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Early Indiana was strikingly different from other states in the Old Northwest because of its considerable population of southern natives and former residents of the South. Southerners' impact upon Indiana exceeded that of any other group because migrants from the South were the first to arrive in significant numbers and the first to contribute to the state's growth; further, their Hoosier-born children later helped settle the state's newly emerging central and northern frontiers. As the "first effective settlers," southerners heavily influenced Indiana's cultural development. Varying degrees of "southern-ness" colored the state's social, economic, and political systems, vernacular architecture, dialects, and religions, while many of these elements, including the term "Hoosier," can be directly linked to southern antecedents. Indeed, the northern boundary of the southern cultural...
region in the eastern United States is typically drawn through central Indiana.²

An understanding of the southern presence in the Hoosier state is therefore crucial to any consideration of Indiana's frontier culture and course of development. Because of the South's physical and social diversity, however, the ingredients that comprise southern-ness are difficult to determine. The exact nature of the southern traits affecting Indiana, for example, could be quite distinct from those influencing Louisiana if the settlers in one state came from the region identified as the upland South and those in the other state hailed from areas of the lowland South. Consequently, before the southern influence on Indiana can be accurately measured and southern cultural and social traditions correctly assigned to their sources, the areas of the South that supplied most Hoosier settlers must be ascertained. Although previous research has identified the states of birth for southern migrants to Indiana, their county origins, indicating whether the southerners were lowlanders or uplanders, have not heretofore been determined.

In order to redress this deficiency, four sets of records have been examined to discover the origins of southerners who settled in Indiana by 1850. Since these records deal with segments of the population which were surveyed at different times and which, in some cases, were asked different questions, they are not exactly interchangeable. The first record, the federal census, includes the state or country of birth for every inhabitant in Indiana in 1850. The second, a selection of data by Joseph E. Layton, lists the state or country of previous residence for inhabitants in Indiana in 1850. The third, a selection of data by Joseph E. Layton, lists the state or country of previous residence for indi-

viduals whose biographies were included in county histories, atlases, and directories or who were listed in land office records and who lived in the state at any time between 1816 and 1850. The third, "Registers of Receipts" collected by the General Land Office, provides the counties of previous residence for southerners who purchased government land between the opening of the various land offices in Indiana and 1850. The fourth, the records of the Society of Indiana Pioneers, contains the counties of birth and previous residence for southerners who had arrived in the state by 1851 and whose descendants have joined that genealogical association. Persons in each of the last three records were not necessarily residents of Indiana when the census canvassers surveyed the state in 1850: some had probably moved elsewhere while others were deceased. Although the four records do not contain the same individuals, the conclusions that can be drawn from them generally agree, and this conformity supports the representativeness of each record.

