and values involved in council negotiations could materially affect the perceived validity of any agreement reached. See Mary A. Druke, "Iroquois Treaties: Common Forms, Varying Interpretations," in Jennings et al., *History and Culture*, 85–98.

7 Cadwallader Colden, *The History of the Five Indian Nations of Canada which are dependent on the Province of New York, and are a barrier between the English and the French in that part of the World*, 2 vols. (New York: Allerton Book Co., 1922), 2: 111, 188; CRP 6: 60.

8 Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies from its beginnings to the Lancaster Treaty of 1744* (New York: Norton, 1984), 63.

9 Questions regarding an interpreter's trustworthiness could arise for a variety of reasons ranging from greed and self-interest to ethnic background or intoxication. See, for example, Sir William Johnson, *The Papers of Sir William Johnson (WJP)*, ed. Alexander C. Flick et al., 14 vols. (Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1921–62), 3: 771; 4: 723; 6: 401; 9: 164, 625. When such doubts arose, another more familiar or seemingly more trustworthy interpreter might be engaged, CRP 6: 193; 8: 639. In addition, at least rudimentary bilingualism seems to have been surprisingly widespread among Indian department officials, traders, and missionaries. See, for example, Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 235; *WJP* 2: 660; 11: 741. Indian multilingualism is much harder to gauge, but some Indians certainly understood a European language. Teedyuscung, the Delaware chief, and other Indians

sometimes had their own private interpreters present at conferences. See, for example, CRP 7: 205.

10 CRP 4: 581.

11 Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 111, 113; CRP 8: 631. Conrad Weiser was a Pennsylvanian of German descent, who acquired a knowledge of Iroquois languages and customs while living with the Mohawks as a young man. He served as Pennsylvania's official Indian agent and interpreter during the 1740s and 1750s.

12 *WJP* 12: 85.

13 Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 101; CRP 4: 576.

14 A. Millar, ed., *An Account of Conferences Held and Treaties made, Between Major-General Sir William Johnson, Bart. and The chief Sachems and Warriours of the . . . Indian Nations in North America* (London, 1756), iii.

15 William M. Beauchamp, ed., *Moravian Journals Relating to Central New York, 1745–66*, Onondaga Historical Association (Syracuse, NY: The Dehler Press, 1916), 119, 123.

16 While the term *métis* normally applies to persons who have one French and one Indian parent, it is here extended to include all individuals of mixed European and Indian ancestry as preferable to the terms "mixed bloods" or "half-breeds." Although métis may have come by their interpretive abilities more easily than Euro-Americans or Indians, their in-between status presented unique problems of identity, both for themselves and for the Iroquois and Europeans with whom they worked. Andrew Montour, for example, sometimes appears in the rosters of conference attendees as a "white" man and at others as an Indian. See CRP 5: 431; 6: 160, 588; 7: 64. Count Zinzendorf clearly revealed the confusion surrounding Montour in his description of their first meeting at Shamokin in 1742. Montour's "cast of countenance is decidedly European, and had not his face been encircled with a broad band of paint, applied with bear's fat, I would certainly have taken him for one. He wore a brown broadcloth coat, a scarlet damasken lappel waist-coat, breeches, over which his shirt hung, a black Cordovan neckerchief decked with silver bugles, shoes and stockings, and a hat. His ears were hung with pendants of brass and other wires plaited together like the handles of a basket. He was very cordial, but on addressing him in French, he, to my surprise, replied in English" (William M. Darlington, *Christopher Gist's Journals with Historical, Geographical, and Ethnological Notes and Biographies of His Contemporaries* [New York: Argonaut Press Ltd., 1966], 175).

