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ENTRE NOUS

Ce numéro des Cahiers est consacré à l’histoire coloniale acadienne. Il témoigne en quelque sorte des nouvelles recherches effectuées dans ce domaine, particulièrement en ce qui concerne l’histoire des femmes et celle des familles.

Madame Josette Brun est une jeune historienne acadienne originaire de Cap-Pelé. Elle est actuellement inscrite au programme de doctorat en histoire à l’Université de Montréal. En décembre 1994, elle soutenait avec succès une thèse de maîtrise en histoire à l’Université de Moncton. Sa recherche portait sur les activités économiques des femmes d’affaires de Louisbourg au 18e siècle. Elle nous présente ici le fruit d’un travail antérieur, soit une étude de la gestion de la seigneurie de Port-Royal par une seigneuresse, Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour.

Professeur de langue anglaise à l’Université de Moncton, Monsieur Paul Delaney s’intéresse depuis plusieurs années à l’histoire des familles acadiennes. Son article sur les époux et les enfants d’Agathe de Saint-Étienne de La Tour présente un nouvel éclairage au sujet de cette Acadienne exceptionnelle qui fut responsable, dans les années 1730, de la vente des droits seigneuriaux acadiens à la Couronne britannique.

Peu de travaux ont été consacrés au régime seigneurial dans l’Acadie coloniale. Les Cahiers proposent ici le premier d’une série de trois articles de la regrettée Madame Joan Bourque Campbell, historienne et auteure de plusieurs ouvrages sur l’histoire acadienne qui a mené une recherche sur les différentes seigneuries acadiennes d’avant le grand Dérangement.

Chercheur infatiguable, le Père Anselme Chiasson revient à la charge avec une note de recherche examinant le supposé Concordat que l’abbé Jesse Fléché aurait signé avec la nation micmac du début du 17e siècle.

La maison d’édition Acadiensis Press de Fredericton a fait paraître récemment un ouvrage collectif analysant la dimension rurale de l’histoire des Maritimes. Monsieur Roy Bourgeois, étudiant au doctorat en histoire à l’Université Laval, nous en donne un compte rendu.

Et, puisqu’il est de mise par le contenu de ce numéro, à tout seigneur, tout honneur! Madame Léone Boudreau-Nelson, présidente de la Société historique acadienne nous communique les activités et les projets de la société.

Je m’en voudrais de ne pas remercier mon prédécesseur Monsieur Robert Pichette. Son passage à la rédaction des Cahiers fut grandement apprécié par la qualité de son travail qui demeure toujours synonyme de son nom.

Maurice Basque
Rédacteur
MARIE DE SAINT-ÉTIENNE DE LA TOUR

Josette Brun

Peu de chercheurs se sont intéressés jusqu'à maintenant au rôle que jouent les femmes dans la vie politique, sociale et économique de la société coloniale acadienne1. Naomi Griffiths, l'une des seules à s'être penchée sur ce thème, a surtout tenté de redonner aux activités des femmes dans la sphère domestique l'importance qui leur revient dans l'organisation sociale et économique de l'Acadie coloniale2. Nous avons choisi de nous intéresser à un autre aspect de la réalité féminine, soit l'activité des femmes dans la sphère publique. Ce concept fait référence aux activités des femmes qui dépassent les limites de la sphère domestique (tâches ménagères, soin des enfants) et qui englobent des champs d'action traditionnellement réservés aux hommes, tels la gestion des biens et des terres, le commerce, etc. Des études du genre portant sur les femmes des colonies américaines3 et du Canada4 ont remis en question la conception traditionnelle qui veut que les femmes soient confinées à la sphère domestique et révèlent la complexité des rôles féminins dans la société coloniale.


Notre étude porte sur Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour, veuve d’Alexandre LeBorgne de Béllisle, seigneur de Port Royal après la mort de son mari\(^5\). Nous verrons la place qu’elle occupe dans la vie publique en tant que gestionnaire d’une seigneurie. Notre recherche repose principalement sur l’étude des actes faits devant le notaire de Port Royal, Jean-Christosophe Loppinot, de 1687 à 1710\(^6\), de même que sur les disputes et les revendications seigneuriales impliquant la seigneurie sous les régimes français et britannique\(^7\). Nous avons aussi dépouillé les registres paroissiaux de Port Royal pour voir si Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour est souvent marraine ou témoin, honneur habituellement réservé aux personnes les plus en vue dans la communauté.

**Toile de fond**

Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour, l’aînée d’une famille de cinq enfants\(^8\), est née vers 1655\(^9\). Son père, Charles de Saint-Étienne de La Tour, avait épousé en 1653 (en troisièmes noces\(^10\)) Jeanne Motin,

---

5. Cet article est tiré d’un mémoire réalisé dans le cadre d’un cours offert par le département d’histoire de l’Université de Moncton (mémoire de 4e année). Nous tenons à remercier M. Maurice Basque, qui a dirigé nos recherches, pour son enthousiasme communicatif et ses bons conseils.


la veuve de son ennemi juré, Charles de Menou d'Aulnay, seigneur de Port Royal. La querelle de ces deux hommes qui avaient autorité sur diverses régions de l'Acadie a marqué les débuts de la colonie. La Tour, qui fait le commerce des fourrures à la rivière Saint-Jean et au Cap-Sable, s'installera à Port Royal après la mort de d'Aulnay, en 1650.

Nous possédons peu d'information sur l'enfance de Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour. Les enfants La Tour auraient surtout vécu à Port Royal jusqu'en 1663, année présumée du décès de leur père. Quand leur mère meurt, entre 1669 et 1672, les enfants sont trop jeunes pour se suffire à eux-mêmes. Ils ne figurent ni au recensement de Port Royal ni à celui du Cap-Sable en 1671. L'historien Clarence D'Entremont suggère que Jeanne, leur demi-soeur, qui habite à l'embouchure de la rivière Saint-Jean, les a pris sous son aile. On ne sait pas quelle formation a reçue Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour, même si les documents nous montrent qu'elle sait au moins signer son nom, ce qui n'est pas le cas de beaucoup d'Acadiens. Des écoles existent en Acadie au début de la colonisation, notamment à Port Royal et à La Hève, mais les bouleversements provoqués par les conquêtes successives rendent l'entreprise difficile. Quoi qu'il en soit, son éducation aurait été semblable à celle offerte aux jeunes filles du 17e siècle : "elles recevaient une éducation (...) pour les mieux préparer à jouer le rôle de futures mères de


12. Leurs demi-frères et soeurs, enfants de Jeanne Motin et de son premier mari, Charles de Menou d'Aulnay, sont tous décédés en France avant 1691. Nous reparlerons de leur demi-soeur Marie de Menou d'Aulnay plus loin.


familles ». Aux 17ᵉ et 18ᵉ siècles, en France comme dans ses colonies, les conceptions sociales dominantes définissent le mariage comme étant la destinée naturelle de la femme et la sphère domestique, son principal domaine d’activité. Les femmes n’ont pas accès aux fonctions publiques et, selon les principes de la Coutume de Paris (dont relève le droit privé), les épouses sont soumises juridiquement à l’autorité du mari. Elles doivent être dûment autorisées par ce dernier pour administrer leurs biens, s’engager par contrat, se lancer en affaires ou ester en justice. Les célibataires majeures et les veuves en ont cependant le droit.

Vers 1675, Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour épouse Alexandre LeBorgne de Bellisle, seigneur de Port Royal. Les LeBorgne sont liés à l’histoire de l’Acadie depuis ses débuts. Charles de Menou d’Aulnay, alors qu’il dirigeait la colonie, avait contracté une dette importante à l’endroit d’Emmanuel LeBorgne, marchand de La Rochelle, le père d’Alexandre LeBorgne de Bellisle. Après la mort de d’Aulnay, en 1650, sa veuve, Jeanne Motin, Charles de Saint-Étienne de La Tour et Emmanuel LeBorgne se disputent les droits sur les terres d’Acadie. La Tour reçoit du roi un brevet de gouverneur en 1651, ce qui n’empêche pas LeBorgne de se proclamer seigneur de l’Acadie, comme créancier du sieur d’Aulnay, en 1652.

19. Le mari a même la gestion des biens « propres » de sa femme, c’est-à-dire des biens hérités par celle-ci, mais il ne peut en disposer (par exemple, vendre une terre) sans son accord.
21. L’âge de la majorité est fixé à 25 ans. Peu de femmes profitent de ces droits, puisque la plupart d’entre elles se marient avant de devenir majeures. Les garçons ont le droit de demander leur « émancipation » avant l’âge de 25 ans, privilège qui n’est pas accordé aux filles.
22. White, Dictionnaire généalogique.
Endettée et harcelée par Le Borgne, Jeanne Motin contracte en 1653 un mariage de convenance avec Charles de Saint-Étienne de La Tour. Le contrat de mariage exprime leur souhait de rétablir la paix dans la colonie.

La prise de l’Acadie par Robert Sedgwick brouille les cartes en 1654. Pendant que l’Acadie est entre les mains de l’Angleterre, Emmanuel Le Borgne reçoit un brevet du roi de France le nommant gouverneur de l’Acadie. Le Borgne récupère ses possessions quand le traité de Bréda rend l’Acadie à la France, en 1667 (La Tour est alors décédé). L’année suivante, il confie le gouvernement de la colonie à son fils, Alexandre Le Borgne de Bellisle, qui s’y installera en 1670. Les enfants de Jeanne Motin et de Charles de Saint-Étienne de La Tour affirmeront plus tard dans un mémoire que leur défunte mère se plaignait amèrement, avant sa mort, des problèmes causés à sa famille par les Le Borgne en leur disant :

mes enfants, vous resterez ruinés et pauvres toutes vos vies par la fourberie et méchanceté du Sr Le Borgne qui ma ravy et surpris malicieusement lesdits transactions et papiers qui concernent le peu de biens que j’ay toujours eu pendant ma vie, dont vous deviez jouyr après ma mort.

Le mariage de Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour et d’Alexandre Le Borgne de Bellisle vise sans doute, comme celui de ses parents, à mettre fin aux disputes sur les possessions respectives de ces familles en Acadie. Le célibat n’est d’ailleurs pas un sort enviable au 17e siècle et presque toutes les femmes se marient. Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour a 20 ans à son mariage, soit un an de moins que l’âge.

moyen au mariage des Acadiennes de cette période\textsuperscript{31}. Elle a donné naissance à sept enfants (Emmanuel, Marie, Alexandre, Jeanne, Charles, Marie-Françoise et Anne)\textsuperscript{32}.

On sait peu de choses des activités d’Alexandre LeBorgne de Bellisle pendant les deux décennies qui suivent son installation en Acadie, si ce n’est qu’on lui reconnaît selon toute évidence des droits sur les établissements de Port Royal et des Mines\textsuperscript{33}. Il ne fait pas l’unanimité comme Seigneur du lieu : il se préoccupe peu du développement de ses terres et l’on dit même que sous l’influence de l’alcool, il concède parfois la même terre à plusieurs colons\textsuperscript{34}. La période d’occupation anglaise aurait contribué à affaiblir le système seigneurial en Acadie\textsuperscript{35} ; c’est cependant à Port Royal, aux Mines et à Beaubassin qu’il a ses racines les plus solides\textsuperscript{36}. Andrew Hill Clark affirme que si les Acadiens ont pris à la légère le système seigneurial et les devoirs qu’il impose aux agriculteurs et à ceux qui possèdent des terres, peu d’entre eux auraient nié les droits reconnus aux seigneurs par la Coutume de Paris\textsuperscript{37}. Le seigneur possède des terres qu’il concède à des censitaires qui doivent lui payer les cens et rentes, taxes portant sur les terres (le cens étant symbolique et la rente, substantielle) ainsi que les lods et ventes, taxe que doit acquitter celui qui achète une terre déjà concédée (le douzième du prix de la terre) ; les censitaires doivent aussi faire moudre leur grain au moulin du

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, p.11.

\textsuperscript{32} La moyenne d’enfants pour les femmes qui se sont mariées entre 20 et 24 ans est de 9 pour celles qui n’ont pas connu de rupture d’union avant l’âge de 45 ans. Hynes, « Some Aspects », p. 12. Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour est devenue veuve vers l’âge de 39 ans.


\textsuperscript{35} Reid, Acadia, Maine, p. 140.

\textsuperscript{36} Clark, Acadia, p.118.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid, p. 115.
seigneur et lui laisser une partie du grain moulu (droit de mouture ou banalité, habituellement le quatorzième minot) 38.

« Dame propriétaire et Seigneur de Port Royal Et de parties d'acadie »

Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour succède à son mari comme seigneuresse de Port Royal après la mort de ce dernier, vers 1691 39. Elle a survécu une quarantaine d'années à son mari puisqu'elle n'est décédée qu'en mai 1739, à l'âge de 84 ans 40. Rien dans les documents n'indique qu'elle se soit remariée. Pourtant, la plupart des veufs et des veuves de Port Royal se remarièrent, nous dit Gisa Hynes; même que les deuxièmes mariages sont monnaie courante chez les gens plus âgés 41. Les revenus que Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour tire de ses terres sont peut-être suffisants pour lui éviter d'avoir à se remarier pour survivre, même en présence de prétendants attirés par les avantages que lui confère la possession d'une seigneurie 42.

Il n'est pas rare au 17e siècle de voir des femmes à la tête de seigneuries : en 1663, en Nouvelle-France, 54,5 % des seigneuries appartiennent à des veuves 43. Les auteures du Collectif Clio sur


42. Les auteures du Collectif Clio sur l'historie des femmes au Québec indiquent qu'« on a toutes les raisons de croire que les veuves sont recherchées et qu'elles tirent parti de leurs avantages (matériels) ». Dumont et al, L'histoire des femmes au Québec depuis quatre siècles, Québec, Le Jour, 1992, p. 63 et 67. Gauvreau note, pour sa part, une plus grande propension au remariage chez les femmes de marchands à Québec. Québec. Une ville, p. 133.

l’histoire des femmes au Québec affirment que les femmes n’en détiennent pas pour autant un pouvoir sur les affaires et ne possèdent leurs seigneuries qu’en attendant de céder leurs biens à leurs fils. Nous verrons que Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour s’occupe toujours de la gestion de sa seigneurie même quand ses fils ont atteint l’âge adulte. Les veuves semblent d’ailleurs jouer d’un certain pouvoir « politique » dans la société acadienne, si l’on se fie à une requête envoyée au gouverneur Philipps par les Acadiens d’Annapolis Royal en 1720 au sujet de la nomination de députés acadiens : le document est signé par 110 hommes et l’on y précise que toutes les veuves sont du même avis.

De 1693 à 1710, on note une présence marquée de « Madame de Bellisle » dans les archives notariales de Port Royal (voir le tableau A). Sur 16 actes où il est question de ventes, de concessions ou de donations de terres ou d’habitations, huit font mention d’elle.

---

44. Ibid.


47. C’est ainsi qu’on se réfère à elle dans les documents.

48. Parmi les autres actes (même ceux touchant des terres situées à Port Royal ou le long de la Rivière Dauphin, habituellement « en la censive de Madame de Bellisle »), certains ne font mention d’aucune obligation seigneuriale, quelques-uns ne précisent pas le nom du seigneur et d’autres nomment un autre seigneur que Madame de Bellisle.
# Tableau A

**Gestion d’une seigneurie par Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour : étude des actes faits devant le notaire Loppinot à Port Royal, 1693-1710**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOMBRE D'ACTES</th>
<th>CATÉGORIE</th>
<th>DATES ET GENS EN CAUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2              | concessions et ventes par Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour | -2 mai 1693: concession à Denis Petitot, chirurgien (un billet de concession de 1692 y est attaché)  
                 -31 janv. 1705: vente à Alexandre Girouard, son gendre, et à Pierre Dupuis |
| 6              | actes de vente où l'on fait mention d'obligations seigneuriales envers Madame de Bellisle | -21 nov. 1699: Antoine Hébert et Jeanne Corpron vendent un terrain (concession faite le 4 juin 1694)  
                 -21 nov. 1699: Antoine Hébert et Jeanne Corpron vendent une terre à Jean Mitifier  
                 -26 fév. 1700: Jean Labat et Renée Gautrot concèdent une terre à Pierre Landry, Claude Landry et Jean Babineau  
                 -10 mai 1700: Étienne Pellerin et Jeanne Savoie vendent une terre à Jean Naquin et Marguerite Bourg  
                 -15 mai 1700: Marie Gaudet, veuve, fait don d’une terre à Étienne Potevin et Marie Daigre  
                 -12 juillet 1700: Jean Presjean et Andrée Savoie vendent un emplacement à Jacques Levron |
| 8              | actes de vente | -mention d’un autre seigneur (LaVallière, D’Entre-mont, Sa Majesté), nom du seigneur non précisé ou aucune mention d’un seigneur |
| Total : 16     | ventes, concessions et donations de terres, ou d’habitations | |


Dans deux cas, Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour est présente devant notaire et les actes sont signés de sa main⁴⁹. Le 2 mai 1693, elle concède trois arpents de terre situés au camp des Anglais à Denis Petitot, chirurgien de Port Royal.

*Et ce à la charge et moyennant par le dit acceptant de bailler et paier à la dite (Dame) de St Estienne ou autres pour elle un denier tournois de cens et un poulet de rente annuelle a*

---

⁴⁹. Série G3, vol. 2040, le 2 mai 1693 et le 31 janvier 1705. Elle signe « Marie de St etienne ». 