The leading states supplying Indiana's southern population in 1850 are most accurately determined from birthplace data collected in the federal census because theoretically every inhabitant was surveyed. Southerners accounted for 44.0 percent of all Hoosiers native to the United States but born outside of Indiana, a far greater proportion of the population than the 28.3 percent southern average for the entire Old Northwest and nearly 10 percent higher than in any other state of the region. While this figure indicates that the majority of Indiana's United States-born settlers were northern natives, most of the northerners hailed from Ohio—a state that also received many southern pioneers—and they generally came after the southerners had arrived. Natives of four southern states comprised 39.2 percent of Indiana's non-foreign-born, non-native-Hoosier population in 1850: Kentucky (17.3 percent of the migrants), Virginia (10.6), North Carolina (8.1), and Tennessee (3.2). The counties in which the natives of these four southern states exceeded the state mean are mapped in Figures 1-A and 1-B. (For example, Adams County had 25 Kentucky natives in its non-native-Hoosier population of 3,255, or 0.8 percent of the total; Orange County had 1,120 Kentuckians, accounting for 36.6 percent of its similarly defined population of 3,061. Since the statewide average for Kentuckians was 17.3 percent, on Figure 1-A Orange County is designated as above the mean while Adams County was below it and remains unmarked.) Southerners tended to settle south of the National Road, which bisected Indiana from east to west through Indianapolis. Natives from each state had slightly different patterns of concentration, probably reflecting the influences of time of mi-
Figures 1-A and 1-B. Indiana counties where natives of selected Southern States exceeded the Indiana mean, according to the 1850 Census.
Data supplied by a second source of information, the study by Layton, support the conclusions regarding Indiana's southern-ness as drawn from the census records. In 1916 Layton identified the states and countries that provided Indiana's settlers between 1816 and 1850 by consulting two groups of dormant sources, General Land Office records and the county histories, atlases, and city and county directories. The land office reports recorded the previous residences of individuals who purchased land from the government while the biographies of pioneers contained in the histories, atlases, and directories typically provided the same information plus location of birth. These sources are not as comprehensive as the census. Wealthy individuals, social elites, or subscribers were more likely to be profiled in the county histories, atlases, and directories than were yeoman farmers or town laborers; adult males were the ones typically filing for government land, leaving the previous residences of other family members and all subsequent purchasers unrecorded. Rather than using birthplace as in the census, Layton collected only the migrant's place of former residence because he theorized that the areas from which Hoosier settlers moved had the greatest influence upon their "social and political tendencies . . . for in hundreds of cases they were taken . . . [from their birthplace] to grow up and form their habits under a wholly different environment." Finally, while all of Layton's sources indicate settlers' origins by counties and sometimes even by towns, Layton himself limited his study to entire states or countries of previous residence.

According to Layton's data, southern states provided 40.6 percent of the non-foreign-born Hoosier pioneers who had pre-
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ious residences within the United States. Settlers from the four leading southern states totaled 38.6 percent of the population: Kentucky sent 22.6 percent of the migrants, Virginia 7.6, North Carolina 6.0, and Tennessee 2.4. Maps of Layton’s data indicating those Indiana counties where southerners exceeded the mean value for their respective states (Figures 2-A and 2-B) are very similar to those drawn from the 1850 census.\textsuperscript{7} Comparisons between census nativity records and Layton’s figures place Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee in the same relative order according to the percentage of settlers each supplied, but the exact values changed. A larger percentage of migrants had previous residences in Kentucky than were born there, while Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee had smaller values for previous residences than for birthplaces.

The census reports and Layton’s sources are not perfectly analogous because they do not deal with the same population surveyed at the same time: the census provides a snapshot of all Hoosiers in 1850 while Layton’s materials list the previous residences of a number of constituencies who lived in Indiana between 1816 and 1850. The statistical differences between birthplaces and previous residences of migrants suggest that some pioneers, especially those born in states like Virginia and North Carolina which were more distant from the Hoosier state, may have gradually moved westward using Kentucky as the last stop before migrating to Indiana.\textsuperscript{8}

Records such as the manuscript census and Layton’s materials confirm researchers’ general agreement that southerners formed a major portion of Indiana’s early population. Most investigators also agree that these migrants from the South were uplanders.\textsuperscript{9} Historian R. Carlyle Buley, for example, wrote that although southerners in Indiana “may have developed some local characteristics, most of them were essentially no different from the upland South folk who filled Kentucky and Tennessee . . . .”\textsuperscript{10} Statistical evidence to support the assumption that these Hoosier pioneers were from the upland South, however, is

\textsuperscript{7} The blank county in southwestern Indiana marked with an “M” is Martin, for which the data were too few to be significant according to Layton.


\textsuperscript{10} Buley, \textit{Old Northwest}, I, 27.
Figures 2-A and 2-B. Indiana counties where previous residents of selected Southern states exceeded the Indiana mean, according to Layton's data.
either weak or absent. Contemporary accounts (letters, journals, emigrants’ guidebooks) often accurately described the inhabitants’ origins in particular locations at certain times, but the information that they contain is insufficient for statistical inquiry because the accounts are spatially limited and nearly anecdotal in character. Census and non-census records that list pioneers’ sources by state simply do not provide enough locational detail to determine settlers’ specific origins. The problem is further complicated by the difficulty in determining precisely what states or source areas constitute the upland South.