17 E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *The Documentary History of the State of New-York* (*DHNY*), 4 vols. (Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons & Co., Public Printers, 1849), 2: 947. In a letter to George Clinton, March 12, 1754, Johnson suggested that "Some Young People of learning, at least Grammar[, be sent] to reside among them [Indians] in order to become good interpreters which are verry much wanted" (*WJP* 9: 127). See also *WJP* 10: 469. Interestingly, unlike Conrad and Samuel Weiser, Daniel Claus, David Zeisberger, and others who served as interpreters, Johnson never actually resided with the Indians for any length of time. This gap in his training, while filled to some extent by his close association with Molly Brant, may account for his heavy reliance on council interpreters despite his ability to converse in Mohawk. When he treated with the Indians in council they considered him "as an Englishman, ignorant of their language; conversing all along by an interpreter" (Millar, *Account of Conferences*, vii; Milton W. Hamilton, "Sir William Johnson: Interpreter of the Iroquois," *Ethnohistory* 10 [1963]: 272–73). See also Paul A. W. Wallace,

Conrad Weiser: Friend of Colonist and Mohawk (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945), 17; CRP 5: 479, 518; 7: 14; *WJP* 1: 489n.; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 54–55.

18 Delawares seem to have served as interpreters much more frequently than the Iroquois. John Pumpshire, Moses Tatamy, Isaac Still, and Steven Calvin appear quite frequently in the records of Anglo-Delaware and Anglo-Iroquois-Delaware conferences. See, for example, CRP 7: 207; 8: 151, 201, 633; Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 104; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 7. Joseph Brant is a notable exception to this general trend. He was the younger brother of Molly Brant and was educated at Eleazar Wheelock's school and served William Johnson as an interpreter on a number of occasions. See *WJP* 10: 279–80, 729; 12: 209. For more information on Wheelock's school, see James Axtell, "Dr. Wheelock's Little Red School," in *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 87–109.

19 Foster, "Who Spoke," 194–97; Foster, "Another Look," 104–8.

20 Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 65–66. For a clear discussion of the nature of conference proceedings in general, see William N. Fenton, "Structure, Continuity, and Change in the Process of Iroquois Treaty Making," in Jennings et al., *History and Culture*, 3–36.

21 For a contemporary description, see Foster, "Another Look," 105–6. The ceremony is also referred to at various times as the "Rubbing Down of the Body" or "Three Bare Words."

22 *WJP* 3: 442, 761. As Warren Johnson, Sir William Johnson's brother, described the ceremony in his journal in 1760, "the Indians goe in Mourning for their Relations, the white people condole with them, by clearing their throats to make them speak, they wipe away the Tears from their Eyes, & the Blood of the Deceased from their Bed & out of their Sight, that their Hearts may be chearful: this is done by giving them strings of wampum, & black Strouds, & by covering the Grave of the Deceased that they may mournn noe more over it" (*WJP* 13: 189). For other contemporary descriptions of these ceremonies, see *WJP* 1: 625–28; 3: 209, 430, 475–77, 483–85, 537–38, 761–62; 9: 174–79, 356–58, 589, 730–33, 796–97; 13: 428; CRP 5: 476–77; 7: 68, 508–10, 650–52; *DHNY* 2: 633. See also Foster, "Another Look," 107.

23 CRP 6: 275; 7: 97. See also CRP 5: 474; 6: 180; 7: 47, 466. For an idea of the quantities and cost of the wampum consumed during the condolence ceremonies, see *WJP* 5: 248; 9: 18, 593.

24 Foster, "Another Look," 102; *Early Western Travels*, ed. Reuben Gold Thwaites (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1904), 1: 42; Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 108; CRP 4: 580, 680; 5: 307; 8: 176.

25 Samuel Kirkland, *The Journals of Samuel Kirkland: Eighteenth-Century Missionary to the Iroquois, Government Agent, Father of Hamilton College*, ed. Walter Pilkington (Clinton, NY: Hamilton College, 1980), 8, 14. Mohawk, as one eighteenth-century missionary lamented, was "Extream hard to be learnt" and was "almost impossible for any to learn it perfectly except they begin it as children" (Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 17). Much the same could be said for the other Iroquois languages. The Indians advised potential interpreters and missionaries to stay in one place for at least a year, preferably without non-Indian companions, in order to learn a language thoroughly. Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 130, 133, 137, 139, 187. See also James Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America," in *The European and the Indian*, 199–200.

26 Indeed, Cadwallader Colden asserted that Iroquois "Speeches abound with

Metaphors, after the Manner of the Eastern Nations," Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 1: xxxvi. For references to adapting speeches to "Indian forms" and idioms, see also Thwaites, in *Early Western Travels*, 1: 76; CRP 5: 733; *WJP* 13: 501.