---
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perpétuité et non rachetable envers la dite (Dame) à cause de son fief et manoir Seigneurial du dit Port Royal payable denier tournois de cens et le dit poulet de rente par chacun an au jour et feste de St. Michel en sa maison Seigneuriale du dit Port Royal portant le dit cens lods et vente, saisine et amendes (...) pour chacune vente cellée et non notifiée dans vingt jours de datte du contrat50.

On y précise que le contrat a été fait « le tout suivant qu'il est porté par un billet sous seing privé de la dite damoiselle de St Estienne en date du dix May 1692 cy attaché ». La concession avait donc été accordée un an avant la ratification de cette transaction devant notaire51. Ces billets de concession sont assez communs au Canada53. Nous ne savons pas si Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour agit, en 1692, en tant que procuratrice de son mari ou si le Sieur LeBorgne de Bellisle est déjà décédé à ce moment-là. Il n'est pas exceptionnel, en Nouvelle-France, qu'une femme soit au courant des affaires de son mari et agisse à titre de procureuratrice de celui-ci53. L'un des actes passés devant le notaire Loppinot concerne d'ailleurs la nomination de sa belle-soeur Jeanne Angélique Loreau comme procureuratrice de son mari, Charles de Saint-Étienne de LaTour54. D'autres actes sont signés par les deux membres du couple. Dans certains cas, il pourrait s'agir de transactions touchant les « propres » de la femme (par exemple, des terres dont elle a hérité), pour lesquelles sa signature est requise.

Le 31 janvier 1705, Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour vend sa part d'un septième dans la ferme dite Notre-Dame du Levant à son gendre Alexandre Girouard, époux de sa fille Marie, et à Pierre Dupuis. Cela,

à la charge de payer a la dite dame de bellisle pendant sa vie durant seulement dix boisseaux de blé (...) aussi de nourrir et

50. Ibid, le 2 mai 1693.
51. Le court billet se termine par les mots « En foy de quoi je signe marie de St estienne », d'une écriture plutôt assurée. Il est difficile d'affirmer que cette écriture est la même que celle du billet.
hiverner deux vaches et les ramener a la maison de la dite dame au bout de l’hiver et ce aussi pendant sa vie (...) et en outre a la charge de payer après la mort de la dite Dame a ses héritiers et ayant causes la somme de huit livres par an le tout de rente fonciere et non rachetable pour aucune raison ny pretexte que ce peut estre 55.

Le contrat précise que les acquéreurs ont déjà payé deux ans de rente à la Dame de Bellisle.

Six autres actes font mention de la seigneuresse de Port Royal : les terres en question sont « en la censive de Madame de Bellisle », c’est-à-dire assujetties au cens ou à une rente devant être payés au seigneur du lieu chaque année 56. Le terrain d’un arpent et demi de terre défrichée que vendent Antoine Hébert et son épouse, Jeanne Corporon, le 21 novembre 1699, appartient « au dit vendeur (...) par une concession du seigneur du lieu du quatrième juin mil six cent quatre vingt quatorze étant icelle terre en la censive de Madame de Bellisle seigneur de Port Royal envers elle charge de douze sols six deniers de rente » 57. Au Canada, le taux de cens est en général d’un ou deux sols et celui de la rente, de vingt sols par arpent de front (parfois payable en chapons ou en blé froment) 58. La valeur des redevances seigneuriales à Port Royal est la plupart du temps impossible à déterminer : l’écriture du notaire est souvent indéchiffrable et certains contrats ne précisent pas la valeur du cens ou de la rente. Dans le cas de Jean Presjean et de sa femme, Andrée Savoie, qui vendent à Jacques Levron la moitié d’un emplacement situé en haut de la Rivière Dauphin, le 12 juillet 1700, le nouveau propriétaire devra livrer à Madame de Bellisle un boisseau de blé par an, la vente

55. Ibid, le 31 janvier 1705.
56. Habituellement le jour de la Saint-Martin, le 11 novembre, ou de la Saint-Michel, le 29 septembre.
étant « faite à la charge de droits seigneuriaux (...) étant la dite terre en la censive de Madame de Belisle dame propriétaire et Seigneur de Port Royal Et parties d'acadie »

59. Deux actes mentionnent que le « cens porte lods et vente, saisine et amende » pour chaque vente « scellée et non notifiée dans vingt jours de la date du contrat »

Habituellement, cette taxe sur la mutation des terres en censive est réduite du quart si le seigneur en est informé avant le délai de vingt jours suivant la signature du contrat. La formulation des actes mentionnés ci-dessus suggère cependant que la taxe en entier n'est imposée que si le délai n'est pas respecté.

L'analyse des actes notariés montre que la gestion des terres n'est pas un domaine exclusivement masculin en Acadie coloniale et que les veuves, comme les épouses, y sont souvent mêlées. Elle indique aussi que le système seigneurial, malgré ses failles, est bel et bien présent dans la vie des habitants de Port Royal et qu'il représente une source de revenus (dont la valeur réelle est cependant impossible à déterminer) pour les seigneurs et leurs familles.

Les disputes entre les descendants des La Tour et des LeBorgne reprennent après la mort d'Alexandre, vers 1691. Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour et ses soeurs accordent une procuration à leur frère Charles, en 1699, afin qu'il réclame, en France, la rente annuelle et les terres dont ils ont hérité de leur demi-soeur Marie de Menou d'Aulnay, légataire universelle de Charles et de Jeanne Motin, et qu'il intercède en leurs noms auprès du roi pour qu'on leur permette de jouir des propriétés foncières héritées de leur père en dépit des réclamations d'André LeBorgne du Coudray, frère d'Alexandre.

60. Acte de concession fait par Madame de Bellisle à Denis Petitot (Ibid, le 2 mai 1693) et acte de vente fait par Étienne Pellerin et Jeanne Savoie à Jean Naquin et Marguerite Bourg (Ibid, le 10 mai 1700).


62. Clark, Acadia, p. 121.


64. Près de la rivière Kennebec, à l'intérieur des frontières actuelles du Maine.

65. Fief : une seigneurie.
Le Borgne de Bellisle et de Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour. Ainsi :

les dits fiefs de Port royal et des Mines, lesquels deux derniers fiefs seront partagés en sept portions égales, dont cinq appartiendront: la première au dî de la Tour, la seconde à la dite Melançon, la troisième à la veuve Le Borgne de Bellisle, la quatrième à la dite d’Entremont, la cinquième à la dite veuve Plainmarais, et les deux autres restant aux enfants de la dite veuve de Bellisle.

Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour et ses sœurs, Anne et Marguerite, héritent donc de ces terres au même titre que leur frère Charles même si, selon les principes de la Coutume de Paris, le fils ainé a droit à la moitié d’une seigneurie, l’autre moitié devant être partagée également entre les autres enfants d’un couple.

La redistribution des terres en 1703 n’a pas mis un terme aux disputes et aux revendications des personnes en cause. Même les La Tour ne s’entendent plus entre eux :

dans les Lots des Srs de Latour, il s’est trouvé une Ferme et un Moulin à Eau dont la dite Dame de Bellisle et ses enfants jouissent et sont en possession depuis trente ans, les Srs de Latour ont prétendu qu’étant dans l’étendue de leurs lots, ils devaient leur appartenir et ils s’en sont mis en possession. La dite Dame soumet que l’Intention du roy n’a esté que d’ordonner le partage des Mouvances et des terres incultes, et non pas de celles qui étoient actuellement possédées et Cultivées par aucun des Habitants comme celles-cy. En conséquence Elle demande d’être remise en possession de la Ferme et du Moulin à Eau.

Le Conseil d’État du roi lui donne raison et ordonne, en juin 1705, « que la dite Veuve Le borgne de Belleisle (soit) remise en posses-

sion de la dite ferme et Moulin à Eau pour en jouir ainsi qu'elle faisoit avant le dit arrêt » 70. La présence de ce moulin et l'importance qu'il semble avoir pour Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour nous permettent de penser qu'il est une source de revenus pour la seigneuresse de Port Royal et ses enfants. Cette question fait encore couler de l'encre trois années plus tard, ce qui laisse deviner que les tensions sont encore vives dans la famille : Mathieu Desgoutins, administrateur de la colonie, écrit qu'il n'est pas facile de tirer cette affaire au clair puisque « les pièces justificatives sont passées par tant de mains que la dame de Belle Isle ne scait auquel de ses gendres elle les a confiés pour elle, elle na memoire de rien, c'est une bonne femme qui ne va que quand on la pousse » 71. Cette « bonne femme » n'est pourtant pas passive face aux circonstances. Comme nous l'avons vu, elle veille à ses intérêts et à ceux de ses enfants en s'alliant ou en s'opposant aux membres de sa famille. Le contenu de la requête qu'elle présente au Conseil d'État du roi au sujet de la ferme et du moulin montre qu'elle est au courant des questions seigneuriales puisqu'elle y cite d'anciens arrêts, y discute des intentions du roi et obtient gain de cause.

La prise de Port Royal et l'occupation anglaise

Après la conquête anglaise de 1710, Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour quitte l'Acadie pendant quelques années, passant une partie de cette période à Québec, accompagnée de quelques-uns de ses enfants 72, ainsi qu'à Louisbourg, chez sa fille Anne, où elle se trouve en 1715 73. Couillard-Després avance que les conditions avantageuses

70. Archives nationales du Canada, MG1, Archives des Colonies, Série E, Dossiers personnels, nos 266-276, « Le Borgne-Lemoine-Despins », le 2 juin 1705.
du traité d'Utrecht et celles de la lettre de la reine Anne ont sans
doute poussé la seigneuresse de Port Royal à revenir en Acadie :

_les seigneurs recevaient la jouissance de leurs terres en fiefs
comme sous l'ancien régime : les censitaires devaient continuer
tà leur payer les cens et rentes; et tous pouvaient quitter l'Acadie,
non plus après un an, mais quand ils le voudraient_74.

Ayant déjà vécu plusieurs conquêtes et reconquêtes, Marie de
Saint-Étienne de La Tour semble s'adapter sans trop de difficultés à
la nouvelle administration britannique, s'occupant toujours de la
gestion de ses terres et se présentant à plusieurs reprises devant le
Conseil d'Annapolis Royal pour défendre ses droits sur les terres
seigneuriales d'Acadie.

Au cours des années 1720 et 1730, période pendant laquelle les
autorités britanniques tentent de régler la question seigneuriale en
transformant les terres des seigneurs en tenures royales75, Marie de
Saint-Étienne s'oppose à sa nièce, Agathe de Saint-Étienne76. Cette
dernière se dit propriétaire de toutes les terres seigneuriales d'Acadie,
affirmant que ses parents lui ont abandonné leurs parts lors de la
prise de l'Acadie par les Anglais77. Le 3 juin 1725, devant le Conseil
d'Annapolis Royal, la veuve LeBorgne de Bellisle défend ses droits
sur certaines terres qu'elle croit avoir hérité des LeBorgne face aux
réclamations du mari d'Agathe de Saint-Étienne, James Campbell, et
de ses neveux Jacques et Charles D'Entremont (fils de sa soeur
Anne)78. La cause est reportée à l'automne par le Conseil d'Anna-

75. D'Entremont, _Histoire du Cap Sable_, p. 1674.
76. Agathe de Saint-Étienne de La Tour, fille de Jacques et d'Anne Melanson,
épousera deux officiers britanniques, Bradstreet et Campbell.
77. Selon Clarence D'Entremont, qui reprend l'explication du gouverneur
Armstrong, ces actes signés en novembre 1714 par plusieurs membres de la famille
La Tour ou leurs conjoints n'auraient été faits qu'à la condition que ces derniers
se retirent du territoire britannique. En soulignant le lien de parenté avec Marie
de Saint-Étienne de La Tour, qui n'a pas signé de tels documents, les signataires
de ces actes sont les suivants : sa soeur Anne et son mari Jacques Mius
D'Entremont; sa belle-soeur Anne Melanson (mère d'Agathe) et ses enfants
Charles et Marie, de même que son deuxième mari, Alexandre Robichaud; son
frère Charles; sa soeur Marguerite et son mari Jean-François Villate. D'Entremont,
_Histoire du Cap Sable_, p. 1709.
78. Ibid., p. 1673; Macmechan, _Nova Scotia Archives_, vol. 3, p. 101-102. Les
deux soeurs de Marie de Saint-Étienne, Anne et Marguerite, ont épousé Jacques
et Abraham D'Entremont, membres d'une famille seigneuriale du Cap Sable (ces
droits seigneuriaux leur avaient été accordés par Charles de Saint-Étienne de La
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polis qui lui demande de produire d'autres documents à cet effet, qu'elle doit aller quérir aux Mines chez son fils. Cette question est demeurée en suspens.

Au début des années 1730, le Conseil d'Annapolis ordonne aux Acadiens de verser leurs redevances seigneuriales à la Couronne britannique\(^7^9\). Malgré les ordres du gouverneur, certains habitants ont continué à payer leurs redevances à Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour : en 1733, Jean Dion, chargé de percevoir ces taxes pour le Conseil d'Annapolis, insinue que les habitants ont payé à Madame de Bellisle sept chelins et six deniers\(^8^0\). Cette année-là, Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour et sa fille Marie demandent la permission de percevoir les rentes sur la ferme qui avait opposé les La Tour entre eux au début du siècle et qui était échue à la veuve et à ses enfants en vertu d'une décision du Conseil d'État du roi de 1705.

Then was Read a Petition from Mary de St Etienne Widow of Alexander le Burn of Belisle and of Mary le burn her Daughter Setting forth that that they had no contract for Some lands Called the farm, and that it was only Granted them by virtue of Arrest de cour, as were also the Seignorial (...) Rents, and therefore as they had been at Great Charges in Settling the Province, Prays the Enjoyment of Said Rents and farms &c. as upon file\(^8^1\).

Un an plus tard, en janvier 1734, le Conseil d'Annapolis ordonne à René Forest, Jacques Girouard et René Richard, de payer à Madame de Bellisle : « Each of you one half of the Usual Rents of your ffarm Which Consists of Six hogsheads three Bushels Wheat and Thirteen fowles yearly from Jan. 1st 1733/34 and the other half to be lodged in his Majesty's stores until further orders »\(^8^2\). Le 10 avril, le gouverneur exige que cette rente soit payée en entier à Madame de Bellisle, jusqu'à nouvel ordre, puisque ces rentes sont foncières plutôt que

---

\(^7^9\) D'Entremont, *Histoire du Cap Sable*, p. 1675.

\(^8^0\) Couillard-Després, *Histoire des seigneurs*, p. 238.


Il s'agit de 6 barriques et de 3 boisseaux de blé ainsi que de 13 volailles représentant la moitié de la rente, l'autre moitié allant à la Couronne britannique.
seigneuriales, ces terres étant des tenures par bail, louées pour un temps déterminé. Une année plus tôt, son fils Alexandre LeBorgne de Bellisle prête le serment d'allégeance à la Couronne britannique et adresse une requête au gouverneur, « tant en son Nom que pour sa Mère et sa soeur », afin d'obtenir la reconnaissance des droits seigneuriaux hérités de son père, Emmanuel LeBorgne. Cette demande n'a pas eu de suite en raison de la reconnaissance par la Grande-Bretagne des prétentions d'Agathe de Saint-Étienne sur les terres seigneuriales d'Acadie, dont la Couronne a fait l'acquisition en février 1734. Nous ne savons pas quelles ont été les conséquences de cette décision pour Marie de Saint-Étienne, alors âgée de 80 ans. Elle semble toujours être dans les bonnes grâces des autorités puisque le 22 novembre 1736, trois ans avant sa mort, le conseil d'Annapolis l'exempe ainsi que sa fille d'une taxe sur le bois coupé dans les terres non concédées : « the council had imposed a tax or stumpage duty on cord wood cut on ungranted lands. From this the two messrs. Belleisle were exempted. »

L'étude des registres paroissiaux de Port Royal (1702-1740) nous montre que la « dame du lieu » n'a pas agi souvent comme

89. C'est ainsi que Mathieu Desgoutins, procureur du roi, se réfère à Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour dans une lettre datant de 1708 dans laquelle il affirme que Louis Allain aurait « excédé la dame du lieu à la porte de l'église et au sortir de la grand messe, et (...) le Sr de Bellisle, son fils, alors âgé de 14 ans, prenant le parti de sa mère, reçut un soufflet d'Allain qui le mit tout en sang; et l'on m'a assuré que M. Petit, prêtre, revêtu des habits sacerdotaux, y était accouru ». Cet incident se serait produit vers 1690. Public Archives of Nova Scotia, RG1, vol. 3, no 38, le 29 décembre 1708. Allain avait reçu d'Alexandre LeBorgne de Bellisle, en
marraine ou témoin. Cet honneur est habituellement réservé aux personnes les plus en vue dans la communauté et dans certaines régions de la France, l'épouse du seigneur sert généralement de marraine aux filles du village\textsuperscript{90}. Elle est marraine à une seule occasion et elle est témoin au mariage de sa nièce Marie Mius de Pleinmarais, fille d'Abraham et de Marguerite de La Tour, en 1705\textsuperscript{91}. Que la seigneurisse de Port Royal ait été si peu souvent marraine ou témoin peut sembler surprenant. Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour ne figure peut-être pas parmi les choix privilégiés des parents en raison de son âge avancé. Sa fille Marie et sa petite-fille Françoise (fille d'Alexandre et d'Anastasie de Saint-Castin) sont marraines plusieurs fois, souvent sans que leurs maris soient parrains, au cours des années étudiées. Les sources généalogiques reflètent cependant la place que sa famille semble occuper dans la société acadienne. Plusieurs de ses enfants ont en effet contracté des mariages avantageux dans une société où les réseaux familiaux sont de toute première importance : Anne a épousé Jean Rodrigue, pilote du roi à Port Royal, qui deviendra l'un des plus riches marchands de Louisbourg; Jeanne a pris comme époux Bernard Damours, d'une famille de seigneurs de la rivière Saint-Jean; et Alexandre a épousé Anastasie de Saint-Castin, fille du baron de Saint-Castin, personnage important de l'histoire de l'Acadie, et de la fille du chef abénakis Madokawando\textsuperscript{92}.