An upland/lowland physical division of the South occurs at the Appalachian Fall Line, where the newer, weaker rocks of the Coastal Plain physiographic province abut the older, stronger rocks of the Piedmont physiographic province. The lowland is comprised of the Coastal Plain landform zone, while the upland includes the Piedmont, Blue Ridge, Ridge and Valley (Shenandoah Valley), Appalachian Plateau, and Interior Low Plateaus landform zones. The Fall Line border trends from northeast to southwest through most southeastern Atlantic Coast states, placing the eastern parts of Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia in the lowland South and their western or northwestern parts in the upland, along with Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia (Figure 3). Not only does the physiography or geomorphology of the South change at the Fall Line, research in southern history and culture has also uncovered varying degrees of contrast between upland and lowland in population origins, historical development, agricultural and economic systems, use of slaves, and general culture. Identifi-
cation of settlers' counties of origin therefore becomes even more significant if one is to understand clearly the southern-ness of Indiana's population.

Unlike previous studies that have depended on state-based nativity sources, this paper uses two records that separate southerners into uplanders and lowlanders—as defined physiographically—on the basis of county origin. The first record was collected by the General Land Office. When pioneers bought federally owned territory at the land offices scattered throughout Indiana, clerks requested their county and state or country of previous residence. This information was entered in the Register of Receipts, along with the township and range location, size, and cost of the purchased parcel. Many buyers named Indiana counties as their former places of residence, often counties in-


15 Indiana's territory was divided into seven districts for the purpose of land sale through centrally located land offices. Although the districts contained numerous counties, they did not necessarily follow county boundaries; therefore, the precise location of individual land parcels must be determined from the township and range description provided for each purchase. The records of six of these districts are available at the Archives Division, Indiana Commission on Public Records, Indiana State Library and Historical Building, Indianapolis. Land in the seventh district, comprised of a narrow line of counties along the Ohio border from Switzerland County on the Ohio River north to Randolph County, was sold at Cincinnati. These records are held at the Ohio Historical Center in Columbus. Previous residences of southerners living in this seventh area are not included in this article because the clerks did not record the county of origin for any land purchasers except those coming from Ohio and Indiana. See Mayburt Stephenson Riegel, comp., Early Ohioans' Residences from the Land Grant Records (Mansfield, Ohio, 1976), vi, 1-15.
cluded in the same land office district. These settlers could have moved from nearby areas or from across the state to purchase land on the frontier; they could have purchased more land to add to their holdings or could finally have bought the tract upon which they were squatting. The rest of the settlers named counties in other states or places in foreign countries. The previous residences of nearly 6,600 land purchasers who bought acreage between the opening of the various land offices (as early as 1804 at Vincennes) and 1850 and who came from Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, or Tennessee were collected from the registers.  

The land office records encompass a sufficient number of settlers to assure statistical reliability, although the 6,589 previous-residence locations included in this source are far fewer than the birthplaces identified by the 178,847 southerners in the census. Three biases, however, may color the land office records. First, only those individuals who purchased land directly from the government are listed in the registers. This includes speculators but excludes all who purchased land from the original or subsequent owners and all town dwellers who did not own land. Second, the registers do not contain a sex and age cross section that is representative of the pioneer population. Because adult males comprised most of the buyers, the previous residences of few females and still fewer children are recorded. While one can probably assume that other family members came from the same place as the individual filing for land, data to support that assumption are not available from the registers. Finally, previous residences rather than birthplaces are listed on the registers. The two locations could have been but were not necessarily the same and, despite Layton's statement, the precise degree of influence on an individual's cultural development exerted by
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16 Malcolm J. Rohrbough, "The Land Office Business in Indiana, 1800-1840," in This Land of Ours: The Acquisition and Disposition of the Public Domain (Indianapolis, 1978), 48. Although the Vincennes land office was established in 1804, the sale of acreage did not begin until April, 1807.