27 Jennings et al., *History and Culture*, 44, 192. For a discussion of the use of metaphor and relational forms of address, see William N. Fenton, "Structure, Continuity, and Change" and the "Glossary of Figures of Speech in Iroquois Political Rhetoric," in Jennings et al., *History and Culture*, 11, 16–17, 21–24, 115–24.

28 During a conference at Lancaster in June 1744, for example, Conrad Weiser had to explain to the Englishmen present that Canassatego's allusions to a "strong and big Rock" and to the "big Mountain" referred to the Oneidas and Onondagas, respectively (Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 139).

29 Foster, "Who Spoke," 203 n. 5; Foster, "Another Look," 113 n. 20; CRP 7: 519.

30 Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 224; Kirkland, *Journals*, 15.

31 CRP 7: 206.

32 *DHNY* 2: 946.

33 *WJP* 11: 400.

34 CRP 7: 49–50. A similar situation occurred during the Easton conference in July 1757 with the Delaware. On July 29 Delaware sachem "Teedyuscung's Speech to the Governor of Yesterday was carefully read, and appearing to be very obscure, it was thought proper to desire Mr. Croghan to call Teedyuscung and his Council, with the Interpreters, to a private Meeting, and desire them to explain it, which was done" (CRP 7: 679).

35 CRP 7: 517.

36 CRP 8: 470.

37 Darlington, *Gist's Journals*, 52; John Bartram, *Travels in Pensilvania and Canada*, March of America Facsimile Series, no. 41 (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc., 1966), 58; William M. Beauchamp, *Civil, Religious and Mourning Councils and Ceremonies of Adoption of the New York Indians*, New York State Museum *Bulletin*, no. 113, repr. (Albany: University of the State of New York & State Education Department, 1981), 423; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 48; CRP 4: 663.

38 Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 1: xxxiv–xxxv. See also Thwaites, *Early Western Travels*, 1: 121; Kirkland, *Journal*, 7.

39 *WJP* 9: 380.

40 Beauchamp, *Councils and Ceremonies*, 388; Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 1: xviii–xix; *WJP* 3: 450; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 222; and Thwaites, *Early Western Travels*, 1: 30.

41 CRP 8: 218; 4: 702; 5: 151; 7: 145; 8: 181, 757; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 55, 146; Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 91, 165. Whether the wampum was hung across a stick or laid upon a table seems to have been a matter of setting and convenience—a table most often being used during councils in European settlements and a stick during councils in Indian villages or towns.

42 *WJP* 2: 127, 379; 3: 446; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 222; Thwaites, *Early Western Travels*, 59–60. In one case at Onondaga in 1752, the return of the original wampum merely indicated a desire to refrain from responding until the proposals, with the original wampum, could be made to a larger public assembly of the Six Nations. See Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 115. In this sense it alludes to the prospective function of wampum discussed by Foster.

43 *DHNY* 2: 625; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 228, 236, 239. Such informal discussion is sometimes referred to in the records as "discourse" or talk "in the bushes."

44 Until recently, most research on wampum's function in Indian councils has focused on its uses as a validating or ratifying device and as a mnemonic aid in recalling the details of treaties, as in *WJP* 3: 709. See, for example, George S. Snyderman, "The Functions of Wampum," American Philosophical Society, *Proceedings* 98 (1954): 469–94; Fenton, "New York State Wampum Collection," 455–56; and Mary Druke in Jennings et al., *History and Culture*, 89. As Michael Foster has recently pointed out, these are retrospective functions. He makes a convincing case for the prospective functions of wampum in his article, "Another Look at the Function of Wampum" (see especially p. 108). The prospective uses of wampum are my primary concern here and are of most significance in considering the interpreter's role as a cultural broker.

45 CRP 7: 216; Thwaites, *Early Western Travels*, 26; *WJP* 2: 579. The actual manufacturers of the belts and strings are rarely noted in the records, which generally only include expense account entries regarding the cost of wampum and of "making them up in proper belts." See, for example, *WJP* 2: 575, 599, 625, 639; 3: 159, 175; 8: 1095.

46 CRP 6: 150.

47 Horatio Hale, ed., *The Iroquois Book of Rites*, Brinton's Library of Aboriginal American Literature, no. 2 (Philadelphia: D. G. Brinton, 1883), 151.