1687, la permission de prendre du bois et de bâtir des moulins sur les terres non concédées de la seigneurie. Série G3, vol. 2040, le 3 juillet 1687.
  \textsuperscript{90} Huffton, \textit{Histoire des femmes}, p.33
  \textsuperscript{91} Série G3, vol. 2040, le 7 août 1705.
  \textsuperscript{92} Nous avons déjà fait allusion à Emmanuel, qui a épousé Cécile Thibodeau, fille de Jeanne Thériot et du célèbre meunier Pierre Thibodeau, qui serait arrivé en Acadie en 1654 en compagnie de son grand-père Emmanuel LeBorgne; et à Marie, qui a épousé Alexandre Girouard, Sieur de Ru. Nous ne connaissons pas le sort de son fils Charles mais nous savons que Marie Françoise est entrée chez les Soeurs Hospitalières de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Québec en 1713. Cette communauté accueille des filles d'origines plus modestes (mais ayant de plus grosses dot) que celles de l'Hôpital-Général de Québec, qui accueille celles de la petite noblesse. Dumont et \textit{al}, \textit{L'histoire des femmes}, p. 131. Trois de ses nièces (filles d'Anne de Saint-Étienne et de Jacques D'Entremont) ont épousé des officiers de l'Île Royale.
CONCLUSION

Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour, veuve d'Alexandre LeBorgne de Bellisle, est un exemple intéressant de femme active dans la sphère publique en Acadie coloniale. Comme seigneuresse de Port Royal, elle concède et vend des terres, perçoit et gère les revenus que lui procurent sa seigneurie. Elle revendique les droits de la famille La Tour et ceux des LeBorgne en présentant des pétitions au Conseil d'État du roi, en France, et au Conseil d'Annapolis Royal. Son principal souci semble de protéger ses acquis, même quand les propriétés en litige impliquent certains membres de sa famille. Elle semble entretenir de bonnes relations avec les membres du Conseil d'Annapolis, qui lui accordent certaines faveurs (exemption de taxes). Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour est active dans la sphère publique pendant une quarantaine d’années, soit de la mort de son mari jusqu'à quelques années avant son propre décès. Le fait que ses enfants sont assez âgés pour prendre la relève ne l'empêche pas de voir elle-même à certaines affaires. L'occupation anglaise ne l'a pas rendue moins active, ni son âge avancé : elle a environ 70 ans quand elle se présente devant le Conseil d'Annapolis en 1725; sept ans plus tard, en 1733, elle présente une pétition au même conseil. Les mariages avantageux que font certains de ses enfants témoignent de la place importante qu'occupe sa famille dans la société coloniale acadienne; le fait qu'elle n'est que très rarement marraine ou témoin est surprenant, mais s'explique sans doute en raison de son âge avancé.

Notre recherche remet en question la conception traditionnelle du rôle des femmes en Acadie coloniale et rend compte de la nécessité d'étudier de façon plus approfondie la question de la participation des femmes dans la vie sociale et économique des 17e et 18e siècles. L'intégration de l'histoire des Acadiennes à celle des Acadiens nous permettra en effet de mieux saisir la dynamique de la société dans laquelle ils et elles évoluent. Plusieurs questions se posent à la suite de cette recherche. Il serait notamment important de voir si les femmes de l'élite dont font partie Marie de Saint-Étienne de La Tour et ses parentes sont représentatives de la majorité des Acadiennes ou si leur statut social rend leur condition particulière. La même question se pose en ce qui a trait à leur statut matrimonial. Ces pistes de recherche seront intéressantes à parcourir...
THE HUSBANDS AND CHILDREN OF AGATHE DE LA TOUR

Paul Delaney

While a number of historians have dealt with the life and career of Agathe de La Tour, no one has hitherto paid much attention to her two husbands, both British officers at Port Royal after the British conquest. Of her children by these marriages, one son has received a full biography. Dr. William G. Godfrey’s John Bradstreet’s Quest: Pursuit of Profit and Preferment in Colonial North America, (1982), together with his earlier entry on Bradstreet in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, has traced the career of a son by her first marriage. A good deal is also said there about her other Bradstreet son, Simon. Little has been published, however, about their father, Edmund Bradstreet, or about Agathe’s second husband, Hugh Campbell; and almost nothing, about Agathe’s second family. This article will bring new information, mostly from unpublished sources, to bear on what is already known about Agathe’s husbands and children, and add some new details to the biography of Agathe herself.

Born about 1690, she was the third child of Jacques Turgis de Saint Etienne de La Tour and Anne Melanson, and the granddaughter of the famous Charles de La Tour, governor of Acadia, by his third wife, Jeanne Mottin, the widow of D’Aulnay. In spite of this distinguished Acadian ancestry, Agathe eventually allied herself with the British after the fall of Port Royal in 1710. By her own account, she had "embraced the Principals of the Protestant Religion" even

before her first marriage. She left no record to explain or justify her actions. She may have been influenced by the fact that there was already some Protestantism in her ancestry: her maternal grandfather Charles Melanson had been raised a Protestant in England, the son of a Huguenot father, Pierre Laverdure, and an English mother, Priscilla. However, he (like his brother Pierre) had repudiated Protestantism before his marriage to an Acadian wife, Marie Dugas. Nevertheless, their eldest daughter Marie, a sister of Agathe’s mother, had been raised a Protestant by her grandmother Priscilla in Massachusetts. Even on Agathe’s father’s side there were hints of Protestantism. Her paternal great-grandfather, Claude de La Tour, has often been accused, during his lifetime and since, of being Catholic when he was with the French and Protestant when he was with the English. Agathe did not share his inconstancy, and having converted to the faith of her people’s enemies and conquerors, she appears never to have wavered.

Mrs. Bradstreet

Her first marriage must have taken place during the winter of 1712-3. In an undated document she speaks of her older son being "Nineteen years of age" while her younger son was "upwards of Seventeen years old." There was evidently a year and some months difference in their ages. As her younger son was born on 21 December 1714, the elder one must have been born in the summer or autumn of 1713. This puts the marriage back to the winter months of 1712-13. It was certainly after 10 June 1712, when as "Mademoiselle Agathe de La Tour" she stood as godmother to Agathe Viger at Port Royal. Indeed, she must not only have been single but presumably still a Catholic at that point, but within a short time she took her marriage vows before the Anglican military chaplain in the fort.

Her husband Edmund Bradstreet is first mentioned in Nova Scotia records on 7 Oct 1712, when he had orders to carry out an

3. The Petition of Agatha Campbell, ... widow and relict of Mr. Hugh Campbell... in behalf of her and her five children, Public Archives of Canada, MG 11 CO 217 6/199; Microfilm reel B-1623.
6. Cap de Sable, III 880.
inspection of the "Works at Fort Annapolis Royal done by Major Livingston"; on 31 Oct of that year he signed the report. Though Edmund seems to have been his real name, he is often referred to, and even signed as, Edward, probably because this English form was more familiar to his English colleagues than the Irish one he had been given in baptism. In April 1713, he headed a detachment ordered to bring a French privateer to Annapolis. During 1714 he signed two memorials, one complaining of the meagre allowance given to the garrison for "fireing and candle," and another of the inadequate pay and provisions for the garrison. On the 9th of November, he is described as "Edmond Brastried lieutenant d'une Compagnie dans cette garnison d'Annapolis Royalle." His signature, simply "Ed Bradstreet," appears in oaths of allegiance dated 19 November, 1714, 21 December 1714 and 10 Jan 1714/5 to the new King, George I. These were important, as they showed acceptance of the Protestant Hanoverian succession. Bradstreet's commission was renewed in April 1715, and he is listed as a Lieutenant in Philipps' Regiment of Foot stationed at Annapolis Royal in 1717, which along with three other independant companies was formed into the 40th Regiment the following year. In the ledgers of King Gould, the regiment's agent in London, he is mentioned in a payment for provisions made from December 1717 to 24 June 1718. This is the last mention of him. Agathe claimed that he had been "tué... par les Sauvages à la teste d'un detachement fait par la garnison pour aller contre Eux." However, Lawrence Armstrong, lieutenant colonel of the 40th Regiment and lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia, later asserted that this claim of Agathe's contained things "prejudicial to the truth," that it was "intended only to move compassion" and that

9. Copy of Memorial of Lieutenant Governor and other officers of Port Royal..., 3 November 1714; PAC MG 11 NS'A' 5/140.
10. The Memorials of the officers of this your Majesties Garrison at Annapolis Royal in behalf of the troops under their command [1714]; ibid., pp. 227-30.
Bradstreet "after a long lingering illness" had "died on his bed" in December, 1718.15

From this marriage Agathe had two sons. The elder Simon is first mentioned in the deed of 9 November 1714, six weeks before the birth of his younger brother, when he must have been over a year old.16 He was raised to be British and a Protestant. Agathe later assured the British authorities that she, having adopted the Protestant faith, "hath Carefully educated her Children therein & in the Strictest Loyalty to your Majesty." This was corroborated by a friend from Annapolis Royal who testified that Agathe was "a constant Communicant of the Church of England" and that she "hath Carefully Educated her Five Children in the same Religion." Like his father, Simon took up a military career, and having started off as a cadet at Pemaquid, he quickly rose in the ranks: adjutant in Col. Philipps' Regiment (November 1735); ensign, 40th Regiment (22 March 1739/40), after which he served at Canso; Lieut. Gen. Henry Harrison's Regiment (May 1744); Captain in Col. Philipps' Regiment (21 March 1744/5); and finally Major and Captain of a Company in Col. Shirley's Regiment (1 September 1745). In that era of patronage, Agathe had pushed for the advancement of her elder son in letters to King Gould and no doubt to other influential people.

Around 1742, he married a woman whose Christian name, Anna Elizabetha, is all we know at present. Nor do we know whether Simon found her on his own or took up King Gould's offer to find him a richer wife in England than he could hope for in Nova Scotia: "be sure not to Marry in the Country if you are that way Dispos’d We can get you a Girl here with some Crop and I’m sure You’ll meet with none there." Such a mercenary attitude to marriage was the rule in upper class society of the eighteenth century. Despite the

15. Lawrence Armstrong to Council of Trade and Plantations, 14 January 1734/5, Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies., 61/353.
16. Cessions et transports faits à... Agathe de La Tour, MG 11 NS 'A' 22/59-60.
17. Petition of Agatha Campbell, MG 11 CO 217, 6/199; PAC Microfilm B-1023.
18. Affadavit of Mary Barton, 23 June 1733, MG 11 NS 'A', 22/70.
19. His career can be followed in the first three chapters of Dr Godfrey's John Bradstreet's Quest.
20. The Petition of Anna Elizabetha Bradstreet, PAC MG 23 A2, Chatham, Mss Bundle, 73, 211.
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bride's rather Germanic name, the marriage almost certainly took place while Simon was on a visit to England, which began in the fall of 1742. He had fathered two children, a son Simon (b.c. 1743) and a daughter Anna Elizabetha (b.c. 1745), before his death, aged 31, in the shipwreck of the Rousby off the coast of Cape Breton on 27 December 1745\(^22\). With his new commission in Col Shirley's Regiment, he had been on his way to join the British forces in the first siege of Louisbourg.

No doubt because of his early death, almost nothing had been written about Simon until Dr Godfrey's biography of his brother, whereas a great deal had been written about John\(^3\). He had started off his distinguished military career as a cadet at Placentia and eventually rose to be Lieutenant Governor of St. John's Newfoundland (1746), Deputy Quartermaster for America in the British Army (1756) and a Major General (1772). Born on 21 December 1714, he had first been christened in the Anglican Church by Major Spelman in the fort at Annapolis Royal. Though the actual record is lost, this first christening was mentioned by Père Justinien when he rebaptised the child as Jean Baptiste, "fils de Sieur Edmon Bradstreet lieutenant de Compagnie et d'Agathe de St-Etienne de la Tour," in a Catholic ceremony on 12 March 1716\(^4\). It appears that Agathe had bowed to family pressure, since the child's godmother was her own mother Anne Melanson, who had married Alexandre Robi-chaud after her first husband's death. Despite this precaution by his Acadia relations, he became as convinced a Britisher and Protestant as his mother could have wished, and played an important role in the British campaigns against both Louisbourg and New France.

It was this Catholic baptismal record that first led to the apparently implausible identification of Jean Baptiste Bradstreet with General John Bradstreet of the British army. For obvious reasons, the ambitious Bradstreet had kept the nationality of his mother hidden, and been very vague about his origins. Early historians had commented on the fact that so little was known about these\(^5\). His

---

22. Godfrey, pp. 34-5; see also the Petition of Anna Elizabetha Bradstreet, in 20 above.

23. See fn 25 below.


real identity was first suggested by the American historian Stanley Pargellis, but the Acadian genealogist Placide Gaudet had also reached the same conclusion, as Pargellis noted in a letter to Gaudet "It is very encouraging... that you, working quite independently, should have reached the same suspicions as I hold myself, that Jean-Baptiste and General John Bradstreet are one and the same person."

Initially Mr. Pargellis felt that "the evidence is not enough... to warrant the categorical statement," but he later made the suggestion in print. Dr Godfrey's researches in the papers of King Gould in the National Library of Wales puts the question beyond doubt, however hard it might be for Acadians to accept that two of the British officers who were preparing to attack the fortress of Louisbourg had an Acadian mother.

In his earlier years as a young officer stationed at Canso in Nova Scotia, John Bradstreet had taken advantage of his kinship with some of the officers at Louisbourg to make a number of visits there, so as to do some profitable but illegal trading and to spy for the British. During one of these, Du Quesnel the commander at Louisbourg wrote to the Minister in France on 19 Oct 1741:

*Il en est venu de Canceau le Sieur Brastrit qui est parent de plusieurs officiers ici, je luy ay fait accueil et la meilleure chère que j'ai pu ainsi que Monsieur Bigot, nous luy avons même permis de vendre la goéllette dans laquelle il est venu qu'on luy a paié en sirops [rum] et taftiats et en outre il a laissé icy plus de deux mil escus en argent, nous luy avons permis d'affretter un bateau pour emporter à Canceau avec luy les effets qu'il a achetés, et j'ay profité de cette occasion, et j'ay envoyé le Sieur de Saint Estienne, Enseigne en Second qui a pensé se noyé par un gros coup de vent.*

This Sieur de St. Estienne, one of the relatives that Bradstreet found in the fort, was probably Pierre Charles de La Tour (b.c. 1715), a son of

---

26. Stanley Pargellis to Placide Gaudet, 6 August 1928, Centre d'études acadiennes, Ms 1, 78-35.
of Bradstreet’s great-uncle, Charles de La Tour. He was a first cousin of Agathe’s³⁹. Even more closely related to Bradstreet was the family of Pierre Rousseau de Souvigny, who had married Agathe’s sister Jeanne. Rousseau was a captain at the fort and a Chevalier de St. Louis, and his son and namesake Pierre, Bradstreet’s first cousin, was an ensign who was killed three years later in the first siege of Louisbourg. The elder Pierre also had two daughters married to officers at the fort, Marie-Charlotte, whose husband was Louis Leneuf de la Vallière, an ensign, and Marie-Josèphe, the wife of François-Nicolas Chassin de Thierry, a lieutenant. Other cousins were the sons of François DuPont Duvivier, who were all officers on Île Royale: François (b. 1705), who had become a captain in 1732, Joseph (b. 1707) and Michel (b. 1710), who had each become an enseigne en pied in 1738 and 1736 respectively³⁰. Their mother was Marie Mius d’Entremont, a daughter of Jacques Mius d’Entremont, Sieur de Pobomcoup, and of Anne de La Tour, a sister of Agathe’s father. Another daughter of this marriage, Jeanne Mius d’Entremont, had married Louis DuPont Duchambon, a brother of François DuPont Duvivier mentioned above. His sons François l’aîné and Louis de Vergor were stationed at Port Dauphin, also in Cape Breton, during this visit of Bradstreet’s in 1741, but at other times also served at Louisbourg. These were all second cousins of John Bradstreet’s. Another second cousin, once removed, was Louis-Thomas Jacau de Fiedmont, who though of the officer class was not yet an officer in 1742. He later wrote an account of the siege of Fort Beausejour³¹. His maternal grandfather was Pierre Melanson, the brother of Agathe’s maternal grandfather Charles Melanson. Such connections with the old ruling class in Acadia were exploited to improve Bradstreet’s finances and to further his career in the British army. Not only was the knowledge of Louisbourg that he had picked up during his visits there put at the service of the British authorities for their attack on the fort but he also took a leading role in the assault itself.

---

²⁹ Genealogical details for these and the following officers at Port Royal are from Stephen White, *Dictionnaire généalogique des familles acadiennes*, while details of their military careers are from Aegidius Fauteux, *Les Chevaliers de St-Louis en Canada*, (1940).