17 The names and former homes of investors who filed for large amounts of land are regularly found in the registers. If these individuals' previous residences were included in the data each time their names were mentioned, over-representation of source counties could result. To avoid this contingency investors who purchased numerous, large parcels of Indiana land were considered as speculators for the purpose of data collection, and their names were omitted from the count. Further, if an early settler obtained a tract from someone who had originally bought it from the government—a land agent, a farmer with extra acreage, a pioneer who was moving elsewhere—the previous residence of the second purchaser does not appear in the land office records and thus could not be included in the data. For additional information concerning land speculation in Indiana see Appendix to this article.
birthplace or previous residence is hard to determine without a complete biography of each individual.

The counties of previous residence for southern migrants to Indiana are identified in Figure 4. According to the land office records, Kentucky was the largest source of southerners, supplying 5,555 settlers from sixty-nine counties. Most had former homes in the Bluegrass section of north central Kentucky, well within the geographically defined upland South and close to Indiana. Virginia was the second leading state of previous residence, with 533 migrants coming largely from upland counties. The Virginians' former homes tended to be in the Shenandoah Valley, clearly marked by a northeast to southwest concentration of locations midway across the state, or in the northwestern section. North Carolinians comprised the third largest group of 240 pioneers. Nearly all hailed from the north central Piedmont area, identified as a major source of the Quakers who settled in east central and southwestern Indiana.18 Tennessee provided 125 settlers, most of whom came from the eastern upland. Previous residences of migrants from Maryland concentrated in the north central portion where the Shenandoah Valley crosses the state, while pioneers who formerly lived in Delaware came from throughout the state. Only seventeen settlers moved from South Carolina, and nearly all were uplanders.

According to the General Land Office records, then, the majority of southern customers for Hoosier land migrated from the upland region. Kentucky overwhelmingly dominated as the state from which southerners came, accounting for 84.3 percent of the total. Virginia and North Carolina supplied 8.1 and 3.6 percent, respectively, of the previous residents from the South, far less than the percentage of natives each state had provided according to the census. The dramatic difference between the percentage of Hoosier migrants born in Kentucky, Virginia, and North Carolina and that of settlers previously residing in those states suggests that many pioneers moved westward in stages from their birthplaces to Indiana. A final source of data, the records of the

The Society of Indiana Pioneers has been collecting genealogies of Hoosier settlers since its founding in 1916. Applicants for membership submit genealogical information as proof that an ancestor lived in Indiana prior to 1851. The information includes the settler's date of birth and date of arrival in Indiana, as well as his or her county and state or country of birth and previous residence. Since both birthplace and previous residence are located by county and state, the origins of Indiana's southern-born settlers can be determined even more precisely than from the land office Registers of Receipts. The society's records differ from those of the land office in other ways. Women and children frequently appear as early Hoosiers. The requirement that one have purchased government land to be listed does not apply, meaning that settlers who bought farms from others or who were town dwellers may be included among the pioneers. Because the society depends upon voluntary information and because no systematic sampling of all segments of the frontier population has occurred, the records cannot be assumed to represent a cross section of Indiana's population. Genealogies have come only from those who are aware of the society and who are or were members; the membership fee may deter others from joining. Probably due to the efforts of particularly interested individuals and families or to strong local historical and genealogical societies, certain counties have a greater number of pioneers listed than others, irrespective of population differences among them during the frontier era. However, when the records of the Society of Indiana Pioneers are used in conjunction with other sources, they can make a significant contribution to Indiana's migration history.

Two maps present the data collected from nearly 1,500 genealogies of Indiana pioneers born and/or having their last non-Hoosier residence in counties of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, or Tennessee. One figure plots the birthplaces of southerners living in Indiana while the other marks their previous residences. The map denoting birthplaces indicates that most migrants hailed from the upland South, particularly western Maryland, the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, north central North Carolina, eastern Tennessee, and the Bluegrass of Kentucky (Figure 5). On the map marking previous residences, a shift of origins farther west into the upland is apparent, evidenced by an increased number of pioneers coming from the Kentucky Bluegrass and eastern Tennessee and a decrease in those from western Maryland and Virginia's Shen-
Figure 5. Birthplaces of Southern Migrants to Indiana Listed in the Society of Indiana Pioneers Records
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andoah Valley (Figure 6). However, a similar number of settlers claimed birthplaces and former homes in Piedmont North Carolina.