48 *WJP* 6: 399–400.

49 Bartram, *Travels*, 58.

50 According to Colden, even urgent messages were never delivered at the messengers' first approach. Rather, they "sit down for a Minute or two, at least, in Silence, to recollect themselves, before they speak, that they may not show any Degree of Fear or Surprize, by an indecent Expression" (Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 1: xli).

51 Bartram, *Travels*, 58; Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 71, 83, 127; *WJP* 2: 795. Sometimes the English were forced to wait months rather than days for a reply, while the Indians returned to their homes to consult about an answer. See, for example, *WJP* 2: 796.

52 *DHNY* 2: 943.

53 *WJP* 12: 952.

54 Foster, "Who Spoke," 184.

55 William Johnson complained to Lord Hillsborough in 1769 that his health, "already reduced to a very low state from severe fatigue in his Majesty's service, was . . . rendered much worse by being obliged to sit whole nights generally in the open woods in private Conferences with the leading men" (*DHNY* 2: 943).

56 CRP 4: 662–63. For further examples, see CRP 5: 476, 532, 670; Thwaites, *Early Western Travels*, 35, 62.

57 CRP 6: 115; Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 157.

58 CRP 7: 527. For other examples of interpreters engaged in writing speeches, see CRP 6: 186, 591; 7: 90, 653, 655; Thwaites, *Early Western Travels*, 92.

59 CRP 7: 517.

60 For example, see CRP 5: 147, 148; 7: 80, 146, 182, 206; 8: 149, 297; *WJP* 4: 330–31. Weiser engaged in nearly all of these activities at the Easton peace conference of 1758, which involved the English, the Six Nations, the Delawares, and several other Indian groups. See Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, chapters 59–61.

61 Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 97; CRP 5: 683; 7: 95.
62 For a fuller explanation of the speaking order at conferences and its implications, see Foster, "Who Spoke." As Foster points out, Teedyuscung, a Delaware chief, seems to have been particularly adept at using protocol to his advantage and employed it to gain the upper hand at Easton in 1756. Easton lay in territory whose ownership was disputed by the English government of Pennsylvania and the Delaware Indians. Teedyuscung managed to seize the initiative from an inexperienced Governor Denny and act as host at the opening of the council, subtly bolstering his claim to Easton as Delaware territory. Once the business phase began, the Delaware again seized the advantage by speaking first and setting the agenda for the conference. See ibid., 190–91, 200–201. It is interesting to note that a similar seizure of the initiative at Easton in 1758 gained him no advantage but, rather, the anger of his own counselors and the Six Nations. See Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 538–39.
63 CRP 7: 488.
64 Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 239.
65 Regarding the 1755 incident, see CRP 6: 283. For a description of events at Easton in 1758, see Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 536, 539–40.
66 CRP 7: 515, 516, 649.
67 CRP 6: 112; 4: 661; 7: 216. Shikellamy, a former French captive and adopted Oneida, served Conrad Weiser as his personal advisor and friend on many occasions early in his career. See, for example, Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 154. As Wallace remarks in reference to Shikellamy's death in 1748(?), Weiser had actually "depended" on the Indian for advice and "blundered dangerously when he first found himself without it" (ibid., 277).
68 CRP 4: 663.
69 In 1758 Weiser interpreted the substance of the governor's opening speech at Easton, but as "his Memory did not serve him to remember the Several Ceremonies [there]in, . . . he desired Nichas, a Mohock Chief, to do it for him, which he did" (CRP 8: 177).
70 Colden, *Five Indian Nations*, 2: 224–25; *WJP* 3: 164; 11: 207; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 51, 53, 116; Bartram, *Travels*, 59; CRP 5: 520, 670.
71 CRP 8: 189; Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 542–43. See also CRP 6: 281; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 175.
72 *WJP* 10: 505; 8: 212.
73 See, for example, CRP 7: 137.
74 CRP 4: 668; 5: 477; Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 167–68. See also Beauchamp, *Councils and Ceremonies*, 425.
75 Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 194–95, 222; Beauchamp, *Moravian Journals*, 119.
76 Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 193.

Submitted 29 August 1986
Accepted 15 January 1987
Final revisions received 7 May 1987