³¹ DCB, IV, 412-3 mentions that he became a cadet in 1743; Louis Thomas Jacau de Fiedmont, *The Siege of Beausejour in 1755: a journal of the attack...*, trans. Alice Webster, ed. J.C. Webster (1936).
As mysterious as the question of John Bradstreet’s origins was that of his marriage and children. This was finally sorted out by Dr Godfrey on the discovery of a letter in the King Gould papers from Bradstreet’s cousin, Christopher Aldridge, to King Gould’s son, explaining the complicated situation\(^32\). Bradstreet’s wife was Christopher’s aunt, Mary Aldridge, a daughter of the Major Aldridge who occurs in the records of Annapolis Royal. She was a widow when Bradstreet married her in about 1743. Her first husband, who had died at Canso on 4 November 1739, had been an officer in the British army and was, most perplexingly, also called John Bradstreet. In several letters he is referred to as a "cousin" or "kinsman" of Agathe’s son John\(^33\). This first marriage of Mary Aldridge had produced two children, Samuel, who became a Major in the 40th Regiment, and Elizabeth, who married Peter Livius, later Chief Justice of Quebec. Mary Aldridge’s marriage to the future General had added two more to the family, Agatha, no doubt named after her paternal grandmother, and Martha. While the latter remained unmarried, the former married twice, first to a Mr. Buttar, and then to a rather indolent and alcoholic actor/singer whose stage name was Charles du Bellamy, but who reverted to his real name of Evans soon after their marriage. In various wills these are all referred to as brothers and sisters, but the half-blood relationship between the two pairs was only rediscovered recently\(^34\).

These then are the known children and grandchildren of Agathe de La Tour and Edmund Bradstreet. Only one of them continued the line, Simon’s daughter Anna Elizabetha, who married Robert Garstin at the highly fashionable St. George’s Church, Hanover Square, London, on 30 August 1764\(^35\). Also from a landed Irish Protestant family, he was a military man, like their son John Bradstreet Garstin, who spent a good part of his career serving in Canada and actually

---

\(^32\) A book containing an account in the hand of Christopher Aldridge... relating to... the Bradstreet family, c 1808, Gould MS 128/1730; PANS Microfilm 10, 100. For the careers of his grandfather and his father, both also called Christopher Aldridge, see Dr Godfrey’s articles in DCB, III, 8-10. See also A.H. Eaton, History of Halifax, Americana, III (Oct 1916), no 4, p. 403 and Henry Piers, The Fortyeth Regiment raised at Annapolis Royal in 1717, Collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society, XXI (1921), pp. 115-183.

\(^33\) King Gould to ensign John Bradstreet, 6 July 1736, Gould MS, 284/81; PANS Microfilm 13204.

\(^34\) This had puzzled Pargellis, see CEA, Ms I, 78-35.

\(^35\) Marriages at St. George’s Hanover Square, Harleian Society Pubs: Registers, XI (1886). See also Burke’s Landed Gentry, (1898) II, 164.
married a Ketchum from New Brunswick. Through their daughter Mary, who married William Hay of Duns Castle, Berwickshire, Scotland, there are many descendants in Britain and Canada.

As for the antecedents of Agathe and Edmund Bradstreet, her ancestry on the De La Tour side is well known. His, however, has remained rather vague. He has been identified as a descendant of John Bradstreet (d. 1688), who went to Ireland with Cromwell and was granted a large estate there in 1653. Called Blanchfield Park and situated near Kilkenny, it had been forfeited by the Blanchfield family, Catholic Irish gentry who had opposed the English Puritans.

By his wife Margaret, John Bradstreet, had at least three children, Samuel of Tinniscolly in County Kilkenny, Simon of Port Lahane in nearby County Tipperary and a daughter Margaret, who married into the Butler family. Samuel of Tinniscolly married Elizabeth Agar, daughter of Charles Agar and Ellis Blanchfield, who was of a remote junior branch of the family that had held Blanchfield Park. One of the sons of this marriage was John Bradstreet, the first husband of Mary Aldridge. In her will of 1754, Elizabeth Agar mentions Samuel and Elizabeth, the children of her son John, deceased. These names and the date correspond with those of Mary Aldridge’s children by

36. See under Marquess of Tweedale in any recent edition of Burke’s Peerage and Baronetage.


38. George the First’s Army, II, 322; Dalton says Gen Bradstreet was the grandson of the grantee of Blanchfield Park, but he was actually his great-grandson. See Thomas Gamble, Data concerning the Families of Bancroft, Bradstreet, Dudley, Emerson, etc. in England and America, 1277-1906, (1903), 43, 47; John O’Hart, Irish Landed Gentry, Appendix, Addenda, Corrigenda and Index, pp. 412, 454, and Burke’s Peerage and Baronetage under the Bradstreet baronetcy, which became extinct in 1924.


41. For the Agars see George Burtchaell, Genealogical Memoirs of the Members of Parliament for... Kilkenny, (1888), p. 114.

her first marriage to a cousin of her second husband. Their relationship was actually first cousin, once removed.

The other son, Simon of Port Lahane, County Tipperary, was the father of Agathe’s husband, Edmund Bradstreet. This is proved by the will of another of Simon’s sons, the baronet Sir Simon Bradstreet, in 1760. Sir Simon leaves a bequest to his nephew, Lt Col John Bradstreet, Governor of St. John’s, Newfoundland, the very post held by Agathe’s son. So Edmund was a brother of Sir Simon and thus a son of Simon of Port Lahane. This is confirmed in a reference in a deed dated 29 August 1718 to an earlier deed dated 5 February 1694, in which a full moiety of lands at Port Lahane and other places is granted for the lives of "Edmd Bradstreet, John Bradstreet, and Redmond Bradstreet, 1st, 2nd and 3rd sons of... Simon Bradstreet." Other sons were born later, Samuel, Simon and Dudley, and there were also several daughters. John, Redmond and Samuel all later attended Kilkenny School, an institution that catered to Protestant boys of the region. Since the records there show that John was aged 12 in 1703 and thus born about 1691, his elder brother Edmund must have been born about 1689. That Edmund was the eldest son and therefore his father’s legal heir was to have important consequences for Agathe’s son Simon.

More of the family background is provided by Edmund Bradstreet’s youngest brother in his picaresque autobiography, The Life and Uncommon Adventures of Dudley Bradstreet, first published in 1755. In it he describes his origins:

I was born in Ireland, in the county of Tipperary, in the year 1711: My Father had the Command of a Troop of Horse and was also in the Commission of the Peace; his Possessions at that Time are now let at 3000L a Year; but being bound to the Crown in large Sums, together with an expensive Life, in the Course of some Years reduced this Fortune very low. Of many Children I was the last that

43. It was Sir Simon’s will which must have led Playfair, vol. 9, App. cxx-i to identify the governor of St. John’s Newfoundland, as Sir Simon’s nephew by an unnamed brother.
came into the World, and as my Father's Circumstances were then continually declining, ... he removed the whole Family from the Country to Dublin, except me.\textsuperscript{47}

In Dublin, they lived on King Street, near Stephen's Green\textsuperscript{48}. The fact that both his father and grandfather had been soldiers, together with the family's falling fortunes, may explain why Edmund, an eldest son and heir, took up a military career.

Dudley never identifies his mother, though he mentions her death in about 1734, two years after the death of her husband\textsuperscript{49}. He does refer to an uncle in the rather coy practice of the time as a Capt F--Gerald living in County Wexford, who may be the Thomas Fitzgerald of Crane, Wexford, who died in 1735. As John Bradstreet (d. 1688) did not have a daughter who married a Fitzgerald, it is quite possible that this was a brother of his mother's and that she was from a Protestant branch of this great Norman-Irish family\textsuperscript{50}.

While Dudley mentions his brothers Redmond and Sir Simon, he never directly mentions Edmund, which is not surprising since he could not have known him. Edmund was in Nova Scotia within a year of Dudley's birth and never returned to Ireland. Dudley does, however, make several clear references to Agathe's son Simon, though without ever naming him:

\begin{quote}
At the end of this time my Father's Grandson, and Heir at Law, came from America, he had been sent for by his Uncle, and lodged at his House in Dublin, or near it... My Nephew came into the Country to take Possession of what my Father had\textsuperscript{51}.
\end{quote}

This occurred 4 or 5 years after the death of his mother in about 1734, so around 1738/9. The uncle may have been Sir Simon, who lived in Kilmainham, just outside Dublin\textsuperscript{52}.

\textsuperscript{48} Dudley Bradstreet, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., p. 36.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., p. 32; see Index to Diocesan Wills: Ferns in PRO Dublin.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., p. 37.
\textsuperscript{52} Though Sir Simon did not become a baronet until 1759, I have used his title to distinguish him from his father, his nephew and his son of the same name.
We know from his correspondence with King Gould that Agathe’s son Simon Bradstreet visited Ireland in the late 1730s. In August 1737 he was in Boston ready to embark for Ireland, where he remained throughout 173853. King Gould wrote to him at the Widow Campbells at Kilkenny Ireland on 5 June 1738. In the end, he had to get permission to extend his leave of absence since he had been ill and had a great many affairs to see to54. These resulted from being the heir to his grandfather’s estate. It was not until May 1739 that he took up once again his position at Canso, having "lately gone" there from London, which he had visited after Ireland55.

While in Ireland Simon looked after the interests of his uncle Dudley, who had fallen upon hard times. Dudley records: "he generously gave me a Freehold lease worth thirty-six pounds a year, to make Life tolerable56." The Registry of Deeds in Dublin duly records that on 26 August 1738 Simon Bradstreet of Dublin, Gent., lets Dudley Bradstreet have lands in Killeen, Co. Longford during the life of Dudley, his wife and Redmond Bradstreet, his natural son57. These lands, worth about 100 pounds a year, had been left to Dudley’s father, "who had spent the very remains of his fortune," by one of his old business partners, and in about 1723 the family had left Dublin to take up residence on this estate that was much more modest than their original one58. With the British practice of primogeniture, it had passed to Edmund and Agathe’s elder son Simon on his grandfather’s death in about 1732.

Another of Simon’s legal responsibilities concerned a marriage settlement that had been made by his grandfather for the marriage of his aunt Mary to William McColly: "Simon Bradstreet, city of Dublin, Gent., grandson of Simon Bradstreet who leased lands to William McColly" reduced the rent by 2 pounds a year as the farm in Monescribin had turned out to be much smaller in area (not quite 80

53. King Gould to Mrs. Campbell, 5 October 1737, Gould Ms 284/217; PANS Microfilm 13204.
55. King Gould to Governor Cope, 3 May 1739; Gould Ms 286/142-3; PANS Microfilm 13204.
58. Dudley Bradstreet, p. 25. Dudley says that this occurred when he was about 12 years old (1723) and that his father’s benefactor was called McCants. At the PRO Dublin an Index to Cause Papers refers to a case in that year between Bradstreet/Farrell and one McCants deceased. The actual documents are lost.
instead of 120 acres) than described in the original deed\textsuperscript{9}. Though this was registered on 23 August 1739, when Simon was back in Nova Scotia, it is not uncommon for there to be a delay in the recording of such deeds. The genealogical details given make it certain that this is Agathe’s son. The only other Simons alive among the Irish Bradstreets at this time were the future baronet, whose grandfather’s name was John, and his son Simon who was born about 1728 and so only a child\textsuperscript{60}. Simon of Port Lahave had died 6 years before.

Dudley Bradstreet almost certainly refers to his nephews Simon and John in another passage of his autobiography. One of the more remarkable episodes in his career was his acting as a spy among the forces of the Young Pretender during the 1745-6 Rebellion. To improve his credibility among the rebels, he revealed to them something of his family and background:

\begin{quote}
I told them my Father was a Gentleman, and mentioned two or three very near Relations, two of them noble, and the other worth above three thousand Pounds: this was afterwards confirmed to them. I had two Nephews in the Elector’s Service (thus was I obliged to stile the King) one a Major the other a Captain, which was true\textsuperscript{61}.
\end{quote}

The nephews were of course Simon, promoted to Major in September 1745, and John, advanced to Captain in November 1745, while one of the noble relations was probably his niece Charlotte who had in 1744 married Edmund Butler, the heir to Viscount Mountgarret. Some twenty years later, Agathe’s son John mentions the Butlers and Lord Mountgarret as close relations\textsuperscript{62}. Since Simon and John’s promotions had only taken place late in 1745 and this incident must have occurred before the news of Simon’s death at the end of December 1745 had reached England and no later than April 1746, when the Jacobite rebels were crushed at Culloden, their uncle had very up-to-date information about them. They may well have met during John’s visit to Ireland in the summer and fall of 1736 and Simon’s visits to Britain in 1737-1738 and 1742-1743.

\textsuperscript{59} Registry of Deeds, Dublin, Simon Bradstreet to McColly, 23 August 1739, 97, 80.
\textsuperscript{60} Cokayne, Baronetage, V, p. 363.
\textsuperscript{61} Dudley Bradstreet, pp. 128-9.
\textsuperscript{62} John Bradstreet to Charles Gould, 22 April 1765, Gould MS 128/153; PANS Microfilm 10,097.
Finally, it is highly probable that these Irish Bradstreets were closely related to Gov. Simon Bradstreet of Massachusetts. The Governor was the son of the Rev. Simon Bradstreet, Vicar of Horbling in Lincolnshire, and had younger brothers called Samuel and John. This John Bradstreet, who was baptised at Horbling on 8 February 1606/7, has been identified as probably the origin of the Irish branch, the one who was granted Blanchfield Park, Kilkenny\(^63\). While there is no conclusive proof of this, there is much circumstantial evidence to support it. In both the American and Irish families the names Simon, Samuel and John occur in each generation, the name Simon often, though not always, being given to the eldest son. Indeed, the Governor tells us that his own father and grandfather were called Simon; the latter was said to be a "Suffolk gentleman of fine estate." Moreover, new names as well as such traditional family ones were shared. The more unusual name Dudley turns up in the American family in 1648, because the Governor’s first wife had that surname, and is copied in the next generation, while it occurs in Ireland in 1711 for no apparent reason\(^64\). This suggests some contact between the two families.

What’s more, the coat of arms used by the American family was the same as that used by the Irish branch: Argent, a greyhound passant gules, on a chief sable three crescents or\(^65\). An investigation at the College of Heralds in London produced no further information about them, except that the coat of arms, which does not appear to have been recorded at the time of the grant, looks seventeenth century in origin\(^66\). It may thus have been granted to the Rev. Simon Bradstreet, Vicar of Horbling, or to his father, the Suffolk squire, very probably the common ancestors of both the Irish and American branches.

Finally, the Rev. Simon was a strong non-Conformist and a fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, a hotbed of Puritanism\(^67\). Cambridgeshire, in the East Anglian region of England near where Cromwell himself originated, was also among the areas where his support was strongest. It would be entirely fitting that while one son

\(^{64}\) John Dean and Dean Dudley, Descendants of Gov. Bradstreet. New England Historical and Genealogical Register, VIII (1854), 313-33.
\(^{65}\) Descendants of Gov. Bradstreet, p. 313.
\(^{66}\) P. Ll. Gwynn-Jones, Lancaster Herald, to the Author, 6 April 1993.
\(^{67}\) John Venn, Alumni Cantabrensis, (1922), p. 203.
joined the Puritan exodus to the New World, another took up arms in support of the Puritan cause in England and Ireland.

Mrs. Campbell

The date of Agathe's second marriage is uncertain. She appears to have remained a widow for a few years after Edmund's death at the end of 1718, and is described as "Mrs. Bradstreet" in orders from Col. Philipps dated 5 July 1721 and 19 September 1722. These instructed the inhabitants of "Quobaquit and Sheccanectou" to pay her their arrears in their rents "on account of her seniorie." So the marriage must have taken place between this date, and 3 June 1725, when ensign James Campbell, together with Agathe's cousins Jacques and Charles de Pobomcoup, submitted a petition concerning their rights in the will of their aunt Marie de Menou, who was a daughter of their grandmother's first marriage to Charles de Menou d'Aunay. Jacques and Charles de Pobomcoup were members of the Mius d'Entremont family who were Seigneurs de Pobomcoup. The Campbell is clearly her second husband, acting on her behalf.

Their marriage produced at least one son, for King Gould mentions a "half-brother" whom John Bradstreet had recommended "be provided for with a pair of colours." At the time this half-brother was living in Ireland with Mrs. Campbell. Gould replied that his "interest for the two first vacancies" in the fortieth Regiment was already taken up, but would try to find a vacancy in another Regiment. There appears also to have been a daughter: John Bradstreet mentions in 1765 the Irish family of Agar "to whom his sister or Relation was Marry'd." The Agar family, distinguished by the fact that five of its branches acquired noble titles, was already connected with the Bradstreets. Edmund's uncle Samuel of Tinniscolly, who is perhaps the "relation" John referred to, had married an Agar. Their daughter Eleanor had brought the families ever closer together by marrying her first cousin, Edmund's brother Sir Simon. So there is nothing surprizing in a further union between Agathe's daughter and an Agar, which must have taken place during

---

68. PAC MG 11, NS 'A', vol. 22, p. 41.
69. A.M. MacMechan, ed. Original Minutes of his Majesty's Council at Annapolis Royal, 1720-39, Nova Scotia Archives, III (1908), p. 101; Murdock, I, 423; Cap de Sable, IV, 1673. The question of his Christian name will be discussed below.
70. King Gould to Simon Bradstreet, 15 March 1741/2, Gould MS 287/68-9; PANS Microfilm 13204.
her long visit with her younger children in Ireland. As Agathe had five children, and only Simon and John are ever mentioned in the King Gould correspondence with her and her Bradstreet sons, it seems likely that this daughter and the remaining child were also by Campbell. Unfortunately, as Gould was not so closely concerned with the second family, we have much less information about them.