According to the Pioneer Society records, most of the southern migrants to Indiana were natives of three states: Virginia contained 305 settlers' birthplaces, Kentucky was second with 271, and North Carolina ranked third with 241. Yet the count of settlers' previous residences places Kentucky first with 466, North Carolina second with 221, and Virginia third with 149. This difference in ranking indicates that numerous native Virginians moved at least once before they arrived in Indiana and that more migrants had lived in Kentucky than were born there. North Carolina had nearly the same number of natives and previous residents, suggesting that many Tar Heel natives made their first interstate movement directly to Indiana.

The same general pattern emerged when the land office records were compared to the census: a larger percentage of previous residences than birthplaces were in Kentucky and a smaller percentage of previous residences than birthplaces were in Virginia. The significant shift from Virginia birthplaces to Kentucky previous residences tends to confirm the theory of step migration westward, with many pioneers moving from their birthplaces to at least one interim location, often Kentucky, before they arrived in Indiana. The pattern also supports evidence for step migration as uncovered through the "child ladder method," which examines the gradual migration of pioneer families from the parents' birthplaces through the children's birthplaces to their current residences as recorded in the census schedules. And it further strengthens the uplander characterization of Indiana's southern population. Most were born in the upland and moved within the region before continuing on to the Hoosier state. Pioneers born in the lowland South also tended to settle in the upland prior to migration to Indiana, and while living there they probably were acculturated to at least some of the region's traits.

The migration linkage and associated cultural relationship between the upland South and Indiana is clear, but the migra-
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FIGURE 6. PREVIOUS RESIDENCES OF SOUTHERN MIGRANTS TO INDIANA LISTED IN THE SOCIETY OF INDIANA PIONEERS RECORDS
tory and cultural origins of the pioneers who settled the upland area are uncertain because the region began to be populated more than a century before the census bureau started recording the birthplaces of inhabitants. However, analyses of surnames recorded in the 1790 census provide general outlines of the region's ethnic composition and suggest the sources of its settlers. 20 Individuals with surnames indicating English ethnic origins dominated in the United States population, with the Scotch-Irish and Germans present in lesser amounts. Settlers of English background also formed the majority in the lowland South, but the upland region was ethnically distinctive because Celtic and German population percentages there were significantly higher while English percentages decreased. 21 Many of the settlers with English backgrounds were natives of the American colonies who had moved to the upland South from the lowland areas or southeastern Pennsylvania, while many of the Scotch-Irish and Germans had arrived more recently and had moved directly into the interior in search of available, inexpensive, and fertile land. 22

In about 1725 migrants entered the upland South through the northern Shenandoah Valley, the wide lowland nestled between the Piedmont and the eastern edge of the Appalachians. Soon settlers had expanded from north central Maryland to southwestern Virginia and crossed the Blue Ridge Mountains into the Carolina Piedmont, finally reaching the southernmost extremities of the Shenandoah in eastern Tennessee by the late 1760s. 23 Just before the Revolution migrants from Virginia and


North Carolina began moving through the Cumberland Gap into eastern Kentucky, and after the war such heavy migration focused on the Bluegrass region of north central Kentucky that the state rapidly became a trans-Appalachian extension of the upland South. The entire settlement region eventually incorporated a crescent of territory reaching from north central Maryland through the Shenandoah Valley, Piedmont North and South Carolina, eastern Tennessee, and north central Kentucky to Indiana.

Migration to the upland South brought many people of American, European, Indian, and African origins into contact with each other, and eventually their respective cultures mingled. The upland became an area of "cultural preadaptation" where aspects of various cultures were combined, tested, sifted, and selected until a new culture emerged, an amalgam of older cultures best suited to newly encountered conditions. Settlers from two major culture hearths—southeastern Pennsylvania and the Chesapeake Bay area—joined between 1725 and 1775 in the Shenandoah Valley-Piedmont North Carolina region to create a new upland South cultural hearth. Frederick Jackson Turner wrote that settlers moving into the upland "built up a new Pennsylvania in contrast with the old Quaker colonies, and a new South in contrast with the tidewater." This developing center of "trait fusion" expanded as uplanders spread into Tennessee, Kentucky, and northwestern Virginia. As natives or migrants from the original upland South and its extensions crossed the Ohio River, they transferred their culture to Indiana.