The confusion as to whether Agathe’s second husband was James or Hugh Campbell was first cleared up by Dr Godfrey72. All but one of the direct references to him call him Hugh; Agathe always names him thus in her petitions, and in one of the signed statements drawn up in 1733 to support her claims before the British Government, she is described as "Mrs. Agatha la Tour now the widow of Hugh Campbell, Esq deceased73". The only time he is called James is in the above-mentioned petition. However, the James Campbell who was an officer at Annapolis Royal was a lieutenant, whereas Agathe’s husband is described as an ensign in the petition. The solution is that Ensign Hugh is here given the name of his father, Lieutenant James Campbell, who may have been dead by this date, as we shall see below. On 6 December 1716 James writes to ask if he may remit in his son’s favour and describes him as "a handsome young fellow and has served as a Volunteer these four years"74. Though he is not named in his father’s letter, this was almost certainly Agathe’s future husband. A Hugh Campbell signed the oaths of allegiance to King George on 23 December 1714 with Capt. Lawrence Armstrong’s Company. Almost a year after his father’s letter, 5 November 1717, John Doucett recommends to Col. Philips "two cadets that have served here some time vizt Mr. Hugh Campbell and Mr. John Bradstreet75." The second was Mary Aldridge’s first husband. Hugh Campbell was promoted to Ensign in Col. Richard Philipps Regiment of Foot on 14 June 1722, and his signature appears in documents dated 16 August and 24 November 172676. He died between this date and September 1730, when a reference is made to a widow’s pension.

74. James Campbell to James Stanhope, 6 December 1716, PAC MG 11 NS ‘A’ 8/41.
75. PANS RG 1 S/7.5; Microfilm 15220; John Doucett to Richard Philipps, 5 November 1717, PAC MG 11 NS ‘A’ 8/173-4.
76. George the First’s Army, pp. 322-3; see also PAC MG 11, NS ‘A’ 17/51-2, 72-8, 90-4.
for Agathe. The context suggests that he had been dead for a while by this time. As the widow of an ensign, she received a pension of 16 pounds a year for the rest of her life.

The father James Campbell mentions in the same letter from Annapolis Royal quoted above that he has been 26 years in the service, and hopes to be provided for in Chelsea Hospital, an institution that catered for retired soldiers in London, "eage cumming on apace, and I infirme & unfitte for the service in this part of the world." He has been identified as the James Campbell who on 1 April 1710 became a Lieutenant in Col. William Taylor's Company. This was one of four regiments raised in New England to attack the French settlements in Canada and Nova Scotia, and under General Nicholson it took part in the siege and capture of Port Royal. Campbell was not an American, however, for in the first mention of him in Nova Scotia on June 1st, 1711, he is listed as an officer in the British establishment brought over by Col. Nicholson. Although he had been a captain-lieutenant at the taking of Port Royal, he accepted a lieutenancy in an independant Company on 11 December 1712. His commission was renewed on 8 April 1715, and his signature appears in the oaths of allegiance to King George I in 1714. Even after his letter expressing his wish to retire, he was appointed Lieutenant in Col. Philipps' Regiment of Foot, newly raised at Annapolis Royal, his commission being dated 25 August 1717. This is the last we hear of him. In 1733 a Jane Campbell, widow of a Lieutenant in Col. Philipps' Regiment, was in receipt of an annual pension of 20 pounds. She is not included in an earlier list dated 1729. As James and his son were the only officers in the Regiment called Campbell, we may conclude that Jane was his widow and that

78. James Campbell to James Stanhope, 6 December 1716, PAC MG 11 NS 'A' 8/41.
80. Officers upon the British establishment brought over by Colonel Nicholson, 1 June 1711, PAC MG 11 NS 'A' 3/185; Dalton, English Army Lists, VI, p. 287.
81. James Campbell to James Stanhope, 6 December 1716, PAC NS 'A' 8/41.
82. PANS RG 1 6/15; Microfilm 15220.
83. George the First's Army I 239, 312.
84. Public Record Office (Kew), London, WO 24 805 (1729); WO 25 3020 (1735-6).
he died sometime between 1729 and 1733. Her death must have occurred in 1742, when payment of her pension ceased\textsuperscript{85}.

It has not yet been possible to identify which of the many branches of the Campbell clan James and Hugh belonged to. To have become officers in the British army at this period means that they must have been from the British gentry or from some cadet branch of a noble family. Only a few rather vague clues do exist of their possible identity.

Agathe, always litigious, was in correspondence with King Gould over her "Scots affair" between November 1735 and 1738. Gould assured her that

\begin{quote}
neither Pains or Dilligence has been wanting in Our Sollicitations, and I doubt not but that in the end youl Reap the Benefit thereof and that very likely much sooner than you Could well expect, when you Consider how troublesome it is to trace those Old Affairs and bring them to bear\textsuperscript{86}.
\end{quote}

Evidently, Agathe had resurrected some old claim of her second husband's family. In this connection she was in touch with the Earl of Loudun and his steward, who acted as her attorney in this matter. As the Earl was himself a Campbell, it seems possible that her second husband was a distant relation of this family. The names James and Hugh are very common, and occur repeatedly from generation to generation, in some of its branches. These include the Campbells of Cesnock, of Treesbank, and of Barquaharrie, but genealogies in print of these families do not usually trace the descendants of their younger and poorer branches\textsuperscript{87}. It is probably in one of these lines that the Campbells of Annapolis Royal belong. As for the Scots Affair, Agathe was evidently successful, for in Gould's account book for Mrs. Campbell, a payment is recorded of 33 pounds 15 shillings and 10 pence "being the balance... due to you from Mr. Arnott upon your affairs in Scotland\textsuperscript{88}"

\textsuperscript{85}PRO (Kew) WO 24 807 (1742).

\textsuperscript{86} King Gould to Mrs. Campbell, 9 December 17737, Gould MS 284/228; see also 1 November 1735, Gould MS 285/65; both PANS Microfilm 13204.

\textsuperscript{87} Burke's Commoners (1833-5): Campbell of Cesnock and Treesbank, II, 359; Campbell of Barquharrie, II 157-8.

\textsuperscript{88} Gould MS 259/79; PANS Microfilm 13204.
exceptionally well, and survived purges of officers in the regiment may also be significant. However, whether this was because of his exceptional ability or of such a family connection or both is impossible at present to determine.\(^{89}\)

After Hugh's death, Agathe spent very little time in Nova Scotia. In the autumn of 1731, she went to England to plead her grievances and to sell — fraudulently — the La Tour seigneurial rights to the British government. These were cynically purchased for 2000 pounds, even though British officials knew that Agathe only actually possessed part of these rights.\(^{90}\) After a brief return to Annapolis Royal, she went to live in Kilkenny, Ireland, where King Gould wrote to her on 23 September 1736.\(^{91}\) Her sons John and Simon visited her there during the winters of 1736 and 1737-8 respectively. She was certainly still living in Ireland with her younger children in March of 1742.\(^{92}\) Two visits to Kilkenny by Dr Godfrey and one by myself, however, failed to find any trace of her there.

It is interesting to speculate about what had brought her to Kilkenny. It was not to rejoin Edmund's immediate family, for none of them lived in the vicinity. Their former estate of Port Lahane had been in County Tipperary, and they now all lived either in Dublin or at Killeen in distant county Longford. Only the descendants of Edmund's uncle, Samuel of Tinniscolly, still lived in Kilkenny, near their Agar relations. Charles Bradstreet, the elder brother of Mary Aldridge's first husband John, had an estate at the Roar, near Tinniscolly.\(^{93}\) Perhaps Agathe had gone to live with them, or with the Agars at nearby Gowran. Indeed it might have been the attraction of these rich and powerful relatives and connections of her first husband that drew her to Ireland.

Another possible motive for her presence there can be suggested. The estate of Blanchfield Park, which Edmund's grandfather had acquired from Cromwell in about 1653, had been returned by King Charles II to the Blanchfields in 1660, but they had again forfeited their estates for rebellion in 1691. These had not, however, been given back to the Bradstreets, but sold at auction to others.\(^{94}\) Did Agathe, fresh from her triumphs over the La Tour seigneurial rights and the Scots affair, hope to get back the

---

89. I am indebted to Dr Godfrey for some of these points.
90. Cap de Sable, pp. 1688-1702.
91. King Gould to ensign John Bradstreet, 23 September 1736, Gould MS 284/181-2; PANS Microfilm 13204.
92. King Gould to Simon Bradstreet, 15 March 1741/2 Gould MS 287/68-9; PANS Microfilm 13204.
93. It is also called the Rower in many documents, and like Tinniscolly is in the parish of Inistioge. It should be mentioned that there were Campbells living in Kilkenny at that time, but there is nothing to connect them with Agathe's second husband.
94. Carrigan Ossory III 415; Healy Kilkenny I 54-5.
Blanchfield estates for her son Simon? It would have been very much in character.

Agathe lived on for many years, but whether in Kilkenny or elsewhere is not yet known. She continued to receive her annual pension until 1765, which must be the year of her death. The pension books for the "widows of officers who have been killed or dyed in the service" list her name annually until that date, and leave little doubt that this is Agathe de La Tour. The name of "Agatt" or "Agatha Campbell", widow of an ensign, occurs every year under the name of her husband's regiment. At first this was Philipps's, but the name changed with that of the commanding officer, as is clearly indicated by one of the headings over her name: "Philipps's now Cornwallis's now Hopkin's." It had finally become Armiger's by the time of Agathe's death. Apart from these pension records and occasional mentions in the ledgers of King Gould and his son in 1742, 1743/4 and 1755, we hear nothing of her for over twenty years. It is hard to imagine that she did not leave some trace, probably in some court records or lawyer's office, that will enable us one day to fill in this last period of her eventful life.

95. PRO (Kew) W O 25 3027 (1765-7); 3022 (1757-9).
96. PRO (Kew) W O 24 807 (1742).
97. PRO (Kew) W O 24 809 (1752).
98. PRO (Kew) W O 25 f3024 (1761-2).
99. King Gould's Records, which are incomplete, note payments of a bill for Agatha Campbell in 1741 and 1742-3 and the receipt of Mrs. Campbell's pension and further bill payments in 1755-6, Gould Mss 259/79 (PANS microfilm 12302) and 279/9 (PANS microfilm 13204). Though the latter is not specifically identified as Agathe, the mention of the pension and the fact that she is the only Mrs. Campbell mentioned anywhere in the books makes it seem likely that this refers to her.

100. I would like to thank Dr. William Godfrey for discussing Agathe's family with me and for lending me his thesis and photocopies of material from the King Gould papers in Wales, the Public Archives of Canada and the Public Archives of Nova Scotia. His thesis and book on John Bradstreet also provided me with many useful pointers on where to look for relevant material. I would also like to thank Mr. Stephen White, genealogist at the Centre d'études acadiennes, Université de Moncton, who put his Dictionnaire généalogique des familles acadiennes as well as his encyclopedic knowledge of Acadian genealogy at my disposal as he does to every visiting scholar. The staff of PANS have also been very helpful, particularly in enabling me to rectify a defective footnote. Father Fearghus O'Fearghail and Ms Mary Flood of the Kilkenny Archeological Society, Kilkenny, Ireland kindly answered many inquiries both by post and in person. Finally, my thanks to Marcel Barriault for proofreading the typescript.
* Most dates are approximate.
THE SEIGNEURS OF ACADIE: HISTORY AND GENEALOGY

Joan Bourque Campbell

Preface

My wife, Joan Bourque Campbell, was immensely proud of her heritage as an Acadienne, and throughout her lifetime did much to foster a greater awareness in this province of Acadian history, literature and genealogy. Her undergraduate work at Dalhousie University, which led to a B.A. (Honours) in 1978 and then to an M.A. in French in 1981, was in the field of Acadian literature; in 1988 she became a Certified Genealogist (Canada), again specializing in Acadian family reconstitution. Over the years, she researched, wrote and published three books, most notably her L'Histoire de la Paroisse de Sainte-Anne-du-Ruisseau (Yarmouth : Lescarbot, 1985), which was her tribute to the community she called 'home' and La Famille Bourque, De Port-Royal à Ste-Anne-du-Ruisseau 1609-1969 (Yarmouth : Lescarbot, 1983), a family genealogy.

At the time of her death in March 1992, Joan left an unfinished manuscript which was to be her fourth book. It concerned the seigneurs of Acadie, and in addition to presenting detailed genealogies for these individuals, it offered a brief overview of the seigneurial system as it developed in Nova Scotia during the French régime.

Her manuscript, which was in the form of a rough first draft based largely on secondary sources, cannot be regarded as complete, definitive or polished; it remains very much a work-in-progress. Nevertheless, the story of the seigneurs is a subject which has not been examined to any great extent, and it was furthermore a topic in which my late wife was especially interested. It was her intention to bring the history of the seigneurs forward to general attention, and regardless of the status of the manuscript at the time of her death, she would still want her research made available for scholars of Acadian history to use and expand upon.

Two editors, a translator and a skilled typist have worked with the draft manuscript in order to polish it sufficiently for publication. The editors wish to note that their work has been chiefly confined to copy-
editing and proof-reading. It has not been possible, in many instances, to provide sufficient context, continuity, or substantive clarification of dates, events and sources, since to do so would mean rewriting the text — thereby effectively destroying both the author’s prerogative and responsibilities.

This, then, is the story of *The Seigneurs of Acadie*, as Joan would have wished them to be presented. The book which has resulted is a tribute to her perseverance and to her belief in the *esprit acadien*.

D. Robert Campbell, M.D.
Ferguson’s Cove, Halifax
September 1993

Sources of Historical Information

The story of the seigneurs of Acadie, their lands and their lives, is one of the more turbulent episodes in the history of our province. The historical outline provided in the first section of this book was regrettably left incomplete at the time of the author’s death. Readers will catch glimpses of the high drama and intrigue which are the hallmarks of this early period of colonization, but will miss much of the context and continuity needed to appreciate fully the backdrop against which the genealogies contained in the second section should be displayed.

For those interested in reading further about Acadie during the French régime, there are several new and significant studies now available in addition to those cited in the Bibliography. The *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (Toronto : University of Toronto Press) is widely obtainable, and is recognized both for its lively presentation style and as a standard of excellence in biographical studies. Volume I, 1000 to 1700 (1967) and Volume II, 1701 to 1740 (1969) include entries for many of the individuals discussed in this book.

Chapter I

The Early Settlement of Acadie, 1604-1636

On 8 November 1603, Pierre Du Gua, Sieur de Monts, was named lieutenant-general of Acadie by Henri IV of France (Figure 1) (Appendix I). This commission enabled him to grant lands "and represent our person in the countries, territories, coasts, and confines of La Cadie commencing from the fortieth to the forty-sixth degree." The grant thus extended as far south as present-day Philadelphia, and included Acadie, Canada and other parts of New France.

The King's intention was to foster colonization and promote exploitation of trade and natural resources. De Monts was empowered to bring out sixty settlers per year, and to provide for them not only suitable housing, but also port facilities, barracks, garrisons and fortifications, a basic system of law courts, and appointed officials to run the colony. Additionally he was to set up alliances with the Indians, both to promote trade and to convert them to Christianity, particularly Roman Catholicism. To this end a secular priest, Nicolas Aubry, and a Protestant pastor — de Monts was a Calvinist — would accompany this first expedition. Jesuits, Récollets, Capucins and Sulpicians would follow in later years. Another secular priest, Jessé Fléché, came with the second expedition, in 1610.

A formal order was signed by the King on 18 December 1603, granting to de Monts a monopoly on trade in furs and other merchandise with the Indians living within the confines of the land he had been granted. The earlier commission had additionally permitted de Monts to search for minerals, reserving as royalties for the King ten per cent of any profit realized. De Monts viewed his concession as a commercial venture of great potential, and set about to raise capital via a trading company, the partners of which were merchants of

1. Marc Lescarbot, Histoire de la Nouvelle-France, intro. H. P. Biggar (Toronto: Champlain Society, 1907), II, 212. This usage of the spelling of La Cadie is the first to appear in a formal document; Acadie, Arcadie, etc. were shown on earlier maps. Many names used by the Indians used the ending cadie, as in Shubenacadie and Tracadie.

2. Ibid., II, 213. He was ordained by the King to "prescribe, subject to our good pleasure, laws, statutes and ordinances, conforming in all possible respects unto our own...."

La Rochelle, Rouen and St-Malo. Merchandise coming from New France was exempt from customs duties, and profits from the fur trade were a great motivating force in development of the new colony.

On 7 March 1604, two vessels, each less than 150 tons, weighed anchor from Havre-de-Grâce, France, bound for Acadie. On board were the Sieur de Monts with, among others, Samuel de Champlain, the senior officer François Gravé Du Pont, Père Aubry and de Monts's close friend, Jean de Biencourt, Baron de Poutrincourt et de Saint-Just (Champagne), a nobleman from Picardy who was to become the first seigneur of Acadie.

The first vessel, under the command of Gravé Du Pont, arrived in Acadie in early May, immediately continuing along the coast on a brief exploratory cruise. De Monts arrived on 8 May, dropping anchor at Cap LaHève (LaHave). After the two vessels had rendezvoused a month later at Port Mouton, they weighed anchor and rounded Cap-Sable to enter a large open bay which they named Baie Française (Bay of Fundy); venturing further, they spent a fortnight at Baie Sainte-Marie. It was there that Père Aubry wandered into the woods and became lost. Giving him up for dead, the others continued their scouting expedition without him — only to find the good father sixteen days later, wandering along the shoreline.

Continuing onward, they discovered a beautiful basin of water with high mountains on the north side; de Monts named the area Port-Royal. Poutrincourt was very taken with the location and "asked it of de Monts," expressing a desire to settle there; so de Monts, in the name of the King of France, granted his friend the concession of Port-Royal. Poutrincourt's grant was made with the understanding

5. Ibid., II, 228.
6. A few days after his arrival, de Monts encountered a Captain Rossignol from Havre-de-Grâce, bartering for furs with the Indians; since this was contrary to the King's prohibition, the de Monts party confiscated the vessel and named the harbour "Port Rossignol."
8. Lescarbot, Histoire, II, 212, notes that de Monts's commission referred to the Port-Royal area as part of the "said country of La Cadie"; and, p. 234, that Poutrincourt found "the spot to his liking, [and] asked it...of de Monts."
Monument of Sieur de Monts
"The Founder of Civilization in North America
1604
Annapolis, N.S."
that he would honour and carry out the same obligations as defined by Henri IV in the latter's commission to de Monts. Specifically, within two years he was to colonize the area, establish fishing and trading posts, and Christianize the Indians. True to the attitudes of colonizing nations four centuries ago, the latter were referred to in the commission as "God-less barbarians, without faith or religion" who needed to be lifted "out of the ignorance and infidelity to which they had sunk."

De Monts, Champlain, Poutrincourt and their men continued their explorations around the Bay of Fundy, cruising by the Bassin des Mines (Minas Basin) and the Rivière St-Jean (Saint John River, so named by Champlain because they arrived there on Saint-John Baptist Day, 24 June 1604). Reaching Passamaquoddy Bay, they decided to spend the first winter in Acadie at Île Sainte-Croix (Dochet's Island, Maine), believing it to be a good area in which to settle. Poutrincourt and his company returned to France, taking with them a cargo of fish and furs. De Monts remained behind, hastily erecting a fortification and directing his men in the construction of a small settlement or habitation. The island, however, turned out to be an unfortunate choice. The winter was severe, the colonists were at the mercy of the north and north-west winds, there was neither fresh food nor water, and all the available timber had been used to construct their rough shelter. At least thirty-six men died, while thirty-six more were struck with scurvy.

The following spring, June 1605, it was decided to demolish the Sainte-Croix habitation and rebuild at Port-Royal on the north side of the Annapolis Basin, opposite Île-aux-Chèvres (Goat Island). This was the first Port-Royal Habitation and was to exist from 1606 until

9. Ibid., II, 212.

10. Lescarbot thought settling on an island an unfortunate choice: "I shall always be of the opinion that any man who goes into a country to possess it should not settle down in islands to make himself a prisoner" (Rumilly, L'Acadie française, p. 24).

Lescarbot, Histoire, II, pp. 258-271, wonders over the causes of scurvy. He reflects on the writings of Hippocrates on the subject and writes of having consulted doctors in France. He considers the possible causes, such as the seasons, the winds, the cold, and wonders about treatments, the right foods to eat and the effect of an honourable wife on the constitution. He describes how Poutrincourt had the body of a Black man opened in an effort to determine what had caused his death; this is probably the first autopsy performed in Acadie by a European.

11. Lescarbot, Histoire, II, Bk. 4; Clark, Acadia, p. 78, fn. 8. Père Pierre Biard, reporting eleven years later, said that of the seventy-nine men, only eleven remained well.
1626. The self-contained community was built in the shape of a square palisade, and contained a manoir for the seigneur, houses, barns, a kiln, a blacksmith shop, a chapel and store-houses\textsuperscript{12} (Fig. 2, 3).

Meanwhile, in September 1605 de Monts returned to France to attend to difficulties which had arisen concerning his trading company and monopoly. The situation required his continuing presence at home, and accordingly he appointed Poutrincourt lieutenant-governor of Acadie, and began to organize a second voyage for the latter, whose seigneury of Port-Royal was officially ratified by Henri IV on 26 February 1606. On 13 May the Jonas, with Poutrincourt as captain, set sail for Acadie. On board were Poutrincourt's fifteen-year-old son, Charles de Biencourt de Saint-Just, his wife's cousin the apothecary Louis Hébert, the lawyer and author Marc Lescarbot, and about fifty male settlers\textsuperscript{13}.

The day following his return from France, Poutrincourt had the men begin tilling and preparing the soil for planting\textsuperscript{14}. Under the direction of Louis Hébert, the settlers planted vines, wheat, rye, oats, corn, peas and beans. Hébert gathered herbs and roots for medicinal use. The community traded blankets, knives and hatchets for beaver pelts, elk and moose meat with the Micmacs and the Indians of Pentagouët (Penobscot, Maine)\textsuperscript{15} (Fig. 4).

\textsuperscript{12} A restored version of this first Port-Royal Habitation has been constructed on the original site at Lower Granville, N.S., about 10 kms. from Annapolis Royal.

\textsuperscript{13} Marc Lescarbot, b. ca. 1570, d. 1630-1634, was called to the bar of Paris in 1599. He spent twelve months in Acadie, 1606-07. He wrote L'Histoire de la Nouvelle-France, a three-volume work which also included Les Musées de la Nouvelle-France and the Théâtre de Neptune, written to celebrate Poutrincourt's return to Port-Royal after a short exploratory trip down the coast as far as Mallebarre (Martha's Vineyard). The Théâtre de Neptune was presented on the beach in front of the Port-Royal Habitation. Les Musées are odes and sonnets honouring and praising the courage, piety and glory of de Monts, Poutrincourt, Champlain and an Indian named Floridian.

\textsuperscript{14} Lescarbot, Histoire, II, 317 and 322. At the site of present-day Fort Anne National Historic Site; on Lescarbot's map the location is referred to as "Marie Fort."

\textsuperscript{15} Lanctôt, L'Acadie des origines, p. 10.
Habitation of Port-Royal
Reproduction of a Design by Samuel de Champlain
*Voyages de la Nouvelle-France* (1613)
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Replica of Port-Royal Habitation, Lower Granville, N.S. 1992
Canada Parks Service - Photo by John Wooler

Replica of Port-Royal Habitation, Lower Granville, N.S. 1992
Canada Parks Service - Photo by Joël Doucet
1. La porte principale
2. Maisonnette près de l'entrée
3. La forge
4. La cuisine
5. Le fournil
6. La salle commune
7. La plate-forme à canons
8. Le bâtiment des artisans
9. Le dortoir de l'étage supérieur
10. La chapelle
11. Le logis de Louis Hébert
12. La maison du prêtre
13. Maison de Champdoré
14. Logis de Lescarbot
15. La maison du gouverneur
16. Magasin du haut
17. Magasin du bas
18. La salle de traite
19. La salle de garde
20. La palissade
21. Le puits

1. The Gateway
2. Small House Next to Gate
3. Blacksmith's Shop
4. The Kitchen
5. The Bake Shop
6. The Community Room
7. The Gun Platform
8. The Artisans' Building
9. Upper Dormitory
10. The Chapel
11. Louis Hébert Dwelling
12. Priest's Dwelling
13. Champdoré Dwelling
14. Lescarbot Dwelling
15. Governor's House
16. Upper Store-room
17. Lower Store-room
18. The Trading Room
19. The Guard Room
20. The Palisade
21. The well

Plan of Port-Royal
Constructed at Lower Granville
First Port-Royal, 1606-1624
Figure 4

Louis Hébert
First Apothecary in North America
Trading with an Indian
Poutrincourt’s Mill
Replica constructed by Nova Scotia Light and Power Company as a Centennial project in 1967 at l’Equille near Annapolis Royal, N.S.
In 1607, Poutrincourt built a water-powered grist mill on the Petite Rivière, which flowed into the Dauphin River (now the Annapolis River) from the south side of the basin, across from the Port-Royal Habitation. This was the first mill built in North America, and helped to ease the toil of making flour by hand (Fig. 5)\(^6\).

To help the morale of the settlers through the long winter nights, Samuel de Champlain established the first social club in North America, the now-famous *L'Ordre de Bon Temps*. Every second week a large meal was prepared and served as a feast by a designated person, named the *maître d'hôtel* or steward for the occasion. Membertou, the *sachem* or chief of the local Micmac band, regularly ate and drank at the table and, according to Marc Lescarbot, another twenty to thirty Indians, including women, girls and children also enjoyed these celebrations and were given bread to eat, "as one would do for the poor\(^7\)." Though living conditions had improved since the Île Sainte-Croix winter, four people nevertheless died of scurvy during the winter of 1606-07\(^8\).

In July 1607, a letter arrived at Port-Royal from de Monts, directing Poutrincourt to return to France: thanks to general resentment of the company’s preferred status, the King had revoked the original ten-year trading monopoly, and the settlement was to be abandoned. On 30 July, three barques transported practically the entire colony to Canso, where they embarked on the *Jonas* for France; the last to leave Port-Royal were Poutrincourt, Louis Hébert and eight men. The Habitation and the livestock were left behind under the care of Sachem Membertou; samples of fish, grain and minerals were taken back to France to prove the commercial viability of the settlement.

---

16. Also called Rivière au Moulin, and later Allain’s River, after Louis Allain (1654-1737) who had a sawmill and a flour mill on the site. This mill was rebuilt by the then Nova Scotia Light and Power Company as a Centennial project in 1967, on the site of the original mill (telephone conversation with Morris MacDonald, Nova Scotia Power). An old millstone monument on the site refers to the Petite River as the l’Equille River; on Champlain’s map of the Annapolis Basin, drawn in 1605, the Annapolis River is called the l’Equille River (Appendix IV).


18. Lanctôt, *L’Acadie*, p. 15. [Ed. note: George MacBeath, *"Du Gua de Monts, Pierre, in Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, 1 (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1967), 291-294, claims that seven died, compared to twelve the previous winter.]
When the expenses of the venture were tallied up, de Monts was said to have lost 10,000 livres. In an effort to recoup his losses in Acadie, he now joined with Champlain in a venture to settle the St. Lawrence River. Meanwhile, Poutrincourt had written on 8 October 1608 to Pope Paul V that his one desire was to

\[
devote [himself] to the glory of Christ and the salvation of the people...who live in the unexplored region destined to become a New France.... [His] sole wish was to win over to Christ those scattered populations on the territo- ries ceded to [him] by royal edict...\]

Historian Marcel Trudel has noted, however, that Poutrincourt was basically a trader, and consequently was motivated by certain less devout considerations: "In 1610 the baptism of Indians was of interest to Poutrincourt only for promotional ends[;]...the serious conversion of the Indians was of little importance."

Whether Poutrincourt was interested in the resettling of Acadie for the glory of France, for the Christianization of the Indians—or so he could leave his two sons substantial estates in North America—the problem of resettlement was still a financial one. He was determined, however, to return. It took two years to gain royal and papal support, secure funding, and make all the necessary arrangements. Finally, Poutrincourt resolved to "wait no longer on anyone, but to trust only to himself," and on 25 February 1610 he put to sea from Dieppe. Accompanying him were his son Charles de Biencourt, Poutrincourt’s wife Claude Pajot, the two La Tours—father and

---

20. Marc Lescarbot, Nova Francia, pp. 612-615; Clarence-J. d’Entremont, Histoire du Cap-Sable de l’an mil au Traité de Paris (1763) (Eunice, LA: Hébert, 1981), II, 382. All translations from the French are by the author, unless otherwise stated. Father Raymond Melanson, C.J.M. of Sainte-Anne-du-Ruisseau, Yarmouth Co., N.S. spent some time in the Vatican Archives attempting to find this letter, but was unable to do so.
22. Lescarbot, Histoire, III, 35.
23. d’Entremont, Cap-Sable, II, 416, agrees with Père Lucian Campeau that Jacques de Salazar, second son of Poutrincourt, never came to Canada. He was, however, named in absentia as godfather to certain of the Indians. Poutrincourt’s wife is said to have been the first European woman to immigrate to Acadie. [Ed. note: MacBeath, "Du Gua de Monts," p. 98, places her arrival in 1611, but notes that there is no conclusive evidence for her presence.]
son, Claude and Charles — the priest Jessé Fléché and Louis Hébert, who had been on the first expedition. The voyage this time was long and troublesome; they were driven within sight of the Azores and were beaten by ill winds for two months, making land at last at Mont-Désert (Blue Hill, Maine). They then crossed the Bay of Fundy to Port-Royal, where they found all intact; Membertou had taken good care of the Habitation.

The first thing Poutrincourt did upon arrival was to ready the soil for planting. The second was to give spiritual instruction to Membertou and his family, so that within a short time twenty-one Micmacs received the sacrament of baptism from Père Fléché. During this period, Poutrincourt also distributed land to twenty-three settlers, giving them the concessions in the form of simple written notes. The colony appeared to be both stable and prosperous, but events overseas soon conspired to draw Poutrincourt back to France in 1611. When he was finally able to return to Port-Royal in 1614, he was to find the settlement in ruins.

In November 1613, Captain Samuel Argall of Virginia demolished the Saint-Sauveur mission at Penobscot and then attacked Port-Royal. He pillaged and burned the buildings, destroyed the crops in the fields and carried off the livestock, while the settlers were busy foraging at Prée Ronde. This forced Poutrincourt to return to France with most of his family and the colonists.

For all intents and purposes, the second effort to settle Port-Royal had come to an abrupt halt. Biencourt and his cousin Charles de La Tour, however, decided to remain in Acadie. They set up fur trading posts at Cap-Sable, Fort Saint-Louis (Villagedale), and at the mouth of the Saint John River, and as a means of survival plied the fish and fur trade along the Acadian coast. In 1615 Poutrincourt died, leaving his seigneur of Port-Royal to Biencourt. Letters from Biencourt to France attest to the latter's feeling of abandonment by the King, especially when at the same time he observed the colonies flourishing in New England and Virginia under English sponsorship. There is no evidence that Biencourt married; his legacy to Acadie upon his death ca. 1623 was to bequeath his worldly goods to his cousin, Charles de La Tour.

24. d'Entremont, Cap-Sable, II, 346. Here d'Entremont cites Rameau de St-Père in his extract from the Archives de la Marine at Paris: "Les concessions données par le Sieur de Poutrincourt sont par simple billets."
25. Ibid., 245.
26. Ibid., 183.
La Tour, accepted by the few remaining French and by the Indians as their leader and chief, became *de facto* commander of Acadie on the death of Biencourt. His first move was to relocate at Cap-Sable, a safer haven from English attack. There he built Fort Lomeron and maintained a relationship with the merchants of La Rochelle through visiting fishing vessels; by 1627, Fort Lomeron (later renamed Fort La Tour) was the only surviving French outpost in Acadie, and in that year La Tour wrote the King requesting assistance and a Royal Commission confirming his succession to Biencourt (Appendix II). At the request of Cardinal Richelieu, who had established the Compagnie de la Nouvelle-France in 1627 for the purposes of trade and settlement, Louis XIII on 8 February 1631 named La Tour governor and lieutenant-general "of the Country of Acadie, Fort Louis and Fort La Tour and the surrounding area," as an associate of the new company (Appendix III).

The colonization of Acadie, which was started in 1604 by de Monts, interrupted in 1607, restored by Poutrincourt in 1610, practically annihilated in 1613, and then held together by a thread by Biencourt and La Tour after 1614, was begun again with new enthusiasm in 1632. In that year, Isaac de Razilly set up a subsidiary of the Compagnie de la Nouvelle-France and called it the Compagnie Razilly-Cordonnier. It included himself, his brother Claude, Jean Cordonnier, a bourgeois merchant of Paris, Louis Motin de Corcelles and Jean LeGrand, King's councillor. Razilly was specifically charged to reclaim and settle Acadie as a French colony, and was appointed lieutenant-general of the colony.

On 8 September 1632 he arrived at LaHève with three vessels, bringing some three hundred *hommes d'élites* as settlers, including about a dozen families. According to Lanctôt, the following were among those who arrived in 1632: Germain Doucet, *dit* (*called or known as*) La Verdure, military officer; Jacques Bourgeois, military officer, his son Pierre and daughter Marguerite; the Bourg family with son Antoine and daughter Perrine; Jehan Terriot and his wife Perrine Brault; Martin Dupuy and his wife Perrine Terriot; Robert Martin, wife Marguerite Landry and son Mathieu; Claude Petipas, wife and

---

27. Ibid., 393, 398. In a letter of 1627 to Richelieu, La Tour says he had "une petite troupe de Français," estimated to be between fifteen and twenty-five men.
son Claude; Michel Boudreau; Pierre Comeau; François Gautherot; Louis Robichaud; and Simon Pelletret 30.

Joan Dawson has noted that Charles de Menou d'Aulnay, under Razilly made frequent visits to France for recruits: "He acted as Razilly's agent on many occasions...negotiating for ships and supplies on behalf of the Company of New France 31." Razilly had also asked Nicolas Le Creux Du Breuil to recruit settlers for the colony, and the latter returned from France in 1636 with seventy-eight persons aboard the Saint-Jehan. The settlement at LaHève had all the earmarks of a seigneur in the making.

Meanwhile, Isaac de Razilly had died unexpectedly in December 1635, leaving his brother Claude de Launay-Rasilly as his heir. Since the latter chose to remain in France, he appointed d'Aulnay to act for him as lieutenant-general and governor in Acadie. This was recognized by Louis XIII in 1638 and confirmed in 1647. In a decision which had far-reaching consequences, d'Aulnay decided to transfer the colony to Port-Royal.

Chapter II

The Seigneurial System in New France and Acadie

The seigneurial system, a method of land tenure in France during medieval times, was introduced into the territory called Canada by a commission given to Jean-François de La Rocque de Roberval by François I in 1540 32. Roberval, as lieutenant-general, was to represent the King, was authorized to grant lands, and was given a monopoly on the fur trade. This commission was the first official document of the new colony, and as such, it provided a "governmental scheme founded on the French model of Seigniorial tenure, 33" which in turn was based on the medieval feudal system.