The impact of southerners in general and uplanders in particular on Indiana's culture and progress was undoubtedly greater than the portion of the population that they accounted for would suggest. Trans-Appalachian development, land availability, and transportation routes defined their entrance into and dispersal throughout the Hoosier state in advance of other immigrant groups, with original southern settlement along the Ohio River and gradual movement northward as more land was ceded by the Indians. As the "first effective settlers" they set the tone

---
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for future development because "the specific characteristics of the first group able to effect a viable, self-perpetuating society are of crucial significance for the later social and cultural geography of the area...".\(^{30}\) Their influence was further extended by many of their Hoosier native children who helped settle the rest of the state. In an article tracing the origins of a midwestern culture James M. Bergquist wrote that because southerners first settled much of the Hoosier state, "fewer migrants from the Middle and New England states moved directly to Indiana during the period from 1800 to 1840, when much of the state passed from a wilderness to an established society." Turner considered southern pioneers and their descendants to have held such supremacy in the state that "not until a few years before the Civil War did the Northern current exert a decisive influence upon Indiana."\(^{31}\) The early dominance of southerners in the state seems to have reduced or discouraged the immigration of settlers native to other regions, thus reinforcing the cultural ascendancy of the South. For example, Richard Lyle Power suggested that their very presence was one reason why other settlers failed to view the state as an attractive frontier, and another scholar claimed that "Indiana was never a favorite stopping-place for the New Englanders, for the Southern element was strong here...".\(^{32}\)

The competition between South and North for cultural hegemony in Indiana continued throughout the frontier era, despite the advantage that first settlement gave southerners. Even as early as 1826, perhaps reflecting their fear of losing economic, social, and political control of Indiana to incoming cultural groups, southerners "seemed to entertain no small apprehension, that this also would be a Yankee state," mirroring Ohio's course of development.\(^{33}\) They had some reasons for concern, for by 1850 many pioneers from other areas had joined them in the Hoosier state: almost 3 percent of those born in the United States but outside of Indiana were from New England; Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey together accounted

\(^{30}\) Quotation from Zelinsky, Cultural Geography of the United States, 13; see also Johansen, "A Working Hypothesis," 11-12.

\(^{31}\) Bergquist, "Tracing the Origins of a Midwestern Culture," 2; Turner, Frontier in American History, 225.


\(^{33}\) Lindley, Indiana as Seen by Early Travelers, 440.
for nearly 20 percent; and over 30 percent were Ohioans. The unusually large number of southern settlers and their descendants, however, maintained Indiana's unique status among states of the Old Northwest.

Data from census records or from county histories, atlases, and directories provide significant proof of the southern-ness of Indiana's population prior to 1850. That most southern migrants to the Hoosier state were uplanders is also apparent, as shown by the counties of previous residence for those who purchased land from the government or by the counties of birth and previous residence for those who are listed in a genealogical record. The evidence supporting such conclusions also substantiates studies of Hoosier culture that have revealed similarities in dialect, religion, political allegiance, building techniques, and economy between the upland South and Indiana. It further provides support and encouragement for future research to clarify the associations and to trace the sources of modifications between the cultures of the two regions.