Following Roberval's death in 1560, sovereignty over this territory lapsed until passed to the Marquis de La Roche-Mesgouez in 1598, with the commission given to him by Henri IV. The territory thus devised included Canada, Hochelaga, the Saguenay, and what we now

32. Dorothy Heneker, "The Seigneurial System in Canada," (No. 7 of the Canadian History Competition, Government of the Province of Québec, 1927), pp. 7, 35.
33. Ibid., pp. 31-35.
know as Newfoundland, Labrador and Nova Scotia. La Roche’s commission as lieutenant-general was little different from Roberval’s earlier one; together, the two documents became the charter of the colony of New France and the source of Samuel de Champlain’s authority in Québec.

The feudal system as it operated in medieval France consisted of a contract drawn up between two individuals, one of whom was called the seigneur and the other the vassal. This contract carried conditions: The seigneur granted land (a fief) to the vassal, who swore an oath of homage and loyalty and was required to perform military service if called upon to do so; the seigneur, in turn, owed his vassal justice and protection. A rich and powerful seigneur would grant many concessions of land and would have numerous vassals at his command, thus forming an extended feudal group. A secondary group, called serfs, obtained land either from the seigneur or his vassal, and were therefore subordinate landowners or tenants. They paid rents and met the economic needs of both groups, which were bound together by the land.

Over time, the seigneurial system in France came to be governed by a system of customary and unwritten laws, whereby regulations from various regions of the country were drawn together to form the basis of a code of law. These regulations derived from long practice, or customs; those applying to a wide geographical area — sometimes an entire province — were termed general customs, while those pertaining to a specific area or instance were referred to as local customs. This codification, with some local modifications, formed the foundation for the introduction of the seigneurial system into New France.

In 1627, Cardinal Richelieu granted the Compagnie de la Nouvelle-France the right to make grants of land under seigneurial tenure and to appoint senior officials to the colony. The Compagnie used the Coutume de Paris as its code of law. Under this general law, land grants were made specifying what forms of justice (high, medium or low) could be administered by the seigneur. High justice governed criminal behaviour, while medium and low governed civil affairs and matters of lesser importance. Local governors were appointed with civil and military powers, along with an agent to handle the colony’s finances. Although it had been intended for the Compagnie to develop New France as a quasi-independent commercial venture, the huge expenses of colonization ultimately defeated this initial purpose;

34. Ibid., p. 10.
in 1663, New France became a royal province under the Crown. Under this monarchical and paternalistic régime, social order was status-oriented, stratified, and in its rites and terminology was a direct importation of the old feudal system of France.

The term seigneur, in its broadest sense, could signify the King of France, the Minister of the Marine, senior members of the Compagnie de la Nouvelle-France, or the governor of a colony such as Acadie or Québec. All seigneurs had the power to grant and distribute land and all were entitled to an oath of fealty for concessions granted. In its narrowest sense, the term seigneur could also mean merely a land-settling agent. It is in this latter sense that we will refer to the seigneurs of Acadie.

The seigneur, as a land-settling agent, was accorded his status in one of several ways: through inheritance; by being a member of the lesser nobility; as a reward for services rendered the Crown; or by possession of a commission such as that of Governor — though not all governors were seigneurs. Michel Trudel has noted that in Acadie the "Seigneury was not simply a gift from the state in recompense to an individual, nor was it given him for the pleasure of making him a great land proprietor. He who became a Seigneur became a promoter of colonization and had to accept a whole series of duties which had been ordained him."

As noted above, the seigneurial system on this side of the Atlantic was status-ordered, with the seigneurial power to grant land coming from the King of France through the colonial governors. Andrew H. Clark has given an accurate summation of the system as it operated in Acadie by observing that:

following the Coûtume de Paris or one of the similar 'customs' which traditionally established the relationship of people in medieval societies to each other and to the land, ... most Acadians must have assumed that everyone must indeed hold land as a concession from some lord.

36. Acadie had seven seigneur-governors: Charles de Saint-Etienne de La Tour, Charles de Menou d'Aulnay, Emmanuel Le Borgne, his son Alexandre Le Borgne de Belle-Isle, Isaac de Razilly, Michel Lenoef de La Vallière et de Beaubassin, and Nicolas Denys.
[seigneur] who held [it] in turn from some superior lord or, ultimately, the crown.

Next in line to the governors were the intendants who, like ombudsmen, held the important job of monitoring the interrelationship between governors, seigneurs and residents of the seigneury (censitaires). The intendant, trained in the law, saw that the Code of Laws as established by royal decree in 1663 was adhered to. Additionally, he supervised all regulations, presided over meetings of the Conseil Souverain (Sovereign Council), and ensured that all honours and rights accruing to both seigneurs and censitaires were properly observed, and that the seigneurs did not exact more than their just due.

No seigneur could keep an entire seigneury for his exclusive personal use. His portion was the domaine, the size of which varied from one seigneury to another. Lots ceded to the censitaires averaged 3 x 30 leagues (approx. 9 x 90 miles) in size. Church lands were granted from the seigneurial domaine, with the seigneurial manor usually found next to the church. An area called the common provided a free communal tract which could be used for shipbuilding or cattle-grazing. The seigneur had certain duties toward the state. He was expected to pay homage; present an enumeration of his seigneurial fief, including a statement of cens et rentes (literally, a census and rent roll); reserve for the King all oak trees grown on the land, similarly all mines and minerals; and transfer seigneuries only in direct succession, or if sold, to pay 1/5 of the income to the state.

Again, the seigneur had duties toward his censitaires, the most important of which was that of Tenir feu et lieu — literally, to "keep the home fires burning," i.e. to maintain a manorhouse with a responsible tenant. He also was expected to allot lands to anyone who applied, an obligation he was not able to refuse without just cause. In cases of reasonable doubt, the seigneur was required to give temporary title, permitting the habitant to prove he was capable of cultivating his fief. The seigneur also had to build and operate a flour mill, and if he had judicial rights, he had to establish a seigneurial court. The seigneur himself was expected to work on construction and maintenance of roads and bridges under the supervision of the Captain of the Militia, usually the most respected man among the censitaires, and

39. Eccles, France, pp. ii and 72; Trudel, Seigneurial Regime, p. 11.
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a key figure in the feudal relationship. According to Eccles, "The inhabitants were better off than most of Europe's rural population. They were not completely removed from the seat of power because of the role played by the Captain of the Militia".

In return for the above, the seigneur could expect various honours and rights, most importantly fealty and homage from his various fiefs. From his censitaires he received cens or rent; this was usually calculated at two sous per arpent of land frontage, but could also be tendered in pelts or produce. Payment was submitted on a predetermined day of the year, usually a religious feast day or the seigneur's personal feast day or birthday. He was also given a free pew in a prominent place — usually in the right front of the church — and he had the right of burial under this pew. In processions he was given preferred status, walking directly behind the curé or priest.

There were also duties and rights expected of and by the censitaires. Each had the right to receive a concession of land and to have a responsible person residing in the seigneurial manor. Each was expected to subscribe to the needs of the church, to live on the land he had been allotted, and to pay dues in the form of cens et rentes to the manorhouse on a prescribed day each year. Each was expected to cultivate the land and live amicably with his neighbours, giving them a right-of-way when required, as well as permission to construct communal roads. Finally, each was to bequeath his land in succession. If the censitaire failed to meet all these obligations, his land would revert back to the seigneurial domaine.

The seigneurial system was successful in the early years of Acadie and served to promote colonization. It created a solidarity and a sort of national unity. It was also the only known land-holding system of that time. There were both positive and negative consequences flowing from this way of life. The settlers found themselves in a fairly ordered society. The censitaire, wherever he might settle, was not isolated. He was close to a manorhouse and had the use of a mill. The seigneur and the censitaire found themselves on, if not an equal, then a closely parallel footing. Both shared the work of the church and helped to support it. Both, in their respective ways, toiled on the land and worked to develop it. The system was suited to a society in its formative years.

On the negative side, the seigneurial system of itself could not attract settlers. In addition, it needed the supervision and cohesive

force of the state in order to survive. One of the most disruptive forces of the system was that grants were poorly described and often overlapped geographically. In addition, prior grants were barely extinguished before new ones involving the same territory were made. For example, in 1638 the King of France granted Charles de Saint-Etienne de La Tour peninsular Nova Scotia — but not Port-Royal, where Charles de Menou d'Aulnay had established himself. Subsequently d'Aulnay was granted the northern coast of the Bay of Fundy, where the fur trade was the most lucrative — but not Fort Sainte-Marie, where La Tour had erected his fort at the mouth of the Saint John River. It would seem that the distribution in France of lands in Acadie was in the hands of people who were not familiar with its geography.

To understand the seigneurial system as it existed in Acadie from 1635 to 1710, one must take into account that the colony during this period changed hands between the English and French at least eight times. This made it incredibly difficult to govern the various developing areas. Furthermore, during the combative governorships of d'Aulnay and La Tour from 1632 to 1650, the Acadians were very much left to fend for themselves. Many of the land-holding seigneurs in Acadie also never settled their lands — for example Paul Dupuy, who received the area today known as Cap-Pelé. Some held their seigneurial grant for a few days only and then passed it on to another, as did Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville et d'Ardillières who received the Restigouche area on 26 May 1690, and two days later devised it to Richard Denys. In other cases, seigneurs were conceded one area, but decided to settle in another. This occurred, for example, when Louis Damours de Chauffours received the seigneurie of Richibouctou in 1684, but moved to Jemseg on the Saint John River in 1686, a seigneurie previously owned by Pierre de Joybert de Soulanges.

The following chapters of this study will examine those areas in which the seigneurial system had the greatest influence in the development of Acadie: Cap-Sable, Port-Royal and Minas, Cobequid and Beaubassin.

42. Ibid., pp. 11-15, 17 and 20.
43. Ibid., p. 20.
Chapter 3

The Barony of Pubnico, the Seigneurie of Port-Royal and the Lands of the Minas Basin

Just as the first seigneurial grants at Québec were parceled out along the St. Lawrence River, the Port-Royal seigneurie was settled along the shores of the Port-Royal (Annapolis) Basin, the shores of the Port-Royal (Annapolis) River and inland along the Petite (Allain) River.

The area at Port-Royal where d’Aulnay transplanted Razilly’s settlers was on a "point of land where M. d’Aulnay had a Fort built" — the site of the second Port-Royal Habitation (now Annapolis Royal). By 1688, Governor Louis-Alexandre Des Friches de Meneval reported that the "Settlers were dispersed, far from one another in an area six or seven leagues above and along the shores of the Port-Royal River". Meanwhile, Nicolas Denys, an eyewitness to the early settlement, described the beautiful location and excellent anchorage for large vessels, noting especially

the quantity of prairies on each side upriver from the Fort. There is a very large stretch of prairie which is covered by the tide and which d’Aulnay had dyked. Presently it bears good wheat and since the English have been masters of the land, the inhabitants who had been living near the Fort have gone and settled upriver. They have their dykes above the large prairie, which is presently owned by Mme. de La Tour, and where they have again dyked more land. This land bears wheat more abundantly than the wheat cultivated around the Fort, though that wheat was very good...".

In 1647, d’Aulnay had been confirmed as governor of all the "territory, coasts, and confines of l’Acadie, beginning at the large river Saint Lawrence as far as Virginia"; and as lieutenant-general for the Compagnie de la Nouvelle-France at Port-Royal, LaHève, and Sainte-Croix. La Tour was lieutenant-general for the Compagnie at Cap-Sable and at the Saint John River. However, d’Aulnay refused to surrender to La Tour the Pentagouët fort which the King had ceded

44. Clark, Acadia, p. 132; translated from the French.  
to La Tour's father\textsuperscript{46}. Both lieutenants-general were therefore living in each other's territory and encroaching on each other's prerogatives. The rivalry between the two men has been well-told by many historians\textsuperscript{47} and ended only with the drowning death of d'Aulnay in 1650, after which a measure of peace settled on the colony. A period of land expansion and consolidation followed.

The Barony of Pubnico

In one of the first manifestations of this new era of stability, on 15 July 1653 La Tour ceded to his childhood friend, Philippe Mius d'Entremont, a grant of land "with the title of Barony and noble Fief, including high, medium and low justice,...and as the dominant Fief it began at a place called Vieux Logis...an extension of land one league wide and four leagues deep at a place called Pobomcoup...starting from the said place Vieux Logis...\textsuperscript{48}" This barony extended from present-day Pubnico Head to Shag Harbour, Shelburne Co., N.S. Four weeks later, on 8 September 1653, La Tour ceded the border concession of Vieux Logis to Antoine Hervieux; this was not a full seigneurie, but a grant "one quarter of a league wide and two deep at an area called Pobomcoup, with Justice and Seigneurie as a noble fief...[and] with the right to fish and hunt...\textsuperscript{49}" This fief was subsequently inherited through a cognatic descendancy (i.e. from a common ancestor) by François Amirault, the first of that surname to settle in Acadie\textsuperscript{50}.

In granting these concessions, La Tour accorded his \textit{censitaires} the right to criminal and civil justice. He also stipulated that a beaver pelt or beaverskin pouch, plus two \textit{bouquets} in rent, were to be paid annually on St-Jean-Baptiste day, and he additionally requested, with

\textsuperscript{46} Lanctôt, \textit{L'Acadie des origines}, p. 49.

\textsuperscript{47} d'Entremont, Nicolas Denys, pp. 285 and 313 recount some of their exploits. At one time, d'Aulnay burned an Indian cabin at Cap-Sable, imprisoned the husband and fathered a child by the wife. In the same area, he went on to burn Fort Saint-Louis, as well as a monastery and a chapel belonging to the Recollet Fathers, before proceeding to besiege and capture Fort La Tour on the Saint John River. D'Aulnay was drowned, 24 May 1650, and his widow, Jeanne Motin, subsequently marr. in 1653, as his third wife, Charles de La Tour; the marriage contract specifically noted that the union was for the "peace and tranquillity of the country." See Rumilly, \textit{L'Acadie française}, p. 93.

\textsuperscript{48} d'Entremont, \textit{Cap-Sable}, II, 294. Mius d'Entremont was of the French nobility, hence the designation \textit{barony}.

\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 295.

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 355. He was a soldier who had arrived aboard l'Orangier.
regard to the fief of Vieux Logis, that he receive a "sword...each year". Meanwhile, on 17 July 1654, Charles La Tour père was taken prisoner and sent to England; his wife Jeanne Motin was authorized to remain at Port-Royal with her children. La Tour was not able to return until 1656, whereupon he retired to Cap-Sable and died there in 1666. Later, Charles La Tour’s son, also called Charles, inherited feudal rights over the Pobomcoup barony as the senior representative of the several La Tour families then in Acadie. He demanded of the incumbent at Pubnico, Joseph Mius, dit d’Azy, cens et rentes amounting to £2 sterling and two capons. Since La Tour fils (junior) resided in the seigneury of Port-Royal, annual dues were to be paid at his manor, situated on the upper part of the Annapolis River.

The Barony of Pobomcoup, instituted in perpetuity, continued intact until the time of Le Grand Dérangement — the Expulsion of the Acadians, in 1755. By a judgement of the King made on 20 March 1703, the La Tour heirs were formally confirmed in their ownership of the seigneuries of Port-Royal, Les Mines (Grand-Pré), the Vieux Logis and Port-La Tour. These holdings, formerly under dispute, were now divided equally among seven claimants: Charles La Tour fils; Anne La Tour, wife of Jacques Mius d’Entremont; Anne Melanson, widow of Jacques La Tour; Marguerite La Tour, widow of Abraham Mius d’Entremont; Marie La Tour, widow of Alexandre Le Borgne de Belle-Isle; and the two remaining shares to the children of the widow Belle-Isle.

The theory and practice of transferring seigneurial lands from the Acadians to the British Crown have been discussed in full by Clarence-J. d’Entremont in Volume IV of his Histoire du Cap-Sable. The final purchase of all the La Tour lands and seigneuries was made on 19 September 1734 by representatives of the British Crown. By this agreement, Agathe La Tour Bradstreet Campbell, daughter of Jacques La Tour and granddaughter of the governor and proprietor of Acadie, Charles de La Tour, received only 2,000 livres for her inheritance.

The Seigneury of Port-Royal

Emmanuel Le Borgne was a prosperous merchant of La Rochelle who had loaned large sums of money to d’Aulnay. In the aftermath of the latter’s sudden death in 1650, Le Borgne moved quickly to

51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., III, 1384.
consolidate his own position in Acadie by coming out to Port-Royal in 1653 and seizing much of d’Aulnay’s real estate. As Denys noted, the Sieur Le Borgne of La Rochelle, put himself in a position, by a parliamentary decree from Paris, as creditor of Sieur d’Aulnay, for Pentagouët, Port-Royal and LaHève, first habitation of Sieur de Razilly where he had made large expenditures for his buildings, fortifications, and for bringing over habitants,...he thought himself Seigneur of all that country as creditor of Sieur d’Aulnay.

Le Borgne also had Jeanne Motin (now La Tour), sign a document acknowledging a debt of over 200,000 livres owed him, Le Borgne, by her first husband, Charles d’Aulnay. She refused to pay him that amount, claiming that justification of the debt was not made available to her; she did, however, let Le Borgne have the revenues and produce of d’Aulnay’s properties for nine years.

Le Borgne returned to Port-Royal in 1654 aboard the Châteaufort, which was "loaded with all sorts of merchandise, food and ammunition worth at least 75,000 livres." Most importantly, he brought new settlers to Port-Royal, adding to the Acadian population. These new arrivals included the Daigles and the Forests, and his own son, Alexandre Le Borgne de Belle-Isle, who would become the next seigneur of Port-Royal. The latter community was under English ownership from 1654 to 1667, and during this period Alexandre served as temporary governor and representative of his father’s interests in Acadie. By the Treaty of Breda, 31 July 1667, France received her colonies back from England; Alexandre was subsequently replaced as governor by Hector d’Andigné, Sieur de Grandfontaine, but retained his authority as seigneur of Port-Royal.

According to François-Marie Perrot, governor of Acadie from 1684-87, Belle-Isle "considered himself Seigneur of Port-Royal and distributed lands too readily, that is concessions too vast to title holders incapable of cultivating them." The subsequent governor, Louis-Alexandre Des Friches de Meneval acknowledged in 1689 Alexandre de Belle-Isle’s title to most but not all of the Port-Royal
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lands, but the next governor, Joseph Robineau de Villebon, complained that Belle-Isle had not fulfilled his seigneurial duties, especially the development of the lands, and that he had no right to charge the English fifty livres per vessel to trade at Port-Royal.

The Lands of the Minas Basin

That the descendants of the first colonists at Port-Royal should spread out along the coastal waters of Acadie is not surprising. Families at that time were large, and sons and daughters obviously needed their own homes. Travel in the colony was mainly by boat. Much of the land near the water had been reclaimed by the building of aboiteaux (dykes) and since the houses were built near water, inland roads were not a priority.

Along the shores of the Bassin des Mines (Minas Basin) were developed gradually settlements at Pisiquid (Windsor), Les Mines (Grand-Pré), Rivière aux Canards (Canard), Rivière de la Vielles Habitants (Habitant Creek), Rivière Gaspereau (Gaspereau River), and Rivière des Habitants (Cornwallis River). These four rivers all flowed into the Minas Basin.

As Governor Villebon noted in 1699, "A great advantage to Port-Royal is its nearness to Minas, by sea 7 leagues, by boat up the head of the tide of the Port-Royal river 6 leagues and 13 leagues on a good level road." Further northeast along the Fundy shore, the Shubenacadie River and the rivers Dugas, Aucoin (Salmon River) and Chiganois flowed into Cobequid Bay.

There were no seigneurial grants as such given out for the Minas area, but one was given for Cobequid and another for Shubenacadie. The Minas area was first settled by Pierre Terriot (son of Jean Terriot) and several of his young nephews. Mathieu de Goutin, lieutenant-general for justice in Acadie, writing in 1694 noted that Terriot's home was "a haven of all the orphans and men in need; one should not be surprised to see his nephew living with him, since three or four of his other nephews did the same while waiting until their homes became livable."

58. Clark, Acadia, p. 119.
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Pierre Melanson, dit La Verdure was a son of Pierre La Verdure, a French Huguenot, and an Englishwoman named Priscilla. He, along with two brothers and his parents, arrived in Acadie aboard the Satisfaction in 1657. His brother Charles settled at Port-Royal, his other brother John went to the Azores, and Pierre himself settled about 1680 in the area which came to be known as Grand-Pré. Other colonists in the area developed villages named after the predominant founding family, including settlements named Landry, Terriot, LeBlanc and Hébert. The lands at Grand-Pré flooded daily, and by establishing dykes the settlers were able to recover large tracts of land from the tidal Minas Basin. The land thus recovered from the sea became very fertile ground in future years.

At the Rivière aux Canards, the parish of Saint-Joseph was established in 1688 or 1689; the church had a bell and the interior was sculptured in oak. The parish at Grand-Pré was Saint-Charles-des-Mines. The settlements at Pisiquid and Sainte-Croix formed the parishes of Assumption and Sainte-Famille.

Though Pierre Melanson and Pierre Terriot were colonizers in the true sense of the word, they were not designated seigneurs. Yet the Minas Basin region was considered a seigneurie in 1703 when a judgement was made by the Conseil d'Etat in favour of the La Tour heirs. The seigneurie was described then as "consisting of six leagues...beginning at and including the first house which faces on the one side Port-Royal."

In 1671, Governor Grandfontaine had ordered that a census of Acadie be taken by Père Laurent Molin, curé at Port-Royal. The latter counted only the families of Port-Royal, Cap-Sable and Cap-Nègre (Cape Negro). In Port-Royal there were 58 families, consisting of 56 married men, 3 single men, 3 widowers, 54 married women, 2 widows and 227 children. They owned a total of 829 horned animals, 399 sheep and had 417 arpents of land under cultivation. Cap-Sable had 3 families (3 men, 3 women) and 8 children, with 12 horned animals and 12 goats. At Cap-Nègre there was one family (one man, one woman) with two children, 25 animals, 24 goats and two arpents of garden.

63. d'Entremont, Cap-Sable, III, 1296.
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By 1686 Port-Royal had grown to 95 families, with 197 men and women, 218 boys, 177 girls, 75 rifles, 643 horned animals, 377 arpents under cultivation and 627 sheep. The 1686 enumeration encompassed most of Acadie, including Port-Royal, Cap-Sable, LaHève, Rivière St-Jean, Pentagouët, Beaubassin, Les Mines, Chedabouctou, Nepisiquit and Ile Percée. There was a total of 885 people, 222 rifles, 986 horned animals, 896 arpents of land under cultivation, 759 sheep and 608 pigs\textsuperscript{65}.

A 1710 map of Port-Royal shows an extensive community around the area of the second settlement, including sixteen houses and a chapel built along the edge of the Annapolis Basin. Most of these houses were owned by the local élite of the time, i.e. the surgeon Pontiff; Jean-Baptiste Rodrigue, the King’s pilot; Jean-Chrysostome Loppinot, the King’s attorney; Madame Louise Damours de Freneuse; and the governor, Jacques-François de Monbeton de Brouillan. Inland from the fort and along the Petite (Allain) River was a hospital and a row of widely separated houses, owned by the censitaires. With time, each of the settlers cleared land near their homes. On high ground and away from the tidal waters they planted apple, pear and cherry trees, all brought over from France after 1630 by the Récollet fathers to Cap-Sable, and from there to Port-Royal\textsuperscript{66}. A 1733 map of the Annapolis River shows an extended settlement along the Annapolis Basin and upriver, including the names of the inhabitants.


\textsuperscript{66} Lanctôt, L’Acadie des origines, p. 45.
CONCORDAT ENTRE LES MICMACS ET L’ÉGLISE

Père Anselme Chiasson, cap.

Dans le Cahier 25, n° 1, pages 5 et 6, nous publiquions un article sur le prétendu Concordat entre les Micmacs et l’Église, et nous nous demandions s’il était une réalité ou une légende. Nous terminions en affirmant que si entente il y eut, il était plus probable qu’elle fut faite avec l’Église de France qu’avec le Vatican. Or, après recherches effectuées, il semble peu probable qu’il y ait eu entente entre les Micmacs et l’une ou l’autre de ces institutions.

Quant au Vatican, voici ce que des recherches ont donné.

Le Père Jacques Bleau, Capucin canadien à Rome, à qui le curé de la réserve de Ristigouche avait demandé de faire des recherches à ce sujet, répondait le 21 juillet 1994:

J’ai pu contacter... un certain monsieur Matteo San Filippo, membre du Centre académique canadien à Rome, actuellement recherchiste aux Archives du Vatican pour le compte du gouvernement canadien. Il s’est montré très intéressé à la question, mais ses recherches n’ont pas abouti à trouver un document qui justifierait l’existence d’une entente (certainement pas un concordat) entre le Saint-Siège et le Grand Conseil de la nation micmaque. Au sujet du Père Jesse Fléché, il n’a trouvé aux Archives vaticanes que peu d’informations valables (ex. il a été missionnaire au Canada) ... Il m’a laissé entendre également que le Père Fléché aurait eu sa manière à lui d’être missionnaire et qu’il soit possible qu’il ait fait lui-même des ententes non nécessairement ratifiées par le Saint-Siège. La photocopie que les Micmacs seraient fiers d’avoir du document d’une entente entre le Saint-Siège et le Grand Conseil de la nation micmaque reste donc pour l’instant une belle feuille toute blanche.

La chose n’est guère probable non plus du côté de l’Église de France.

Vu que le roi Henri IV avait en 1607 « permis à Jean de Biencourt de Poutrincourt de maintenir son entreprise de colonisation
en Acadie... à la condition d’y conduire quelques jésuites pour l’évangélisation des Indiens¹», et que Poutrincourt qui ne souhaitait pas la présence des jésuites avait emmené Jesse Fléché à leur place, il est aussi peu probable qu’il y ait eu entente entre la nation micmaque et l’Église de France, trop respectueuse de la volonté du roi pour agir ainsi.

Voici une autre hypothèse plausible. L’abbé Fléché qui, à peine un mois après son arrivée en Acadie, baptisa le chef Membertou et une centaine des siens, « avait cédé, semble-t-il, aux pressions de Poutrincourt, qui voulait, en manifestant son zèle pour l’évangélisation, conserver la faveur royale, obtenir l’appui des personnes pieuses et riches et, par la même occasion, prouver à la cour que le ministère des jésuites n’était pas, somme toute, nécessaire en Acadie²». Alors, vu cette hâte et cet intérêt de Poutrincourt et cette manière peu orthodoxe qu’avait l’abbé Fléché de faire des chrétiens, ne peut-on pas penser qu’ils auraient eux-mêmes pu faire cette entente, avec beaucoup appareil peut-être, mais sans aucune ratification d’une autorité supérieure?

---

1. André Vachon, Jesse Fléché, Dictionnaire biographique du Canada, volume premier, de l’an 1000 à 1700, les Presses de l’Université Laval, p. 315-316.
2. Ibid.
COMPTE RENDU


En dépit du fait que la majorité des habitants des provinces atlantiques de la période avant l'Entre-deux-guerres demeurait toujours dans des communautés dites rurales, très peu de l'historiographie portant sur cette région tient compte de la population vivant en ce milieu. Même l'ouvrage récent *The Atlantic Provinces in Confederation*1 démontre un parti pris pour le contexte urbain dans ses sections traitant des années 1867-1920. À titre d'exemple, Ramsay Cook faisait la remarque suivante au sujet de la contribution de Larry McCann à ce volume: « [...] his insistence on urban-industrial change may be exaggerated at the expense of rural development [...]». *Contested Countryside* paraît alors dans le but de réintégrer la vie rurale dans l'historiographie du Canada atlantique au XIXe siècle. Par ailleurs, les auteurs visent à mettre en évidence les complexités de l'existence humaine en milieu rural. Depuis longtemps présenté comme un monde homogène, statique et entièrement dépendant des activités agricoles pour sa survie, la population rurale a en fait été beaucoup plus dynamique, ayant recours au travail rémunéré industriel comme supplément à son revenu et contribuant activement à la restructuration des relations entre ruraux et citadins. Les articles se retrouvant dans ce livre rendent compte de quelques unes de ces complexités.

Rusty Bitterman débute la collection en s'attaquant au mythe du franc-tenant indépendant qui était réputé être fort répandu en Amérique du Nord dans la première moitié du XIXe siècle. En effet, l'auteur démontre d'une façon convaincante que le personnage en question dépendait davantage sur un travail salarié. D'ailleurs, l'article

---

d’Erik Kristiansen attribue en partie l’origine de cette mythologie aux écrits littéraires de Charles Bruce et de Ernest Buckler. Comme contrepoids au monde urbain des années 1950 jugé néfaste, ces écrivains ont dépeint le monde rural du siècle dernier comme étant idyllique, habité par des hommes et des femmes vivant de manière autonome des fruits de la terre. Bon nombre des images retenues par la société contemporaine de cette ère nous parviennent de ces récits. Pour sa part, Steven Maynard contredit l’idée jusqu’alors incontestée de l’absence de relations conflictuelles entre paysans de la même localité. En fait, plusieurs litiges entre ruraux sont survenus lors de l’implantation graduelle de l’économie de marché. Les relations se sont également envenimées entre agriculteurs et industriels. Selon Bill Parenteau, les fermiers qui pratiquaient la coupe du bois en plus de leurs activités agricoles se sont opposés aux grandes compagnies forestières, évitant du même coup la prolétarisation des masses rurales. L’article de Daniel Samson s’oriente dans le même sens. Il relate l’histoire des habitants de la campagne néo-écossaise qui ont cherché du travail dans les mines de charbon à Inverness, provoquant ainsi une rivalité entre la direction et les ouvriers qualifiés au sujet de la place des nouveaux venus au sein du syndicat. L’épisode fait état de l’influence que la campagne pouvait exercer sur la ville. Enfin, Sean Cardigan démontre comment les Terre-Neuviens ont fait à part en traitant de l’exploitation de l’industrie de la pêche par les puissants marchands, ce qui s’est fait au détriment du développement d’un marché intérieur et d’une vie économique prospère et diversifiée pour les habitants de l’île.

Dans les dernières pages du volume, Samson résume l’orientation générale des ouvrages ci-rassemblés en les termes suivants : « Far from being simple, the countryside was vastly complex. Here, indeed, is the stuff of rural history : of recognizing the variable bases and possibilities which existed within what we once thought whole. » (p. 269). À ce niveau, Contested Countryside constitue un franc succès. On peut toutefois déplorer l’absence d’un article portant sur les Acadien-ne-s du XIXe siècle rural. Une nouvelle génération d’historiens ont, eux aussi, découvert les complexités de la réalité acadienne aux Maritimes. Loin de constituer un monolithe « enraciné » dans le silence, les Acadiens ont également contesté à leur manière les contraintes de la vie sociale. Nonobstant cette carence, la qualité des contributions contenues dans ce livre demeure incontestable.

Roy Bourgeois
Conférence publiques

Pour la quatrième année consécutive, la Société historique acadienne offre au public une série de conférences sur l’histoire acadienne. Cette nouvelle série qui a pour thème : « Les Acadiens de la diaspora » a débuté en août dernier par une conférence sur les Acadiens de Belle-Île-en-Mer prononcée par Jean-Marie Fonteneau, conservateur du musée acadien de Belle-Île.


Rappelons que les trois séries antérieures de conférences publiques ont portées respectivement sur L’histoire acadienne, La culture des Micmacs, et Chefs de file acadiens.

Publications spéciales


À la rédaction des Cahiers

Monsieur Robert Pichette vient de terminer son mandat de rédacteur des Cahiers. Aussi la Société historique acadienne tient-elle à lui exprimer sa vive appréciation et ses remerciements sincères pour avoir bénévolement contribué, par un excellent travail, à faire connaître l’histoire acadienne.
Au nouveau rédacteur, Monsieur Maurice Basque, historien, la Société le remercie, à l'avance, de son aimable collaboration.
À l'occasion de la nouvelle année 1995, je désire exprimer à tous les membres, mes meilleurs voeux de santé, de succès et de joie.

Léone Boudreau-Nelson
Présidente de la SHA

Le conseil d'administration de la Société historique acadienne (1994-1995)

Dans la photo, de gauche à droite, assis : Honoré Bourque, vice-président; Léone Boudreau-Nelson, présidente; Alyre Cormier, trésorier; Fernand Arsenault, secrétaire; deuxième rangée : Léona Cormier, conseillère; Edmond Babineau, fonds de fiducie; Bernard Poirier, conseiller; Alonzo LeBlanc, président sortant; P. Anselme Chiasson, conseiller à vie; Lewis LeBlanc, conseiller; Evangéline Roy, secrétaire adjointe. Absent de la photo : Maurice Basque, rédacteur des Cahiers.
Lancement de *Les Curés, notices biographiques*


Lancement du *Cahier spécial sur la Généalogie*

Dans la photo, de gauche à droite : Stephen White, généalogiste et auteur du Cahier spécial; Son Excellence Monsieur Alfred Siefer-Gaillardin, Ambassadeur de France au Canada; Léone Boudreau-Nelson, présidente de la Société historique acadienne; Robert Pichette, rédacteur des Cahiers de la SHA.
35ᵉ anniversaire

C’est par un voyage en France que la Société historique acadienne marquera d’une façon spéciale le 35ᵉ anniversaire de sa fondation. Un voyage de quinze jours qui, du 24 mai au 7 juin 1995, permettra de découvrir la beauté grandiose des paysages de la côte ouest de la France ainsi que les richesses ancestrales et culturelles de lieux chers aux Acadiens.

Au large de la côte de Bretagne, une île émerge fièrement des eaux de l’Atlantique, c’est Belle-Île-en-Mer. Son nom est évocateur d’histoire. À son port d’entrée, Le Palais, se dresse une imposante citadelle, autrefois utilisée pour la défense de l’île, aujourd’hui pour servir de garde au musée que renferme son enceinte. Ce musée, témoin de la présence des descendants acadiens de Belle-Île, est celui qui, en août dernier à Moncton, a été jumelé avec le Musée Acadien de l’Université de Moncton.

L’enchanteur se poursuit avec la variété et la richesse des étapes du voyage : Vannes, Nantes, Angers, La Rochelle, Rochefort, Royan, L’Île d’Aix, Loudun, Châtellerault, Marennes, Brouage (qui célébrera l’an prochain le 360ᵉ anniversaire de la mort de Champlain), et la prestigieuse région des vins du Médoc. Aussi, bien entendu, les villes pleines de merveilles que sont Bordeaux et Paris…

Un itinéraire de voyage, si beau soit-il, ne saurait être complet sans les rencontres d’accueil qui d’ores et déjà ont été prévues.

En somme, un voyage de rêve à réaliser!

Pour recevoir le prospectus du voyage s’adresser à:

La Société historique acadienne
C.P. 632, Moncton, N.-B.
E1C 8M7
la société historique acadienne