**APPENDIX**

**Land Speculators and the General Land Office Records**

Indiana was not immune from land speculators and their impact on development, although such individuals did not account for nearly as many buyers as in other states. Everett Dick, *The Lure of the Land* (Lincoln, Neb., 1970), 199-219; Paul Wallace Gates, "Land Policy and Tenancy in the Prairie Counties of Indiana," *Indiana Magazine of History*, XXXV (March, 1939), 1-26; Gates, "The Role of the Land Speculator in Western Development," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LXVI (July, 1942), 314-33; Reginald Horsman, "Changing Images of the Public Domain: Historians and the Shaping of Midwest Frontiers," in *This Land of Ours: The Acquisition and Disposition of the Public Domain* (Indianapolis, 1978), 60-86; Edward H. Rastatter, "Nineteenth Century Public Land Policy: The Case for the Speculator," in David C. Klingaman and Richard K. Vedder, eds., *Essays in Nineteenth Century Economic History: The Old Northwest* (Athens, Ohio, 1975), 118-37; Malcolm J. Rohrbough, *The Land Office Business: The Settlement and Administration of American Public Lands, 1789-1837* (New York, 1968), 211-12, 230. Before the Civil War some southerners, generally lawyers, bankers, capitalists, politicians, or planters, were involved in land speculation in the Midwest, but states west of Indiana received most of their attention. Paul Wallace Gates, "Southern Investments in Northern Lands before the Civil War," *Journal of Southern History*, V (May, 1939), 155-85. Hardly any speculative purchases by outsiders were made in central Indiana, and although more occurred in southern Indiana, for example the 4,500 acres bought by two South Carolinians in 1836, the total amount "was small when compared with that in northern Indiana" because mostly northern acres re-
mained to be sold by the mid-1830s when this activity began in earnest. Gates, "Land Policy and Tenancy," 4-6; Gates, "Southern Investments in Northern Lands," 168. Purchasers from North and South, some led and encouraged by Henry L. Ellsworth, the premier investor, publicist, and booster of the Grand Prairie, and others simply attracted by speculation fever, amassed large tracts of territory in the northwestern prairie counties. Gates, "Land Policy and Tenancy," 6-26. Many of these men were absentee owners who held the land until prices promised a sufficient return while others, like Ellsworth himself, intended to increase the value of their investments by hiring tenant farmers and herdsmen and promoting agricultural experimentation. Ray Allen Billington, Westward Expansion: A History of the American Frontier (2nd ed., New York, 1960), 305-306; Gates, "Land Policy and Tenancy," 8-12, 14-15, 20-26; Paul Wallace Gates, "Hoosier Cattle Kings," Indiana Magazine of History, XLV (March, 1948), 1-24. One southerner, William J. Grayson of Charleston, South Carolina, responded to Ellsworth's salesmanship in 1836 by investing $10,000 in 7,000 acres of prairie that, after fruitlessly waiting for land values to increase, he eventually sold to Ellsworth for a disappointing $13,312. Gates, "Land Policy and Tenancy," 12-13; Gates, "Southern Investments in Northern Lands," 156-57. In 1835 a trio of Tidewater Virginians purchased 22,500 acres in northwest Indiana, territory which never attracted land hungry settlers and was a decade later being offered at tax delinquency sales: "Their investment was a pure speculation and none of the three apparently intended to settle upon the lands." Gates, "Southern Investments in Northern Lands," 156-58. For Indiana the effect of speculating southerners on the distribution of previous residences may be minimal because, according to the locations they reported to the land office clerks, most of the land investors seem to have come from the North. Of the individuals whose counties of previous residence outside Indiana are given in Gates's article about speculators in northern Indiana, forty were from the North and only fourteen came from the South. Gates, "Land Policy and Tenancy," 5, 12-17. Eleven of the fourteen were lowlanders, most of whom came from the urban centers of Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Norfolk, and Charleston; the uplanders were from central and western Virginia and Lauderdale County, Alabama, located right on the Fall Line itself. According to Gates's article about southern investors in the North, the speculators selecting acreage in Indiana resided in Delaware, Washington, D.C., Richmond, and Charleston and Columbia, South Carolina, all lowland locations. Gates, "Southern Investments in Northern Lands," 156-57, 162, 164-65, 168-69. Although the lists are not complete, they do suggest that the few southern speculators were generally lowlanders, while as a rule southerners purchasing land in Indiana were uplanders. The rarity of upland southern investors may confirm the traditional description of most uplanders as yeoman farmers, not wealthy and unlikely to have the large amounts of unencumbered capital needed for speculative ventures.